....

Supplemental Web Material: Adaptively-Tuned Particle Swarm Optimization with Application to Spatial Design

Matthew Simpson[a]

....

A. PSO and BBPSO details

In Section 2 we introduced PSO, BBPSO, and our adaptively tuned variants of both. Here we describe in detail several modifications to both PSO and BBPSO.

A.1. PSO

The standard PSO algorithm is given by equation (1). We consider several additions and modifications to this algorithm below. Each of these modifications is combined with adaptively tuned inertia as in equation (4) to create the AT-PSO algorithms we employ.

A.1.1. Initialization: In order to initialize the swarm, the number of particles, their initial locations, and their initial velocities have to be chosen. Clerc (2011) suggests making the swarm size a function of the dimension of the search space, but notes that this is known to be suboptimal. We use their alternative suggest to use a default swarm size of 40. We assume the search space is a D-dimensional hypercube given by $\bigtimes_{j=1}^{D}[min_j, max_j]$. Then each particle's initial location is randomly generated uniformly on the cube, i.e. $\theta_{ij}(0) \overset{ind}{\sim} U(min_j, max_j)$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$ and $j = 1, 2, \ldots, D$. Each particle's velocity is initialized based on its location via $v_{ij}(0) \overset{ind}{\sim} U(min_j - x_{ij}(0), max_j - x_{ij}(0))$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$ and $j = 1, 2, \ldots, D$.

....

[a]**Department of Statistics, University of Missouri,**
146 Middlebush Hall, Columbia, MO 65211-6100
[*]**Email: themattsimpson@gmail.com**

....

Prepared using staauth.cls [Version: 2012/05/12 v1.00]

In Section 3.3 each design point is constrained to be in Harris County, TX, which is not a rectangle. We initialize the swarm by placing initial design points on the smallest rectangle containing Harris County. Design points outside of Harris County will quickly move back into the county due to the confinement strategy.

A.1.2. Confinement: Even though the initialization of the swarm is confined to a hypercube, nothing prevents any given particle from leaving the search space. There are a number of things that can be done in order to solve this problem and each has advantages and disadvantages depending on the situation (Helwig & Wanka, 2007). We focus on two approaches. One is to move any particle that leaves the search space to the nearest point still inside the search space and then adjust its velocity, e.g. Clerc (2011) suggests that whenever $x_{ij}(k) > max_j$, it should be set to $x_{ij}(k) = max_j$ and similarly when $x_{ij}(k) < min_j$ it should be set to $x_{ij}(k) = min_j$, and in both cases the velocity along that dimension should be reversed and halved, i.e. $v_{ij}(k) = -0.5v_{ij}(k)$. This causes particles to bounce off the boundary and move back toward the middle of the search space. This is the default strategy we use.

Another strategy is to simply define the objective function to be $\pm\infty$ outside of the search space ($+$ when minimizing, $-$ when maximizing) so that the swarm tries to stay in bounds naturally. In Section 3.3 we employ this method in combination with the other strategy. When a design point is proposed outside of the smallest rectangle containing Harris County, we move it back to the edge of the rectangle using the method described in the previous paragraph. All points inside the rectangle but outside Harris County are defined to have infinite MSPE variance in order to further restrict the swarm to the desired area.

A.1.3. Redraw Neighborhoods: In Section 2 we briefly described a variant of the stochastic star neighborhood which we use. This neighborhood is stochastic, meaning that each particle's neighbors are randomly drawn when the algorithm is initialized. After an iteration in which the best known value of the objective function is unchanged, each particle's neighbors are randomly redrawn according to the same distribution.

A.1.4. Asynchronous Updates: The way we defined PSO in equation (1) each particle can update simultaneously. This means that the algorithm is parallelizable, which is a major advantage for implementation on modern GPUs. However, asynchronously updating the particles typically results in faster converging algorithms when it is computationally feasible. In an asynchronous update from period k to $k + 1$, particle i recognizes that particle $i - 1$ has already updated its personal best location to $\boldsymbol{p}_{i-1}(k + 1)$ by the time it is i's turn to update. So i computes its group best location taking this into account. This causes particle $i = 1$ to behave differently from particle $i = n$ since particle n always has better information in order to perform its update, so every iteration the particles are randomly reordered. More formally, before every iteration sample $o_1(k + 1), o_2(k + 1), \ldots, o_n(k + 1)$ from $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$ without replacement. Then the particles update starting with o_1, o_2, etc., where the group best update becomes $\boldsymbol{g}_{o_i}(k + 1) = \arg\min_{\{\boldsymbol{p}_{o_j}(k+1)|j\in\mathcal{N}_i\}} Q(\boldsymbol{p}_j(k_j^*))$ where $k_j^* = k + 1$ if $j < i$ and k otherwise. We asynchronously update in all of our algorithms.

