Chapter 2

Metaheuristics Developing Intelligent Solutions for Complex Optimization Problems

Farica Qureshi
https://orcid.org/0009-0000-9631-7392
GNA University, Phagwara, India

Satyam Sharma
https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1866-5070
GNA University, Phagwara, India

Rafiya Nazir
https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4774-1215
GNA University, Phagwara, India

ABSTRACT

Metaheuristics are a category of optimization algorithms constructed to tackle complex real-world problems which traditional approaches struggle to address. This chapter analyzes the classification, application and evolution of metaheuristics algorithms in dealing with large-scale, NP-hard and nonlinear constraints. Metaheuristics, involving swarm intelligence, physics-based models, and evolutionary approaches, provide robust search framework by maintaining a balance between exploration and exploitation techniques. The discussion includes their contribution in biomedical image processing, finance, artificial intelligence and robotics. The study also investigates the computational problems of metaheuristics, focusing on parameter tuning, trade-offs in performance and process of hybridization with machine learn-

DOI: 10.4018/979-8-3373-0523-3.ch002

ing. The observations highlight the adaptive behaviour of metaheuristics in dynamic surroundings, offering solutions spanning various domains.

INTRODUCTION

Optimization is an elementary means to handle non-linear problems in real life. Large-scale, high-dimensional and multi-objective optimization problems are now an intrinsic challenge of quickly evolving branches of science and engineering (Tian et al., 2023). Stochastic algorithms with randomness and uncertainty and deterministic algorithms with stringent rules represent two major categories of optimization algorithms designed to address such challenges (Yang, 2011).

Classic deterministic algorithms are effective for well-structured problems like computational geometry, graph traversal, and string matching; however, they are inadequate for ill-posed, non-differentiable, or combinatorially explosive problems. To fill this gap, metaheuristic algorithms particularly for NP-hard problems have proven to be handy tools that can achieve near-optimal solutions within acceptable computing timescales (Abualigah et al., 2021; Mohapatra et al., 2023).

Their function as strategic principles directing subordinate heuristics in the process of search is seen in the term "metaheuristic," derived from the Greek prefix meta- above or higher level (Yang, 2011). During search activities, metaheuristics are caused to successfully strike a balance between exploitation (intensification) and exploration (diversification). Recent trends illustrate growing flexibility in metaheuristics through domain adaptation, deep learning incorporation, and hybrid approaches. Ghosh et al. (2023), for example, suggested a deep neuroevolutionary framework for hyperparameter tuning of neural networks based on metaheuristics. Likewise, a domain-specific adjustment-focused hybrid version of the Grey Wolf Optimizer was presented by Jaberipour et al (2022) for biomedical image segmentation exclusively. In addition, Kaur and Kumar (2023) noted recent progress in swarm intelligence and multi-agent coordination when they examined nature-inspired algorithms.

With emphasis on biomedical image processing, the chapter is devoted to giving a concise and complete outline of metaheuristic algorithms, from their taxonomy to algorithmic formulation and uses. We start by sketching classification frameworks, and then stress fundamental algorithm forms, uses, and research needs to guide future study.

Methodology and Scope of the Chapter

This chapter is structured as a conceptual and thematic literature review. Its objective is to analyse, consolidate and classify recent metaheuristic approaches with a focus on their application in biomedical image processing and high-dimensional optimization. Literature from the years 2010 to 2024 was extensively reviewed using employing databases like ScienceDirect, IEEE Xplore, and Scopus. Some of the keywords included medical image segmentation, bio-inspired optimization, metaheuristics, and hybrid optimization. The selection criteria preferred application performance in complicated situations, novelty, and usability. This chapter synthesizes the results of current empirical research to guide future studies and hybrid algorithm design, but not experimental benchmarking.

Contribution of the Chapter

This chapter presents a conceptual synthesis of metaheuristic algorithms, offering a thematic literature review and classification while emphasizing their evolution and real-world applications. In contrast to general surveys, this chapter provides a complete taxonomy of metaheuristics (non-nature-inspired and nature-inspired), addresses novel hybridization techniques, and illustrates how metaheuristics are becoming more and more important in biomedical image processing. It weaves together algorithm families with informative data, detects scalability and parameter tuning issues, and provides suggestions for further reading.

HEURISTICS VS. METAHEURISTICS: CONCEPTUAL FOUNDATION

Optimization techniques can be broadly classified into exact and approximate approaches. Exact algorithms guarantee an optimal solution but are often computationally expensive and limited to small-scale problems. Approximate algorithms, including heuristics and metaheuristics, aim to find near-optimal solutions more efficiently. Heuristics are typically problem-specific methods that apply domain knowledge and local search strategies to guide the solution process. While effective for well-defined tasks, they often suffer from limited generalizability and a tendency to get trapped in local optima due to their deterministic nature (Desale et al., 2015; Gandomi et al., 2013).

Metaheuristics, in contrast, provide problem-independent frameworks that combine exploration and exploitation using mechanisms like randomization, objective evaluation functions, and neighborhood operators (e.g., mutation and crossover).

Their stochastic nature allows them to avoid premature convergence and explore the solution set more effectively. Unlike heuristics, they do not require deep domain knowledge and are widely applicable to diverse, complex optimization problems (Gavrilas, 2010).

Heuristics vs Metaheuristics

Table 1. Heuristics vs metaheuristics

Attributes	Heuristics	Metaheuristics
Definition	Constraint specific rules for instant solution	Wide range optimization methods
Exploration strategy	Pursue predefined logic	Implement exploration and exploitation
Efficiency	Is unable to assure the best solution	Aims to find the best optimal solution
Execution Complexity	Low complexity, with quick execution	Enhanced as a result of repetitive improvements
Adaptability	Only applicable on some specific problems	Problem independent and applicable across various problems
Example	Greedy algorithm for finding the approximate solution	Genetic algorithm for feature selection in the machine learning

The exact optimization algorithms were insoluble to give the solution for the higher complexity and computational constraints, however the metaheuristics offer the best possible solution for the nonlinear problems without actually being stuck in the global optimum. (Tomar et al., 2024). These optimization algorithms play a fundamental role in the domain like Machine learning(ML), Artificial intelligence(AI) and Medical Image processing since these domains count on the best optimal solution having least errors and incompetency (Taghavi, 2024).

Requirement of Metaheuristics in Solving the NP-Hard Problems.

