

Universe-inspired algorithms for Control Engineering: A review

Rodrigo M. C. Bernardo^{a,*}, Delfim F. M. Torres^b, Carlos A. R. Herdeiro^b, Marco P. Soares dos Santos^{a,c,*}

^a*Center for Mechanical Technology & Automation (TEMA), Department of Mechanical Engineering,
University of Aveiro, 3810-193 Aveiro, Portugal*

^b*Center for Research and Development in Mathematics and Applications (CIDMA), Department of Mathematics,
University of Aveiro, 3810-193 Aveiro, Portugal*

^c*Intelligent Systems Associate Laboratory (LASI), Portugal*

Abstract

Control algorithms have been proposed based on knowledge related to nature-inspired mechanisms, including those based on the behavior of living beings. This paper presents a review focused on major breakthroughs carried out in the scope of applied control inspired by the gravitational attraction between bodies. A control approach focused on Artificial Potential Fields was identified, as well as four optimization metaheuristics: Gravitational Search Algorithm, Black-Hole algorithm, Multi-Verse Optimizer, and Galactic Swarm Optimization. A thorough analysis of ninety-one relevant papers was carried out to highlight their performance and to identify the gravitational and attraction foundations, as well as the universe laws supporting them. Included are their standard formulations, as well as their improved, modified, hybrid, cascade, fuzzy, chaotic and adaptive versions. Moreover, this review also deeply delves into the impact of universe-inspired algorithms on control problems of dynamic systems, providing an extensive list of control-related applications, and their inherent advantages and limitations. Strong evidence suggests that gravitation-inspired and black-hole dynamic-driven algorithms can outperform other well-known algorithms in control engineering, even though they have not been designed according to realistic astrophysical phenomena and formulated according to astrophysics laws. Even so, they support future research directions towards the development of high-sophisticated control laws inspired by Newtonian/Einsteinian physics, such that effective control-astrophysics bridges can be established and applied in a wide range of applications.

Keywords: Nature-inspired control, Gravitational Search Algorithm, Black hole, Artificial Potential Field, Multi-Verse Optimizer, Galactic Swarm Optimization, Optimization, Nonlinear control

*Corresponding authors at: Department of Mechanical Engineering, University of Aveiro, 3810-193 Aveiro, Portugal (Rodrigo M. C. Bernardo and Marco P. Soares dos Santos).

Email addresses: rodrigo.bernardo@ua.pt (Rodrigo M. C. Bernardo), delfim@ua.pt (Delfim F. M. Torres), herdeiro@ua.pt (Carlos A. R. Herdeiro), marco.santos@ua.pt (Marco P. Soares dos Santos)

Abbreviations

ABC	Artificial Bee Colony algorithm
ACO	Ant Colony Optimization
APF	Artificial Potential Field
BA	Bat Algorithm
BH	Black Hole algorithm
DE	Differential Evolution
FLC	Fuzzy Logic Controller
FOPID	Fractional Order Proportional Derivative Proportional Integral controller
FPDPI	Fractional Order Proportional Derivative Proportional Integral controller
GA	Genetic Algorithm
GSA	Gravitational Search Algorithm
GSO	Galactic Swarm Optimization
GWO	Grey Wolf Optimizer
MPC	Model Predictive Control
MVO	Multi-Verse Optimizer
NN	Neural Network
PI	Proportional Integral Controller
PID	Proportional Integral Derivative Controller
PID+DD	PID plus double-derivative controller
PIDF	PID Controller with Derivative Filter
PIMR	Proportional-Integral Multiresonant controller
PS	Pattern Search algorithm
PSO	Particle Swarm Optimization
RL	Reinforcement Learning
SMC	Sliding Mode Controller
SSA	Salp Swarm Algorithm
THD	Total Harmonic Distortion
UPFC	Unified Power Flow Controller
WOA	Whale Optimization Algorithm

1. Introduction

In recent decades, control of non-linear systems has been one of the most important topics in control theory [1]. Despite the massive use of non-linear models for accurate prediction of physical systems, it is still difficult to ensure high stability margins and desired performances in non-linear systems, mainly if uncertainties must be overcome [2]. Researchers have been observing nature seeking inspiration to solve complex real-world control-related problems, since it is a clear example of a time-dependent process in a state of optimization, according to evolutionary mechanisms. One can find many natural processes in which a state of equilibrium and adaptation is reached, which can be investigated for nature-inspired high-performance optimization and control. Steer *et al.* [3] stated that the term *nature* refer "to any part of the physical universe which is not a product of intentional human design". These authors also distinguish between 'strong' inspiration and 'weak' inspiration, where the first one involves "the investigation of some existing problem-solving mechanism, the extraction of some qualitative process description, and the application to some alternative purpose", while the second is the "less formal role of some phenomenon in the creative stage of solution formulation".

Well known control methods do not consider the dynamics occurring in natural phenomena (non-inspired control) or only consider some dynamics occurring in biological structures (bio-inspired control). Many non-inspired control methods were already proposed, such as the Proportional, Integral and Derivative (PID) control, predictive control, optimal control, and sliding mode control [4, 5, 6]. These are non-nature-inspired and employ "artificial" control approaches, often neglecting the rationality and effectiveness inherent in

natural systems. In the case of sliding mode control, it does exhibit an attraction-like behavior, as the system state appears to be drawn towards the sliding surface. However, this attraction to the sliding surface is achieved through an artificial mechanism using a variable switching structure. Nonetheless, these controllers are formulated using a non-natural attraction, therefore they are not rooted in the natural behavior of celestial bodies in the universe. Intelligent control and bio-inspired control, including the design of Artificial Neural Networks and Fuzzy Logic Controller (FLC) [7, 8, 9], have also been extensively applied. However, their usage often demands a non-negligible degree of intuition and lacks interpretability [10, 11].

The main goal of this paper is to provide a literature review of the most relevant studies that highlight major scientific achievements in the domain of nature-inspired universe-conveyed control, to highlight their ability for future applications in multiple areas. Regarding their application in control systems engineering, scientific efforts have been centered on optimization and development of metaheuristics, despite the excess of metaphorical heuristics already reported [12]. No control methods have been found with mathematical and physical formulations of gravitational attraction or black holes dynamics directly in their composition, thus evidencing a literature gap to be explored, where promising control methods may be designed using astrophysical dynamics, as they may provide mechanisms of stability and robustness (e.g. the strong gravitation field occurring in black holes). Moreover, the use of spacetime curvatures may hold great potential to engineer high performance trajectory tracking systems, as such phenomena ensure the shortest natural path between two points/states. Indeed, this review perform a thoroughly analysis to both optimization algorithms, already applied in the field of Control Engineering, and the control algorithms themselves, as long as their formulations are deeply related to gravitational attraction phenomena. This goal was achieved by providing an extensive analysis to the main concepts from which the original algorithms and related variants were developed, including their performance, characteristics and applications.

After conducting an initial structured search, no actual control methods inspired by gravitational attraction were found. The closest approach involves the use of Artificial Potential Field (APF) to introduce attraction or repulsion behavior into systems. However, concerning optimization applied to control (e.g. the optimization of controller parameters), four algorithms were identified: Gravitational Search Algorithm (GSA), Black Hole algorithm (BH), Multi-Verse Optimizer (MVO), and Galactic Swarm Optimization (GSO). To our knowledge, no literature reviews were already focused on the use of gravitational phenomena in Control Engineering. Indeed, several review papers were already published in the scope of GSA, BH, MVO, but they are mainly focused in data clustering, classification or general optimization problems [13, 14]. Besides, bio-inspired control methods (including those inspired in swarm intelligence or evolutionary phenomena) are currently much more explored than non-biological nature inspired control methods, even though astrophysical phenomena hold potential to be used for developing high-sophisticated control systems, due to their inherent gravitational attraction.

The contributions of this paper can be summarized as follows: (i) Identification and exploration of control methods inspired by gravitational attraction or black-hole attraction derived dynamics; (ii) Critical analysis to the optimization algorithms already applied to control problems. Included are the GSA, BH, MVO, and GSO, as well as their variants and modifications; (iii) Critical analysis to the APF already applied to control problems; (iv) Discussion on the potential advancements and limitations related to the use of gravitational attraction and universe-inspired algorithms in control systems. The ultimate goal is to contribute towards the development of high-sophisticated control systems inspired by realistic astrophysical phenomena and authentically formulated by Newtonian/Einsteinian physics.

2. Methods

2.1. Selection Criteria

In this paper we present a rigorous analysis of controllers and optimization algorithms applied in control systems inspired in a specific natural phenomenon: gravity, and related attraction between bodies. The Scopus database was searched in the time interval between 2000 and 2023 by seeking for the terms “gravit* AND control*”, “attrac* AND control*”, “black-hole AND control*”, and “galactic AND control*”, in the title, abstract and keywords. A search using the term “universe AND control” was also conducted; however,

only studies outside the scope were obtained. Control inspired in black-holes was included as they are currently considered an extreme phenomenon where extreme gravity and related extreme attraction conditions occur. The searching results were limited to: (i) document type: journals; (ii) subject: engineering; (iii) language: English. The compilation was further refined to remove documents outside the scope of this review, which as carried out according to the following rules:

1. All the papers in control field obtained by searching the word "attraction", but referring to multiple meanings of the term not related to control science were removed (*e.g.* interest, liking, and tempting).
2. All the papers which contain the term "control" but do not refer to field of control systems (*e.g.* attraction of ants by pheromones).
3. All the papers that refer the terms "attraction", "gravity" and "black-holes" but whose controllers were not inspired in the gravity phenomenon (*e.g.*, control in zero-gravity, micro-gravity environment).
4. All the papers in the third and fourth quartiles, according to the Clarivate ranking, were removed, as we found they do not provide relevant content.

The search was completed in March 2024. Ninety-one relevant papers were selected according to these criteria.

2.2. Literature Search Strategy

The following data were extracted and analyzed from the selected collection of papers: (1) inspired control law (concept, architecture, and analytical formulation); (2) inspired optimization algorithm (concept, type of optimization, and analytical formulation); (3) differences in the main concepts and main analytical formulations found in modified or hybrid versions when compared to the original proposed versions; (4) application of the proposed methods in the field of control systems; (5) relevant performance indicators.

2.3. Terminology

In the last decades, a large number of different nature-inspired algorithms and variants (*e.g.* modifications and hybridization) were proposed to overcome relevant limitations mainly related to entrapment in local optima, premature convergence, parameter tuning, and exploration and exploitation imbalance [15]. Nevertheless, the adopted terminology to describe the different algorithms has not been widely consensual among researchers. Hence, concerning the conceptual differences between the original algorithm and its variants, the following classification was established:

- **Standard:** The algorithm is used in its original formulation without any changes.
- **Improved:** The algorithm was upgraded aiming to achieve superior performances, but without affecting the original conceptualization, (no artificial mechanisms were introduced).
- **Modified:** The algorithm was modified aiming to achieve superior performances, but in such a way that partially or totally loses the affinity to its original conceptualization.
- **Hybrid:** Merging of two algorithms aiming to achieve better performances in comparison with their individual performance. The algorithms must be truly combined in their formulation, i.e., they must not be formulated as an individual sequencing.
- **Cascade:** Two algorithms individually sequenced.
- **Fuzzy:** Algorithm that include fuzzy logic in their conceptualization (*e.g.*, for fine-tune parameterization).
- **Chaotic:** Algorithm that include chaotic behaviors aiming to improve its performance.
- **Adaptive:** Algorithm that include time-dependent modifications to the original algorithm throughout iterations (*e.g.*, parametric modification).

3. Attraction inspired optimization algorithms applied to control of dynamic systems

3.1. Gravitational Search algorithm

3.1.1. Overview

The GSA was firstly proposed by Rashedi *et al.* [16], who developed a heuristic optimization method based on the Newton's law of gravity from classical physics. In this optimization algorithm, the search agents are represented by bodies whose mass depends on their fitness [16]. The optimized solutions are obtained by body attraction phenomena, since bodies are modelled by larger masses to produce large attraction forces. Through this mechanism (Fig. 1a) inspired by the gravitational force, the agents converge towards the best solution, which is represented by the body with the highest mass [16]. The baseline for the GSA development was Newton's law of universal gravitation [17],

$$\vec{\mathbf{F}} = -G \frac{M_1 M_2}{r^2} \hat{\mathbf{r}},$$

where G is the gravitational constant, M_1 and M_2 are the bodies mass that attract each other, and r is the distance between the two bodies. Although the GSA behaves as an artificial isolated system of masses with dynamics defined by the laws of gravitation and motion, these laws may be artificially modified from classic Newton law formulations, such that improved results can be achieved.

According to the original conceptualization GSA [16], heavier bodies, which correspond to good solutions, move slowly than the lighter ones, which ensures the exploitation step of the algorithm. The method require to implement the GSA as expressed in Fig. 3a.

