

Design and Analysis of Evolutionary and Swarm Intelligence Techniques for Topology Design of Distributed Local Area Networks

by

Salman A. Khan

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree Philosophiae Doctor
in the Faculty of Engineering, Built Environment, and Information Technology

University of Pretoria

Pretoria

July 2009

Design and Analysis of Evolutionary and Swarm Intelligence Techniques for Topology Design of Distributed Local Area Networks

by
Salman A. Khan

Abstract

Topology design of distributed local area networks (DLANs) can be classified as an NP-hard problem. Intelligent algorithms, such as evolutionary and swarm intelligence techniques, are candidate approaches to address this problem and to produce desirable solutions. DLAN topology design consists of several conflicting objectives such as minimization of cost, minimization of network delay, minimization of the number of hops between two nodes, and maximization of reliability. It is possible to combine these objectives in a single-objective function, provided that the trade-offs among these objectives are adhered to. This thesis proposes a strategy and a new aggregation operator based on fuzzy logic to combine the four objectives in a single-objective function. The thesis also investigates the use of a number of evolutionary algorithms such as stochastic evolution, simulated evolution, and simulated annealing. A number of hybrid variants of the above algorithms are also proposed. Furthermore, the applicability of swarm intelligence techniques such as ant colony optimization and particle swarm optimization to topology design has been investigated. All proposed techniques have been evaluated empirically with respect to their algorithm parameters. Results suggest that simulated annealing produced the best results among all proposed algorithms. In addition, the hybrid variants of simulated annealing, simulated evolution, and stochastic evolution generated better results than their respective basic algorithms. Moreover, a comparison of ant colony optimization and particle swarm optimization shows that the latter generated better

results than the former.

Keywords: Optimization, Local area networks, Fuzzy logic, Simulated annealing, Simulated evolution, Stochastic evolution, Swarm intelligence, Ant colony optimization, Particle swarm optimization, Unified And-Or operator.

Thesis Supervisor: Prof Andries P. Engelbrecht
Department of Computer Science
Degree: Doctor of Philosophy



Dedicated to my beloved parents

Acknowledgements

All praise be to God Almighty, for his limitless blessing and guidance. It is only because of his will and mercy that this thesis was made possible.

I would like to express my profound gratitude and appreciation to my supervisor, Professor Andries P. Engelbrecht, for his guidance, patience, and sincere advice throughout this thesis. I acknowledge his valuable time and constructive criticism. Each moment I spent working with him in this research was enjoyable and exciting.

All my family members, especially my parents, were a constant source of motivation and support. Their love and care carried me through some difficult moments in my life. Their prayers, guidance and inspiration led to this accomplishment. I am also very thankful to my sisters Amber and Sahar for their kind support, and to my wife Sobia for her patience and understanding.

Contents

| | |
|---|------------|
| List of Tables | xv |
| List of Figures | xvi |
| 1 Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1 Motivation | 2 |
| 1.2 Objectives | 4 |
| 1.3 Methodology | 6 |
| 1.4 Contributions | 6 |
| 1.5 Organization of Thesis | 8 |
| 2 Optimization and Optimization Approaches | 11 |
| 2.1 Optimization | 11 |
| 2.2 Constrained Multi-objective Optimization | 16 |
| 2.2.1 Weighted Sum Method | 18 |
| 2.2.2 ε -Constraint Method | 20 |
| 2.2.3 Lexicographic Ordering | 22 |
| 2.2.4 Goal Programming | 23 |
| 2.2.5 Goal Attainment | 25 |
| 2.2.6 Other Approaches | 27 |
| 2.3 Fuzzy Logic and Multi-objective Optimization | 28 |
| 2.3.1 Fuzzy Set Theory | 29 |
| 2.3.2 Fuzzy Reasoning | 31 |
| 2.3.3 Linguistic Variables | 32 |
| 2.3.4 Fuzzy Rules | 33 |
| 2.3.5 Fuzzy Logic System | 34 |
| 2.3.6 Common Fuzzy Operators | 34 |
| 2.3.7 Role of Preferences in Multi-objective Optimization | 41 |
| 2.4 Optimization Algorithms | 41 |
| 2.4.1 Genetic Algorithm | 43 |
| 2.4.2 Simulated Evolution | 47 |
| 2.4.3 Stochastic Evolution | 52 |
| 2.4.4 Simulated Annealing | 57 |
| 2.4.5 Tabu Search | 63 |

