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ABSTRACT
In the software projects, one of the essential and difficult problems faced by the managers in the competitive software industry is the Software Project Scheduling Problem (SPSP). With the increase in employees and tasks’ numbers the problem is becoming an NP-hard problem. The goal of this proposal is to resolve the problem of the software project scheduling with Whale optimization algorithm (WOA) and utilized it on various instances from three datasets. In order to prove the soundness and viability of Whale optimization algorithm (WOA), we illustrated some experimental results. This algorithm gave good outcomes for datasets that have a few tasks but failed to find feasible solutions when increasing the number of tasks.
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1- INTRODUCTION

Project management can be defined as the knowledge, tools, skills, and techniques application of the activities of a project in order to meet the requirements of the project. The complex management in the development of modern software projects includes project scheduling, monitoring, planning, risk management, and controlling tasks [1].

In the scheduling of the software project, minimizing project cost considers the main purpose. In the development of software projects, every stage is a group of umbrella activities. Scheduling of each activity through a limited time becomes
cumbersome for the managers by taking into account the analysis, design and coding stage’s principles [2]

In general, the goal of the SPSP is to get the best schedule arranging engineers of the software to complete one task or more with reducing the cost and the duration of a project [1].

SPSP considers an NP-hard with very complex combinatorial optimization problems. If SPSP has been optimized manually by human beings, it will probably cause error-prone with time-consuming. In a real software project, a project scheduling automatically with high qualities of a project is extremely useful to the managers. In the recent years, using computer algorithms with software project schedules has attracted high attention from researchers. [1]

Sommerville explained scheduling of the project as: “separating the project total work into separate activities and determine the time required to accomplish those activities”. Generally, several of those activities are executed in parallel. The schedulers of the Project must arrange the work and coordinate these parallel activities so that the workforce is utilized in a professional way [3].

In this paper, we will concentrate on (assigning employees to tasks) problem utilizing automated methods in an optimal way. When making allocations, typical goals to be optimized are minimizing the software project cost and completion time. When allocating employees to tasks, in the SPSP, employees can divide their attention among several tasks at the same time. This is often modeled by dedication values. This value represents the time percentage which an employee ordains on a particular task. To avoid overwork, each employee has a dedication (maximum value) that must be taken into account. The another constraints of The SPSP, for example, when a task assigned to a specific employee, the employee should have all the required skills for that task, and the constraints (task precedence) between tasks should be taken into account. All these factors participate in the difficult of SPSP, producing it more complicated than the problems of classical scheduling. So, it is important to have automatic approaches to get near-optimal schedules that meet all limitations (constraints) and can help the manager of the software project to make a decision of what schedule to choose in order to reduce the project cost and duration time.

The rest of this article is ordered as: Section (2): illustrated the Related Work. Section (3): describes Software Project Scheduling Problem (SPSP). Section
(4): identifies whale optimization algorithm. Experimental Results are found in Section (5). The paper is concluded in section (6).

2- RELATED WORK

Different articles have been introduced in the field of software project scheduling problem (SPSP), each developing a various methodology leading to diversity in the gained outcomes, some of these are:

In 2013, Jing Xiao, et al. [1] used an ant colony optimization (ACO) approach to solving the scheduling problem of the software project which is called ACS-SPSP algorithm, In the experimental results, the developed algorithm shows that it is promising and when compared to the solution of genetic algorithm in the previous researches, it can obtains higher hit rates with more accuracy. In 2014, Dinesh B. Hanchate and Rajankumar S. Bichkar [4] developed a particle swarm optimization algorithm (PSO) to resolve the problem of the software project scheduling (SPSP). This paper studied the impact of PSO parameter on the cost and the time of the project, in terms of minimum the Software Cost Estimation (SCE) and time, some better outcomes were gained when compared to GA and ACO. Lately in 2015, A.C .Biju, et al. [5] introduced a new mechanism of mutation when was presented with a refined Differential Evolution (DE) approach. The proposed method superiority was experimented and demonstrated on 50 random instances to solving the SPSP problem, the outcomes were compared with some techniques in the literature. In 2016, Broderick Crawford, et al. [6] considered the SPSP as a combinational optimization problem and proposed a novel approach to solved SPSP by using a Firefly Algorithm , this algorithm is a new meta-heuristic depended on the firefly behavior . The article introduced the resolution model design to solved SPSP using firefly algorithm, in order to clarify the soundness and viability of this approach, some experimental outcomes were illustrated. Also In 2017, Natasha Nigar [7] formulated the SPSP problem as an optimization problem under uncertainties and dynamics for hybrid scRUmP software model, five objectives were used to construct a mathematical model such as: the duration of a project, the cost, the robustness, stability and task fragmentation. In 2018, Broderick Crawford, et al. [8] presented intelligent water drops algorithm as a recent stochastic swarm-based approach to solving the problem of software project scheduling, this algorithm was used for solving the problems of optimization. To
demonstrating water drops solidity, comparisons were performed with other techniques. Lastly in 2019, Jian Cheng, et al.[9] proposed an improved firework algorithm (multi-objective) with a novel operator of explosion, the reservation strategy is integrated with the rescheduling approaches to completely guide the evolution by utilizing the historical evolutionary, the SPS was modeled as a dynamic optimization problem with four-objective. The experimental outcomes show that the suggested approach has the better results in scheduling, and the schemes of optimal scheduling have better stability and robustness.

