

1. (a) Premature convergence can be prevented either by introducing a varying mutation rate (based on the degree of diversity in the population) or by reducing the crossover probability p_c . Another alternative is to introduce some form of mating restriction (as is done in diffusion models). Using fitness ranking would have been an alternative if roulette-wheel selection were used, but in this case it was stated that tournament selection would be used, thus excluding fitness ranking as an option.
- (b) The two steps are called transcription and translation. In transcription, the information in a gene (in the form of a sequence of bases, from the alphabet A, C, G, and T) is read by RNA polymerase, resulting in an mRNA molecule, containing the same information (albeit coded slightly differently) as the gene. In translation, the mRNA molecule is used as a template when forming a chain of amino acids (i.e. a protein). Each codon, i.e. a sequence of three bases in the mRNA molecule, e.g. CAA, encode a particular amino acid. Some codons encode the start and stop command. Once the stop command has been reached the amino acid chain is complete.
- (c) i. The number of possible pairs of individuals equals $5 \times 5 = 25$. Each of these pairs have equal probability of occurring, namely $1/25$. Of those pairs, nine involved individual 4, namely (1,4), (2,4), (3,4), (4,4), (5,4), (4,1),(4,2),(4,3),(4,5). Individual 4 is the better individual in 6 cases, namely (4,1),(4,2),(4,3),(1,4),(2,4), and (3,4) and the worse individual in two cases, namely (4,5) and (5,4). In the remaining case, (4,4), individual 4 is selected with probability 1. Thus, with a tournament selection parameter of 0.8, one finds

$$p_4 = \frac{1}{25} (6 \times 0.8 + 2 \times (1 - 0.8) + 1) = 0.248. \quad (1)$$

- ii. The expression for the cumulative normalized fitness sum is

$$\phi_j = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^j F_i}{\sum_{i=1}^N F_i}, \quad (2)$$

where F_i denotes the fitness of individual i and N is the population size. In RWS, a random number $r \in [0, 1[$ is drawn, and the selected individual is taken as the one with the smallest j that satisfies $\phi_j > r$.

iii. The fitness sum equals 38. Using the equation for ϕ_j one finds $\phi_1 = 3/38 \approx 0.0789$, $\phi_2 = 9/38 \approx 0.2368$, $\phi_3 = 16/38 \approx 0.4211 > 0.3$. Thus, the individual with the smallest j that satisfies ϕ_j is individual 3, which will thus be selected.

2. (a) The search direction is the negative gradient $(-\nabla f)$. Here, the gradient takes the form

$$\nabla f(x_1, x_2) = \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1}, \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_2} \right)^T = (4x_1 + 3x_2, 3x_1 + 2x_2)^T, \quad (3)$$

where T denotes the transpose of the vector. Thus,

$$-\nabla f(x_1, x_2)|_{x_1=1, x_2=1} = -(7, 5)^T. \quad (4)$$

In gradient descent, the next iterate \mathbf{x}_{i+1} is given by

$$\mathbf{x}_{i+1} = \mathbf{x}_i - \eta \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_i). \quad (5)$$

At the point $(1, 1)^T$, one then obtains

$$\mathbf{x}_{i+1} = (1, 1)^T - \eta(7, 5)^T = (1 - 7\eta, 1 - 5\eta)^T. \quad (6)$$

At this point, the function thus becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(\eta) &\equiv f(1 - 7\eta, 1 - 5\eta) = 2(1 - 7\eta)^2 + 3(1 - 7\eta)(1 - 5\eta) + (1 - 5\eta)^2 - 4 \\ &= 2 - 28\eta + 98\eta^2 + 3 - 15\eta - 21\eta + 105\eta^2 + 1 - 10\eta + 25\eta^2 - 4 = \\ &228\eta^2 - 74\eta + 2. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

- (b) The function to be minimized is the distance (squared) from a point $(x_1, x_2, x_3)^T$ to the point \mathbf{P} , given by

$$f(x_1, x_2, x_3) = (x_1 - 3)^2 + (x_2 - 1)^2 + (x_3 + 1)^2 \quad (8)$$

The constraint h takes the form

$$h(x_1, x_2, x_3) = x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2 - 4 = 0. \quad (9)$$

