

# A fast converging particle swarm optimization through targeted, position-mutated, elitism (PSO-TPME)

T. SHAQARIN<sup>1</sup> AND B. R. NOACK<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Tafila Technical University, Department of Mechanical Engineering, 66110 Tafila, Jordan (e-mail: tshagareen@ttu.edu.jo)

<sup>2</sup>Harbin Institute of Technology, School of Mechanical Engineering and Automation, Shenzhen 518055, P.R. China (e-mail: bernd.noack@hit.edu.cn)

Corresponding author: T. Shaqarin (e-mail: tshagareen@ttu.edu.jo).

This work is supported by the National Science Foundation of China (NSFC) through grants 12172109 and 12172111 and by the Natural Science and Engineering grant 2022A1515011492 of Guangdong province, P.R. China.

**ABSTRACT** We dramatically improve convergence speed and global exploration capabilities of particle swarm optimization (PSO) through a targeted position-mutated elitism (PSO-TPME). The three key innovations address particle classification, elitism, and mutation in the cognitive and social model. PSO-TPME is benchmarked against five popular PSO variants for multi-dimensional functions, which are extensively adopted in the optimization field. In particular, the convergence accuracy, convergence speed, and the capability to find global minima is investigated. The statistical error is assessed by numerous repetitions. The simulations demonstrate that proposed PSO variant outperforms the other variants in terms of convergence rate and accuracy by orders of magnitude.

**INDEX TERMS** Elitism, Mutation, Particle swarm optimization, Particles' Classification

## I. INTRODUCTION

**P**ARTICLE swarm optimization (PSO) is a metaheuristic optimization approach that imitates the dynamics of biological systems such as the swarm of birds. Kennedy and Eberhart [1] published the first seminal paper on PSO. As a result, the variety of research articles ascribed to the development of particle swarm optimization and swarm intelligence grown massively. The PSO algorithm is simple to implement and has a low memory requirements. Consequently, it has been used in a multitude of complex applications that involve optimization, control, machine learning, and so on.

PSO is widely used in the design, sizing, control and maximum power point tracking (MPPT) of renewable energy systems; such as photovoltaic (PV) systems [2]–[4], wind turbines [5]–[7] and Hybrid PV-wind systems [8]–[10]. The authors in [11]–[13] implemented PSO in the control of robotics for various applications. PSO is also popular in unmanned vehicles in performing path planning [14], [15] and path tracking [16]–[18].

PSO has been implemented widely in the sizing, design, modeling, and control of various types of refrigeration system, such as reducing power consumption of multiple chiller systems [19], optimizing cascade refrigeration cycles [20], standing wave thermoacoustic refrigerators [21] and vapor

compression refrigeration cycles [22].

Nevertheless, while PSO is efficient in optimizing multi-dimensional complexities [23], its drawbacks involve premature convergence and stagnation to local optima [24]–[29], as well as a slow convergence rate [24], [25], [28]–[30]. According to Jiao *et al.* and Chen [24], [25], the drawbacks of PSO originates from its own structure. The social model readily falls into local optima, practically, each particle in PSO follows rather dynamically the path of the global best position. This global best could be influenced by a local minimum, which leads all particles to a position with poor fitness. Whereas, the cognitive model has the drawback of slow convergence especially in the final phases of the evolving iterations when tackling various complexities. This motivates the particles' classifications in order to treat each category with different updating strategy to achieve better convergence rates and to enhance global explorations capabilities [25], [31]–[33].

The authors in [24], [31], [34]–[36] implemented the particle elitism approach to speed up the convergence of PSO. Elitism is a process in which particles with poor fitness values are replaced with particles with the best fitness value (elite particles) after a certain number of iterations, resulting in the production of a new swarm with a better particle's average

arXiv:2207.00900v1 [cs.NE] 2 Jul 2022

fitness. The elitism process in nature requires a preliminary step which is the particle classification, in order to distinguish poor and elite particles. This process will indeed speed up the convergence but on the other hand, it will lessen the diversity of the particles and may increase the probability of falling into a local optimum.

Beneficial to boost particle swarm diversity and mitigate the risk of falling into local optimum. References [24], [37]–[40] proposed the concept of mutation in PSO algorithm to improve the convergence accuracy and speed. In the literature there are mainly two mutation's types implemented in the PSO algorithm. The first one is the global best mutation as proposed by [24], [40], in which the particles' position are mutated indirectly in response to the change of global best. The second type is the direct position mutation as reported by [39], which is better emulating the mutation process inspired by genetic algorithms (GA). The mutation process will enhance the diversity of the swarm which results in better exploration capabilities but it may slow down the convergence as reported by [39]. This can be explained by the fact that mutation will indeed be useful to poor or moderate particles but it may also deteriorate the fitness of good particle.

