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Abstract—Fireworks algorithm (FWA) is one swarm intelligence algorithm proposed in 2010, which takes the inspiration from the fireworks explosion process. Compared with other meta-heuristic algorithms, FWA presents a cooperative explosive search manner. In the explosive search manner, the explosion amplitudes, explosion sparks’ numbers and explosion dimension selection methods play the key roles for its successful implementation. In this paper, the performance analyses of the different explosion dimension number strategies in FWA and its variants are presented at first, then the exponentially decreased explosion dimension number strategy is introduced for the most recent dynamic search fireworks algorithm (dynFWA), called ed-dynFWA, to enhance its local search ability. To validate the performance of ed-dynFWA, it is used to participate in the CEC 2015 competition for solving learning based optimization problems.

I. INTRODUCTION

Fireworks algorithm (FWA) is one swarm intelligence algorithms designed by Tan and Zhu in 2010 [1]. Compared with other swarm intelligence algorithms, such as particle swarm optimization and ant colony optimization, FWA presents a novel search mechanism with inspiration derived from the observation of fireworks explosion in the night sky. In fact, the fireworks’ explosion process can be used as the search strategy for the global optimum of an optimization problem. Fig. 1 presents the comparison between the firework explosion and the solution search in a local region for optimization problems.

The fireworks explosion process is a kind of sampling. Through sampling in the potential region, the algorithm tries to estimate the properties of the local regions. Moreover, the cooperative strategy among the different sampling regions enables the locations with better fitness to have higher sampling probabilities while those with worse fitness will have smaller sampling probabilities. After the explosion process, the Gaussian sparks are also introduced to increase the sampling diversity. Then, the candidates from the set which includes fireworks, explosion sparks and Gaussian sparks are selected as fireworks for the next iteration. The FWA continues the search till the stop criterions are met.

So far, a number of researchers have promoted the developments of FWA in three aspects: theoretical analysis [3], algorithmic developments [4]–[17] and applications [10], [18]–[28]. For algorithmic developments, they can be classified into single objective algorithm developments [4]–[9], some hybrid works [10]–[14], multi-objective developments [15], [16] and parallel implementations [17]. For applications, FWA has been used for digital filters design [10], non-negative matrix factorization calculation [18]–[20], pattern recognition [21], spam detection [22], network reconfiguration [23], [24], swarm robots [25], truss mass minimization [26], selective harmonic elimination problem [27], clustering [28], and so on. The
successful applications in practical problems indicate that FWA is one promising algorithm, which is worthy of further research.

**Synopsis.** Section II presents a detailed introduction of FWA and dynFWA. In Section III, the performance analyses of different dimension numbers in the explosive search process of dynFWA is firstly introduced. Based on the analyses, the exponentially decreased dimension number strategy for explosive search manner is introduced, and thus forms the ed-dynFWA. Then, the ed-dynFWA is used to participate in the CEC2015 competition and results on the learn based problems. Then, the candidate with minimal fitness among the fireworks is denoted as CF and the rest of fireworks except for the CF are denoted as non-CFs. Thus, the dynamic strategy is taken on CF, rather than non-CFs.

In Section V.

Finally, the conclusion is drawn in Section V.

II. THE CONVENTIONAL FWA AND DYNFWA

This section will present detailed descriptions of conventional FWA [1] and dynFWA [8].

Without loss of generality, the fireworks algorithms are assumed to search the global minimal solution \( x \) of the optimization problem in the form:

\[
\min_{x \in \Omega} f(x),
\]

where \( f: \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R} \) is a minimization problem, and \( \Omega \) is the feasible region, and the dimension of \( x \) is \( D \).

A. The Conventional FWA

In FWA, at the beginning, \( N \) fireworks are initialized, and the fitness \( f(X_i) \) of the fireworks’ locations \( (X_i) \) are evaluated. For each firework, the explosion amplitude \( A_i \) and explosion sparks number \( S_i \) are calculated as follows.

\[
A_i = \hat{A} \times \frac{f(X_i) - \min_i(f(X_i)) + \varepsilon}{\sum_{i=1}^{N} (f(X_i) - \min_i(f(X_i))) + \varepsilon}, \quad (2)
\]

\[
S_i = \hat{M} \times \frac{\max_i(f(X_i)) - f(X_i) + \varepsilon}{\sum_{i=1}^{N} (\max_i(f(X_i)) - f(X_i)) + \varepsilon}, \quad (3)
\]

where \( i = 1, 2, ..., N \), \( \hat{A} \) and \( \hat{M} \) are two constants to control the explosion amplitudes and explosion sparks number. \( \varepsilon \) is a machine epsilon.

