

Goal-Oriented Preservation of Essential Genetic Information by Offspring Selection

Michael Affenzeller

Institute of Formal Models and Verification
Johannes Kepler University
Altenbergerstrasse 69
A-4040 Linz, Austria
michael.affenzeller@jku.at

Stefan Wagner

Institute of Formal Models and Verification
Johannes Kepler University
Altenbergerstrasse 69
A-4040 Linz, Austria
stefan@heuristiclab.com

ABSTRACT

The basic selection ideas of the different representatives of evolutionary algorithms are sometimes quite diverse. The selection concept of Genetic Algorithms (GAs) and Genetic Programming (GP) is basically realized by the selection of above-average parents for reproduction whereas Evolution Strategies (ES) use the fitness of newly evolved offspring as the basis for selection (survival of the fittest due to birth surplus). This contribution considers aspects of population genetics and Evolution Strategies in order to propose an enhanced and generic selection model for Genetic Algorithms which is able to preserve the alleles which are part of a high quality solution. Some selected aspects of these enhanced techniques are discussed exemplarily on the basis of standardized benchmark problems.

Keywords

Genetic Algorithms, selection, adaptation/self adaptation

1. INTRODUCTION

As some kind of approximation for the gradient information which is not available for many optimization problems, neighborhood search aims to obtain information about the descent/increase of the objective function in the local neighborhood of a certain point. Conventional neighborhood search starts from an arbitrary point in the search space and iteratively moves to more and more promising points along a given neighborhood structure (w.r.t. the objective function) as long as no better solution can be detected in the local neighborhood. The self-evident drawback of this method is that for more complex functions the algorithm converges and gets stuck in the next attracting local optimum which may be far away of a global optimum. It is a common feature of all methods based upon neighborhood search to counteract this essential handicap. Simulated An-

nealing for example also allows moves to worse neighborhood solutions with a certain probability which decreases as the search process progresses in order to scan the solution space broader at the beginning and to become more and more goal-oriented at the end. Tabu Search on the other hand introduces some kind of memory in terms of a so-called tabu list which stores moves that are considered to lead to already visited areas of the search space. However, also Evolution Strategies (ES), a well-known representative of Evolutionary Computation, have to be considered as some kind of parallel neighborhood search as asexual mutation (a local operator) is the only way to create new individuals (solution candidates) in the classical ES-versions. Therefore, in the case of multimodal search spaces, global optima are detected by Evolution Strategies only if one of the starting values is located in the absorbing region of a global optimum.

Genetic Algorithms and certainly also Genetic Programming (GP) take a fundamentally different approach by considering recombination (crossover) as their main operator whereby the essential difference to neighborhood-based techniques is given by the fact that recombination is a sexual operator, i.e. properties of individuals from different regions of the search space are combined in new individuals. Therefore, the advantage of applying GAs to hard problems of combinatorial optimization lies in their ability to scan broader regions of the solution space than heuristic methods based upon neighborhood search do. Nevertheless, also GAs are frequently faced with a problem which, at least in its impact, is quite similar to the problem of stagnating in a local but not global optimum. This drawback, called premature convergence in the terminology of GAs, occurs if the population of a Genetic Algorithm reaches such a suboptimal state that the genetic operators are no longer able to produce offspring that are able to outperform their parents (e.g. [8], [4]). This happens if the genetic information stored in the individuals of a population does not contain that genetic information which would be necessary to further improve the solution quality. Therefore, in contrast to the present contribution, the topic of premature convergence is considered to be closely related to the loss of genetic variation in the entire population in GA-research [15], [19]. In this contribution we do not identify the reasons for premature convergence in the loss of genetic variation in general but more specifically in the loss of what we say essential genetic information, i.e. in the loss of alleles which are part of a global optimal solution. Therefore, we will denote the genetic information of

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. To copy otherwise, to republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee.

Copyright 200X ACM X-XXXXX-XX-X/XX/XX ...\$5.00.

the global optimal (which may be unknown a priori) solution as essential genetic information in the following. If parts of this essential genetic information are missing, premature convergence is already predetermined in some way.

But what are the reasons for premature convergence, or in other words what are the reasons that this essential genetic information is not or no more available: Firstly, one reason for this loss of essential genetic information may be that this alleles are simply not represented in the initial population of the Genetic Algorithm. Then, especially in the earlier phase of genetic search it frequently happens that essential genetic information is hidden in individuals with bad total fitness and is therefore eliminated due to selection. Furthermore, for the majority of GA applications it is absolutely not guaranteed that the applied crossover operators are able to create new children in a way that the newly evolving child contains exactly the genetic information of its own parents. If this is not guaranteed this fact represents a further reason for a genetic algorithm to lose essential genetic information and therefore cause premature convergence. The main measure in conventional GA-theory to counteract against this phenomenon is mutation (and migration in the parallel variants) and indeed - as will be shown in the empirical part of the paper - this works quite well and a lot of already lost essential genetic information can be recovered by mutation.

