



Dynamic Dimension Wrapping (DDW) Algorithm: A Novel Approach for Efficient Cross-Dimensional Search in Dynamic Multidimensional Spaces

Dongnan Jin^a, Yali Liu^{a, *}, Qiuzhi Song^{a,b}, Xunju Ma^a, Yue Liu^a, Dehao Wu^a

^aSchool of Mechatronical Engineering, Beijing Institute of Technology, Beijing 100081, China

^bAdvanced Technology Research Institute, Beijing Institute of Technology, Jinan 250300, China

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Keywords:

Dynamic multidimensional space; Optimization
DTW

ABSTRACT

In the real world, as the complexity of optimization problems continues to increase, there is an urgent need to research more efficient optimization methods. Current optimization algorithms excel in solving problems with a fixed number of dimensions. However, their efficiency in searching dynamic multi-dimensional spaces is unsatisfactory. In response to the challenge of cross-dimensional search in multi-dimensional spaces with varying numbers of dimensions, this study proposes a new optimization algorithm—Dynamic Dimension Wrapping (DDW) algorithm. Firstly, by utilizing the Dynamic Time Warping (DTW) algorithm and Euclidean distance, a mapping relationship between different time series across dimensions is established, thus creating a fitness function suitable for dimensionally dynamic multi-dimensional space. Additionally, DDW introduces a novel, more efficient cross-dimensional search mechanism for dynamic multidimensional spaces. Finally, through comparative tests with 31 optimization algorithms in dynamic multidimensional space search, the results demonstrate that DDW exhibits outstanding search efficiency and provides search results closest to the actual optimal solution.

1. Introduction

An optimization problem refers to the task of finding the optimal solution under given constraints. Typically, this kind of problem can be described as nonlinear programming (NLP) [1]. In nonlinear programming, the objective is to find a set of optimal variables under constraints, such that the objective function achieves the maximum.

For many NP-hard optimization problems in the real world, Metaheuristic (MH) optimization algorithms and other stochastic methods demonstrate better search efficiency compared to deterministic strategies (such as gradient descent). In previous studies, scholars have proposed many excellent metaheuristic algorithms which have been widely applied in various fields such as medicine [2], engineering [3] and finance [4,5]. MH can be divided into the following four categories: Swarm intelligence (SI) [6] algorithms simulate the intelligent coordination and social behavior of a swarm or group, such as Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO) [7], Gray Wolf Optimizer (GWO) [8], Moth Flame Optimization (MFO) [9], Aquila

Optimizer (AO) [10], Dingo Optimization Algorithm (DOA) [11]; Evolutionary algorithms (EA) mimic the evolutionary behavior of natural organisms, such as Genetic Algorithms (GA) [12], Differential Evolution (DE) [13] algorithms, and Evolutionary Strategies (ES) [14]; Physics-based (PB) algorithms mimic fundamental laws of physics or physical phenomena, such as Simulated Annealing algorithm (SA) [15], Gravitational Search Algorithm (GSA) [16], Archimedes Optimization Algorithm (AOA) [17], and Water Wave Algorithm (WWO) [18]; Human-based (HB) algorithms related to human behavior, such as Harmony Search (HS) [19]. Despite the existence of several excellent optimization algorithms, according to the "No Free Lunch" (NFL) theorem [20], no single optimization method can achieve the best solution for all types of problems [21]. Therefore, the development of new optimization algorithms for addressing emerging practical problems holds significant research significance and practical value.

In the study of human movement, we aim to utilize optimization algorithms to find a temporal data chain with the minimum distance to other gait cycle time data chains as a motion template, thus providing reference

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: dongnanjin@163.com (D. Jin), buaaliuyali@126.com (Y. Liu), qzhsong@bit.edu.cn (Q. Song), xunjuma@163.com (X. Ma), ly2078917188@163.com (Y. Liu), dehao.wu@gmail.com (D. Wu).

and foundational support for subsequent research. Due to the non-constancy of human gait cycles, the search space for motion templates exhibits dynamic multidimensional characteristics, implying that the number of dimensions in the variable group is not fixed. This dynamic multidimensional space is composed of multiple multidimensional spaces with a fixed number of dimensions, and the optimal solution may exist in any one of these spaces. Traditional optimization algorithms excel at solving problems with a fixed number of dimensions, but they can only search for the optimal solution in a single multidimensional space. Unless bearing enormous computational costs, conducting exhaustive searches in each multidimensional space, traditional optimization algorithms will inevitably overlook the optimal solutions in other multidimensional spaces and may very likely fail to obtain the global optimal solution. Thus, searching in dynamic multidimensional spaces poses a completely new challenge for optimization algorithms.

In order to search for optimal human motion templates in dynamic multidimensional space, firstly, we established a dimension-crossing mapping mechanism and constructed an adaptability evaluation model for dynamic dimensionalization problems based on this mechanism. Subsequently, we further proposed DDW, which possesses efficient cross-dimensional search capability. Finally, we compared and validated DDW against 31 metaheuristic algorithms. The results indicate that DDW exhibits higher efficiency in dynamic multidimensional space search and can obtain superior human motion templates.

2. Experiment and problem analysis

2.1. Experiment

In this study, 6 healthy men (male, height: $1.81 \pm 0.08\text{m}$, weight: $77.50 \pm 9.5\text{kg}$, BMI: 23.81 ± 4.15) participated in the experimental data collection process. The subjects' postures (including back, thigh, calf angle data) while walking on a Bertec treadmill (Bertec Corporation, Columbus, OH, USA) with an inclination angle of 0° at a speed of 4 km/h were captured by the Functional Assessment of Biomechanics (FAB, USA). The sampling frequency f was 50Hz . More than 80 continuous gait cycles were collected for each subject. All subjects were provided with an informed consent form for the experiment approved by the Ethics Committee at Beijing Institute of Technology (Approval code: BIT-EC-H-2024156).

2.2. Problem analysis

When studying the temporal data chains of human gait cycles, we observed fluctuations in the number of dimensions, rather than fixed values. Figure 1 depicts a multidimensional space portraying the dynamic nature of constituent dimensions, wherein the X-axis denotes the duration of gait cycles, the Z-axis denotes angle data, and the Y-axis represents the number of dimensions in the temporal data chains. Furthermore, Figure 1 illustrates temporal data chains with dimension counts of 59, 60, and 61, with yellow and blue scatter points respectively denoting the sagittal plane angles of the right and left thighs.