| | | |
|----------|--|------------|
| 2.4.6 | Ant Colony Optimization | 67 |
| 2.4.7 | Particle Swarm Optimization | 77 |
| 2.5 | Conclusion | 85 |
| 3 | Topology Design of Distributed Local Area Networks | 86 |
| 3.1 | Background | 86 |
| 3.2 | Assumptions and Problem Statement | 90 |
| 3.2.1 | Assumptions | 90 |
| 3.2.2 | Problem Statement | 91 |
| 3.3 | Design Objectives and Constraints | 92 |
| 3.3.1 | Design objectives | 92 |
| 3.3.2 | Constraints | 95 |
| 3.4 | Fuzzy Logic Approach to the DLAN Topology Design Problem | 96 |
| 3.5 | Characteristics of Test Cases | 100 |
| 3.5.1 | Upper and Lower Bounds for Objective Values | 101 |
| 3.6 | Conclusion | 103 |
| 4 | The Unified AND-OR Fuzzy Operator | 104 |
| 4.1 | Definition of the Unified AND-OR Operator | 104 |
| 4.2 | Mathematical Properties | 107 |
| 4.3 | Fuzzy Rules for Topology Design | 112 |
| 4.3.1 | Case 1: Simultaneous Optimization of All Four Objectives | 112 |
| 4.3.2 | Case 2: Simultaneous Optimization of Three Objectives | 112 |
| 4.3.3 | Case 3: Simultaneous Optimization of Two Objectives | 113 |
| 4.3.4 | Case 4: Optimization of Any One Objective | 115 |
| 4.4 | Preferences and UAO | 115 |
| 4.4.1 | Preference rules involving all four objectives: | 118 |
| 4.4.2 | Preference rules involving three objectives: | 119 |
| 4.4.3 | Preference rules involving two objectives: | 119 |
| 4.4.4 | Combining the main rules with preference rules | 119 |
| 4.5 | Application of UAO to Topology Design | 122 |
| 4.6 | Empirical Results and Discussion | 123 |
| 4.6.1 | Application of UAO and OWA to Ex1 | 124 |
| 4.6.2 | Application of UAO and OWA to Ex2 | 126 |
| 4.7 | Conclusions | 128 |
| 5 | Fuzzy Stochastic Evolution Algorithm for DLAN Topology Design | 130 |
| 5.1 | Fuzzy Stochastic Evolution | 131 |
| 5.2 | Tabu Stochastic Evolution | 133 |
| 5.3 | Experimental Results | 135 |
| 5.3.1 | Effect of Tabu List Size | 136 |
| 5.3.2 | Comparison of FStocE and TFStocE | 138 |
| 5.4 | Dynamic Value of R_c | 146 |
| 5.5 | Comparison of OWA and UAO Operators | 150 |