The main aim of the present work is to discuss, analyze and improve new generic theoretical concepts for avoiding or at least retarding premature convergence in a non-problem-specific way by taking the above stated considerations into account:

A very essential question about the general performance of a GA is, whether or not good parents are able to produce children of comparable or even better fitness (the building block hypothesis implicitly relies on this). In natural evolution, this is almost always true. For Genetic Algorithms this property is not so easy to guarantee. The disillusioning fact is that the user has to take care of an appropriate coding in order to make this fundamental property hold.

In order to somehow overcome this strong requirement we try to get to the bottom of reasons for premature convergence from a technical as well as from a population genetics inspired point of view and draw some essential interconnections.

The basic idea of the new selection model is to consider not only the fitness of the parents in order to produce a child for the ongoing evolutionary process. Additionally, the fitness value of the evenly produced child is compared with the fitness values of its own parents. The child is accepted as a candidate for the further evolutionary process if and only if the reproduction operator was able to produce a child that could outperform the fitness of its own parents. This strategy guarantees that evolution is presumed mainly with crossover results that were able to mix the properties of their parents in an advantageous way. I.e. **survival of the fittest alleles is rather supported than survival of the fittest individuals** which is a very essential aspect for the preservation of essential genetic information stored in many individuals (which may not be the fittest in the sense of individual fitness).

The experimental part analyzes the characteristics of the newly developed methods: As commonly done when evaluating the capability of heuristic techniques, some main features are analyzed separately.

2. SOME BASIC CONSIDERATIONS ABOUT GA-SELECTION

In terms of goal orientedness, selection is the driving force of GAs. In contrast to crossover and mutation, selection is completely generic, i.e. independent of the actually employed problem and its representation. A fitness function assigns a score to each individual in a population that indicates the 'quality' of the solution the individual represents. The fitness function is often given as part of the problem description or based upon the objective function. In the Standard Genetic Algorithm the probability that a chromosome in the current population is selected for reproduction is proportional to its fitness. However, there are also many other ways of accomplishing selection. These include roulette-wheel selection, linear-rank selection or tournament selection (cf. e.g. [11], [14]).

However, all evenly mentioned GA-selection principles have one thing in common:

They all just consider the aspect of sexual selection, i.e. mechanisms of selection only come into play for the selection of parents for reproduction. The enhanced selection model which will be described in the following section defies this limitation by considering selection in a more general sense.

2.1 The Afflatus of Population Genetics for the Redesign of GA Selection

In the following we describe and aim to bring together technical as well as biologically motivated considerations in order to motivate the concepts proposed in this paper. The following listing itemizes the most essential aspect in the development phase of the new methods in the above mentioned sense:

- **Selection and Selection Pressure:** In the theory of Genetic Algorithms selection and selection pressure are predetermined by the so-called mating scheme and by the replacement strategy actually deployed. By that it should be achieved that offspring of highly fit individuals are represented in the next generation with a higher probability than offspring of average or below average individuals. The goal of this procedure is a continuous advancement of the population over the generations. Typical mating schemes are roulette wheel, linear rank or tournament. This classical GA selection concept is known as sexual selection in the terminology of population genetics. In the population genetics view, sexual selection covers only a rather small aspect of selection which appears when individuals have to compete to attract mates for reproduction. The population genetics basic selection model considers the selection process in the following way:

random mating \rightarrow selection \rightarrow random mating \rightarrow selection \rightarrow

I.e. selection is considered to depend mainly on the probability of surviving of newborn individuals until they reach pubescence which is called viability in the terminology of population genetics. The essential aspect of offspring selection in the interpretation of selection is rarely considered in conventional GA selection. The classical (μ, λ) Evolution Strategy in contrast does

this very well: Reconsidering the basic functioning of a (μ, λ) ES in terms of selection μ parents produce λ ($\lambda \geq \mu$) offspring from which the best μ are selected as members of the next generation. In contrast to GAs where selection pressure is predetermined by the choice of the mating scheme and the replacement strategy, ES allow an easy steering of selection pressure by the ratio between μ and λ . The selection pressure steering model introduced in section 3 picks up this basic idea of ES and transforms these concepts for GAs in order to be have an adjustable selection pressure (independent of the mating scheme and replacement strategy) at one's disposal.