In this work, the basic PSO will be highlighted along with several PSO variants that involve the three key elements affecting the convergence speed and global exploration capabilities; particle's classification, elitism and mutation. The proposed PSO method, particle swarm optimization with targeted position-mutated elitism (PSO-TPME), will benefits from these key features in order to enhance both convergence speed and the global exploration capabilities, by introducing an alternative classification technique, elitism and targeted position mutation in the PSO algorithm. The proposed algorithm will be tested on multidimensional benchmark functions with various complexities.

## II. PARTICLE SWARM OPTIMIZATION (PSO)

PSO's method generates a swarm of particles at random positions to represent possible solutions to an optimization task throughout the parameter space. The particle locations are hence iterated with the target of achieving a global optimum of a fitness value. The algorithm then examines each particle's position and stores the best solution for each particle, which is called personal best ( $P_b$ ). Moreover, during every iteration ( $It$ ), PSO records the best solution throughout the swarm, which is called global best ( $G_b$ ). For every subsequent iteration, the particles' position ( $x$ ) and velocity ( $v$ ) are determined as a function of the swarm's best position (social component), the particle's best personal position (the cognitive component), and its prior velocity (memory component). In general, PSO has several versions, linearly decreasing weight particle swarm optimization is one of the basic versions of PSO, known as LDW-PSO, that reads;

$$v_{ij}^{k+1} = wv_{ij}^k + c_1r_1(P_{bij} - x_{ij}^k) + c_2r_2(G_{bj} - x_{ij}^k) \quad (1)$$

$$x_{ij}^{k+1} = x_{ij}^k + v_{ij}^{k+1} \quad (2)$$

$$w = w_{max} - It \times \frac{(w_{max} - w_{min})}{It_{max}} \quad (3)$$

The subscript  $i$  is ranging from 1 to  $N$  number of particles and the subscript  $j$  is ranging from 1 to  $n$  dimensions. The factor  $w$  is known as the inertia weight,  $w_{max}$  and  $w_{min}$  are the maximum and the minimum inertia weight, respectively, and the product  $wv$  represents the particle's momentum. The acceleration factors are  $c_1$  and  $c_2$ , while  $r_1$  and  $r_2$  are the output of random generators ranging from 0 to 1.

### A. PSO WITH CLASSIFICATION

Chen [25] proposed PSO-M, a study on particle classification that improves the convergence rate and convergence accuracy of PSO. The classification is based on observing the particles' fitness value at each iteration, identifying the particles' fitness mean ( $aver$ ) and also the best and worst fitness values, ( $f_{max}$ ) and ( $f_{min}$ ), respectively. Then, two averages are calculated,  $aver1$  and  $aver2$ , between  $f_{max}$  and  $aver$  and between  $f_{min}$  and  $aver$ , respectively. Hence, the fitness space ( $f_{min} - f_{max}$ ) is divided into three categories. Considering maximization problem, the classification will be as follows; particles with fitness values in the range ( $aver1 - f_{max}$ ) are updated using the cognitive PSO component, particles with fitness values in the range ( $f_{min} - aver2$ ) are updated using the social PSO component, and the remaining particles are updated using the basic PSO model. One drawback of this classification is that all particles are classified starting from the initialization and can even last after the convergence, that is, no classification termination criteria, as seen in Fig. 1.


### B. PSO WITH MUTATION

Influenced by genetic algorithms (GA), Jiao *et al.* [24] proposed the concept of elite PSO with mutation (EPSOM) to improve the convergence accuracy and speed. The global best was mutated to boost particle swarm diversity and mitigate the risk of falling into local optimum. The mutation is performed as follows;

$$G_b' = G_b(1 + 0.5\eta) \quad (4)$$

where  $\eta$  is a randomly generated number ranging from 0 to 1.

Another recent study by Lü *et al.* [40] that relies on the global best mutation in a similar manner as in (4), proposed an adaptive weighted and mutation particle swarm optimization (AWMPSO) to enhance global search capabilities of the PSO. In which the mutation probability of the global best is now adaptive, where the mutation probability of the global best depend on the population fitness's variance. Apart from the significant improvement of this approach on the enhanced exploration ability and the convergence speed and accuracy, this approach still has limitations due to the fact that the mutation is implemented on the global best as seen in (4). Hence, the particles' positions are mutated indirectly through the global best mutation. According to (4), the change in the global best is limited and can vary gradually with the



**FIGURE 1.** Particles' evolution and classification with evolving iterations using PSO-M.

evolving iterations. Furthermore, the mutation is not targeted, since the mutation of the global best affect all particles. In this case, the mutation will indeed be useful to poor or moderate particles but it may also deteriorate the fitness of good particle.

