

• Word Count: 3443

Plagiarism Percentage

11%

sources:

1 1% match (publications)

[Wong, F. T. and Syamsoeyadi, H.. "Kriging-based Timoshenko Beam Element for Static and Free Vibration Analyses", Civil Engineering Dimension, 2011.](#)

2 1% match (publications)

[Cheng, Min-Yuan, and Doddy Prayogo. "Symbiotic Organisms Search: A new metaheuristic optimization algorithm", Computers & Structures, 2014.](#)

3 1% match (Internet from 10-Jun-2015)

http://www.cs.uoi.gr/~kostasp/citations/cita_scopus_papers_2013_09.txt

4 1% match (Internet from 06-Sep-2017)

http://cice.petra.ac.id/wordpress/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/SOS_CAS.pdf

5 1% match (publications)

[Subhodip Saha, V. Mukherjee. "A novel chaos-integrated symbiotic organisms search algorithm for global optimization", Soft Computing, 2017.](#)

6 < 1% match (publications)

[Ram, Gopi, Durbadal Mandal, Rajib Kar, and Sakti Prasad Ghoshal. "Circular and Concentric Circular Antenna Array Synthesis Using Cat Swarm Optimization", IETE Technical Review, 2015.](#)

7 < 1% match (publications)

[Sharma, Harish, Jagdish Chand Bansal, K. V. Arya, and Xin-She Yang. "Lévy flight artificial bee colony algorithm", International Journal of Systems Science, 2015.](#)

8 < 1% match (Internet from 22-Mar-2016)

http://www.sersc.org/journals/IJGDC/vol6_no6/10.pdf

9 < 1% match (publications)

[Mukherjee, V., and Subhodip Saha. "Optimal placement and sizing of distributed generators in radial distribution system using a novel chaos embedded symbiotic organisms search algorithm", IET Generation Transmission & Distribution, 2016.](#)

10 < 1% match (Internet from 18-Aug-2014)

http://www.albadronline.com/oldsite/books/Power_optimization.pdf

11 < 1% match (Internet from 24-Mar-2016)

http://www.sersc.org/journals/IJSIP/vol6_no6/24.pdf

12 < 1% match (Internet from 21-Jun-2017)

<http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/92310/1/A%20new%20hybrid%20method%20for%20size%20and%20topology%20optimization%20of%20truss%20structures.pdf>

13 < 1% match (publications)

[Tran, Duc-Hoc, Min-Yuan Cheng, and Doddy Prayogo. "A novel Multiple Objective Symbiotic Organisms Search \(MOSOS\) for time–cost–labor utilization tradeoff problem", Knowledge-Based Systems, 2016.](#)

14 < 1% match (publications)

[Secui, Dinu Calin. "A modified Symbiotic Organisms Search algorithm for large scale economic dispatch problem with valve-point effects", Energy, 2016.](#)

15 < 1% match (publications)

[Eskandar, Hadi, Ali Sadollah, Ardeshir Bahreininejad, and Mohd Hamdi. "Water cycle algorithm @ A novel metaheuristic optimization method for solving constrained engineering optimization problems", Computers & Structures, 2012.](#)