Our advanced selection scheme allowing self-adaptive steering of selection pressure aims to transform the basic ideas for improving the performance of GAs. In doing so the survival probability is determined by a comparison of the fitness of the newly generated individual with the fitness values of its parents. Indeed, as demonstrated in the experimental part, it appears that the first sexual selection step (selection before reproduction) as in case of a standard GA does not drastically effect the qualitative or quantitative performance of the algorithm if being equipped with the newly defined offspring selection step (selection after reproduction). Even with random sexual selection (corresponding to the basic model of the population genetic's selection model) the results were about the same or even better than with roulette wheel or linear-rank as the first selection step. A very important consequence of selection in population genetics as well as in evolutionary computation is its influence on certain alleles. As a matter of principle there are four possibilities for each allele in the population :

- The allele may be fixed in the population.
- The allele may disappear in the population.
- The allele may converge to an equilibrium state.
- No change in the allele frequency.

The basic approaches for retarding premature convergence discussed in GA literature aim to maintain genetic diversity. The most common techniques for this purpose are based upon preselection [6], crowding [7], or fitness-sharing [9]. The main idea of these techniques is to maintain genetic diversity by the preferred replacement of similar individuals [6], [7] or by the fitness-sharing of individuals which are located in densely populated regions [9]. While methods based upon [7] or [9] require some kind of neighborhood measure depending on the problem representation, [9] is additionally quite restricted to proportional selection. Moreover, these techniques have the common goal to maintain genetic diversity which is very important in natural evolution where a rich gene pool is the guarantor in terms of adaptiveness w.r.t. changing environmental conditions.

In case of artificial genetic search as being performed by a Genetic Algorithm the optimization goal does not change during the run of a GA and the fixing of alleles of high quality solutions is desirable in the same manner as the erasement of alleles which are definitely not

part of a good solution in order to reduce the search space and make genetic search more goal-oriented. I.e. we claim that pure diversity maintenance mechanisms as suggested in [6], [7], or [9] do not support goal-oriented genetic search w.r.t the locating of global optimal solutions.

- **Adjustable Selection Pressure:** One interpretation of GA-selection similar to the concepts of a (μ, λ) Evolution Strategy is to generate an intermediate population (what is called virtual population in our notation) of size $|POP| \cdot T$ ($T \geq 1$) by sexual selection, crossover and mutation from the actual population of size $|POP|$. Then, similar to the interpretation of ES-selection, the best $|POP|$ members from the virtual population are chosen as members of the real next generation that contains the genetic information for the evolutionary process yet to come. The remaining $(1 - T) \cdot |POP|$ candidates can be seen as individuals that do not reach the age of sexual maturity. A practical problem in the technical appliance of this technique is that it does not contain any indicator about the effectiveness of actual genetic search, the effectiveness of the actually used operators, etc. I.e. there is no information about the amount of selection pressure to be employed at a certain stage of genetic search. The aim is on the one hand to provide enough selection pressure for not losing essential building block information. On the other hand too much selection pressure causes unwanted premature convergence to a suboptimal solution. Even if this concept of selection pressure steering has already proven to be very powerful in terms of stability and global solution quality [1], [2] it is a time consuming task to find an advantageous steering of (T) that requires an experienced user. These considerations already highly indicate the need for some kind of self-adaptation. The essential question is how to introduce self-adaptation into the GA-selection process in a generic i.e. non problem specific way. The approach which we have developed for this reason will be described in the following.

3. AN ENHANCED SELECTION MODEL INTRODUCING SELF-ADAPTIVE STEERING OF SELECTION PRESSURE

The basic idea to create and evaluate a certain amount (greater or equal population size) of offspring, to be considered for future members of the next generation, is adapted from Evolution Strategies. Self-adaption comes into play when considering the question which amount of offspring is necessary to be created at each round, and which of these candidates are to be selected as members of the next generation, i.e. for the ongoing evolutionary process. In order to keep the concepts generic, no problem specific information about the solution space is allowed to be used for stating the self-adaptive model. Thus, it is desirable to systematically utilize just the fitness information of the individuals of the actual generation for building up the next generation of individuals, in order to keep the new concepts and methods generic. In principle, the new selection strategy acts in the following way:

The first selection step chooses the parents for crossover either randomly or in the well-known way of Genetic Algorithms by roulette-wheel, linear-rank, or some kind of tournament selection strategy. After having performed crossover and mutation with the selected parents we introduce a further selection mechanism that considers the success of the apparently applied reproduction in order to assure the proceeding of genetic search mainly with successful offspring in that way that the used crossover and mutation operators were able to create a child that surpasses its parents' fitness. Therefore, a new parameter, called success ratio ($SuccRatio \in [0, 1]$), is introduced. The success ratio gives the quotient of the next population members that have to be generated by successful mating in relation to the total population size. Our adaptation of Rechenberg's success rule [12] for Genetic Algorithms says that a child is successful if its fitness is better than the fitness of its parents, whereby the meaning of 'better' has to be explained in more detail: is a child better than its parents, if it surpasses the fitness of the weaker, the better, or is it in fact some kind of mean value of both?