The purpose of this study is to explore optimal temporal data chains within dynamic multidimensional space, serving as reference templates for human motion. The specific process is as follows: after initializing M random templates X , an iterative computation through the optimization algorithm is employed to identify an x_k , which minimizes the fitness to N gait cycles (θ).




Fig. 1. Dynamic multidimensional space.

$$\text{Minimize } F(x_k, \theta) \quad (1)$$

$$\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_j, \dots, \theta_N) \quad (2)$$

$$\theta_j = \begin{cases} \theta_{back} = (\theta_{back}^1, \dots, \theta_{back}^i, \dots, \theta_{back}^D) \\ \theta_{l_thigh} = (\theta_{l_thigh}^1, \dots, \theta_{l_thigh}^i, \dots, \theta_{l_thigh}^D) \\ \theta_{r_thigh} = (\theta_{r_thigh}^1, \dots, \theta_{r_thigh}^i, \dots, \theta_{r_thigh}^D) \\ \theta_{l_calf} = (\theta_{l_calf}^1, \dots, \theta_{l_calf}^i, \dots, \theta_{l_calf}^D) \\ \theta_{r_calf} = (\theta_{r_calf}^1, \dots, \theta_{r_calf}^i, \dots, \theta_{r_calf}^D) \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

$$X = (x_1, \dots, x_k, \dots, x_M) \quad (4)$$

$$x_k = \begin{cases} x_{back} = (x_{back}^1, \dots, x_{back}^i, \dots, x_{back}^{D1}) \\ x_{l_thigh} = (x_{l_thigh}^1, \dots, x_{l_thigh}^i, \dots, x_{l_thigh}^{D2}) \\ x_{r_thigh} = (x_{r_thigh}^1, \dots, x_{r_thigh}^i, \dots, x_{r_thigh}^{D3}) \\ x_{l_calf} = (x_{l_calf}^1, \dots, x_{l_calf}^i, \dots, x_{l_calf}^{D4}) \\ x_{r_calf} = (x_{r_calf}^1, \dots, x_{r_calf}^i, \dots, x_{r_calf}^{D5}) \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

$$D1, D2, D3, D4, D5 \in [D_{min}, D_{max}] \quad (6)$$

Where, θ_j represents the data for the j -th gait cycle within θ , encompassing five attributes corresponding to the back, left thigh, right thigh, left calf, and right calf. Each attribute of θ_j is an array with a dimensionality of D . x_k represents the k -th template within X , which has the same attributes with θ_j . However, the attributes of x_k has varying dimensionality ($D1, D2, D3, D4, D5$), which are integers in $[D_{min}, D_{max}]$. D_{min} and D_{max} are statistically derived from θ . M represents the population size.

Traditional optimization search algorithms, such as PSO, typically focus on problems with a fixed number of dimensions. Consequently, these methods are only applicable to searching for target temporal data chains within multidimensional spaces with fixed dimensions. Conducting a global exhaustive search for each multidimensional space would entail significant temporal and spatial resource consumption, leading to low search efficiency. Moreover, restricting traditional methods to search only within certain portions of multidimensional spaces inevitably overlooks potential solutions in other dimensions, thereby predisposing the search to local optimization traps and hindering the attainment of a global optimum. Therefore, we introduced DTW to establish mapping relationships between

different dimensional data chains within dynamic multidimensional space, thus proposing the DDW tailored for problems within dynamic multidimensional space.

3. Dynamic Dimension Warping algorithm

The algorithmic flowchart of DDW is depicted in Figure 2, which encompasses the following principal steps:




Fig. 2. The Flowchart of DDW.

In Step 1, initialize the population (X) and compute the fitness of all individuals.

In Step 2, select the necessary segments to achieve optimal dimension gathering.

In Step 3, individuals within the population are stratified into three categories, labeled as A, B, and C, according to their fitness values. Then, novel individuals will be synthesized using diverse strategies.

In Step 4, compute the fitness of all newly generated individuals, and select a subset required for regenerating the population from both the newborn individuals and the existing population.

In Step 5, assess whether the termination criteria have been satisfied. If not, iterate through steps 2 to 5; otherwise, output the optimal individual.

3.1. Initialization

Figure 3 illustrates the initialization process of "back" within x_k . The horizontal axis represents time, while the vertical axis represents the angle. In the figure, the "Gaits" (blue scatter) represent the temporal data series of gait cycle counts across various dimensions. The "Ave" (red line) denotes the average reference temporal data series, while the "Init" (green line) signifies the outcome of the ultimate initialization process.

$$D_{count} = \text{Mode}(D_1, \dots, D_j, \dots, D_N), D_j = D \text{ of } \theta_j \quad (7)$$

$$\theta_{ave-back} = (\theta_{back}^1, \dots, \theta_{back}^i, \dots, \theta_{back}^{D_{count}}) \quad (8)$$

$$\theta_{ave-back}^i = \sum_{j=1}^{count} \theta_{j-back}^i / count, \theta_j \in \theta, D \text{ of } \theta_j \quad (9)$$

$$= D_{count}$$

$$D1 = \text{randint}(D_{min}, D_{max}) \quad (10)$$

$$x_{k-back}^i = \theta_{ave-back}^i + \text{rand}(\theta_{back}^{min}, \theta_{back}^{max}) \quad (11)$$




Fig. 3. Initialize the 'back' of x_k .

D_{count} represents the mode of the dimensionality count for each gait cycle in θ (as shown in "Gaits" in Figure 3), and $count$ represents the statistical count of gait cycles with dimensionality equal to D_{count} ; $\theta_{ave-back}$ represents the mean value of all gait cycles with dimensionality equal to D_{count} in each dimension (Equations 12 and 13); randint means to get a random integer inside $[D_{min}, D_{max}]$, while $D1$ represents the dimensionality count of x_{k-back} ; θ_{back}^{min} and θ_{back}^{max} represent the minimum and maximum values of attribute "back" in each dimension, respectively. As shown in "Init" in Figure 3, to ensure the final dimensionality count is $D1$, we need to randomly delete some data or perform linear interpolation on random portions.

The other attributes of x_k are then initialized using the same method. This process is repeated M times to complete the initialization of the entire population. Each individual in the population is a particle in multidimensional space, and each dimension of each attribute describes the position of the particle in the multidimensional space. Each individual is also a potential solution for practical problems.

