

# Comparison tables: BBOB 2010 function testbed in 40-D

The BBOBies

August 30, 2010

## Abstract

This document provides tabular results of the workshop for Black-Box Optimization Benchmarking at GECCO 2010, see <http://coco.gforge.inria.fr/doku.php?id=bbob-2010>. More than 30 algorithms have been tested on 24 benchmark functions in dimensions between 2 and 40. A description of the used objective functions can be found in [9, 5]. The experimental set-up is described in [8].

The performance measure provided in the following tables is the expected number of objective function evaluations to reach a given target function value (ERT, expected running time), divided by the respective value for the best algorithm. Consequently, the best (smallest) value is 1 and the value 1 appears in each column at least once. See [8] for details on how ERT is obtained. Bold entries in the table correspond to values below 3 or the top-three best values.

Table 1: 40-D, running time excess  $ERT/ERT_{\text{best}}$  on  $f_1$ , in italics is given the median final function value and the median number of function evaluations to reach this value divided by dimension

<b>1 Sphere</b>											
$\Delta f_{\text{target}}$ $ERT_{\text{best}}/D$	1e+03	1e+02	1e+01	1e+00	1e-01	1e-02	1e-03	1e-04	1e-05	1e-07	$\Delta f_{\text{target}}$ $ERT_{\text{best}}/D$
(1+1)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>6.0</b>	<b>7.2</b>	<b>8.5</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>12</b>	(1+1)-CMA-ES [2]
(1+2ms)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>4.1</b>	<b>5.2</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>7.4</b>	<b>8.5</b>	<b>11</b>	(1+2ms)-CMA-ES [1]
avg NEWUOA	<b>1</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	avg NEWUOA [15]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	139	<b>2.8</b>	4.7	7.0	9.3	12	14	16	18	23	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [6]
Adap DE (F-AUC)	<b>1</b>	24	64	119	185	257	339	422	491	629	Adap DE (F-AUC) [4]
DE (Uniform)	<b>1</b>	42	117	200	280	363	450	533	618	781	DE (Uniform) [3]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>1.2</b>	3.0	4.9	6.6	8.6	10	12	14	18	IPOP-aCMA-ES [10]
IPOP-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>2.9</b>	4.9	6.7	8.5	10	12	14	18	IPOP-CMA-ES [14]
CMA+DE-MOS	<b>1</b>	6.8	16	18	20	24	33	39	42	50	CMA+DE-MOS [11]
NBC-CMA	<b>1</b>	<b>1.7</b>	3.8	5.9	8.0	10	12	14	16	21	NBC-CMA [13]
PM-AdapSS-DE	<b>1</b>	28	66	114	164	216	272	332	391	513	PM-AdapSS-DE [3, 4]
Basic RCGA	<b>1</b>	4.5	22	340	1297	1804	2200	2496	2736	3070	Basic RCGA [16]
SPSA	478	3.9	4.7	6.1	7.6	8.9	10	12	13	15	SPSA [7]



Table 3: 40-D, running time excess  $ERT/ERT_{\text{best}}$  on  $f_3$ , in italics is given the median final function value and the median number of function evaluations to reach this value divided by dimension

	<b>3 Rastrigin separable</b>										
$\Delta f_{\text{target}}$	1e+03	1e+02	1e+01	1e+00	1e-01	1e-02	1e-03	1e-04	1e-05	1e-07	$\Delta f_{\text{target}}$
$ERT_{\text{best}}/D$	5.5	96	17818	21192	21900	22547	23212	23890	24566	25903	$ERT_{\text{best}}/D$
(1+1)-CMA-ES	<b>1.4</b>	<i>32e+1/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1+1)-CMA-ES [2]
(1+2ms)-CMA-ES	3.9	<i>31e+1/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1+2ms)-CMA-ES [1]
avg NEWUOA	21	<i>38e+1/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	avg NEWUOA [15]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	3.1	138	<i>56e+0/1e5</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [6]
Adap DE (F-AUC)	18	<i>22e+1/1e5</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	Adap DE (F-AUC) [4]
DE (Uniform)	30	<i>23e+1/1e5</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	DE (Uniform) [3]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<i>15e+0/2e5</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	IPOP-aCMA-ES [10]
IPOP-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<i>13e+0/2e5</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	IPOP-CMA-ES [14]
CMA+DE-MOS	4.8	<b>5.1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	CMA+DE-MOS [11]
NBC-CMA	<b>1.5</b>	11	<i>72e+0/8e3</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	NBC-CMA [13]
PM-AdapSS-DE	22	<i>20e+1/1e5</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	PM-AdapSS-DE [3, 4]
Basic RCGA	<b>2.5</b>	118	<i>14e+0/5e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	Basic RCGA [16]
SPSA	72567	<i>10e+3/1e5</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	SPSA [7]





