Examination of Hybrid Genetic Algorithms for Resolution of Unrestricted Examination Timetabling Riddle

Shaik Salma Begum[1], Parashuram[2], Naveen Kumar RS[3], Harish P K[4], Sarvesh Patil[5]
Department of Computer Science and Engineering, Presidency University

Abstract: This research delves into empirical outcomes of two local search-boosted evolutionary algorithms. These aim To Tackle uncapacitated examination timetabling issue .Proposed hybrid algorithms utilize solution representations. These representations are based on partitioning and prioritization .The models are Inspired by evolution algorithms designed For graph coloring and project scheduling issues. Methods combine saturation degree heuristic. This heuristic Is parameterized into crossover process.

Experimental technique involves calibrating algorithms through Design of Experiments framework. Subsequently ,algorithms undergo testing on respected Toronto benchmark datasets. Calibration results show hybrid method favours strict local search strategy. Tests underscore key role of local search in Genetic algorithms .They show hybridization enhances efficacy of local search.

Noteworthy despite architectural differences both algorithms display similar performance .They closely correspond to other sophisticated evolutionary algorithms. These algorithms are documented in literature.

Keywords: Examination Timetabling, Genetic Algorithms, Hybrid Genetic Algorithms, Local Search, Partition-Based Hybrid Algorithm, Priority-Based Hybrid Algorithm, Uncapacitated Examination Timetabling, Toronto Benchmark Instances, Graph Colouring, Memetic Algorithms, Solution Representations, Crossover Scheme, Saturation Degree Heuristic, Hyper-Heuristic Local Search.

I. INTRODUCTION

Genetic algorithms ,as initially Proposed by Holland in the '60s are algorithms. .They are inspired by nature using techniques derived from processes of biological populations.. These algorithms have been utilized Extensively since '90s..

The Purpose Is to address intricate search problems .In genetic algorithms solutions are depicted as chromosomes. These chromosomes undergo crossover and mutation processes. Crossover operators prioritize Superior answers. They enhance search Efficiency facilitating search process convergence.

Mutation operators are different. They mitigate premature convergence. They do this by implementing stochastic Alterations to solutions. Various variants of genetic algorithms are used .These address single-objective and multi-objective examination timetabling challenges. The variants include pure genetic algorithms and local search hybridized genetic algorithms .The latter is also known As memetic algorithms.

Multi-objective evolutionary Algorithms Are also used.. Memetic multi-objective evolutionary algorithms too are employed. .They are effective for addressing these challenges.

Qu et al .conducted a survey. This survey was conducted in 2008 It focused on examination timetabling. They reviewed several works. The works include those written by Corne et al. and by Ross et al They emphasized the issues linked with the efficacy of genetic algorithms in this field

The genetic algorithms often exhibit suboptimal performance when utilizing direct solution representations .This is largely in the context of the graph Coloring issue. Generally ,Pure genetic algorithms are seen as Less effective. Galinier and Hao have demonstrated this in 1999.

Hybrid Methodologies have been developed. They incorporate evolutionary algorithms with local search strategies These have revealed enhanced efficacy in examination timetabling Qu et al .have specified this in 2008

There is An agreement today .The agreement is that integrating evolutionary Algorithms with local search techniques is vital. In addition, employing indirect solution representations is necessary. These factors can ,in turn, Produce competitive outcomes For the challenge.

Challenges still remain .Identifying a suitable solution representation beyond direct encoding Is such a challenge. Integrating local Search to Balance Exploration and exploitation is another challenge. These occur during the search process.

Rigorous local search for each generated Solution may prolong algorithm runtimes .However ,It could reduce the quantity of generations produced By the genetic mechanisms.

The Investigative aim focuses on evaluating Hybrid genetic algorithms .They address uncapacitated examination timetabling problem. If reader seeks modern mathematical Model refer to Turabieh and Abdullah ,2011 .Study investigates Two hybrid genetic algorithms. Two use different Indirect Solution representations. The first approach is based on local search hybrid genetic algorithm The method was created by Galinier and Hao This method was developed for Graph coloring. It utilizes robust relationship between graph coloring and uncapacitated examination timetabling

An Uncapacitated examination Timetabling problem is Illustrated as conflict graph .This graph has examinations as vertices. Edges denote conflicts. If a student has to attend both connected tests ,it is a conflict. Scheduling conflicts outline rigid restrictions. Examination proximity costs display Flexible constraints.