| | | |
|----------|---|------------|
| 5.6 | Conclusions | 153 |
| 6 | Fuzzy Simulated Evolution for DLAN Topology Design | 155 |
| 6.1 | Fuzzy Simulated Evolution Algorithm | 156 |
| 6.1.1 | Initialization | 156 |
| 6.1.2 | Fuzzy Evaluation | 156 |
| 6.1.3 | Fuzzy Allocation | 160 |
| 6.2 | Tabu Simulated Evolution | 160 |
| 6.3 | Experimental Results | 161 |
| 6.3.1 | Effect of Tabu List Size | 162 |
| 6.3.2 | Comparison of FSimE and TFSimE | 164 |
| 6.4 | Dynamic Bias | 171 |
| 6.5 | Comparison of OWA and UAO Operators | 176 |
| 6.6 | Conclusions | 178 |
| 7 | Fuzzy Simulated Annealing for DLAN Topology Design | 180 |
| 7.1 | Fuzzy Simulated Annealing Algorithm | 180 |
| 7.1.1 | Initialization | 181 |
| 7.1.2 | Metropolis Algorithm | 182 |
| 7.1.3 | Evaluation of a solution | 183 |
| 7.1.4 | Stopping Criterion | 183 |
| 7.2 | Hybrid Simulated Annealing Algorithms | 183 |
| 7.2.1 | Tabu Fuzzy Simulated Annealing | 184 |
| 7.2.2 | Evolutionary Tabu Fuzzy Simulated Annealing | 184 |
| 7.3 | Results and Discussion | 186 |
| 7.3.1 | Effect of Tabu List size | 187 |
| 7.3.2 | Comparison of FSA, TFSA, and TEFSA | 189 |
| 7.4 | Dynamic Markov chain size | 201 |
| 7.4.1 | Comparison of OWA and UAO | 205 |
| 7.5 | Conclusion | 211 |
| 8 | Fuzzy Ant Colony Optimization Algorithm for DLAN Topology Design | 212 |
| 8.1 | Fuzzy Ant Colony Optimization Algorithm | 213 |
| 8.1.1 | Initialization (Generation of Ants) | 213 |
| 8.1.2 | Ants Activity | 213 |
| 8.1.3 | Fuzzy Heuristic Value | 215 |
| 8.2 | Results and Discussion | 215 |
| 8.2.1 | Effect of Pheromone Deposit and Evaporation | 216 |
| 8.2.2 | Effect of Number of Ants | 219 |
| 8.2.3 | Comparison of OWA and UAO | 227 |
| 8.3 | Conclusions | 229 |

| | | |
|-----------|---|------------|
| 9 | Fuzzy Particle Swarm Optimization for DLAN Topology Design | 231 |
| 9.1 | Fuzzy Particle Swarm Optimization Algorithm | 231 |
| 9.1.1 | Particle Position and Velocity Representation | 232 |
| 9.1.2 | Velocity Update | 233 |
| 9.1.3 | Particle Position Update | 237 |
| 9.1.4 | Fitness Evaluation | 237 |
| 9.1.5 | Initialization | 238 |
| 9.1.6 | Particle Activity | 238 |
| 9.2 | Results and Discussion | 239 |
| 9.2.1 | Effect of Swarm size | 240 |
| 9.2.2 | Effect of Acceleration Coefficients | 246 |
| 9.2.3 | Effect of Inertia Weight | 248 |
| 9.2.4 | Effect of Velocity Clamping | 250 |
| 9.3 | Comparison of OWA and UAO | 252 |
| 9.4 | Conclusions | 254 |
| 10 | Comparison of Techniques | 255 |
| 10.1 | Comparison of Single Solution Algorithms | 255 |
| 10.2 | Comparison of Population Based Algorithms | 258 |
| 10.3 | Overall Comparison of OWA and UAO | 261 |
| 10.4 | Overall Best Algorithm | 262 |
| 10.5 | Conclusion | 263 |
| 11 | Conclusion | 264 |
| 11.1 | Summary | 265 |
| 11.2 | Future Research | 268 |
| | Appendix A - Nomenclature | 308 |
| | Appendix B - Linear Regression Analysis | 311 |
| | Appendix C - Derived Publications | 313 |