A.1.5. Coordinate Free Velocity Updates: The standard velocity update in equation (1) is well known to bias the algorithm toward locations near the coordinate axes and especially the origin (Monson & Seppi, 2005; Spears et al., 2010). In general we may not know if the true optimum is near an axis, so this behavior is undesirable. There are several alternative velocity updates available, e.g. in Monson & Seppi (2005). We use the coordinate free (CF) update suggested by Clerc (2011). First define the center of gravity for particle i to be $\boldsymbol{C}_i(k) = \boldsymbol{\theta}_i(k) + \phi_1\{\boldsymbol{p}_i(k) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_i(k)\}/3 + \phi_2\{\boldsymbol{g}_i(k) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_i(k)\}/3$. Let $\mathcal{H}_i(k)$ denote the hypersphere centered at $\boldsymbol{C}_i(k)$ with radius $||\boldsymbol{C}_i(k) - \boldsymbol{\theta}_i(k)||$ where $||.||$ denotes Euclidean distance. Then a new point $\boldsymbol{\theta}_i'(k)$ is drawn randomly from $\mathcal{H}_i(k)$ by sampling a direction and a radius, each uniformly. This is *not* the same as drawing uniformly over $\mathcal{H}_i(k)$ and in fact

favors points near the center. Then the CF velocity update is given by $v_i(k+1) = \omega v_i(k) + x_i'(k)$. We use both the standard and CF velocity updates in our algorithms. The standard PSO algorithm with each feature in this subsection including the CF velocity update is what Clerc (2011) calls SPSO 2011.

A.1.6. When Personal Best = Group Best: When a particle's personal best and group best locations coincide, it is often advantageous to allow the particle to explore more than usual. In the standard velocity update we do this by removing the social term so that $v_i(k+1) = \omega v_i(k) + \phi_1 r_{1i}(k) \circ \{p_i(k) - \theta_i(k)\}$. In the CF velocity update we change the center of gravity to ignore the social term so that $C_i(k) = \theta_i(k) + \phi_2 \{p_i(k) - \theta_i(k)\}/2$.

A.2. BBPSO

The standard BBPSO algorithm was introduced by Kennedy (2003) and updates from t to $t+1$ via equation (2). We use each of the features in Section A.1 in our BBPSO algorithms, though some of them need to be modified for the BBPSO setting. We list them below along with another modification of BBPSO which we employ. Each of these modifications are combined with adaptively tuning a scale parameter as in equation (3) to create our AT-BBPSO algorithms.

A.2.1. BBPSOxp: A commonly used variant of BBPSO also introduced by Kennedy (2003) is called BBPSOxp. In this variant, each coordinate of each particle has a 50% chance of updating according to (2) and a 50% chance of moving directly to that particle's personal best location on that coordinate. In other words

$$\theta_{ij}(k+1) = \begin{cases} N\left(\frac{p_{ij}(k)+g_{ij}(k)}{2}, h_{ij}^2(k)\right) & \text{with probability } 0.5 \\ p_{ij}(k) & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \tag{1}$$

where $h_{ij}(k) = |p_{ij}(k) - g_{ij}(k)|$. We use both xp and non-xp versions of our BBPSO algorithms.

A.2.2. CF BBPSO: BBPSO's update also depends on the coordinate system since each coordinate of θ gets a different standard deviation. We employ BBPSO algorithms using the default standard deviation, but also using a coordinate free standard deviation given by $h_{ij}(k) = ||p_i(k) - g_i(k)||$.

A.2.3. When Personal Best = Group Best in BBPSO: A downside of both BBPSO and BBPSOxp is that any particle whose personal best is currently its group best location does not move due to the definition of the standard deviation term. Several methods have been proposed to overcome this; e.g. Hsieh & Lee (2010) and Zhang et al. (2011). Zhang et al. (2011) propose using mutation and crossover operations for the group best particle. To do this, each group best particle randomly selects three other distinct particles from the entire swarm, i_1, i_2, and i_3, and updates according to

$$\theta_{ij}(k+1) = p_{i_1 j}(k) + 0.5\{p_{i_2 j}(k) - p_{i_3 j}(k)\}. \tag{2}$$

This combines easily with BBPSOxp to update each coordinate of each particle with $h_{ij}(k) = 0$ according to (2) and the rest according to (1).

B. Comparing PSO and BBPSO algorithms

In order to compare AT-BBPSO to other PSO variants, we employ a subset of test functions used in Hsieh & Lee (2010). Each function is listed in Table 1 along with the global minimum and argmin. Further description of many of

these functions can be found in Clerc (2010). For each function, we set $D = 20$ so the domain of each function is $\Re^{20}$. Each function was constrained to the hypercube $[-100, 100]^D$.

Equation	ArgMin	Minimum
$Q_1(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{i=1}^{D} \theta_i^2$	$\boldsymbol{\theta}^* = \boldsymbol{0}$	$Q_1(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) = 0$
$Q_2(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{i=1}^{D} \left(\sum_{j=1}^{i} \theta_j \right)^2$	$\boldsymbol{\theta}^* = \boldsymbol{0}$	$Q_2(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) = 0$
$Q_3(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{i=1}^{D-1} \left[100\{\theta_{i+1} + 1 - (\theta_i + 1)^2\} + \theta_i^2 \right]$	$\boldsymbol{\theta}^* = \boldsymbol{0}$	$Q_3(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) = 0$
$Q_4(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{i=1}^{D} \{\theta_i^2 - \cos(2\pi\theta_i) + 10\} - 9D$	$\boldsymbol{\theta}^* = \boldsymbol{0}$	$Q_4(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) = 0$
$Q_5(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \frac{1}{4000}||\boldsymbol{\theta}||^2 - \prod_{i=1}^{D} \cos\left(\frac{\theta_i}{\sqrt{i}} \right) + 1$	$\boldsymbol{\theta}^* = \boldsymbol{0}$	$Q_5(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) = 0$
$Q_6(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = -20 \exp\left(-0.2\sqrt{\frac{1}{D}||\boldsymbol{\theta}||} \right)$		
$\quad - \exp\left\{ \frac{1}{D} \sum_{i=1}^{D} \cos(2\pi\theta_i) \right\} + 20 + \exp(1)$	$\boldsymbol{\theta}^* = \boldsymbol{0}$	$Q_6(\boldsymbol{\theta}^*) = 0$

Table 1. Test functions for evaluating PSO algorithms. The dimension of $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is D and $||.||$ is the Euclidean norm: $||\boldsymbol{\theta}|| = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^{D} \theta_i^2}$.