Table 6: 40-D, running time excess  $ERT/ERT_{\text{best}}$  on  $f_6$ , in italics is given the median final function value and the median number of function evaluations to reach this value divided by dimension

<b>6 Attractive sector</b>											
$\Delta f_{\text{target}}$ $ERT_{\text{best}}/D$	1e+03	1e+02	1e+01	1e+00	1e-01	1e-02	1e-03	1e-04	1e-05	1e-07	$\Delta f_{\text{target}}$ $ERT_{\text{best}}/D$
(1+1)-CMA-ES	<b>1.3</b>	6.6	223	<i>17e+0/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1+1)-CMA-ES [2]
(1+2ms)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	3.9	1200	<i>13e+0/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1+2ms)-CMA-ES [1]
avg NEWUOA	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	avg NEWUOA [15]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	7.4	3.1	<b>3.0</b>	<b>2.9</b>	3.1	3.2	3.6	3.8	4.5	11	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [6]
Adap DE (F-AUC)	30	23	24	24	26	26	27	26	27	27	Adap DE (F-AUC) [4]
DE (Uniform)	89	48	43	40	41	39	40	38	39	38	DE (Uniform) [3]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	<b>1.9</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.1</b>	IPOP-aCMA-ES [10]
IPOP-CMA-ES	<b>2.3</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.2</b>	IPOP-CMA-ES [14]
CMA+DE-MOS	7.6	3.6	3.3	<b>2.9</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>2.4</b>	CMA+DE-MOS [11]
NBC-CMA	23	41	24	17	13	11	10	8.1	7.7	6.6	NBC-CMA [13]
PM-AdapSS-DE	44	28	29	28	29	29	31	31	33	35	PM-AdapSS-DE [3, 4]
Basic RCGA	13	74	96	85	86	76	71	63	128	1337	Basic RCGA [16]
SPSA	3638	<i>42e+1/1e5</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	SPSA [7]















Table 13: 40-D, running time excess  $ERT/ERT_{\text{best}}$  on  $f_{13}$ , in italics is given the median final function value and the median number of function evaluations to reach this value divided by dimension

<b>13 Sharp ridge</b>											
$\Delta f_{\text{target}}$ $ERT_{\text{best}}/D$	1e+03	1e+02	1e+01	1e+00	1e-01	1e-02	1e-03	1e-04	1e-05	1e-07	$\Delta f_{\text{target}}$ $ERT_{\text{best}}/D$
(1+1)-CMA-ES	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>2.2</b>	4.3	7.6	6.2	8.6	13	(1+1)-CMA-ES [2]
(1+2ms)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>2.3</b>	5.4	12	18	<i>82e-5/1e4</i>	(1+2ms)-CMA-ES [1]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	<b>2.6</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>2.0</b>	7.9	37	601	483	360	<i>67e-4/1e5</i>	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [6]
Adap DE (F-AUC)	27	36	24	8.1	3.8	<b>2.8</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>1.8</b>	Adap DE (F-AUC) [4]
DE (Uniform)	51	58	34	11	4.8	3.5	3.1	<b>2.8</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>2.1</b>	DE (Uniform) [3]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	IPOP-aCMA-ES [10]
IPOP-CMA-ES	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.5</b>	IPOP-CMA-ES [14]
CMA+DE-MOS	9.0	4.9	4.0	3.3	<b>2.3</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>1.9</b>	CMA+DE-MOS [11]
NBC-CMA	<b>1.9</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>2.4</b>	3.3	4.5	8.0	18	<i>63e-4/7e3</i>	.	NBC-CMA [13]
PM-AdapSS-DE	29	35	22	7.1	3.4	<b>2.6</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>1.7</b>	PM-AdapSS-DE [3, 4]
Basic RCGA	10	252	202	85	153	199	310	<i>20e-2/5e4</i>	.	.	Basic RCGA [16]
SPSA	26	1638	9281	4121	1449	<i>52e+0/1e5</i>	.	.	.	.	SPSA [7]

Table 14: 40-D, running time excess  $ERT/ERT_{\text{best}}$  on  $f_{14}$ , in italics is given the median final function value and the median number of function evaluations to reach this value divided by dimension