For this problem we have decided to introduce a cooling strategy similar to Simulated Annealing. Following the basic principle of Simulated Annealing we claim that an offspring only has to surpass the fitness value of the worse parent in order to be considered as 'successful' at the beginning and while evolution proceeds the child has to be better than a fitness value continuously increasing between the fitness of the weaker and the better parent. Like in the case of Simulated Annealing, this strategy effects a broader search at the beginning whereas at the end of the search process this operator acts in a more and more directed way. Having filled up the claimed ratio ($SuccRatio$) of the next generation with successful individuals in the above meaning, the rest of the next generation ($(1 - SuccRatio) \cdot |POP|$) is simply filled up with individuals randomly chosen from the pool of individuals that were also created by crossover but did not reach the success criterion. The actual selection pressure $ActSelPress$ at the end of a single generation is defined by the quotient of individuals that had to be considered until the success ratio was reached and the number of individuals in the population in the following way:

$$ActSelPress = \frac{|POP|SuccRatio + |POOL|}{|POP|}$$

Figure 1 shows the operating sequence of the above described concepts. With an upper limit of selection pressure ($MaxSelPress$) defining the maximum number of children considered for the next generation (as a multiple of the actual population size) that may be produced in order to fulfill the success ratio, this new model also functions as a precise detector of premature convergence:

If it is no longer possible to find a sufficient number of ($SuccRatio \cdot |POP|$) offspring outperforming their own parents even if ($MaxSelPress \cdot |POP|$) candidates have been generated, premature convergence has occurred.

As a basic principle of this selection model a higher success ratio causes higher selection pressure. Nevertheless, higher settings of success ratio and therefore of selection pressure do not necessarily cause premature convergence as the preservation of fitter alleles is additionally supported and not only the preservation of fitter individuals.

Also it becomes possible within this model to state selec-




Figure 1: Flowchart for embedding the new selection principle into a Genetic Algorithm.

tion pressure in a very intuitive way that is quite similar to the notation of selection pressure in Evolution Strategies. Concretely, we define the actual selection pressure as the ratio of individuals that had to be generated in order to fulfill the success ratio to the population size. For example, if we work with a population size of say 100 and it would be necessary to generate 1000 individuals in order to fulfill the success ratio, the actual selection pressure would have a value of 10. Via these means we are in a position to attack several reasons for premature convergence as illustrated in the following sections. Furthermore, this strategy has proven to act as a precise mechanism for self-adaptive selection pressure steering, which is of major importance in the migration phases of parallel evolutionary algorithms. The aspects of offspring selection w.r.t. parallel GAs are combined in the parallel SASEGASA-algorithm [3], [4].

4. EMPIRICAL WORK

The empirical section is subdivided into three parts: The first subsection aims to highlight the main message of the paper (preservation of essential alleles) whereas the second subsection aims to touch on further subjects concerning the effects of self-adaptive offspring selection. As the scope of the present work does not allow a deeper and more sophisticated analysis of different problem situations, the third part of the experimental discussion gives some references to related contributions which include a more detailed and statistically more relevant experimental discussion on the basis of several benchmark but also practical problems on which we have applied the new selection model recently.

4.1 Preservation of Essential Genetic Information

This subsection aims to point out the importance of mutation for the recovery of essential genetic information in the case of conventional GAs in order to oppose these results with the results being achieved with the enhanced selection model discussed in this paper. By reasons of compactness, the results are mainly shown on the basis of diagrams and give only a brief description of introduced operators, parameter settings, and test environments. Furthermore, the chosen benchmark instance is of rather small dimension in order to allow the observation of essential alleles during the run of the algorithm.




Figure 2: The effect of mutation in case of a standard GA for the ch130 benchmark TSP.

The results displayed in Figure 2 show the effect of mutation for reintroducing already lost genetic information. The horizontal line of the diagram shows the number of iterations and the vertical line stands for the solution quality. The bottom line indicates the global optimal solution which is known for this benchmark test case. The three curves of the diagram show the performance of a Genetic algorithm with no mutation, with a typical value of 5% mutation as well as a rather high mutation rate of 10%. For each of the three curves the lower line stands for the best solution of the actual population and the upper line shows the average fitness value of the population members. The results with no mutation are extremely weak and the quality curve stagnates very soon and far away from the global optimum. The best and average solution quality are the same and no further evolutionary process is possible - premature convergence has occurred. As already stated before, mutation is a very essential feature of standard GAs in order to avoid premature convergence. But also a rather high mutation rate of 10% produces results which are not very satisfying and indeed the best results are achieved with a mutation rate which is very typical for GA applications - namely a mutation rate of 5%. Considering a standard benchmark problem like the ch130 (a 130 city TSP taken from the TSPLib [13]) with one single best solution allows to consider the edges of the shortest path as the essential alleles whose preservation during the run can be observed. The following figures indicate the spreading of essential alleles during the runs of the certain algorithms. This is visualized by inserting bar charts which have to be considered as snapshots after a certain number of iterations approximately corresponding to the position in the figure. The higher a certain bar (130 bars for a 130-city TSP) the higher the relative occurrence of the corresponding essential allele in the population.