- 16 < 1% match (publications)
[Handbook of Genetic Programming Applications, 2015.](#)
-
- 17 < 1% match (publications)
[Archana Tiwari, Manjaree Pandit. "Bid based economic load dispatch using symbiotic organisms search algorithm", 2016 IEEE International Conference on Engineering and Technology \(ICETECH\), 2016](#)
-
- 18 < 1% match (Internet from 24-May-2016)
http://dspace.uah.es/dspace/bitstream/handle/10017/22084/TESIS_NEKANE_BILBAO.pdf?isAllowed=y&sequence=1
-
- 19 < 1% match (Internet from 14-May-2016)
<http://www.academypublisher.com/jcp/vol09/no06/jcp0906.pdf>
-
- 20 < 1% match (Internet from 28-May-2016)
<http://www.ijcaonline.org/research/volume133/number13/bawane-2016-ijca-908163.pdf>
-
- 21 < 1% match (Internet from 12-Apr-2017)
<https://uwspace.uwaterloo.ca/bitstream/handle/10012/3017/Hatem%20Thesis.pdf?sequence=1>
-
- 22 < 1% match (Internet from 29-Jul-2017)
http://orca.cf.ac.uk/75632/1/WZhao_SMCS_2015.pdf
-
- 23 < 1% match (publications)
[Sonmez, Yusuf, H. Tolga Kahraman, M. Kenan Dosoglu, Ugur Guvenc, and Serhat Duman. "Symbiotic organisms search algorithm for dynamic economic dispatch with valve-point effects". Journal of Experimental & Theoretical Artificial Intelligence, 2016.](#)
-
- 24 < 1% match (publications)
[Fahad S. Abu-Mouti. "Overview of Artificial Bee Colony \(ABC\) algorithm and its applications", 2012 IEEE International Systems Conference SysCon 2012, 03/2012](#)
-
- 25 < 1% match (publications)
[Pan, Q.K.. "A self-adaptive global best harmony search algorithm for continuous optimization problems". Applied Mathematics and Computation, 20100401](#)
-
- 26 < 1% match (publications)
[Li, H.S.. "Design optimization using Subset Simulation algorithm", Structural Safety, 201011](#)
-
- 27 < 1% match (publications)
[Dede, T.. "Weight minimization of trusses with genetic algorithm", Applied Soft Computing Journal, 201103](#)

paper text:

Enhanced Symbiotic Organisms Search (ESOS) for Global Numerical Optimization Doddy Prayogo Dept.

of Civil Engineering Petra Christian University Surabaya, Indonesia

prayogo @petra.ac.id

1

Foek Tjong Wong Master Program

of Civil Engineering Petra Christian University Surabaya, Indonesia

wftjong@petra.ac.id

1

Steven Sugianto Master Program

of Civil Engineering Petra Christian University Surabaya, Indonesia

m01516011@john .petra.ac.id

1

Abstract

—Symbiotic organisms search (SOS) is a simple yet effective metaheuristic algorithm

17

to solve a wide variety of optimization problems.

3

Many studies have been

carried out to improve the performance of the SOS algorithm. This research proposes an

16

improved version of the SOS algorithm called the "enhanced symbiotic organisms search" (ESOS)

for global numerical optimization. The

5

conventional SOS is modified by implementing a new searching formula into the parasitism phase to produce a better searching capability.

The performance of the ESOS is verified using 26 benchmark functions and

11

one structural engineering design problem. The results are then

compared with existing metaheuristic optimization methods. The obtained results show that the

3

ESOS gives a competitive and effective performance for global numerical optimization. Keywords

—metaheuristic algorithm, symbiotic organisms search, global numerical optimization, structural engineering design I. INTRODUCTION In the

4

last few decades, global numerical optimization has become an interesting and challenging field of study to develop. Many of the optimization problems were solved by gradient-based optimization methods. However, technology has advanced rapidly in the last few decades, causing optimization problems to be varied and difficult to resolve. As a result, gradient-based optimization methods become less efficient in solving some complex problems. Due to these limitations, researchers have sought to find other optimization methods that are more effective than gradient-based optimization methods. Recently, numerous metaheuristic optimization methods have been extensively researched and have evolved into potential alternatives to gradient-based methods. A "metaheuristic" is defined as an algorithmic framework that has a particular pattern, often nature-inspired, that iteratively simulates a set of randomly generated solutions to achieve better optimal solutions [1]. Notable

examples of metaheuristic algorithms include the genetic algorithm (GA)

4

[2], simulated annealing (SA)

[3], particle swarm optimization (PSO) [4], differential evolution (DE) [5], ant colony optimization (ACO) [6], harmony search (HS) [7], artificial bee colony (ABC) [8], firefly algorithm (FA) [9], cuckoo search (CS) [10],

2

and teaching-learning-based optimization (TLBO) [11]. However, there are limitations of existing metaheuristic methods. For example, GA uses complicated operators (on selection and crossover), often trapped in local optima, and has a weak local search capability [12]. PSO has a poor exploration capability in solving complex multimodal problems and can be easily trapped in local optima [12]. As a result, in

agreement with the “no-free-lunch” theory [13], new metaheuristic optimization methods must be developed to solve specific and more complex optimization problems [14- 16]. Furthermore, there is a growing number of studies in combining metaheuristic algorithms with other techniques to handle advanced problems [17-20].