The optimization problem is modelled as a system with N mass-defined agents. The position of the i th agent is defined by

$$X_i = (x_i^1, \dots, x_i^d, \dots, x_i^n) \quad \text{for } i = 1, 2, \dots, N \quad (1)$$

where x_i^d is the position of the i th agent in the d th dimension. The gravitational constant G at time t is computed by

$$G(t) = G_0 \exp\left(-\beta \frac{t}{t_{max}}\right), \quad \beta < 1, \quad (2)$$

where G_0 is initial value of G . The Large Number hypothesis [20], which was the first hypothesis proposing a time varying gravitational constant, supported the paradigm stating that physical quantities should acquire dynamically their current values. Indeed, the GSA was established by defining the force acting on mass i at time (t) due to the presence of mass j as follows:

$$F_{ij}^d(t) = G(t) \frac{M_i(t) M_j(t)}{R_{ij}(t) + \varepsilon} (x_j^d(t) - x_i^d(t)) \quad (3)$$

where ε is a small constant and $R_{ij}(t)$ is the Euclidean distance between the two agents i and j . The total force acting on agent i in the dimension d is a randomly weighted sum of d th components of the forces due to other agents:

$$F_i^d(t) = \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^N \text{rand}_j F_{ij}^d(t), \quad (4)$$

where rand_j is a random number in the interval $[0, 1]$. The position of the agents at the end of each iteration is calculated by:

$$x_i^d(t+1) = x_i^d(t) + v_i^d(t+1), \quad (5)$$

$$v_i^d(t+1) = \text{rand}_i v_i^d(t) + a_i^d(t), \quad (6)$$

$$a_i^d(t) = \frac{F_i^d(t)}{M_i(t)},$$




Figure 1: (a) Forces due to gravitational attraction on a three-body system. F_{12} is the force that M_2 applies on M_1 , F_{13} is the force that M_3 applies on M_1 , F_{R1} is the resultant force applied on M_1 and a_1 is the acceleration due to F_{R1} ; (b) Black Hole structure. The Schwarzschild (R_S) radius is calculated by $R_S = \frac{2GM}{c^2}$ where M is the black hole mass, G is the gravitational constant and c is the light speed. According to the Black Hole theories [18], all objects that enter into the event horizon can not escape due to the massive gravitational attraction force. (c) Illustration of white-hole, black-hole and wormhole, respectively from left to right. Reproduced with permission from Ref.[19]

where $rand_i$ is a random value in the interval $[0, 1]$; $M_i(t)$ is the mass of i th agent at time t , and it is defined by

$$M_i(t) = \frac{m_i(t)}{\sum_{j=1}^N m_j(t)},$$

$$m_i(t) = \frac{fit_i(t) - worst(t)}{best(t) - worst(t)},$$

with $fit_i(t)$ the fitness value of the i th agent at time t , which depends on the defined objective function; $best(t)$ and $worst(t)$ are defined respectively by

$$best(t) = \begin{cases} \min_{j \in \{1, \dots, N\}} fit_j(t) & , \text{ if minimizing} \\ \max_{j \in \{1, \dots, N\}} fit_j(t) & , \text{ if maximizing} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

and

$$worst(t) = \begin{cases} \max_{j \in \{1, \dots, N\}} fit_j(t) & , \text{ if minimizing} \\ \min_{j \in \{1, \dots, N\}} fit_j(t) & , \text{ if maximizing} \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

Functions (7) and (8) are problem-dependent, i.e, minimization problems require a different formulation from maximization problems.

3.1.2. GSA and related variations applied in control

Twenty-seven control applications were found related to use of the standard version of GSA, and thirty-six related to its variations (Table 2 and Table 3). Applications of GSA in control are mainly focused on optimal tuning of controllers gains, searching of the best control parameters, and finding the best control settings of complex systems. The main application field was electric energy generation (62%), although they were already applied in the control of servo systems (10%), as well as in applications with multiple constraints and requiring optimization of multiple parameters, and also in applications in which control problems are transformed in optimization problems. The Proportional Integral Derivative Controller (PID) (Fig. 2a), FLC, and Unified Power Flow Controller (UPFC), whose parameters were optimized by some version of GSA, represent the majority of the study cases (29%, 16%, and 5%, respectively).

Concerning GSA variants, the most used algorithm in control applications was the hybrid GSA-PSO, followed by chaotic mechanisms and improved versions of GSA. Significant advantages have been found by using GSA optimization algorithms. On the one hand, GSA provides [21, 22, 23]: (i) a good global exploration capacity (good ability to search for new results); (ii) faster convergence in comparison to other methods (*e.g.*, Particle Swarm Optimization (PSO), Genetic Algorithm (GA)); (iii) high computational efficiency; and (iv) higher accuracy in comparison to other methods (*e.g.*, GA, Ant Colony Optimization (ACO)). On the other hand, limitations of GSA are related to [24, 25, 26]: (a) diversity loss of new solutions in the final search steps; (b) possibility of getting stuck in local optima; (c) parametrization of the algorithm itself is required: their parameters have a significant influence in the effectiveness of the algorithm. Three modifications to GSA were proposed so far to improve their effectiveness, by complementing the advantages of original GSA with the advantages inherent to mechanisms of other searching or optimization methods: In order to find the optimal controller parameters of a hydraulic turbine governing system, an increasing β value and a diversity based mutation were proposed [27]. The change performed on β affects Eq. (2), allowing to obtain a better control in the balance between exploration and exploitation. The second mechanism, triggered when the population diversity is lower than a dynamic threshold, ensures that the probability of agent mutation increases, such that the trap on local optima solutions is avoided. On the other two modified variants, changes were performed on Eq. (6). To adjust the balance between global exploration and local exploitation, a simple mechanism based on a linear increasing γ was introduced in Eq. (6) to divide the equation in two terms. Concerning the problem of finding optimal UPFC settings, an improvement of 2% was achieved with less iterations in comparison with original GSA [28]. Lu *et al.* [29] suggested a more complex modification to the velocity update equation (6), including the transmission of information between agents to allow that all agents are updated based on the best ones, and adding memory to ensure that the best individual position is stored and used to compute (6). This concept is similar to the one used in PSO [30], despite it is differently formulated.

Some improved methods using non-complex concepts were found to conduct to more effective results. To find the best thyristor controlled series compensator location to control a power system, Mahapatra *et al.* [31] proposed a mechanism to limit the maximum value of the velocity update (6), with a decreasing maximum velocity, ensuring that the algorithm exploits the local search space in the final search phase. A similar approach was tested to optimize the thresholds and weights of a Neural Network (NN) model [32]. Li *et al.* [33] proposed to perform a mutation based on Gaussian and Cauchy distributions to enhance the exploitation and exploration capabilities of GSA, respectively. This method was tested by optimizing the controller gains of a pump turbine governing system, where the optimization capabilities of the improved GSA were highlighted in contrast to the Ziegler-Nichols tuning approach (Fig. 2b).

Opposition-based optimization is a technique already tested with many other optimization algorithms [34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39]. Opposition optimization was used with GSA and applied to control systems in order to find the optimal control parameters of power systems [40, 41]. The main concept of opposition-based optimization is to check the opposite solution \check{x}_i , defined as $\check{x}_i = L + U - x_i$, where L and U are the lower and upper bounds of the search space, respectively. If the opposite candidate is fitter than the initial one,

the opposite one is saved for the next iteration [42]. Such optimization was also used with GSA, and applied to control systems to find the optimal control parameters of power systems [40, 41].

Some processes, such as the GSA tuning, are hard to determine objectively. However, Fuzzy Logic is a practical method of tuning the GSA parameters as it can emulate the human reasoning in the use of imprecise information [43, 44, 45]. Aghaie *et al.* [43] proposed a fuzzy system to set the β value in Eq. (2). Such proposed fuzzy system output new β values according to four inputs: (1) the current iteration; (2) the progression level; (3) the diversification; and (4) the previous β value. The diversification of population is given by

$$div = \frac{r_{ave} - r_{min}}{r_{max} - r_{min}},$$

where r is the euclidean distance between two agents and r_{ave} , r_{max} and r_{min} , are the average, maximum and minimum distances between agents, respectively. The level of progression is defined by

$$prog = \frac{fit_{ave}(t) - fit_{ave}(t-1)}{fit_{ave}(t)}.$$

The proposed set of rules is shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Fuzzy rules used by Aghaie *et al.* [43] to determine the β values.

Rule	Inputs				Output	
	Iteration	$prog$	div	$\beta(t-1)$	$\beta(t)$	
1	low	low	low	medium	low	
2	medium	low	low	high	medium	
3	high	low	high	medium	high	

Adaptation over iterations is other mechanism that has been employed by researchers to enhance the GSA abilities. Two main conceptualizations were found using adaptive GSA applied to control: by adapting G and ε values over time [46, 47], and by performing a mutation with an adaptive probability, which is determined based on the success rate of the previous mutations [48]. Applications of deterministic chaos can be observed in control theory, computer science and physics; recently, chaotic-embedded GSA has also been investigated as another mechanism to improve the GSA performance [49]. The use of chaotic maps allows to comprise additional layers of randomness to the algorithm, enhancing the local search capabilities [50, 51]. By including neural behavior, Vikas and Parhi [52] recently proposed a Modified Chaotic Neural Oscillator-based Hyperbolic GSA (MHGSA) applied to humanoid robot path planning. They reported the ability of this adaptive GSA to achieve short paths in relation to original GSA and avoid obstacles.

The most common hybrid algorithms applied to control is the hybrid GSA-PSO, due to the high similarities between GSA and PSO algorithms, which allows an easy merging of their analytical formalization. Two versions were already proposed: (1) a simplified one only considering the propagation of the best solution through agents [53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62]; and (2) a more complex one that saves the personal best of each agent, adding memory to the algorithm [63, 64]. Other versions may arise through the combination of the various mechanisms mentioned above. Included is a chaotic hybrid GSA-PSO designed to optimize the parameters of a robust controller aiming to solve the load frequency problem of a micro grid, showing relevant results (improvement up to $\sim 83\%$), as shown in Fig. 2c.




Figure 2: (a) Control of transient voltage on a hybrid energy system using a PID controller tuned by GSA. Adapted with permission from Ref. [65]. (b) Frequency control of a pump turbine governing system using a PID tuned by Ziegler–Nichols (ZN) method and by the proposed improved GSA (CGGSA). Adapted with permission from Ref. [33]. (c) Comparison of different robust controller settings applied to control micro grid output frequency deviation, where the proposed H_2/H_{inf} was optimized by hybrid particle swarm optimization and gravitational search algorithm with chaotic map algorithm (CPSOGSA). The proposed method was faster in retrieve the reference frequency with significantly less overshoot. Adapted with permission from Ref. [66]. (d) Comparison of performance between Real Coded Genetic algorithm (RGA), PSO, GSA, and hybrid Real Coded Genetic - Pattern Search algorithm (RGA-PS). Adapted with permission from Ref. [67].

Table 2: Applications of original GSA in control systems found in literature from 2000 to 2023. NA - Not Applicable

Controller	Application Description	Reference
NA	Find the optimal settings (<i>e.g.</i> generator terminal voltages, transformer settings, output of compensating devices) for the reactive power dispatch problem that minimize the active power loss and enhance voltage stability of power system.	[68]
UPFC	Search of optimal gains of UPFC that exhibit greater robustness in the power system control.	[69]
NA	Define the optimal switching angles of an inverter to minimize the THD.	[67]
State of charge feedback controller	Optimize the controller parameters to smooth the impact of photovoltaic sources in the power grid.	[70]
PIDF	Optimize the PIDF gains of an Automatic Generation Control to minimize the generator frequency deviations and the tie-line power error of interconnected power systems.	[71]
UPFC	Search of optimal gains and location of multiple UPFC that minimize the power loss and the dispatch cost of the power system.	[72]
FLC	Find the optimal membership functions parameters of FLC. The controller is applied to drive the speed of an induction motor.	[73]
NA	Parametric optimization of ultrasonic machining processes	[74]
PID	Tuning of PID gains to control a field-sensed magnetic suspension system	[75]
UPFC	Find optimal settings of UPFC during the post-fault period	[76]
Type II/ Type III compensators	Find the optimal gains, zeros and poles location of the compensators to control a DC-DC boost converter	[77]
PI	Optimize the PI gains of an Automatic Generation Control to minimize the generator frequency deviations and the tie-line power error of interconnected power systems	[78]
Fuzzy PID	Optimize the controller parameters for Automatic Generation Control of a multi-area multi-source power system	[79]
FLC	Optimize the rules and membership functions of FLC to control the traffic flow	[80]
NA	Optimize the switching angles of a reactive power compensator	[81]
Backstepping Control	Optimize the controller parameters for the trajectory tracking control of autonomous quadrotor helicopter	[82]
NA	Find the optimal settings to control the electric power generation system	[83]
NA	Find the optimal electric vehicles controller settings that minimizes the voltage fluctuations and the degradation of batteries	[84]
PID	Optimize the PID gains to control an inverted pendulum system	[85]
NA	Find the optimal settings of a congestion management system in a power system under deregulated regime	[86]
FOPID	Optimize the FOPID parameters to optimal control a micro grid system with various components	[87]
SMC	Optimize the SMC parameters to control a dual-motor driving system	[88]
PIDF	Optimize the PIDF gains to control a hybrid power system	[65]
NA	Find optimal settings of a battery energy storage system	[89]
MPC	Optimize the MPC parameters to determine online the optimal control sequence. Applied to a quadrotor	[90]
PI	Determine the optimal parameters of a PI to control the voltage and frequency of a micro grid	[91]
RL-based control	Find optimal initial weights and biases of the Neural Network controller to avoid instability. The controller was tested in a linear position servo system	[92]

Table 3: Applications of GSA variations in control systems found in literature from 2000 to 2023. NA - Not Applicable