We use several PSO algorithms in the simulation study. The details of each PSO algorithm are described in Appendix A. All PSO algorithms were run for 1,000 iterations and use one of three neighborhood topologies: the global topology, or the stochastic star topology with either 1 (SS1) or 3 (SS3) informants. The velocity update for the PSO algorithms can either be standard or coordinate free (CF), and the inertia parameter can either be constant), deterministically adjusted (DI) or adaptively tuned (AT) with $R^* = 0.3$ (AT3) or $R^* = 0.5$ (AT5). The DI algorithms set $\alpha = 0.2 \times 1,000$ and $\beta = 2$ while the AT algorithms set $c = 0.1$ and $\omega(0) = 1.2$. Additionally, each PSO algorithm uses one of two parameter settings: either $\phi_1 = \phi_2 = \ln 2 + 1/2$ with $\omega = 1/(2\ln 2)$ if appropriate (PSO1) or $\phi_1 = \phi_2 = 1.496$ with $\omega = 0.7298$ if appropriate (PSO2). With 3 neighborhoods, 2 velocity updates, 3 inertia updates, and 2 parameter settings that yields 48 PSO algorithms. We consider AT-BBPSO algorithms with the same number of iterations and the same set of neighborhood topologies as the PSO algorithms. Additionally, each AT-BBPSO algorithm can use a CF scale parameter update or not, can use the standard or "xp" kernel, and use one of two parameter settings: $R^* = 0.3$ or $R^* = 0.5$ (AT3 or AT5 respectively), with $df = 1$, $c = 0.1$, and $\sigma(0) = 1$ in all AT-BBPSO algorithms. With 3 neighborhood topologies, 2 scale parameter updates, 2 kernels, and 2 parameter settings we consider 24 AT-BBPSO algorithms. Each algorithm was run for 40 replications of 1,000 iterations for each objective function.

Tables 2-7 contain the simulation results for objective functions 1-6 respectively (OF1, OF2, etc.). We use several measures to quantify how well each algorithm finds the global minimum. First, each table includes the mean and standard deviation of the absolute difference between the true global minimum and the algorithm's estimated global minimum across all 40 replications, denoted by Mean and SD. Second, each table includes a convergence criterion — the proportion of the replications that came within 0.01 of the true global minimum, denoted by $\widehat{P}$. Finally, $\widehat{K}$ denotes the median number of iterations until the algorithm reaches the convergence criterion; $\widehat{K} > 1000$ indicates that the algorithm did not converge in the allotted 1,000 iterations in at least of 50% of replications. Mean, $\widehat{P}$, and $\widehat{K}$ can be thought of how close on average the algorithm gets to the global minimum, what proportion of the time it converges, and long it takes to converge respectively. Values for the Mean and SD that are greater than 10,000 are omitted to keep the size of the tables manageable.

We highlight only some of the features of these tables. The first is that the CF versions of the PSO algorithms do much worse than their corresponding non-CF versions. This is unsurprising since non-CF PSO variants tend to be biased toward finding solutions at the origin and along coordinate axes and each of our objective functions were designed to have a global minimum at the origin. However, for BBPSO variants whether the scale parameter update is CF or not

. . . .

OF1; Nbhd:	Global				SS3				SS1			
Algorithm	Mean	SD	$\widehat{P}$	$\widehat{K}$	Mean	SD	$\widehat{P}$	$\widehat{K}$	Mean	SD	$\widehat{P}$	$\widehat{K}$
PSO1	0.00	0.00	1.00	205.5	0.00	0.00	1.00	358.5	384.26	891.68	0.32	> 1000
PSO2	0.00	0.00	1.00	113	0.00	0.00	1.00	200.5	724.66	1160.10	0.20	> 1000
PSO1-CF	173.52	201.37	0.00	> 1000	174.60	139.70	0.00	> 1000	1633.30	975.59	0.00	> 1000
PSO2-CF	164.60	117.21	0.00	> 1000	122.56	97.48	0.00	> 1000	1956.30	1074.90	0.00	> 1000
DI-PSO1	0.00	0.00	1.00	214	0.00	0.00	1.00	265.5	1467.50	1543.60	0.00	> 1000
DI-PSO2	0.00	0.00	1.00	187	0.00	0.00	1.00	233.5	1641.30	1566.30	0.00	> 1000
DI-PSO1-CF	1709.90	897.14	0.00	> 1000	694.98	346.65	0.00	> 1000	2418.30	1140.10	0.00	> 1000
DI-PSO2-CF	1535.30	848.11	0.00	> 1000	790.97	429.16	0.00	> 1000	2435.10	1173.80	0.00	> 1000
AT3-PSO1	0.00	0.00	1.00	186	0.00	0.00	1.00	263	1962.50	1777.20	0.00	> 1000
AT3-PSO2	0.00	0.00	1.00	183	0.00	0.00	1.00	247	932.07	1118.20	0.00	> 1000
AT3-PSO1-CF	329.08	260.13	0.00	> 1000	294.80	166.07	0.00	> 1000	2489.30	1040.10	0.00	> 1000
AT3-PSO2-CF	342.09	293.48	0.00	> 1000	268.43	181.01	0.00	> 1000	2096.10	1131.30	0.00	> 1000
AT5-PSO1	0.00	0.00	1.00	112	0.00	0.00	1.00	154	232.14	205.78	0.00	> 1000
AT5-PSO2	0.00	0.00	1.00	117	0.00	0.00	1.00	150.5	127.58	164.99	0.00	> 1000
AT5-PSO1-CF	165.98	133.79	0.00	> 1000	196.39	130.15	0.00	> 1000	1550.60	696.54	0.00	> 1000
AT5-PSO2-CF	118.22	77.93	0.00	> 1000	160.47	118.92	0.00	> 1000	1453.20	922.27	0.00	> 1000
AT3-BBPSO	0.00	0.00	1.00	740	0.00	0.00	1.00	756	0.00	0.00	1.00	679.5
AT3-BBPSOxp	0.00	0.00	1.00	822.5	0.00	0.00	1.00	831	0.00	0.00	1.00	694
AT3-BBPSO-CF	0.00	0.00	1.00	637	0.00	0.00	1.00	642	0.00	0.00	1.00	572.5
AT3-BBPSOxp-CF	0.00	0.00	1.00	724.5	0.00	0.00	1.00	717	0.00	0.00	1.00	607.5
AT5-BBPSO	0.00	0.00	1.00	445.5	0.00	0.00	1.00	465	0.00	0.00	1.00	451
AT5-BBPSOxp	0.00	0.00	1.00	501	0.00	0.00	1.00	511	0.00	0.00	1.00	479
AT5-BBPSO-CF	0.00	0.00	1.00	386.5	0.00	0.00	1.00	404.5	0.00	0.00	1.00	392
AT5-BBPSOxp-CF	0.00	0.00	1.00	436.5	0.00	0.00	1.00	458	0.00	0.00	1.00	420