3.2. Fitness function

To compute the fitness value of each individual in the population, we need to consider the multidimensional time series attributes of each individual (e.g., A and B, see Formula 12). Due to the potentially different dimensionalities of these time series, we employed methods based on DTW and Euclidean distance (Formulas 13-15) to establish mappings between different dimensions.

$$A = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_i, \dots, a_{l_A}), B = (b_1, b_2, \dots, b_i, \dots, b_{l_B}) \quad (12)$$

$$V, v, dir = \text{Map}(A, B) = \begin{cases} DTW(A, B), & l_A \neq l_B \\ Euclidean(A, B), & l_A = l_B \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

$$dir = (dir_1, dir_2, \dots, dir_i, \dots, dir_{l_A}) \quad (14)$$

$$v = (v_1, v_2, \dots, v_i, \dots, v_{l_A}), v_i = \min \{(a_i - b_j)^2 \mid j \in dir_i\} \quad (15)$$

A and B can represent time series which can be any attribute of any element in θ or X . V represents the distance between A and B; v represents the distance of the corresponding elements mapped from B to A; dir represents the set of indices of the corresponding elements mapped from B to A, which also indicates the mapping direction from B to A.

As shown in Figure 4, when $l_A = l_B$, both v and dir are the results of each element in A and B being one-to-one correspondence. However, when

$l_A \neq l_B$ occurs, we need to search for the optimal path through the path matrix in the DTW calculation process.




Fig. 4. Mapping from B to A.

Figure 5 shows the computational details of the DTW part. "Dis" and "Route" denote the distance matrix and path matrix generated during the DTW computation, respectively. $Route[l_A - 1, l_B - 1]$ denotes the end point of the path matrix, i.e., the direct distance V between both A and B (Formulas 13). "Best Route" denotes the set of consecutive elements in the distance matrix that makes V the minimization. In the optimal path, a_i may have a mapping relationship with multiple elements in B, which means that dir_i is a set containing multiple element indices in B. At the same time, v_i reflects the minimum distance between a_i and these multiple elements in B.




Fig. 5. Details of DTW.

Based on the above calculation method, the process of obtaining the fitness fit_k of x_k is as follows:

$$fit = \{fit_1, \dots, fit_k, \dots, fit_M\} \quad (16)$$

$$fit_k = F(x_k, \theta) = \sum_{j=1}^N f(x_k, \theta_j) / N \quad (17)$$

$$f(x_k, \theta_j) = Ave(\{V_{back}, V_{l_thigh}, V_{r_thigh}, V_{l_calf}, V_{r_calf}\}) \quad (18)$$

fit represents the set of fitness values of all individuals in the entire population; $f(x_k, \theta_j)$ represents the distance between x_k and θ_j ; $Ave()$ represents the average value of all elements in the set;

$\{V_{back}, V_{l_thigh}, V_{r_thigh}, V_{l_calf}, V_{r_calf}\}$ represents the distance between x_k and θ_j on various attributes, which is calculated by Formula 17.




Fig. 6. Population division.

As depicted in Figure 6, following each update of X and fit , the population undergoes partitioning into "Part A" (5%), "Part B" (45%), and "Part C" (50%) based on the ascending order of fitness values. These three sections will generate new individuals with diverse strategies. x_{best} represents the least fit individual in the current population.

3.3. Optimal Dimension Collection

Optimal Dimension Collection (ODC) involves establishing inter-dimensional mapping relationships with all other individuals in "Part A" based on x_{best} (see Formula 17), aiming to determine the optimal dimension value for each dimension within the best group of the current population. The specific process is as follows:

$$D_{best-back} = \{D_{best-back}^1, \dots, D_{best-back}^i, \dots, D_{best-back}^{len(x_{best-back})}\} \quad (19)$$

$$v, v_{dir} = Map(x_{best-back}, x_{j-back}) \quad (20)$$

$$D_{best-back}^i = \begin{cases} x_{best}^{dir-i}, & \text{if } v_{x_{best}}^{dir-i} \leq v_{x_j}^{dir-i} \\ x_j^{dir-i}, & \text{if } v_{x_{best}}^{dir-i} > v_{x_j}^{dir-i} \end{cases} \quad (21)$$

$D_{best-back}$ represents the "back" attribute of the Optimal Dimension Solution (ODS) D_{best} . x_j is a randomly selected solution ranked j -th in X based on fitness, but it cannot be the optimal solution itself. v and dir provide mapping information between $x_{best-back}$ and x_{j-back} after dimension folding. $dir - i$ represents the dimension in x_{j-back} corresponding to the i -th dimension in $x_{best-back}$. $v_{x_{best}}$ and v_{x_j} respectively denote the minimum dimensional distances obtained by $x_{best-back}$ and x_{j-back} with respect to each dimension corresponding to all elements in θ during the fitness calculation process.

Following the aforementioned method, the remaining attributes of D_{best} are resolved. Building upon this, we substitute D_{best} for x_{best} and proceed to explore, alongside other individuals in "Part A", the optimal value for each dimension, ultimately deriving the definitive D_{best} .

3.4. Strategy A

In order to avoid getting trapped in local optimization and search for better positions globally, individual x_a in "Part A" randomly moves around individual x_{best} . The movement process is as follows:

$$x_{a-new-back}^j = x_{best}^j + (\theta_{back}^{max} - \theta_{back}^{min}) * step \quad (22)$$

$$step = Lévy(\lambda) * (1 - (gen/Max_gen)^2) \quad (23)$$

$$D_{new} = randint(D_{min}, D_{max}) \quad (24)$$

$x_{a-new-back}^j$ represents the value of the j-th dimension of the "back" attribute of the new individual x_{a-new} for x_a (Equation 22). Lévy(λ) generates a random number based on the heavy-tailed power-law step size distribution, which has infinite variance and mean. λ is a parameter within the interval (1,3]. $iter$ represents the current iteration number, while Max_iter represents the maximum iteration number. D_{new} is the required number of dimensions.

To ensure that the final number of dimensions is D_{new} , multiple deletions of the worst dimension data or linear interpolation near the worst dimension need to be performed on $x_{a-new-back}$. The worst dimension refers to the dimension with the maximum dimensional distance (Equation 13).

Based on the above process, the solution for the other attributes of the new individual x_{a-new} will be completed.