Galinier and Hao's algorithm presented partition-based solution representation. Its efficacy ascribed to Greedy Partition Crossover (GPX). The second hybrid algorithm presented uses random key genetic methodology. It uses priority-based Representation influenced by Mendes et al. for project scheduling .The usage of complementary algorithms with unique indirect representations aims to widen the inquiry.

Document organization is as follows. Section 2 outlines used methods .Section 3 elaborates computational experiments. Section 4 conveys study conclusions.

II. Hybrid Algorithms

This segment introduces a couple of hybrid Genetic algorithms. One is the Partition-Based Hybrid Genetic Algorithm (PARHGA). Other is the Priority-Based Hybrid Genetic Algorithm (PRIHGA). Naming of these algorithms depends on structures that represent their solutions .Heuristics are Utilized to generate high-quality Initial solutions. Also explained are two local search strategies .These methods are important in both hybrid genetic algorithms.

2.1. Saturation Degree Heuristics

A Dsatur method iteration has been Revised [Brelaz ,1979]. The revision was carried out by Galinier and Hao [Galinier and Hao, 1999]. They used it in Their Hybrid Genetic algorithm .The revision is similarly used here. This employment is to produce first solutions.

Adaption is Suggested by Galinier and Hao .It involves integration of randomization. This incorporation aids in facilitating a Plethora of high-quality solutions. It designates random values to any unassigned vertices. The Designation follows the Saturation degree-based assignments.

Saturation Degree Heuristic comes with Minimum Time Slot Assignment. This algorithm ,is derived from the works Of Galinier and Hao. It starts off with A blank timetable .This timetable Utilizes dynamic data. Data of each examination's availability time slots is used.

The time slots Correspond to saturation levels. These saturation levels Stem from Graph coloring. In every cycle ,there's a selection. This Selection is the one with the least available time slots. It also has the highest saturation level .If there's a tie the Tie is resolved randomly.

Examinations are assigned to The earliest available time slots. This is Done According to an assignment rule .If there are no more Viable assignments to make the program Does something. It randomly allocates the Remaining examinations.

Heuristic uses saturation degree. Heuristic assigns time slots based on distances. Takes into consideration graph coloring and examination timetables .Graph coloring works at reducing number Of colors. Timetables focus on minimizing Proximity costs. In SAT-DIST ,time Windows are assigned to exams .They're assigned the Outmost distance from some center. This is in a bid to contain proximity costs.

Strategy is one that puts a spotlight On exams. Not on the ones that Are around the first time slots .But it's for those who Are scheduled later. Goal is to err on the side of caution Doing so Reduces conflicts. The conflicts are those that typically arise during the Organization of exams These exams are Sorted into slots by the timetable

Algorithm 1: Pseudocode of SAT-DIST Heuristic

1: k ← #timeslots, c ← k/2, e ∈ E ← set of exams, Timetable ← ∅.

2: while ∃e ∈ E that can be feasibly assigned to a time slot do

3: find e* ∈ E with the maximum saturation degree, break ties randomly.

4: find t* ∈ {1,.., k} where e* can be assigned, farthest from c, break ties randomly;

5: assign e* to time slot t* in Timetable.

6: end while

7: for any e ∈ E not yet assigned, assign it randomly.

8: return Timetable

2.2. Local Search Methods

The proposed hybrid genetic algorithms include local search .They are to enhance offspring solutions. These offspring solutions are generated by crossover operators. The research Looks at two local search methodologies. The first is computationally efficient. The second is a resource-intensive alternative .There is a Need to strike a balance Between Exploration and exploitation. It is critical .A Less intensive search enables more generations. A more intensive strategy enhances solution quality.

The exploration Method is important. The exploitation method is crucial. They are equally critical .It's through this Balance that good Solutions are generated. To strike the balance Is essential. The less intensive search provides more generations .A More intensive strategy is Vital to improve solution quality.