3- SOFTWARE PROJECT SCHEDULING PROBLEM (SPSP)

SPSP is an issue of getting the best schedule in which the priority and the constraints of the resource are satisfied and the final cost of the project which consisting of the duration of the project and personal salaries is reduced. In addition to the employees’ salaries and skills consideration, SPSP also takes into account the workload and needed skills of every task. Consequently, SPSP is appropriate and able to represent the actual scheduling of a project of the software [1].

SPSP is associated with the problem of (resource-constrained project scheduling (RCPSP)) that objectives to get the best schedule which meets the requirements of precedence and resource while reducing the project’ duration.[1]

SPSP is near to RCPSP, but here are many variations among SPSP and RCPSP, these variations are:

1- SPSP has one another goal to be minimized (cost related to the employees) in addition to the minimization goal of the project’ duration in RCPSP.

2- In SPSP, the employees with many skills are the main resource, while RCPSP contains many types of resources.

3- In RCPSP, every activity needs variant quantities of every resource, in SPSP the employee’ skills are not quantifiable entities.

SPSP considers more actual than RCPSP because in the software Project Scheduling Problem (SPSP) the employee who have a salary and individual skills is able to do many tasks through a regular working day [1].

In the model of the SPSP, the engineers of the software with various software skills are the most necessary resource. Usually, the project of the software contains
many tasks and the Task Precedence Graph (TPG) is used to describe the precedence relationships between the tasks. The TPG is an acyclic directed graph known as \( G(V,A) \), where \( V \) represents a vertex set, \( V=\{t_1,t_2,\ldots,t_T\} \) that contains all tasks, \( A \) represents an arc sets where \( A=\{(t_i,t_j),\ldots,(t_m,t_n)\} \), where \( (t_i,t_j) \in A \), which means \( t_j \) can be started after task \( t_i \) completed.

In the project of the software, every task \( t_j \) related to two resources which are a group of skills \( t_j^{skill} \) and work effort \( t_j^{effort} \). [1]

To assess the feasible solutions in the SPSP, three issues are taken into account [4]:

1- Solution’ feasibility.
2- Whole project’s duration.
3- Whole project’s cost.

The steps of computing the whole project’s duration and total project’s cost are as the following [4]:

1- **Formulation for the Duration and Starting and Finishing Time for Each Individual Task:**

According to the matrix of the solution, we will compute every task’ duration and according to the equation (1) below [4]:

\[
t_j^{dur} = \frac{t_j^{effort}}{\sum_{i=1}^{E} m_{ij}} \\
\text{.................................(1)}
\]

Where:

- \( t_j^{dur} \): It is the (task j)’s duration.
- \( t_j^{effort} \): It is the (task j)’s workload represented as person-month.
- \( m_{ij} \): is a matrix \( M=(m_{ij})_{E \times T} \), which size is \( (E \times T) \) can be utilized to describe the solution of SPSP, the matrix’s element is a number (real value) and \( 1 \geq m_{ij} \geq 0 \). The element of \( (m_{ij}) \) is the degree of dedication of employee \( e_i \) to task \( t_j \) [1].

For every task, we can compute (\( t_j^{start} \)) and (\( t_j^{end} \)), the starting and finishing time respectively in terms of:-

1- **Duration**.
2- Precedence relationships (TPG G (V, A)) [4].