Table 2. Simulation results for OF1. See text for description

OF2; Nbhd:	Global				SS3				SS1			
Algorithm	Mean	SD	$\widehat{P}$	$\widehat{K}$	Mean	SD	$\widehat{P}$	$\widehat{K}$	Mean	SD	$\widehat{P}$	$\widehat{K}$
PSO1	0.00	0.00	0.92	882.5	42.08	41.70	0.00	> 1000	3121.10	1900.60	0.00	> 1000
PSO2	0.00	0.00	1.00	455	0.05	0.09	0.28	> 1000	2128.20	2264.80	0.00	> 1000
PSO1-CF	1198.70	727.12	0.00	> 1000	718.76	477.04	0.00	> 1000	3467.90	1973.20	0.00	> 1000
PSO2-CF	892.45	593.77	0.00	> 1000	639.33	342.00	0.00	> 1000	2966.50	1426.90	0.00	> 1000
DI-PSO1	52.59	108.12	0.00	> 1000	225.76	210.47	0.00	> 1000	5494.70	2604.70	0.00	> 1000
DI-PSO2	151.31	169.29	0.00	> 1000	516.50	282.07	0.00	> 1000	4323.90	1872.50	0.00	> 1000
DI-PSO1-CF	3793.40	1717.40	0.00	> 1000	1401.90	678.72	0.00	> 1000	4510.60	2058.90	0.00	> 1000
DI-PSO2-CF	3873.30	1935.70	0.00	> 1000	1566.30	733.85	0.00	> 1000	3637.10	1528.20	0.00	> 1000
AT3-PSO1	0.00	0.00	1.00	478.5	0.08	0.18	0.25	> 1000	7808.60	2929.70	0.00	> 1000
AT3-PSO2	0.00	0.00	1.00	481.5	0.01	0.01	0.85	924	4071.70	1647.50	0.00	> 1000
AT3-PSO1-CF	1424.90	620.02	0.00	> 1000	1021.10	509.66	0.00	> 1000	2910.80	1528.70	0.00	> 1000
AT3-PSO2-CF	1517.60	1070.00	0.00	> 1000	883.77	458.02	0.00	> 1000	2480.30	1419.50	0.00	> 1000
AT5-PSO1	91.83	356.78	0.10	> 1000	0.40	0.85	0.12	> 1000	4323.20	1925.80	0.00	> 1000
AT5-PSO2	5.98	20.86	0.52	979	0.23	1.24	0.60	965.5	2122.30	1402.00	0.00	> 1000
AT5-PSO1-CF	1358.10	766.94	0.00	> 1000	969.11	476.07	0.00	> 1000	2737.70	1082.90	0.00	> 1000
AT5-PSO2-CF	1078.80	640.14	0.00	> 1000	878.00	410.46	0.00	> 1000	2342.40	1427.20	0.00	> 1000
AT3-BBPSO	0.06	0.03	0.00	> 1000	0.01	0.01	0.62	989	0.00	0.00	0.90	916.5
AT3-BBPSOxp	0.67	0.41	0.00	> 1000	0.02	0.01	0.15	> 1000	0.01	0.00	0.85	944
AT3-BBPSO-CF	0.03	0.01	0.05	> 1000	0.00	0.00	0.97	916	0.00	0.00	1.00	819.5
AT3-BBPSOxp-CF	0.35	0.22	0.00	> 1000	0.01	0.01	0.72	972	0.00	0.00	1.00	873.5
AT5-BBPSO	0.00	0.00	1.00	852	0.00	0.00	0.92	846.5	0.00	0.00	1.00	660
AT5-BBPSOxp	0.45	0.63	0.00	> 1000	0.05	0.13	0.50	972	0.00	0.00	1.00	718
AT5-BBPSO-CF	0.00	0.00	1.00	821	0.01	0.02	0.92	825	0.00	0.00	1.00	636.5
AT5-BBPSOxp-CF	0.24	0.20	0.00	> 1000	0.04	0.08	0.52	962	0.00	0.00	1.00	682