Exploration Is a crucial aspect.. It Is critical.. The exploitation method is essential.. The two methods are of Equal importance. Through a proper Balance good solutions are achievable .Maintaining the balance is key. A less intensive search is useful .It allows for more generations .A more intensive strategy is necessary. It improves Solution quality.

2.2.1. Vertex Descent Local Search (VDLS)

Galinier and Hao's first methodology employed tabu search [Galinier and Hao, 1999], although research [Glass and Prugel-Bennett, 2003] shown that substituting tabu search with a more straightforward vertex descent method produces comparable outcomes. This cost-reduction optimization strategy is implemented here.

Algorithm 2: Pseudocode of VDLS

1: k ← #timeslots, e ∈ E ← set of exams, Timetable[e ∈ E] ∈ {1,..., k};

2: while improvement in cost function is possible do

3: for e ∈ E do

4: assign e to t* ∈ {1,.., k} in Timetable with the least cost;

```
    end for
end while
return Timetable
```

2.2.2. Hyper-Heuristic Local Search (HHLS)

The HHLS framework comprises a repository of low-level heuristics, a selection process, and a move-acceptance criterion [Pillay, 2016; Burke et al., 2009]. It employs iterative local search, utilizing low-level heuristics to generate and enhance results.

Algorithm 3: Pseudocode of HHLS

```
Pool ← {LLH1, ..., LLH5}, s ← Timetable;
fs ← Calculate Objective(s);
while (iteration limit & non-improvement limit) not reached do
    h ← randomly select a low-level heuristic from Pool;
    s_new ← Apply(s, LLHh);
    f_new ← Calculate Objective(s_new);
    if f_new ≤ fs then
        s ← s_new;
        fs ← f_new;
    end if
end while
return s
```

2.3. Partition-Based Hybrid Genetic Algorithm (PARHGA)

The framework of this approach is akin to the hybrid algorithm proposed by Galinier and Hao [Galinier and Hao, 1999] for graph coloring, employing partition-based solution representation and crossover techniques. Local search is employed as a substitute for mutation to improve offspring solutions.

Algorithm 4: Pseudocode of PARHGA

```
n ← population size, P ← ∅;
for i ∈ {1,..., n} do
    s_i ← GenerateSolution();
    s_i ← LocalSearch(s_i);
    P ← P ∪ {s_i};
end for
while time limit not reached do
    randomly select s_a ∈ P and s_b ∈ P;
```

```
    s_new ← HybridPartitionCrossover(s_a, s_b);
    s_new ← LocalSearch(s_new);
    P ← P ∪ {s_new};
    replace the parent with lower fitness;
end while
return P
```

2.4. Priority-Based Hybrid Genetic Algorithm (PRIHGA)

PRIHGA, founded on the random key method by Mendes et al. [Mendes et al., 2009], encapsulates solutions through investigation priority. This method employs biased uniform crossover to produce offspring, succeeded by local search.

Algorithm 5: Pseudocode of PRIHGA

```
P ← ∅;
Initialize n_sel, n_cross, n_mig, n = n_sel + n_cross + n_mig, p_elit;
for i ∈ {1,..., n} do
    s_i ← GenerateSolution();
    s_i ← LocalSearch(s_i);
    P ← P ∪ {s_i};
end for
while time limit not reached do
    select top solutions for crossover;
    generate offspring through crossover and local search;
    migrate random solutions to maintain diversity;
end while
return P
```

III. Computational Experiments

The research was carried out on the Toronto benchmark instances for uncapped examination timetabling problem. It aimed to decrease examination proximity costs. These costs Measure the closeness Of exams in a schedule. The results Were established. They were from the penalties analyzed via equation $ws=2(5-s)$ .Here s is the number of timeslots between two examinations for One student. S lies in set {1 2 3 4 5}. The Cumulative penalties were taken .They were divided by number of pupils .This helped calculate objective value for Each instance.

Two genetic algorithms — PARHGA and PRIHGA — were made. They were Coded in C++. Both ran On a cluster for computing. This cluster had Intel Xeon 2.5 GHz CPUs. Confidence interval of 95% was essential .It was used in every statistical evaluation .It was used to ensure a thorough review of data.