<b>14 Sum of different powers</b>											
$\frac{\Delta f_{\text{target}}}{ERT_{\text{best}}/D}$	1e+03	1e+02	1e+01	1e+00	1e-01	1e-02	1e-03	1e-04	1e-05	1e-07	$\frac{\Delta f_{\text{target}}}{ERT_{\text{best}}/D}$
(1+1)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.8</b>	(1+1)-CMA-ES [2]
(1+2ms)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.5</b>	(1+2ms)-CMA-ES [1]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	85	10	3.1	<b>2.6</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>2.7</b>	3.3	3.6	4.9	7.6	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [6]
Adap DE (F-AUC)	<b>1</b>	4.1	22	30	37	36	25	14	8.9	6.9	Adap DE (F-AUC) [4]
DE (Uniform)	<b>1</b>	<b>2.4</b>	42	53	58	50	32	17	10	7.8	DE (Uniform) [3]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	IPOP-aCMA-ES [10]
IPOP-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>2.0</b>	IPOP-CMA-ES [14]
CMA+DE-MOS	<b>1.1</b>	3.7	7.2	5.2	4.5	5.5	6.2	5.9	5.0	4.7	CMA+DE-MOS [11]
NBC-CMA	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>2.8</b>	3.0	<b>2.8</b>	3.2	NBC-CMA [13]
PM-AdapSS-DE	<b>1.1</b>	<b>2.9</b>	26	31	35	32	22	12	7.8	6.4	PM-AdapSS-DE [3, 4]
Basic RCGA	<b>1</b>	<b>1.6</b>	7.1	19	216	255	745	<i>10e-4/5e4</i>	.	.	Basic RCGA [16]
SPSA	195	53	34	27	21	18	22	48	1569	<i>22e-6/1e5</i>	SPSA [7]















Table 21: 40-D, running time excess  $ERT/ERT_{\text{best}}$  on  $f_{21}$ , in italics is given the median final function value and the median number of function evaluations to reach this value divided by dimension

<b>21 Gallagher 101 peaks</b>											
$\frac{\Delta f_{\text{target}}}{ERT_{\text{best}}/D}$	1e+03	1e+02	1e+01	1e+00	1e-01	1e-02	1e-03	1e-04	1e-05	1e-07	$\frac{\Delta f_{\text{target}}}{ERT_{\text{best}}/D}$
(1+1)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	(1+1)-CMA-ES [2]
(1+2ms)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.1</b>	(1+2ms)-CMA-ES [1]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	20	224	6.1	57	64	64	64	64	64	64	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [6]
Adap DE (F-AUC)	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	124	407	267	267	266	265	265	264	Adap DE (F-AUC) [4]
DE (Uniform)	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	15	154	575	574	573	571	570	567	DE (Uniform) [3]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	3.9	86	122	122	122	121	121	120	IPOP-aCMA-ES [10]
IPOP-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	4.4	89	86	86	86	85	85	85	IPOP-CMA-ES [14]
CMA+DE-MOS	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	6.4	120	105	104	104	104	104	103	CMA+DE-MOS [11]
NBC-CMA	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	31	107	43	43	43	43	43	42	NBC-CMA [13]
PM-AdapSS-DE	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	124	660	<i>21e-1/1e5</i>	.	.	.	.	.	PM-AdapSS-DE [3, 4]
Basic RCGA	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>48</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>34</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>35</b>	<b>36</b>	Basic RCGA [16]
SPSA	188	541	371	1422	<i>25e-1/1e5</i>	.	.	.	.	.	SPSA [7]

Table 22: 40-D, running time excess  $ERT/ERT_{\text{best}}$  on  $f_{22}$ , in italics is given the median final function value and the median number of function evaluations to reach this value divided by dimension

