

A comparison of continuous genetic algorithm and particle swarm optimization in parameter estimation of Gompertz growth model

by Eridani Eridani

Submission date: 15-Apr-2019 05:17PM (UTC+0800)

Submission ID: 1112748599

File name: 1.5094281_1.pdf (637.44K)

Word count: 3472

Character count: 19241

A comparison of continuous genetic algorithm and particle swarm optimization in parameter estimation of Gompertz growth model

Cite as: AIP Conference Proceedings 2084, 020017 (2019); <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.5094281>
Published Online: 22 March 2019

Windarto, Eridani, and Utami Dyah Purwati



View Online



Export Citation

ARTICLES YOU MAY BE INTERESTED IN

Multivariate adaptive regression spline in Ischemic and Hemorrhagic patient (case study)
AIP Conference Proceedings 2084, 020003 (2019); <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.5094267>

Biclustering protein interactions between HIV-1 proteins and humans proteins using LCM-MBC algorithm
AIP Conference Proceedings 2084, 020015 (2019); <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.5094279>

Implementation of factor analysis for bicluster acquisition: Sparseness projection (FABIAS) on microarray of Alzheimer's gene expression data
AIP Conference Proceedings 2084, 020004 (2019); <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.5094268>

AIP | Conference Proceedings

Get **30% off** all
print proceedings!

Enter Promotion Code **PDF30** at checkout



AIP Conference Proceedings 2084, 020017 (2019); <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.5094281>

2084, 020017

© 2019 Author(s).

A Comparison of Continuous Genetic Algorithm and Particle Swarm Optimization in Parameter Estimation of Gompertz Growth Model

Windarto^{1,a)}, Eridani¹ and Utami Dyah Purwati¹

¹*Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science and Technology, Universitas Airlangga, Indonesia.*

^{a)}Corresponding author: windarto@fst.unair.ac.id

Abstract. Genetic algorithm and Particle Swarm Optimization are heuristic optimization methods inspired by genetic principles and swarm behavior phenomena, respectively. Those two methods are initiated by random generation of initial populations (initial solutions), fitness evaluation of every solution, solution updating until a termination condition are met. It is well known that those two methods are not always converge to an optimal solution. Those methods sometimes converge to suboptimal solutions, solution near the optimal solution. In this paper, continuous genetic algorithm and particle swarm optimization were implemented to estimate parameters in the Gompertz growth model from rooster weight data cited from literature. Although the best results of the two models were not significantly differs, we found that the particle swarm optimization method was more robust than the continuous genetic algorithm. Hence, the particle swarm optimization method is more recommended than the continuous genetic algorithm.

Keywords: Gompertz growth model, rooster weight dynamic, parameter estimation, particle swarm optimization.

INTRODUCTION

Mathematical models are useful tool to describe many real problems. A mathematical model is usually began by identification of a real problem. Then one could construct a suitable mathematical model and determining mathematical solution of the model. Finally, one should interpret mathematical solution of the model into real problem points of view. A mathematical model might occur in either a deterministic model or a probabilistic (stochastic) model. Mathematical model validation could be performed whenever relevant data from real phenomena are available. If the predicted results from a mathematical model fit the real data, then the model is said a good model. When the predicted results from the model differ significantly the real data, then the model should be improved and modified.

Most mathematical models contain one or more parameters. The parameters should be estimated in order to accurately perform model simulation. Parameter estimation of a mathematical model could be considered as an optimization problem. Deterministic optimization methods such as conjugate gradient method, Nelder-Mead method or Newton method could be applied to estimate parameters in a mathematical model whenever analytical solution of the model could be presented in closed form [1]. Unfortunately, deterministic optimization methods such as Nelder-Mead or Newton method fail to converge into global minimum of a function if the function has many local minima [2]. Moreover, some mathematical models occur in non-linear ordinary differential equation systems, so exact solution (closed form solution) of the model could not be determined. In this case, heuristic method such as particle swarm optimization and genetic algorithm method could be implemented to estimate parameter values from the models.