In addition, the overwhelming effects of good/bad fireworks are bounded using following equation:

\[
S_i = \begin{cases} 
\text{round}(a \cdot \hat{M}) & \text{if } S_i < a \cdot \hat{M}, \\
\text{round}(b \cdot \hat{M}) & \text{if } S_i > b \cdot \hat{M}, \\
\text{round}(S_i) & \text{otherwise},
\end{cases} \quad (4)
\]

where \( a \) and \( b \) are two constant values to control the lower and upper bound for \( S_i \).

Then, for each firework \( X_i, i = 1, 2, ..., N \), the explosion sparks are generated to perform the local search within the explosion amplitude, respectively. Alg.1 gives the process of generating one explosion spark for firework \( X_i \).

To increase the diversity of explosion sparks swarm, FWA also introduces the Gaussian sparks. Alg.2 gives the process of generating one Gaussian spark for firework \( X_i \).

Then, the candidate with minimal fitness among the fireworks, explosion sparks, and Gaussian sparks is selected as one firework to the next iteration firstly, while the rest of fireworks are selected randomly with probability according to their crowdness [1]. Then, the selected fireworks continue the process of generating explosion sparks and Gaussian sparks till the terminal criterion is met.

B. The dynFWA

In dynFWA, the fireworks are classified into two groups, the core firework (CF) and non-core fireworks (non-CFs). The definitions of CF and non-CFs are as follows:

Definition: CF/non-CF, among the fireworks in each iteration, the firework with best fitness is denoted as CF and the rest of fireworks except for the CF are denoted as non-CFs.

Compared with non-CFs, the CF is with smaller explosion amplitude and will perform the local search while non-CFs are with bigger explosion amplitudes which are responsible for global search. Moreover, the biggest difference between the two is that the CF has very high probability to generate the best candidate which will be selected to the next iteration as firework. Thus, the dynamic strategy is taken on CF, rather than non-CFs.

In dynFWA, for the non-CFs, their explosion amplitudes \( A_i \) in each iteration \( t \) are still calculated by Eq. (2), while for the
CF, the $A_{CF}(t)$ is updated as follows.

$$A_{CF}(t) = \begin{cases} C_a \times A_{CF}(t-1) & \text{if } f(X_{CF}(t)) < f(X_{CF}(t-1)), \\ C_r \times A_{CF}(t-1) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$ (5)

where $C_a$ and $C_r$ are two parameters to control the amplification and reduction of explosion amplitudes. Moreover, $A_{CF}(1)$ is usually initialized with a constant value.

From Eq.(5), it can be seen that if the best fitness found by the fireworks has been updated, then $A_{CF}$ will be amplified in the next iteration, as $C_a > 1$, otherwise, the $A_{CF}$ will be reduced as $C_r < 1$.

For an optimization problem, the objective is to find the global optimum as soon as possible, which contains two principles: i) the fireworks swarm should make sure that they move towards to global optimum, i.e. their best fitness needs be updated consecutively, ii) the fireworks swarm had better use large explosion amplitude to make it move as fast as possible to the global optimum. For dynFWA, the amplification of the CF’s explosion amplitude makes it run faster, and the reduction of explosion amplitude will increase the probability that the firework can find a better position. More details can be found in [8].

In addition, dynFWA also removes the Gaussian sparks from FWA and only maintains the explosive search manner for the optimization.

**Algorithm 3 – Generating one “explosion sparks” in dynFWA**

1. Initialize the position of one explosion spark: $X_i = X_i$
2. Set $z^k = \text{floor}(\text{rand}(0,1) + \beta)$, $k = 1, 2, ..., D$, $\beta = 0.5$
3. for each dimension of $X_i^k$, where $z^k = 1$ do
4. $X_i^k = X_i^k + A_i \times \text{rand}(-1,1)$
5. if $X_i^k$ out of bounds then
6. map $X_i^k$ to the feasible range.
7. end if
8. end for

The explosion sparks generating process for dynFWA can be found in Alg.3 while the framework of dynFWA is shown in Alg. 4.

