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Note

This article is accepted for publication in another journal. This article is submitted for re-publication in this journal in an attempt to popularize “Artificial Human Optimization” Field like never before. The First Author of this paper (Satish Gajawada) is completely responsible for this action of re-publication.

Abstract

Artificial Human Optimization is a latest field proposed in December 2016. Just like artificial Chromosomes are agents for Genetic Algorithms, similarly artificial Humans are agents for Artificial Human Optimization Algorithms. Particle Swarm Optimization is very popular algorithm for solving complex optimization problems in various domains. In this paper, Human Thinking Particle Swarm Optimization (HTPSO) is proposed by applying the concept of thinking of Humans into Particle Swarm Optimization. The proposed HTPSO algorithm is tested by applying it on various benchmark functions. Results obtained by HTPSO algorithm are compared with Particle Swarm Optimization algorithm.
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Section 2 explains Particle Swarm Optimization Algorithm. The proposed Human Thinking Particle Swarm Optimization (HTPSO) is described in Section 3. Section 4 shows results obtained. The conclusion is given in Section 5.

2. Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO)

In PSO, first we initialize all particles as shown below. Two variables pbest, and gbest are maintained. pbest, is the best fitness value achieved by i th particle so far and gbest is the best fitness value achieved by all particles so far. Lines 4 to 11 in the below text helps in maintaining particle best and global best. Then the velocity is updated by rule shown in line no. 14. Line 15 updates position of i th particle. Line 19 increments the number of iterations and then the control goes back to line 4. This process of a particle moving towards its local best and also moving towards global best of particles is continued until termination criteria will be reached.
**Procedure:** Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO)

1) Initialize all particles
2) iterations = 0
3) do
   4) for each particle i do
      5) If ( f(x_i) < f(pbest_i) ) then
         6) pbest_i = x_i
      7) end if
      8) if ( f(pbest_i) < f(gbest) ) then
         9) gbest = pbest_i
     10) end if
   11) end for
   12) for each particle i do
      13) for each dimension d do
      14) \[ v_{i,d} = v_{i,d} + C_1 \times \text{Random}(0,1) \times (pbest_{i,d} - x_{i,d}) + C_2 \times \text{Random}(0,1) \times (gbest_d - x_{i,d}) \]
      15) \[ x_{i,d} = x_{i,d} + v_{i,d} \]
   16) end for
   17) end for
   18) iterations = iterations + 1
3) while (termination condition is false)

3. Human Thinking Particle Swarm Optimization (HTPSO)

Almost all Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO) algorithms are proposed such that the particles move towards best particles. But Human Thinking is such that they not only move towards best but also moves away from the worst. This concept was used to design algorithm titled “Multiple Strategy Human Optimization (MSHO)” in [4]. In MSHO, artificial Humans move towards the best in even generations and move away from the worst in odd generations. But in Human Thinking Particle Swarm Optimization, both strategies happen in the same generation and all generations follow the same strategy. That is moving towards the best and moving away from the worst strategies happen simultaneously in the same generation unlike MSHO designed in [4]. The Proposed HTPSO algorithm is shown below:
**Procedure:** Human Thinking Particle Swarm Optimization (HTPSO)

1) Initialize all particles

2) iterations = 0

3) do

4) for each particle i do

5) if ( f( x_i) < f( pbest_i) ) then

6) pbest_i = x_i

7) end if

8) if ( f( pbest_i) < f( gbest ) ) then

9) gbest = pbest_i

10) end if

11) if ( f( x_i) > f( pworst_i) ) then

12) pworst_i = x_i

13) end if

14) if ( f( pworst_i) > f( gworst ) ) then

15) gworst = pworst_i

16) end if

17) end for

18) for each particle i do

19) for each dimension d do

20) \[ v_{i,d} = w \cdot v_{i,d} + \text{Random}(0,1) \cdot (pbest_{i,d} - x_{i,d}) + \text{Random}(0,1) \cdot (gbest_d - x_{i,d}) \]

21) \[ v_{i,d} = v_{i,d} + \text{Random}(0,1) \cdot (x_{i,d} - pworst_{i,d}) + \text{Random}(0,1) \cdot (x_{i,d} - gworst_d) \]

22) \[ x_{i,d} = x_{i,d} + v_{i,d} \]

23) end for

24) end for

25) iterations = iterations + 1
26) **while** (termination condition is false)

### 4. Results

This section shows results obtained after applying proposed HTPSO on various benchmark functions. The obtained results are compared with PSO algorithm. The figures and equations of benchmark functions are taken from [14].