Particle swarm optimization and genetic algorithm are optimization methods based on a population-based stochastic search process [3, 4]. Particle swarm optimization methods and modified particle swarm optimization have been widely applied in many areas, including performance improvement of Artificial Neural Network [5, 6], scheduling problems [7, 8], flowshop scheduling problem [9], traveling salesman problem [10], vehicle routing problem [11, 12] and clustering technique [13]. Genetic algorithm has been in parameter estimation in poultry growth model [14, 15] and parameter estimation for dynamical system model [1, 16].

Some authors compared performance of particle swarm optimization and genetic algorithm in some research are. Yang et al. compared the methods in a Hidden Markov Model training [17]. Wang et al. have been compared performance of genetic algorithm and particle swarm optimization in relativistic backward wave oscillator [18]. Islam et al. have compared performance of some nature inspired algorithms including genetic algorithm and particle swarm optimization in function optimization of some benchmark functions [19]. In this paper, we compared performance of continuous genetic algorithm and particle swarm optimization in parameter estimation of Gompertz growth model.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 briefly presents particle swarm optimization and genetic algorithm procedure. Comparison of particle swarm optimization and genetic algorithm in parameter estimation of Gompertz growth model will be presented in Section 3. Finally, conclusions are presented in Section 4.

CONTINUOUS GENETIC ALGORITHM AND PARTICLE SWARM OPTIMIZATION

Genetic algorithm is inspired from principles of genetic and natural selection in a life organism. Therefore, many terms such as gene chromosome, individual, parent, selection, mating, crossover, offspring in genetic algorithm are adopted from biology. From mathematical point of view a gene represents a variable, while a chromosome or an individual represents a solution. Genetic algorithm has at least the following elements, namely populations of chromosomes, selection according to fitness, crossover to produce new offspring, and random mutation of new offspring [20]. Genetic algorithm diagram is presented in the Figure 1. The diagram is adapted from Haupt and Haupt [2].




FIGURE 1. Flowchart of continuous genetic algorithm.

We can transform an optimization problem into a minimization problem. Here is genetic algorithm procedure for finding either optimal or suboptimal solution of a minimization problem [2, 16, 20]:

- (1) Define the objective function (the cost function) and decision variables related to the optimization problem.
- (2) Determine parameter values in genetic algorithm, namely number of generations/number of iteration, crossover probability, and mutation probability/mutation rate.
- (3) Generate initial solutions (initial population) from the search space/solution space.
- (4) Evaluate cost function of each solution (individual). In a minimization problem, all individuals are ordered from the lowest to the highest of objective function value objectivecost to the highest cost.
- (5) Select part of individuals for the next generation as parent individuals. Only the best solutions are maintained for the next generation. The remaining individuals are replaced by better individuals. The selection rate parameter determines the fraction of all population that survives for the next generation. The typical value of selection rate parameter is 50%.
- (6) Carry out mating process from parent individuals.
- (7) Do crossover process to generate offspring individual.
- (8) Perform mutation process to part of solutions to generate solutions.
- (9) Test termination condition. If the termination condition did not satisfy yet, then go to the fourth step.

A main problem in the genetic algorithm is premature convergence where the solutions converge to a local optimum. The premature convergence occurs when a high fitness solution (individual) quickly dominate the population. The problem especially occurs in multimodal problems [21, 22]. Hence, genetic algorithm should be implemented many times to obtain the best solution.

Eberhart and Kennedy developed the particle swarm optimization algorithm in 1995. The algorithm has resemblance to genetic algorithm. The algorithm is started by a set random solutions in a solution space. Then the algorithm searches optimal solution by updating the solutions. However, there are no crossover and mutation process in the particle swarm optimization algorithm. In the algorithm, potential solutions (particles) are updated in the solution space by following the current best solution [4].

In the particle swarm optimization method, a solution is represented by position of a particle. We start the particle swarm optimization by randomly selecting initial solutions in a solution space. Then, we evaluate fitness function of current position. We update the local best position of a particle whenever fitness value of current particle is better than the previous best value. We update the global best based on the best fitness value of all particles. Here are the steps of particle swarm optimization algorithm [4, 23]:

- (1) Calculate fitness value of every particle. The fitness function is related to the objective function. In a minimization problem, the smaller objective function the the greater fitness value will be.
- (2) Update position of local best and global best.
- (3) Update particle velocity by using the equation

$$v_i(t+1) = wv_i(t) + c_1r_1(lbest(t) - x_i(t)) + c_2r_2(gbest(t) - x_i(t)), \quad (1)$$

Here $v_i(t)$ and $x_i(t)$ are velocity of particle i and position of particle i at time t , while $lbest(t)$ and $gbest(t)$ are local best and global best position at time t . Parameters r_1 and r_2 represent random number between zero and one with uniform distribution.