Table 3. Simulation results for OF2. See text for description

OF3; Nbhd:	Global				SS3				SS1			
Algorithm	Mean	SD	$\hat{P}$	$\hat{K}$	Mean	SD	$\hat{P}$	$\hat{K}$	Mean	SD	$\hat{P}$	$\hat{K}$
PSO1	51.84	81.96	0.00	>1000	32.87	35.51	0.00	>1000			0.00	>1000
PSO2	24.09	40.64	0.00	>1000	34.97	56.51	0.00	>1000			0.00	>1000
PSO1-CF			0.00	>1000			0.00	>1000			0.00	>1000
PSO2-CF			0.00	>1000			0.00	>1000			0.00	>1000
DI-PSO1	73.91	118.06	0.00	>1000	138.79	237.03	0.00	>1000			0.00	>1000
DI-PSO2	73.15	101.70	0.00	>1000	285.84	515.43	0.00	>1000			0.00	>1000
DI-PSO1-CF			0.00	>1000			0.00	>1000			0.00	>1000
DI-PSO2-CF			0.00	>1000			0.00	>1000			0.00	>1000
AT3-PSO1	42.13	62.63	0.00	>1000	27.96	32.20	0.00	>1000			0.00	>1000
AT3-PSO2	29.68	49.48	0.02	>1000	31.32	39.42	0.00	>1000			0.00	>1000
AT3-PSO1-CF			0.00	>1000			0.00	>1000			0.00	>1000
AT3-PSO2-CF			0.00	>1000			0.00	>1000			0.00	>1000
AT5-PSO1	63.40	150.86	0.02	>1000	27.31	45.22	0.00	>1000			0.00	>1000
AT5-PSO2	45.50	127.02	0.00	>1000	21.57	33.17	0.00	>1000			0.00	>1000
AT5-PSO1-CF			0.00	>1000			0.00	>1000			0.00	>1000
AT5-PSO2-CF			0.00	>1000			0.00	>1000			0.00	>1000
AT3-BBPSO	286.56	733.87	0.00	>1000	163.98	568.42	0.00	>1000	55.96	68.75	0.00	>1000
AT3-BBPSOxp	152.06	495.54	0.00	>1000	53.66	40.22	0.00	>1000	38.12	36.67	0.00	>1000
AT3-BBPSO-CF	121.97	358.24	0.00	>1000	199.26	573.65	0.00	>1000	36.63	52.87	0.00	>1000
AT3-BBPSOxp-CF	390.89	857.50	0.00	>1000	39.49	42.56	0.00	>1000	31.37	35.33	0.00	>1000
AT5-BBPSO	192.88	490.38	0.00	>1000	63.77	83.78	0.00	>1000	84.38	132.31	0.00	>1000
AT5-BBPSOxp	124.92	235.06	0.00	>1000	41.88	46.31	0.00	>1000	34.63	36.02	0.00	>1000
AT5-BBPSO-CF	325.19	767.79	0.00	>1000	115.76	398.59	0.00	>1000	71.89	121.28	0.00	>1000
AT5-BBPSOxp-CF	229.62	646.40	0.00	>1000	45.22	55.65	0.00	>1000	37.75	59.87	0.00	>1000

Table 4. Simulation results for OF3. See text for description

OF4; Nbhd:	Global				SS3				SS1			
Algorithm	Mean	SD	$\hat{P}$	$\hat{K}$	Mean	SD	$\hat{P}$	$\hat{K}$	Mean	SD	$\hat{P}$	$\hat{K}$
PSO1	3.78	1.53	0.00	>1000	0.90	1.12	0.47	>1000	411.24	913.72	0.00	>1000
PSO2	8.82	4.25	0.00	>1000	2.62	1.62	0.07	>1000	814.28	1218.90	0.00	>1000
PSO1-CF	504.88	318.43	0.00	>1000	337.63	182.82	0.00	>1000	1951.90	1010.30	0.00	>1000
PSO2-CF	337.14	160.49	0.00	>1000	253.11	127.14	0.00	>1000	1973.70	971.52	0.00	>1000
DI-PSO1	7.68	2.34	0.00	>1000	3.02	1.76	0.07	>1000	1499.60	1649.80	0.00	>1000
DI-PSO2	11.15	4.86	0.00	>1000	4.71	2.28	0.00	>1000	1497.30	1511.10	0.00	>1000
DI-PSO1-CF	1796.40	910.83	0.00	>1000	780.47	623.55	0.00	>1000	2276.80	1045.00	0.00	>1000
DI-PSO2-CF	1652.70	826.63	0.00	>1000	717.85	335.94	0.00	>1000	2295.10	941.03	0.00	>1000
AT3-PSO1	4.76	2.15	0.00	>1000	2.16	1.76	0.17	>1000	1584.60	1101.90	0.00	>1000
AT3-PSO2	6.85	2.12	0.00	>1000	2.43	1.49	0.05	>1000	772.81	909.62	0.00	>1000
AT3-PSO1-CF	963.98	737.17	0.00	>1000	470.14	242.39	0.00	>1000	2032.40	937.66	0.00	>1000
AT3-PSO2-CF	721.45	403.80	0.00	>1000	358.45	172.38	0.00	>1000	1780.40	650.79	0.00	>1000
AT5-PSO1	7.44	3.39	0.00	>1000	3.50	1.66	0.00	>1000	108.91	112.21	0.00	>1000
AT5-PSO2	10.01	4.71	0.00	>1000	5.02	2.70	0.00	>1000	122.32	191.30	0.00	>1000
AT5-PSO1-CF	495.75	240.51	0.00	>1000	454.87	259.16	0.00	>1000	1355.10	663.30	0.00	>1000
AT5-PSO2-CF	425.66	293.16	0.00	>1000	363.88	192.89	0.00	>1000	1209.60	810.10	0.00	>1000
AT3-BBPSO	3.22	1.39	0.05	>1000	0.46	0.53	0.30	>1000	1.15	1.23	0.35	>1000
AT3-BBPSOxp	0.05	0.15	0.00	>1000	0.03	0.01	0.00	>1000	0.14	0.35	0.65	974.5
AT3-BBPSO-CF	3.59	1.63	0.00	>1000	0.24	0.52	0.80	898.5	1.17	1.15	0.35	>1000
AT3-BBPSOxp-CF	0.15	0.34	0.75	985	0.01	0.00	0.85	973.5	0.12	0.32	0.88	865
AT5-BBPSO	4.59	1.93	0.00	>1000	0.62	0.79	0.52	633.5	1.14	1.18	0.40	>1000
AT5-BBPSOxp	0.17	0.43	0.85	656	0.00	0.00	1.00	672	0.12	0.32	0.88	633.5
AT5-BBPSO-CF	3.54	1.85	0.00	>1000	0.59	0.74	0.52	583.5	1.57	1.30	0.22	>1000
AT5-BBPSOxp-CF	0.09	0.36	0.92	591.5	0.00	0.00	1.00	614	0.10	0.29	0.90	598.5