List of Tables

| | | |
|-----|---|-----|
| 3.1 | Network characteristics assumed for experiments. | 101 |
| 3.2 | Characteristics of test cases used in experiments. MinC is in US\$, MinD is in milliseconds, and traffic is in Mbps. | 101 |
| 4.1 | Results for UAO for Ex1. N= number of local sites in the network, B=Bias, C=Cost, D=Delay, H=Hops, R=Reliability, Avg= Average percentage improvement of the five test cases. Statistically significant improvements are in italics. | 125 |
| 4.2 | Results for OWA for Ex1. N= number of local sites in the network, B=Bias, C=Cost, D=Delay, H=Hops, R=Reliability, Avg= Average percentage improvement of the five test cases. Statistically significant improvements are in italics. | 126 |
| 4.3 | Results for UAO for Ex2. N= number of local sites in the network, B=Bias, C=Cost, D=Delay, H=Hops, R=Reliability, Avg= Average percentage improvement of the five test cases. Statistically significant improvements are in italics. | 128 |
| 4.4 | Results for OWA for Ex2. N= number of local sites in the network, B=Bias, C=Cost, D=Delay, H=Hops, R=Reliability, Avg= Average percentage improvement of the five test cases. Statistically significant improvements are in italics. | 129 |
| 5.1 | Parameter settings for fuzzy StocE used in the experiments. | 135 |
| 5.2 | Effect of tabu list size on the quality of overall goodness for TFStocE using OWA. Run time is in seconds. Statistically significant improve- ment is in italics. NA = Not Applicable (since size 7 was used as the reference for comparison). | 139 |
| 5.3 | Effect of tabu list size on the quality of overall goodness for TFStocE using UAO. Run time is in seconds. Statistically significant improve- ment is in italics. NA = Not Applicable (since size 7 was used as the reference for comparison). | 140 |
| 5.4 | Comparison of FStocE and TFStocE for OWA. TL = Tabu List Size, Time = Run time (in seconds), and % imp = percentage improve- ment. Statistically significant percentage improvements are in italics. | 144 |

| | | |
|------|--|-----|
| 5.5 | Comparison of FStocE and TFStocE for UAO. TL = Tabu List Size, Time = Run time (in seconds), and % imp = percentage improvement. Statistically significant percentage improvements are in italics. | 144 |
| 5.6 | Ratio of tabu moves for TFStocE using UAO. | 145 |
| 5.7 | Effect of different R_c values on overall goodness of solutions with $p_0 = 0.1$ and $p_{incr} = 0.05$ for OWA and UAO. Statistically significant difference is in italics. | 146 |
| 5.8 | Comparison of FStocE and DTFStocE for OWA. Time = Run time (in seconds), and % imp = percentage improvement. % improvement is for DTFStocE compared to FStocE. Statistically significant improvement is in italics. | 151 |
| 5.9 | Comparison of FStocE and DTFStocE for UAO. Time = Run time (in seconds), and % imp = percentage improvement. % improvement is for DTFStocE compared to FStocE. Statistically significant improvement is in italics. | 151 |
| 5.10 | Comparison of OWA and UAO for TFStocE. | 152 |
| 6.1 | Effect of tabu list size on the quality of overall goodness for TFSimE using OWA. Run time is in seconds. Statistically significant improvement is in italics. NA = Not Applicable (since size 7 was used as the reference for comparison). | 165 |
| 6.2 | Effect of tabu list size on the quality of overall goodness for TFSimE using UAO. Run time is in seconds. Statistically significant improvement is in italics. NA = Not Applicable (since size 7 was used as the reference for comparison). | 166 |
| 6.3 | Comparison of FSimE and TFSimE for OWA. TL = Tabu List Size, Time = Run time (in seconds), and % imp = percentage improvement. Statistically significant percentage improvements are in italics. | 170 |
| 6.4 | Comparison of FSimE and TFSimE for UAO. TL = Tabu List Size, Time = Run time (in seconds), and % imp = percentage improvement. Statistically significant percentage improvements are in italics. | 170 |
| 6.5 | Comparison of FSimE and DTFSimE for OWA. Time = Run time (in seconds). % improvement is for DTFSimE compared to FSimE. Statistically significant improvement is in italics. | 173 |
| 6.6 | Comparison of FSimE and DTFSimE for UAO. Time = Run time (in seconds). % improvement is for DTFSimE compared to FSimE. Statistically significant improvement is in italics. | 173 |
| 6.7 | Comparison of OWA and UAO for DTFSimE. | 177 |
| 7.1 | Summary of best overall goodness with Markov chain size $M = 10$ and $M = 30$ using the OWA operator for FSA. % improvement shows improvement achieved by $M = 10$ with reference to $M = 30$. Statistically significant improvement is in italics. | 187 |