3.5. Strategy B

Unlike "Part A", individual x_b in "Part B" searches for an individual x_{better} which is better than x_b . The search process is as follows:

$$T_b = \begin{cases} x_{better}, & \text{if } fit_{x_{better}} \leq fit_{D_b} \\ D_b, & \text{if } fit_{x_{better}} > fit_{D_b} \end{cases} \quad (25)$$

$$x_{b-new-back}^j = x_{b-back}^j + step_b * (T_b^{dir_j} - x_{b-back}^j) \quad (26)$$

$$step_b = (step_{max} - step_{min}) * e^{-\gamma * dis^2} + step_{min} \quad (27)$$

$$dis = f(x_b, T_b) \quad (28)$$

x_{better} is an individual with a fitness value less than x_b 's fitness value randomly selected from "Part A" and "Part B". D_b is the result of optimal dimension collection for set $\{x_b, x_{better}\}$. $fit_{x_{better}}$ and fit_{D_b} represent the fitness values of x_{better} and D_b , respectively. T_b represents the individuals in $\{x_b, x_{better}\}$ with lower fitness values, which is the actual direction that x_b needs to search.

$x_{b-new-back}^j$ represents the value of the j-th dimension of the "back" attribute of the new individual x_{b-new} for x_b . $T_b^{dir_j}$ represents the value of the dir_j -th dimension of the attribute "back" of T_b corresponding to x_{b-back}^j . dir can be calculated using equation 13. $step_b$ represents the current actual step size of the search. $step_{max}$ and $step_{min}$ respectively represent the maximum and minimum step sizes during the search process. γ is the parameter for step calculation. dis represents the distance between x_b and T_b .

Based on the above process, the solution for other attributes of the new individual x_{b-new} will be completed.

3.6. Strategy C

As the largest proportion of the population, "Part C" has the greatest impact on the global search efficiency. Therefore, individuals in this part (such as x_c) choose a multi-path competitive search approach that revolves around the best individual and optimal dimension of the population during the updating process.

$$x_{c-new-back}^j = \begin{cases} x_{c-back}^j + route_1 \\ x_{c-back}^j + route_2 \\ x_{c-back}^j + route_3 \end{cases} \quad (29)$$

$$route_1 = step_1 * (x_{best-back}^{dir_1j} - x_{c-back}^j) \quad (30)$$

$$route_2 = step_2 * (D_{best-back}^{dir_2j} - x_{c-back}^j) \quad (31)$$

$$route_3 = \beta * route_1 + (1 - \beta) * route_2 \quad (32)$$

$$\beta = rand(0,1) \quad (33)$$

$x_{c-new-back}^j$ represents the value of the j-th dimension of the "back" attribute of the new individual x_{c-new} for x_c . The computation process of equations 30 and 31 can be referred to equation 26, where the calculation method for variables $step_1$ and $step_2$ is consistent with equation 27. $route_1$ and $route_2$ represent two paths that search around the globally optimal individual x_{best} and the dimensionally optimal individual D_{best} , respectively. In order to search in more directions, $route_3$ simultaneously utilizes the two previous search paths. β represents a uniformly distributed random number within range (0,1).

Based on the aforementioned process, the solution for other attributes will be completed. In contrast to the other two parts, in this case, three new individuals are generated by x_c , corresponding to three different search routes.

3.7. Selection

After completing the update calculations for all individuals, it is necessary to select the desired individuals based on their fitness values in order to recombine a new population for the next round of computations. As shown in Figure 7, the new population will consist of two parts. All the new individuals generated by "Part B" and "Part C", along with the original population X and the dimensionally optimal individual D_{best} , will form a collective set. The first part will select 95% * M individuals with relatively lower fitness values from this collective set. The second part will directly consist of new individuals generated from "Part A", accounting for 5% of the population.




Fig. 7. The process of population renewal.

4. Experimental results

The algorithms were programmed in Python (3.10.5) and executed on computation environment of Intel Core i7-7700HQ CPU 2.80GHz, 2.5GHz, 16GB RAM and 64-bit operating system.

4.1. Test for step size parameter

During each iteration, the step size parameter (γ) plays a pivotal role in DDW, as it significantly influences the iterative outcomes for 95% of individuals within the population. Hence, before proceeding with additional testing tasks, it is imperative to ascertain the optimal value of the step size parameter for addressing the challenge of motion template construction.

Figure 8 illustrates the impact of the out-of-sync length parameter on the step size. In this depiction, "Step" denotes the proportion of steps taken, while "Distance" signifies the inter-individual separation within the population, calculated via the fitness formula. Following initial rudimentary assessments, it was observed that the central fluctuation span of inter-individual distances lies within the range of [10, 40], delineated as

the "Key range" within the diagram. The optimal step size curve is anticipated to manifest predominantly within this "Key Range," indicating a broader range of step size variations for identical inter-individual distances. Guided by the step length curve presented in Figure 7, a series of subsequent step length parameter tests were meticulously devised. The pertinent parameters for these tests are detailed in Table 1 below.

Table 1 Parameter values for DDW.

Parameter	Value
M	30
Max_gen	20
γ	1e-05, 0.0002, 0.0003, 0.0004, 0.0005, 0.0006, 0.0007, 0.0008, 0.0009, 0.001, 0.002, 0.003, 0.004, 0.005
$[step_{max}, step_{min}]$	[1.5, 0.1]




Fig. 8. Step curve.

The test results are depicted in Figure 9. To ensure robustness, we conducted five repetitions of the test using the same step length parameter and subsequently analyzed the average test results. The left panel illustrates the impact of varying step parameters on the search process, while the right panel elucidates the correlation between the fitness value of the optimal individual and the step parameters after 20 iterations.




Fig. 9. Results of step parameter test.

The test results indicate that when the step size parameter approaches 0.001, the population's search efficiency experiences a notable enhancement. Specifically, with a step size parameter set at 0.001, the population exhibited the most rapid decline in fitness value over 20 iterations. Notably, within this test scenario, populations operating with a step size parameter of 0.001 demonstrated the most favorable rate of fitness decline, averaging only 1.038 per iteration. In contrast, the average rate of decline across all test instances stood at 1.164 per iteration. This disparity underscores that setting the step size parameter to 0.001 accelerates the population's search pace by approximately 10.83% above the mean. Hence, these findings distinctly advocate 0.001 as the optimal step parameter for DDW.