Variation	Modified Equations	Controller	Application Description	Reference
Modified	In (2) β is updated as: $\beta(t) = \gamma \sinh\left(\eta\left(\frac{t}{t_{max}} - 0.5\right)\right) + \lambda$ Perform the mutation: for each x_i^d , $x_i^d = z_i^d$ if $rand_1 < P_c$ where $Z_i = X_{r_1} + rand_2(X_{r_2} - X_{r_3})$. The mutation occurs if $div < \varepsilon(t)$ where $\varepsilon(t) = \varepsilon_0 \exp(-\mu t/t_{max})$	PID	Optimal parameter identification of a hydraulic turbine governing system	[27]
	Substitute (6) by: $v_i^d(t+1) = \gamma \times gv_i^d(t+1) + (1-\gamma) \times lv_i^d(t+1)$ where $gv_i^d(t+1) = rand_i \times gv_i^d(t) + a_i^d(t)$ and $lv_i^d(t+1) = rand_i \times lv_i^d(t) + a_i^d(t)$	UPFC	Find optimal UPFC settings that minimize the power losses	[28]
	Substitute (6) by: $v_i^d(t+1) = rand_0 v_i^d(t) + F \times a_i^d(t) + pbest_i^d(t) (1 - e^{-c_1 rand_1 \times t}) + gbest_i^d(t) (1 - e^{-c_2 rand_2 \times t})$ where $F = \frac{1}{\sqrt{a}} e^{-(\phi/a)^2} \cos(5\phi/a)$	Neural Network controller	Find neural network optimal parameters. The controller was applied on the integration of offshore wind and wave energy systems	[29]
Improved	(3) is substituted by: $F_{ij}^d(t) = G(t) \frac{M_i(t) M_j(t)}{R_{ij}(t) + \varepsilon x_j^d(t)} (x_j^d(t) - x_i^d(t))$	FLC	Optimize the FLC parameters. The controller was applied on a DC servo system	[93]
	Perform a velocity limitation in (6): $-V_{max} \leq v_i^d \leq V_{max}$ where $V_{max} = V_{max0} \times [1 - (t/t_{max})^h]$ with $V_{max0} = \alpha(x_{max} - x_{min}), \alpha \in]0, 1]$	NA	Find the optimal thyristor controlled series compensator location in a power system	[31]
	Perform the following mutation to X_i : $X_i^{new} = X_i \times (1 + \alpha \times (\eta N(0, 1) + (1 - \eta)C(0, 1)))$ where $N(0, 1)$ and $C(0, 1)$ are random numbers from the Gaussian and Cauchy distributions respectively. Then, a new vector is obtained as $X_{all} = [X_{new} X]$ and only the best N solutions are selected.	PID	Optimize the PID gains applied to a pump turbine governing system	[33]
	Substitute (6) by: $v_i^d(t+1) = rand_i w(t) v_i^d(t) + a_i^d(t)$, where $w(t) = w_{max} - \frac{w_{max} - w_{min}}{t_{max}} \times t$	NA	Optimise the the neural network thresholds and weights. The neural network is used to filter the speed error that is used in the design of the servo system controller	[32]
Opposition based	With a certain probability named jumping rate, J_r , after (5) the opposite solutions in relation to the actual population are verified: $Ox_i^d = \min^d + \max^d - x_i^d$. Then, the N fittest agents from set $\{X, OX\}$ are selected.	FLC	Search the optimal control parameters of an autonomous power system. The goal is to enhance the transient response, minimize the overshoot and oscillations, and improve the damping factor	[40]
		NA	Search the optimal control parameters for the problem of optimal reactive power dispatch of power systems	[41]
Fuzzy based	The β parameter in (2) is defined by fuzzy system. The gravitational constant $G(t)$ and the parameter ε in (3) are adapted using a fuzzy logic mechanism.	NA	Search the optimal design parameters of core patterns for nuclear reactors to solve the loading pattern optimization problem	[43]
		PI	Search the optimal design parameters of a PI controller for position control a servo system	[44]
Adaptive	On the first 15% of iterations, (2) is given by: $G(t) = G_0 \left(\frac{1-\beta t}{t_{max}}\right)$. During next 45% iterations (2) is defined by $G(t) = G_0 \exp\left(-\beta \frac{t}{t_{max}}\right)$ and ε in (3) is given by $\varepsilon(t) = \varepsilon_0 - \varepsilon_0 \frac{(t-0.15t_{max})}{0.85t_{max}}$. The remaining 40% of iterations $G(t)$ is set as a constant.	FLC	Find optimal parameters of a FLC for position control of a servo system	[46]
		PI	Find optimal parameters of a PI for position control of a servo system	[47]

Adaptive	Two mutation mechanisms are considered: $X_{i,1} = X_{r_1} + rand_1(X_{r_2} - X_{r_3}) + rand_2(X_{r_4} - X_{r_5})$ and $X_{i,2} = X_{r_1} + rand_1(X_{best} - X_{worst})$. On each iteration, the probability P_a of occurring the mutation $X_{i,a}$ with $a = 1, 2$ is given by $P_a = \frac{sr_a}{sr_1 + sr_2}$, where sr_a is the success rate of the mutation mechanism on past iterations.	NA	Applied for optimal reactive power dispatch and voltage control in power system operation	[48]
Chaotic	After (5), with a given probability, perform the chaotic search: $z_i(t) = \frac{x_{maxi} + x_{mini}}{2} + \frac{x_{maxi} - x_{mini}}{2} cx_i(t)$, where, $x_{maxi} = x_{best} + \delta$, $x_{mini} = x_{best} - \delta$ and $cx_i(t)$ is a chaotic map $\in [-1, 1] \setminus 0$. If $z_i(t)$ is fitter than x_{best} then $z_i(t)$ is the new solution.	NA	Find the optimal parameters of a hydraulic turbine governing system fuzzy model	[50]
		Model-free controller	The optimal model-free controller was designed according to the quadratic performance index and applied to a vibro-impact system	[51]
	(4) is replaced by: $F_i^d(t) = \sum_{j=1, j \neq i}^N C(t) F_{ij}^d(t)$, where $C(t)$ is a normalized chaotic map.	Robust controller	Optimal load frequency control settings applied to a micro grid	[66]
Chaotic neural oscillators	(2) is replaced by $G(t) = G_0 \times Z(t)$, with $Z(t) = 0.5(1 - L(t))$, where $L(t) = (V(t) - U(t))e^{-kt^2} + Y(t)$. Here, $Y(t) = \text{tansig}(J(t))$. $U(t)$ and $V(t)$ are updated over iterations as following: $U(t+1) = \text{tansig}(p_1 L(t) + p_2 U(t) - p_3 V(t) + p_4 (J(t) - \phi_u))$ and $V(t+1) = \text{tansig}(q_1 L(t) - q_2 U(t) - q_3 V(t) + q_4 (J(t) - \phi_v))$.	Robust FLC	Find optimal controller parameters with application to the hydraulic turbine governing system	[94]
		NA	Find the optimal path for humanoid robot to avoid dynamic obstacles	[52]
Cascade	After performing a global search using GSA, the Gradient Descent Method is used to perform a refined local search (see [95] additional details). After performing a global search using GSA, the PS is used to perform a refined local search (see [97] for additional details).	Lead-lag phase compensator	Find the optimal gains and lead-lag parameters of a power system stabilizer installed on synchronous generator	[96]
		PID	Find optimal automatic generation controller parameters to minimize frequency deviation of a multi-area electric power system	[98]
Hybrid GSA-FA	(5) is replaced by: $x_i^d(t+1) = x_i^d(t) + \alpha(x_j - x_i) + v_i^d(t+1)$, where $\alpha = \alpha_0 e^{-\gamma r^2}$	PI	Find optimal controller gains for the load frequency control problem of a power system	[99]
Hybrid GSA-GA	In each main iteration, $K\%$ of population is selected to evolve by using GA [100], and remaining population evolves using GSA. Then, solutions of both methods are combined. This process is repeated until the maximum iteration is achieved.	UPFC	Find optimal controller parameters to minimize system oscillations of a power system	[101]
		FLC	Find optimal controller parameters applied to speed control of a permanent magnet synchronous motor	[102]
Hybrid GSA-PSO	(6) is replaced by: $v_i^d(t+1) = w \times v_i^d(t) + k_1 rand_1 a_i^d(t) + k_2 rand_2 (x_{best}^d - x_i^d(t))$	PI	Find optimal speed controller parameters to minimize the ripple of a switched reluctance motor	[53]
		FLC/PID	Find optimal automatic generation controller parameters to minimize the frequency deviation of a electric power system	[54]
		NA	Find optimal settings of a multi-valve steam turbines system for power generation	[55]

**Hybrid
GSA-PSO**

(6) is replaced by:

$$v_i^d(t+1) = w \times v_i^d(t) + k_1 rand_1 a_i^d(t) + k_2 rand_2 (x_{best}^d - x_i^d(t))$$

(6) is replaced by:

$$v_i^d(t+1) = w \times v_i^d(t) + k_1 rand_1 (x_{best,i}^d - x_i^d(t)) + k_2 rand_2 \left(\frac{a_i^d(t) + x_{best}}{2} - x_i^d(t) \right)$$

NA	Find optimal controller parameters of a power system stabilizer, applied to a multi-machine power system	[56]
Neural Network MPC	Find optimal neural network parameters of a nonlinear continuous stirred tank reactor model used in the MPC	[57]
PID	Find optimal gains of PID to control the interconnection of two area power system	[58]
NA	Find optimal settings for the optimal reactive power dispatch problem	[59]
NA	The state estimation of a three-phase unbalanced distribution system is formulated as a nonlinear optimization problem which is solved by the proposed method	[60]
NA	Applied to state-of-charge optimization (charging control) in the electric vehicles charging	[61]
Neural PID	Find optimal initial settings of the controller applied as automatic load frequency controller of interconnected hybrid power system	[62]
Fuzzy SMC	Find optimal controller parameters to control a generator-based wind turbine, ensuring power extraction maximization and regulation of reactive power according to grid requirements	[63]
PID	Optimal PID for load frequency control of multi-source deregulated power system	[64]

3.2. Black-Hole algorithm

3.2.1. Overview

A novel heuristic optimization method, motivated by the behavior of stars around a black hole (Fig. 1b), was proposed by Hatamlou *et al.* [103] in 2013: the BH. Its search agents are represented by stars; the one with the highest fitness value is established as the black hole-agent, which attracts all the others aiming to mimic the behavior of a real black hole. A star-agent is absorbed when it crosses the so-called Schwarzschild radius, which results in the remotion of the agent from the search space. To maintain a balance in the number of agents, a new star-agent is added at a random position of the search space. Throughout the iterations, if any star-agent becomes fitter than the black hole-agent, then the role of black hole-agent will be performed in the next iteration. After a predefined stopping criterion, the optimal solution is obtained by the the black hole-agent in the last iteration [103]. Even though the BH is inspired by the behavior of the black hole phenomenon, it uses a conceptual form not supported by (Newtonian or Relativistic) physical laws already theorized to describe the dynamics of black holes.

Similarly to other population-based algorithms, the first step consists in generating an initial population of candidate solutions randomly distributed over the search space. Due to the small number of equations formulating this algorithm, its implementation is not complex, even though its high efficiency has been reported [104]. The BH algorithm is summarized in Fig. 3b. The original algorithm was established as follows. Let us consider a system with N agents, in which the position of the i th agent is defined by Eq. (1). After the initialization, the fitness values of the agents are evaluated, and the best candidate is selected as the black hole-agent. As natural black holes absorb the stars surrounding them, the i th agent is dragged towards the black hole. The positioning of each agent is defined by

$$x_i(t+1) = x_i(t) + rand (x_{BH} - x_i(t)), \quad (9)$$

where $rand$ is a random value in the interval $[0, 1]$. While mimicking the motion towards the black hole, if a star-agent becomes fitter than the black hole-agent in this new position, both this star-agent and the black hole-agent switch their positions. If during its movement, a star-agent crosses the event horizon of the black hole-agent, this star-agent “dies” and a new one is created randomly in the search space, to ensure a constant number of agents. The radius that defines the event horizon is given by

$$R = \frac{f_{BH}}{\sum_{i=1}^N f_i}, \quad (10)$$

where f_{BH} is the fitness value of the black hole and f_i is the fitness value of the i th star (agent).

3.2.2. BH and variations applied in control

Few applications using the BH and its variations were reported, as summarized in Table 4. The BH was mostly applied in the optimization of parameters and gains of controllers (the exception was the modified BH). By using the original version of the BH, the operation strategy (focused on finding the set point parameters) for a combined cooling, heating, and power system was optimized, such that the energy consumption, the system cost and the carbon dioxide emissions can be minimized [105]. Only a comparison with a PSO algorithm was conducted: while the PSO algorithm achieved optimal results with an objective function value minimized up to 0.595, the BH obtained was minimized up to 0.58, which represents the slight improvement of 2.5%. The original algorithm was also applied to enhance the power quality of an AC micro grid by searching the optimal Proportional-Integral Multiresonant controller (PIMR) gains that minimize the Total Harmonic Distortion (THD) [106]. The comparison was also carried out with PSO, but higher performances were observed, namely 33% improved objective function value and a faster convergence.

An improved version of the BH was found aiming to improve the motion of agents by introducing a new concept that prevents the dispersion of solutions: instead of a randomly generation, the obtained data of existing agents is used to generate new members (Table 4) [107]. This version was able to achieve good results when used to optimize the parameters of membership functions of a FLC. By computing the minimization of the carbon emissions, this method was able to provide improvements of 17% and 14%, over the GA

and PSO, respectively [107]. A similar formulation was used for urban traffic network control, leading to improvements of 29% compared to an already well-established approach [108]. This improved version was also applied to optimize the parameters of a Model-free SMC for a Frequency Load Controller, designed to regulate a micro grid [109]. The proposed approach provided the best regulation under load changes.

A modified version was proposed to optimize an extreme learning machine soft-sensor model to predict the grinding granularity [110]. Comparing to the original BH algorithm, this modified BH was upgraded by applying two well-known operators to the movement of the agents, namely the Golden Sine operator [111, 112, 113, 114], and the Levy flight operator [115, 116, 117]. These operators have already been used to modify other optimization algorithms, namely Bat Algorithm (BA), Salp Swarm Algorithm (SSA), Grey Wolf Optimizer (GWO) and Whale Optimization Algorithm (WOA) [112, 114, 118, 119], and its ability to improve the original BH algorithm has been recently demonstrated. Lower prediction errors were achieved in comparison to other methods, namely the original BH and the Golden Sine BH (without the Levy flight operator) (Fig. 4a).




Figure 3: (a) Standard GSA algorithm. (b) Standard BH algorithm. (c) Standard MOV algorithm. (d) Standard GSO algorithm.





Figure 4: (a) Error of grinding granularity using the proposed soft-sensor model with different optimization algorithms. Note that the Golden Sine Levy-flight BH (GSLBH-ELM) achieved better results than without Levy-flight operator (GSBH-ELM) and than the base algorithm (BH-ELM). Adapted with permission from Ref. [110]. (b) Displacement of a structure during an earthquake with and without structure control (MVO-based Optimized FLC). Reproduced with permission from Ref. [19].