Table 5. Simulation results for OF4. See text for description

OF5; Nbhd:	Global				SS3				SS1			
Algorithm	Mean	SD	$\widehat{P}$	$\widehat{K}$	Mean	SD	$\widehat{P}$	$\widehat{K}$	Mean	SD	$\widehat{P}$	$\widehat{K}$
PSO1	0.03	0.03	0.30	> 1000	0.01	0.01	0.57	441	0.52	0.65	0.07	> 1000
PSO2	0.02	0.02	0.38	> 1000	0.01	0.01	0.60	205	0.56	0.60	0.07	> 1000
PSO1-CF	0.89	0.20	0.00	> 1000	0.96	0.14	0.00	> 1000	1.45	0.28	0.00	> 1000
PSO2-CF	0.94	0.15	0.00	> 1000	0.99	0.09	0.00	> 1000	1.48	0.31	0.00	> 1000
DI-PSO1	0.02	0.02	0.28	> 1000	0.01	0.01	0.65	258.5	1.27	0.45	0.00	> 1000
DI-PSO2	0.02	0.03	0.38	> 1000	0.01	0.02	0.65	239	1.36	0.42	0.00	> 1000
DI-PSO1-CF	1.42	0.26	0.00	> 1000	1.16	0.08	0.00	> 1000	1.60	0.30	0.00	> 1000
DI-PSO2-CF	1.33	0.18	0.00	> 1000	1.15	0.09	0.00	> 1000	1.58	0.28	0.00	> 1000
AT3-PSO1	0.02	0.02	0.42	> 1000	0.01	0.01	0.78	253	1.37	0.28	0.00	> 1000
AT3-PSO2	0.02	0.02	0.32	> 1000	0.01	0.01	0.82	239.5	1.44	0.56	0.00	> 1000
AT3-PSO1-CF	1.09	0.22	0.00	> 1000	1.04	0.10	0.00	> 1000	1.64	0.26	0.00	> 1000
AT3-PSO2-CF	1.03	0.21	0.00	> 1000	1.04	0.11	0.00	> 1000	1.61	0.26	0.00	> 1000
AT5-PSO1	0.03	0.03	0.38	> 1000	0.01	0.01	0.52	167	0.93	0.28	0.00	> 1000
AT5-PSO2	0.03	0.03	0.35	> 1000	0.01	0.01	0.65	132.5	0.85	0.27	0.00	> 1000
AT5-PSO1-CF	0.97	0.25	0.00	> 1000	1.02	0.10	0.00	> 1000	1.42	0.21	0.00	> 1000
AT5-PSO2-CF	0.91	0.19	0.00	> 1000	0.97	0.10	0.00	> 1000	1.38	0.21	0.00	> 1000
AT3-BBPSO	0.01	0.01	0.55	875.5	0.00	0.01	0.85	555.5	0.00	0.01	0.82	535.5
AT3-BBPSOxp	0.01	0.01	0.72	631	0.00	0.00	1.00	623.5	0.00	0.00	0.95	566.5
AT3-BBPSO-CF	0.02	0.02	0.35	> 1000	0.00	0.01	0.85	475	0.01	0.01	0.68	472
AT3-BBPSOxp-CF	0.01	0.01	0.78	518.5	0.00	0.00	1.00	549	0.00	0.00	0.97	469.5
AT5-BBPSO	0.02	0.02	0.40	> 1000	0.00	0.01	0.92	366.5	0.01	0.01	0.72	406.5
AT5-BBPSOxp	0.01	0.01	0.78	387	0.00	0.00	0.97	400.5	0.00	0.01	0.90	380.5
AT5-BBPSO-CF	0.01	0.02	0.52	478.5	0.00	0.01	0.82	308.5	0.00	0.01	0.78	307
AT5-BBPSOxp-CF	0.01	0.01	0.72	370.5	0.00	0.00	1.00	342.5	0.00	0.01	0.80	349