Metaheuristics provides versatility, making them applicable across diverse domains. These algorithms are trained to tackle computationally intractable problems, including NP-hard problems. Metaheuristics' objective is to deliver high-quality solutions within a practical time limit. A key characteristic of metaheuristics is their problem independence, which enables them to be applicable in the comprehensive optimization problems with negligible alteration. NP-hard problems mean that one's wherein elementary methods struggle to get to the optimum solution over computation time bound by a polynomial function (S. M. Almufti et al., 2021). The algorithms which are utilized for resolving, maximizing solutions for aforementioned problems are categorized as complete searching techniques as well as approximate searching techniques (S. M. Almufti et al., 2021). The complete algorithm needs exponential time which basically means long execution time for solving the NP-hard problems, while the approximate approaches are classified into two frameworks, population based and single-based search. The main focus of these two-search techniques is to attain the relatively good solution in a comparatively less time (short execution time) rather than searching a feasible solution which is taking long execution time for computing (S. Almufti, 2017). Approximate search algorithms are more suitable for NP-hard problems, due to their capability to obtain the near optimal solution in an exceptionally shorter period. They are even referred to as metaheuristics-based approaches (S. M. Almufti et al., 2021). There are numerous real-world problems that are unable to solve in a polynomial time and are associated with NP-hard problems. The most popular problems are travelling Salesman problem (TSP), Knapsack problem, Graph Coloring problem, Vehicle Routing Problem (VRP), Hamiltonian Cycle Problem (HCP), Boolean Satisfiability Problem (SAT), Job Scheduling Problem (JSP), Bin Packing Problem (BPP)…. etc). Several NP-hard problems fall under the category of combinatorial optimization, where the aim is to search for the best solution from a vast number of possible solutions (Consoli & Darby-Dowman, 2006). Usually, for solving small-scale problems the exact methods including branch, bound and dynamic programming have been effective. But it is observed that in solving the large-scale problems exact methods consume the large computational time for the execution. To deal with these problems metaheuristic methods are used (Rahman et al., 2021). Generally used metaheuristics for solving the combinatorial optimization involves Genetic algorithm- uses the crossover and mutation to enhance the solution (e.g. for solving Job Scheduling, Traveling Salesman Problem), Simulated Annealing- uses the annealing process in metallurgy (e.g. Vehicle Routing Problem (VRP)), Particle Swarm Optimization- uses swarm intelligence, mimics the behaviour of fishes and birds (e.g. Task Scheduling, Feature Selection), Differential Evolution(DE)- based on the crossover strategies (e.g. Parameter Optimization in Neural Networks) plenty more are there.

Key Terminologies and Conceptual Clarifications

To reduce ambiguity and clarify the concepts, this section offers definitions and distinctions among consistently used metaheuristic terms that commonly used interchangeably. This includes categories of search strategies, integration models and types of randomness.

Table 2. Key terminologies

Term	Definition
Trajectory-based	Applies a single solution to traverse the solution space, commonly adjusting one solution iteratively (e.g., Simulated Annealing).
Population-based	Handles several candidate solutions at once, Improving them as a group (e.g., Genetic Algorithm, PSO).
Stochastic	Integrates random elements into process such as selection, initialization or mutation.
Probabilistic	Uses probabilistic models for decision-making, commonly used in modelling and inference.
Hybrid	Integrates multiple optimization techniques to leverage their reinforcing abilities.
Ensemble	Combines multiple models or algorithms in collaboration, usually by consolidating their outcomes or selections.

Nature Inspired Metaheuristics

Metaheuristics is a rapidly evolving field of computer intelligence, designed to discover approximate solutions to complex optimization problems. " This well-built optimization foundation is basically designed to deal with the complex problems that were unable to be handled by the traditional optimization methods. Metaheuristic algorithms can be further divided in several ways. One method is to distinguish them as population-based and trajectory-based (Yang, 2010). Among these, in recent years nature-inspired optimization algorithms are designed to mimic the swarm behaviour (Deepthi & Ravikumar, 2015). Throughout the years, much research has been carried out to find the effective solution for the rising complex problems. As a result of continuous attempts, algorithms inspired by nature have been developed (Yazdani & Jolai, 2016). These algorithms are extensively influenced by animal behaviour, physical processes and biological entities. These strategies replicate the dynamic nature of biological structure which efficiently explores and exploits the solution space. There are a number of illustrations which showcase these capabilities, having those who derive from the social behaviour of animals like bird flocks, ant colonies and apiaries (beehives). The concept including stigmergy (indirect communication) and collective swarming exhibit Swarm Intelligence (SI), where the notion of central control is used by the agents, which enables them for the improved exploration of complex search spaces (Del Ser et al., 2019).

Effectiveness of Metaheuristics in Biomedical Image Processing

Biomedical imaging has contributed in being the most useful tool for analyse and diagnose multiple diseases for an extended duration (Chakraborty & Mali, 2023). Although, the accuracy of medical images can frequently compromise because of factors like noise interference, poor illumination and artifacts (Oloyede et al., 2022). Nature inspired algorithms have contributed in solving the complex biomedical imaging problems which traditional algorithms are struggling to address. Metaheuristics have become popular in biomedical image processing by using techniques like image segmentation, categorization and feature selection to enhance image quality. The features of metaheuristics such as problem independence, adaptability and computational efficiency make them significantly beneficial for computing the medical imaging issues.

Image Segmentation

Image Segmentation acts as the crucial primary stage in the implementation of image evaluation. If image segmentation is correctly applied in the field of biomedical image processing, then it would be the ultimate support to the medical experts in the identification of different diseases, inspection of anatomic structures also for surgical planning (He et al., 2008). Medical image segmentation is generally troublesome due to poor image contrast, noise, diffuse organ edges and variability, however these problems may lead to complication while implementing traditional algorithms such as edge detection and thresholding (Mesejo et al., 2015). Metaheuristic algorithms, including Particle Swarm Optimization and Genetic Optimization Algorithms, enhance image segmentation by classifying the pixels of images proficiently and selecting the most effective thresholds.

Feature Selection and Classification

Generally, a massive amount of data is retrieved and generated in healthcare discipline, and the rate of storing this large data of diverse healthcare in the data repository is growing rapidly (Kaur et al., 2023). Data visualisation supports efficient decision making and feature selection (Simran, Sharma, & Kaur, 2021). Selecting the most appropriate feature from the wide range of datasets is difficult for high performance of the model, to achieve this metaheuristic algorithms such as Genetic Algorithm and Ant Colony Optimization is effective in selecting the high performing feature segment. These algorithms are contributing in optimizing sorting precision while minimizing computational complexity. Current relative researches focus upon assessing the performances of intelligent, swarm-based techniques within higher-dimensionality feature selections. For instance, Sharma et al. (2022) equated PSO, ACO, and Firefly Algorithm along standard, yardstick bio-medical datasets and testified that PSO attains quicker converging, whereas ACO showcases greater strength towards features with noise. Likewise, Liu et al. (2023) combined ABC with support vector machine for selecting features within tumour diagnosis, leading to enhanced classifying accuracy. Such discoveries emphasize the significance of selecting algorithms and hybrid approaches customized towards problem-specific area.