Table 4: Applications of BH and variations of it in control systems found in literature from 2000 to 2023. NA - Not Applicable

Variation	Modified Equations	Controller	Application Description	Reference
Standard	NA	NA	Optimization of the set points of a combined cooling, heating, and power-ground source heat pump system.	[105]
	NA	PIMR	Optimization of the controller gains. The controller was applied to improve the power quality components of an AC microgrid.	[106]
Modified	After (9) perform the Golden Sine and Levy flight operators: $x_i(t+1) = x_i(t) + a \cdot \text{sign}(\text{rand} - 0.5) \otimes s$ $x_i(t+1) = \sin(r_1) x_i(t) - r_2 \sin(r_1) m_1 x_{BH} - m_2 x_i(t) $ where a , m_1 and m_2 are coefficients, s is the step size vector for Levy flight, r_1 is a random number in $[0, 2\pi]$ and r_2 is a random number in $[0, \pi]$	NA	Optimization of extreme learning machine (ELM) soft-sensor model on grinding process	[110]
Improved	(9) is changed for: $x_i(t+1) = x_i(t) + \text{rand}_1(x_{BH} - x_i(t)) + \text{rand}_2(x_r(t) - x_i(t))$ where $r \in [1, N]$	FLC	Applied to FLC membership functions parameters optimization. The controller was applied in a multi-objective dynamic optimal power flow framework.	[107]
	(10) is changed for: $R = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N \ x_i - x_{mean}\ }{N}$ New candidate solutions are created by: $x_{new} = x_{BH} + (2\text{rand}(1, N) - 1) \frac{\max(\ x_i - x_{BH}\)}{N}$	Model-Free SMC	Applied to optimize the parameters of Model-Free SMC. The controller is then applied as Frequency Load Controller in a microgrid.	[109]
		FLC	Applied in control of traffic signal scheduling and phase succession to ensure smooth traffic flow with the objective of minimize the waiting time and average queue length.	[108]

3.3. Multiverse algorithm

3.3.1. Overview

The MVO is a recent population-based optimization algorithm inspired in the multi-verse theory, focused on the interaction between universes, from which white-holes, black-holes and wormholes emerge [120]. While white-holes present similarities with universes under expansion, black-holes attract everything with their extreme gravitational force. Wormholes are responsible for connecting different parts of a universe, acting like space-time traveling tunnels. These three cosmic objects of MVO are illustrated in Fig. 1c.

Each solution of the MVO is analogous to a “universe”, and each solution dimension is an object that can be transmitted through “white-holes”, “black-holes” and “wormholes”. The objects are transferred from “white-holes” of a source-universe-solution to “black-holes” of a destination-universe-solution. Therefore, the population, corresponding to the set of universes-solutions, is described as

$$U = \begin{bmatrix} x_1^1 & x_1^2 & \cdots & x_1^d \\ x_2^1 & x_2^2 & \cdots & x_2^d \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ x_n^1 & x_n^2 & \cdots & x_n^d \end{bmatrix}$$

where d is the dimension of search space, and n is the number of candidate solutions. For each object x_i^j , which denotes the j th variable of i th universe-solution, the following comparison is performed:

$$x_i^j = \begin{cases} x_k^j & r_1 < NI(U_i) \\ x_i^j & r_1 \geq NI(U_i) \end{cases}$$

where $NI(U_i)$ is the normalized inflation rate of the i th universe, r_1 is a random number in $[0, 1]$, and k is a universe-solution selected by a roulette wheel selection mechanism [120]. The inflation rate of a universe-solution is a value proportional to the fitness of the corresponding solution. This mechanism performs the exchange of objects between universes-solutions; in order to provide local changes, wormhole tunnels are established between a specific universe-solution and the best universe-solution emerged at time t . The formulation of such mechanism is the one that follows:

$$x_i^j = \begin{cases} \begin{cases} X_j + \text{TDR} \cdot (r_4 \cdot (ub_j - lb_j) + lb_j) & r_3 < 0.5 \\ X_j - \text{TDR} \cdot (r_4 \cdot (ub_j - lb_j) + lb_j) & r_3 \geq 0.5 \end{cases} & r_2 < \text{WEP} \\ x_i^j & r_2 \geq \text{WEP} \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

where X_j is the j th variable of the best solution, TDR (traveling distance rate) and WEP (wormhole existence probability) are coefficients, lb_j and ub_j are respectively the lower and upper bounds of the j th variable, and r_2 , r_3 and r_4 are random numbers defined in $[0, 1]$. The MVO algorithm is illustrated in Fig. 3c.

3.3.2. MVO applied in control

Only this standard MVO was proposed so far, and its application is reduced to optimization of controller parameters, namely PID-derived and FLC controllers (Table 5). The first application in control systems of this method dates back to 2017, which was engineered to search for the optimal parameters of a PID plus double-derivative controller (PID+DD) to operate as a Load Frequency Controller on a power system [121]. Recently, the same problem was revisited using the same algorithm to optimize a Fractional Order Proportional Derivative Proportional Integral controller (FPDPI). MVO was also applied in the active structural control of a building (vibration control) by searching the optimal set of parameters for the membership functions of a FLC [19], which reduced the vibration of a structure during tests with Kobe earthquake data, as shown in Fig. 4b. The performance of the MVO was compared with other optimization metaheuristics (namely GA, PSO and GWO) using test functions. However, in all the aforementioned papers, no comparisons were found extending to other optimization methods considering real case problems.

Table 5: Applications of MOV in control systems found in literature from 2000 to 2023.

Variation	Controller	Application Description	Reference
Standard	PID+DD	Optimization of controller parameters. The controller was applied as a load frequency controller used to control the flow of steam to the turbines of a generator.	[121]
	FLC	Optimization of the membership functions. The FLC was applied in active control of structures in civil engineering.	[19]
	FPDPI	Optimization of the controller parameters. Controller applied in a multi area power system consisting in hydro, thermal, and gas power plants.	[122]

3.4. Galactic Swarm Optimization algorithm

3.4.1. Overview

To enhance the equilibrium between exploration and exploitation, the GSO was introduced in 2016 by Muthiah-Nakarajan and Noel [123]. This algorithm draws inspiration from the movement of galaxies and the stars within them. Stars are not uniformly distributed throughout the cosmos; rather, they cluster into galaxies, which are not evenly distributed.

While GSO has been conceptualized based on PSO, the authors emphasize that this choice was made primarily due to the simplicity of implementing PSO. They assert that GSO could be implemented using any population optimization heuristic [123]. Hence, the base method is not delineated to maintain generality.

To implement GSO, M galaxies are created, each containing N different stars. During each iteration of the algorithm, the core heuristic is executed for each galaxy to determine the optimal solution within each galaxy. If a superior solution to the current global one is discovered during this process, the global solution is updated. At the conclusion of this phase, each galaxy is represented by its best local solution. In the subsequent phase, the core heuristic is applied, with the galaxies acting as the search agents, moving towards the best solution. This iterative process continues until a stopping criterion is met.

In summary, GSO entails the application of a fundamental algorithm to ascertain the best local solution for each galaxy, followed by applying the algorithm at a broader level to determine the best global solution. Analogously, it can be conceptualized that during the initial phase, stars converge within each galaxy toward the star with the greatest mass, whereas in the subsequent phase, galaxies (clusters of stars) converge toward the galaxy with the greatest mass. The GSO algorithm is illustrated in Fig. 3d.

3.4.2. GSO applied in control

The utilization of GSO in system control remains relatively limited and under explored: only five distinct applications of this algorithm were identified. Among these cases, only one notably study employed the WOA algorithm as its foundation, while the remaining cases utilized PSO, as outlined in [123]. These applications encompass the optimization of FLC membership functions [124, 125], the refinement of micro grid parameters [126, 127], and the determination of optimal control parameters for an IoT network [128]. A summary of the research findings is presented in Table 6.

4. Attraction Phenomena Applied to Control of Dynamic Systems

4.1. Overview

Attraction is a fundamental phenomenon that governs a wide range of interactions across the universe. In both physical and engineering senses, attraction and gravitational potential embody the notion of entities drawn towards one another, whether in the physical space or within the complex relationships of intelligent natural entities. In the context of swarm intelligent systems, attraction plays a significant role in coordination of social organisms, including ants, bees, and birds, embedding the principles of collaboration, emergence, and decentralized decision-making. On the cosmos, gravity is the primary phenomena responsible for the attraction between bodies, formation of stars and planets, as well as to maintain stable orbits.

Table 6: Applications of GSO in control systems found in literature from 2000 to 2023. NA - Not Applicable

Embedded algorithm	Controller	Application Description	Reference
PSO	FLC	Optimization of the membership functions of the controller. The FLC was applied to an autonomous mobile robot for trajectory tracking under noise effects.	[124, 125]
PSO	FLC	Optimization of the membership functions. The FLC was applied to control the water level in a water tank.	[129]
PSO	NA	Optimization of the settings parameters to provide the optimal power flow of a hybrid energy micro grid.	[126]
PSO	PI	Optimization of a Maximum Power Point Tracking controller to control a micro grid composed by photovoltaic panels and wind generators.	[127]
PSO-WOA	NA	Finding the optimal settings for IoT network.	[128]

Inspired in the attraction phenomena, in the last decade, techniques to control swarms of intelligent systems have been developed, aiming to control both the swarm dynamics and its formation [130, 131]. The proposed controllers were designed using APF functions i.e., functions that mimic specific potential field. Considering $G(\delta)$ as a APF, it may comprise two components, the attraction $G_a(\cdot)$, and the repulsion $G_r(\cdot)$, and can only converge to a single equilibrium point, occurring at the minimum potential where $G_a(\cdot) = G_r(\cdot)$. Such approach defines controllers laws dependent on a resultant force $f(\cdot)$ due to the potential $G(\cdot)$: $f(\delta) = -\nabla G(\delta)$. This method was already used for trajectory path planning, where a APF is inputted in the kinetic models [132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137], and also as control laws for dynamic models [138, 139].

4.2. APF in control

Eleven APF control laws were already proposed, as presented in Table 7. All the APF were applied in the kinematics field, in particular in robotics, in which most of them (7 in 11) are focused on the robot swarm control, and some (4 in 11) are applications related to aircraft trajectory planning. Considering the attraction behavior, the majority of studies (X in 11) use the quadratic attractor $G_a(\delta) = k \|\delta^2\|$, with $k = \frac{1}{2}\lambda_1$ or a similar function only differing in the constant parameter k . This formulation was most likely defined due to its simplicity and linearization of the resultant force $f(\delta) = -\nabla G(\delta) = -\lambda_1\delta$. Regarding the repulsive case, the most common established function was $G_r(\delta) = \frac{1}{2}\lambda_2\lambda_3 \exp(-\|\delta^2\|/\lambda_3)$. Even though control dynamics are performed according to attraction and repulsion algorithms, it is important to emphasize that the proposed functions/ control laws are not inspired by potentials with physical or natural significance.

The APF was used to control a satellite cluster using the repulsive potential function $G_r(\delta) = \frac{1}{2}\lambda_2\lambda_3 \exp(-\|\delta^2\|/\lambda_3)$, where $\|\delta^2\|$ is the distance between two agents [132]. Self-collisions are avoided by summing the resulting potentials between all pairs of agents. A similar approach was used to control a mobile robot swarm to track moving target [133], as well as in a multiple fish robot system with a leader [135]. The capability of APF control to guide a swarm along a designated trajectory and ensure formations with specific shapes is illustrated in Fig. 5a and Fig. 5b. The attractive function $G_a(\delta) = \frac{1}{2}\lambda_1 \|\delta^2\|$ causes the agents to attract each other, generating the formation region. The swarm region is unique as the controlled systems are moved towards an equilibrium state of minimum potential. Considering the ideal kinetic model, the application of APF is given by $v(t+1) = v(t) - \nabla G(\delta)$, where $-\nabla G(\delta)$ defines the acceleration established by the dynamics related to the kinematic model [133, 135, 136].

Table 7: APFs focused on control system applications. G is the potential function and δ the distance between agents and targets / obstacles. $\|\cdot\|$ is the euclidean norm.

APF Equation	Type	Application	Reference
$G(\delta) = \frac{1}{2}\lambda_1 \ \delta^2\ + \frac{\lambda_2\lambda_3}{2} e^{-\frac{\ \delta\ ^2}{\lambda_3}}$	Attraction and Repulsion	Satellite cluster formation avoiding self collisions	[132]
$G(\delta) = \frac{1}{2}\lambda_1 \ \delta\ ^2$	Attraction	Swarm mechanical system following a target trajectory	[133]
$G(\delta) = \frac{1}{2}\lambda_1 \ \delta^2\ + \frac{\lambda_2\lambda_3}{2} e^{-\frac{\ \delta\ ^2}{\lambda_3}}$	Attraction and Repulsion	Swarm mechanical system formation avoiding self collisions	[133]
$G(\delta) = \frac{\lambda_1}{\ \delta\ ^2} - \lambda_2 \ln(\lambda_3 - \ \delta\ ^2) + \lambda_4$	Attraction and Repulsion	Robotic fish leader-follower formation flocking problem	[135]
$G(\delta) = \frac{\lambda_1}{2} \ \delta_1\ ^2 + \frac{\lambda_2}{2} \ \delta_2\ ^2 + \frac{\lambda_3\lambda_4}{2} e^{-\frac{\ \delta_3\ ^2}{\lambda_3}}$	Attraction and Repulsion	Path following control of a wireless sensor network avoiding self collision	[139]
$G(\delta) = \frac{1}{2}\lambda_1 \ \delta\ ^2$	Attraction	Quad-rotor path control towards a target	[137]
$G(\delta) = \frac{1}{2}\lambda_1 \left(\frac{1}{\ \delta\ } - \frac{1}{\lambda_2}\right)^2$, if $\ \delta\ \leq \lambda_2$	Repulsion	Quad-rotor obstacles avoidance	[137]
$G(\delta) = \lambda_1 \ \delta^2\ - \lambda_2 \ln(\ \delta\)$	Attraction and Repulsion	Swarm formation for mobile odor source localization problem avoiding self collisions	[136]
$G(\delta) = \lambda_1 \ \delta^2\ - \lambda_2 \ln\left(\frac{1}{\lambda_3} \ \delta^2\ - 1\right)$	Attraction	Agent swarm formation shape control	[134]
$G(\delta) = -\frac{\lambda_1}{2} \ln\left(\frac{\ \delta^2\ }{\lambda_2}\right)$	Repulsion	Agent swarm self collision avoidance	[134]
$G(\delta) = \frac{\lambda_1}{2} \ \delta^2\ + \frac{\lambda_2}{2} \left(\frac{1}{\delta} - \frac{1}{\lambda_3}\right)^2$	Attraction and Repulsion	Movement control of multi-UAV system with leader following and fixed obstacle avoidance	[138]

In such cases, the APF method is used to generate desired trajectory, but a dynamic controller is needed to effectively track the defined trajectories ensuring robustness, i.e., a controller with compensating ability in response to disturbances deviating the controlled system from desired trajectories. Differently, the APF was designed taken $G_a(\delta) = -\lambda_2 \ln(\lambda_3 - \|\delta\|^2)$ and $G_r(\delta) = \frac{\lambda_1}{\|\delta\|^2}$, where $\|\delta\|$ is also the distance between agents [135]. In such case, a FLC was designed for path tracking defined by the potential function method. When the APF is inputted to the dynamic model, the gradient of the potential function is introduced on the control input of the dynamic model, as follows: $x(k+1) = f(x(k)) + u(k)$; $u(k+1) = u(k) - \nabla G(\delta)$ [138, 139], where $x(k)$ and $u(k)$ are the current state and the control input, respectively. The APF was also incorporated in the dynamic model, aiming to control mobile collectors [139]. The proposed function is composed by three components, two of them implementing attractiveness dynamics, and another one implementing repulsiveness dynamics. The first attractive component is used to eliminate the state estimation error, by defining $\frac{\lambda_1}{2} \|\delta_1\|^2$, where δ_1 is given by $x(k) - \hat{x}(k)$, and $\hat{x}(k)$ is the estimated state. The second component was defined as $\frac{\lambda_2}{2} \|\delta_2\|^2$, with $\delta_2 = x(k) - x_d(k)$, where $x_d(k)$ is the reference or the desired system state, such that it is able to move the system under control towards the desired states. In

the repulsive component, δ_3 is the distance between the agents, and it is used to avoid self-collisions. The strategy based on incorporating the APF in the control law is highly promising to tackle feedback systems, involving the fundamental concept of attraction of system state towards the required state according to a natural rationale found in the real physical universe.