Symbiotic organisms search (SOS) proposed by Cheng and Prayogo 14

[21] is a promising new metaheuristic method that can produce a better solution

in comparison with other traditional metaheuristic methods such as GA, PSO, and 22

DE. This method simulates symbiotic behaviors between living creatures of different species in an ecosystem with the goal of survival. Although quite new, SOS

has been utilized to solve many difficult optimization problems. In 3

this research, an improved version of SOS is proposed called “enhanced symbiotic organisms search” (ESOS), which modifies the mechanism of the parasitism phase to produce a better exploration strategy. The proposed ESOS method is then used to solve complicated mathematical benchmark problems and one structural engineering design problem. II. METHODOLOGY A. Brief Introduction to the SOS Algorithm First

developed by Cheng and Prayogo [21], SOS is a metaheuristic algorithm inspired by the 13

symbiotic relationships among organisms in their ecosystem as illustrated in Fig. 1. Initially developed for continuous numerical optimization, SOS

has been widely used for solving various optimization problems 18

in a variety of research areas. Fig. 1. Illustrations of symbiotic mutualism, commensalism, and parasitism. Similar to well-known metaheuristic algorithms, SOS comprise a sequence of operations that can generate potential best solutions at each iteration. The

algorithm is constructed in three main phases: mutualism, commensalism, and parasitism. In the 5

mutualism phase, two candidate solutions benefit from the interaction; in the commensalism phase, one of the candidates receives an advantage while the other candidate is not affected; and in the parasitism phase, one candidate

benefits while the other is harmed. The cycle of these symbiotic 9

interactions continues until the specific criteria are satisfied. B. Modification in the SOS Algorithm Since its introduction by Cheng and Prayogo [21], SOS

has been widely applied in many research fields [22-26]. The 19

three phases that comprise the SOS structure offer unique searching characteristics [21]. For example, mutualism and commensalism benefit SOS with their good exploration capabilities, and parasitism has a strong exploiting characteristic with its cloning and random-based mutation operator. Additionally, parasitism has the capability to remove inferior solutions. Nevertheless, improving the performance of SOS has become even more necessary as the complexity of numerical problems has increased tremendously. In this research, enhanced SOS (ESOS) is introduced as an improved version of SOS by modifying the current parasitism phase. In addition to the commonly known cloning and mutation concept, a sub-phase, called “cleptoparasitism” is introduced in the parasitism phase. The proposed sub-phase is originally adopted from the crow search algorithm (CSA) [27]. The cleptoparasitism sub-phase mimics the ingenious behavior of crows that keep their food reserves in hiding places for future retrieval. The following pseudo-code explains the mechanism of the modified parasitism phase:

1: Generate a uniform random number, rand1, between [0, 1] 2: if

20

rand1 < 0.5 then 3: 4: 5: 6: 7: 8: 9: 10: 11: /* parasitism sub-phase */ Generate parasite_vector Evaluate its fitness value Select the fittest organism between parasite_vector and its host else if rand1 > 0.5 then /* cleptoparasitism sub-phase */ Generate cleptoparasite_vector Evaluate its fitness value Select the fittest organism between cleptoparasite_vector and its host 12: end if 13: end for Similar to the canonical SOS, the ecosystem passes through the mutualism and commensalism phases in sequence before entering the modified parasitism phase. The modified parasitism phase is now of two sub-phases: the original parasitism sub-phase and the cleptoparasitism sub-phase. In the cleptoparasitism sub-phase, ri is introduced as a uniform random number with a value determined by Askarzadeh [27], as seen in (1): $ri = \text{rand}(0,1)$ (1) Thereafter, fl is the range of the range between the m- organism and (m + 1)-organism in a single loop. The value of fl is determined by the user taking

a random number with a uniform distribution between -2 and 2. There is

10

a possibility of random numbering for fl that results in better search performance, but the researcher has not done so due to time constraints. The definition of fl can be seen in (2): $fl = \text{rand}(-2,2)$ (2) The coef is the coefficient of the difference in value possessed by

the best position of organism (xbest) and the current position of the

8

m-organism (xm), which can be seen in (3); and the new position of the m-organism (xm') obtained through (4): $\text{coef} = ri \times fl$ (3) $xm' = xm + \text{coef} (xbest - xm)$ (4) III. ESOS VALIDATION ON NUMERICAL BENCHMARK