| | | |
|------|--|-----|
| 7.2 | Summary of best overall goodness with Markov chain size $M = 10$ and $M = 30$ using the UAO operator for FSA. % improvement shows improvement achieved by $M = 10$ with reference to $M = 30$. Statistically significant improvement is in italics. | 187 |
| 7.3 | Effect of tabu list size on the quality of overall goodness for TFSA using OWA. Run time is in seconds. Statistically significant improvement is in italics. NA = Not Applicable (since size 7 was used as the reference for comparison). | 190 |
| 7.4 | Effect of tabu list size on the quality of overall goodness for TFSA using UAO. Statistically significant improvement is in italics. NA = Not Applicable (since size 7 was used as the reference for comparison).191 | |
| 7.5 | Summary of overall goodness and percentage improvement with OWA for FSA, TFSA, and TEFSA. TL = Tabu list size, imp = percentage improvement. Statistically significant improvement is in italics. | 194 |
| 7.6 | Average run time (in seconds) of algorithms in Table 7.5. | 194 |
| 7.7 | Summary of overall goodness and percentage improvement with UAO for FSA, TFSA, and TEFSA. TL = Tabu list size, imp = percentage improvement. Statistically significant improvement is in italics. | 195 |
| 7.8 | Average run time (in seconds) of algorithms in Table 7.7. | 195 |
| 7.9 | Average goodness of links for FSA, TFSA, and TEFSA using the OWA operator. AGL represents the average goodness of links. Statistically significant percentage difference is given in italics. | 200 |
| 7.10 | Comparison of FSA and DTEFSA for OWA. Time = Run time (in seconds). % imp shows percentage improvement achieved by DTEFSA compared to FSA. Statistically significant results are in italics. | 205 |
| 7.11 | Comparison of FSA and DTEFSA for UAO. Time = Run time (in seconds). % imp shows percentage improvement achieved by DTEFSA compared to FSA. Statistically significant results are in italics. | 206 |
| 7.12 | Comparison of OWA and UAO for monetary cost of best solutions of 30 runs for FSA. % imp = percentage improvement achieved by UAO compared to OWA. Statistically significant results are in italics. | 207 |
| 7.13 | Comparison of OWA and UAO for monetary cost of best solutions of 30 runs for TFSA. % imp = percentage improvement achieved by UAO compared to OWA. Statistically significant results are in italics. | 207 |
| 7.14 | Comparison of OWA and UAO for monetary cost of best solutions of 30 runs for TEFSA. % imp = percentage improvement achieved by UAO compared to OWA. Statistically significant results are in italics. | 207 |
| 7.15 | Comparison of OWA and UAO for delay of best solutions of 30 runs for FSA. % imp = percentage improvement achieved by UAO compared to OWA. Statistically significant results are in italics. | 208 |
| 7.16 | Comparison of OWA and UAO for delay of best solutions of 30 runs for TFSA. % imp = percentage improvement achieved by UAO compared to OWA. Statistically significant results are in italics. | 208 |

| | | |
|------|---|-----|
| 7.17 | Comparison of OWA and UAO for delay of best solutions of 30 runs for TEFSA. % imp = percentage improvement achieved by UAO compared to OWA. Statistically significant results are in italics. | 208 |
| 7.18 | Comparison of OWA and UAO for number of hops of best solutions of 30 runs for FSA. % imp = percentage improvement achieved by UAO compared to OWA. Statistically significant results are in italics. | 209 |
| 7.19 | Comparison of OWA and UAO for number of hops of best solutions of 30 runs for TFSA. % imp = percentage improvement achieved by UAO compared to OWA. Statistically significant results are in italics. | 209 |
| 7.20 | Comparison of OWA and UAO for number of hops of best solutions of 30 runs for TEFSA. % imp = percentage improvement achieved by UAO compared to OWA. Statistically significant results are in italics. | 209 |
| 7.21 | Comparison of OWA and UAO for reliability of best solutions of 30 runs for FSA. % imp = percentage improvement achieved by UAO compared to OWA. Statistically significant results are in italics. . . . | 210 |
| 7.22 | Comparison of OWA and UAO for reliability of best solutions of 30 runs for TFSA. % imp = percentage improvement achieved by UAO compared to OWA. Statistically significant results are in italics. . . . | 210 |
| 7.23 | Comparison of OWA and UAO for reliability of best solutions of 30 runs for TEFSA. % imp = percentage improvement achieved by UAO compared to OWA. Statistically significant results are in italics. . . . | 210 |
| 8.1 | Parameter settings for fuzzy ACO used in experiments. DEP = difference between pheromone deposit and evaporation rates. | 216 |
| 8.2 | Results for best and worst average overall goodness and their respective pheromone deposit and evaporation rate setup using OWA. Time = Run time (in seconds), % imp = percentage improvement. Statistically significant improvement is in italics. | 217 |
| 8.3 | Results for best and worst average overall goodness and their respective pheromone deposit and evaporation rate setup using UAO. Time = Run time (in seconds), % imp = percentage improvement. Statistically significant improvement is in italics. | 218 |
| 8.4 | Results for n50 with OWA for different population size, pheromone deposit rate, and evaporation rate. OG = average overall goodness with standard deviation. | 222 |
| 8.5 | Results for n40 with OWA for different population size, pheromone deposit rate, and evaporation rate. Goodness = average overall goodness with standard deviation. | 222 |
| 8.6 | Results for n33 with OWA for different population size, pheromone deposit rate, and evaporation rate. Goodness = average overall goodness with standard deviation. | 223 |
| 8.7 | Results for n25 with OWA for different population size, pheromone deposit rate, and evaporation rate. Goodness = average overall goodness with standard deviation. | 223 |