5. Discussion

Most studies perform comparisons with other well-established algorithms to demonstrate their performance. Nonetheless, given the wide range of existing metaheuristics and optimization methods, conducting a comprehensive comparison with all of them is hardly feasible, making it difficult to conclusively determine which is the best algorithm. Based on the analyses here performed, the GSA exhibited superior performances in 20 (out of 20) control problems when compared to PSO and GA. Additionally, it outperformed Differential Evolution (DE) and Artificial Bee Colony algorithm (ABC) in 6 (out of 6) control problems. These findings, depicted in Fig. 6a, suggest the superiority of GSA over PSO and GA. While other comparisons are presented, they lack significant expression for a meaningful analysis. Indeed, the BH demonstrated a performance superiority over PSO in 2 cases (out of 2), and MVO outperformed DE, PSO, GA, and GWO in 4 cases (out of 4). This discrepancy highlights the disparity in the number of studies applied to control between GSA and other methods inspired by gravitational attraction (BH and MVO). Even so, it is important to recall the No Free Lunch theorem [140], which states that there is not a single algorithm that outperforms all others across all metrics and problems: performance is inherently problem-dependent.

The GSA provides several advantages, namely its minimal need for hyper-parameter adjustment, as it only requires three parameters: G_0 , β , and ε . Moreover, it typically reaches rapid convergences even though its non-complex implementation (see Fig. 2d), and features intuitive and easily interpretable movements of agents. GSA also facilitates the incorporation of adaptation mechanisms, as well as the resolution of constrained problems. However, it can exhibit low agent dispersion during the final stages, resulting in reduced exploration capabilities. Additionally, GSA lacks memory, and may become trapped in local minima during the latter iterations. Other limitations include the blind evolution of the variable G , and the need to predefine the maximum number of iterations, as the evolution of G is dependent of the duration of the established optimization process.

Concerning the BH algorithm, it has been formulated using a straightforward mechanism, easily understandable and implemented, only requiring the computation of two equations. Notably, the BH is devoid of hyper-parameters, ensuring performances independent of user settings. This algorithm effectively tackles problems with constraints, and maintains a strong exploration capacity across all iterations. When a solution is eliminated, it is promptly replaced by a new one randomly generated within the search space, ensuring population dispersion. Despite its simplicity, its few parameters hardly allow the inclusion of adaptation mechanisms in its original formulation, as well as the ability to effectively balance exploration and exploitation. It relies solely on randomization, potentially leading to extended convergence times. Furthermore, its formulation lacks is not supported by real physical laws, which significantly deviates from an authentic alignment with natural inspired rationality.

The MVO is recognized for its rapid convergence and robust exploration capabilities, facilitated by solution mutation and crossover. It only requires one hyper-parameter to determine its exploration ability. However, MVO poses relevant challenges in interpretation, due to its complex nature and hypothetical astronomical objects. Moreover, it shares the limitation of requiring the predefinition of the maximum number of iterations. Additionally, auxiliary mechanisms need to be incorporated into its algorithm, such as the roulette wheel selection and sorting procedures, the latter being computationally heavier due to the sorting of solutions in each iteration.

The novelty of GSO is indeed questionable, given that its architecture bears resemblance to multi-layered versions of other algorithms. Additionally, its classification as an optimization algorithm is debatable, as the proposed concept lacks an inherent optimization mechanism and relies on other mechanisms. Therefore, GSO can be perceived more as an advancement over existing algorithms, rather than a novel optimization approach. Furthermore, while GSO claims inspiration from gravitational attraction between stars and galaxies, its attraction mechanisms are contingent upon the underlying algorithm, which may or may not

incorporate gravitational principles. This reliance on external algorithms limits the argumentation presented by the authors presenting the GSO as an optimization method. Although the potential of utilizing GSO to enhance the performance of algorithms like GSA or BH remains unexplored, such an endeavor holds strong motivation for future research. These algorithms demonstrate complementary foundational inspirations, suggesting that exploring their integration could yield promising results.

To address the mentioned limitations, researchers have been developing enhancements and modifications, introducing new mechanisms and hybridization, as highlighted in [Table 3](#) and [Table 4](#). However, concerning variants of algorithms applied to control, the most relevant developments have been focused on the use of GSA. In the case of BH algorithms, only two variants have been identified, while only the original MVO algorithm was already applied in control applications. Therefore, it is mandatory to highlight other variants aiming to implement more sophisticated mechanisms, even if they remain untested in the field of system control, as they hold potential to stimulate future excellence research in a multidisciplinary basis. Relevant studies are detailed in [Table 8](#). Included are other GSA relevant variants: (1) a Curved Space GSA, where a dimension reduction technique is applied to the problem search space [\[143\]](#); (2) a Memory-based GSA, where the concept of personal best is introduced [\[144\]](#); (3) adaptive versions, that introduce novel mechanisms to guide agents out of local optimum trapping [\[145\]](#), and a personal gravitational constant [\[146\]](#); (4) hierarchical and distributed GSA, where the overall population is divided in subsets of populations ([Fig. 6b](#)) with multi layers of hierarchy ([Fig. 6c](#)) [\[147, 142, 141, 148\]](#); and (5) Multiple chaos GSA a mechanism that uses several chaotic maps [\[149, 150\]](#), supported by the performance superiority of multiple embedded chaos [\[151\]](#). Regarding BH, other variants include: (1) an improved BH, which includes a crossover mechanism, inspired in Genetic algorithms, to generate new agents, avoiding a random generation [\[152\]](#); (2) a Chaotic inertia weight BH which improves the local search by using chaotic maps [\[153\]](#); and (3) a Multi-population BH which uses multiple populations of agents, instead of a single one [\[154\]](#). To enhance MVO, it was already proposed: (1) Chaotic MVO [\[155\]](#), by introducing the chaotic behavior in the standard MVO, as already proposed in other algorithms [\[156, 157, 158\]](#); and (2) a hybrid Sine-Cosine-MVO algorithm [\[159, 160\]](#).

Given the wide range of metaheuristics and their variants [\[161, 162\]](#), the question arises: is modification and hybridization the path to higher-performance algorithms? Thyamianis *et al.* [\[161\]](#) reported evidence suggesting that hybridization and the inclusion of additional mechanisms can have positive effects on nature-inspired algorithms. However, they highlight that the additional algorithm complexification can also result in not relevant improvements in exploration and exploitation. Piotrowski *et al.* [\[163\]](#) also question the complexity inherent to innovative hybrid algorithms: as complexity of the numerous modifications to basic algorithms increases, the risk of discouraging their use also increases. There is supporting evidence suggesting that simplifying algorithms can enhance transparency and performance [\[163\]](#). Indeed, modifications to nature-inspired algorithms often introduce artificial (not-natural inspired) elements into basic algorithms, in a clear opposition to their primary foundations, which stemmed from their assumed simplicity of interpretation and use, grounded in natural origins. Another relevant contradiction identified in the analyzed algorithms is their formulation without explicit use of real astrophysics laws, even though they are labeled as nature-inspired algorithms. Notice that BH and MVO algorithms only incorporate nature-inspired concepts without a rigorous mathematical foundation of the related phenomena. Concerning the GSA, although it seems to have the strongest connection to the real astrophysical nature, Gauci *et al.* [\[164\]](#) concluded that it cannot be truly inspired by Newton's laws of gravity, because the square of the distance is disregarded. Indeed, there is strong evidence suggesting that the force model formulated so far for the GSA algorithms does not rely on the distance between agents at all [\[164\]](#). Thus, the movement mechanism in the GSA is primarily proportional to the fitness of the solutions, as the division by the distance between agents mainly serves to normalize it. Based on this analysis, there is evidence indicating that the movement of agents in the GSA bears similarities to that of the PSO.

Finally, we must highlight that, the use of APF emerged as the most closely related approach to leveraging gravitational attraction or the dynamics of black holes in the development and design of controllers. The results obtained through the combination of attraction and repulsion functions are intuitive and straightforward to interpret, rendering this approach particularly appealing. Nevertheless, the use of dynamics inspired in Newtonian or Einsteinian gravitation, including as it occurs in black holes, in control systems has not yet been deeply researched: they have only been an inspiration-trigger only aiming to design new

methods for optimization problems of well-known control methods (*e.g.* PID and FLC controllers). To our knowledge, no control methods were developed whose formalization is directly and truly inspired by gravitational attraction laws, and related mathematical Newtonian/ Einsteinian-based formulation.




Figure 5: (a) Example of swarm trajectory following the leader (green mark) by using APF control. Adapted with permission from Ref. [136]. (b) Simulation of swarm following a trajectory $\phi(t)$ (red line) by using APF control. The black circles are the initial positions of the agents and the dotted lines are the paths traveled by the agents. Three temporal snapshots of the agents' states are depicted - magenta: $t = 10$ s; green: $t = 50$ s; blue: $t = 80$ s. Adapted with permission from Ref. [134].




Figure 6: (a) The number of studies in the control field wherein the GSA exhibits a superior optimization capacity compared to other algorithms documented in the literature. (b) Population distributed structure of Distributed Multi-Layer Gravitational Search Algorithm. Reproduced with permission from Ref. [141]. (c) Illustrative population structure of Hierarchical Multi-Layered Gravitational Search Algorithm. Reproduced with permission from Ref. [142].

Table 8: Other recent relevant variants of GSA, BH and MVO, not applied in the control field.

Base method	Designation	Concept novelty description	Reference
GSA	Curved Space GSA	Feasible solutions of GSA may be contained in a manifold of lower dimensions, in such a way that, according to the Euclidean distance, the agents may seem close, although they are far apart. The proposed modification calculates the distance between agents along the manifold, instead of directly calculate the Euclidean distance, by utilizing diffusion maps as dimensionality reduction	[143]
	Memory-based GSA	This algorithm ensures that the best position of any agent (<i>pbest</i>) is stored as the agent's personal best position, and thus, the new positions of the agents, are always calculated based on the previous best values, such that the path towards the best solution is not lost. In this formulation $R_{ij}(t)$ is computed by: $R_{ij}(t) = \ X_i(t), pbest_j(t)\ $	[144]
	Adaptive position-guided GSA (disGSA)	A novel mechanism is proposed to guide agents out of local optimum trapping in the direction of global best solution: $v_i^d(t+1) = rand \times v_i^d(t) + c_1 a_i^d(t) + c_2 a_{i2}^d(t)$, where $a_{i2}^d(t) = \frac{F_{i2}^d(t)}{M_i(t)}$ and $F_{i2}^d(t) = \sum_{j \in Dbest, j \neq i} rand_j F_{ij}^d(t)$. $Dbest$ is a sorted set of D_i defined as $D_i(t) = \frac{R_{i,best}(t)}{R_{i,worst}(t) + \epsilon}$.	[145]
	Self-adaptive and aggregative learning GSA	This method proposes an adaptive mechanism wherein each agent possesses its own gravitational constant, defined as: $G_i(t) = \begin{cases} G_i(t)r_i(t) & \text{if } counter > \theta \text{ and } rand < p \\ G_i(t) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$, where $r_i(t) = \left \log \left(\frac{ a_i(t) }{G_i(t)} \right) \right $. An aggregative mechanism was also included, with (4) being replaced by: $F_i^d(t) = \sum_{j=1}^k Y_i(j)$, with $Y_i(j) = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^j G_k(t)}{j} \left\{ \frac{M_i(t)}{R_{i,k} + \epsilon} \sum_{k=1, k \neq j}^j r_k M_k(t) [x_k^d(t) - x_i^d(t)] \right\}$	[146]
	Multi hierarchical layer GSA	A hierarchical population structure categorizes individuals into layers based on specific criteria, guiding their evolution in a systematically basis. Layers, organized from top to bottom like a tree, influence individuals progressively. This hierarchical arrangement fosters interactive relationships among layers, shaping the evolution of the population.	[147, 142]
	Distributed and hierarchical GSA	In addition to the hierarchical layers with varying levels, the population is also distributed into several sub-populations, each one segmented into hierarchical layers.	[141, 148]
	Multiple chaos GSA	Multiple chaotic maps into the GSA are incorporated as follows: (1) In each iteration, a new chaotic map is selected randomly; (2) The agents undergo mutation using all the different chaotic maps under consideration. Among the solutions generated, the one with the best fitness value is preserved; (3) The probability of selecting a specific chaotic map in each iteration is dynamically adapted based on its success rate.	[149, 150]
BH	Improved BH	With a certain probability, when a new agent is created, the process involves crossing over two existing feasible solutions instead of randomly generating a new one.	[152]
	Chaotic inertia weight BH	This algorithm uses chaos theory to enrich the search behavior. A hiper-parameter named inertia weight (w) is introduced to control the balance between exploration and exploitation, with w given by: $w(t) = (w_{max} - w_{min}) \left(\frac{t_{max} - t}{t_{max}} \right) + w_{min} C(t)$, where $C(t)$ is a chaotic map. Therefore, (9) is replaced by $x_i(t+1) = w(t)x_i(t) + rand (x_{BH} - x_i(t))$	[153]
	Multi-Population BH	This algorithm has the same formulation of the base version but uses multiple populations instead of a single one. At the end, the solution is the best agent of all populations	[154]
MVO	Chaotic MVO	This algorithm proposes to replace r_4 in (11) by a chaotic map, to improve the local search ability of standard MVO	[155]
	Sine Cosine MVO	By using a sine cosine mechanism, (11) is replaced by: $x_i^j = \begin{cases} \begin{cases} AP + TDR \cdot \left(2r_6 X_j - x_i^j \right) \sin(2\pi r_5) & r_3 < 0.5 \\ AP - TDR \cdot \left(2r_6 X_j - x_i^j \right) \cos(2\pi r_5) & r_3 \geq 0.5 \end{cases} & r_2 < WEP \\ x_i^j & r_2 \geq WEP \end{cases}, \text{ where } AP = (X_j + x_i^j) / 2$	[159, 160]

6. Conclusions

Significant scientific breakthroughs have been carried out in the field of Control Engineering using universe-inspired algorithms. Two main categories have been the focus of such advances: optimization algorithms applied in control problems (GSA, BH, MVO, and GSO), where main improvements were achieved in the scope of control parameters optimization; and the identification of a proper control method, inspired by the attraction between bodies, known as Artificial Potential Fields, which was mainly used to guide agents to an equilibrium state defined by choosing appropriate attraction and repulsion functions.