The tasks which have no pre-tasks, we can compute the starting time for them, then we can compute the ending time depending on its start time and duration. The task’s starting time can be computed if the all its pre-tasks’ finishing time is computed. Each duration, starting, and ending time of the task can be computed as TPG G (V, A) is acyclic. And as the two following equations [1]:

\[
\begin{align*}
    t_{j}^{\text{start}} &= \begin{cases} 
    0 & \text{if } \forall k \neq j, (t_{k}, t_{j}) \not\in A \\
    \max\{t_{k}^{\text{end}} | (t_{k}, t_{j}) \in A \} & \text{otherwise} 
    \end{cases} \\
    t_{j}^{\text{end}} &= t_{j}^{\text{start}} + t_{j}^{\text{dur}}
\end{align*}
\]

We can create a Gantt diagram after computed the duration, beginning and finishing time for every task, as shown in Figure(1) [4].

![Gantt Diagram](image)

Figure (1) describes Gantt diagram

2- Calculate the Total Duration of the Software Project:

The whole duration \((p_{dur})\) can be simply computed from the Gantt diagram that mentioned above in Figure (1). Really, whole project’s duration is computes as follow [4]:

... (2)
... (3)
\[ P_{dur} = \max \{ t_j^{end} \mid \forall l \neq j, (t_j, t_k) \notin A \} \] ...........................(4)

Where:
- \( p_{dur} \) : is the duration of the whole software project.
- \( t_j^{end} \) : is the finish time of task \( j \).

3- **Calculate the Total Cost of the Software Project.**

We can compute the cost of every task according to the following equation [4]:

\[ t_j^{cost} = \sum_{i=1}^{E} e_i^{salary} \cdot m_{ij} \cdot t_j^{dur} \] .............................. (5)

Where:
- \( t_j^{cost} \) : is the cost of task \( j \).
- \( e_i^{salary} \) : is the monthly salary of employee \( e_i \).
- \( t_j^{dur} \) : is the duration of task \( j \).

Then the whole cost of the software project \( (p_{cost}) \) is computed according to the following formula [4]:

\[ p_{cost} = \sum_{i=1}^{T} t_j^{cost} \] ................................. (6)

Where:
- \( p_{cost} \) : is the total project’s cost.

The aim to optimize SPSP is to reduce the \( (p_{dur}) \) and \( (p_{cost}) \), the whole duration and the total cost of the project respectively, from the summation of the project’s cost and duration, the fitness function will be derived [4].

4- **Calculate the fitness function of the SPSP problem**

As the following formula [1]:

\[ f(X) = (p_{cost} \cdot W_{cost} + p_{dur} \cdot W_{dur})^{-1} \] ................................. (7)
Where:

\[ W_{\text{cost}} \] and \[ W_{\text{dur}} \] are real values.

Some constraints must be taken into account during the scheduling of SPSP [10]:

1- One employee must handle every task at least.
2- The set of employees responsible for a particular task should have all skills needed by that task.

\[ t_j^{\text{skills}} \subseteq \bigcup_{i \mid x_{ij} > 0} e_i^{\text{skills}} \quad \forall j \in \{1,2,\ldots,T\} \] .......................... (8)

3- The work related to every employee must not exceed the maximum of the dedication, the work of employees is computed as following :

\[ e_i^{\text{work}}(\mathcal{T}) = \sum\{j \mid t_j^{\text{start}} \leq \mathcal{T} \leq t_j^{\text{end}}\} \times_{ij} \] .......................... (9)

An overwork is detected if the work exceeds the maximum dedication \( e_i^{\text{work}}(\mathcal{T}) > e_i^{\text{maxded}} \) at instant.

\[ e_i^{\text{over}} = \int_{r=0}^{r=p_{\text{dura}}} \text{ramp}(e_i^{\text{work}}(\mathcal{T}) - e_i^{\text{maxded}}) d\mathcal{T} \] .......................... (10)

\text{ramp} represents a function which defined as:

\[ \text{ramp} = \begin{cases} x & \text{if } x > 0 \\ 0 & \text{if } x \leq 0 \end{cases} \] .......................... (11)

The overwork in the project is the summation of all employees overwork [10]:

\[ p_{\text{over}} = \sum_{i=1}^{E} e_i^{\text{over}} \] .......................... (12)

There is no overwork must occur in the project.

\[ p_{\text{over}} = 0 \]
This condition is considered the most difficult one to satisfy. When an overwork occurs, the repair operator must be utilized which divides all employees’ dedications on the maximum of the overwork found [10]:

$$X_{ij} = \frac{x_{ij}}{\max_i \{e_i^{work}(\mathcal{T}) + \epsilon\}}$$

(13)