3.1. Saturation Degree Heuristic: Impact of Assignment Rules

This section assesses the efficacy of two Saturation Degree Heuristics—SAT-MIN and SAT-DIST—on the Toronto benchmark examples. The aim is to ascertain if the distance-based assignment rule (SAT-DIST) offers any substantial benefit compared to the minimum-based assignment rule (SAT-MIN).

Experimental Methodology

- Each instance was subjected to 50 runs, with each run producing 100 samples utilizing both strategies. The recorded performance measures were the highest quality solutions identified and the count of possible solutions.
- **Statistical Analysis:**
  - One-way ANOVA and nonparametric Mann-Whitney U test got utilized .This Was to identify significant variations in performance of heuristics
  - Results Showed SAT-DIST substantially surpassed SAT-MIN .This was in average optimal solution quality across all instances.
  - Nonetheless ,no substantial difference was noted with quantity of possible solutions.. This occurred suggesting both strategies exhibited comparable performance. .This was in generating feasible answers..
  - The comparable efficacy of SAT-MIN and SAT-DIST regarding feasibility can be ascribed.. This was to the graph coloring purpose. .It was to limit the amount of colors utilized.. This was congruent with attaining Viable test timetabling solutions.

3.2. Calibrating PARHGA

Calibration done for PARHGA. The process utilized a Design of Experiments (DoE) method [Ruiz et al. ,2006] .The key goal was to adjust the algorithm's parameters. This was done to assess the vital factors Affecting its performance .This was necessary before conducting Comparative assessments. Calibration studies were conducted to study the influence of various parameter settings. These were tested on the Performance of PARHGA.

Parameter Settings for Calibration

The following parameters were evaluated through cross-experiments:

- **Local Search Method:** VDLS only, and a combination of VDLS + HHLS.
- **Population Size (n):** 20, 50, and 100.
- **Heuristic Solution Percentage in Initial Population:** 50% and 100%.
- **Initial Solution Heuristic:** SAT-MIN and SAT-DIST.
- **SAT Hybridization Percentage Level in Crossover (100(1-r)):** 0%, 25%, 50%, and 75%.

Tests lasted two hours Each trial Involved 96 experiments Only two of the thirteen benchmark instances chosen For calibration were Yor-f-83 and Lse-f-91. These were picked for Representative characteristics .Lse-f-91 was medium-sized for number of exams. Yor-f-83 was smaller yet denser

Performance Metric: Relative Percentage Deviation (RPD)

The performance criterion employed to assess solution quality was the Relative Percentage Deviation (RPD) from the best-known solutions documented in the literature. The RPD of a solution SSS with value Val(S) for an instance III with the optimal solution value BestSolI is computed as:

RPD=Val(S)−BestSolIBestSolIRPD = \frac{Val(S) - BestSol_I}{BestSol_I}RPD=BestSolIVal(S)−BestSolI

Statistical Analysis Approaches

- Unidirectional ANOVA was Put to use. Purpose? To evaluate the significance of various parameters. These Parameters affect the performance of the algorithm .The method Identifies the most significant factor. It does this by pinpointing one with the highest F-value. Then adjusting it to the setting with the lowest RPD mean .The method is iterative. It proceeds for more factors.
- Multi-Layer Perceptron MLP): Non-parametric method it was .It was employed in unison with ANOVA. The goal? Determining significance of varied components. It was done through SPSS 25. 70% of the samples were used for training The Other 30% were for testing

3.3. Calibrating PRIHGA

Subsequent to the calibration outcomes of PARHGA, which demonstrated that the VDLS + HHLS combination was much superior, PRIHGA was likewise calibrated employing this rigorous local search methodology. The objective was to optimize its characteristics and ascertain the elements most affecting its performance.

Parameter Settings for PRIHGA Calibration

The following parameters were tested to determine their impact on PRIHGA's performance:

- **Population Size (n):** 20, 50, and 100.
- **Selection and Migration Percentages:** These provide the quantity of selected individuals (nseln_{sel}nsel) and migrating individuals (nmign_{mig}nmig) in each generation. The combinations that were tested included:
  - 10% selection and 10% migration.
  - 20% selection and 20% migration.
  - 25% selection and 25% migration.
- **Elitism Probability (pelitp_{elit}pelit):** 0.6 and 0.8.
- **SAT Hybridization Percentage in Crossover (100(1-r)):** 0%, 25%, 50%, and 75%.