GSA algorithms has been designed according to the gravity law, and the movement of the agents is due to gravitational forces, which allow the information transfer between agents, as masses within the gravitational system are affected by one another. Most results obtained by GSA were able to provide superior results in comparison with GA and PSO. Concerning the BH algorithms, two significant advantages were identified: (i) its structure is not complex, and its implementation is easily performed; (ii) it does not raise parameter tuning issues. For these reasons, it is considered a feasible option when fast and accurate results are required within a short period of time. MVO and GSO are the most recent proposed algorithms, and, for this reason, the number of studies analyzing their performance and characteristics remains limited. Applications and modifications carried out to GSA, BH, MVO, and GSO algorithms have revealed that such concepts can be used in a wide range of control problems, and can still evolve towards improved performances. APF represents the closest approach to natural gravitational phenomena by introducing artificial attraction behaviors. Therefore, future high-sophisticated control systems inspired by black-hole attraction dynamics can be engineered if they are further analyzed and considered.

Some difficulties arise when effective conclusions must be stated. On the one hand, only few studies present the data in a clear way or report meaningful comparisons; on the other hand, relevant data is lacking in most studies (such as convergence times). Besides, the comparison between the different approaches here analyzed is hard to achieve, due to the influence of: (i) the diversity of methodologies ; (ii) the diversity of the objective functions; (iii) the parametrisation of the algorithms, as different parameters can conduct to different results; and (iv) the diversity of the applications and related scopes. Despite all these problems, the achieved results suggest that optimization and proper control methods inspired by gravitation and black holes attraction perform better than other approaches, namely the PSO, while ensuring easier implementation and interpretation. Nevertheless, these results highlight the capability of black holes, gravitational attraction, and universe dynamics in general, to overcome many control engineering problems, even though they are still limited to the field of optimization and metaheuristics. Likewise, future studies may explore realist universe-related dynamics in order to design effective control methods. To date, no control methods have been truly designed from scientific formulations related to real astrophysical phenomena. This fact, together with the results achieved in this study, provides new research directions where highly innovative concepts can be developed, namely controller ruled by astrophysics-like laws to establish effective bridges between black hole physics and automatic control. Attraction may behave as a feedback mechanism of the distance between the considered masses. Consequently, future controllers can be built upon natural feedback interactions inspired by the gravitational attraction towards the singularity of black holes. Supported by analogies with physics, where nothing can escape from a black hole once the Schwarzschild radius is crossed, new concepts can established such stable equilibrium points.. These are highly promising future prospects that overcome the methods here discussed and analyzed, as they do not employ control approaches based on artificial phenomena, avoiding then to neglect the rationality and effectiveness inherent of natural systems.

Data availability statement

No data was used for the research described in the article.

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

R.M.C.B. and M.P.S.S. were supported by the Portuguese Foundation for Science and Technology (FCT) (PhD grant reference: 2023.01947.BD; project references: UIDB/00481/2020 and UIDP/00481/2020; DOI 10.54499/UIDB/00481/2020, <https://doi.org/10.54499/UIDB/00481/2020>, and DOI 10.54499/UIDP/00481/2020, <https://doi.org/10.54499/UIDP/00481/2020>). D.F.M.T. and C.A.R.H were supported by FCT through project UIDB/04106/2020 (DOI 10.54499/UIDB/04106/2020, <https://doi.org/10.54499/UIDB/04106/2020>).

References

- [1] A. N. K. Nasir, A. A. A. Razak, Opposition-based spiral dynamic algorithm with an application to optimize type-2 fuzzy control for an inverted pendulum system, *Expert Systems with Applications* 195 (January) (2022) 116661. [doi:10.1016/j.eswa.2022.116661](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2022.116661).
- [2] H. I. Ali, *Swarm Intelligence to Robust Control Design*, United Scholars Publications, New York, 2018.
- [3] K. C. Steer, A. Wirth, S. K. Halgamuge, The rationale behind seeking inspiration from nature, in: *Nature-inspired algorithms for optimisation*, Springer, 2009, pp. 51–76.
- [4] J. Fu, Z. Ma, Y. Fu, T. Chai, Hybrid adaptive control of nonlinear systems with non-Lipschitz nonlinearities, *Systems & Control Letters* 156 (2021) 105012.
- [5] X. Yu, Y. Feng, Z. Man, Terminal sliding mode control—an overview, *IEEE Open Journal of the Industrial Electronics Society* 2 (2020) 36–52.
- [6] R. P. Agarwal, D. Baleanu, J. J. Nieto, D. F. M. Torres, Y. Zhou, A survey on fuzzy fractional differential and optimal control nonlocal evolution equations, *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics* 339 (2018) 3–29. [doi:10.1016/j.cam.2017.09.039](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cam.2017.09.039).
- [7] X. Jin, K. Chen, Y. Zhao, J. Ji, P. Jing, Simulation of hydraulic transplanting robot control system based on fuzzy PID controller, *Measurement* 164 (2020) 108023.
- [8] L.-B. Wu, H. Wang, X.-Q. He, D.-Q. Zhang, Decentralized adaptive fuzzy tracking control for a class of uncertain large-scale systems with actuator nonlinearities, *Applied Mathematics and Computation* 332 (2018) 390–405.
- [9] Z. Yao, J. Yao, F. Yao, Q. Xu, M. Xu, W. Deng, Model reference adaptive tracking control for hydraulic servo systems with nonlinear neural-networks, *ISA transactions* 100 (2020) 396–404.
- [10] R. Ibrahim, M. O. Shafiq, Augmented score-cam: High resolution visual interpretations for deep neural networks, *Knowledge-Based Systems* 252 (2022) 109287.
- [11] A. Sarabakha, C. Fu, E. Kayacan, Intuit before tuning: Type-1 and type-2 fuzzy logic controllers, *Applied Soft Computing* 81 (2019) 105495.
- [12] C. Aranha, C. L. Camacho Villalón, F. Campelo, M. Dorigo, R. Ruiz, M. Sevaux, K. Sörensen, T. Stützle, Metaphor-based metaheuristics, a call for action: the elephant in the room, *Swarm Intelligence* 16 (1) (2022) 1–6.
- [13] E. Rashedi, E. Rashedi, H. Nezamabadi-Pour, A comprehensive survey on gravitational search algorithm, *Swarm and evolutionary computation* 41 (2018) 141–158.
- [14] L. Abualigah, Multi-verse optimizer algorithm: a comprehensive survey of its results, variants, and applications, *Neural Computing and Applications* 32 (16) (2020) 12381–12401.
- [15] M. Thymianis, A. Tzanetos, G. Dounias, V. Koutras, Hybridization in nature inspired algorithms as an approach for problems with multiple goals: An application on reliability–redundancy allocation problems, *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence* 121 (2023) 105980.
- [16] E. Rashedi, H. Nezamabadi-pour, S. Saryazdi, GSA: A Gravitational Search Algorithm, *Information Sciences* 179 (13) (2009) 2232–2248. [doi:10.1016/j.ins.2009.03.004](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ins.2009.03.004).
- [17] I. Newton, *The Principia: mathematical principles of natural philosophy*, Univ of California Press, 1999.
- [18] S. Kumar, D. Datta, Sanjay Kumar Singh, Black Hole Algorithm and Its Applications, *Studies in Computational Intelligence* 575 (December) (2015) v–vii. [doi:10.1007/978-3-319-11017-2](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-11017-2).
- [19] M. Azizi, S. A. M. Ghasemi, R. G. Ejlali, S. Talatahari, Optimal tuning of fuzzy parameters for structural motion control using multiverse optimizer, *The Structural Design of Tall and Special Buildings* 28 (13) (2019) e1652.
- [20] P. A. M. Dirac, Cosmological models and the Large Numbers hypothesis, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. A. Mathematical and Physical Sciences* 338 (1615) (1974) 439–446. [doi:10.1098/rspa.1974.0095](https://doi.org/10.1098/rspa.1974.0095).
- [21] T. A. Khan, S. H. Ling, A novel hybrid gravitational search particle swarm optimization algorithm, *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence* 102 (March) (2021) 104263. [doi:10.1016/j.engappai.2021.104263](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engappai.2021.104263).
- [22] R. K. Sahu, S. Panda, S. Padhan, A novel hybrid gravitational search and pattern search algorithm for load frequency control of nonlinear power system, *Applied Soft Computing Journal* 29 (2015) 310–327. [doi:10.1016/j.asoc.2015.01.020](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asoc.2015.01.020).
- [23] E. Rashedi, H. Nezamabadi-Pour, S. Saryazdi, Filter modeling using gravitational search algorithm, *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence* 24 (1) (2011) 117–122. [doi:10.1016/j.engappai.2010.05.007](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.engappai.2010.05.007).
- [24] F. Zhao, F. Xue, Y. Zhang, W. Ma, C. Zhang, H. Song, A hybrid algorithm based on self-adaptive gravitational search algorithm and differential evolution, *Expert Systems with Applications* 113 (2018) 515–530. [doi:10.1016/j.eswa.2018.07.008](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2018.07.008).

- [25] J. Ji, S. Gao, S. Wang, Y. Tang, H. Yu, Y. Todo, Self-Adaptive Gravitational Search Algorithm with a Modified Chaotic Local Search, *IEEE Access* 5 (2017) 17881–17895. doi:10.1109/ACCESS.2017.2748957.
- [26] G. Sun, P. Ma, J. Ren, A. Zhang, X. Jia, A stability constrained adaptive alpha for gravitational search algorithm, *Knowledge-Based Systems* 139 (2018) 200–213. doi:10.1016/j.knsys.2017.10.018.
- [27] C. Li, L. Chang, Z. Huang, Y. Liu, N. Zhang, Parameter identification of a nonlinear model of hydraulic turbine governing system with an elastic water hammer based on a modified gravitational search algorithm, *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence* 50 (2016) 177–191.
- [28] S. Deepa, J. Rizwana, Minimization of losses and facts installation cost using proposed differential gravitational search algorithm optimization technique, *Journal of Vibration and Control* 23 (2) (2017) 235–251.
- [29] K.-H. Lu, C.-M. Hong, Q. Xu, Recurrent wavelet-based elman neural network with modified gravitational search algorithm control for integrated offshore wind and wave power generation systems, *Energy* 170 (2019) 40–52.
- [30] J. Kennedy, R. Eberhart, Particle swarm optimization, in: *Proceedings of ICNN'95-international conference on neural networks*, Vol. 4, IEEE, 1995, pp. 1942–1948.
- [31] S. Mahapatra, A. Jha, B. Panigrahi, Hybrid technique for optimal location and cost sizing of thyristor controlled series compensator to upgrade voltage stability, *IET Generation, Transmission & Distribution* 10 (8) (2016) 1921–1927.
- [32] Y. Li, D. Wang, S. Zhou, X. Wang, Intelligent parameter identification for robot servo controller based on improved integration method, *Sensors* 21 (12) (2021) 4177.
- [33] C. Li, N. Zhang, X. Lai, J. Zhou, Y. Xu, Design of a fractional-order pid controller for a pumped storage unit using a gravitational search algorithm based on the cauchy and gaussian mutation, *Information Sciences* 396 (2017) 162–181.
- [34] N. Rojas-Morales, M.-C. R. Rojas, E. M. Ureta, A survey and classification of opposition-based metaheuristics, *Computers & Industrial Engineering* 110 (2017) 424–435.
- [35] T. Si, D. Bhattacharya, S. Nayak, P. B. Miranda, U. Nandi, S. Mallik, U. Maulik, H. Qin, Pcobl: A novel opposition-based learning strategy to improve metaheuristics exploration and exploitation for solving global optimization problems, *IEEE Access* (2023).
- [36] M. Agarwal, G. M. S. Srivastava, Opposition-based learning inspired particle swarm optimization (opso) scheme for task scheduling problem in cloud computing, *Journal of Ambient Intelligence and Humanized Computing* 12 (10) (2021) 9855–9875.
- [37] A. A. Ewees, M. Abd Elaziz, D. Oliva, A new multi-objective optimization algorithm combined with opposition-based learning, *Expert Systems with Applications* 165 (2021) 113844.
- [38] S. Shekhawat, A. Saxena, Development and applications of an intelligent crow search algorithm based on opposition based learning, *ISA transactions* 99 (2020) 210–230.
- [39] S. Dhargupta, M. Ghosh, S. Mirjalili, R. Sarkar, Selective opposition based grey wolf optimization, *Expert Systems with Applications* 151 (2020) 113389.
- [40] A. Banerjee, V. Mukherjee, S. Ghoshal, Intelligent controller for load-tracking performance of an autonomous power system, *Ain Shams Engineering Journal* 5 (4) (2014) 1167–1176.
- [41] B. Shaw, V. Mukherjee, S. Ghoshal, Solution of reactive power dispatch of power systems by an opposition-based gravitational search algorithm, *International Journal of Electrical Power & Energy Systems* 55 (2014) 29–40.
- [42] H. R. Tizhoosh, Opposition-based learning: a new scheme for machine intelligence, in: *International conference on computational intelligence for modelling, control and automation and international conference on intelligent agents, web technologies and internet commerce (CIMCA-IAWTIC'06)*, Vol. 1, IEEE, 2005, pp. 695–701.
- [43] M. Aghaie, S. Mahmoudi, Multi objective loading pattern optimization of pwrs with fuzzy logic controller based gravitational search algorithm, *Nuclear Engineering and Design* 322 (2017) 1–13.
- [44] R.-E. Precup, R.-C. David, E. M. Petriu, S. Preitl, M.-B. Rădac, Fuzzy logic-based adaptive gravitational search algorithm for optimal tuning of fuzzy-controlled servo systems, *IET Control Theory & Applications* 7 (1) (2013) 99–107.
- [45] M. A. Díaz-Cortés, E. Cuevas, J. Gálvez, O. Camarena, A new metaheuristic optimization methodology based on fuzzy logic, *Applied Soft Computing* 61 (2017) 549–569.
- [46] R.-E. Precup, R.-C. David, E. M. Petriu, S. Preitl, M.-B. Radac, Novel adaptive gravitational search algorithm for fuzzy controlled servo systems, *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics* 8 (4) (2012) 791–800.
- [47] R.-E. Precup, R.-C. David, E. M. Petriu, M.-B. Radac, S. Preitl, Adaptive gsa-based optimal tuning of pi controlled servo systems with reduced process parametric sensitivity, robust stability and controller robustness, *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics* 44 (11) (2014) 1997–2009.
- [48] T. Niknam, M. R. Narimani, R. Azizpanah-Abarghooee, B. Bahmani-Firouzi, Multiobjective optimal reactive power dispatch and voltage control: a new opposition-based self-adaptive modified gravitational search algorithm, *IEEE Systems Journal* 7 (4) (2013) 742–753.
- [49] I. Zelinka, Q. B. Diep, V. Snášel, S. Das, G. Innocenti, A. Tesi, F. Schoen, N. V. Kuznetsov, Impact of chaotic dynamics on the performance of metaheuristic optimization algorithms: An experimental analysis, *Information Sciences* 587 (2022) 692–719.
- [50] C. Li, J. Zhou, J. Xiao, H. Xiao, Hydraulic turbine governing system identification using t-s fuzzy model optimized by chaotic gravitational search algorithm, *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence* 26 (9) (2013) 2073–2082.
- [51] X.-j. Wei, N.-z. Li, W.-c. Ding, C.-h. Zhang, Model-free chaos control based on ahgsa for a vibro-impact system, *Nonlinear Dynamics* 94 (2018) 845–855.
- [52] Vikas, D. R. Parhi, Multi-robot path planning using a hybrid dynamic window approach and modified chaotic neural oscillator-based hyperbolic gravitational search algorithm in a complex terrain, *Intelligent Service Robotics* 16 (2) (2023) 213–230.
- [53] N. Saha, S. Panda, Speed control with torque ripple reduction of switched reluctance motor by hybrid many optimizing