Figure 3 shows the distribution of essential alleles over the iterations for a standard GA with a mutation rate of 5%. The interesting thing is that some minor ratio of essential alleles is rapidly fixed in the population and the majority of essential alleles which are still missing have disappeared in the entire population. During the further run of the algorithm it is only mutation which can reintroduce this essential genetic information. As it could be seen in Figure 2, without mutation premature convergence would already have occurred at this early state of evolutionary search. But with an appropriate mutation rate (5% in this example) more and more essential alleles are discovered ending up with quite a good solution. But there is still a gap to the global optimum




Figure 3: The distribution of essential genetic information in case of a standard GA for the ch130 benchmark TSP.

caused by that alleles which could not be recovered due to mutation. The next figures will show how the new selection concept is able to close this gap and make the algorithm much more independent of mutation.

So let us take a closer look at the distribution of essential genetic information in the population when using the enhanced selection concepts. The next curve (Figure 4) shows the quality curve and the distribution of essential alleles for 5% mutation which was able to achieve the best results in case of a standard GA.




Figure 4: The distribution of essential genetic information when using the enhanced selection concept considering the ch130 benchmark TSP.

When applying the GA with the new selection principle to the same benchmark test case one can see that the global optimal solution is detected in only about 100 iterations. Nevertheless, the computational effort is comparable to the standard GA as much more individuals have to be evaluated at each iteration step due to the higher selection pressure. Considering the distribution of essential alleles we see a totally different situation. Almost no essential alleles get lost and the ratio of essential alleles continuously increases in order to end up with a final population that contains almost all pieces of essential genetic information and therefore achieving a very good solution. This shows that the essential alleles are preserved much more effectively and indicates that the influence of mutation should be much less. But is this really the case? In order to answer this question, let us consider the same example with the same settings - only without mutation.

And indeed the assumption holds and also without mutation the algorithm finds a solution which is very close to the global optimum. The essential alleles interfuse the pop-




Figure 5: The distribution of essential genetic information when using the enhanced selection concept considering the ch130 benchmark TSP without mutation.

ulation more and more and almost all of them are members of the final population. Reconsidering the standard GA without mutation the algorithm was prematurely converging very soon with a very bad total quality.

4.2 Experimental Studies of Some More Aspects on the Basis of Small TSP Instances

The analysis of producible results considering various algorithms and benchmark test cases still denotes the most commonly used and possibly also the most objective way to analyze the potential of heuristic optimization techniques.

In our experiments, all computations are performed on Pentium 4 PCs with 1 GB RAM under Windows XP. The environment in which the algorithms are implemented and tested is HeuristicLab¹ [16]. For the tests shown here we have selected some rather small instances of the Travelling Salesman Problem (TSP) taken from the TSPLIB [13]. Reference to more sophisticated tests also on higher dimensional TSP instances are given in the next subsection. In all experiments, the results are represented as the relative difference to the best known solution defined as $relativeDifference = \left(\frac{Result}{Optimal} - 1\right) \cdot 100\%$.

However, it is to be pointed out once again that the newly introduced methods are by no means restricted or somehow optimized to routing problems like the TSP. Further experimental tests on other combinatorial optimization problems like the JSSP (Job Shop Scheduling Problem), the MPSP (Multi Processor Scheduling Problem), or the TTP (Timetabling Problem) have already been performed and show the same effects and improvements as being described here for the TSP. References are given in subsection 4.3.

In order to not dilute the effects of the different aspects too much, some selected aspects are pointed out separately in this section.

4.2.1 Operator Improvement and Independence of Sexual Selection

The first aspect to be considered is the effect of the enhanced selection model to the quality improvement of different crossover operators. To visualize the positive effects of the new methods in a more obvious way we also present results that were generated by a classical GA with genera-

¹More details can be found on the HeuristicLab homepage <http://www.heuristiclab.com>.

tional replacement and 1-elitism.

Remarkable in this context is the effect that also crossover operators that are considered as rather unsuitable for the TSP [10] achieve quite good results in combination with the new selection model. The reason for this behavior is given by the fact that in our selection principle only children that have emerged as a good combination of their parents' attributes are considered for the further evolutionary process, if the success ratio is set to a higher range. In combination with a higher upper value for the maximum selection pressure genetic search can therefore be guided advantageously also for poor crossover operators as the larger amount of handicapped offspring is simply not considered for the further evolutionary process.