In order to use the Lagrange multiplier method we set up $L(x_1, x_2, x_3, \lambda)$ as

$$L(x_1, x_2, x_3, \lambda) = f(x_1, x_2, x_3) + \lambda h(x_1, x_2, x_3). \quad (10)$$

Taking the partial derivatives of L with respect to x_1 , x_2 , x_3 and λ one obtains, in order, the equations

$$2(x_1 - 3) + 2\lambda x_1 = 0, \quad (11)$$

$$2(x_2 - 1) + 2\lambda x_2 = 0, \quad (12)$$

$$2(x_3 + 1) + 2\lambda x_3 = 0, \quad (13)$$

and

$$x_1^2 + x_2^2 + x_3^2 - 4 = 0. \quad (14)$$

From the first of those equations, one gets $x_1(1 + \lambda) = 3$, so that

$$x_1 = \frac{3}{1 + \lambda}. \quad (15)$$

From the second and third equation, one obtains, in a similar fashion,

$$x_2 = \frac{1}{1 + \lambda}. \quad (16)$$

$$x_3 = -\frac{1}{1 + \lambda}. \quad (17)$$

Using the constraint, one thus finds

$$\frac{9}{(1 + \lambda)^2} + \frac{1}{(1 + \lambda)^2} + \frac{1}{(1 + \lambda)^2} = 4, \quad (18)$$

so that

$$(1 + \lambda)^2 = \frac{11}{4}. \quad (19)$$

Therefore $\lambda = -1 \pm \frac{\sqrt{11}}{2}$. With these values of λ one finally obtains the two points $\mathbf{Q}_1 = (6, 2, -2)/\sqrt{11}$ and $\mathbf{Q}_2 = (-6, -2, 2)/\sqrt{11}$. It is then easy to check that the smallest value of f occurs at \mathbf{Q}_1 (and the largest value occurs at \mathbf{Q}_2).

3. (a) Cooperative behavior in ants depends on *stigmergy*, which is a form of communication relying on (local) modification of the environment: As the ants move, they deposit pheromones (a form of volatile hydrocarbon) that other ants can (and often will) follow.

(b) The probability $p(e_{ij}|S)$ takes the form

$$p(e_{ij}|S) = \frac{\tau_{ij}^\alpha \eta_{ij}^\beta}{\sum_{\nu_i \notin L_T(S)} \tau_{ij}^\alpha \eta_{ij}^\beta}, \quad (20)$$

where τ_{ij} is the pheromone level on the edge from node j to node i , η_{ij} is the visibility (which for TSP takes the form $1/d_{ij}$, where d_{ij} is the distance from node j to node i). $L_T(S)$ is the tabu list, i.e. the list of all nodes visited so far. α is a parameter that usually takes the value 1, whereas the parameter β usually takes values in the range 2 to 5.

- (c) If the pheromones are equal on all edges (as was assumed here), the probability of following a given edge is proportional to $\eta_{ij}^\beta = (1/d_{ij})^\beta$. Now, since the value of β generally is (at least) 2, it is evident that the probability of going to the nearest node (for which $1/d_{ij}$ is maximal) will be higher than the probability of going to any other node. Thus, it is not unlikely that at least one or a few ants will follow the nearest-neighbour path in the first iteration (or one of the first iterations).
- (d) Starting from Node 1, at $(1, 0)$, the nearest node is clearly Node 2 (at $(0, 1)$), which is at a distance $d_{21} = \sqrt{2}$. The distances to the other nodes equal $d_{31} = 2$ and $d_{41} = \sqrt{5}$. Since the pheromone levels are the same on all edges, one can neglect them, and the probability of going from Node 1 to Node 2 thus takes the form

$$p(e_{21}|S = \{\nu_1\}) = \frac{\left(\frac{1}{d_{21}}\right)^2}{\left(\frac{1}{d_{21}}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{1}{d_{31}}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{1}{d_{41}}\right)^2} = \frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{5}} = \frac{10}{19}. \quad (21)$$