PROBLEMS In this section, the performance of ESOS is tested

15

through complex benchmark problems. For comparison purpose, PSO, DE, and the original SOS algorithm are employed. The experimental setting is described as follows: the population sizes of PSO, DE, SOS, and ESOS are set to 50 each; the

maximum number of function evaluations is set to be 250,000; and the

7

iteration stops only if the function evaluations exceed the maximum number allowed. To maintain an equivalent comparison, PSO, DE, SOS, and ESOS algorithms are tested under the same conditions and parameter settings for the four

algorithms as shown in Table I. The number of

21

ecosystems is denoted by n;

w is the inertia weight; c is the crossover rate; and F is the scaling factor. A

6

set of 26 benchmark functions is used to evaluate the

24

algorithms. The experiment is repeated over 30 times and the average results for mean (M) and standard deviation (SD) are recorded in Table II. TABLE I. TABLE II. PARAMETER SETTINGS FOR NUMERICAL BENCHMARK PROBLEMS PSO n = 50, w = 1, c1 = 2, c2 = 2 DE n = 50, F = 0.4, c = 0.5 SOS n = 50 ESOS n = 50 COMPARISON OF ANALYSIS BETWEEN ESOS AND OTHER METAHEURISTICS Functions Min. PSO DE SOS ESOS Beale M 0 0.00049 7245.70 0 0 SD 0.00075 0 0 0 Easom M -1 -0.9263 -1 -1 SD 0.05701 0 0 0 Matyas M 0 5.39E-05 4.90 0 0 SD 5.54E-05 0 0 0 Boachevsky1 M 0 0.41971 9.3E-17 0 0 SD 0.22651 1.1E-16 0 0 Booth M 0 0.01673 76.97 0 0 SD 0.01671 63.50 0 0 Michalewicz2 M -1.8013 -1.8002 -0.8013 -1.8013 -1.8013 SD 0.00126 3.4E-16 9.03E-16 9.03E-16 Schaffer M 0 0.03034 0.0487 0 0 SD 0.01538 0.19061 0 0 Six Hump M -1.03163 -1.0310 0.0082 -1.03163 -1.03163 Camel Back SD 0.00090 9.0E-10 6.78E-16 6.78E-16 Boachevsky2 M 0 0.25366 1.1E-17 0 0 SD 0.19874 2.3E-17 0 0 Boachevsky3 M 0 0.24715 1.9E-16 0 0 SD 0.15172 2.2E-16 0 0 Shubert M -186.73 -186.63 189.57 -186.73 -186.73 SD 0.12542 22.74 4.70E-08 3.95E-14 Colville M 0 7.44825 23.29 9.64E-12 2.07E-12 SD 3.95789 118.28 1.19E-11 4.30E-12 Michalewicz5 M -4.6877 -3.5903 -2.24 -4.6877 -4.6877 SD 0.22732 2.9E-08 2.27E-15 1.51E-15 Zakharov M 0 9.73168 5.3E-83 7.4E-247 1.6E-254 SD 5.61788 1.8E-82 0 0 Michalewicz10 M -9.6602 -5.1983 -3.2790 -9.65588 -9.65711 SD 0.32766 1.0E-07 0.012404 0.015359 Step