Wang *et al.* [39] proposed a new method that relies on the position mutation (M-PSO). The particles' position mutation process is activated conditionally as an intermediate step just before the evaluation of the personal best and the global of the PSO algorithm. The condition requires that a randomly generated number to be less than an adaptively generated threshold value ( $TH$ ). The threshold value was defined as:

$$TH = \left(1 - \frac{i - 1}{It_{max} - 1}\right)^{\frac{1}{mu}} \quad (5)$$

where  $mu$  is the mutation factor. Wang *et al.* [39] reported that increasing mutation factor can enhance the convergence accuracy but it reduces the convergence speed. As seen in (5), the threshold value is updated by the evolving iterations, not the particles' fitness, which can be mainly considered as a termination criterion. The threshold value is crucial parameter in M-PSO approach, not only because it is dictating the activation of the mutation process, but because it also decides the upper and the lower bounds of the mutated position. In M-PSO approach, there is no particle classifications, hence, the mutation is performed on all the particles. That is, M-PSO does not use targeted mutation which can contribute negatively on the movement of the good particles and consequently affect the convergence speed as reported by Wang

*et al.* [39].

### C. PROPOSED PSO (PSO-TPME)

The initial concept of the proposed PSO, is automated-termination, adaptive particles' classification with elitism based on particles' fitness values ( $f$ ). The classification is performed as follows; the mean ( $m$ ) of the fitness values of all particles is calculated at each iteration. Then, a fixed percentage ( $p$ ) around the mean is calculated to generate lower and upper bounds. Now the particles are divided into three categories: good, fair, and bad. Hence, considering a maximization problem, particles with fitness higher than the upper bound (good particles) can decrease their velocity to improve exploitation in the local domain via relying on their personal best (PSO cognitive component) instead of the global best (PSO social component). The particles with fitness that is located within the lower and upper bounds (fair particles), those have relatively average fitness can continue both exploration and exploitation while using the basic PSO algorithm. Particles with fitness that is less than the lower bound (bad particles) can initially increase their velocities to enhance exploration in the global search domain, via relaying on the global best instead of its personal best. If the bad particles after a number of iterations ( $N_e$ ) are still classified as bad particles. Then the elitism process is activated to speed up the convergence rate. The elitism process is basically intended to cope with the so called "hopeless particles", those given the chance for exploring the search space and failed to level up to better category. Now the elitism simply

locates the hopeless particles in the position of the particle with the maximum fitness ( $f_{max}$ ). This process speeds up the convergence rate significantly with proper choice of  $N_e$  as shown in the Fig. 2. Conducting PSO using the earlier approach will drastically reduce the diversity of the particle swarm during the preliminary stages of evolving iterations. As a result, the probability of entrapment in a region of the local optimum is high. Adding a mutation to the particle's position of the maximum fitness ( $x_j(f_{max})$ ) will boost the diversification of the elite particle and reduce the possibility of falling into a local optimum. Hence, the mutation is now targeting bad particles only, and the mutation is performed on the particle's position directly instead of indirect mutation of the position using the global best as proposed by Jiao *et al.* [24]. The details of the proposed PSO algorithm considering a maximization problem are in (6), in which the elite particle's positions ( $x_j(f_{max})$ ) are mutated by  $(2a\eta + (1 - a))$ , where  $\eta$  is a randomly generated number ranging from 0 to 1 and  $a$  is a presetting parameter that defines the mutation range. The basic idea is that the elite position ( $x_j(f_{max})$ ) is mutated in the range  $(x_j(f_{max})(1 \pm a))$ , in which the mean is unity multiplied by  $x_j(f_{max})$  which gives higher probability to  $x_j(f_{max})$ , that is, exploitation of the elite particle's position without neglecting the chances of exploring

new particles' positions. The aforementioned range can be increased or decreased via varying  $a$  for higher or lower dimension functions, respectively.