- (4) Update particle position using the following equation

$$x_i(t+1) = x_i(t) + v_i(t+1). \quad (2)$$

The steps are reiterated some termination condition is met.

In Eq. (1), parameters w, c_1, c_2 are inertia weight, cognitive coefficient and social coefficient respectively. The typical value of w between 0.8 and 1.2, while the typical values of c_1 and c_2 are commonly nearly 2. We can apply velocity clamping to avoid particles from moving very distant outside the solution space. For a solution space restricted by the range $[x_{min}, x_{max}]$, the velocity is limited within the range $[-v_{max}, v_{max}]$ where $v_{max} = m(x_{max} - x_{min})$ for some constant m , $0.1 \leq m \leq 1$. The ending conditions in particle swarm optimization comprises a maximum number of iterations, a number of iterations since the last update of global best solution, or a target fitness value has reached by some particles [23].

In a one dimensional problem, particle swarm optimization converges towards a local optimum for a comparatively wide range of objective functions. In multidimensional problem, it turns out that the swarm might not converge towards a local optimum [24]. Convergence of particle swarm optimization to a local optimum is called premature convergence. The premature convergence is commonly caused by particle velocity decrease in the solution space. Then the particle velocity decrease causes to a total implosion and eventually fitness stagnation of the swarm [25]. Hence, particle swarm optimization method should be implemented many times to obtain the best solution.

1 A COMPARISON OF CONTINUOUS GENETIC ALGORITHM AND PARTICLE SWARM OPTIMIZATION

In this section, we compared performance of continuous genetic algorithm and particle swarm optimization in parameter estimation of Gompertz growth model. Gompertz growth model is derived from the following Gompertz differential equation

$$\frac{dy}{dt} = ry \ln\left(\frac{K}{y}\right), y(0) = Y_0. \quad (3)$$

Here, $y(t)$ is population size at time t . The exact solution of the Gompertz differential equation in Eq. (3) could be represented as

$$y(t) = \frac{K}{\exp(\exp(-r(t - t_{inf})))}, \quad (4)$$

where $t_{inf} = \frac{1}{r} \ln\left(\ln\left(\frac{K}{Y_0}\right)\right)$. The Gompertz growth model has three parameters namely intrinsic growth (r), carrying capacity (K), and inflection time (t_{inf}) parameter. From biological point of view, the fastest growth of a population occur at the inflection time.

In this paper, the Gompertz growth model is applied to describe rooster growth where the data is cited from literature [15, 26]. The rooster growth data is shown in the Table 1.

TABLE 1. Means of the rooster weight data (y).

t (days)	y (grams)	t (days)	y (grams)
0	37	42	519.72
3	41.74	45	577.27
6	59.19	48	633.59
9	79.94	51	667.18
12	102.96	54	717.17
15	132.13	57	786.35
18	170.18	71	1069.28
21	206.56	85	1326.49
24	250.71	99	1589.71
27	285.27	113	1859.26
30	324.92	127	2015.44
33	372.83	141	2142.31
36	417.41	155	2220.54
39	469.13	170	2262.63

Since $y(t)$ is the rooster weight at time t , then the carrying capacity parameter (K) could be interpreted as the rooster mature weight or the maximum weight that can be attained by the rooster. Parameters in the Gompertz model (K, r, t_{inf}) are estimated such that the mean absolute percentage error (MAPE)

$$MAPE = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \left| \frac{y_i - \widehat{y}_i}{y_i} \right| \quad (5)$$

is minimum. Here n is number of observation data.