FUNDAMENTALS OF METAHEURISTICS

Adaptive Learning: Balancing Exploration and Exploitation

In the search space, balancing exploration and exploitation is one of the main strengths of metaheuristic algorithms (Morales-Castañeda et al., 2020; Yang et al., 2014). Exploration involves generating a diverse set of solutions to avoid premature convergence to local optima as well as conducting a thorough survey of the search space. Exploitation, on the other hand, is about intensively exploring around promising areas according to feedback from good solutions discovered hitherto.

There should be a balance between these two. Excessive exploration gives rise to ineffective convergence as it is too random, while exploitation makes one vulnerable to the threat of getting stuck in local optima. Metaheuristics utilize diversification mechanisms like population diversity, randomization, and perturbation methods for exploration, and intensification based on memory or selection pressure for exploitation, to counter this.

For example, Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO) uses global and local optimal solutions to search adaptively in the space by varying velocity. The search becomes more targeted through the use of Simulated Annealing (SA), which lowers its acceptance probability over time, and Tabu Search (TS), which avoids revisiting previous positions through the use of memory structures. Metaheuristics are powerful, adaptive, and suitable for hard, multi-modal optimization problems because of their approaches.

Global Search vs Local Search

In metaheuristics, global search examines the solution space widely, using methods like swarm intelligence optimization and evolutionary algorithms to prevent local minima and discover the global optimum. Local search, on flip side, sharpens an initial solution by examining neighbouring solutions, targeting on enhancing the present solution, but daring getting stuck in local optima. Several algorithms merge both tactics, using global search for inquiry and local search for refining the solution.

Figure 1. Taxonomy of metaheuristic algorithm organized by their driving principles and search mechanisms

Figure1 Demonstrates the key types of metaheuristic algorithms based on their inspiration (nature-inspired vs. non-nature inspired) and strategy (population vs. trajectory-based). This classification offers a fundamental framework to understand the conceptual and functional relationships between algorithms.

NATURE INSPIRED METAHEURISTIC ALGORITHMS

Nature inspired optimization processing is a method taking inspiration from processes perceived by nature (Agarwal & Mehta, 2014). These computational approaches are extensively used because of their potential to maintain the balance between identification and diversification efficiently. These algorithms can be further classified into:

Evolutionary Algorithm (EAs)

Evolutionary algorithms (EAs) are the foremost widely recognized subset of metaheuristics. These algorithms aim to resolve the complex nonlinear problems by replicating the mechanism of Darwinian evolution (Jones, 1998). It is stimulated based on gradual transformation and begins their method by applying the species group of stochastically generated results (Agrawal et al., 2021). Evolutionary algorithms depend on the notion of population of individuals which represents the exploration nodes in the space of possible solutions addressing a given problem, that endures probabilistic operators including selection, mutation and recombination in order to expand towards the continuously enhanced fitness values of performance metrics of the individuals (Lozano & García-Martínez, 2010).

Swarm Intelligence Algorithms (SIA)

The concept of swarm intelligence was initially proposed by Gerardo Beni and Jing Wang in 1989 in terms of cellular robotics systems (Brezočnik et al., 2018). These optimization techniques are derived from the swarm behaviour of insects, animals, fishes or birds and more (Agrawal et al., 2021). As introduced by Mark Millonas, Swarm Intelligence possesses five principles. (Lim & Dehuri, 2009). They are as follow:

1. **Proximity principle:** potential of performing the simple space and computation time to adapt the surrounding factors.
2. **Quality principle**: potential to correspond to the quality aspects like food and safety
3. **Diverse response principle**: potential to distribute resources and to ensure opposing the environmental stimuli.
4. **Stability principle**: potential to continue the group behaviour contrasting the variations in the surrounding.
5. **Adaptability principle**: potential to change the collective behaviour which leads to the increased flexibility to the surrounding.

There are several Swarm Intelligence models which includes Particle Swarm Optimization, Ant colony Optimization, Artificial Immune System, Cat Swarm optimization, Glowworm Swarm Optimization (Ahmed & Glasgow, 2012)

Ant Colony Optimization (ACO)

ACO is derived by the foraging behaviour of ants and is used to enhance contour detection and region-based segmentation. Artificial ants construct various segmentation paths depending on intensity gradients and pheromone trails, refining segmentation boundaries.

Application: Used in lesion segmentation in melanoma skin cancer detection, where precise boundary detection is critical.

1. Firefly Algorithm (FA)

The Firefly Algorithm (FA), in which the brightness of a firefly indicates the value of the objective function, is motivated by the flashing pattern of fireflies. Fireflies that are brighter attract more of them, which moves the population towards regions that are optimum. FA works great for multimodal optimization problems. FA has also been used to dynamically adjust threshold values for biomedical image segmentation to improve tumour boundary detection.

2. Cat Swarm Optimization (CSO)

Cat Swarm Optimization (CSO) reflects the innate actions of cats, transitioning between exploration (seeking) and exploitation (tracing) phases. It employs velocity and memory-driven adjustments adapt search behaviour to changing environmental conditions. CSO has been successfully utilized for wireless sensor deployment in healthcare systems, enhancing coverage while reducing energy usage.

- **Artificial Bee Colony (ABC)**

Artificial Bee Colony (ABC) algorithm Is influenced by the foraging actions of honeybee colonies. The search process is shared among the scout bees and employed bees and onlooker bees to replicate exploration and exploitation. ABC Is extensively utilized in feature selection and medical image classification. It enhances disease detection accuracy by selecting the most significant features from MRI and CT images.

Physics Inspired Metaheuristics

Physics inspired algorithms are driven in terms of physical paradigms in essence rather than biological entities (Sridharan et al., 2021). It has stochastic and probabilistic elements which will help to escape the local optima. Due to its dynamic adaptability physics-based metaheuristics adjust the parameters like force, temperature and energy levels throughout the optimization process. These algorithms simulate the physics laws such as electromagnetism, thermodynamics, quantum mechanics and celestial mechanics. There are multiple types of Physics Based Algorithm

Simulated Annealing (SA)

Simulated annealing (SA) is the non-deterministic proximity search technique which is designed to solve the combinatorial optimization problems (Baykasoğlu & Gindy, 2001). This approach relies on the annealing technique to conclude the quantum ground level of matter, that is the ground-level energy configuration of the solid state (Rere et al., 2015). Simulated Annealing implements a probabilistic function so as to escape the local optima.

$$P(\Delta E) = e^{-\frac{\Delta E}{T}}$$

Here ΔE refers to the energy difference whereas T refers to the temperature.

Gravitational Search Algorithm (GSA)

Gravitational search algorithm is built on the law of gravity and the notion of mass interactions (Mahmoudi et al., 2016). This algorithm is derived from the fundamental Newtonian rule "Every entity in the universe transmits force of attraction to every other particle, that is directly proportional to the product of their masses and is inversely proportional to the square of the distance connecting them" (Rashedi et al., 2009). Within the suggested algorithm, entities are regarded as the objects in addition to their results as estimated by their masses (Mahmoudi et al., 2016). Gravitational search algorithms were primarily intended for tackling ongoing optimization problems and as with the majority of metaheuristics techniques this approach has an adaptable and effectively balanced methodology for the better enhancement of exploration and exploitation aptitudes (Dowlatshahi & Nezamabadi-Pour, 2014).