M 0 2014.11 3.4E-18 1.64E-33 1.34E-33 SD 2009.55 1.9E-17 4.11E-33 3.20E-33 Sphere M 0 2343.93 4.8E-67 0 0 SD 1948.64 2.6E-66 0 0 Sum Squares M 0 364.59 7.8E-32 0 0 SD 266.11 4.2E-31 0 0 Quartic M 0 2.26620 6.2081 0.00205 0.000185 SD 1.78097 4.68605 7.51E-05 8.47E-05 Schwefel 2.22 M 0 21.17 1.1E-66 0 0 SD 8.10003 1.7E-66 0 0 Schwefel 1.2 M 0 27564.87 4.5E-19 0 0 SD 22372.68 2.5E-18 0 0 Rosenbrock M 0 428791.9 1969.32 9.887101 0.576513 SD 556753.5 3607.47 1.430548 0.435882 Dixon-Price M 0 6415.98 15.38 0.666667 0.666667 SD 13932.88 38.31 2.50E-16 1.13E-16 Rastrigin M 0 202.88 87.82 0 0 SD 54.48 36.74 0 0 Griewank M 0 17.76 0.03580 0 0 SD 13.23 0.19608 0 0 Ackley M 0 8.99452 8.1E-15 4.2E-15 3.97E-15 SD 3.05423 1.7E-15 9.01E-16 1.23E-15 Note: Bolded numbers represent the best mean value for each function. Obtained result demonstrates that the SOS and ESOS algorithms are the most effective methods, having perfectly completed 18 mathematical benchmark problems. However, the difference between the two methods is that the ESOS algorithm can produce a solution that is closer to its exact value in seven of those problems: Colville, Zakharov, Michalewicz10, Step, Quartic, Rosenbrock, and Ackley. To further find out about the superiority of the ESOS compared with the original SOS algorithm, we show the convergence profiles for Rosenbrock mathematical benchmark problem in each iteration as shown in Fig. 2. Fig. 2. Convergence profiles for the SOS and ESOS algorithm on Rosenbrock mathematical benchmark problem. As can be seen in Fig. 2, the SOS algorithm has a slightly better convergence rate in comparison with the ESOS algorithm. However, as the iteration progresses to a greater value, ESOS converges faster. The ESOS and SOS algorithms found the best value of 0.13893 and 4.64578, respectively, after 1200 iterations. This proves that improvisation in one phase of the SOS algorithm produces a positive impact on the computation of more optimal results. IV. PRACTICAL EXAMPLE OF STRUCTURAL PROBLEM Practical

performance of the ESOS algorithm is investigated by using

25

72-bar space truss structure problem. PSO, DE, and SOS algorithms are used as comparisons. For all four methods, the best weight (minimum), standard deviation, and average (mean) were obtained from 30 independent runs, with the maximum value for the function evaluation set at 50,000. The objective of the 72-bar space truss problem is to obtain the lightest structural weight and was previously investigated by Li et al. [28]. This test problem uses two linear inequality constraints, stress (σ) and displacement (Δ), and one design variable, cross-sectional area (x). Due to the symmetry of existing structures and according to previous research, these structures are divided into 16 groups of elements. The load case for 72-bar space truss problem is listed in Table III and the structure is shown in Fig. 3. TABLE III. LOAD CASE FOR 72-BAR SPACE TRUSS PROBLEM Nodes Load (kg) P_x P_y P_z 17 2267.96 2267.96 -2267.96 Fig. 3. A

72-bar space truss structure. The following objective of

26

design optimization on structural problem is

to find a minimum weight (W) of structures,

27

so we can get a minimum cost of construction. The objective function for this problem can be seen in (5): $N m W = \sum L_m m m$ (5) $m=1$ with $N m$