We applied continuous genetic algorithm and particle swarm optimization to estimate parameters in the Gompertz growth model. Here, optimal parameters in the Gompertz growth model was found from the following search space

$$\Omega = \left\{ (K, r, t_{inf}) \in R^3 : K \in [2000, 5000], r \in [0, 0.1], t_{inf} \in [30, 100] \right\}. \quad (6)$$

We applied particle swarm optimization method described in the previous section with the inertia weight parameter $w = 1$, the cognitive coefficient parameter $c_1 = 2$ and the social coefficient parameter $c_2 = 2$ respectively. We also applied continuous genetic algorithm for various mutation rate (m) namely $m = 0.05, 0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4, 0.5$. For

both algorithm, number of population is set to 100 individuals (particles). We applied both methods for 50 trials while for every trial the methods were terminated after 500 iterations. The best estimation results of the particle swarm optimization and the continuous genetic algorithm was presented in the Table 2.

TABLE 2. The best estimation results of the particle swarm optimization and the continuous genetic algorithm.

Methods	K	r	t_{inf}	MAPE
PSO	2468.54	0.023646	60.68	0.039334
GA (m = 0.05)	2445.65	0.023870	60.15	0.039465
GA (m = 0.1)	2435.97	0.023800	60.21	0.039225
GA (m = 0.2)	2437.81	0.023740	60.34	0.039117
GA (m = 0.3)	2468.65	0.023749	60.67	0.039326
GA (m = 0.4)	2444.90	0.023750	60.41	0.039173
GA (m = 0.5)	2468.70	0.023628	60.77	0.039185

m = mutation rate.

From the Table 2, we found that best result (minimum of MAPE) of the continuous genetic algorithm and the particle swarm optimization method were not significantly differ. The mean average percentage error for the Gompertz growth model obtained from the methods were around 3.9%. The results indicated that the Gompertz growth model could be applied to describe rooster growth dynamic. It also indicated that particle swarm optimization and continuous genetic algorithm were successfully implemented in parameter estimation of the Gompertz growth model.

Particle swarm optimization and continuous genetic algorithm are essentially probabilistic methods. Hence, the two methods will generally produce different optimal/sub optimal solution in every trial/calculation/experiment. Statistics of the MAPE of the both methods was presented in the Table 3.

TABLE 3. Statistics of Mean Absolute Percentage Error.

Methods	Number of trials	Average of MAPE	Standard deviation	Minimum	Median	Maximum	p-value
PSO	50	0.045661 ^a	0.003743	0.039334	0.045548	0.058081	
GA (m = 0.05)	50	0.092665 ^b	0.051349	0.039465	0.077008	0.267170	
GA (m = 0.1)	50	0.093638 ^b	0.044163	0.039225	0.087674	0.202533	p-value < 0.0005
GA (m = 0.2)	50	0.084986 ^b	0.037714	0.039117	0.080257	0.244075	
GA (m = 0.3)	50	0.098225 ^b	0.054169	0.039326	0.084729	0.270992	
GA (m = 0.4)	50	0.092345 ^b	0.066085	0.039173	0.070386	0.400521	
GA (m = 0.5)	50	0.091441 ^b	0.051345	0.039185	0.077055	0.325060	

m = mutation rate.

^{a,b} different superscripts showed significant difference between group at the level 0.05.

From the Table 3, we found that the MAPE average of various mutation rate in the continuous genetic algorithm did not significantly differ. Although the best result (minimum of MAPE) of the continuous genetic algorithm and the particle swarm optimization method were not significantly differ, the MAPE average of the particle swarm optimization method was smaller than the continuous genetic algorithms one. We also found that the MAPE variance of the genetic algorithms were more higher than the particle swarm optimization variance. This results indicate that the particle swarm optimization method was more robust than the continuous genetic algorithm.

CONCLUSIONS

We have implemented particle swarm optimization and continuous genetic algorithm in parameter estimation of the Gompertz growth model. Although the best results of the two models were not significantly differs, we found that the particle swarm optimization method was more robust than the continuous genetic algorithm.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research was financially supported by Ministry of Research, Technology, and Higher Education through "Penelitian Unggulan Perguruan Tinggi" project.

