

Comparison tables: BBOB 2010 noisy testbed in 5-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 [10, 6]. The experimental set-up is described in [9].

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 [9] 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: 05-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{best} on f_{101} , in *italics* is given the median final function value and the median number of function evaluations to reach this value divided by dimension

101 Sphere moderate Gauss											
$\Delta\text{ftarget}$ ERT_{best}/D	1e+03	1e+02	1e+01	1e+00	1e-01	1e-02	1e-03	1e-04	1e-05	1e-07	$\Delta\text{ftarget}$ ERT_{best}/D
	0.20	0.20	5.2	11	14	17	19	20	21	23	
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1.2	3.5	3.0	4.1	4.8	5.6	6.6	7.2	8.5	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	3.1	1.8	2.3	3.2	3.5	3.9	4.3	4.8	5.7	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.6	2.0	2.6	3.0	3.3	3.8	4.3	5.0	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1	2.9	3.2	4.3	4.7	5.0	5.8	6.3	7.8	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.2	1.9	2.3	2.7	3.0	3.6	4.0	4.6	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1.3	1	1.4	1.8	2.3	2.7	2.9	3.3	4.1	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1.2	1.0	1.1	1.5	1.7	2.0	2.3	2.5	3.0	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	3.3	1.1	1.4	1.7	2.0	2.3	2.6	2.9	3.5	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	2.6	1.2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	avg NEWUOA [15]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	41	61	9.5	8.6	9.1	10	11	12	13	16	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [7]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1.2	1.2	2.0	2.7	3.4	3.8	4.4	4.9	6.0	IPOP-aCMA-ES [11]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1.2	1.4	2.3	3.0	3.5	4.0	4.5	5.1	6.0	IPOP-CMA-ES [14]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1.1	3.1	7.9	12	13	16	18	20	24	CMA+DE-MOS [12]
NEWUOA	1	3.6	1.1	1.1	1.3	1.5	1.7	1.9	1.9	2.0	NEWUOA [15]
Basic RCGA	1	1.1	3.3	17	31	52	75	102	133	189	Basic RCGA [16]
SPSA	40	64	35	117	246	255	301	325	368	6241	SPSA [8]

Table 2: 05-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{best} on f_{102} , in italics is given the median final function value and the median number of function evaluations to reach this value divided by dimension

102 Sphere moderate unif											
Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D	1e+03 0.20	1e+02 0.20	1e+01 5.1	1e+00 10	1e-01 15	1e-02 19	1e-03 22	1e-04 24	1e-05 27	1e-07 30	Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1.4	4.0	4.0	4.3	4.6	5.1	5.9	6.2	7.1	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	1.4	1.7	2.3	2.4	3.0	3.2	3.5	3.9	4.5	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	2.4	1.8	2.3	2.7	2.8	3.1	3.3	3.5	4.1	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	2.3	1.8	3.6	4.4	4.6	5.3	5.6	6.0	6.9	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.4	1.7	2.0	2.1	2.4	2.7	3.0	3.5	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1.7	1.0	1.6	1.9	1.9	2.3	2.5	2.6	3.0	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	1.2	1.4	1.7	1.8	2.0	2.0	2.4	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1.6	1.2	1.4	1.6	1.9	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.9	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	1.3	1.2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	avg NEWUOA [15]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	45	79	9.1	10	10	10	10	11	12	13	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [7]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1.4	1.5	2.3	2.6	3.1	3.3	3.8	3.9	4.6	IPOP-aCMA-ES [11]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1.5	1.5	2.2	2.8	3.0	3.3	3.9	4.2	4.8	IPOP-CMA-ES [14]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1.1	2.5	8.7	11	12	14	15	16	18	CMA+DE-MOS [12]
NEWUOA	1	3.9	2.7	4.1	4.8	11	13	18	21	27	NEWUOA [15]
Basic RCGA	1	1.2	4.5	20	27	40	58	80	99	138	Basic RCGA [16]
SPSA	41	60	863	3390	6811	6831	6080	7162	15738	<i>31e-3/1e5</i>	SPSA [8]

Table 3: 05-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{best} on f_{103} , in italics is given the median final function value and the median number of function evaluations to reach this value divided by dimension

