Bacterial foraging optimization algorithm: A Derivative free technique

Nitin Kumar Jhankal, Dipak Adhyaru, *Member, IEEE*

Abstract--**Bacterial foraging optimization algorithm (BFOA) has been widely accepted as a global optimization algorithm of current interest for optimization and control. BFOA is inspired by the social foraging behaviour of Escherichia coli. BFOA has already drawn the attention of researchers because of its efficiency in solving real-world optimization problems arising in several application domains. In present paper, a detailed explanation of this algorithm is given. Comparative analysis of BFOA with Genetic Algorithm (GA) is presented.**

Index Terms--**About four, alphabetical order, key words or phrases, separated by commas.**

I. INTRODUCTION

Optimization problems defined by functions for which derivatives are unavailable or available at a prohibitive cost are appearing more and more frequently in computational science and engineering. Increasing complexity in mathematical modelling, higher sophistication of scientific computing, and abundance of legacy codes are some of the reasons why derivative-free optimization is currently an area of great demand.

In many physical applications, the true models or functions being optimized are extremely expensive to evaluate but, based e.g. on simplified physics or mesh coarsening, there are often surrogate models available, less accurate but cheaper to evaluate. In these circumstances, one would expect to design an optimization framework capable of extracting as much information as possible from the surrogate model while parsimoniously using the fine, true model to accurately guide the course of the optimization process.[1]

A. Different Types of Derivative free Optimization

1) Genetic Algorithm
2) Simulated Analysis
3) Random Search Method
4) Swarm Optimization
5) Ant Colony Algorithm
6) Bacterial Foraging

Natural selection tends to eliminate animals with poor "foraging strategies" (methods for locating, handling, and ingesting food) and favor the propagation of genes of those animals that have successful forging strategies since they are more likely to enjoy reproductive success (they obtain enough food to enable them to reproduce). After many generations, poor foraging strategies are either eliminated or shaped into good ones (redesigned). Logically, such evolutionary principles have led scientists in the field of "foraging theory" to hypothesize that it is appropriate to model the activity of foraging as an optimization process: A foraging animal takes actions to maximize the energy obtained per unit time spent foraging.

II. BASIC DETAILS: BACTERIA FORAGING TECHNOLOGY

A. Foraging: Element of Foraging Theory

Foraging theory is based on the assumption that animals search for and obtain nutrients in a way that maximizes their energy intake E per unit time T spent foraging. Hence, they try to maximize a function like E/T (or they maximize their long-term average rate of energy intake). Maximization of such a function provides nutrient sources to survive and additional time for other important activities (e.g., fighting, fleeing, mating, reproducing, sleeping, or shelter building).

Optimal foraging theory formulates the foraging problem as an optimization problem and via computational or analytical methods [2].

B. Search Strategies for Foraging

Some animals are "cruise" or "ambush" searchers. For the cruise approach to searching, the forager moves continuously through the environment, constantly searching for prey at the boundary of the volume being searched (tuna fish and hawks are cruise searchers). In ambush search, the forager (e.g., a rattlesnake) remains stationary and waits for prey to cross into its strike range [2]. The search strategies of many species are actually between the cruise and ambush extremes.

C. Bacterial Foraging: E.coli

The *E. coli* bacterium has a plasma membrane, cell wall, and capsule that contains the cytoplasm and nucleoid (Figure 1). The pili (singular, pilus) are used for a type of gene transfer to other *E. coli* bacteria, and flagella (singular, flagellum) are used for locomotion. The cell is about 1 μm in diameter and 2 μm in length [1]. The *E. coli* cell only weighs about 1 picogram and is about 70% water. *Salmonella typhimurium is* a similar type of bacterium.

D. Swimming and Tumbling via Flagella

Locomotion is achieved via a set of relatively rigid flagella that enable the bacterium to swim via each of them rotating in the same direction at about 100-200 revolutions per second (in control systems terms, we think of the flagellum as providing for actuation). Each flagellum is a left-handed helix configured so that as the base of the flagellum (i.e., where it is connected to the cell) rotates counterclockwise, as viewed from the free end of the flagellum looking toward the cell, it produces a force against the bacterium so it pushes the cell.


Fig. 1. Bacterial foraging E.coli [7]

An *E. coli* bacterium can move in two different ways; If the flagella rotate clockwise, each flagellum pulls on the cell, and the net effect is that each flagellum operates relatively independently of the others, and so the bacterium "tumbles" about (i.e., the bacterium does not have a set direction of movement and there is little displacement See Fig. 2. (a) [4]) If the flagella move counterclockwise, their effects accumulate by forming a bundle (it is thought that the bundle is formed due to viscous drag of the medium), and hence they essentially make a composite propeller and push the bacterium so that it runs (swims) in one direction (see Fig. 2 (a) [5]).


Fig. 2. Swimming, tumbling and chemotactic behavior of E coli

III.   BACTERIAL FORAGING OPTIMIZATION ALGORITHM

A. Steps For BFOA

1) Chemotaxis:

This process simulates the movement of an E.coli cell through swimming and tumbling via flagella. Suppose θi(j,

k, l) represents the ith bacterium at jth chemotactic, kth reproductive, and lth elimination–dispersal step. C (i) is a scalar and indicates the size of the step taken in the random direction specified by the tumble (run length unit). Then, in computational chemotaxis, the movement of the bacterium may be represented by

$$\theta\ (j+\ ,k,l) = \theta\ (j,k,l) + \ (i)\frac{\Delta\ )}{\sqrt{\Delta\ i)\Delta\ )}} \qquad (1)$$

where Δ indicates a unit length vector in the random direction.