NON-NATURE INSPIRED METAHEURISTICS

Non-nature inspired metaheuristics search algorithms which do not depend on physical, biological, or ecological processes. Rather these algorithms rely on problem solving approaches like mathematical formulations, heuristic search techniques and memory frameworks. This approach offers an optimal way to address non-trivial exploration fields without imitating the natural phenomenon. There are several types of non-nature inspired algorithms:

Tabu Search (TS)

Tabu search was first proposed in 1988 by Fred Glover and originated as a different approach for local search algorithms tackling combinatorial optimization problems within a wide range of areas such as cluster analysis, computer channel balancing, scheduling and more (Pirim et al., 2008). For the purpose of enhancing the performance of the exploration process, it is necessary to observe both local features including the current evaluation function value, and auxiliary information significant to the exploration process (Hertz et al., 1995). Tabu search is an influential optimization strategy which is proficient in addressing an extensive variety of real-world complications. These incorporate multifaceted scheduling tasks including multiprocessor task scheduling and job shop scheduling, in addition to logistical challenges such as vehicle routing. Moreover, it is applicable to combinatorial optimization problems, like graph colouring where high-performing allocation of assets is needed. Exceeding these, tabu search algorithm has demonstrated effectiveness in tackling several other complicated optimization problems over numerous disciplines (Díaz et al., 2008).

Integer and Linear Programming Heuristics:

Integer and linear programming (IP and LP) are advancement strategies for the constraints that can be designed to resolve constraints which involve decision attributes that are alternately continuous or integer-based. These methods operate among a mathematical architecture where results are intended by upgrading a linear objective function during adhering to a sequence of linear constraints. Integer programming (IP) precisely deals with instances where certain or entire variables are constrained to integer value, which makes it specifically helpful for discrete optimization problems, however Linear programming (LP) permits for continuous entities, making it efficient for handling problems having real-valued or fractional solutions (Piacentini et al., 2018). The Linear Integer Programming (LIP) optimization constraint can be formulated as following:

Generic form

Maximize ax

Subject to: $Cx \leq b$,

Where: $x \in Zn$

Here, optimization vector x contains n integer variables, which is represented as $x = (x1, x2, x3, \ldots, xn)^a$ (Genova & Guliashki, 2011).

CLASSIFICATION BASED ON SEARCH STRATEGY

Trajectory Based Metaheuristics

Trajectory based is also known as the single solution-based metaheuristics. This algorithm computes optimal or sub-optimal solutions by sequentially exploring the feasible region in an effective manner, meanwhile concurrently reducing the data-driven complexity and refining the efficient search space to emphasis on the most optimal clusters (Doğan & Ölmez, 2015). In point-based metaheuristics, a refinement method concentrates on an individual participant's optimal result, which can be constantly refined and enhanced over several iterations. In place of maintaining a distinct population of responses (solutions), these algorithms recursively implement minute modifications or perturbations to the present solution, progressively upgrading its quality. Along this recursive improvement process, the search method efficiently analyses the solution space while ensuring computational efficiency, assuring that the solution aligns towards a near-optimal and optimal stage gradually (Camacho-Villalón et al., 2023). In contrast to population-based metaheuristics which develop a cluster of solutions coincidently (e.g., Particle Swarm Optimization, Genetic Algorithms).

Characteristics of Trajectory Based Metaheuristics

1. Local Search intent: It proceeds throughout the search space with an incremental progression, frequently changing small regions of the solution.
2. Exploration and Exploitation: Essentially exploitation-focused, yet different methodologies include randomness to escape local optima.
3. Probabilistic and Greedy Moves: Solutions are enhanced depending on a greedy approach which always takes the best move or probabilistic approval which accepts the worst solutions periodically.
4. Single Solution Strategy: This algorithm basically functions with a single solution at a time instead of taking populations of solutions.
5. Memory based Version: Several trajectory-based methods, such as tabu search, sustain a memory of previous solutions to avoid cycling.

Population Based Metaheuristics

Numerous population-based metaheuristic search approaches are implemented for providing the high-performance near optimal solution enclosed in a practical computational timespan, which ensures an effective balance between exploration and exploitation of intricate search space (Abd Rahman et al., 2019). Population based metaheuristics computational models demonstrate different levels of functionality in attaining the global optimum, influenced by the variation in the configuration scheme. The variant of initialization substantially affects the search procedure, as it defines the initial diversity of solution candidate, which consequently impacts the algorithm's potential to analyse the solution space effectively and prevents premature convergence (Agushaka & Ezugwu, 2022). However, population-based metaheuristics are frequently criticized for their extensive computational cost, the broad attainability of parallel computing has considerably reduced this concern. The enhancement in current computational control has made the problems associated with generational cost and population size reduced critical when contrast to the distinct advantages offered by these algorithms. Their inherent proficiency to effectively operate multimodal landscape, delusive objective feature, and complex search spaces which makes them extremely efficient for handling a diverse selection of optimization problems. By utilizing the parallel processing, these approaches can investigate numerous regions of the solution space concurrently, minimizing integration time while retaining solution diversity. Consequently, their computational overheads are dominated by their advanced global search expertise, making them an essential mechanism in complex optimization and large-scale instances (Omidvar et al., 2021).

Hybrid Metaheuristics

In the past few years, there has been a valuable upturn in the growth of algorithms that do not rigidly fix to the fundamentals of a single traditional metaheuristic. On second thought, these algorithms merge the combination of numerous optimization approaches, frequently comprising objectives from outside the usual metaheuristic framework. By placing remarkable algorithmic conceptualisation together, these strategies line up to strengthen search ability, focusing on the outcome, resilience beyond a comprehensive domain of composite optimization issues. These sort of methodologies, frequently make reference to as hybrid metaheuristics, grasp the supremacy of divergent techniques to accomplish more advanced interpretation as opposed to standalone metaheuristic methods. The ultimate provocation for blending contradictory algorithms positioned in the competency to ascend the corresponding calibre of multiplicity of optimisation approaches. By integrating several methods, hybrid algorithms endeavour to achieve emphasized interpretation, overpowering the drawbacks of individual strategies. This incorporation give authorisation to enhanced productivity, workability, resilience, as compounds are originated to extract superiority of the collaborative effects between divergent search operations, inducing to more valuable and conclusive optimisation results in the final analysis (Blum et al., 2011). The combination of metaheuristics accompanied by additional heuristic or metaheuristic methods, generally considered as hybridisation, has attained considerable prevalence in the past few years. This direction is extremely transparent in the confederation of restricted search methods enclosed by population-based metaheuristics, as a result hybrid methods line up the strengths of both techniques to upgrade optimisation accomplishment.