- liaison gravitational search technique, *Engineering science and technology, an international journal* 20 (3) (2017) 909–921.
- [54] M. Mohanty, R. Kumar Sahu, S. Panda, A novel hybrid many optimizing liaisons gravitational search algorithm approach for agc of power systems, *Automatika: časopis za automatiku, mjerenje, elektroniku, računarstvo i komunikacije* 61 (1) (2020) 158–178.
- [55] S. Duman, N. Yorukeren, I. H. Altas, A novel modified hybrid psogsa based on fuzzy logic for non-convex economic dispatch problem with valve-point effect, *International Journal of Electrical Power & Energy Systems* 64 (2015) 121–135.
- [56] R. K. Khadanga, J. K. Satapathy, Time delay approach for pss and sssc based coordinated controller design using hybrid pso-gsa algorithm, *International Journal of Electrical Power & Energy Systems* 71 (2015) 262–273.
- [57] S. Deepa, I. Baranilingesan, Optimized deep learning neural network predictive controller for continuous stirred tank reactor, *Computers & Electrical Engineering* 71 (2018) 782–797.
- [58] V. Veerasamy, N. I. Abdul Wahab, R. Ramachandran, A. Vinayagam, M. L. Othman, H. Hizam, J. Satheeshkumar, Automatic load frequency control of a multi-area dynamic interconnected power system using a hybrid pso-gsa-tuned pid controller, *Sustainability* 11 (24) (2019) 6908.
- [59] N. H. Khan, Y. Wang, D. Tian, M. A. Z. Raja, R. Jamal, Y. Muhammad, Design of fractional particle swarm optimization gravitational search algorithm for optimal reactive power dispatch problems, *IEEE Access* 8 (2020) 146785–146806.
- [60] Z. Ullah, M. R. Elkadeem, S. Wang, J. Radosavljević, A novel psos-cgsa method for state estimation in unbalanced dg-integrated distribution systems, *IEEE Access* 8 (2020) 113219–113229.
- [61] P. Vasant, J. A. Marmolejo, I. Litvinchev, R. R. Aguilar, Nature-inspired meta-heuristics approaches for charging plug-in hybrid electric vehicle, *Wireless Networks* 26 (2020) 4753–4766.
- [62] V. Veerasamy, N. I. A. Wahab, R. Ramachandran, M. L. Othman, H. Hizam, J. S. Kumar, A. X. R. Irudayaraj, Design of single-and multi-loop self-adaptive pid controller using heuristic based recurrent neural network for alfc of hybrid power system, *Expert Systems with Applications* 192 (2022) 116402.
- [63] N. Bounar, S. Labdai, A. Boukroune, Pso-gsa based fuzzy sliding mode controller for dfg-based wind turbine, *ISA transactions* 85 (2019) 177–188.
- [64] A. Kumar, D. K. Gupta, S. R. Ghatak, B. Appasani, N. Bizon, P. Thounthong, A novel improved gsa-bpso driven pid controller for load frequency control of multi-source deregulated power system, *Mathematics* 10 (18) (2022) 3255.
- [65] P. K. Guchhait, A. Banerjee, Stability enhancement of wind energy integrated hybrid system with the help of static synchronous compensator and symbiosis organisms search algorithm, *Protection and Control of Modern Power Systems* 5 (1) (2020) 11.
- [66] Y. Zou, J. Qian, Y. Zeng, S. Ismail, F. Dao, Z. Feng, C. Nie, H. Mei, Optimized robust controller design based on cpsogsa optimization algorithm and h_2/h_{∞} weights distribution method for load frequency control of micro-grid, *IEEE Access* 9 (2021) 162093–162107.
- [67] A. Chatterjee, K. Roy, D. Chatterjee, A Gravitational Search Algorithm (GSA) based Photo-Voltaic (PV) excitation control strategy for single phase operation of three phase wind-turbine coupled induction generator, *Energy* 74 (C) (2014) 707–718. doi:10.1016/j.energy.2014.07.037.
- [68] S. Duman, Y. Sönmez, U. Güvenç, N. Yörükeren, Optimal reactive power dispatch using a gravitational search algorithm, *IET generation, transmission & distribution* 6 (6) (2012) 563–576.
- [69] A. Ali, A. Mehdi, A multi-objective gravitational search algorithm based approach of power system stability enhancement with upfc, *Journal of Central South University* 20 (2013) 1536–1544.
- [70] M. Z. Daud, A. Mohamed, A. A. Ibrahim, M. Hannan, Heuristic optimization of state-of-charge feedback controller parameters for output power dispatch of hybrid photovoltaic/battery energy storage system, *Measurement* 49 (2014) 15–25.
- [71] R. K. Sahu, S. Panda, S. Padhan, Optimal gravitational search algorithm for automatic generation control of interconnected power systems, *Ain Shams Engineering Journal* 5 (3) (2014) 721–733. doi:10.1016/j.asej.2014.02.004.
- [72] J. Sarker, S. Goswami, Solution of multiple upfc placement problems using gravitational search algorithm, *International Journal of Electrical Power & Energy Systems* 55 (2014) 531–541.
- [73] J. Abd Ali, M. A. Hannan, A. Mohamed, A novel quantum-behaved lightning search algorithm approach to improve the fuzzy logic speed controller for an induction motor drive, *Energies* 8 (11) (2015) 13112–13136.
- [74] D. Goswami, S. Chakraborty, Parametric optimization of ultrasonic machining process using gravitational search and fireworks algorithms, *Ain Shams Engineering Journal* 6 (1) (2015) 315–331.
- [75] J.-H. Li, J.-S. Chiou, Gsa-tuning ipd control of a field-sensed magnetic suspension system, *Sensors* 15 (12) (2015) 31781–31793.
- [76] B. V. Kumar, N. Srikanth, Optimal location and sizing of unified power flow controller (upfc) to improve dynamic stability: A hybrid technique, *International Journal of Electrical Power & Energy Systems* 64 (2015) 429–438.
- [77] A. Ghosh, S. Banerjee, M. K. Sarkar, P. Dutta, Design and implementation of type-ii and type-iii controller for dc-dc switched-mode boost converter by using k-factor approach and optimisation techniques, *IET Power Electronics* 9 (5) (2016) 938–950.
- [78] E. Gupta, A. Saxena, et al., Performance evaluation of antlion optimizer based regulator in automatic generation control of interconnected power system, *Journal of Engineering* 2016 (2016).
- [79] P. C. Pradhan, R. K. Sahu, S. Panda, Firefly algorithm optimized fuzzy pid controller for agc of multi-area multi-source power systems with upfc and smes, *Engineering Science and Technology, an International Journal* 19 (1) (2016) 338–354.
- [80] Y. Bi, X. Lu, Z. Sun, D. Srinivasan, Z. Sun, Optimal type-2 fuzzy system for arterial traffic signal control, *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems* 19 (9) (2017) 3009–3027.
- [81] S. Das, D. Chatterjee, S. K. Goswami, A reactive power compensation scheme for unbalanced four-wire system using virtual y-tcr model, *IEEE transactions on industrial electronics* 65 (4) (2017) 3210–3219.

- [82] M. A. Mohd Basri, Trajectory tracking control of autonomous quadrotor helicopter using robust neural adaptive backstepping approach, *Journal of Aerospace Engineering* 31 (2) (2018) 04017091.
- [83] S. Özyön, C. Yaşar, Gravitational search algorithm applied to fixed head hydrothermal power system with transmission line security constraints, *Energy* 155 (2018) 392–407.
- [84] A. Ali, D. Raisz, K. Mahmoud, Voltage fluctuation smoothing in distribution systems with res considering degradation and charging plan of ev batteries, *Electric Power Systems Research* 176 (2019) 105933.
- [85] M. Magdy, A. El Marhomy, M. A. Attia, Modeling of inverted pendulum system with gravitational search algorithm optimized controller, *Ain Shams Engineering Journal* 10 (1) (2019) 129–149. doi:10.1016/j.asej.2018.11.001.
- [86] A. Sharma, S. K. Jain, Gravitational search assisted algorithm for tcsc placement for congestion control in deregulated power system, *Electric Power Systems Research* 174 (2019) 105874.
- [87] Zaheeruddin, K. Singh, Design a novel fractional order controller for smart microgrid using multi-agent concept, *SN Applied Sciences* 1 (2019) 1–14.
- [88] T. Zeng, X. Ren, Y. Zhang, Fixed-time sliding mode control based plant/controller co-design of dual-motor driving system, *International Journal of Systems Science* 50 (9) (2019) 1847–1859.
- [89] R. Sakipour, H. Abdi, Optimizing battery energy storage system data in the presence of wind power plants: a comparative study on evolutionary algorithms, *Sustainability* 12 (24) (2020) 10257.
- [90] H. Nobahari, M. Alizad, S. Nasrollahi, A nonlinear model predictive controller based on the gravitational search algorithm, *Optimal Control Applications and Methods* 42 (6) (2021) 1734–1761. doi:10.1002/oca.2757.
- [91] A. A. Almani, X. Han, F. Umer, R. ul Hassan, A. Nawaz, A. A. Shah, E. Mustafa, Optimal solution for frequency and voltage control of an islanded microgrid using square root gray wolf optimization, *Electronics* 11 (22) (2022) 3644.
- [92] I. A. Zamfirache, R.-E. Precup, R.-C. Roman, E. M. Petriu, Reinforcement learning-based control using q-learning and gravitational search algorithm with experimental validation on a nonlinear servo system, *Information Sciences* 583 (2022) 99–120.
- [93] R.-C. David, R.-E. Precup, E. M. Petriu, M.-B. Rădac, S. Preitl, Gravitational search algorithm-based design of fuzzy control systems with a reduced parametric sensitivity, *Information Sciences* 247 (2013) 154–173.
- [94] L. Li, J. Qian, Y. Zou, D. Tian, Y. Zeng, F. Cao, X. Li, Optimized takagi–sugeno fuzzy mixed h_2/h_{inf} robust controller design based on cpsogsa optimization algorithm for hydraulic turbine governing system, *Energies* 15 (13) (2022) 4771.
- [95] S. Ruder, An overview of gradient descent optimization algorithms, arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.04747 (2016).
- [96] W. Peres, I. C. S. Júnior, J. A. Passos Filho, Gradient based hybrid metaheuristics for robust tuning of power system stabilizers, *International Journal of Electrical Power & Energy Systems* 95 (2018) 47–72.
- [97] Y. S. Sherif, B. A. Boice, Optimization by pattern search, *European Journal of Operational Research* 78 (3) (1994) 277–303.
- [98] R. K. Khadanga, A. Kumar, Hybrid adaptive ‘gbest’-guided gravitational search and pattern search algorithm for automatic generation control of multi-area power system, *IET Generation, Transmission & Distribution* 11 (13) (2017) 3257–3267.
- [99] D. K. Gupta, A. K. Soni, A. V. Jha, S. K. Mishra, B. Appasani, A. Srinivasulu, N. Bizon, P. Thounthong, Hybrid gravitational–firefly algorithm-based load frequency control for hydrothermal two-area system, *Mathematics* 9 (7) (2021) 712.
- [100] H. R. Maier, S. Razavi, Z. Kapelan, L. S. Matott, J. Kasprzyk, B. A. Tolson, Introductory overview: Optimization using evolutionary algorithms and other metaheuristics, *Environmental modelling & software* 114 (2019) 195–213.
- [101] R. K. Khadanga, J. K. Satapathy, A new hybrid ga–gsa algorithm for tuning damping controller parameters for a unified power flow controller, *International Journal of Electrical Power & Energy Systems* 73 (2015) 1060–1069.
- [102] S. Ünsal, I. Aliskan, Investigation of performance of fuzzy logic controllers optimized with the hybrid genetic-gravitational search algorithm for pmsm speed control, *Automatika: časopis za automatiku, mjerenje, elektroniku, računarstvo i komunikacije* 63 (2) (2022) 313–327.
- [103] A. Hatamlou, Black hole: A new heuristic optimization approach for data clustering, *Information Sciences* 222 (2013) 175–184. doi:10.1016/j.ins.2012.08.023.
- [104] L. Abualigah, M. A. Elaziz, P. Sumari, A. M. Khasawneh, M. Alshinwan, S. Mirjalili, M. Shehab, H. Y. Abuaddous, A. H. Gandomi, Black hole algorithm: A comprehensive survey, *Applied Intelligence* 52 (10) (2022) 11892–11915.
- [105] Y. Deng, Y. Liu, R. Zeng, Q. Wang, Z. Li, Y. Zhang, H. Liang, A novel operation strategy based on black hole algorithm to optimize combined cooling, heating, and power-ground source heat pump system, *Energy* 229 (2021) 120637.
- [106] N. Khosravi, S. Echalih, Z. Hekss, R. Baghbanzadeh, M. Messaoudi, M. Shahideipour, A new approach to enhance the operation of m-upqc proportional-integral multiresonant controller based on the optimization methods for a stand-alone ac microgrid, *IEEE Transactions on Power Electronics* 38 (3) (2022) 3765–3774.
- [107] R. Azizipanah-Abarghooee, V. Terzija, F. Golestaneh, A. Roosta, Multiobjective dynamic optimal power flow considering fuzzy-based smart utilization of mobile electric vehicles, *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics* 12 (2) (2016) 503–514.
- [108] M. H. Khooban, A. Liaghat, A time-varying strategy for urban traffic network control: A fuzzy logic control based on an improved black hole algorithm, *International Journal of Bio-Inspired Computation* 10 (1) (2017) 33–42. doi:10.1504/IJBIC.2017.085332.
- [109] M.-H. Khooban, Secondary load frequency control of time-delay stand-alone microgrids with electric vehicles, *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Electronics* 65 (9) (2017) 7416–7422.
- [110] W. Xie, J.-S. Wang, C. Xing, S.-S. Guo, M. Guo, L.-F. Zhu, Extreme learning machine soft-sensor model with different activation functions on grinding process optimized by improved black hole algorithm, *IEEE Access* 8 (2020) 25084–25110.
- [111] M. Li, Z. Liu, H. Song, An improved algorithm optimization algorithm based on RungeKutta and golden sine strategy,