4.2. Test for ODC

The ODC constitutes a pivotal stage within DDW, with the ODS generated therein exerting a significant influence on the search and updating processes of the entire population. To evaluate its ramifications, we conducted 1,000 tests of ODC for two randomly selected individuals at the culmination of each population iteration. The crucial parameters of this assessment are delineated in Table 2.

Table 2 Parameter values for ODC test.

Parameter	Value
M	50
Max_gen	500
γ	0.001
$[step_{max}, step_{min}]$	[1.5, 0.1]

Figure 10 illustrates the test results of ODC, depicting the fitness variations of the ODS throughout the entire iteration process. "Best" and "Better" denote the likelihood of surpassing all and some of the original individuals, respectively. "Worst" indicates the probability of performing worse than all the original individuals. "Ave", "Std", and "Min" denote the mean, standard deviation, and minimum of the fitness values, respectively.




Fig. 10. Results of ODC test.

Throughout 500 iterative searches, the global average probabilities of "Best", "Better", and "Worst" collected by the optimal dimension are 37.23%, 28.68%, and 34.09%, respectively. This indicates that this unique search method yielded superior individuals more than 65% of the time.

Within the initial 6 iterations, the probability of "Best" collected from the optimal dimension exceeded 40%. Simultaneously, the minimum value of individual fitness was less than 10 by the third iteration, aligning with the ideal value set in this study. By the fifth iteration, within the initial 10 iterations, the average individual fitness approached 20, signifying the transition of the group search into the refinement stage.

The findings from this test highlight the crucial role of ODC throughout the entire search process. It significantly narrows down the search space and is anticipated to converge towards the true optimal solution. Moreover, the average fitness values of individuals hovered around 20 during the mid-term search phase and swiftly approached the minimum feasible value in subsequent iterations. Hence, the ODC furnishes essential support for the population-wide search across various iteration stages.

4.3. Test for motion template construction

To assess the motion template construction capability of DDW, we conducted comparative experiments employing 31 meta-heuristic algorithms. For this assessment, the population size and maximum number of iterations for all algorithms were uniformly set to 50 and 500, respectively. The critical parameters of all algorithms are delineated in Table 3.

Table 3 Parameter values of DDW and other meta-heuristic algorithms.

Algorithm	Parameter	Value
Fireworks Algorithm (FWA) [22]	a, b	0.2, 0.8
Genetic Algorithm (GA) [12]	-	-
Artificial Bee Colony Algorithm (ABC) [23]	$Fs, limit$	10, 60
Cuckoo search (CS) [24]	pa, α	0.3, 1
Firefly Algorithm (FA) [25]	$\alpha, \beta_{max}, \beta_{min}, \gamma$	0.97, 1.0, 0.2, 1
Group Search Optimizer (GSO) [26]	l_{max}	3
Water wave optimization (WVO) [18]	$h_{max}, \lambda, \alpha, \beta$	5, 0.5, 1.0026, 0.0001
Bat Algorithm (BA) [27]	$\alpha, \gamma, f_{max}, f_{min}$	0.85, 0.9, 1, 0
Shuffled Frog Leaping Algorithm (SFLA) [28]	m	10
Gravitational Search Algorithm (GSA) [16]	G_0	100
Grey Wolf Optimizer (GWO) [8]	a	2
Brain Storm Optimization (BSO) [29]	$k, p5a, p6b, p6b3, p6c$	20, 0.2, 0.8, 0.4, 0.5
Sparrow Search Algorithm (SSA) [30]	ST, PR, SD	0.8, 80%, 20%
Ant Lion Optimization (ALO) [31]	-	-
Butterfly Algorithm (BFA) [32]	p, c, a	0.8, 0.001, 0.1
Monarch Butterfly Optimization (MBO) [33]	$p, BAR, S_{max}, peri$	5/12, 5/12, 100, 1.2
Moth-Flame Optimization (MFO) [9]	t	-1
Harmony Search (HS) [19]	$HMCR, PAR$	0.9, 0.1
Mayfly Optimization Algorithm (MA) [34]	a_1, a_2, β, fl, d	1, 1.5, 2, 0.1, 0.1

Grasshopper Optimisation Algorithm (GOA) [35]	f, l, C_{max}, C_{min}	0.5, 1.5, 1e-5, 1
Bald Eagle Search (BES) [36]	c_1, c_2, α, a, R	2, 2, 2, 10, 1.5
Marine Predators Algorithm (MPA) [37]	$FADs$	0.2
Archimedes Optimization Algorithm (AOA) [17]	C_1, C_2, C_3	2, 6, 2
Salp Swarm Algorithm (SSA-2) [38]	-	-
Slime Mould Algorithm (SMA) [39]	Z	0.03
Pigeon-inspired Optimization (PIO) [40]	$NcRate, R$	0.75, 0.2
Aquila Optimizer (AO) [10]	-	-
Harris Hawks Optimization (HHO) [41]	-	-
Dingo Optimization Algorithm (DOA) [11]	P, Q	0.5, 0.7
Whale Optimization Algorithm (WOA) [42]	a, b	2, 1
Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO) [7]	ω, C_1, C_2	0.8, 1.49445, 1.49445
DDW	$\gamma, step_{max}, step_{min}$	0.001, 1.5, 0.1

Algorithms other than DDW lack the capability to traverse dimensions, necessitating uniformity in the number of dimensions across attributes for all individuals within their respective populations. To facilitate comparison and construction of optimal templates with varying dimensionalities, we initialized three distinct populations, setting the initial dimensions to correspond to the top three values in the dimension quantity statistics. The initialization process for these comparison algorithms closely mirrors that of DDW, albeit with fixed dimensionality for all attributes of all individuals, unlike DDW where the dimensionality of any attribute for any individual is randomly selected within the statistical range. Subsequently, each algorithm underwent a minimum of three repeated tests to mitigate the impact of random variation in algorithmic calculations.