Additionally to the already mentioned aspect that the enhanced selection mechanism is able to improve the performance of the certain crossover operators it is furthermore observable that the new self-adaptive selection model makes the performance of the GA almost independent of sexual selection in terms of qualitative performance.

Table 1: Parameter values used in the test runs of the several algorithms

Classical GA with several selection mechanisms (Tab. 2, Tab. 3, Tab. 4)	
Generations	100'000
Population Size	120
Elitism Rate	1
Mutation Rate	0.05
Selection Operator	Roulette, Linear Rank resp. Random
Mutation Operator	Inversion & Translocation
GA with self-adaptive selection in combination with several sexual selection mechanisms (Tab. 5, Tab. 6, Tab. 7)	
Population Size	500
Elitism Rate	1
Mutation Rate	0.1
Selection Operator	Roulette, Linear Rank resp. Random
Mutation Operator	Inversion & Translocation
Success Ratio	0.7
Maximum Selection Pressure	250

In Tab. 2, 3, and 4 the results achieved with the conventional GA using either roulette-wheel (Tab. 2), linear-rank (Tab. 3) respectively random, i.e. no, (Tab. 4) selection are listed. On the other hand Tab. 5, 6, and 7 show the results achieved with the enhanced self-adaptive selection concept using either roulette-wheel (Tab. 5), linear-rank (Tab. 6), or no (Tab. 7) sexual selection.

The fixed parameter values for all algorithms that were used in the different test runs of the present subsection are given in Tab. 1. All values presented in the following tables are the best resp. average values of twenty independent test runs executed for each test case.

Table 2: Experimental results achieved with the classical GA using roulette-wheel selection

Problem	Crossover	Results with roulette-wheel selection		
		Best	Av:	Evaluated Solutions
berlin52	OX	0.00	3.76	12'000'000
berlin52	ERX	5.32	7.73	12'000'000
berlin52	MPX	21.74	26.52	12'000'000
ch130	OX	3.90	5.41	12'000'000
ch130	ERX	142.57	142.62	12'000'000
ch130	MPX	83.57	85.07	12'000'000
kroa200	OX	3.14	4.69	12'000'000
kroa200	ERX	325.92	336.19	12'000'000
kroa200	MPX	146.94	148.08	12'000'000

Similar improvements of solution quality are also observ-

able when comparing the GA using linear-rank selection with the enhanced GA using linear-ranking as the first selection step. So far the results underpin the crossover improvement not only for roulette-wheel selection but also for linear-ranking.

What is really notable is the comparison of Tab. 4 and Tab. 7. Firstly, it is barely remarkable that a GA with no (i.e. random) sexual selection is unable of producing high-quality results. So the results of Tab. 4 are in the region of random search which is caused by the 1-elitism (the only goal-oriented force under these settings). What is really remarkable is that the results of the new GA with enhanced selection and no sexual selection (Tab. 7) are about the same than the results obtained with roulette-wheel respectively with linear-rank as the first selection step. This observation supports the theory of population genetics that sexual selection really plays a rather inferior role in the natural selection process.

Table 3: Experimental results achieved with the classical GA using linear-rank selection

Problem	Crossover	Results with linear-rank selection		
		Best	Av:	Evaluated Solutions
berlin52	OX	0.00	5.40	12'000'000
berlin52	ERX	2.52	4.58	12'000'000
berlin52	MPX	20.90	27.31	12'000'000
ch130	OX	5.60	8.88	12'000'000
ch130	ERX	99.18	128.47	12'000'000
ch130	MPX	85.78	97.46	12'000'000
kroa200	OX	8.58	12.24	12'000'000
kroa200	ERX	351.41	365.80	12'000'000
kroa200	MPX	144.25	150.34	12'000'000

Table 4: Experimental results achieved with the classical GA using no (random) sexual selection

Problem	Crossover	Results with random selection		
		Best	Av:	Evaluated Solutions
berlin52	OX	25.07	31.85	12'000'000
berlin52	ERX	80.54	89.96	12'000'000
berlin52	MPX	52.24	78.52	12'000'000
ch130	OX	148.54	161.77	12'000'000
ch130	ERX	397.46	406.94	12'000'000
ch130	MPX	252.59	286.18	12'000'000
kroa200	OX	296.22	309.71	12'000'000
kroa200	ERX	667.71	692.22	12'000'000
kroa200	MPX	420.76	464.49	12'000'000

Table 5: Experimental results achieved with the new selection principle using using roulette-wheel sexual selection