Among the fundamental grounds for the universal appropriation of hybrid metaheuristic frameworks is the genuine supplementary joining population-based methods and local search methods. A hybrid metaheuristic merging the Cuckoo Search and Augmented Grey Wolf Optimizer has demonstrated significant capability to solve complex global optimization constraints (Sharma, Kapoor, & Dhiman, 2021). Population based algorithms, including Genetic Algorithms (GA) and Ant Colony Optimisation (ACO), surpass in worldwide examination, productively wrapping substantial domains of search margin and desisting from impulsive gathering. Regardless of how, these approaches may encounter harmonizing conclusions at a limited intensity. On the contrary, local search techniques are tremendously potent in reinforcement, rectifying established methods by assembling slight monotonous development.

Most industrial-strength genetic and evolutionary algorithms (GEAs) are explicit hybrids in the sense that they introduce one or more problem-specific local search procedures to the underlying GEA. Although a good argument can be made that all GEAs are implicit hybrids since they blend on one hand the action of selection with one or more variation operators, the typical inspiration for hybridization in application leads to attain of higher capability. That is, the practitioners desire solution excellence enough in reduced time or advanced quality at given time, although it is not always the case that practitioners have been even this precise in specifying their objectives. In addition, whenever any theory has been utilized during development of hybrid practice, it has been a micro-level theory, used mainly for exact operator design. There remains the need for enhanced understanding of effective hybrids at the macro- or systems level.

As a consequence of this collective association, a significant portion of the majority of victorious approaches of metamorphic analysis and collaborative decision-making methods depends on compositing the limited search processes to cleanse the methods generated by the predominant metaheuristic. By immersing local search processes into population-based approaches, the comprehensive optimization method embellishes more impactful, ensuring that high-quality results are achieved within a reasonable time frame.

Eventually, the robustness of population-based algorithms reclines in their high-powered consideration capability, authorizing them to effectively explore multimodal search spaces. Nevertheless, when integrating among confined search rarefaction, they accomplish a preferable stability allying consideration and utilization, leading to improved precision and escalated precision of the solution (Blum et al., 2010).

NO-FREE-LUNCH (N-F-L) THEOREM

Introduction to the No Free Lunch Theorem

In machine learning, artificial intelligence, and optimization, algorithm selection plays a crucial role in determining the effectiveness of predictive models and search strategies. However, a fundamental theorem known as the **No Free Lunch Theorem (NFLT)** states that no single algorithm is superior for all problems. Formally introduced by **David H. Wolpert and William G. Macready** in the 1990s, the theorem asserts that across all possible problem distributions, all algorithms have the identical expected performance. This profound outcome has deep implications for model selection, optimization strategies, and artificial intelligence methodologies, influencing how researchers and practitioners' approach problem-solving in these domains.

Mathematical Foundations of NFLT

The No Free Lunch Theorem can be formally expressed in the context of optimization and learning algorithms. Consider a search algorithm that is applied to a function drawn from a uniform distribution over all possible functions. The theorem states that, on average, over all possible functions, the performance of any two algorithms and is equal:

This means that if an algorithm performs well on one class of problems, there must exist another class where it performs poorly, balancing out its overall effectiveness when all problems are considered. Consequently, **there is no universally superior algorithm for all learning tasks**.

Implications of NFLT in Machine Learning

The NFLT has significant consequences in machine learning, particularly in the following areas:

Algorithm Selection and Model Performance

Since no single model is optimal for all problems, model selection must be **data-dependent**. For example:

1. **Decision trees** excel in rule-based classification problems but struggle with high-dimensional data.
2. **Neural networks** are powerful for image and text data but require substantial computational resources and large datasets.
3. **Support Vector Machines (SVMs)** perform well in small-to-medium-sized datasets with clear margins but scale poorly in high-dimensional spaces.

Bias-Variance Trade-off

NFLT implies that there is no universal solution to the bias-variance dilemma. High-bias models (e.g., linear regression) underfit data, while high-variance models (e.g., deep learning) overfit. The choice of model should be guided by cross-validation techniques and domain-specific knowledge.

Generalization and Overfitting

Since no algorithm generalizes perfectly across all datasets, practitioners must focus on techniques such as **regularization, data augmentation, feature selection, and transfer learning** to improve model generalization to unseen data.

Implications of NFLT in Optimization

In optimization, NFLT indicates that **none of single optimization technique is generally best across every function**. This affects various optimization strategies:

Metaheuristic Algorithms

Algorithms such as **Genetic Algorithms (GA), Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO), Simulated Annealing (SA), and Ant Colony Optimization (ACO)** perform efficiently on a given problem domain; however, they fail to guarantee superior performance to arbitrary optimization tasks.

Hyperparameter Tuning

In deep learning, choosing the optimal hyperparameters (learning rate, batch size, activation functions) must be done empirically through grid search, random search, or Bayesian optimization. NFLT suggests that a fixed set of hyperparameters cannot be optimal for all datasets.

Gradient-Based vs. Gradient-Free Methods

1. **Gradient-based methods (e.g., SGD, Adam)** work well for differentiable, convex functions but struggle with highly non-convex landscapes.
2. **Gradient-free methods (e.g., Evolutionary Strategies, Bayesian Optimization)** work better for black-box optimization but are computationally expensive.

Strategies to Mitigate NFLT Effects

While the No Free Lunch principle suggests that none of the method is universally advanced, practitioners use several strategies to adapt models to specific problems effectively:

Ensemble Learning

Combining multiple models through techniques like **bagging (Random Forests), boosting (XGBoost, AdaBoost), and stacking** allows leveraging the strengths of different algorithms, improving generalization.

Transfer Learning

Instead of training models from scratch, utilizing pre-established deep learning systems (e.g., BERT, ResNet,) and refining on particular tasks reduces data along with computational requirements.

AutoML and Neural Architecture Search (NAS)

Automated Machine Learning (AutoML) and NAS optimize model architectures and hyperparameters dynamically, mitigating the trial-and-error approach and adapting to different datasets.

Domain Knowledge and Feature Engineering

Understanding the underlying problem domain and applying feature engineering can significantly improve model performance, ensuring that algorithms are tailored to specific problem characteristics.

The No Free Lunch Theorem serves as a cornerstone principle in machine learning and optimization, reinforcing that algorithm selection must be problem-specific rather than assuming a one-size-fits-all approach. By acknowledging the implications of NFLT, researchers and practitioners can adopt data-driven strategies such as ensemble learning, transfer learning, hyperparameter tuning, and domain adaptation to maximize performance on specific tasks. Ultimately, understanding the NFLT empowers machine learning experts to make informed decisions, emphasizing empirical validation over theoretical superiority.