is the total number of truss members, L_m is the length of

12

each truss members, and $m m$ is the coefficient of weight per length of truss members, as follows: $m m = 2.71447 x$ (6) The boundary conditions for cross-sectional area of truss (x) can be seen in (7) and the following limitations are the design constraints for structural problem tested, that can be seen in (8) and (9) as follows: $64.52 \leq x \leq 2064.51$ g $\sigma_m = (\sigma_m)_{all} - 1 \leq 0; m = 1, 2, 3, \dots, N m$ (7) $\delta_{j k} (d_{j,k})_{all} - 1 \leq 0; j = 1, 2, 3, \dots, N_j = d_{j,k}$ (9) In (8) and (9), g_m and $\delta_{j k}$ are the optimization constraints for stress and displacements, respectively. For the m -th member, σ_m is the computed axial stresses and $(\sigma_m)_{all}$ is its allowable. While for j -th joint on the k -th direction, $d_{j k}$ is the computed displacements and $(d_{j,k})_{all}$ is its allowable, and N_j is the total number of joints. A performance comparison of the statistical results between ESOS and other metaheuristics is presented as Table IV. In this table, bold texts indicate the best results. The ESOS and SOS algorithms achieve the best (minimum) weight of the structure, i.e., 1714.98 N. However, the ESOS algorithm outperforms SOS in best average and standard deviation for the weight of the structure. For best mean and standard deviation, the SOS algorithm achieves, respectively, 1717.95 N and 4.29 while the ESOS algorithm achieves 1715.90 N and 2.89. TABLE IV. COMPARISON OF STATISTICAL RESULTS FOR ESOS AND OTHER METAHEURISTICS Algorithms Best Mean St. Dev. PSO 5510.87 7725.08 1072.46 DE 1778.42 3193.12 990.52 SOS 1714.98 1717.95 4.29 ESOS 1714.98 1715.90 2.89 V. CONCLUSIONS This research proposes the ESOS method for global numerical optimization. This method modifies the conventional SOS method by implementing a new searching formula in the parasitism phase, with the intention of producing a better searching capability. We compared ESOS performance with PSO, DE, and the original

problem. The computational results and comparisons verify the superiority of ESOS in solving some complex mathematical benchmark problems better than other tested algorithms. Furthermore, for the structural problem, ESOS demonstrated consistent performance to produce optimal solutions. This is confirmed from the smaller standard deviation produced by ESOS compared with other metaheuristic algorithms including SOS. Thus, the implemented improvisation in the parasitism phase produced a large positive impact on the computational results. The ESOS algorithm delivers competitive, superior, and effective performance for global numerical optimization.