Once the artificial ant reaches Node 2, it can either go to Node 3 (distance $d_{32} = \sqrt{2}$) or to Node 4 (distance $d_{42} = 3$). The probability of moving to the nearest node (Node 3) is given by

$$p(e_{32}|S = \{\nu_1, \nu_2\}) = \frac{\left(\frac{1}{d_{32}}\right)^2}{\left(\frac{1}{d_{32}}\right)^2 + \left(\frac{1}{d_{42}}\right)^2} = \frac{\frac{1}{2}}{\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{9}} = \frac{9}{11}. \quad (22)$$

At Node 3, the ant has no option but to go to Node 4 (with probability 1), from which it then returns to Node 1. Thus, the probability of traversing the nearest-neighbour path, starting from Node 1, equals

$$p_{1234} = \frac{10}{19} \times \frac{9}{11} = \frac{90}{209} \approx 0.431. \quad (23)$$

4. (a) The velocity update for particle i is given by

$$v_{ij} \leftarrow wv_{ij} + c_1q \left(\frac{x_{ij}^{\text{pb}} - x_{ij}}{\Delta t} \right) + c_2r \left(\frac{x_j^{\text{sb}} - x_{ij}}{\Delta t} \right), \quad j = 1, \dots, n, \quad (24)$$

where w , the inertia weight, handles the tradeoff between exploration and exploitation. If $w > 1$, exploration is favored. If instead $w < 1$, the particle focuses on exploitation of the results already found. Normally, one starts with a value of w of around 1.4, then reduces w by a factor $\beta \approx 0.99$ until w reaches a lower limit of around 0.3 – 0.4, where it is then kept constant.

- (b) i. Initially, the function values are 49/144 (particle 1), 1/16 (particle 2), and 1/4 (particle 3). Thus, the swarm best position is equal to the position of particle 2 (i.e. $x = 0$). With the simplifications, the velocity update takes the form

$$v_i \leftarrow v_i + 2(x_i^{\text{pb}} - x_i) + 2(x^{\text{sb}} - x_i), \quad i = 1, 2, 3. \quad (25)$$

One then obtains:

$$v_1 = 3 + 2(-1/3 - (-1/3)) + 2(0 - (-1/3)) = 11/3, \quad (26)$$

$$v_2 = 1/4 + 2(0 - 0) + 2(1/3 - 1/3) = 1/4, \quad (27)$$

and

$$v_3 = -1 + 2(3/4 - 3/4) + 2(0 - 3/4) = -5/2. \quad (28)$$

Thus, using the equation $x \leftarrow x + v$, the new positions become

$$x_1 = -1/3 + 11/3 = 10/3, \quad (29)$$

$$x_2 = 0 + 1/4 = 1/4, \quad (30)$$

$$x_3 = 3/4 - 5/2 = -7/4. \quad (31)$$

- ii. In the second iteration, the swarm best position is $x = 1/4$, i.e. the position of particle 2 (which, of course, also is the particle best position for that particle). The particle best position is unchanged for particle 1 and particle 3, since the function values at their new positions exceeds those obtained at their initial positions. Using the same equations as above, one obtains

$$v_1 = 11/3 + 2(-1/3 - 10/3) + 2(1/4 - 10/3) = -59/6. \quad (32)$$

However, this value exceeds (in magnitude) the maximum (negative) speed of -4, meaning that the actual speed of the particle will be $v_3 = -4$ instead. For particle 2 one gets

$$v_2 = 1/4 + 2(1/4 - 1/4) + 2(1/4 - 1/4) = 1/4 \quad (33)$$

and for particle 3

$$v_3 = -5/2 + 2(3/4 - (-7/4)) + 2(1/4 - (-7/4)) = 13/2. \quad (34)$$

This value is larger than the limit of 4, so that the actual speed will be $v_3 = 4$ instead. Thus, finally, one obtains

$$x_1 = 10/3 - 4 = -2/3, \quad (35)$$

$$x_2 = 1/4 + 1/4 = 1/2, \quad (36)$$

and

$$x_3 = -7/4 + 4 = 9/4. \quad (37)$$