Problem	Crossover	Results with roulette-wheel selection		
		Best	Av:	Evaluated Solutions
berlin52	OX	0.00	3.88	15'964'680
berlin52	ERX	0.00	3.10	16'337'700
berlin52	MPX	0.00	1.45	11'775'071
berlin52	OX,ERX,MPX	0.00	0.72	7'204'601
ch130	OX	3.88	5.40	15'602'824
ch130	ERX	4.02	5.30	16'920'451
ch130	MPX	1.83	3.53	13'994'686
ch130	OX,ERX,MPX	0.00	2.71	7'702'818
kroa200	OX	2.25	5.72	10'814'980
kroa200	ERX	5.10	5.99	18'268'888
kroa200	MPX	5.21	7.65	12'296'581
kroa200	OX,ERX,MPX	0.00	2.78	6'647'256

4.3 References to Recent Related Works

Table 6: Experimental results achieved with the new selection principle using using linear-rank sexual selection

Problem	Crossover	Results with linear-rank selection		
		Best	Av:	Evaluated Solutions
berlin52	OX	2.29	4.94	7'448'762
berlin52	ERX	0.00	1.92	399'296
berlin52	MPX	0.00	3.92	8'199'592
berlin52	OX,ERX,MPX	0.00	1.59	60'920'006
ch130	OX	3.04	7.90	2'515'637
ch130	ERX	4.36	5.36	1'245'727
ch130	MPX	2.22	3.61	9'029'807
ch130	OX,ERX,MPX	2.16	2.80	61'759'481
kroa200	OX	8.14	9.30	2'011'929
kroa200	ERX	6.28	8.12	4'822'588
kroa200	MPX	5.63	6.37	8'527'427
kroa200	OX,ERX,MPX	1.75	2.79	57'493'081

Table 7: Experimental results achieved with the new selection principle using using no (random) sexual selection

Problem	Crossover	Results with random selection		
		Best	Av:	Evaluated Solutions
berlin52	OX	3.09	5.62	16'045'200
berlin52	ERX	0.00	1.35	16'938'904
berlin52	MPX	0.00	3.78	19'307'034
berlin52	OX,ERX,MPX	0.00	1.45	7'233'215
ch130	OX	2.24	4.59	15'281'043
ch130	ERX	2.27	5.20	18'840'038
ch130	MPX	3.60	4.77	23'164'733
ch130	OX,ERX,MPX	0.00	2.05	6'797'867
kroa200	OX	3.77	6.49	13'188'469
kroa200	ERX	118.61	121.78	28'406'603
kroa200	MPX	3.13	4.04	22'728'010
kroa200	OX,ERX,MPX	0.00	2.72	6'171'308

The basic concepts of the enhanced selection ideas as published in the present paper have already emerged more than one year ago. As the actual focus (like also stated in the present contribution) is to study the properties of the new selection concepts systematically, the potential w.r.t. achievable advancements in global solution quality were obvious immediately. Therefore, the main aim of the first works in this area was to check the generality of the new algorithmic concepts by applying them to various theoretically as well as practically relevant problems. And indeed this worked out very well and it was possible to demonstrate similar effects and achievements in global solution quality in various areas of application under very different problem codifications with exactly that enhanced generic selection techniques as being proposed in this paper.

While the last subsections considered only relatively small TSP instances in order to illustrate some selected aspects, journal article [4] includes a detailed and comprehensive empirical analysis also based on TSP instances of much higher dimension. Furthermore, [4] gives a comprehensive solution analysis based on several real valued n-dimensional test functions (like the n-dimensional Rosenbrock, Rastrigin, Griewangk, Ackley, or Schwefel's sine root function). Also here it is possible to locate the global optimal solution in dimensions up to $n = 2000$ with exactly the same generic extensions of the selection model as being stated here - only the crossover- and mutation-operators have been replaced with standard operators for real-valued encoding.

But also in practical applications like the Optimization of Production Planning in a Real-World Manufacturing Environment based on an extended formulation of the Job-shop Scheduling Problem [5] a significant increase in solution

quality could be accomplished with the described methodology. Especially in combination with Genetic Programming self-adaptive selection pressure steering has already proven to be very powerful. In [17] and [18] we report first results achieved in the context of nonlinear structure identification based on time-series data of a diesel combustion engine. Concretely the aim of this project is the development of models for the NO_x emission. Already until now it has become possible with a GP-based approach equipped with offspring selection to identify models which are superior to the models achieved with conventional GP-techniques and also superior to machine learning techniques which have also been considered in earlier stages of this project. Very recently we have adapted this GP-approach for the application on symbolic as well as logistic regression problems. First results achieved on benchmark classification problems (taken from the UCI machine learning repository) indicate a high potential also in these areas of application.²