<b>22 Gallagher 21 peaks</b>											
$\frac{\Delta f_{\text{target}}}{ERT_{\text{best}}/D}$	1e+03	1e+02	1e+01	1e+00	1e-01	1e-02	1e-03	1e-04	1e-05	1e-07	$\frac{\Delta f_{\text{target}}}{ERT_{\text{best}}/D}$
(1+1)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4.7</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	(1+1)-CMA-ES [2]
(1+2ms)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.5</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.4</b>	<b>4.4</b>	(1+2ms)-CMA-ES [1]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	21	205	170	46	<i>20e-1/1e5</i>	.	.	.	.	.	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [6]
Adap DE (F-AUC)	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	248	64	<i>26e-1/1e5</i>	.	.	.	.	.	Adap DE (F-AUC) [4]
DE (Uniform)	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	344	93	<i>73e-1/1e5</i>	.	.	.	.	.	DE (Uniform) [3]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	153	36	<i>20e-1/7e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	IPOP-aCMA-ES [10]
IPOP-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	191	27	<i>20e-1/8e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	IPOP-CMA-ES [14]
CMA+DE-MOS	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	254	42	<i>20e-1/1e5</i>	.	.	.	.	.	CMA+DE-MOS [11]
NBC-CMA	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>4.8</b>	<i>51e-1/7e3</i>	.	.	.	.	.	NBC-CMA [13]
PM-AdapSS-DE	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	340	323	<i>56e-1/1e5</i>	.	.	.	.	.	PM-AdapSS-DE [3, 4]
Basic RCGA	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	174	21	<i>20e-1/5e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	Basic RCGA [16]
SPSA	183	630	399	151	<i>51e-1/1e5</i>	.	.	.	.	.	SPSA [7]







## References

- [1] Anne Auger, Dimo Brockhoff, and Nikolaus Hansen. Comparing the (1+1)-CMA-ES with a mirrored (1+2)-CMA-ES with sequential selection on the noiseless BBOB-2010 testbed. In Pelikan and Branke [12], pages 1543–1550.
- [2] Anne Auger and Nikolaus Hansen. Benchmarking the (1+1)-CMA-ES on the BBOB-2009 function testbed. In Franz Rothlauf, editor, *GECCO (Companion)*, pages 2459–2466. ACM, 2009.
- [3] Álvaro Fialho, Wenyin Gong, and Zhihua Cai. Probability matching-based adaptive strategy selection vs. uniform strategy selection within differential evolution: an empirical comparison on the BBOB-2010 noiseless testbed. In Pelikan and Branke [12], pages 1527–1534.
- [4] Álvaro Fialho, Marc Schoenauer, and Michèle Sebag. Fitness-AUC bandit adaptive strategy selection vs. the probability matching one within differential evolution: an empirical comparison on the BBOB-2010 noiseless testbed. In Pelikan and Branke [12], pages 1535–1542.
- [5] S. Finck, N. Hansen, R. Ros, and A. Auger. Real-parameter black-box optimization benchmarking 2009: Presentation of the noiseless functions. Technical Report 2009/20, Research Center PPE, 2009. Updated February 2010.
- [6] Steffen Finck and Hans-Georg Beyer. Benchmarking CMA-EGS on the BBOB 2010 noiseless function testbed. In Pelikan and Branke [12], pages 1633–1640.
- [7] Steffen Finck and Hans-Georg Beyer. Benchmarking SPSA on BBOB-2010 noiseless function testbed. In Pelikan and Branke [12], pages 1657–1664.
- [8] N. Hansen, A. Auger, S. Finck, and R. Ros. Real-parameter black-box optimization benchmarking 2010: Experimental setup. Technical Report RR-7215, INRIA, 2010.
- [9] N. Hansen, S. Finck, R. Ros, and A. Auger. Real-parameter black-box optimization benchmarking 2009: Noiseless functions definitions. Technical Report RR-6829, INRIA, 2009. Updated February 2010.
- [10] Nikolaus Hansen and Raymond Ros. Benchmarking a weighted negative covariance matrix update on the BBOB-2010 noiseless testbed. In Pelikan and Branke [12], pages 1673–1680.
- [11] Antonio LaTorre, Santiago Muelas, and José María Peña. Benchmarking a MOS-based algorithm on the BBOB-2010 noiseless function testbed. In Pelikan and Branke [12], pages 1649–1656.
- [12] Martin Pelikan and Jürgen Branke, editors. *Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference, GECCO 2010, Proceedings, Portland, Oregon, USA, July 7-11, 2010, Companion Material*. ACM, 2010.
- [13] Mike Preuss. Niching the CMA-ES via nearest-better clustering. In Pelikan and Branke [12], pages 1711–1718.

- [14] Raymond Ros. Black-box optimization benchmarking the IPOP-CMA-ES on the noiseless testbed: comparison to the BIPOP-CMA-ES. In Pelikan and Branke [12], pages 1503–1510.
- [15] Raymond Ros. Comparison of NEWUOA with different numbers of interpolation points on the BBOB noiseless testbed. In Pelikan and Branke [12], pages 1487–1494.
- [16] Thanh-Do Tran and Gang-Gyoo Jin. Real-coded genetic algorithm benchmarked on noiseless black-box optimization testbed. In Pelikan and Branke [12], pages 1731–1738.