REFERENCES

- [1] Tutkun, N., Parameter estimation in mathematical models using the real coded genetic algorithms, *Expert Systems with Applications* 36, pp. 3342-3345, 2009.
- [2] Haupt, R. L. & Haupt, S. E., Practical genetic algorithms, 2nd ed., John Wiley & Sons, 10-13, 2004.
- [3] Eberhart R. & Kennedy, J. A new optimizer using particle swarm theory, Proceedings of the Sixth International Symposium on Micro Machine and Human Science, 3943, 1995.
- [4] Kuo, R. J., Wang, M. J. & Huang, T. W., An application of particle swarm optimization algorithm to clustering analysis, *Soft Computing* 15, pp. 533542, 2011.
- [5] Salerno, J., Using the particle swarm optimization technique to train a recurrent neural model, Proceedings of the Ninth IEEE International Conference on Tools with Artificial Intelligence, pp 4549, 1997.
- [6] Zhang, C., Shao, H. & Li, Y., Particle swarm optimization for evolving artificial neural network, IEEE international conference on systems, man and cybernetics, 24872490, 2000.
- [7] Koay, C.A. & Srinivasan, D., Particle swarm optimization-based approach for generator maintenance scheduling. In: Proceedings of the 2003 IEEE swarm intelligence symposium, 167173, 2003.
- [8] Weijun, X., Zhiming, W., Wei, Z. & Genke, Y., A new hybrid optimization algorithm for the job-shop scheduling problem, Proceedings of the 2004 American Control Conference, 55525557, 2004.
- [9] Liao, C. J., Chao-Tang Tseng, Luarn, P., A discrete version of particle swarm optimization for flowshop scheduling problems, *Computers and Operations Research* Vol. 34, No. 10, pp. 3099-3111, 2017.
- [10] Wang, K.P., Huang, L., Zhou, C.G. & Pang, W., Particle swarm optimization for traveling salesman problem, 2003 International Conference on Machine Learning and Cybernetics, 15831585, 2003.
- [11] Wu, B., Yanwei, Z., Yaliang, M., Hongzhao, D. & Weian, W., Particle swarm optimization method for vehicle routing problem, Fifth World Congress on Intelligent Control and Automation, 22192221, 2004.
- [12] Xiao, J.M., Li, J.J., Wang, X.H., Modified particle swarm optimization algorithm for vehicle routing problem, *Jisuanji Jicheng Zhizao Xitong (Computer Integrated Manufacturing Systems)* Vol. 11 No. 4, pp. 577-581, 2005.
- [13] Niu, B., Duan, Q., Liu, J., Tan, L. , Liu, Y., A population-based clustering technique using particle swarm optimization and k-means, *Natural Computing* Vol 16. No. 1: 45-59, 2017.
- [14] Roush, W.B. & Branton, S. L., A Comparison of Fitting Growth Models with a Genetic Algorithm and Nonlinear Regression, *Poultry Science* 84, pp. 494502, 2005.
- [15] Windarto, Indratno, S. W., Nuraini, N., & Soewono, E., A comparison of binary and continuous genetic algorithm in parameter estimation of a logistic growth model, *AIP Conference Proceedings* 1587, 139142, 2014.
- [16] Windarto, An implementation of continuous genetic algorithm in parameter estimation of predator-prey model, *AIP Conference Proceedings* 1718, 2016.
- [17] Yang, F., Zhang, C., Sun, T., Comparison of Particle Swarm Optimization and Genetic Algorithm for HMM training, Proceedings - International Conference on Pattern Recognition 2008, 2008.
- [18] Wang, H., Liu, D., Meng, L., Liu, L., Particle swarm optimization and genetic algorithm for a relativistic backward wave oscillator, *Jisuan Wuli (Chinese Journal of Computational Physics)* Vol. 31, No. 4, pp. 479-485, 2014.
- [19] Islam, M.J., Tanveer, M.S.R., Akhand, M.A.H., A comparative study on prominent nature inspired algorithms for function optimization, 5th International Conference on Informatics, Electronics and Vision (ICIEV) 2016, 7760112, pp. 803-808, 2016.
- [20] Mitchell, M., An Introduction to Genetic Algorithms, MIT Press, 1-10, 1999.
- [21] Nicoara, E.S., Mechanisms to Avoid the Premature Convergence of Genetic Algorithms, *Buletinul Universitații Petrol - Gaze din Ploiești* 61(1):87-96, 2009.
- [22] Malik, S., Wadhwa, S., Preventing Premature Convergence in Genetic Algorithm Using DGCA and Elitist Technique, *International Journal of Advanced Research in Computer Science and Software Engineering* 4(6): 410-418, 2014.