| | | |
|------|---|-----|
| 8.8 | Results for n15 with OWA for different population size, pheromone deposit rate, and evaporation rate. Goodness = average overall goodness with standard deviation. | 224 |
| 8.9 | Results for n50 with UAO for different population size, pheromone deposit rate, and evaporation rate. OG = average overall goodness with standard deviation. | 224 |
| 8.10 | Results for n40 with UAO for different population size, pheromone deposit rate, and evaporation rate. OG = average overall goodness with standard deviation. | 225 |
| 8.11 | Results for n33 with UAO for different population size, pheromone deposit rate, and evaporation rate. Goodness = average overall goodness with standard deviation. | 225 |
| 8.12 | Results for n25 with UAO for different population size, pheromone deposit rate, and evaporation rate. Goodness = average overall goodness with standard deviation. | 226 |
| 8.13 | Results for n15 with UAO for different population size, pheromone deposit rate, and evaporation rate. Goodness = average overall goodness with standard deviation. | 226 |
| 8.14 | Improvement with respect to increase in number of ants for different DEP rates using OWA. Statistically significant improvements are in italics. | 227 |
| 8.15 | Improvement with respect to increase in number of ants for different DEP rates using UAO. Statistically significant improvements are in italics. | 227 |
| 8.16 | Comparison of OWA and UAO for ACO. | 230 |
| 9.1 | Parameter settings for fuzzy PSO used in experiments. | 240 |
| 9.2 | Effect of swarm size on overall goodness for n50 with OWA and UAO. Time = Run time (in seconds), % Diff = % Difference. Statistically significant difference is in italics. | 241 |
| 9.3 | Effect of swarm size on overall goodness for n40 with OWA and UAO. Time = Run time (in seconds), % Diff = % Difference. Statistically significant difference is in italics. | 242 |
| 9.4 | Effect of swarm size on overall goodness for n33 with OWA and UAO. Time = Run time (in seconds), % Diff = % Difference. Statistically significant difference is in italics. | 242 |
| 9.5 | Effect of swarm size on overall goodness for n25 with OWA and UAO. Time = Run time (in seconds), % Diff = % Difference. Statistically significant difference is in italics. | 242 |
| 9.6 | Effect of swarm size on overall goodness for n15 with OWA and UAO. Time = Run time (in seconds), % Diff = % Difference. Statistically significant difference is in italics. | 243 |