Table 4 presents the mean, minimum, and standard deviation of fitness for the optimal motion templates discovered by 32 algorithms. The top five performing algorithms in both average (Ave) and minimum (Min) fitness are identified as DDW, BES, MA, MBO, and FA. Among these, DDW demonstrates superior performance in terms of both mean and minimum values. The average fitness value of the motion templates generated by DDW is 9.16, marking a remarkable 41% reduction compared to the overall average across all 32 algorithms. This indicates that DDW has the highest possibility of searching for the motion template closest to the actual optimal solution. Notably, the minimum fitness value attained by DDW stands at 8.54, representing a substantial 37% decrease relative to the average fitness level observed across all 32 algorithms. This assessment underscores each algorithm's efficacy in achieving optimal solutions within finite temporal and spatial constraints. Moreover, multiple repeated tests eliminate the influence of randomness on the search process of all algorithms to some extent. Given the practical utility of optimal computational outcomes, this analysis focuses solely on the minimum fitness values, omitting consideration of the maximum values. Furthermore, the standard deviation serves as a measure of the variability inherent in the computational outcomes of each algorithm. DDW's standard deviation in fitness calculations ranks 7th among the 32 algorithms assessed, indicating a notable 65% reduction compared to the average standard deviation observed across all algorithms. In summary, compared with other

algorithms, DDW can stably search for the optimal motion template with the highest possibility, and the searched motion template is closest to the actual optimal solution.

Table 3 Parameter values of DDW and other meta-heuristic algorithms.

Algorithm	Ave	Min	Std	Algorithm	Ave	Min	Std
FWA	21.5	19.0	1.7	MFO	21.4	18.8	1.6
	8	3	7		5	7	6
GA	16.9	14.6	1.5	HS	9.64	9.07	0.3
	9	0	7				5
ABC	10.6	9.90	0.5	MA	9.43	8.88	0.4
	9		1				0
CS	22.7	20.0	1.8	GOA	12.2	10.6	1.0
	4	6	4		0	0	3
FA	9.59	9.06	0.3	BES	9.45	8.88	0.4
		9					0
GSO	21.5	18.0	2.0	MPA	20.9	18.4	1.7
	5	0	4		0	4	8
WWO	13.2	11.4	1.0	AOA	10.2	9.56	0.4
	7	1	1		4		4
BA	21.9	18.7	2.0	SSA-2	15.4	13.6	1.1
	9	5	2		4	9	9
SFLA	10.5	9.81	0.4	SMA	14.3	12.5	1.0
	8		7		9	5	9
GSA	22.7	19.5	1.9	PIO	18.7	16.5	1.5
	7	8	1		8	4	2
GWO	16.0	14.0	1.4	AO	10.2	9.58	0.4
	5	2	5		6		3
BSO	16.3	14.2	1.3	HHO	9.73	9.10	0.3
	0	5	6				6
SSA	13.5	11.4	1.3	DOA	21.2	18.7	1.7
	9	5	9		6	0	2
ALO	22.7	20.0	1.8	WOA	11.0	10.1	0.5
	4	8	9		4	3	2
BFA	22.7	19.6	1.9	PSO	17.0	13.0	2.6
	1	3	7		8	8	4
MBO	9.58	8.98	0.3	DDW	9.16	8.54	0.4
		8					2

The fluctuation in the fitness level of the top individual over the iterative process serves as an indicator of the search efficiency within the population. Drawing from the insights gleaned from Table 4, Figure 11 depicts variations in average fitness, minimum fitness of the top individual, and standard deviation of population fitness across iterations for the top 5 algorithms (DDW, BES, MA, MBO, FA).

The five algorithms demonstrate remarkable search efficiency in the initial exploration phases. By the 10th iteration, the average fitness of the best individual is significantly lower than that of other algorithms, demonstrating its ability to quickly locate potential optimal solutions. Throughout the entirety of the search process, DDW maintained a relatively high level of population fitness standard deviation (approximately 0.9), indicating its ongoing effective exploration in multiple directions rather than a singular focus. In contrast, other algorithms exhibited lower standard deviations (around 0.4), suggesting a more concentrated exploration along a specific direction. Consequently, DDW did not manifest a discernible

advantage during the initial stages of the search, merely demonstrating search efficiency comparable to that of other algorithms.




Fig. 11. The iterative process of the top 5 algorithms.

Although DDW maintained a high level of exploratory freedom in the early stages of the search, it demonstrated remarkable performance towards the end of the search process by rapidly converging its population to the optimal solution. Furthermore, the final search results achieved by DDW surpassed those of all other algorithms. This exceptional performance can be attributed to DDW's ability to effectively balance exploration and exploitation strategies throughout the search process. In summary, the DDW algorithm excels in maintaining population diversity and achieving rapid convergence, thereby endowing it with a significant advantage in addressing dynamic problems.

5. Discussions

In order to effectively construct personalized motion templates, we employ optimization algorithms to search among multiple gait cycle time series for the one with the minimum distance, which serves as the optimal motion template. However, due to the fluctuations in human gait cycles, the number of dimensions in the time series data varies. Traditional optimization algorithms excel at solving problems with a fixed number of dimensions, but lack the ability to evaluate fitness for dynamic problems. To evaluate the distance between time series data with potentially different numbers of dimensions, we utilize DTW and Euclidean distance (as shown in Equation 13) to establish dynamic data mapping relationships across dimensions, enabling these traditional optimization algorithms to search for motion templates in multi-dimensional spaces with fixed numbers of dimensions. Based on this, we further propose the DDW, which possesses both dynamic dimensionality and cross-dimensional search capabilities.

In the application of optimization algorithms, the fitness function plays a crucial role in transforming real-world problems into mathematical models. For both cases of consistent and inconsistent dimensionality, Equation 13 computes the total distance between two time series data chains, the minimum distance corresponding to each dimension, and the index set of dimension mappings. Traditional optimization algorithms only utilize the total distance as the individual fitness value to assess dynamic dimensionality problems. However, during the updating process, nearly all traditional optimization algorithms adopt a uniform update approach for individual dimension values. This uniform update method may lead to

situations where a single dimension is already close to the actual optimal solution but gets overwritten during updates. Although some algorithms (such as GA) can make adjustments to individual dimensions, this update method is solely based on overall fitness and cannot provide fine-grained evaluation and separate updates for individual dimensions.

In order to overcome the aforementioned limitations, we introduced an innovative updating operation called ODC in DDW. This operation gathers the optimal solutions on each dimension from the current population based on the minimum distances calculated by Equation 13, forming ODS. Due to the fact that local optimization processing may not necessarily achieve global optimization, the ODS is not necessarily superior to the original population. However, the ODS provides clear updating directions for other individuals through its dimension optimization, ensuring the efficiency and accuracy of population updates across dimensions. Actual test results demonstrate that the ODS not only aids in rapidly narrowing the search range for the actual optimal solution in the early stages of exploration but also accelerates the decrease in the population's optimal fitness values. Furthermore, the ODS provides new reference positions for population updates, aiding in the avoidance of falling into local optimization traps.