Table 6. Simulation results for OF5. See text for description

OF6; Nbhd:	Global				SS3				SS1			
Algorithm	Mean	SD	$\widehat{P}$	$\widehat{K}$	Mean	SD	$\widehat{P}$	$\widehat{K}$	Mean	SD	$\widehat{P}$	$\widehat{K}$
PSO1	20.01	0.02	0.00	> 1000	20.13	0.07	0.00	> 1000	20.26	0.10	0.00	> 1000
PSO2	20.00	0.01	0.00	> 1000	20.21	0.11	0.00	> 1000	20.37	0.13	0.00	> 1000
PSO1-CF	20.67	0.14	0.00	> 1000	20.59	0.11	0.00	> 1000	20.56	0.13	0.00	> 1000
PSO2-CF	20.68	0.19	0.00	> 1000	20.62	0.11	0.00	> 1000	20.62	0.13	0.00	> 1000
DI-PSO1	20.02	0.03	0.00	> 1000	20.06	0.04	0.00	> 1000	20.11	0.05	0.00	> 1000
DI-PSO2	20.13	0.14	0.00	> 1000	20.18	0.11	0.00	> 1000	20.23	0.09	0.00	> 1000
DI-PSO1-CF	20.43	0.11	0.00	> 1000	20.33	0.10	0.00	> 1000	20.29	0.11	0.00	> 1000
DI-PSO2-CF	20.48	0.13	0.00	> 1000	20.38	0.11	0.00	> 1000	20.32	0.11	0.00	> 1000
AT3-PSO1	20.00	0.00	0.00	> 1000	20.01	0.01	0.00	> 1000	20.00	0.00	0.00	> 1000
AT3-PSO2	20.02	0.04	0.00	> 1000	20.08	0.06	0.00	> 1000	20.00	0.00	0.00	> 1000
AT3-PSO1-CF	20.06	0.06	0.00	> 1000	20.14	0.07	0.00	> 1000	20.00	0.00	0.00	> 1000
AT3-PSO2-CF	20.23	0.09	0.00	> 1000	20.16	0.09	0.00	> 1000	19.68	2.06	0.00	> 1000
AT5-PSO1	20.01	0.02	0.00	> 1000	20.07	0.05	0.00	> 1000	20.22	0.09	0.00	> 1000
AT5-PSO2	20.12	0.10	0.00	> 1000	20.27	0.08	0.00	> 1000	20.33	0.11	0.00	> 1000
AT5-PSO1-CF	20.33	0.10	0.00	> 1000	20.33	0.10	0.00	> 1000	20.32	0.11	0.00	> 1000
AT5-PSO2-CF	20.38	0.12	0.00	> 1000	20.32	0.13	0.00	> 1000	20.32	0.11	0.00	> 1000
AT3-BBPSO	17.22	8.02	0.00	> 1000	5.23	9.13	0.00	> 1000	18.71	6.28	0.00	> 1000
AT3-BBPSOxp	18.34	6.18	0.00	> 1000	17.58	6.79	0.00	> 1000	20.42	0.21	0.00	> 1000
AT3-BBPSO-CF	15.63	9.14	0.07	> 1000	0.53	3.30	0.42	> 1000	13.68	9.62	0.22	> 1000
AT3-BBPSOxp-CF	14.75	9.19	0.00	> 1000	10.35	9.46	0.00	> 1000	20.40	0.33	0.00	> 1000
AT5-BBPSO	17.76	7.56	0.15	> 1000	5.95	8.70	0.65	684.5	19.04	5.54	0.07	> 1000
AT5-BBPSOxp	18.22	6.18	0.10	> 1000	17.65	5.79	0.05	> 1000	20.17	1.84	0.00	> 1000
AT5-BBPSO-CF	18.33	6.76	0.07	> 1000	2.06	6.25	0.90	628	14.47	9.01	0.22	> 1000
AT5-BBPSOxp-CF	14.49	9.15	0.28	> 1000	10.03	8.80	0.32	> 1000	18.77	4.41	0.00	> 1000

Table 7. Simulation results for OF6. See text for description

often makes little difference. Often the standard PSO algorithm with either parameter setting, PSO1 or PSO2, and either the Global or SS3 neighborhood performs the best or near the best. Since non-CF PSO algorithms are known to be biased toward the origin and since it is unclear if the DI-PSO and AT-PSO variants are biased to a greater, lesser, or the same degree, PSO1 and PSO2 are not good baselines for comparing to AT variants. Instead we focus on the CF versions of all algorithms. The difference between the CF and non-CF version of each algorithm does serve as a possible measure of the origin-seeking bias of the non-CF version of the algorithm, however.

Narrowing in on the CF algorithms, the AT variants of the PSO-CF algorithms are a mixed bag relative to their pure PSO counterparts. Sometimes the AT version performs better, sometimes not, and often they are essentially indistinguishable. Both classes of algorithms tend to perform better than their DI-PSO-CF counterparts, however, and it is clear for all PSO algorithms that the Global and SS3 neighborhoods both tend to be significantly superior than the SS1 neighborhood. The real story, however, is the performance of the AT-BBPSO-CF variants. Typically they are the best performing CF variant, and often they are even competitive with the best non-CF PSO variants. *Which* AT-BBPSO-CF algorithm performs best depends on the situation. For relatively easy problems such as for OF1 and OF2, AT5 tends to be better than AT3, BBPSO tends to be better than BBPSOxp, and the Global or SS1 neighborhoods tend to be the best across all three measures, so AT5-BBPSO-CF with the Global or SS1 neighborhoods appear attractive. For more complex objective functions such as OF4-OF6, any of the AT-BBPSO-CF variants could perform the best, and whether e.g. AT3 or AT5 is better often interacts with whether the BBPSO or BBPSOxp kernel is used. There does not appear to be a hard an fast rule to abide by, so in more complex optimization problems we recommend trying several AT-BBPSO-CF variants, and perhaps even non-CF variants. Our default recommendation is to try AT5-BBPSO-CF with the global neighborhood. In the case where trying multiple algorithms is worthwhile, e.g. for particularly difficult optimization problems, we recommend experimenting with the neighborhood before experimenting with any of the other knobs on these algorithms. Changing the neighborhood often yields the largest differences between algorithms in our simulations, though sometimes changing the kernel (BBPSO vs. BBPSOxp) or R^* (e.g. AT3 vs. AT5) can also sometimes yield large gains.