- Expert Systems with Applications (2024) 123262.
- [112] Z. Li, A local opposition-learning golden-sine grey wolf optimization algorithm for feature selection in data classification, *Applied Soft Computing* 142 (2023) 110319.
- [113] M. Han, Z. Du, H. Zhu, Y. Li, Q. Yuan, H. Zhu, Golden-sine dynamic marine predator algorithm for addressing engineering design optimization, *Expert Systems with Applications* 210 (2022) 118460.
- [114] J. Zhang, J.-S. Wang, Improved whale optimization algorithm based on nonlinear adaptive weight and golden sine operator, *IEEE Access* 8 (2020) 77013–77048.
- [115] M. Chawla, M. Duhan, Levy flights in metaheuristics optimization algorithms—a review, *Applied Artificial Intelligence* 32 (9-10) (2018) 802–821.
- [116] A. A. Ewees, R. R. Mostafa, R. M. Ghoniem, M. A. Gaheen, Improved seagull optimization algorithm using lévy flight and mutation operator for feature selection, *Neural Computing and Applications* 34 (10) (2022) 7437–7472.
- [117] Y. Liu, B. Cao, H. Li, Improving ant colony optimization algorithm with epsilon greedy and levy flight, *Complex & Intelligent Systems* 7 (2021) 1711–1722.
- [118] J. Xie, Y. Zhou, H. Chen, et al., A novel bat algorithm based on differential operator and lévy flights trajectory, *Computational Intelligence and Neuroscience* 2013 (2013).
- [119] J. Zhang, J.-S. Wang, Improved whale optimization algorithm based on nonlinear adaptive weight and golden sine operator, *IEEE Access* 8 (2020) 77013–77048.
- [120] S. Mirjalili, S. M. Mirjalili, A. Hatamlou, Multi-verse optimizer: a nature-inspired algorithm for global optimization, *Neural Computing and Applications* 27 (2016) 495–513.
- [121] D. Guha, P. K. Roy, S. Banerjee, Multi-verse optimisation: a novel method for solution of load frequency control problem in power system, *IET Generation, Transmission & Distribution* 11 (14) (2017) 3601–3611.
- [122] P. K. Sahoo, S. Mohapatra, D. K. Gupta, S. Panda, Multi verse optimized fractional order pdpi controller for load frequency control, *IETE Journal of Research* 68 (5) (2022) 3302–3315.
- [123] V. Muthiah-Nakarajan, M. M. Noel, Galactic swarm optimization: A new global optimization metaheuristic inspired by galactic motion, *Applied Soft Computing* 38 (2016) 771–787.
- [124] E. Bernal, O. Castillo, J. Soria, F. Valdez, Optimization of fuzzy controller using galactic swarm optimization with type-2 fuzzy dynamic parameter adjustment, *Axioms* 8 (1) (2019) 26.
- [125] E. Bernal, M. L. Lagunes, O. Castillo, J. Soria, F. Valdez, Optimization of type-2 fuzzy logic controller design using the gso and fa algorithms, *International Journal of Fuzzy Systems* 23 (1) (2021) 42–57.
- [126] V. Gajula, R. Rajathy, An agile optimization algorithm for vitality management along with fusion of sustainable renewable resources in microgrid, *Energy Sources, Part A: Recovery, Utilization, and Environmental Effects* 42 (13) (2020) 1580–1598.
- [127] R. Rajasekaran, P. U. Rani, Bidirectional dc-dc converter for microgrid in energy management system, *International Journal of Electronics* 108 (2) (2021) 322–343.
- [128] S. Karthick, N. Gomathi, Galactic swarm-improved whale optimization algorithm-based resource management in internet of things, *International Journal of Communication Systems* 35 (3) (2022) e5006.
- [129] E. Bernal, O. Castillo, J. Soria, F. Valdez, Fuzzy galactic swarm optimization with dynamic adjustment of parameters based on fuzzy logic, *SN Computer Science* 1 (2020) 1–19.
- [130] J. Zhang, J. Yan, P. Zhang, Fixed-wing uav formation control design with collision avoidance based on an improved artificial potential field, *IEEE Access* 6 (2018) 78342–78351.
- [131] Y. Liu, P. Huang, F. Zhang, Y. Zhao, Distributed formation control using artificial potentials and neural network for constrained multiagent systems, *IEEE Transactions on Control Systems Technology* 28 (2) (2018) 697–704.
- [132] S. Nag, L. Summerer, Behaviour based, autonomous and distributed scatter manoeuvres for satellite swarms, *Acta Astronautica* 82 (1) (2013) 95–109.
- [133] R. Zhao, M. Li, Q. Niu, Y.-H. Chen, Udwadia–kalaba constraint-based tracking control for artificial swarm mechanical systems: dynamic approach, *Nonlinear Dynamics* 100 (2020) 2381–2399.
- [134] L. D’Alfonso, G. Fedele, A. Bono, Distributed region following and perimeter surveillance tasks in star-shaped sets, *Systems & Control Letters* 172 (2023) 105437.
- [135] Y. Jia, L. Wang, Leader–follower flocking of multiple robotic fish, *IEEE/ASME Transactions on Mechatronics* 20 (3) (2014) 1372–1383.
- [136] C. Coquet, A. Arnold, P.-J. Bouvet, Control of a robotic swarm formation to track a dynamic target with communication constraints: Analysis and simulation, *Applied Sciences* 11 (7) (2021) 3179.
- [137] F. Ghaderi, A. Toloee, R. Ghasemi, Quadrotor control for tracking moving target, and dynamic obstacle avoidance based on potential field method, *International Journal of Engineering* 36 (10) (2023) 1720–1732.
- [138] D. P. Kucherov, Group of uavs moving on smooth control law with fixed obstacles, *Advances in Science, Technology and Engineering Systems Journal* (2017).
- [139] H. Byun, J. So, Potential function-based control using neural networks in uncertain wsns with mobile collectors, *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology* 71 (4) (2022) 4237–4248.
- [140] D. H. Wolpert, W. G. Macready, No free lunch theorems for optimization, *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation* 1 (1) (1997) 67–82.
- [141] X. Li, H. Yang, J. Li, Y. Wang, S. Gao, A novel distributed gravitational search algorithm with multi-layered information interaction, *IEEE Access* 9 (2021) 166552–166565.
- [142] Y. Wang, S. Gao, M. Zhou, Y. Yu, A multi-layered gravitational search algorithm for function optimization and real-world problems, *IEEE/CAA Journal of Automatica Sinica* 8 (1) (2020) 94–109.
- [143] C. Giladi, A. Sintov, Manifold learning for efficient gravitational search algorithm, *Information Sciences* 517 (2020) 18–36.

[doi:10.1016/j.ins.2019.12.047](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ins.2019.12.047).

- [144] S. Darzi, T. Siah Kiong, M. Tariqul Islam, H. Rezai Soleymanpour, S. Kibria, A memory-based gravitational search algorithm for enhancing minimum variance distortionless response beamforming, *Applied Soft Computing Journal* 47 (2016) 103–118. [doi:10.1016/j.asoc.2016.05.045](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.asoc.2016.05.045).
- [145] A. Guo, Y. Wang, L. Guo, R. Zhang, Y. Yu, S. Gao, An adaptive position-guided gravitational search algorithm for function optimization and image threshold segmentation, *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence* 121 (2023) 106040.
- [146] Z. Lei, S. Gao, S. Gupta, J. Cheng, G. Yang, An aggregative learning gravitational search algorithm with self-adaptive gravitational constants, *Expert Systems with Applications* 152 (2020) 113396.
- [147] Y. Wang, Y. Yu, S. Gao, H. Pan, G. Yang, A hierarchical gravitational search algorithm with an effective gravitational constant, *Swarm and Evolutionary Computation* 46 (2019) 118–139.
- [148] Y. Wang, S. Gao, Y. Yu, Z. Cai, Z. Wang, A gravitational search algorithm with hierarchy and distributed framework, *Knowledge-Based Systems* 218 (2021) 106877.
- [149] Z. Song, S. Gao, Y. Yu, J. Sun, Y. Todo, Multiple chaos embedded gravitational search algorithm, *IEICE Transactions on Information and Systems* 100 (4) (2017) 888–900.
- [150] S. Gao, C. Vairappan, Y. Wang, Q. Cao, Z. Tang, Gravitational search algorithm combined with chaos for unconstrained numerical optimization, *Applied Mathematics and Computation* 231 (2014) 48–62.
- [151] S. Gao, Y. Yu, Y. Wang, J. Wang, J. Cheng, M. Zhou, Chaotic local search-based differential evolution algorithms for optimization, *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems* 51 (6) (2019) 3954–3967.
- [152] H. Deeb, A. Sarangi, D. Mishra, S. K. Sarangi, Improved black hole optimization algorithm for data clustering, *Journal of King Saud University-Computer and Information Sciences* 34 (8) (2022) 5020–5029.
- [153] E. Pashaei, Medical image enhancement using guided filtering and chaotic inertia weight black hole algorithm, in: *2021 5th International Symposium on Multidisciplinary Studies and Innovative Technologies (ISMSIT)*, IEEE, 2021, pp. 37–42.
- [154] S. Q. Salih, A. A. Alsewari, H. Wahab, M. K. Mohammed, T. A. Rashid, D. Das, S. S. Basurra, Multi-population black hole algorithm for the problem of data clustering, *Plos one* 18 (7) (2023) e0288044.
- [155] A. A. Ewees, M. A. El Aziz, A. E. Hassanien, Chaotic multi-verse optimizer-based feature selection, *Neural computing and applications* 31 (2019) 991–1006.
- [156] X. Yuan, J. Zhao, Y. Yang, Y. Wang, Hybrid parallel chaos optimization algorithm with harmony search algorithm, *Applied Soft Computing* 17 (2014) 12–22.
- [157] A. H. Gandomi, X.-S. Yang, S. Talatahari, A. H. Alavi, Firefly algorithm with chaos, *Communications in Nonlinear Science and Numerical Simulation* 18 (1) (2013) 89–98.
- [158] B. Alatas, E. Akin, A. B. Ozer, Chaos embedded particle swarm optimization algorithms, *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals* 40 (4) (2009) 1715–1734.
- [159] M. Otair, A. Alhmoud, H. Jia, M. Altalhi, A. M. Hussein, L. Abualigah, Optimized task scheduling in cloud computing using improved multi-verse optimizer, *Cluster Computing* 25 (6) (2022) 4221–4232.
- [160] J. J. Jui, M. A. Ahmad, M. I. M. Rashid, Modified multi-verse optimizer for solving numerical optimization problems, in: *2020 IEEE International Conference on Automatic Control and Intelligent Systems (I2CACIS)*, IEEE, 2020, pp. 81–86.
- [161] M. Thymianis, A. Tzanetos, Is integration of mechanisms a way to enhance a nature-inspired algorithm?, *Natural Computing* (2022) 1–21.
- [162] A. Tzanetos, G. Dounias, Nature inspired optimization algorithms or simply variations of metaheuristics?, *Artificial Intelligence Review* 54 (2021) 1841–1862.
- [163] A. P. Piotrowski, J. J. Napiorkowski, Some metaheuristics should be simplified, *Information Sciences* 427 (2018) 32–62.
- [164] M. Gauci, T. J. Dodd, R. Groß, Why 'GSA: a gravitational search algorithm' is not genuinely based on the law of gravity, *Natural Computing* 11 (2012) 719–720.