**Algorithm 4 – The Framework of dynFWA**

1. Initialize the fireworks $X_i$ and evaluate the fitness $f(X_i)$
2. while stop criteria is not met do
3. Calculate the numbers of explosion sparks, $S_i$
4. Calculate the explosion amplitudes $A_i$ (cf. Eq. 2, Eq.5)
5. for each firework $X_i$ do
6. Generate the explosion sparks (cf. Alg 3)
7. Evaluate the fitness of explosion sparks
8. end for
9. Select fireworks for the next iteration
10. end while

![Fig. 2. Comparison between FWA and dynFWA explosion dimension number probability density function ($D = 30$).](image)

III. EXPONENTIALLY DECREASED DYNAMIC DIMENSION NUMBER STRATEGY IN DYNFWA

In this section, we present the performance analysis of dimension number in the process of generating the explosion sparks, and then we propose the exponentially decreased dimension number strategy for dynFWA.

A. Performance Analysis of Dimension Number in Explosion Process

For FWA, the key feature compared with other swarm intelligence algorithms lies in the explosive search manner. The explosion amplitude, the explosion sparks number and the manner how the explosion sparks are generated are the parameters controlling the explosive sampling process, thus finally determinate the performance of FWA.

Compare the process of generating explosion sparks between FWA (cf Alg. 1) with dynFWA (cf Alg. 3), it can be seen that the explosion sparks are generated in two different manners. In FWA, the algorithm firstly determinate the total number of dimensions to perform the explosive mutation (cf. Alg.1 in line 2), which is under a uniform distribution in general (as when the dimension number is 0 or 30, the probability is smaller compared with the rest of dimension numbers, it is not a strict uniform distribution). For dynFWA, each dimension has the 0.5 probability to perform the explosive mutation (cf. Alg.3 in line 3 and 4). So, the number of dimensions that will perform the explosion mutation is under a binomial distribution. The comparison of the two explosion dimension number probability density functions can be found in Fig. 2.

In pervious work of EFWA in [5], the experimental results are unintentionally based on the dimension selection method of conventional FWA, which varies the number of selected dimensions with uniform distribution. However, the pseudo algorithm presented in [5] is that each dimension have the probability of 0.5 to take the explosion mutation, and finally the number of dimensions is under the binomial distribution. In [29], experiments are designed to compare the performance of these two dimension number selection methods. Experimental results on the 12 basic functions suggest that EFWA has the better local search ability when it takes the uniform distributed dimension number strategy. In summary, the distribution of the explosion dimension numbers is also one important factor that will influence the performance of fireworks algorithms.
In the following paragraphs, we are going to give an example of how the dimension number of explosive sparks influence the algorithm’s performance.

Assume a 2-dimensional optimization problem shown in Fig. 3(a), the character for this optimization problem is that the global optimum locates in a very narrow region, and the direction of this narrow region is parallel with one of the axes. For this optimization problem, if one firework now locates at the edge of this local region, see Fig. 3(a), then if we set the explosion dimension number to one, it will have high probability to generate explosion sparks with good fitness in this narrow region compared with when the explosion dimension number is set to two. However, if we rotate this optimization problem with an angle, the situation will be different. The two dimensional explosive search strategy will gains better performance compared with one dimensional explosion, see Fig. 3(b).

Readers may feel confused about this two optimization problems’ comparison, as we just add the rotation operation to the original optimization problem, even without any shifting of the global optimal position. Here, we should clarify that it is due to the fact that in FWA and its variants, the explosive mutation in each dimension is designed to be independent, i.e. the explosion mutation value is calculated in each dimension independently (cf. line 4 in Alg.3).

In fact, for a local region of a high dimensional optimization problem, usually the dimension number that greatly influence the performance is limited compared with the total dimension number of the optimization problem. Thus, for FWA, to get a better local search ability, the best dimension number for explosion is supposed to be influenced by the property of the local region that the fireworks locate. The ideal strategy in FWA is to use the explosion sparks to evaluate the property of this local region and to determine optimal explosion dimension number, and even what are the dimensions.