2) Swarming:

Interesting group behaviour has been observed for several motile species of bacteria including E.coli and S. typhimurium, where stable spatiotemporal patterns (swarms) are formed in semisolid nutrient medium. A group of E.coli cells arrange themselves in a traveling ring by moving up the nutrient gradient when placed amid a semisolid matrix with a single nutrient chemo-effecter. The cells when stimulated by a high level of succinate release an attractant aspartate, which helps them to aggregate into groups and, thus, move as concentric patterns of swarms with high bacterial density.

3) Reproduction:

The least healthy bacteria eventually die while each of the healthier bacteria (those yielding lower value of the objective function) asexually split into two bacteria, which are then placed in the same location. This keeps the swarm size constant.

4) Elimination and Dispersal:

To simulate this phenomenon in BFOA, some bacteria are liquidated at random with a very small probability while the new replacements are randomly initialized over the search space.

IV.   EXAMPLE & SIMULATION

A. Function Optimization via Bacterial Foraging

As a simple illustrative example [2], we use the algorithm to try to Find minimum of function in Figure 4 ([15, 5] is the global minimum point, [20, 15] is a local minimum). Standard ideas from optimization theory can be used to set the algorithm parameters.

Fig. 3. Function with multiple extremes point

B. Simulation experiment:

A function to be optimized is created with following MATLAB program:

```
function fposition=Live_fn(x)
p=0;q=0;
for k=1:5
p=p+k*cos((k+1)*x(1)+k);
q=q+k*cos((k+1)*x(2)+k);
end
fposition=p*q+(x(1)+1.42513)^2+(x(2)+.80032)^2;
```

The problem of optimization can be solved by two methods:
- Bacteria foraging optimization algorithm
- Genetic Algorithm

Genetic algorithm follows the nature's law of evolution and survival of the fittest. It is based on the behavior of the chromosomes. The fitter chromosomes survive and the unfit ones don't. The decision of the chromosomes survival in the next generation is based on the fitness function. This fitness function resembles the distance between the bacteria's food and bacteria. The ones having a lower fitness value for the function chosen above will survive in the next generation. They are hence capable of mating and producing offspring's that may or may not contribute to move towards the goal. As compared to that in Bacteria foraging optimization algorithm, we observe the behavior of the bacteria tumbling and swimming is expressed as chemotaxis equation which defines the movement of the bacteria. There is a swarming characteristic of the bacteria which is taken into account, where in the bacteria come together in large numbers in semisolid nutrient medium.

On the basis of the above explanations, we observe that the Bacteria foraging algorithm differs from genetic algorithm.

Simulation results using both methods are presented in Fig. 4 and Fig. 5.


Fig. 4. BFOA resuls

Fig. 5. Fitness function plot by Genetic Algorithm

C. Comment

We can see form the above results that the average fitness value for a genetic algorithm is -24.279. According to the fitness function selected, lower the value better the generation. The best value of the fitness function achieved is -147 approximately.

We can see from the above graphs of BFO that convergence to the minimum point occurs in about four generations while in case of GA after execution of around 100 generations we get minimum of a function .A

S.No.	Factor	Bacterial Foraging Algorithm	Genetic Algorithm
1.	Accuracy	More	Less
2.	Fitness Function Value	-186.565	-147.103
3.	Time	1.2340 sec	Around 2 sec
4.	Optimum point	-1.2871 -0.7281	-4.8475 -0.8037

comparative analysis of both algorithm is presented in the following table:

TABLE I

COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS OF BFOA AND GA

D. Conclusion

From above comparative data one can easily understand that Bacteria foraging optimization algorithm technique is better than the Genetic algorithm.

Thus Bacterial Foraging algorithm, explains Social foraging, Genetic Algorithm, Swarm optimization which thus makes it imperative to analyses strategies required for Global Optimization.

Optimal Foraging theory uses computational or analytical methods to provide an optimal foraging policy that specifies how foraging decisions are made.

Hence the potential uses of Biomimcry of Bacterial Foraging optimization techniques are to develop adaptive controllers & co-operative control strategies for autonomous vehicles.

V. REFERENCES

[1] G. Kevin Passino,"*Biomimicry of Bacterial Foraging for Distributed Optimization and Control,"* IEEE Control Systems Magazine, June 2002.

[2] Stephens and J. Krebs, *Foraging Theory*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton univ. Press, 1986

[3] W. O'Brien, H. Browman, and B. Evans, "*Search strategies of foraging animals," Amer. Scientist,*" vol. 78, pp. 152-160, Mar. /Apr. 1990.

[4] H. Berg, *Random Walks in Biology*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton Univ. Press, 1993.

[5] D. DeRosier, "The turn of the screw: The bacterial flagellar motor," Cell, vol. 93, pp. 17-20, 1998.

[6] G. Lowe, M. Meister, and H. Berg, "Rapid rotation of flagellar bundles in *swimming bacteria," Nature*, vol. 325, pp. 637-640, Oct. 1987.

[7] T. Audesirk and G. Audesirk. *Biology: Life on Earth*. Prentice Hall, NJ, 5 editions, 1999. K. Kristinsson and G. Dumont, "System identification and control using Genetic algorithms," IEEE Trans. Syst., Man, Cybernet., vol. 22, no. 5, pp. 1033-1046, 1992.

[8] Swagatam Das, Sambarta Dasgupta, Arijit Biswas, Ajith Abraham,"On Stability of the Chemotactic Dynamics in Bacterial-Foraging Optimization Algorithm, '' IEEE Trans. Syst.,Man, Cybernet-Part A: systems and humans, vol. 39, no. 3, may 2009

[9] http://eewww.eng.ohio-state.edu/˜passino