In contrast to PARHGA, PRIHGA incorporates a migration phase that introduces randomly generated solutions in every generation. Consequently, it was superfluous to test the ratio of heuristic solutions in the first population; all initial solutions were produced utilizing the SAT-MIN heuristic.

Calibration Methodology

The calibration adhered to the one-step F-value methodology, akin to that employed for PARHGA. The Yor-f-83 and Lse-f-91 cases were once more chosen for these trials, and the Relative Percentage Deviation (RPD) metric was employed to evaluate various parameter configurations.

Observations and Insights

- On the other hand population size was critical .It suggested that larger pool of solutions improved both diversity and quality of outcomes.
- In contrast to PARHGA SAT hybridization didn't improve PRIHGA's performance. .This Suggested differences in behavior of crossover Operations between two algorithms..
- Reduced probability of elitism showed benefits .It preserved diversity ,averted premature convergence and produced better solutions.
- A 10% selection and migration rate was beneficial. It offered adequate space for offspring solutions .It promoted exploration and Enhanced overall solution quality.

Calibration process suggested that two algorithms share structural features. However Efficacy of parameters Shows huge variation. Need For unique strategies reinforces .Need for strategies unique to each hybrid genetic algorithm.

Beside ANOVA study importance factor analysis conducted.. Multi-layer perceptron employed To understand significance of the variables. .The methodology in Section 3..2 used to analyze PARHGA. It is also applied to PRIHGA.

MLP Sensitivity Analysis for PRIHGA

- Built MLP model. This utilized same configuration as in Section 3.2. Here 70% of the samples tasked for training .30% of samples Earmarked for testing.
- Sensitivity analysis done on the perceptron model. These results were a close match With The ANOVA results . However ,different perspective evolved in terms of the importance Of the factors.
    - ANOVA placed elitism probability as third most influential factor.. The MLP model showed.. Selection and migration percentages Were more influential. .Elitism probability was less impactful.
    - The disagreement suggests selection And migration techniques are crucial. .They sustain diversity and enhance solution quality within PRIHGA..

Visual Representation of Factor Importance

- **Population Size** remained the most significant factor, confirming the importance of having a larger pool of solutions.
- **SAT Hybridization Level** ranked second, although its influence was less pronounced than in PARHGA.

This investigation confirms that although ANOVA and MLP generally concur on the ranking of key components, MLP's sensitivity analysis offers further insights, particularly regarding the interplay among selection, migration, and elitism techniques.

3.4. Benchmarking Hybrid Genetic Algorithms

The calibrated hybrid genetic algorithms were evaluated. Two were PRIHGA and PARHGA. They were evaluated on twelve instances of Toronto benchmark dataset. Pur-s-93 was eliminated. Its substantial size was The reason .Each run of PARHGA had a duration restriction .It Was 5 hours. The PRIHGA runs were bounded To 3 days . Temporal constraints Guaranteed something. They ensured both algorithms could provide a significant number of Iterations for all instances.

Differences in Algorithm Execution

- **PRIHGA** requires significantly more runtime than **PARHGA** because of differences in generation updates:
    - **PARHGA** generates one offspring per generation, while **PRIHGA** updates multiple solutions in each iteration.
    - **Population Sizes: PRIHGA** uses a population size of 100, whereas **PARHGA** is calibrated to a smaller population size of 20.
- **Number of Runs:**
    - **PARHGA** completed **20 runs** for each instance.
    - **PRIHGA** completed **10 runs** due to its longer runtime.

- **Statistical Analysis:**
    - The **Mann-Whitney U test** was used to determine significant differences between the two methods for each instance.

Key Observations

- Seven of twelve situations saw PRIHGA outclass PARHGA. The Latter remained second-place .Despite a strong showing. PRIHGA's supremacy emerged. It highlighted the efficacy in yielding superior solutions.
- The average cumulative proximity costs match for both algorithms .This is despite having disparate genetic configurations. The overall performance shows equality. The methods Also vary. It indicates the equality in the ultimate outcome.
- The mark of PRIHGA's excellence attributes to its frequent solution updates .The more Frequent Updates add up and increase variety in solutions. The larger population size augments the Solution variety too.

