

Chapter V

Genetic Programming

Pierre Collet

Université du Littoral Côte d'Opale, France

ABSTRACT

The aim of genetic programming is to evolve programs or functions (symbolic regression) thanks to artificial evolution. This technique is now mature and can routinely yield results on par with (or even better than) human intelligence. This chapter sums up the basics of genetic programming and outlines the main subtleties one should be aware of in order to obtain good results.

INTRODUCTION

Genetic programming (GP) is still rather unknown, even though it has recently obtained spectacular results: John Koza showed in his latest book (Koza et al., 2003) that genetic programming can routinely produce solutions that are competitive with human intelligence, without requiring one to be an expert in the domain of the problem to be solved.

A Bit of History

The idea of evolving computer programs dates back to the dawn of computing. Back in 1958, Friedberg made several attempts to have a computer program itself (Friedberg, 1958; Friedberg, Dunham, & North, 1958) using what would now be called mutations. He started with a “population” of random programs, and modi-

fied the contents stochastically, trying to improve the results.

Later on, Smith (1980), who was working on learning classifier systems, introduced small programs in the rules he was evolving. However, the modern vision of genetic programming starts with a small but seminal paper by Cramer (1985), who uses a tree-like variable size structure to represent a program. Programs are not written in LISP (as suggested by Koza later on) but in TB (a tree version of the JB language). Along with mutation, Cramer also uses a standard subtree crossover, introduces as well a mono-parental crossover, and insists on the necessity to create closed genetic operators. Above all, he evolves his population of programs with an evolutionary engine.

All the seeds were therefore present for the domain to grow, but as for Manderick and Moyson and Ant Colony Optimization (cf. Chap-

ter III), Cramer somehow failed to promote his work enough, and nothing major happened in this domain for several years. In fact, another major problem was that computers of this era were not powerful enough to obtain really good results with GP.

Genetic Programming à la Koza

By the beginning of the 1990s, genetic programming made its comeback thanks to Koza (1989, 1992, 1994; Koza et al., 1999, 2003) who put in a lot of energy (and computer power) to develop the ideas introduced by Cramer and his predecessors.

Genetic programming is nothing else than standard evolutionary techniques (described in Chapter IV) applied to individuals that implement programs. Standard evolutionary algorithms evolve potential solutions to a problem to be optimized. Most of the time, EA individuals are made of a list of parameters that are passed over to a “fitness function” used to evaluate the individual.

In genetic programming, an individual is a program, or more often a function. The main (and only?) difference with EAs is that GP *executes the individuals to evaluate them*. Another difference is that in most of the cases, GP uses variable length individuals where standard EAs use fixed size individuals.

This chapter presents standard genetic programming à la Koza, including hints, suggestions, and pointers to state-of-the-art papers that will hopefully allow newcomers to obtain good results with this delicate technique.

STANDARD GENETIC PROGRAMMING

Representation of an Individual

As is the case in EAs, using the good representation for a particular problem is quite essential,

because the chosen representation more or less determines the search space in which the individuals will evolve: it will be very difficult to obtain an iterative program with a representation that does not allow loops or recursive calls. On the contrary, if everything is allowed, the search space may be so large that finding compiling programs that stop correctly or simply do not hang will be already very difficult.

The individual representation described below corresponds to the most common one^{3/4} that is, the representation that Koza used for the development of what is now standard genetic programming. In order to reduce the search space and find an individual structure adapted to the representation of a program, Koza naturally chose a functional language for several reasons:

- Syntactically speaking, with a purely functional representation, there is no need to define a grammar recognizing valid programs, provided the set of functions is closed.
- Functional languages limit side effects, which, as a side effect, minimizes bug occurrence.
- Above all, a functional program can very easily be implemented as a tree: nodes are operators that have as many children that they need operands and that return to their parent the result of their evaluation.

For instance, a function calculating a factorial:

```
Function fact(n) {
    If n=0 return 1
    Else return fact(n-1)
}
```

can be simply represented by the tree in Figure 1.

Moreover, of all different possible representations, a tree structure can naturally implement variable size individuals on which cross-

13 more pages are available in the full version of this document, which may be purchased using the "Add to Cart" button on the publisher's webpage:

www.igi-global.com/chapter/genetic-programming/21120

Related Content

Control of Dynamic Noise in Transcendental Julia and Mandelbrot Sets by Superior Iteration Method

Ketan Jha and Mamta Rani (2018). *International Journal of Natural Computing Research* (pp. 48-59).
www.irma-international.org/article/control-of-dynamic-noise-in-transcendental-julia-and-mandelbrot-sets-by-superior-iteration-method/209450

Nature-Inspired Algorithms for Problem Solving: A Deep Dive Into Computational Intelligence

Dharmesh Dhabliya, Ankur Gupta, Sukhvinder Singh Dari, Ritika Dhabliya, Anishkumar Dhabliya, Rohit Anand and Nitin N. Sakhare (2024). *Bio-Inspired Intelligence for Smart Decision-Making* (pp. 189-211).
www.irma-international.org/chapter/nature-inspired-algorithms-for-problem-solving/347322

Non Linear Dynamical Systems and Chaos Synchronization

Ayub Khan and Prempal Singh (2010). *International Journal of Artificial Life Research* (pp. 43-57).
www.irma-international.org/article/non-linear-dynamical-systems-chaos/44670

The Universal Constructor

Eleonora Bilotta and Pietro Pantano (2010). *Cellular Automata and Complex Systems: Methods for Modeling Biological Phenomena* (pp. 362-378).
www.irma-international.org/chapter/universal-constructor/43226

Topic Modeling as a Tool to Gauge Political Sentiments from Twitter Feeds

Debabrata Sarddar, Raktim Kumar Dey, Rajesh Bose and Sandip Roy (2020). *International Journal of Natural Computing Research* (pp. 14-35).
www.irma-international.org/article/topic-modeling-as-a-tool-to-gauge-political-sentiments-from-twitter-feeds/250254