This classification is called automated-termination classification because, after some iterations, all the particles will fall into the middle category since, on one hand, the particles' fitness values will eventually be close and, on the other hand, the particles' mean fitness is gradually increasing which will expand the bounds of the middle category. Hence, the classification will stop automatically as depicted in Fig. 2. This classification is also considered adaptive classification because of particles' mean variation at each iteration. The particles' mean will change, therefore the upper and lower bound of the middle category will dynamically vary, as the calculation of these bounds depends only on a fixed percentage around the particles' mean. This type of particles' classification is motivated by its implantation simplicity, low memory requirements, and automated-termination criteria based on the particles convergence. The latter is very crucial since elitism with mutation takes part in the proposed PSO. Now, the automated termination criteria will stop the classification and the elitism with mutation as well, without manual or other termination criteria being involved, which otherwise may require extra processing.

$$\left\{ \begin{array}{ll}
 \begin{array}{l}
 v_{ij}^{k+1} = wv_{ij}^k + c_1r_1(P_{bij} - x_{ij}^k) \\
 x_{ij}^{k+1} = x_{ij}^k + v_{ij}^{k+1},
 \end{array} & \text{if } f_{ij}^k > (1+p)m \\
 \hline
 \begin{array}{l}
 v_{ij}^{k+1} = wv_{ij}^k + c_1r_1(P_{bij} - x_{ij}^k) + c_2r_2(G_{bj} - x_{ij}^k) \\
 x_{ij}^{k+1} = x_{ij}^k + v_{ij}^{k+1},
 \end{array} & \text{if } (1-p)m \leq f_{ij}^k \leq (1+p)m \\
 \hline
 \begin{array}{l}
 v_{ij}^{k+1} = wv_{ij}^k + c_2r_2(G_{bj} - x_{ij}^k) \\
 x_{ij}^{k+1} = x_{ij}^k + v_{ij}^{k+1},
 \end{array} & \text{if } f_{ij}^k < (1-p)m \ \& \ It < N_e \\
 \hline
 \text{-----} & \\
 \begin{array}{l}
 x_{ij}^{k+1} = x_j(f_{max})(2a\eta + (1 - a)),
 \end{array} & \text{if } f_{ij}^k < (1-p)m \ \& \ It \geq N_e
 \end{array} \right. \quad (6)$$

### III. BENCHMARK PROBLEMS


A group of recognized benchmark multi-dimensional functions, which are extensively adopted in the optimization field, were employed to assess the performance of EPSOM, LDW-PSO, PSO-M, M-PSO, and the suggested PSO algorithm in terms of convergence accuracy and convergence speed. The benchmark functions are used herein as minimization problems, each of which offers a distinct level of complexity to the tested algorithm to be assessed. Function complexity such as; unimodality or multimodality, symmetric or asymmetric and separable or inseparable in its variables. The benchmark multi-dimensional functions are:

Rosenbrock function is an unimodal function that is extensively used for local exploration, which was first used

in optimization assessment of Genetic Algorithms (GA) by De Jong [41]. According to Shang and Qiu [42], the  $n$ -dimensional Rosenbrock function ( $n > 4$ ) can be a bimodal function, that makes it even a more complex minimization problem, this complexity also originates from the function's asymmetry and variables inseparability. The global minimum value of Rosenbrock function is zero, which is located at  $(1, 1, \dots)$ . The multi-dimensional Rosenbrock function reads as:

$$f_1(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n 100(x_{i+1}^2 - x_i)^2 + (1 - x_i)^2 \quad (7)$$

Rastrigin function is a multimodal function that is employed for the performance assessment of evolutionary algorithms [43]. Although it is extremely multimodal, the positions of the minima are evenly dispersed, the function is symmetric



**FIGURE 2.** Particles' evolution with evolving iterations using the proposed classification with elitism.

and separable. The global minimum value of Rastrigin function is zero that is located at  $(0, 0, \dots)$ . Rastrigin function is defined as:

$$f_2(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n (x_i^2 - 10 \cos(2\pi x_i)) + 10 \quad (8)$$

Griewank function is also a multimodal and symmetric function that is widely used for global optimization. The global minimum value of Griewank function is zero that is located at  $(0, 0, \dots)$ . Following Locatelli [44], the function contains a huge number of local minima, which increases exponentially with the number of dimensions. According to Jumonji *et al.* [43], Griewank function is inseparable in its variables and is defined as follows:

$$f_3(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{x_i^2}{4000} - \prod_{i=1}^n \cos\left(\frac{x_i}{\sqrt{i}}\right) + 1 \quad (9)$$


#### IV. SIMULATION RESULTS ON THE BENCHMARK PROBLEMS

Beneficial to evaluate the efficiency of the proposed PSO algorithm on large-scale problems, the benchmark functions, Griewank, Rastrigrin, and Rosenbrock, are set to have 30 dimensions. To assess the performance of the proposed PSO algorithm in comparison to EPSOM, LDW-PSO, PSO-M and M-PSO, the parameters of all the tested algorithms are identically selected for consistency. The search and initialization space for all the functions are  $[-100 - 100]$ . The number of particles is set to 40, and a maximum iteration of 2000. Furthermore,  $w$  is declining linearly from  $w_{max} = 0.9$  to

$w_{min} = 0.1$ ,  $c_1$  is 1.4962, and  $c_2$  is 1.4962. Regarding the PSO-M, the mutation factor  $mu$  is set to 0.05.