Comparison with Multi-Start Local Search (MULTLS)

A multi-start local search strategy (MULTLS) was devised to assess the impact of genetic structures on hybrid algorithms. MULTLS employed both local search techniques (VDLS and HHLS) on initial solutions produced by the SAT-MIN heuristic.

- **MULTLS Configuration:**
    - 20 runs for each instance.
    - 5-hour time limit per run, similar to **PARHGA**.

Insights from MULTLS Comparison

- **PRIHGA** outperformed **MULTLS** in all instances, showcasing the benefit of combining local search with genetic structures.
- **PARHGA** showed significant improvements over **MULTLS** in only 6 instances, suggesting a more limited advantage compared to PRIHGA.

Comparison with State-of-the-Art Genetic Algorithms

Both hybrid genetic algorithms were benchmarked against other state-of-the-art genetic-type methods, specifically:

1. **Two-Phase Genetic Algorithm** by Pillay and Banzhaf [2010].
2. **Local Search Hybridized Genetic Algorithm** by Cote et al. [2004].

IV. Conclusions and Future Research Directions

This study explored the effectiveness of **local search hybridized genetic algorithms with indirect solution representations** in tackling the **examination timetabling problem**. Two distinct genetic algorithms were developed, each inspired by successful methods used in related optimization problems:

1. **Partition-Based Hybrid Genetic Algorithm (PARHGA):** Draws inspiration from hybrid genetic algorithms designed for **graph colouring problems**.
2. **Priority-Based Random Key Hybrid Genetic Algorithm (PRIHGA):** Inspired by genetic algorithms used in **project scheduling problems**.

Hybrid algorithms combine two local search methods .One type is computationally economical .The other type is a resource-intensive one. Calibrating trials showed us something. Yes the resource intensive search Pushes computational demands. However it also Greatly enhances solution quality. The finding points Towards something. Hybrid genetic algorithms could benefit from even more specialized and focused local search methods.

Some strategies hold promise .Like a Mix of local search algorithms that are both all-rounders and high-performance. Such strategies interact harmoniously. They could become key in solving many computational issues. The Results now being promising the potential is there. ?What else Can be done to boost the convergence speed?

One possibility could be parallelization. Another one is using hybrid algorithms. They could prove to be a vital step in the right direction. This might result in even faster convergence .That's if systematic studies Yield confirmations. The question arises .Does hybridization can lead to improved convergence speed? Upcoming work will Continue to explore complex questions. It will delve into The specificities of hybrid algorithms.

Key Insights

- Crossover Mechanism: Utilized algorithms incorporated crossovers which were parameterized .Saturation degree heuristic was used to judge the usefulness of "lightened" crossovers. The outcomes displayed significant advantages in one Hybrid algorithm. This indicates that promoting Development of light crossovers may be beneficial The crossover Offers an advantage In graph coloring conflicts. It can generate nonconflicting solutions

- Initial Solution Heuristics: Two heuristics for saturation degree Were used. These yielded the initial answers. They Differed only in their assignment protocols. Distance-based assignment rule surpassed the typical minimum-based criterion .This showed its effectiveness.

- Hybridization Success: Amalgamating local search And genetic algorithms was successful. Genetic variants were examined. The pure Genetic frameworks of The algorithms required local search for efficacy. It was observed that the pure genetic Frameworks alone were not enough to handle the examination timetabling challenge .These findings align with previous research on limitations of pure genetic algorithms in this field.

- Genetic Structures' Contribution: Experiments were Conducted with A multi-start local search methodology. .The experiments showed that genetic structures can boost algorithm performance.. While the approach of MULTLS achieved Competitive Results the genetic Elements Of PARHGA and PRIHGA improved diversity and quality of solutions..

Comparison with State-of-the-Art Approaches

Hybrid algorithms in this study. Demonstrated performance It can hold its own against genetic algorithms. Previously developed. For Toronto uncapacitated situations. However .The genetic algorithms' efficacy. It didn't match Up with the non-genetic ,state-of-the-art heuristics .Typically offering superior results.