| | | |
|------|--|-----|
| 9.7 | Results for best and worst average overall goodness and their respective number of particles for OWA. Statistically significant improvement is in italics. | 244 |
| 9.8 | Results for best and worst average overall goodness and their respective number of particles for UAO. Statistically significant improvement is in italics. | 244 |
| 9.9 | Effect of acceleration coefficients on the test cases, for OWA. Good = average overall goodness, Time = Run time (in seconds). % imp shows the improvement achieved by one set of values of c_1 and c_2 over the other set of values. Statistically significant improvement is in italics. | 246 |
| 9.10 | Effect of acceleration coefficients on the test cases, for UAO. Good = average overall goodness, Time = Run time (in seconds). % imp shows the improvement achieved by one set of values of c_1 and c_2 over the other set of values. Statistically significant improvement is in italics. | 247 |
| 9.11 | Effect of inertia weight on the test cases, for OWA. Good = average overall goodness, Time = Run time (in seconds). % imp shows the improvement achieved by one value of w over the other value. Statistically significant improvement is in italics. | 248 |
| 9.12 | Effect of inertia weight on the test cases, for UAO. Good = average overall goodness, Time = Run time (in seconds). % imp shows the improvement achieved by one value of w over the other value. Statistically significant improvement is in italics. | 249 |
| 9.13 | Effect of velocity clamping on the test cases, for OWA. % imp shows the improvement achieved by one value of V_{max} compared to the other value. NA = Not Applicable. | 250 |
| 9.14 | Average algorithm run time (in seconds) for different values of V_{max} given in Table 9.13. | 251 |
| 9.15 | Effect of velocity clamping on the test cases, for UAO. % imp shows the improvement achieved by one value of V_{max} compared to the other value. NA = Not Applicable. | 251 |
| 9.16 | Average algorithm run time (in seconds) for different values of V_{max} given in Table 9.15. | 252 |
| 9.17 | Comparison of OWA and UAO for FPSO. | 253 |
| 10.1 | Comparison of TFStocE, DTFSimE, and TEFSA using OWA. % imp denote percentage improvements. Statistically significant improvement is in italics. | 256 |
| 10.2 | Average run time (in seconds) of algorithms in Table 10.1. | 257 |
| 10.3 | Comparison of TFStocE, DTFSimE, and TEFSA using UAO. % imp denote percentage improvements. Statistically significant improvement is in italics. | 257 |
| 10.4 | Average run time (in seconds) of algorithms in Table 10.3. | 258 |

| | | |
|-------|---|-----|
| 10.5 | Comparison of FACO and FPSO for OWA. dep = pheromone deposit rate, evap = pheromone evaporation rate, % imp = percentage improvement achieved by FACO. OG = overall goodness. Statistically significant improvement is in italics. | 259 |
| 10.6 | Average run time (in seconds) of algorithms in Table 10.5. | 259 |
| 10.7 | Comparison of FACO and FPSO for UAO. dep = pheromone deposit rate, evap = pheromone evaporation rate, % imp = percentage improvement achieved by FACO. OG = overall goodness. Statistically significant improvement is in italics. | 260 |
| 10.8 | Average run time (in seconds) of algorithms in Table 10.7. | 261 |
| 10.9 | Comparison of FACO and TEFSA for OWA. dep = pheromone deposit rate, evap = pheromone evaporation rate, Time = run time (in seconds), % imp = percentage improvement achieved by TEFSA. Statistically significant improvement is in italics. | 262 |
| 10.10 | Comparison of FACO and TEFSA for UAO. dep = pheromone deposit rate, evap = pheromone evaporation rate, Time = run time (in seconds), % imp = percentage improvement achieved by TEFSA. Statistically significant improvement is in italics. | 263 |