The proposed PSO method includes three more presetting parameters: one is the classification percentage around the fitness mean, denoted by  $p$ , and the other is the elitism with position mutation process initiation iteration, denoted by  $N_e$ , the last one is the mutation range, that is defined by  $a$ . In these simulations, these parameters are selected as  $p = 0.02$ ,  $N_e = 3$ , and  $a = 0.5$ . Consequently, the particles with fitness in the range of  $\pm 2\%$  of mean particles' fitness value are classified in the middle category ("fair particles"), the elitism process starts after the third iteration, and the mutation range is  $\pm 50\%$  of  $x_j(f_{max})$ .

Twenty independent simulations were carried out on the three previously aforementioned functions for each minimization algorithm, which is beneficial to minimizing the statistical errors of the optimization performance of the previously mentioned algorithms. The outcomes of each algorithm were averaged across 20 simulations. The averaged fitness performance of PSO variants on 30-dimensional benchmark functions is depicted in Fig. 3. The optimization results show that the proposed PSO excels EPSOM, LDW-PSO, PSO-M and M-PSO in terms of convergence speed and global exploration capabilities, on all tested benchmark functions. Another important result from the figure, is that all the mutation based approaches have better global exploration capabilities, since their convergence accuracy is better than other PSO approaches, as seen from the optimization performance of Griewank, Rastrigrin and Rosenbrock function.



**FIGURE 3.** Fitness performance of PSO variants on multi-dimensional benchmark functions. Figures (a-c) depict comparison of EPSOM, LDW-PSO, PSO-M and M-PSO with the proposed PSO on a 30-dimensional functions (Griewank, Rastrigrin and Rosenbrock). Figure (d) shows a zoomed-in plot of the performance of the proposed PSO on the three functions.

Figure 3d shows a zoomed-in plot of the minimization performance of the proposed PSO on the 30-dimensional Griewank, Rastrigrin, and Rosenbrock function. The figure undeniably shows the gigantic improvement of the elitism with targeted position mutation on the proposed PSO after the iteration  $N_e = 3$ . The bad particles are now exploiting the particle’s position with maximum fitness with high probability of exploring new particles’ positions as a consequence of position mutation.

It can be seen from Fig. 3 that the proposed PSO attained the global minimum ( $10^{-15}$ ) for the 30-dimensional Griewank function in 11 iterations, whereas the other techniques needed 1900, 501, 732 and 597 iterations to reach considerably greater local minima by orders of magnitude,

for EPSOM, LDW-PSO, PSO-M and M-PSO, respectively. The suggested PSO attained the global minimum ( $10^{-12}$ ) for the 30-dimensional Rastrigrin function in 11 iterations, whereas the other techniques required 1713, 607, 716 and 919 iterations to reach significantly greater local minima by orders of magnitude, for EPSOM, LDW-PSO, PSO-M and M-PSO, respectively. In terms of the optimization results of the Rosenbrock function utilizing the suggested PSO, the proposed technique required 6 iterations to attain a minimum that outperformed the other approaches, considering that the comparative approaches required 1850, 552, 835 and 980 iterations, for EPSOM, LDW-PSO, PSO-M and M-PSO, respectively. For all tested function, the convergence rate for the proposed PSO is faster by orders of magnitude compared

with all tested variants.

## V. CONCLUSIONS

Starting point are five popular variants of particle swarm optimization. The proposed new PSO variant (PSO-TPME) is shown to dramatically improve convergence speed and global exploration capabilities. This variant comprises the three major factors affecting convergence speed and global exploration capabilities: particles' classification, elitism, and mutation, as well as the original PSO's cognitive and social models. This variation introduced an alternative classification approach, elitism, and targeted position mutation, all of which were integrated into the basic PSO algorithm. The introduced particle classification process is simple to apply, requires low memory, is adaptive, and provides automated termination criteria based on convergence. These qualities of the proposed classification technique permitted the implementation of targeted elitism and mutation, in terms of targeting just the poor particles, terminating the elitism and mutation process automatically in the event of convergence, and applying different updating models (social and/or cognitive) based on the particle's category.