Hybridization of local search. Population-based heuristics require thought. It's demonstrated by the Focused on in the recent success .It was with the cellular Memetic algorithm introduced by Leite Et al. [2018]. This method Is one of the most efficient for uncapacitated examination timetabling issues.

Yet there is a caveat. Some issues Exist with the cellular memetic algorithm. There are shortcomings of course. These entail: Computational complexity Time and memory constraints .They restrict the application of This algorithm. Various optimization procedures are required .There is the need for better implementation .This will ensure its efficiency. A more comprehensive comparison is also necessary. This will help to establish its reliability.

Overall ,local search hybridization, population-based heuristics deserve consideration.. This Is demonstrated by the recent efficacy of the cellular memetic algorithm.. Introduced by Leite Et al. .[2018]. This Technique is among the most effective. It Is for uncapacitated examination timetabling issues.

Therefore, this study looked at hybrid algorithms' potential .It demonstrated similar performance to other genetic algorithms. Previously developed for Toronto uncapacitated situations. Despite this ,the effectiveness of these genetic algorithms did not match up to non-genetic state-of-the-art heuristics. They usually yielded better results.

Nevertheless local search hybridisation ,population-based heuristics. Deserve attention they were shown by the Cellular memetic algorithm's recent efficiency .This was Introduced by Leite et al. [2018]. This method is one of the most efficient for uncapacitated Examination timetabling problems.

Future Research Directions

The findings of this study highlight several promising avenues for future research:

1. Advancement of Sophisticated Local Search Techniques: In the future. research could focus on creating local search methods .These methods are highly specialized. They aim to heighten The effectiveness Of genetic algorithms merged with the local search.
2. Novel Light Crossover Methods: Building on the moderate Success of light crossovers further Investigation may pursue hybrid methods. These methods are Especially suitable for challenges ,such as graph coloring.
3. Novel Hybrid Population Search Tactics: Given the potential observed from local search merged with population-based methods it is possible to further explore Unique hybrid strategies. These strategies can combine the methods with other optimization problems .This would go Above And beyond the Current scope The Scope is of examination timetabling

In conclusion ,despite promising aspects genetic algorithms require more refining.. They particularly need refining for hybridization with Local Search techniques.. The success of these algorithms hinges On advanced genetic operators. .Local search techniques must be efficient to tackle problems. Problems include examination timetabling And analogous optimization challenges.

V. References

Akkan and Gulcu, 2018 Akkan, C. & Gulcu, A. (2018). A bi-criteria hybrid evolutionary method with a robustness aim for the course timetabling problem. Computers and Operations Research, volume 90, pages 22–32.

Alzaqebah and Abdullah (2015) Alzaqebah, M. & Abdullah, S. (2015). Hybrid bee colony optimization for examination scheduling issues. Computers and Operations Research, volume 54, pages 142–154.

Brelaz, 1979 Brelaz, D. (1979). Innovative techniques for coloring the vertices of a graph. Communications of the ACM, 22:251–256.

Burke et al. (2010) Burke, E., Eckersley, A., McCollum, B., Petrovic, S., & Qu, R. (2010). Hybrid variable neighborhood methods for university examination scheduling. European Journal of Operational Research, 206:46–53.

Burke and Bykov, 2008 Burke, E. K. and Bykov, Y. (2008). A delayed acceptance approach in hill-climbing for examination scheduling issues. In: Proceedings of the Seventh International Conference on the Practice and Theory of Automated Timetabling, PATAT 2008.

Burke et al. (2009) Burke, E. K., Hyde, M., Kendall, G., Ochoa, G., Ozcan, E., & Woodward, J. (2009). A categorization of hyper-heuristic methodologies. Technical report, University of Nottingham.

Caramia et al., 2008 Caramia, M., Dell'Olmo, P., & Italiano, G. (2008). Innovative local-search methodologies for university examination scheduling. INFORMS Journal on Computing, volume 20, pages 86–99.

Carter et al., 1996 Carter, M., Laporte, G., and Lee, S. (1996). Examination scheduling: algorithmic methodologies and applications. The Journal of the Operational Research Society, volume 47, pages 373–383.