List of Figures

| | | |
|------|---|-----|
| 2.1 | Example of global maximum \mathbf{x}^* and local maximum \mathbf{x}_b | 14 |
| 2.2 | Membership function for a fuzzy set A | 30 |
| 2.3 | Fuzzy logic system | 35 |
| 2.4 | Effect of β on OWA-AND function | 39 |
| 2.5 | Effect of β on OWA-OR function | 40 |
| 2.6 | Structure of the simulated evolution algorithm | 50 |
| 2.7 | The stochastic evolution algorithm | 53 |
| 2.8 | The Perturb function | 55 |
| 2.9 | The update procedure for stochastic evolution algorithm | 57 |
| 2.10 | Structure of the simulated annealing algorithm | 58 |
| 2.11 | Algorithmic description of tabu search | 64 |
| 2.12 | Pseudo-code of the ant colony optimization meta-heuristic | 75 |
| 2.13 | Pseudo-code of the basic particle swarm optimization algorithm | 79 |
| 3.1 | A typical distributed local area network (WS represents a workgroup switch) | 88 |
| 3.2 | Basic components of a good topology | 97 |
| 3.3 | Membership function of the objective to be optimized | 97 |
| 4.1 | Effect of ν on Unified AND-OR operator | 106 |
| 5.1 | Two disjoint trees containing nodes P and Q | 132 |
| 5.2 | Candidate moves (illustrated with dotted lines) that can replace the removed link between P and Q | 132 |
| 5.3 | The fuzzy stochastic evolution algorithm for DLAN topology design . | 134 |
| 5.4 | Plots of average overall goodness versus tabu list size for FStocE using the OWA operator for (a) n50 (b) n40 (c) n33 (d) n25 (e) n15 | 141 |
| 5.5 | Plots average overall goodness versus tabu list size for FStocE using the UAO operator for (a) n50 (b) n40 (c) n33 (d) n25 (e) n15 | 142 |
| 5.6 | Plots of average overall goodness versus tabu list size for FStocE using the OWA operator for (a) n50 (b) n40 (c) n33 (d) n25 (e) n15 | 149 |
| 6.1 | Depths of links with respect to the root node R | 157 |
| 6.2 | Plots of average overall goodness versus tabu list size for FSimE using the OWA operator for (a) n50 (b) n40 (c) n33 (d) n25 (e) n15 | 167 |

| | | |
|-----|---|-----|
| 6.3 | Plots average overall goodness versus tabu list size for FSimE using the UAO operator for (a) n50 (b) n40 (c) n33 (d) n25 (e) n15 | 168 |
| 6.4 | Plots of average goodness of links versus iterations for n40 using OWA obtained with (a) FSimE (with bias = 0.0) (b) DTFSimE | 174 |
| 6.5 | Plots of variation in bias versus iterations for n40 using OWA obtained with DTFSimE | 175 |
| 7.1 | Plots of maximum, minimum, and average values of membership function “Good topology” versus tabu list size using the OWA operator for (a) n50 (b) n40 (c) n33 (d) n25 (e) n15 | 192 |
| 7.2 | Plots of maximum, minimum, and average values of membership function “Good topology” versus tabu list size using the UAO operator for (a) n50 (b) n40 (c) n33 (d) n25 (e) n15 | 193 |
| 7.3 | Frequency of solution in different membership ranges for function “Good topology” using the OWA operator for FSA, TFSA, and TEFSA for (a) n50 (b) n40 (c) n33 (d) n25 (e) n15 | 196 |
| 7.4 | Frequency of solution in different membership ranges for function “Good topology” using the UAO operator for FSA, TFSA, and TEFSA for (a) n50 (b) n40 (c) n33 (d) n25 (e) n15 | 197 |
| 7.5 | Plots of best value of membership function “Good topology” versus execution time using the OWA operator for FSA, TFSA, and TEFSA for (a) n50 (b) n40 (c) n33 (d) n25 (e) n15 | 202 |
| 7.6 | Plots of best value of membership function “Good topology” versus execution time using the UAO operator for FSA, TFSA, and TEFSA for (a) n50 (b) n40 (c) n33 (d) n25 (e) n15 | 203 |
| 8.1 | Plot for overall goodness for test case <i>n50</i> using FACO with DEP = 0.2 and DEP = 0.5 | 219 |
| 8.2 | Percentage improvement with increase in number of ants for different parameter setup using (a) OWA (b) UAO | 228 |
| 9.1 | Network topology for PSO example | 234 |
| 9.2 | Effect of swarm size on overall goodness for (a) n50 (b) n40 (c) n33 (d) n25 (e) n15 | 245 |



“For the things we have to learn before we can do them, we learn by doing them.”

Aristotle

“I learned this, at least, by my experiment; that if one advances confidently in the direction of his dreams, and endeavors to live the life which he has imagined, he will meet with a success unexpected in common hours.”

Henry David Thoreau