A set of benchmark multi-dimensional functions widely used in the optimization problems were used to compare the performance of the proposed PSO-TPME to EPSOM, LDW-PSO, PSO-M and M-PSO, in terms of convergence accuracy and convergence speed. The 30-dimensional Griewank, Rastrigrin, and Rosenbrock functions are employed. Each of them provides a different level of complexity, such as unimodality or multimodality, symmetry or asymmetry, and separability or inseparability. For each benchmark function, many minimization simulations were performed, repeated, and averaged to reduce statistical errors. The simulations revealed that PSO-TPME surpasses the aforementioned variants by orders of magnitude in terms of convergence rate and accuracy.

## REFERENCES

- [1] James Kennedy and Russell Eberhart. Particle swarm optimization. In Proceedings of ICNN'95-international conference on neural networks, volume 4, pages 1942–1948. IEEE, 1995.
- [2] Abdelghani Harrag and Sabir Messalti. PSO-based SMC variable step size P&O MPPT controller for PV systems under fast changing atmospheric conditions. *International Journal of Numerical Modelling: Electronic Networks, Devices and Fields*, 32(5):e2603, 2019.
- [3] Ali M Eltamaly, MS Al-Saud, and AG Abo-Khalil. Performance improvement of PV systems' maximum power point tracker based on a scanning PSO particle strategy. *Sustainability*, 12(3):1185, 2020.
- [4] T Shaqarin. A modified reinitialization mechanism for particle swarm optimization based control, case study: PV system. In 1st International conference on Automation, Robotics & Communications for Industry 4.0 (ARCI), page 86. IFSA, 2021.
- [5] Milton Ernesto Barrios Aguilar, Denis Vinicius Coury, Romeu Reginatto, and Renato Machado Monaro. Multi-objective PSO applied to PI control of DFIG wind turbine under electrical fault conditions. *Electric Power Systems Research*, 180:106081, 2020.
- [6] Mehrnoosh Kamarzarrin and Mohammad Hossein Refan. Intelligent sliding mode adaptive controller design for wind turbine pitch control system using PSO-SVM in presence of disturbance. *Journal of Control, Automation and Electrical Systems*, 31(4):912–925, 2020.
- [7] R Sushmitha, S Chitra Devi, A Manjula, and R Niraimathi. A novel methodology to capture the maximum power from variable speed wind turbines using fuzzy proportional integral controllers, modified PSO-GSA algorithm. *Materials Today: Proceedings*, 2021.
- [8] Narges Ghorbani, Alibakhsh Kasaeian, Ashkan Toopshekan, Leyli Bahrami, and Amin Maghami. Optimizing a hybrid wind-PV-battery system using GA-PSO and MOPSO for reducing cost and increasing reliability. *Energy*, 154:581–591, 2018.
- [9] Saidatul Shema Saad, Muhammad Ammirul Atiqi Mohd Zainuri, and Aini Hussain. Implementation of maximum power point tracking techniques for PV-wind hybrid energy system: A review. In 2021 International Conference on Electrical Engineering and Informatics (ICEEI), pages 1–6. IEEE, 2021.
- [10] Latifa El Boujdaini, Ahmed Mezrhah, Mohammed Amine Moussaoui, Francisco Jurado, and David Vera. Sizing of a stand-alone PV–wind–battery–diesel hybrid energy system and optimal combination using a particle swarm optimization algorithm. *Electrical Engineering*, pages 1–21, 2022.
- [11] Tong Yifei, Zhong Meng, Li Jingwei, Li Dongbo, and Wang Yulin. Research on intelligent welding robot path optimization based on GA and PSO algorithms. *IEEE Access*, 6:65397–65404, 2018.
- [12] Zhengxing Wu, Junzhi Yu, Shuaizheng Yan, Jian Wang, and Min Tan. Motion control method and system for biomimetic robotic fish based on adversarial structured control, March 30 2021. US Patent 10,962,976.
- [13] Haixia Zhang and Qingxiu Peng. PSO and K-means-based semantic segmentation toward agricultural products. *Future Generation Computer Systems*, 126:82–87, 2022.
- [14] Xinghai Guo, Mingjun Ji, Ziwei Zhao, Dusu Wen, and Weidan Zhang. Global path planning and multi-objective path control for unmanned surface vehicle based on modified particle swarm optimization (PSO) algorithm. *Ocean Engineering*, 216:107693, 2020.
- [15] V Tavoosi, J Marzbanrad, and M Golnavaz. Optimized path planning of an unmanned vehicle in an unknown environment using the PSO algorithm. In IOP conference series: materials science and engineering, volume 671, page 012009. IOP Publishing, 2020.
- [16] Auday Al-Mayyahi, William Wang, and Phil Birch. Path tracking of autonomous ground vehicle based on fractional order PID controller optimized by PSO. In 2015 IEEE 13th International Symposium on Applied Machine Intelligence and Informatics (SAMII), pages 109–114. IEEE, 2015.
- [17] Noor Hafizah Amer, Hairi Zamzuri, Khisbullah Hudha, Vimal Rau Aparow, Zulkiffli Abd Kadir, and Amar Faiz Zainal Abidin. Path tracking controller of an autonomous armoured vehicle using modified stanley controller optimized with particle swarm optimization. *Journal of the Brazilian Society of Mechanical Sciences and Engineering*, 40(2):1–17, 2018.
- [18] Yue Jiang, Xiaojun Xu, Lei Zhang, and Tengan Zou. Model free predictive path tracking control of variable-configuration unmanned ground vehicle. *ISA transactions*, 2022.
- [19] Alessandro Beghi, Luca Cecchinato, Giovanni Cosi, and Mirco Rampazzo. A PSO-based algorithm for optimal multiple chiller systems operation. *Applied Thermal Engineering*, 32:31–40, 2012.
- [20] Bahram Ghorbani, Mostafa Mafi, Reza Shirmohammadi, Mohammad-Hossein Hamed, and Majid Amidpour. Optimization of operation parameters of refrigeration cycle using particle swarm and NLP techniques. *Journal of Natural Gas Science and Engineering*, 21:779–790, 2014.
- [21] Anas A Rahman and Xiaoqing Zhang. Single-objective optimization for stack unit of standing wave thermoacoustic refrigerator through particle swarm optimization method. *Energy Procedia*, 158:5445–5452, 2019.
- [22] Dehao Kong, Xiaohong Yin, Xudong Ding, Ning Fang, and Peiyong Duan. Global optimization of a vapor compression refrigeration system with a self-adaptive differential evolution algorithm. *Applied Thermal Engineering*, 197:117427, 2021.
- [23] Ko-Wei Huang, Ze-Xue Wu, Hsing-Wei Peng, Ming-Chia Tsai, Yu-Chieh Hung, and Yu-Chin Lu. Memetic particle gravitation optimization algorithm for solving clustering problems. *Ieee Access*, 7:80950–80968, 2019.
- [24] Wei Jiao, Guangbin Liu, and Dong Liu. Elite particle swarm optimization with mutation. In 2008 Asia Simulation Conference-7th International Conference on System Simulation and Scientific Computing, pages 800–803. IEEE, 2008.
- [25] Guochu Chen. Simplified particle swarm optimization algorithm based on particles classification. In 2010 Sixth International Conference on Natural Computation, volume 5, pages 2701–2705. IEEE, 2010.