REFERENCES [1] I. Osman and G. Laporte, "Metaheuristics: A bibliography", *Ann. Oper. Res.*, 1996, 63, (5), pp. 511- 623. [2] J.H. Holland, *Adaptation in natural and artificial systems*. University of Michigan Press. 1975. [3] S. Kirkpatrick, C.D. Gelatt, and M.P. Vecchi, "Optimization by Simulated Annealing", *Science*, 1983, 220, pp. 671-680. [4] J. Kennedy and R. Eberhart, "Particle swarm optimization". *Proc. of IEEE Int. Conf. on Neural Networks*, 1995, pp. 1942-1948. [5] R. Storn and K. Price, "Differential Evolution – A Simple and Efficient Heuristic for global Optimization over Continuous Spaces", *J. Global Optim.*, 1997, 11, (4), pp. 341-359. [6] M. Dorigo and G.D. Caro, "Ant colony optimization: a new meta-heuristic". *Proc. of the 1999 Congress on Evolutionary Computation*, 1999, pp. 1-1477. [7] Z.W. Geem, J.H. Kim, and G.V. Loganathan, "A New Heuristic Optimization Algorithm: Harmony Search", *Simul.*, 2001, 76, pp. 60-68. [8] D. Karaboga and B. Basturk, "A powerful and efficient algorithm for numerical function optimization: artificial bee colony (ABC) algorithm", *J. Global Optim.*, 2007, 39, (3), pp. 459-471. [9] X.-S. Yang, *Nature-inspired Metaheuristic Algorithms*. Luniver Press. 2008. [10] X.-S. Yang and S. Deb, "Cuckoo Search via Lévy flights". *The World Congr. on Nature and Biologically Inspired Computing (NaBIC'09)*, 2009, pp. 210-214. [11] R.V. Rao, V.J. Savsani, and D.P. Vakharia, "Teaching-learning-based optimization: A novel method for constrained mechanical design optimization problems", *Comp.-Aided Design*, 2011, 43, pp. 303-315. [12] Z. Beheshti and S.M. Shamsuddin, "A Review of Population-based Meta-Heuristic Algorithm", *Int. J. Adv. Soft Comput. Appl.*, 2013, 5, pp. 1-35. [13] D.H. Wolpert and W.G. Macready, "No Free Lunch Theorems for Optimization". *IEEE Trans. Evol. Comput.*, 1997, pp. 67-82. [14] M.-Y. Cheng, D. Prayogo, Y.-W. Wu, and M.M. Lukito, "A Hybrid Harmony Search algorithm for discrete sizing optimization of truss structure", *Automat. Constr.*, 2016, 69, pp. 21-33. [15] M.-Y. Cheng and D. Prayogo, "A novel fuzzy adaptive teaching-learning-based optimization (FATLBO) for solving structural optimization problems", *Eng. Comput.*, 2017, 33, (1), pp. 55-69. [16] M.-Y. Cheng and D. Prayogo, "Fuzzy adaptive teaching-learning-based optimization for global numerical optimization", *Neural. Comput. Appl.*, 2016, pp. 1-19. [17] M.-Y. Cheng, P.M. Firdausi, and D. Prayogo, "High- performance concrete compressive strength prediction using Genetic Weighted Pyramid Operation Tree (GW POT)", *Eng. Appl. Artif. Intel.*, 2014, 29, pp. 104- 113. [18] M.-Y. Cheng, D. Prayogo, Y.-H. Ju, Y.-W. Wu, and S. Sutanto, "Optimizing mixture properties of biodiesel production using genetic algorithm-based evolutionary support vector machine", *Int. J. Green Energy*, 2016, 13, (15), pp. 1599-1607. [19] M.-Y. Cheng, D. Prayogo, and Y.-W. Wu, "Novel Genetic Algorithm-Based Evolutionary Support Vector Machine for Optimizing High-Performance Concrete Mixture", *J. Comput. Civil Eng.*, 2014, 28, (4), pp. 06014003. [20] M.-Y. Cheng, D.K. Wibowo, D. Prayogo, and A.F.V. Roy, "Predicting productivity loss caused by change orders using the evolutionary fuzzy support vector machine inference model", *J. Civil Eng. Manag.*, 2015, 21, (7), pp. 881-892. [21] M.-Y. Cheng and D. Prayogo, "Symbiotic Organisms Search: A new metaheuristic optimization algorithm", *Comput. Struct.*, 2014, 139, pp. 98-112. [22] D. Prayogo, M.-Y. Cheng, and H. Prayogo, "A Novel Implementation of Nature-inspired Optimization for Civil Engineering: A Comparative Study of Symbiotic Organisms Search", *Civil Engineering Dimension*, 2017, 19, (1), pp. 36-43. [23] M.-Y. Cheng, C.-K. Chiu, Y.-F. Chiu, Y.-W. Wu, Z.-L. Syu, D. Prayogo, and C.-H. Lin, "SOS optimization model for bridge life cycle risk evaluation and maintenance strategies", *J. Chin. Inst. Civil Hydraul. Eng.*, 2014, 26, (4), pp. 293-308. [24] M.-Y. Cheng and D. Prayogo, "Modeling the permanent deformation behavior of asphalt mixtures using a novel hybrid computational intelligence", *ISARC 2016 - 33rd Int. Symp. on Automation and Robotics in Construction*, Auburn, USA, 2016, pp. 1009-1015. [25] M.-Y. Cheng, D. Prayogo, and D.-H. Tran, "Optimizing Multiple-Resources Leveling in Multiple Projects Using Discrete Symbiotic Organisms Search", *J. Comput. Civil Eng.*, 2016, 30, (3), pp. 04015036. [26] D.-H. Tran, M.-Y. Cheng, and D. Prayogo, "A novel Multiple Objective Symbiotic Organisms Search (MOSOS) for time-cost-labor utilization tradeoff problem", *Know.-Based Syst.*, 2016, 94, pp. 132-145. [27] A. Askarzadeh, "A novel metaheuristic method for solving constrained engineering optimization problems: Crow search algorithm", *Comput. Struct.*, 2016, 169, pp. 1-12. [28] L.J. Li., Z.B. Huang, and F. Liu, "A heuristic particle swarm optimization method for truss structures with discrete variables", *Comput. Struct.*, 2009, 87, pp. 435- 443.