Where:

$$\epsilon = 0.00001$$ is a value utilized to stop inaccuracies in floating point operations. While using Eq. (12), the project duration will increase:

$$p_{dur} = p_{dur} + \max_i \{e_i^{work}(\mathcal{T}) + \epsilon\}$$

(14)

However, the cost of the project will be unaffected:

$$P_{\text{cost}}[\mathbb{E}] = p_{\text{cost}}$$

(15)

4-WHALE OPTIMIZATION ALGORITHM

Figure 2 describes the hunting behavior of humpback whales (bubble-net). These whales choose to pursuit the small fishes or krill which nearby to the surface. Around the victim, the humpback whales swim inside a shrinking ring and along a path similar to the shaped (spiral) concurrently to make special bubbles along a ring or a path similar to shaped “9”. [11].

Fig 2: behavior of Bubble-net for humpback whales.
Mirjalili and Lewis proposed in 2016[12] a novel optimization algorithm (meta-heuristic), Whale Optimization Algorithm (WOA). This algorithm simulates the performance of the humpback whales’ hunting (bubble-net).

In WOA, to simulate this technique, there is a 50% probability to select among the mechanism of shrinking encircling and the model of spiral to update the whales’ location through optimization [11].

4.1 Encircling Prey

Humpback whales surround the prey because they can know about the prey and their position. While designing, in the space of the search the optimum position unknown beforehand, so the algorithm of Whale optimization presumes the recent better solution as its destination for its victim or presumes it to be closer to the best value. Once the better operator of the search is determined, the other search operators should try to renew their locations depending on the best location of the search operator. This approach is described as follows [13]

\[
D = |C \cdot X^*(t) - X(t)| \\
X(t + 1) = X^*(t) - A \cdot D
\]

Where:
T: represents the existing iteration.
A, D, C: represents the vectors of coefficient.
X*: represents the vector of the position for the better solution found.
X: represents the vector of the position.
X*: In every iteration, it needs to be updated.

A, C vectors are calculated as the following equation [13]:

\[
A = 2 \cdot a \cdot r - a \\
C = 2 \cdot r
\]

Where:
a: is decreased linearly from 2 to 0 for the both phases of exploration and exploitation.

r: is a random vector in [0,1].

The existing better record location (X *) is gained. Then, the location (X) of the operator of the search is changed corresponding to X *. By altering the vectors’ value, A and C places around the better operator can be gained according to their current location.

4.2 Bubble-net attacking method (exploitation phase)

The behavior of humpback whales (bubble-net) contains the mechanism of shrinking encircling and spiral updating position [14]:

1) shrinking encircling mechanism:

‘A’ range is differed by reducing the ‘a’ value. Thus, A is a random value between [−a, a]. Fixing the random values for A in [−1, 1], the search operator’s new location is decided among the existing best operator’s location and the original operator’s location [13].

2) Spiral updating position:

The distance between the whale (X) and prey (X *) is determined in this mechanism. The equation of spiral is then developed among the whale’s location and victim’s location, which grants of these whales a movement, likes a helix form. This is illustrated as the following formulas [13].

\[ X(t+1) = D’ e^{ib} \cdot \cos(2\pi l) + X'(t) \] ............................... (20)

\[ D' = |X^*(t) - X(t)| \] ............................... (21)

Where:

b: is a constant for defining the form of the spiral (logarithmic).
l: is a random value between [−1, 1].

3) Search for prey (Exploration Phase):
In this stage, A is utilized with the random values which larger than 1 or fewer than −1 to keep the operator of the search away from the reference whale. In this stage, the search operator’s location is updated in the same manner as a randomly selected search agent unlike the exploitation stage. This mechanism assists for best exploration that lets WOA algorithm to complete a global search. And as the following model [13]:

\[
D = |C \cdot X_{\text{rand}} - X| \\
X(t + 1) = X_{\text{rand}} - A \cdot D
\]

Where:
\(X_{\text{rand}}\): is a vector of position which randomly chosen from the current population of the whale [14].

5- EXPERIMENTAL RESULT

With regard to empirical study, we used three datasets which generated from the instance generator that developed by alba [15]. The generator produces random instances, nine different instances from it we solved them with a whale algorithm.