- [26] Qunfeng Liu, Wenhong Wei, Huaqiang Yuan, Zhi-Hui Zhan, and Yun Li. Topology selection for particle swarm optimization. *Information Sciences*, 363:154–173, 2016.
- [27] Seyed Mehdi Abedi Pahnehkolaei, Alireza Alfi, and JA Tenreiro Machado. Analytical stability analysis of the fractional-order particle swarm optimization algorithm. *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals*, 155:111658, 2022.
- [28] Dynhora-Danheyda Ramírez-Ochoa, Luis Asunción Pérez-Domínguez, Erwin-Adán Martínez-Gómez, and David Luviano-Cruz. PSO, a swarm intelligence-based evolutionary algorithm as a decision-making strategy: A review. *Symmetry*, 14(3):455, 2022.
- [29] Yiming He, Weiyang Chen, Kangxin Lei, Yang Zhao, and Pengfei Lv. Semi-airborne electromagnetic 2.5 D inversion based on a PSO-LCI strategy. *Journal of Applied Geophysics*, page 104541, 2022.
- [30] Shuang Liu, Miao Liang, and Xiangyun Hu. Particle swarm optimization inversion of magnetic data: Field examples from iron ore deposits in china. *Geophysics*, 83(4):J43–J59, 2018.
- [31] Peter J Angeline. Using selection to improve particle swarm optimization. In 1998 IEEE International Conference on Evolutionary Computation Proceedings. IEEE World Congress on Computational Intelligence (Cat. No. 98TH8360), pages 84–89. IEEE, 1998.
- [32] Daniel Parrott and Xiaodong Li. Locating and tracking multiple dynamic optima by a particle swarm model using speciation. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, 10(4):440–458, 2006.
- [33] Bo Zheng, Hong-Zhong Huang, Wei Guo, Yan-Feng Li, and Jinhua Mi. Fault diagnosis method based on supervised particle swarm optimization classification algorithm. *Intelligent Data Analysis*, 22(1):191–210, 2018.
- [34] Zhen-Lun Yang, Angus Wu, and Hua-Qing Min. An improved quantum-behaved particle swarm optimization algorithm with elitist breeding for unconstrained optimization. *Computational intelligence and neuroscience*, 2015, 2015.
- [35] Motaeb Eid Alshammari, Makbul AM Ramli, and Ibrahim M Mehedi. An elitist multi-objective particle swarm optimization algorithm for sustainable dynamic economic emission dispatch integrating wind farms. *Sustainability*, 12(18):7253, 2020.
- [36] Zhenlun Yang, Xuewen Wei, Meiling Qiu, and Kunquan Shi. A quantum-behaved particle swarm optimization algorithm with self-adaptive elitist crossover. In 2021 13th International Conference on Intelligent Human-Machine Systems and Cybernetics (IHMSC), pages 177–180. IEEE, 2021.
- [37] Natsuki Higashi and Hitoshi Iba. Particle swarm optimization with gaussian mutation. In Proceedings of the 2003 IEEE Swarm Intelligence Symposium. SIS'03 (Cat. No. 03EX706), pages 72–79. IEEE, 2003.
- [38] Xinming Zhang, Xia Wang, Qiang Kang, and Jinfeng Cheng. Differential mutation and novel social learning particle swarm optimization algorithm. *Information Sciences*, 480:109–129, 2019.
- [39] Xi Wang, Paul Henshaw, and David S-K Ting. Exergoeconomic analysis for a thermoelectric generator using mutation particle swarm optimization (M-PSO). *Applied Energy*, 294:116952, 2021.
- [40] Xueqin Lü, Lingzheng Meng, Liyuan Long, and Peisong Wang. Comprehensive improvement of camera calibration based on mutation particle swarm optimization. *Measurement*, 187:110303, 2022.
- [41] Kenneth Alan De Jong. An analysis of the behavior of a class of genetic adaptive systems. University of Michigan, 1975.
- [42] Yun-Wei Shang and Yu-Huang Qiu. A note on the extended rosenbrock function. *Evolutionary Computation*, 14(1):119–126, 2006.
- [43] Takuma Jumonji, Goutam Chakraborty, Hiroshi Mabuchi, and Masafumi Matsuhara. A novel distributed genetic algorithm implementation with variable number of islands. In IEEE Congress on Evolutionary Computation, pages 4698–4705, 2007.
- [44] Marco Locatelli. A note on the griewank test function. *Journal of global optimization*, 25(2):169–174, 2003.