Traditional optimization algorithms are limited by their mathematical models, where the number of dimensions for all individuals must be consistent, thus only allowing the search for optimal solutions in multi-dimensional spaces with fixed dimensionality. The search space for dimension dynamization problems consists of multiple multi-dimensional spaces with fixed dimensionality, where the actual optimal solution may exist in any of the multi-dimensional spaces with fixed dimensionality. To overcome the limitation of traditional optimization algorithms unable to search across dimensions, we utilize the dimension directions calculated by Formula 13 as references, constructing temporal data chain mapping relationships between different numbers of dimensions. This enables DDW to transcend dimensionality restrictions and explore new possibilities in multi-dimensional spaces undergoing dynamization. In contrast, traditional optimization algorithms would need to resort to exhaustive search methods to handle multi-dimensional spaces with varying numbers of dimensions in order to achieve similar effects. Compared to traditional methods, DDW significantly reduces the computational resources required. Furthermore, comparative experimental results further validate the superiority of DDW, as it can identify motion templates superior to those found by the other 31 optimization algorithms. This indicates that DDW possesses significant advantages and potential in addressing dimension dynamization problems.

The overall search strategy of DDW is inspired by the principles of various optimization algorithms. We draw inspiration from strategies akin to prey hunting in WOA, applying them to "Part B" and "Part C" of the algorithm, focusing respectively on the current DOS and the optimal individual for exploration. Furthermore, we optimized the formula for calculating the search step length (Formula 27) to help the population find a balance between global and local searches.

Furthermore, we propose a random exploration method adaptable to dynamic multidimensional spaces (Strategy C), assisting top individuals ("Part A") in the population to explore unknown domains. The process of random exploration not only adjusts the values of each dimension but also adjusts the number of dimensions to prevent the dimension count from excessively approaching the optimal dimension count during the search process. In the filtering process after each update, we persist in retaining these individuals courageous in exploring unknown domains, enabling them to participate in the next iteration update. Each population iteration of DDW involves dual updates regarding dimension values and dimension count. We believe that this dynamic updating mechanism continually

traversing dimensions is the optimal search approach for addressing the issue of dynamic dimensionality.

The design intent of DDW is to address the problem of motion template construction in dynamic multidimensional spaces, and its internal multiple search strategies are customized specifically to deal with dynamic dimensionality issues. Therefore, DDW is difficult to directly apply to optimization problems with fixed dimensions solved by traditional optimization algorithms, such as the CEC-2017 test functions. Further testing and validation are needed for the performance of DDW on traditional optimization problems and in broader fields.

In response to the dynamic dimensionality problem of motion template construction, we propose the DDW algorithm, which possesses the capability of searching across dimensions, aiming to overcome the challenges faced by traditional optimization algorithms. Through comprehensive analysis of test results, we observed that DDW exhibits superior performance in dynamic dimensional search compared to traditional optimization algorithms. Therefore, we firmly believe that this algorithm provides a novel approach to addressing the dynamic dimensionality problem.

6. Conclusions

In response to the dynamic dimension problem of constructing human motion templates, we propose an optimization algorithm with the capability of searching across dimensions—DDW. Compared to traditional fixed-dimensional optimization problems, this problem requires searching in a dynamic multi-dimensional space, where traditional optimization algorithms are inadequate. DDW introduces a dimension-crossing mapping mechanism, which effectively establishes connections between time data chains with consistent and inconsistent dimensional quantities. This mechanism endows traditional optimization algorithms with the capability to evaluate dynamic dimension problems. Additionally, DDW further develops a more precise capability for searching across dimensional spaces, aiding populations in directly searching for optimal solutions throughout the dynamic dimensional space. Finally, through comparative testing with 31 traditional optimization algorithms, the effectiveness of DDW in efficiently constructing personalized human motion templates has been validated.

As a new heuristic dynamic dimension optimization algorithm, DDW has not yet been widely tested and validated in other fields. Therefore, we aim to conduct further tests on DDW and optimize its search strategies to enhance search efficiency.

CRedit authorship contribution statement

Dongnan Jin: Conceptualization, Methodology, Software, Validation, Writing - Original Draft. **Yali Liu:** Writing - Review & Editing, Project administration. **Qiuzhi Song:** Funding acquisition, Supervision. **Xunju Ma:** Writing - Review & Editing. **Yue Liu:** Writing - Review & Editing. **Dehao Wu:** Writing - Review & Editing.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported in part by the National Key Research and Development Program of China under Grant 2023YFC3604902.