The DI-PSO and AT-PSO algorithms are similar conceptually, but often yield very different results. DI-PSO deterministically reduces the inertia parameter over time in the same manner given a fixed set of parameter values (α and β), while AT-PSO dynamically adjusts the inertia parameter to hit a target improvement rate. Figure 1 plots the inertia over time for the DI-PSO algorithm with $\alpha = 200$ and $\beta = 1$, and observed inertia over time for one replication of the AT5-PSO2-CF algorithm with the SS3 neighborhood for OF1 and one replication for OF6. DI-PSO smoothly decreases its inertia with a slowly decreasing rate, while AT5-PSO2-CF behaves very differently depending on the objective function. For OF1 it drops the inertia to about to about 0.7 then bounces back up to about 0.8 and fluctuates around that point. This is pretty typical behavior for the inertia parameter of AT-PSO — it tends to bounce around a level which is approximately the average over time of the DI-PSO's inertia, though lower values of R^* will result in higher inertias. In this way, AT-PSO alternates periods of exploration (relatively high inertia) and periods of exploitation (relatively low inertia). The main exception to this pattern is when AT-PSO converges around a local minimum. In this case, inertia plummets to zero as the particles settle down. This is precisely what happens for OF6 in Figure 1, though in this case the minimum is not global — Table 7 indicates the algorithm never converged to the global min. In optimization problems with multiple local optima, both AT-PSO can exhibit this behavior and prematurely converge to a local minima, so they may not be advantageous for those problems. In theory we expect this behavior for AT-BBPSO as well, but as Table 7 indicates, only some variants of the AT-BBPSO algorithms were able to get significantly close to the global minimum.

Figure 2 displays the scale parameter over time for one replication of the AT5-BBPSO-CF algorithm for each of the objective functions we considered with the SS3 neighborhood. Notably, they all result in similar scale parameter dynamics. This holds up remarkably well across replications, BBPSO vs. BBPSOxp, and CF vs. not, such that it may

. . . .

Figure 1. Inertia over time for the DI-PSO algorithm with $\alpha = 200$ and $\beta = 1$, and for one replication of the AT-PSO-0.5 algorithm with the SS3 neighborhood for each of OFs 1 and 6.

be possible to pick a one-size-fits-all deterministic progression of the scale parameter that matches the algorithm to an AT algorithm with a specific target improvement rate, R^*. One key source of variation that is sometimes more pronounced than in Figure 2 is that for some objective functions the AT algorithms first increase the scale parameter before following the exponentially decreasing progression. This flexibility to adapt to the objective function may not be worth sacrificing for the one-size-fits all approach. Rather, we highlight this possibility as a possible avenue for further understanding the AT-BBPSO algorithms.

References

Blum, C & Li, X (2008), 'Swarm intelligence in optimization,' in Blum, C & Merkle, D (eds.), *Swarm Intelligence: Introduction and Applications*, Springer.

Clerc, M (2010), *Particle swarm optimization*, John Wiley & Sons.

Clerc, M (2011), 'Standard particle swarm optimisation,' Tech. rep.

Clerc, M & Kennedy, J (2002), 'The particle swarm-explosion, stability, and convergence in a multidimensional complex space,' *Evolutionary Computation, IEEE Transactions on*, **6**(1), pp. 58–73.

Helwig, S & Wanka, R (2007), 'Particle swarm optimization in high-dimensional bounded search spaces,' in *2007 IEEE Swarm Intelligence Symposium*, IEEE, pp. 198–205.

Hsieh, HI & Lee, TS (2010), 'A modified algorithm of bare bones particle swarm optimization,' *International Journal of Computer Science Issues*, **7**, p. 11.

Kennedy, J (2003), 'Bare bones particle swarms,' in *Swarm Intelligence Symposium, 2003. SIS'03. Proceedings of the 2003 IEEE*, IEEE, pp. 80–87.

Figure 2. Scale parameter over time for one replication of the the AT5-BBPSO-CF algorithm with the SS3 neighborhood for each of OF1–OF6.

Monson, CK & Seppi, KD (2005), 'Exposing origin-seeking bias in pso,' in *Proceedings of the 7th annual conference on Genetic and evolutionary computation*, ACM, pp. 241–248.

Spears, WM, Green, DT & Spears, DF (2010), 'Biases in particle swarm optimization,' *International Journal of Swarm Intelligence Research*, **1**(2), pp. 34–57.

Zhang, H, Kennedy, DD, Rangaiah, GP & Bonilla-Petriciolet, A (2011), 'Novel bare-bones particle swarm optimization and its performance for modeling vapor–liquid equilibrium data,' *Fluid Phase Equilibria*, **301**(1), pp. 33–45.