T. SHAQARIN received a B.S. degree in mechanical engineering from Mutah University, Al-Karak, Jordan, in 2003 and the M.S. degree in mechanical engineering from University of Jordan, Amman, Jordan, in 2007, and the Ph.D. degree in mechanical engineering from Lille University, Lille, France, in 2011.

From 2014 to 2018, he was an Assistant Professor with the Mechanical Engineering Department, College of Engineering, Tafila Technical University. Since 2018, he has been an Associate Professor with the Mechanical Engineering Department, College of Engineering, Tafila Technical University. He has authored or co-authored several journals and IEEE proceeding publications. He has been a visiting researcher at many well-known universities, including the University of Poitiers, the Technical University of Berlin, and the Technical University of Braunschweig, conducting research in flow control applications such as separation control, mixing layer control, and drag reduction. Control theory, such as robust control, LPV control, and nonlinear control, as well as optimization-based control, including PSO, extremum seeking, and genetic algorithm, are among his research interests. Applied to many physical applications such as Flow control, process control (chemical CSTR, granulation, bio-CSTR), and renewable energy systems control (MPPT, pitch control, supervisory control).



BERND R. NOACK received his degree as M.S. degree in physics at the University of Göttingen in 1989 and followed by a Ph.D. in 1992.

He is national talent professor at the Harbin Institute of Technology, Shenzhen, P.R. China and professor and chair at the Technical University of Berlin, Germany. Focus of his work is turbulence control improving ground and airborne transport. He pushes the frontiers of artificial intelligence in self-learning control and automated modeling and in first principles based understanding of the nonlinear dynamics. He wrote over 250 refereed publications, including over 110 journal articles, 4 books and two US patents.

Prof. Noack's work has been distinguished by numerous awards and honors, e.g. a fellowship of the American Physical Society, the outstanding faculty award at the Harbin Institute of Technology, the CNRS Scientific Excellence Award, the first senior ANR Chair of Excellence in Fluid Mechanics in France, the annual von Mises award of the International Association of Applied Mathematics and Mechanics. He is included in the Mendeley/Stanford highly cited researchers list.

...