- [23] Rini, D.P., Shamsuddin, S.M., Yuhaniz, S.S., Particle Swarm Optimization: Technique, System and Challenges, *International Journal of Computer Applications* 14(1), 2011.
- [24] Schmitt, B.I., Convergence Analysis for Particle Swarm Optimization, FAU University Press, Erlangen, 2015.
- [25] Ye, H., Luo, W., Li, Z., Convergence Analysis of Particle Swarm Optimizer and Its Improved Algorithm Based on Velocity Differential Evolution, *Computational Intelligence and Neuroscience* Volume 2013, Article ID 384125, 2013.
- [26] Aggrey, S.E., Comparison of Three Nonlinear and Spline Regression Models for Describing Chicken Growth Curves, *Poultry Science* 81:1782-1788, 2002.

A comparison of continuous genetic algorithm and particle swarm optimization in parameter estimation of Gompertz growth model

ORIGINALITY REPORT

23%

SIMILARITY INDEX

10%

INTERNET SOURCES

22%

PUBLICATIONS

0%

STUDENT PAPERS

PRIMARY SOURCES

1

Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 2014.

Publication

2%

2

Yuriy Famulyak, Bogdan Demchyna, Justyna Sobczak-Piąstka. "The influence of size and form of plate anchors on their work at anchoring of reinforcement in the array of cellular concrete", AIP Publishing, 2019

Publication

2%

3

Raaj Kumar Rangdale Anandarao, Sriram Srinivasan, Harikiran Reddy Rommala, Yenugadhati Prajna Deepthi. "Experimental investigation on influence of molybdenum content on tribological properties of hybrid PTFE composite", AIP Publishing, 2019

Publication

1%

4

"Advances in Swarm Intelligence", Springer Nature, 2011

Publication

1%

5

Akifumi Oda, Takashi Kawakami, Yasutaka

Kitagawa, Mitsutaka Okumura, Ohgi Takahashi.
"Continuous optimization methods for ground-
state searches of spin clusters", Polyhedron,
2011

Publication

1%

6

euroasiapub.org

Internet Source

1%

7

S.J. Habib, B.S. Al-kazemi. "Comparative Study
Between the Internal Behavior of GA and PSO
Through Problem-Specific Distance Functions",
2005 IEEE Congress on Evolutionary
Computation, 2005

Publication

1%

8

www.softcomputing.net

Internet Source

1%

9

ppjpi.unair.ac.id

Internet Source

1%

10

link.springer.com

Internet Source

1%

11

epdf.tips

Internet Source

1%

12

gigapaper.ir

Internet Source

1%

13

Dang Huu Nghi. "A New Model of Particle
Swarm Optimization for Model Selection of

1%

Support Vector Machine", Studies in Computational Intelligence, 2011

Publication

14

zidapps.boku.ac.at

Internet Source

1%

15

www.geomatejournal.com

Internet Source

1%

16

Bo Yang, Yunping Chen, Zunlian Zhao. "A Hybrid Evolutionary Algorithm by Combination of PSO and GA for Unconstrained and Constrained Optimization Problems", 2007 IEEE International Conference on Control and Automation, 2007

Publication

1%

17

Lecture Notes in Computer Science, 2007.