Cheong et al., 2009 Cheong, C., Tan, K., and Veeravalli, B. (2009). A multi-objective evolutionary algorithm for examination timetabling. Journal of Scheduling, 12:121–146.

Corne et al., 1994 Corne, D., Ross, P., and Fang, H. (1994). Evolutionary Timetabling: Current Practices, Future Prospects, and Ongoing Developments. in P. Prosser (ed.), Proceedings of the UK Planning and Scheduling Special Interest Group Workshop.

Cote et al., 2004 Cote, P., Wong, T., & Sabourin, R. (2004). Utilization of a hybrid multi-objective evolutionary algorithm for the uncapacitated exam proximity problem, in: E.K. Burke, M. Trick (Eds.), Practice and Theory of Timetabling V, 5th International Conference, PATAT 2004, pages 294–312. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg.

Demeester et al., 2012 Demeester, P., Bilgin, B., De Causmaecker, P., & Vanden Berghe, G. (2012). A hyper-heuristic methodology for examination timetabling challenges: benchmarks and a novel practical situation. Journal of Scheduling, volume 15, pages 83–103.

Galinier and Hao, 1999 Galinier, P. & Hao, J. (1999). Hybrid evolutionary techniques for the graph coloring problem.

Journal of Combinatorial Optimization, volume 3, pages 379–397.

Glass and Prugel-Bennett, 2003 Glass, C. & Prugel-Bennett, A. (2003). Genetic algorithm for graph coloring: an examination of Galinier and Hao's methodology. Journal of Combinatorial Optimization, volume 7, pages 229–236.

Holland, 1992 Holland, J. (1992). Adaptation in Natural and Artificial Systems: An Introductory Analysis with Applications to Biology, Control, and Artificial Intelligence. MIT Press, Cambridge.

[Lei and Shi, 2017a] Lei, Y. & Shi, J. (2017a). A memetic method utilizing MOEA/D for the examination timetabling issue. Soft Computing, volume 22, pages 1511–1523.

[Lei and Shi, 2017b] Lei, Y. and Shi, J. (2017b). A neural network-based approach for scheduling issues. Journal of Optimization, page 11.

Leite et al., 2018 Leite, N., Fernandes, C., Melicio, F., & Rosa, A. (2018). A cellular memetic approach for the examination scheduling problem. Computers and Operations Research, volume 94, pages 118–138.

Mendes et al. (2009) Mendes, J., Goncalves, J., & Resende, M. (2009). A stochastic key-based evolutionary algorithm for the resource-constrained project scheduling problem. Computers and Operations Research, Volume 36, Pages 92–109.

Pillay, 2016 Pillay, N. (2016). An analysis of hyper-heuristics in the context of educational timetabling. Annals of Operations Research, volume 239, pages 3–38.

Pillay and Banzhaf, 2010 Pillay, N. & Banzhaf, W. (2010). An informed evolutionary algorithm for the examination timetabling problem. Applied Soft Computing, volume 10, pages 457–467.

Qu et al. (2008) Qu, R., Burke, E. K., McCollum, B., Merlot, L., & Lee, S. (2008). An analysis of search strategies and automated system development for examination scheduling. Journal of Scheduling, pages 55–89.

Ross et al. (1998) Ross, P., Hart, E., and Corne, D. (1998). Observations regarding GA-based exam timetabling. In E. K. Burke and M. W. Carter (Eds.). Lecture notes in computer science: Practice and theory of automated timetabling II: selected papers from the 2nd International Conference, 1408:115–129.

Ruiz et al. (2006) Ruiz, R., Maroto, C., & Alcaraz, J. (2006). Two novel and resilient evolutionary algorithms for the flowshop scheduling problem. Omega, 34:461–476.

Thompson and Dowsland, 1996 Thompson, J. & Dowsland, K. (1996). Variants of simulated annealing for the examination scheduling problem. Annals of Operations Research, Volume 63, Pages 105–128.

Turabieh and Abdullah, 2011 Turabieh, H. & Abdullah, S. (2011). A comprehensive hybrid methodology for addressing the examination timetabling issue. Omega, 39:598–607.