Heuristic Optimization Techniques Exercise 2

Alexander Eisl (0250266), Peter Wiedermann (0025999)

November 7, 2015

1 Local Search

In this programming exercise, we improve the results of the construction heuristic developed in the previous exercise by using a local search. In the following subsection, we will first explain the neighborhoods that we define and then outline the step functions used.

Algorithm 1.1: Local search

```
input: Graph
output: Improved solution
begin

sol \leftarrow calculate initial solution
repeat:

choose sol' \in N(x)

if f(sol') \leq f(sol) then
sol \leftarrow sol'

until stopping criteria satisfied
end
```

1.1 Neighborhoods

We use the following neighborhoods:

- **1-node flip** This neighborhood is defined as all subsets where two vertices of the initial solution are flipped.
 - Size of neigborhood: n(n-1)/2
 - Objective Function: Incremental, crossings from flipped vertices are subtracted and recalculated.
- **1-edge move** This neighborhood consists of all solutions where one edge is moved to a different page.
 - Size of neigborhood: (pages 1)edges

Objective Function: Incremental, only crossings for moved edges are recalculated

1-node edge move This neighborhood consists of all solutions where the edges of one vertex on a specific page are moved to all different pages.

- Size of neigborhood: (pages 1)edges as worst case.¹
- Objective Function: Incremental, only crossings for moved edges are recalculated.

1.2 Stepfunctions

We implemented the following thre stepfunctions:

first This step-function selects the first better solution found in the neighborhood.

best This step-function iterates over all elements of the neighborhood and chooses the best one.

random This step-function selects a random element of the neighborhood.

2 Results

We executed the code on a desktop computer with a Core i7 Quad-Core CPU with 2.67Ghz and 24 GB of main memory. Table 1 shows the results of our local search.

We consider a local optimum if we cannot find a better solution after 10 iterations. We have set a timout of 5 minutes for the calculations.

Best neighborhood step function strategy We compare the results for three different neighborhoods and all the implemented step-functions.

The best performing neighboorhood structure is 1-node-flip, as shown in Table 1. For smaller instances (1-5), the 1-node-flip in combination with the first delivers the best results. For bigger instances (6-10), the 1-node-flip finds better solutions in combination with the random stepfunction.

A very interesting result is the performance of the best stepfunction for the 1-node-flip. For the given instances, the best function reaches a local optimum very quickly while random and first are calculating more iterations or even calculate until timeout for bigger instances and can find better solutions beside the local optimum of the best variant.

¹depending on number of edges on respective node pages

Initial Solution The choice of the initial solution is crucial to achieve results in reasonable calculation time. Using random initialization can easily degenerate into random search or end in a local optimum with less improvement to a random solution itself.

When we compare the results with a random initial solution, we could measure an avg increase of 55% crossings. 2

Neighborhoods Incremental objective functions implemented as described in section 1.1 are performing equally well for all 3 neighborhoods.

Subsequent (possibly random) moves in our neighborhoods can only reach valid solutions in the search space because every solution in our neighborhoods is valid.

Reaching local optimum If a local optimum is reached it is found in less than 10 iterations in most cases. As you can see in table 1 there are only a few exceptions. The results with iterations=-1 didn't reach a local optimum and ran into our timeout condition. For one instance, we do not find an improvement. So with respect to our neighborhood, we seem to be in a local optimum.

²measured with 1-node flip and first stepfunction

automatic-1.txt									
		21) / 0.00	*21* 0 / 0.00	*21* 0 / 0.00	*21* 0 / 0.00	*21* 0 / 0.01	*21* 0 / 0.00	*21* 0 / 0.00	*21* 0 / 0.01
	n c	48	48 0 / 0.01	48 0 / 0.00	48 0 / 0.00	48 0 / 0.00	41 0 / 0.00	48 0 / 0.00	48 0 / 0.00
	2 0	104	97 2 / 0.06	104	104	104 0 / 0.00	104	104	* 79 * 8 / 0.10
	15 9	164) / 0.02	169 4 / 0.02	69 36 / 0.17	192 0 / 0.00	163 6 / 0.00	192 0 / 0.00	192 0 / 0.00	155 9 / 0.02
	32 0	77 () / 0.00	69 1 / 0.02	75 0 / 0.00	00.0 / 0	0 / 0.00	77 0 / 0.00	0 / 0.00	41 15 / 0.04
	84 6, .60 0	.153,059 7 / 7.95	* 5,965,084 * -1 / 308.74	6,153,059 0 / 220.01	6,153,059 0 / 9.83	6,033,148 -1 / 308.61	6,153,059 0 / 8.60	6,152,236 -1 / 319.12	6,151,720 -1 / 308.59
automatic-7.txt 140,291	.14 0	[43,905]	142,786 19 / 18.48	142,777 32 / 3.30	143,905 0 / 0.62	140,027 60 / 12.03	143,905 0 / 0.16	143,781 14 / 3.90	*137,629* 315 / 204.80
automatic-8.txt 537,728		541,969 0 / 1.84	*501,875* -1 / 302.72	541,935 3 / 40.33	541,868 3 / 6.11	521,950 -1 / 302.73	541,969 0 / 1.83	541,598 14 / 79.82	539,307 -1 / 302.73
automatic-9.txt 1,232,469		1,267,963 0 / 2.19	*1,186,295* -1 / 303.06	$\frac{1,268,407}{4/2.89}$	1,267,642 $8 / 12.85$	1,231,026 -1 / 303.05	1,268,456 0 / 2.11	1,267,128 42 / 224.19	1,265,579 -1 / 303.03
automatic-10.txt 56,115		56,260 1 / 1.34	55,134 -1 / 302.28	56,021 70 / 44.49	56,260 0 / 5.97	* 53,952 * -1 / 302.27	56,260 0 / 1.35	56,260 0 / 6.43	54,848 -1 / 302.26

Table 1: Local search results. For each instance, we show the number of crossings (first row), the iteration needed to reach the local optimum (second row, first value) and the run-time in seconds of our algorithm (second row, second value). If no local optimum was found the number of iterations is -1. The best solution is highlighted in bold.