B. Exponentially Decreased Dimension Number Strategy

To investigate the influences of the different dimension numbers of explosion to the performance of dynFWA, the following criterion is introduced.

\[
\gamma_i = \frac{TS_i}{TA_i},
\]

where \(TS_i\) denotes the times that the explosion sparks are generated with \(i\) explosion dimensions and have better fitness than the firework while \(TA_i\) denotes the total times that the explosion sparks are generated with \(i\) explosion dimensions. Here, we only consider the CF for calculation of \(\gamma_i\).

Fig. 4 gives the statistical results on two functions of CEC 2013 competition problems, \(f_1\) and \(f_{28}\) [30]. Here, \(f_1\) is an uni-modal problem while \(f_{28}\) is a multi-modal problem. Results suggest that the smaller dimension numbers will have higher probability to generate the explosion sparks with better fitness. The similar observation can be found among the rest of functions from \(f_2\) to \(f_{27}\).

In fact, the best strategy is to take an adaptive dimension number strategy during the optimization process. For an optimization problem, when the firework locates in the wide region, the bigger dimension number of explosion strategy seems to gain more diversity, while it comes to the narrow region, the smaller dimension number of explosion strategy may gain higher improvement.

According to Alg. 3, it can be seen that in dynFWA, each dimension has the \(\beta = 0.5\) probability to be selected, which is a constant value. However, according to the statistical results from Fig 4, it seems that smaller explosion dimension number may have better performance.

For simplicity, to participate in the CEC 2015 competition, we just take the exponentially decreased dimension number of explosion, i.e. the parameter \(\beta\) in Alg. 3 is an exponentially decreased value rather than a constant parameter. The parameter \(\beta\) updates its value as follows.

\[
\beta = \beta \times C_{ed}
\]

where \(C_{ed}\) is a parameter to control the expectation of the selected dimension number, and \(\beta\) starts with 0.5 and updates its value every other \(I\) iterations. Then the expectation of explosion dimension number is \(\beta D\). The final algorithm
that dynamic search fireworks algorithm with exponentially decreased dimension numbers is called ed-dynFWA.

IV. EXPERIMENTS

A. Experimental Setup

Here, we use ed-dynFWA to participate in the CEC 2015 competition. The details of CEC 2015 competition problems can be found in Tab. I [31].

Compared with the previous CEC competitions, the CEC 2015 competition allows participants to specify the different parameters for each optimization function.

For ed-dynFWA, it includes a number of parameters, only part of them are picked to tune for the competition problems. Tab. II gives a brief summary of the parameters we are going to tune for better performance in ed-dynFWA. For the rest of parameters, they are set identical to dynFWA [8].

For each optimisation problem, the ed-dynFWA is performed 51 runs and the final results are recorded with $D\times10000$ function evaluations are presented. The experimental platform is MATLAB 2011b (Windows 7; Intel Core i7-2600 CPU @ 3.7 GHZ; 8 GB RAM).

B. Experiments Results

At first, the parameters for each optimization problem is tuned. Here, the 30-dimensional problems are used to tune the parameters and then the tuned parameters are used for the 10-dimensional, 50-dimensional and 100-dimensional optimization problems.

Tab. III lists the parameters tuned for the 30-dimensional problems.

The experimental results on the benchmark functions can be found in Tab. IV, Tab. V, Tab. VI, Tab. VII.

From the experimental results in all the dimensional problems, we can see that the results of $f_3$, $f_7$, $f_{13}$, $f_{15}$ are...
very stable and with quite small standard deviations. For the performance, it can be seen that ed-dynFWA almost gains the optimum on $f_{13}$.

In addition, for the 10-dimensional problems, the optimized results are close to the optimum on functions $f_3$, $f_4$, $f_7$, $f_9$, $f_{12}$ and $f_{15}$, and it also achieves very promising results on functions $f_3$, $f_4$, $f_7$, $f_9$, $f_{12}$, $f_{15}$ for 30-dimensional problems. For the 50-dimensional problems and the 100-dimensional problems, promising results are also returned in $f_3$, $f_7$, $f_9$, $f_{12}$, $f_{15}$.

Compare the performance in different dimensional optimization problems, it can be seen that with the increasing of dimensions, the results returned by ed-dynFWA get worse, due to the “curse of dimensionality”.