REAL WORLD APPLICATIONS OF METAHEURISTICS

Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning

Metaheuristics are progressively applied in machine learning and artificial intelligence to resolve complex optimization problems. Their capacity to adaptively deal with large search spaces which makes them appropriate for hyperparameter and tuning feature selection. These mechanisms enhance model accuracy, accelerate training and reduce dimensionality. Combining techniques from soft computing and operations research, metaheuristics like GA, PSO, and ACO have exhibited flexibility across AI domains.

Hyperparameter Tuning in Machine Learning

Hyperparameter tuning contributes significantly to improve machine learning model functionality. Metaheuristic algorithms, including SA, GA, PSO and Bayesian Optimization, enable scalable solutions by adaptively exploring non-convex, high-dimensional search spaces. Unlike conventional approaches, metaheuristics effectively locate near-optimal parameter sets with minimized evaluations, Enhancing model training stability and adaptability. Due to their stochastic properties, they achieve superior escape from local optima, particularly in deep learning.

Operations Research and Scheduling Using Metaheuristics

Metaheuristics have demonstrated robust performance in operations research domains, such as logistics management and timetabling. Algorithms are well-suited for addressing problems with resource allocation and dynamic constraints like ACO, SA, Tabu Search and GA. These solutions proficiently operate within large-scale, restricted search spaces and yield near-optimal scheduling results, supply chain tasks and vehicle routing. Hybrid approaches improve flexibility and lower computational demands.

Robotics and Control System Using Metaheuristics

In robotics, metaheuristics allow efficient swarm coordination, path planning, task allocation and path planning. Algorithms like PA, GA, ACO, and PSO support adaptive decision-making in complex and fluctuating environments. Applications include UAV coordination, warehouse robotics, and autonomous vehicle navigation. Their non-centralized and responsive behaviour positions them as excellent candidates for control systems that require flexible and scalable optimization frameworks

Healthcare Optimization Using Metaheuristics

Healthcare optimization gains from metaheuristic algorithm in areas such as resource allocation, staff scheduling, and medical image analysis. Strategies like SA, FA, ABC, GA, and ABC improve segmentation standard and automate diagnosis procedures. Tasks like boundary ambiguity, noise, and real time constraints are addressed through adjustable optimization. QPSO (Quantum-behaved Particle Swarm Optimization) enhances energy optimization in wireless body area networks (Sharma, 2021). Hybrid models show pledge in improving accuracy and competence across clinical tasks.

Metaheuristics in Finance and Economics

In finance, metaheuristics provide to algorithmic trading, optimization, and risk management. Algorithms such as GA, PSO, DE, and ACO effectively search for optimal asset allocation under dynamic constraints. Their capability to handle high-dimensional and non-linearity data allows adaptive, responsive, and financial strategies. Hybrid approaches refine execution timing and decrease losses due to instability

CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS OF METAHEURISTICS OPTIMIZATION ALGORITHMS

Computational Cost

Metaheuristic algorithms, even though robust in handling complex optimization problems, but this approach can be computationally expensive with respect to large-scale problems. This can lead to multiple factors associated with the algorithm's type and the range of the problem to be solved.

1. Population-Based Methods and Several Evaluations: The algorithms including Genetic Algorithm and Particle swarm Optimization are based on the population of solutions which are evaluated progressively over time. Since the problem size increases, a bigger population is required to manage diversity, expanding the amount of evaluations needed per iteration, which results in increasing computational cost.
2. Stochastic Nature and Multiple Runs: As metaheuristics utilize random processes, sometimes they need to be run several times in order to get reliable results. This leads to the increase in computational costs, specifically for large-scale problems.
3. Parallelization Challenges: Even though metaheuristics can be parallelized, enhancing their scalability throughout multiple processors becomes harder with large problems owing to factors like data transmission cost, limiting the performance of parallelization.

Metaheuristics are often computationally expensive for large-scale problems due to the increasing search space, the requirement for large populations, iterative nature and complex fitness evaluation of these algorithms. All these factors in combination contribute to the significant computational expenses, hence applying metaheuristics to relatively large-scale optimization problems became challenging.

Tuning of Parameters

Tuning of parameters in metaheuristic algorithms including learning factors, mutation rates and other critical settings are the major challenges. These attributes influence directly to the performance of algorithms to explore the search space aligned to an optimal or near-optimal outcome. To illustrate, in approaches like genetic Algorithm (GA), mutation rate defines how often solutions are modified, and if it exceeds the optimal level, the algorithm may lose its structure, whereas if it is too low then it leads to premature convergence. Correspondingly, in Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO), the factors that govern how particles adapt depend on their personal insights including those of their neighbours, if implemented inappropriately, the algorithm is designed to either exceed the ideal solution or collapse converge effectively. Metaheuristics might be affected due to untimely converging, specifically within higher-dimensionality scenarios or after parameter(s) like mutating rate, learning rates aren't properly adjusted. It may affect their capability of exploring optima globally. Although metaheuristic techniques prove adaptable, scalable, and accomplish resolving N P hard problems, these accompany significant trade-offs as well. They comprise of higher computing costs, are sensitive towards parametric setting(s), and also risk for untimely or slower converging. Comprehending such confines are crucial during selection of algorithmic approaches for actual-world applicability, particularly within areas in which executing time, accuracy as well as duplicability are vital.

FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

Metaheuristic approaches, which are extensively used for complex optimization tasks, intend to be produced by an occurrence of quantum-inspired metaheuristics and deep learning-assisted optimization, both offering auspicious directions for better action.

Quantum-inspired metaheuristics incorporate principles of quantum mechanics, such as superposition and entanglement, into elegant optimization algorithms. This enables the concurrent exploration of numerous conclusions, Exceeding the algorithm's potential to prevent near optimal solutions and analyse the solution space more effectively. For example,

quantum-inspired versions of Genetic Algorithms and Particle Swarm Optimization have shown potential in boosting convergence and effectiveness. Future research could focus on integrating quantum computing concepts like Quantum Annealing to scale these algorithms for large, real-world problems, enhancing potential in fields such as logistics and bioinformatics.

In contrast, deep learning-assisted optimization involves the prognostic strength of deep learning with metaheuristics to lead the search process. Neural web can be trained to forecast effective resolutions or optimize algorithm parameters dynamically, minimizing the number of iterations required to find optimal solutions. Reinforcement learning can be used to flexibly adjust parameters, improving both productivity and effectiveness. In addition, generative models like GANs could be employed to learn and focus on reliable areas of the solution space.

A hybrid approach including both quantum-inspired ways and deep learning could further improve optimization algorithms. By integrating the exploration caliber of quantum algorithms with the intelligence of deep learning, researchers could create more powerful algorithms for tackling complex, high-dimensional issues, For instance, multi-objective optimization or neural network design.

To conclude, combining quantum-inspired algorithms with deep learning offers amazing prospects for the future of metaheuristics. This blending of approaches could remarkably enhance the efficiency and reliability of optimization methods, with wide-ranging applications across industries like healthcare, logistics, and artificial intelligence.