Each instance is differs from other instances in the employees’ number, tasks’ number, skills’ number, in addition to the task precedence graph (TGP). Every instance is symbolized as: employee as (e), task as (t) and skill as (s). We implemented the algorithm using matlab language with Windows 10 Professional, processor: 2.20 Ghz Intel(R) core(TM) i7, and RAM: 8 GB.

5.1 DATASET Description

- **DATASET1**
  The first dataset used in this study have five skills number, the value of employee skills between (2-3) and the task need (2-3) numbers of skills.

- **DATASET2**
  The second dataset used differs from DATASET1 in The number of skills so it needs ten instead of five.

  But its similarity to DATASET1 in the employee skills’ number, and the of skills’ number which required to execute a task.
The tasks in DATASET2 have the same effort, maximum dedication, and employee’ salary such in DATASET1. And the DATASET2 has the same TPG.

- **DATASET3**
  DATASET3 needs ten (10) skills, the skills of employee between (6-7) and amount of skills that the task needed to execute is (2-3).

### 5.2 EXPERIMENT1

In the first experiment, we studied the effect of changing the employees’ number, the tasks’ number remaining constant. We have implemented the algorithm on three instances of each dataset (as described in the above subsection) in order to find the best distribution of tasks among employees and implemented tasks with the least time and cost.

Table 1, Table 2 and Table 3 shows the fitness function values as well as the time and cost for the three instances of dataset.

**Table 1: fitness function, cost and time for DATASET1**

| Instance       | Fitness | Cost   | Duration |
|----------------|---------|--------|----------|
| 5e_10t_5s      | 0.1471  | 812870 | 59.8551  |
| 10e_10t_5s     | 0.2076  | 832430 | 39.8349  |
| 15e_10t_5s     | 0.3758  | 786080 | 18.7500  |

**Table 2: fitness function, cost and time for DATASET2**

| Instance       | Fitness | Cost   | Duration |
|----------------|---------|--------|----------|
| 5e_10t_10s     | 0.1567  | 953340 | 54.2747  |
| 10e_10t_10s    | 0.2372  | 865380 | 33.5000  |
| 15e_10t_10s    | 0.3453  | 695970 | 22       |

**Table 3: fitness function, cost and time for DATASET3**

| Instance       | Fitness | Cost   | Duration |
|----------------|---------|--------|----------|
| 5e_10t_6-7s    | 0.1808  | 866900 | 46.6327  |
| 10e_10t_6-7s   | 0.2266  | 940510 | 34.7212  |
| 15e_10t_6-7s   | 0.2483  | 1111300| 29.1667  |

We have taken instances in which the number of tasks is ten, and the employee’s number increases from five to ten and then fifteen, the results were obtained by applying the three constraints of the SPSP within the Whale
optimization algorithm. We noted that the time will decrease as the employee’s number increases and thus the value of the fitness function is better.

5.3 EXPERIMENT2

In the second experiment, we wanted to study the effect of increasing the tasks’ number and keeping the employees’ number constant.

However, when increasing the tasks’ number to twenty or thirty for the purpose of studying the effect of increasing the number of tasks on the results of the algorithm, the algorithm was unable to find feasible solutions that achieve the three constraints of the SPSP, especially the overwork constraint.

5.4 EXPERIMENT3

In the third experiment, we studied the effect of not applying the second constraint of SPSP on the three instances of DATASET1. Meaning we will assume that all employees have the skills required to carry out any of the tasks to be scheduled. Table 4 shows the fitness function values as well as the time and cost for the three instances for DATASET1 (without second constraint).

| Instance     | Fitness | Cost    | Duration |
|--------------|---------|---------|----------|
| 5e_10t_5s   | 0.2639  | 829450  | 29.6023  |
| 10e_10t_5s  | 0.2736  | 829840  | 28.2553  |
| 15e_10t_5s  | 0.4     | 782020  | 17.1817  |

When comparing the results of the table 4 with the results of the table 1, we found that the value of the fitness function was better in the third experiment, as well as the time of project implementation was lower. As for the cost, we did not find a clear explanation for it.

6- CONCLUSION

This paper is employed whale optimization algorithm for resolving the Problem of Software Project Scheduling. The SPSP considers one of the essential issues for the management of a project of the software and the problem is NP-hard. We presented the experimental results for WOA. In order to find the optimal
parameterization and get best outcomes, we performed a set of tests. The tests conducted utilizing various numbers of tasks, various numbers of employees and skills. We demonstrated that the WOA was gave good outcomes for smaller instances of datasets but it failed to find feasible solution for more complex instances (when number of tasks increase).
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