References

- [1] Merris, Russell . Wiley-Interscience Series in Discrete Mathematics and Optimization. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 2011.
- [2] Houssein, Essam H., et al. "A novel hybrid Harris hawks optimization and support vector machines for drug design and discovery." *Computers & Chemical Engineering* 133 (2020): 106656.
- [3] Rodríguez, Nibaldo, et al. "Optimization algorithms combining (meta) heuristics and mathematical programming and its application in engineering." (2018).
- [4] Vasant, P. M. . "Meta-heuristics optimization algorithms in engineering, business, economics, and finance." register (2013).
- [5] Khan, Ameer Tamoor, **nwei Cao, and Shuai Li. "Using quadratic interpolated beetle antennae search for higher dimensional portfolio selection under cardinality constraints." *Computational Economics* 62.4 (2023): 1413-1435.
- [6] Jain, Mohit, Vijander Singh, and Asha Rani. "A novel nature-inspired algorithm for optimization: Squirrel search algorithm." *Swarm and evolutionary computation* 44 (2019): 148-175.
- [7] Eberhart, Russell, and James Kennedy. "A new optimizer using particle swarm theory." *MHS'95. Proceedings of the sixth international symposium on micro machine and human science. Ieee*, 1995.
- [8] Pal, Ashok , and S. Bahuguna . "Grey Wolf Optimizer." 2018 26th European Signal Processing Conference (EUSIPCO) 2018.
- [9] Mirjalili, Seyedali . "Moth-flame optimization algorithm: A novel nature-inspired heuristic paradigm." *Knowledge-Based Systems* 89.NOV.(2015):228-249.
- [10] Abualigah, Laith , et al. "Matlab Code of Aquila Optimizer: A novel meta-heuristic optimization algorithm." *Computers & Industrial Engineering* (2021).
- [11] Peraza-Vázquez, Hernán, et al. "A bio-inspired method for engineering design optimization inspired by dingoes hunting strategies." *Mathematical Problems in Engineering* 2021.1 (2021): 9107547.
- [12] Alipour-Sarabi, Ramin, et al. "Improved winding proposal for wound rotor resolver using genetic algorithm and winding function approach." *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics* 66.2 (2018): 1325-1334.
- [13] Qu, Xue Yiwang, Lin . "Optimizing an integrated inventory-routing system for multi-item joint replenishment and coordinated outbound delivery using differential evolution algorithm." *Applied Soft Computing* 86(2020).
- [14] Wang, Wenbo , et al. "A Hierarchical Game with Strategy Evolution for Mobile Sponsored Content/Service Markets." *GLOBECOM 2017 - 2017 IEEE Global Communications Conference IEEE*, 2018.
- [15] Kirkpatrick, S. , C. D. Gelatt , and M. P. Vecchi . "Optimization by Simulated Annealing." *Science* 220.
- [16] Rashedi, Esmat , H. Nezamabadi-Pour , and S. Saryazdi . "GSA: A Gravitational Search Algorithm." *Information Sciences* 179.13(2009):2232-2248.
- [17] Hashim, Fatma A. , et al. "Archimedes optimization algorithm: a new metaheuristic algorithm for solving optimization problems." *Applied Intelligence* 51.3(2020):1531-1551.
- [18] Zheng, Yu Jun . "Water wave optimization: A new nature-inspired metaheuristic." *Computers & Operations Research* 55(2015):1-11.
- [19] Geem, Zong Woo , J. H. Kim , and G. V. Loganathan . "A new heuristic optimization algorithm: harmony search." *Simulation* 76.2(2001):p.60-68.
- [20] Koppen, M. , D. H. Wolpert , and W. G. Macready . "Remarks on a recent paper on the \"no free lunch\" theorems." *evolutionary computation ieeec transactions on* 5.3(2001):0-296.
- [21] Wolpert, D. H. , and W. G. Macready . "No free lunch theorems for optimization." *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation* 1.1(1997):67-82.
- [22] Tan, Ying, and Yuanchun Zhu. "Fireworks algorithm for optimization." *Advances in Swarm Intelligence: First International Conference, ICSI 2010, Beijing, China, June 12-15, 2010, Proceedings, Part I 1*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2010.
- [23] Abraham, Ajith, Ravi Kumar Jatoth, and A. Rajasekhar. "Hybrid differential artificial bee colony algorithm." *Journal of computational and theoretical Nanoscience* 9.2 (2012): 249-257.
- [24] Yang XinShe, and Suash Deb. "Engineering optimisation by cuckoo search." *International Journal of Mathematical Modelling and Numerical Optimisation* 1.4 (2010): 330-343..
- [25] Yang XinShe. "Firefly algorithms for multimodal optimization." *International symposium on stochastic algorithms*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2009.
- [26] He, Shan, Q. Henry Wu, and Jon R. Saunders. "Group search optimizer: an optimization algorithm inspired by animal searching behavior." *IEEE transactions on evolutionary computation* 13.5 (2009): 973-990.
- [27] Yang XinShe. "A new metaheuristic bat-inspired algorithm." *Nature inspired cooperative strategies for optimization (NICSO 2010)*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2010. 65-74.
- [28] Eusuff, Muzaffar, Kevin Lansey, and Fayzul Pasha. "Shuffled frog-leaping algorithm: a memetic meta-heuristic for discrete optimization." *Engineering optimization* 38.2 (2006): 129-154..
- [29] Shi, Yuhui. "Brain storm optimization algorithm." *Advances in Swarm Intelligence: Second International Conference, ICSI 2011, Chongqing, China, June 12-15, 2011, Proceedings, Part I 2*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2011.
- [30] Xue, Jiankai, and Bo Shen. "A novel swarm intelligence optimization approach: sparrow search algorithm." *Systems science & control engineering* 8.1 (2020): 22-34.
- [31] Mirjalili, Seyedali. "The ant lion optimizer." *Advances in engineering software* 83 (2015): 80-98.
- [32] Arora, Sankalpa, and Satvir Singh. "Butterfly algorithm with levy flights for global optimization." 2015 International conference on signal processing, computing and control (ISPPCC). IEEE, 2015.
- [33] Wang, Gai-Ge, Suash Deb, and Zhihua Cui. "Monarch butterfly optimization." *Neural computing and applications* 31 (2019): 1995-2014.
- [34] Zervoudakis, Konstantinos, and Stelios Tsafarakis. "A mayfly optimization algorithm." *Computers & Industrial Engineering* 145 (2020): 106559.
- [35] Saremi, Shahrzad, Seyedali Mirjalili, and Andrew Lewis. "Grasshopper optimisation algorithm: theory and application." *Advances in engineering software* 105 (2017): 30-47.
- [36] Alsattar, Hassan A., A. A. Zaidan, and B. B. Zaidan. "Novel meta-heuristic bald eagle search optimisation algorithm." *Artificial Intelligence Review* 53 (2020): 2237-2264.
- [37] Faramarzi, Afshin, et al. "Marine Predators Algorithm: A nature-inspired metaheuristic." *Expert systems with applications* 152 (2020): 113377.
- [38] Mirjalili, Seyedali, et al. "Salp Swarm Algorithm: A bio-inspired optimizer for engineering design problems." *Advances in engineering software* 114 (2017): 163-191.
- [39] Li, Shimin, et al. "Slime mould algorithm: A new method for stochastic optimization." *Future generation computer systems* 111 (2020): 300-323.
- [40] Duan, Haibin, and Peixin Qiao. "Pigeon-inspired optimization: a new swarm intelligence optimizer for air robot path planning." *International journal of intelligent computing and cybernetics* 7.1 (2014): 24-37.
- [41] Heidari, Ali Asghar, et al. "Harris hawks optimization: Algorithm and applications." *Future generation computer systems* 97 (2019): 849-872.
- [42] Mirjalili, Seyedali, and Andrew Lewis. "The whale optimization algorithm." *Advances in engineering software* 95 (2016): 51-67.