Publication

<1%

18

"Advanced Intelligent Computing Theories and Applications. With Aspects of Artificial Intelligence", Springer Nature, 2007

Publication

<1%

19

hal.inria.fr

Internet Source

<1%

20

Qingwei Li, Jiang Wu, Hongqi Wei. "Reduction of elemental mercury in coal-fired boiler flue gas with computational intelligence approach", Energy, 2018

<1%

21 citeseerx.ist.psu.edu <1 %
Internet Source

22 "Advances in Intelligent Computing", Springer <1 %
Nature, 2005
Publication

23 J. Madar, J. Abonyi, F. Szeifert. "Interactive particle swarm optimization", 5th International Conference on Intelligent Systems Design and Applications (ISDA'05), 2005 <1 %
Publication

24 Azmi Ahmad, Faizah Shaari. "Solving University/Polytechnics Exam Timetable Problem using Particle Swarm Optimization", Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Ubiquitous Information Management and Communication - IMCOM '16, 2016 <1 %
Publication

25 Zhenxin Du, Dezhi Han, Kuan-Ching Li. "Improving the performance of feature selection and data clustering with novel global search and elite-guided artificial bee colony algorithm", The Journal of Supercomputing, 2019 <1 %
Publication

26 Fatmawati, Muhammad Altaf Khan, Muftiyatul Azizah, Windarto, Saif Ullah. "A fractional model <1 %

for the dynamics of competition between commercial and rural banks in Indonesia", *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals*, 2019

Publication

27

eprints.utm.my

Internet Source

<1%

28

Enea Rezzonico, Sofiane Lariani, Caroline Barretto, Gabriella Cuanoud et al. "Global transcriptome analysis of the heat shock response of *Bifidobacterium longum*", *FEMS Microbiology Letters*, 2007

Publication

<1%

29

file.scirp.org

Internet Source

<1%

30

"Information Computing and Applications", Springer Nature, 2011

Publication

<1%

31

bioinfopublication.org

Internet Source

<1%

32

onlinelibrary.wiley.com

Internet Source

<1%

33

Jacomine Grobler. "Metaheuristics for the multi-objective FJSP with sequence-dependent set-up times, auxiliary resources and machine down time", *Annals of Operations Research*, 01/10/2009

<1%

34

www.essex.ac.uk

Internet Source

<1%

35

vdocuments.mx

Internet Source

<1%

36

www.academpublisher.com

Internet Source

<1%

37

Cheng-Jian Lin. "Using an efficient hybrid of cooperative particle swarm optimization and cultural algorithm for neural fuzzy network design", 2009 International Conference on Machine Learning and Cybernetics, 07/2009

Publication

<1%

38

"Advances in Machine Learning and Cybernetics", Springer Nature, 2006

Publication

<1%

39

Bin Wang. "Dynamic Pricing Model for Flight Based on Passenger Behavior Choice and its Solution of Particle Swarm Optimization", 2008 4th International Conference on Wireless Communications Networking and Mobile Computing, 10/2008

Publication

<1%

40

"Advances in Swarm Intelligence", Springer Nature, 2010

Publication

<1%

41 Noroozi, Amir, Hadi Mokhtari, and Isa Nakhai Kamal Abadi. "Research on computational intelligence algorithms with adaptive learning approach for scheduling problems with batch processing machines", Neurocomputing, 2013. <1%

Publication

42 "Recent Advances on Soft Computing and Data Mining", Springer Nature, 2014 <1%

Publication

43 Mehmood, Shahid, Stefano Cagnoni, Monica Mordonini, and Shoab Ahmad Khan. "An embedded architecture for real-time object detection in digital images based on niching particle swarm optimization", Journal of Real-Time Image Processing, 2015. <1%

Publication

44 Y.L. Dupont, B. Strandberg, C. Damgaard. "Effects of herbicide and nitrogen fertilizer on non-target plant reproduction and indirect effects on pollination in Tanacetum vulgare (Asteraceae)", Agriculture, Ecosystems & Environment, 2018 <1%

Publication

45 Darby I. Cairns, Flavio H. Fenton, E. M. Cherry. "Efficient parameterization of cardiac action potential models using a genetic algorithm", Chaos: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Nonlinear <1%

Science, 2017

Publication

Exclude quotes Off

Exclude matches Off

Exclude bibliography On

A comparison of continuous genetic algorithm and particle swarm optimization in parameter estimation of Gompertz growth model

GRADEMARK REPORT

FINAL GRADE

/0

GENERAL COMMENTS

Instructor

PAGE 1

PAGE 2

PAGE 3

PAGE 4

PAGE 5

PAGE 6

PAGE 7

PAGE 8