![Figure 1 Ackley Function](image1.png)

\[
f(x) = -a \exp \left(-b \sqrt{\frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=1}^{d} x_i^2}\right) - \exp \left(\frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=1}^{d} \cos(cx_i)\right) + a + \exp(1)
\]

![Figure 2 Equation of Ackley Function](image2.png)

![Figure 3 Result given by HTPSO on Ackley Function](image3.png)

![Figure 4 Result given by PSO on Ackley Function](image4.png)
From Figure 3 and Figure 4 we can see that Optimal value given by proposed HTGPSO is 4.262748 where as PSO gave optimal solution as 0 which is the global optimal of Ackley Function. Hence PSO performed better than proposed HTGPSO on Ackley Function.

Figure 5 Beale Function

\[ f(x) = (1.5 - x_1 + x_1 x_2)^2 + (2.25 - x_1 + x_1 x_2^2)^2 + (2.625 - x_1 + x_1 x_2^3)^2 \]

Figure 6 Equation of Beale Function

From Figure 7 and Figure 8 we can see that Optimal value given by proposed HTGPSO is 0.134325 where as PSO gave optimal solution as 0 which is the global optimal of Beale Function. Hence PSO performed better than proposed HTGPSO on Beale Function.
From Figure 11 and Figure 12 we can see that Optimal value given by proposed HTPSO is 5.305778 where as PSO gave optimal solution as 0 which is the global optimal of Bohachevsky Function. Hence PSO performed better than proposed HTPSO on Bohachevsky Function.
From Figure 15 and Figure 16 we can see that Optimal value given by proposed HTPSO is 0.338471 where as PSO gave optimal solution as 0 which is the global optimal of Booth Function. Hence PSO performed better than proposed HTPSO on Booth Function.
Figure 17 Three-Hump Camel Function

\[ f(x) = 2x_1^2 - 1.05x_1^4 + \frac{x_1^6}{6} + x_1x_2 + x_2^2 \]

Figure 18 Equation of Three-Hump Camel Function

Figure 19 Result given by HTPSO on Three-Hump Camel Function

```
C:\Users\qu\Desktop\PSO_AHO\HTPSO\HTPSO.cdos.pso.modified>PSO PSO.RUN
begin time: Wed Jul 25 17:36:55 2018
0 run finished!
Best X =
-0.069427
-0.093796
Optimal Value : 0.024926
end time: Wed Jul 25 17:36:55 2018
```

Figure 20 Result given by PSO on Three-Hump Camel Function

```
C:\Users\qu\Desktop\PSO_AHO\HTPSO\PSO.cdos>PSO PSO.RUN
begin time: Wed Jul 25 18:44:40 2018
0 run finished!
Best X =
0.000000
0.000000
Optimal Value : 0.000000
end time: Wed Jul 25 18:44:40 2018
```

From Figure 19 and Figure 20 we can see that Optimal value given by proposed HTPSO is 0.024926. PSO gave optimal solution as 0 which is the global optimal of Three-Hump Camel Function. Hence both PSO and HTPSO performed well when applied on Three-Hump Camel Function.

5. Conclusion

An innovative algorithm titled “Human Thinking Particle Swarm Optimization (HTPSO)” is proposed in this paper. Results show that HTPSO and PSO both performed well on Three-Hump Camel Function. PSO performed better than HTPSO on all other benchmark functions. Overall PSO performed better than Human Thinking Particle Swarm Optimization (HTPSO) algorithm. This is just the beginning of research in Artificial Human Optimization Field. General Expectation is that algorithms based on Humans will perform better than other algorithms. In this paper it has been found that Artificial Human Optimization Algorithms might not always perform well. Based on this single paper we cannot say PSO is better than Artificial Human Optimization Algorithms. Still lot of work has to be done in this latest field titled “Artificial Human Optimization”.
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