**TABLE IV**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Func.</th>
<th>Best</th>
<th>Worst</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$f_1$</td>
<td>5.26E+02</td>
<td>2.43E+05</td>
<td>6.39E+04</td>
<td>8.35E+04</td>
<td>6.44E+04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f_2$</td>
<td>2.02E+02</td>
<td>3.29E+04</td>
<td>2.93E+03</td>
<td>7.06E+03</td>
<td>8.74E+03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f_3$</td>
<td>3.20E+02</td>
<td>3.20E+02</td>
<td>3.20E+02</td>
<td>3.20E+02</td>
<td>1.30E+05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f_4$</td>
<td>4.05E+02</td>
<td>4.37E+02</td>
<td>4.16E+02</td>
<td>4.18E+02</td>
<td>8.53E+00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f_5$</td>
<td>5.12E+02</td>
<td>1.00E+03</td>
<td>9.04E+02</td>
<td>9.24E+02</td>
<td>2.42E+02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f_6$</td>
<td>6.96E+02</td>
<td>7.94E+03</td>
<td>2.05E+03</td>
<td>6.53E+02</td>
<td>3.18E+02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f_7$</td>
<td>7.00E+02</td>
<td>7.02E+02</td>
<td>7.01E+02</td>
<td>7.01E+02</td>
<td>3.30E-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f_8$</td>
<td>8.37E+02</td>
<td>1.94E+04</td>
<td>3.35E+03</td>
<td>5.15E+03</td>
<td>5.10E+03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f_9$</td>
<td>1.00E+03</td>
<td>1.00E+03</td>
<td>1.00E+03</td>
<td>1.00E+03</td>
<td>3.36E-01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f_{10}$</td>
<td>1.15E+03</td>
<td>1.33E+03</td>
<td>1.44E+03</td>
<td>2.76E+04</td>
<td>1.86E+05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f_{11}$</td>
<td>1.10E+03</td>
<td>1.40E+03</td>
<td>1.40E+03</td>
<td>1.28E+03</td>
<td>1.47E+02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f_{12}$</td>
<td>1.30E+03</td>
<td>1.32E+03</td>
<td>1.31E+03</td>
<td>1.31E+03</td>
<td>2.20E+00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f_{13}$</td>
<td>1.30E+03</td>
<td>1.30E+03</td>
<td>1.30E+03</td>
<td>1.30E+03</td>
<td>1.24E+02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f_{14}$</td>
<td>1.50E+03</td>
<td>1.01E+04</td>
<td>8.23E+03</td>
<td>8.24E+03</td>
<td>1.88E+03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$f_{15}$</td>
<td>1.60E+03</td>
<td>1.60E+03</td>
<td>1.60E+03</td>
<td>1.60E+03</td>
<td>0.00E+00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE V**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dim</th>
<th>$T_0$</th>
<th>$T_1$</th>
<th>$T_2$</th>
<th>$\frac{T_2}{T_1}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1370</td>
<td>2.0444</td>
<td>2.0555</td>
<td>0.0810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.1370</td>
<td>2.3222</td>
<td>2.6669</td>
<td>2.5161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>0.1370</td>
<td>2.8126</td>
<td>3.4365</td>
<td>4.5540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>0.1370</td>
<td>4.6102</td>
<td>6.0284</td>
<td>10.5518</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Moreover, the computation complexity of the algorithm is listed in Tab. VIII, we can see that with the increasing of the dimension, the optimization problems are supposed to have higher complexity, thus the runtime goes higher.

**V. CONCLUSION**

In this paper, we have presented comprehensive analyses on the influence of different explosion dimension numbers to the performance of FWA and its variants, and based on the analyses, the exponentially decreased dimension number strategy is introduced to enhance the performance of dynFWA (ed-dynFWA).

Then we take the ed-dynFWA to participate in the CEC 2015 competition, and the results on 15 functions with dimension number set to 10, 30, 50 and 100 are recorded. Optimization results on the benchmark suite suggest that ed-dynFWA is one promising algorithm that can work well to alleviate these problems. However, there are still many functions that ed-dynFWA can not find the global optimum, which needs further research.
Fig. 5. Convergence curves of ed-dynFWA for CEC2015 competitions
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