

List of Figures

- 1.1 Location of optima in Constrained Vs. unconstrained optimization
- 1.2 Flow Diagram of GA
- 1.3 Binary Encoding
- 1.4 Pictorial representation of Binary Tournament Selection
- 1.5 Pictorial representation of one point Crossover
- 1.6 Pictorial representation of Bitwise Mutation
- 1.7 Pictorial Representation of Complete Elitism
- 2.1 Similarities between GA and BFO
- 2.2 The proposed CGA
- 2.3 Working Principle of Proposed CGA
- 2.4 Flow diagram of CGA
- 2.5 Convergence graph of F1
- 2.6 Convergence graph of F2
- 2.7 Convergence graph of F3
- 2.8 Convergence graph of F4
- 2.9 Ackley Problem
- 2.10 Griewank Problem
- 2.11 Rastrigin Problem
- 2.12 Rosenbrock Problem
- 2.13 Schwefel Problem
- 2.14 Convergence graph of Ackley Problem (ACK)
- 2.15 Convergence graph of Griewank Problem (GWK)
- 2.16 Convergence graph of Rastrigin Problem (RG)
- 2.17 Convergence graph of Rosenbrock Problem (RB)
- 2.18 Convergence graph of Schwefel Problem (SWF)
- 2.19 Convergence graph of Case1

- 2.20 Convergence graph of Case 2
- 2.21 Convergence graph of Case 3
- 3.1 Pictorial diagram of a multi modal non linear function
- 3.2 CGA Cycle
- 4.1 Comparison of step responses for Example 1
- 4.2 Comparison of impulse responses for Example 1
- 4.3 Comparison of step responses for Example 2
- 4.4 Comparison of impulse responses for Example 2
- 4.5 Comparison of step responses for Example 3
- 4.6 Comparison of impulse responses for Example 3
- 5.1 The idea of the constraint tournament method
- 6.1 Convergence graph of 3 Generators
- 6.2 Convergence graph of 13 Generators
- 6.3 Convergence graph of 40 Generators

List of Tables

- 1.1 Difference between Traditional and Heuristic Methods
- 2.1 List of test functions with the bounds of the decision variables
- 2.2 Optimal objective function values by varying the Chemo tactic step
- 2.3 Optimal objective values by varying the swim step
- 2.4 Optimal solutions by varying the Chemo tactic step size
- 2.5 Comparative result (Minimum function value) of GA-BF and CGA
- 2.6 The optimum parameter values of GA-BF and CGA
- 2.7 Comparison of objective function values of GA and CGA
- 2.8 Generation requirement comparison to get optimum value
- 2.9 Performance comparison of CGA, LX-PM, and H-LX-PM to solve the system of linear equations
- 2.10 Performance comparison of CGA, LXPM, and HLXPM to solve Frequency Modulation Sounds Parameter Identification problem
- 3.1 List of test functions with the bounds of the decision variables
- 3.2 Comparative results of CGA and HGAs/GAs (Deep and Das, 2008)
- 4.1 Comparison of the methods for Example 1(Shamash, 1975)
- 4.2 Comparison of the methods for Example 2(Lucas, 1986)
- 4.3 Comparison of the methods for Example 3(Pal, 1986)
- 5.1 Percentage of success for 100 runs
- 5.2 Average no of function evaluations
- 5.3 Average computational time (in sec.)
- 5.4 Mean objective function value and S.D.
- 5.5 Time comparison (in Sec.)(Tang et al., 2011)
- 5.6 Comparison of number of Function Evaluations (Rao et al., 2011)

- 5.7 Fine tuned parameter settings for engineering problems
- 5.8 Comparison of objective function values (Best /median/ mean/worst/ S.D) for EP 1
- 5.9 Comparison of best solution for EP 1
- 5.10 Comparison of objective function values (best/ median/ mean/worst/ S.D) for EP 2
- 5.11 Comparison of best solution for EP 2
- 5.12 Comparison of objective function values (best/ median/ mean/worst/ S.D) for EP 3
- 5.13 Comparison of best solution for EP 3
- 5.14 Comparison of objective function values (best/ median/ mean/worst/ S.D) for EP 4
- 5.15 Comparison of best solution for EP 4
- 5.16 Comparison of objective function values (best/ median/ mean/worst/ S.D) for EP 5
- 5.17 Comparison of best solution for EP 5
- 5.18 Comparison of objective function values (best/ median/ mean/worst/ S.D) for EP 6
- 5.19 Comparison of best solution for EP 6
- 6.1 Best solutions of system 1(3 unit) (Cai et al., 2012)
- 6.2 The best, average and worst results of different ED solution methods for the 3-unit test system in terms of function evaluations (Yang et al., 2012)
- 6.3 Best solutions of system 2(13 unit) (Cai et al.2012)
- 6.4 Comparison of success rate, fun value, S.D., function evaluations between GA-BFO and CGA for 13 unit system
- 6.5 Comparison of the total generation cost in system 3(40 unit) (Cai et al.,

2012)

- 6.6 The best, average and worst results of different ED solution in terms of function evaluation for the 40 unit test system (Yang et al., 2012)
- 6.7 Comparison of best, mean and worst function value in terms of time and function evaluation varying the population size in CGAC(Max gen=500)
- 6.8 Comparison of best, mean and worst function value in terms of time and function evaluation varying the population size in CGAC(Max gen=1500)
- 6.9 Output power of generators in the best result of the proposed CGAC for the 40 unit test system in 500 iterations
- 6.10 Output power of generators in the best result of the proposed CGAC for the 40 unit test system (1500 iterations)
- 6.11 Best simulation of 15 unit systems with POZ and ramp rate limits (Satari & Shayeghi, 2011)