CONCLUSION

Metaheuristic algorithms have been revealed as efficient tools to figure out tangled optimization concerns across multiple spectrums, including artificial intelligence, biomedical image processing, robotics, finance, and operations research. Unlike traditional exact optimization techniques, which compete with high-dimensional and NP-hard issues, metaheuristics provide flexible, adaptable, and efficient results by leveraging stochastic search techniques, nature-inspired principles, and intelligent exploration-exploitation mechanisms.

Regardless of their effectiveness, metaheuristics encounter multiple obstacles, including parameter tuning, computational cost and the uncertainty of early convergence. The balance among exploration and exploitation continues to play a pivotal role in their performance. In order to enhance the efficiency, hybrid metaheuristics algorithms incorporating reinforcement learning, machine learning and deep learning have gained recognition, contributing to enhanced scalability and accuracy. The continuous progress in metaheuristic approaches hold notable promise for future applications, especially in areas needing real- time judgement, robotics and improvement under uncertainty. As processing capacity and algorithmic strategies develop, metaheuristics will play an increasingly crucial role in solving large-scale, real-world enhancement problems with higher accuracy and capability

REFERENCES

Abd Rahman, M. A., Ismail, B., Naidu, K., & Rahmat, M. K. (2019). Review on population-based metaheuristic search techniques for optimal power flow. *Indonesian Journal of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science*, *15*(1), 373–381. DOI: 10.11591/ijeecs.v15.i1.pp373-381

Abualigah, L., Diabat, A., Mirjalili, S., Elaziz, M. A., & Gandomi, A. H. (2021). The Arithmetic Optimization Algorithm. *Computer Methods in Applied Mechanics and Engineering*, *376*, 113609. DOI: 10.1016/j.cma.2020.113609

Agarwal, P., & Mehta, S. (2014). Nature-inspired algorithms: State-of-art, problems and prospects. *International Journal of Computer Applications*, *100*(14), 14–21. DOI: 10.5120/17593-8331

Agrawal, P., Abutarboush, H. F., Ganesh, T., & Mohamed, A. W. (2021). Metaheuristic algorithms on feature selection: A survey of one decade of research (2009-2019). *IEEE Access : Practical Innovations, Open Solutions*, *9*, 26766–26791. DOI: 10.1109/ACCESS.2021.3056407

Agushaka, J. O., & Ezugwu, A. E. (2022). Initialisation approaches for population-based metaheuristic algorithms: A comprehensive review. *Applied Sciences (Basel, Switzerland)*, *12*(2), 896. DOI: 10.3390/app12020896

Ahmed, H., & Glasgow, J. (2012). Swarm intelligence: Concepts, models and applications. *School Of Computing, Queens University Technical Report*.

Almufti, S. (2017). Using Swarm Intelligence for solving NPHard Problems. *Academic Journal of Nawroz University*, *6*(3), 46–50. DOI: 10.25007/ajnu.v6n3a78

Almufti, S. M., Marqas, R. B., Othman, P. S., & Sallow, A. B. (2021). Single-based and Population-based Metaheuristics for Solving NP-hard Problems. *Iraqi Journal of Science*. Advance online publication. DOI: 10.24996/10.24996/ijs.2021.62.5.34

Baykasoğlu, A., & Gindy, N. N. (2001). A simulated annealing algorithm for dynamic layout problem. *Computers & Operations Research*, *28*(14), 1403–1426. DOI: 10.1016/S0305-0548(00)00049-6

Blum, C., Puchinger, J., Raidl, G. R., & Roli, A. (2010). A brief survey on hybrid metaheuristics. *Proceedings of BIOMA*, 3–18.

Blum, C., Puchinger, J., Raidl, G. R., & Roli, A. (2011). Hybrid metaheuristics in combinatorial optimization: A survey. *Applied Soft Computing*, *11*(6), 4135–4151. DOI: 10.1016/j.asoc.2011.02.032

Brezočnik, L., Fister, I.Jr, & Podgorelec, V. (2018). Swarm intelligence algorithms for feature selection: A review. *Applied Sciences (Basel, Switzerland)*, *8*(9), 1521. DOI: 10.3390/app8091521

Camacho-Villalón, C. L., Stützle, T., & Dorigo, M. (2023). Designing new meta-heuristics: Manual versus automatic approaches. *Intelligent Computing, 2*, 0048.

Chakraborty, S., & Mali, K. (2023). *An overview of biomedical image analysis from the deep learning perspective. Research anthology on improving medical imaging techniques for analysis and intervention*.

Consoli, S., & Darby-Dowman, K. (2006). *Combinatorial optimization and meta-heuristics*. Brunel University.

Deepthi, S., & Ravikumar, A. (2015). A study from the perspective of nature-inspired metaheuristic optimization algorithms. *International Journal of Computer Applications*, *113*(9).

Del Ser, J., Osaba, E., Molina, D., Yang, X., Salcedo-Sanz, S., Camacho, D., Das, S., Suganthan, P., Coello, C., & Herrera, F. (2019). Bio-inspired computation: Where we stand and what's next. *Swarm and Evolutionary Computation*, *48*, 220–250. DOI: 10.1016/j.swevo.2019.04.008

Desale, S., Rasool, A., Andhale, S., & Rane, P. (2015). Heuristic and meta-heuristic algorithms and their relevance to the real world: A survey. *Int. J. Comput. Eng. Res. Trends*, *351*(5), 2349–7084.

Díaz, E., Tuya, J., Blanco, R., & Dolado, J. J. (2008). A tabu search algorithm for structural software testing. *Computers & Operations Research*, *35*(10), 3052–3072. DOI: 10.1016/j.cor.2007.01.009

Doğan, B., & Ölmez, T. (2015). A new metaheuristic for numerical function optimization: Vortex Search algorithm. *Information Sciences*, *293*, 125–145. DOI: 10.1016/j.ins.2014.08.053

Dowlatshahi, M. B., & Nezamabadi-Pour, H. (2014). GGSA: A grouping gravitational search algorithm for data clustering. *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence*, *36*, 114–121. DOI: 10.1016/j.engappai.2014.07.016

Gandomi, A. H., Yang, X.-S., Talatahari, S., & Alavi, A. H. (2013). Metaheuristic algorithms. In *Metaheuristic applications in structures and infrastructures* (pp. 1–24). Elsevier Waltham. DOI: 10.1016/B978-0-12-398364-0.00001-2

Gavrilas, M. (2010). *Heuristic and metaheuristic optimization techniques with application to power systems*. 9.

Genova, K., & Guliashki, V. (2011). Linear integer programming methods and approaches–a survey. *Journal of Cybernetics and Information Technologies*, *11*(1).