5. CONCLUSION

Possibly the most important feature of the newly introduced concepts is that the achievable solution quality can be improved in a non-problem specific manner so that it can be applied to all areas of application for which the theory of Genetic Algorithms and Genetic Programming provides suitable operators. Further aspects worth mentioning concern the robustness and self-adaptiveness of the population genetics inspired measures: Basically weak operators become powerful and the selection pressure is steered self-adaptively in a way that the amount of selection pressure actually applied is that high that further progress of evolutionary search can be achieved. Nevertheless the newly developed selection techniques are not problem specific at all (cf. subsection 4.3.). Possible future research topics in that area are certainly to open new areas of application due to the increased robustness and also more theoretical topics like the analysis of various aspects of population genetics and their interaction with concrete applications of Evolutionary computation. Especially for the theory of parallel Genetic Algorithms the interactions between genetic drift and migration should be a very fruitful field of research.

6. REFERENCES

- [1] M. Affenzeller. Segregative genetic algorithms (SEGA): A hybrid superstructure upwards compatible to genetic algorithms for retarding premature convergence. *International Journal of Computers, Systems and Signals (IJCSS)*, 2(1):18–32, 2001.
- [2] M. Affenzeller. A generic evolutionary computation approach based upon genetic algorithms and evolution strategies. *Journal of Systems Science*, 28(2):59–72, 2002.
- [3] M. Affenzeller and S. Wagner. SASEGASA: An evolutionary algorithm for retarding premature convergence by self-adaptive selection pressure steering. *Computational Methods in Neural Modeling, Lecture Notes of Computer Science*, 2686:438–445, 2003.
- [4] M. Affenzeller and S. Wagner. SASEGASA: A new generic parallel evolutionary algorithm for achieving highest quality results. *Journal of Heuristics, Special Issue on New Advances on Parallel Meta-Heuristics for Complex Problems*, 10(3):239–263, 2004.
- [5] R. Braune, S. Wagner, and M. Affenzeller. Applying genetic algorithms to the optimization of production planning in a real-world manufacturing environment. *Proceedings of the European Meeting on Cybernetics and Systems Research - EMCSR 2004*, pages 41–46, 2004.
- [6] D. Cavicchio. *Adaptive Search using Simulated Evolution*. unpublished doctoral thesis, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1970.
- [7] K. DeJong. *An Analysis of the Behavior of a Class of Genetic Adaptive Systems*. PhD thesis, Department of Computer Science, University of Michigan, 1975.
- [8] D. Fogel. An introduction to simulated evolutionary optimization. *IEEE Trans. on Neural Network*, 5(1):3–14, 1994.
- [9] D. Goldberg. *Genetic Algorithms in Search, Optimization and Machine Learning*. Addison Wesley Longman, 1989.
- [10] P. Larranaga, C. Kuijpers, R. Murga, and S. Dizdarevic. Genetic algorithms for the travelling salesman problem: A review of representations and operators. *Artificial Intelligence Review*, 13(2):129–170, 1999.
- [11] Z. Michaliwicz. *Genetic Algorithms + Data Structures = Evolution Programs*. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg New York, 3. edition, 1996.
- [12] I. Rechenberg. *Evolutionstrategie*. Friedrich Frommann Verlag, 1973.
- [13] G. Reinelt. TSPLIB - A traveling salesman problem library. *ORSA Journal on Computing* 3, 3:376–384, 1991.
- [14] E. Schoeneburg, F. Heinzmann, and S. Feddersen. *Genetische Algorithmen und Evolutionsstrategien*. Addison-Wesley, 1994.
- [15] R. Smith, S. Forrest, and A. Perelson. Population diversity in an immune system model: Implications for genetic search. *Foundations of Genetic Algorithms*, 2:153–166, 1993.
- [16] S. Wagner and M. Affenzeller. HeuristicLab: A generic and extensible optimization environment. *Accepted to be published in: Proceedings of the International Conference on Adaptive and Natural Computing Algorithms (ICANNGA) 2005*, 2005.
- [17] S. Winkler, M. Affenzeller, and S. Wagner. Identifying nonlinear model structures using genetic programming techniques. *Proceedings of the European Meeting on Cybernetics and Systems Research - EMCSR 2004*, pages 689–694, 2004.
- [18] S. Winkler, M. Affenzeller, and S. Wagner. New methods for the identification of nonlinear model structures based upon genetic programming techniques. *Proceedings of the 15th International Conference on Systems Science*, pages 386–393, 2004.
- [19] Y. Yoshida and N. Adachi. A diploid genetic algorithm for preserving population diversity - pseudo-meiosis GA. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, 866:36–45, 1994.

²First results tables for the thyroid and Wisconsin breast cancer data-sets are shown on <http://www.heuristiclab.com/results/regression>.