He, L., Peng, Z., Everding, B., Wang, X., Han, C. Y., Weiss, K. L., & Wee, W. G. (2008). A comparative study of deformable contour methods on medical image segmentation. *Image and Vision Computing*, *26*(2), 141–163. DOI: 10.1016/j.imavis.2007.07.010

Hertz, A., Taillard, E., & De Werra, D. (1995). *A tutorial on tabu search. 95*, 13–24.

Jones, G. (1998). Genetic and evolutionary algorithms. *Encyclopedia of Computational Chemistry, 2*(1127–1136), 40.

Kaur, S., Kumar, Y., Koul, A., & Kumar Kamboj, S. (2023). A systematic review on metaheuristic optimization techniques for feature selections in disease diagnosis: Open issues and challenges. *Archives of Computational Methods in Engineering*, *30*(3), 1863–1895. DOI: 10.1007/s11831-022-09853-1 PMID: 36465712

Lim, C. P., & Dehuri, S. (2009). *Innovations in swarm intelligence* (Vol. 248). Springer Science & Business Media. DOI: 10.1007/978-3-642-04225-6_1

Liu, H., Zhang, Y., & Wang, X. (2023). Hybrid ABC-SVM model for effective cancer classification based on gene expression data. *Applied Soft Computing*, *138*, 110093. DOI: 10.1016/j.asoc.2023.110093

Lozano, M., & García-Martínez, C. (2010). Hybrid metaheuristics with evolutionary algorithms specializing in intensification and diversification: Overview and progress report. *Computers & Operations Research*, *37*(3), 481–497. DOI: 10.1016/j.cor.2009.02.010

Mahmoudi, S., Aghaie, M., Bahonar, M., & Poursalehi, N. (2016). A novel optimization method, Gravitational Search Algorithm (GSA), for PWR core optimization. *Annals of Nuclear Energy*, *95*, 23–34. DOI: 10.1016/j.anucene.2016.04.035

Mesejo, P., Valsecchi, A., Marrakchi-Kacem, L., Cagnoni, S., & Damas, S. (2015). Biomedical image segmentation using geometric deformable models and metaheuristics. *Computerized Medical Imaging and Graphics*, *43*, 167–178. DOI: 10.1016/j.compmedimag.2013.12.005 PMID: 24480648

Morales-Castañeda, B., Zaldívar, D., Cuevas, E., Fausto, F., & Rodríguez, A. (2020). A better balance in metaheuristic algorithms: Does it exist? *Swarm and Evolutionary Computation*, *54*, 100671. DOI: 10.1016/j.swevo.2020.100671

Oloyede, M. O., Onumanyi, A. J., Bello-Salau, H., Djouani, K., & Kurien, A. (2022). Exploratory analysis of different metaheuristic optimization methods for medical image enhancement. *IEEE Access : Practical Innovations, Open Solutions*, *10*, 28014–28036. DOI: 10.1109/ACCESS.2022.3158324

Omidvar, M. N., Li, X., & Yao, X. (2021). A review of population-based metaheuristics for large-scale black-box global optimization—Part I. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, *26*(5), 802–822. DOI: 10.1109/TEVC.2021.3130838

Piacentini, C., Castro, M., Cire, A., & Beck, J. C. (2018). *Linear and integer programming-based heuristics for cost-optimal numeric planning. 32*(1).

Pirim, H., Eksioglu, B., & Bayraktar, E. (2008). *Tabu Search: A comparative study* (Vol. 278). INTECH Open Access Publisher London.

Rahman, M. A., Sokkalingam, R., Othman, M., Biswas, K., Abdullah, L., & Abdul Kadir, E. (2021). Nature-inspired metaheuristic techniques for combinatorial optimization problems: Overview and recent advances. *Mathematics*, *9*(20), 2633. DOI: 10.3390/math9202633

Rashedi, E., Nezamabadi-Pour, H., & Saryazdi, S. (2009). GSA: A gravitational search algorithm. *Information Sciences*, *179*(13), 2232–2248. DOI: 10.1016/j.ins.2009.03.004

Rere, L. R., Fanany, M. I., & Arymurthy, A. M. (2015). Simulated annealing algorithm for deep learning. *Procedia Computer Science*, *72*, 137–144. DOI: 10.1016/j.procs.2015.12.114

Sharma, P., Gupta, R., & Mehta, D. (2022). Comparative performance analysis of PSO, ACO, and Firefly algorithm for biomedical feature selection. *Expert Systems with Applications*, *191*, 116318. DOI: 10.1016/j.eswa.2021.116318

Sharma, S. (2021). QRP: QPSO based routing protocol for energy efficiency in wireless body area networks. In Chaubey, N., Hassan, M., & Bhatele, A. (Eds.), *Proceedings of International Conference on Data Science and Applications* (pp. 205–221). Springer. https://doi.org/DOI: 10.1007/978-3-030-76776-1_14

Sharma, S., Kapoor, R., & Dhiman, S. (2021, May). A novel hybrid metaheuristic based on augmented grey wolf optimizer and cuckoo search for global optimization. In *2021 2nd International Conference on Secure Cyber Computing and Communications (ICSCCC)* (pp. 376-381). IEEE. DOI: 10.1109/ICSCCC51823.2021.9478142

Simran, S., Sharma, S., & Kaur, G. (2021). *Fundamentals of data handling and visualization*. Bhumi Publishing.

Sridharan, S., Subramanian, R. K., & Srirangan, A. K. (2021). Physics based meta heuristics in manufacturing. *Materials Today: Proceedings*, *39*, 805–811. DOI: 10.1016/j.matpr.2020.09.775

Taghavi, M. (2024). *Mathematical Optimization in Artificial Intelligence and Machine Learning*. https://doi.org/DOI: 10.13140/RG.2.2.24185.48482

Tian, Y., Zhu, W., Zhang, X., & Jin, Y. (2023). A practical tutorial on solving optimization problems via PlatEMO. *Neurocomputing*, *518*, 190–205. DOI: 10.1016/j.neucom.2022.10.075

Tomar, V., Bansal, M., & Singh, P. (2024). Metaheuristic Algorithms for Optimization: A Brief Review. *Engineering Proceedings*, *59*(1), 238.

Yang, X.-S. (2010). *Nature-inspired metaheuristic algorithms*. Luniver press.

Yang, X.-S. (2011). Metaheuristic optimization. *Scholarpedia Journal*, *6*(8), 11472. DOI: 10.4249/scholarpedia.11472

Yang, X.-S., Deb, S., & Fong, S. (2014). Metaheuristic algorithms: Optimal balance of intensification and diversification. *Applied Mathematics & Information Sciences*, *8*(3), 977–983. DOI: 10.12785/amis/080306

Yazdani, M., & Jolai, F. (2016). Lion Optimization Algorithm (LOA): A nature-inspired metaheuristic algorithm. *Journal of Computational Design and Engineering*, *3*(1), 24–36. DOI: 10.1016/j.jcde.2015.06.003