103 Sphere moderate Cauchy											
Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D	1e+03	1e+02	1e+01	1e+00	1e-01	1e-02	1e-03	1e-04	1e-05	1e-07	Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D
	0.20	0.20	4.7	8.7	21	29	38	48	57	79	
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1.5	2.9	4.2	2.6	2.8	3.0	2.9	3.1	3.0	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	2.5	1.6	2.4	1.6	1.7	1.7	1.8	1.8	1.8	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.8	2.3	1.6	1.5	1.5	1.6	1.6	1.6	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	2.1	3.8	4.4	2.8	2.6	2.6	2.7	2.7	2.7	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1.6	1	1.9	1.3	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.5	1.5	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1.3	1.2	1.8	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1.2	1.1	1.3	1	1	1	1	1	1	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1.6	1.4	1.8	1.4	1.4	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.2	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	2.5	1.2	1	1.0	1.1	2.1	3.4	5.1	10	avg NEWUOA [15]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	32	57	9.1	10	5.7	5.5	5.0	4.9	5.2	5.9	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [7]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1	1.3	2.6	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.9	1.9	IPOP-aCMA-ES [11]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1.4	1.7	2.5	1.9	1.9	2.0	2.1	2.1	2.1	IPOP-CMA-ES [14]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1.1	3.5	8.4	7.9	7.7	7.8	8.0	8.8	8.8	CMA+DE-MOS [12]
NEWUOA	1	3.5	1.1	1.2	1.6	1.9	10	11	22	40	NEWUOA [15]
Basic RCGA	1	1.3	3.3	17	17	27	38	47	53	65	Basic RCGA [16]
SPSA	51	202	70	76	48	52	68	698	11449	<i>42e-6/1e5</i>	SPSA [8]

Table 4: 05-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{best} on f_{104} , in italics is given the median final function value and the median number of function evaluations to reach this value divided by dimension

104 Rosenbrock moderate Gauss												
	$\Delta\text{ftarget}$	1e+03	1e+02	1e+01	1e+00	1e-01	1e-02	1e-03	1e-04	1e-05	1e-07	$\Delta\text{ftarget}$
	ERT_{best}/D	4.2	24	36	308	437	513	556	585	605	643	ERT_{best}/D
	(1,2)-CMA-ES	6.5	3.5	3.8	6.6	32	136	<i>98e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
	(1,2m)-CMA-ES	2.7	3.8	3.2	2.1	7.6	8.7	8.2	8.3	8.1	7.7	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	2.9	1.3	1.6	4.7	8.5	15	15	14	14	13	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
	(1,2s)-CMA-ES	3.7	3.7	3.5	6.4	30	60	261	<i>69e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
	(1,4)-CMA-ES	1.8	1.7	1.5	2.1	2.9	2.6	4.2	4.0	3.9	3.7	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
	(1,4m)-CMA-ES	2.2	1.6	1.4	2.5	2.0	2.4	2.3	2.2	2.1	2.0	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	2.0	1.4	1.3	2.1	2.9	2.6	2.4	2.3	2.3	2.1	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
	(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1.5	1.2	1.3	4.5	8.3	11	10	10	9.4	8.9	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
	avg NEWUOA	1.2	1.3	1	2.5	4.5	8.6	14	14	13	17	avg NEWUOA [15]
	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	20	5.9	5.4	292	264	225	208	198	191	180	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [7]
	IPOP-aCMA-ES	3.0	1.3	1.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	IPOP-aCMA-ES [11]
	IPOP-CMA-ES	1.9	1	1.3	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	IPOP-CMA-ES [14]
	CMA+DE-MOS	5.5	3.9	5.0	2.0	2.1	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.1	CMA+DE-MOS [12]
	NEWUOA	1	1.3	1.2	1.7	3.5	8.4	15	66	<i>14e-4/5e3</i>	.	NEWUOA [15]
	Basic RCGA	6.5	3.6	10	191	254	663	613	1245	<i>12e-1/5e4</i>	.	Basic RCGA [16]
	SPSA	173	68	<i>36e+0/1e5</i>	SPSA [8]

51

Table 5: 05-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{best} on f_{105} , in italics is given the median final function value and the median number of function evaluations to reach this value divided by dimension

	105 Rosenbrock moderate unif										
$\Delta\text{ftarget}$	1e+03	1e+02	1e+01	1e+00	1e-01	1e-02	1e-03	1e-04	1e-05	1e-07	$\Delta\text{ftarget}$
ERT_{best}/D	3.3	18	34	680	1331	1414	1463	1499	1525	1576	ERT_{best}/D
(1,2)-CMA-ES	9.1	3.4	3.0	3.3	15	49	100	97	<i>18e-2/1e4</i>	.	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	4.9	2.6	2.0	2.5	7.6	14	29	<i>88e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	3.8	3.0	2.1	1.5	3.9	33	<i>38e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	7.2	2.4	4.8	4.3	15	<i>14e-2/1e4</i>	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	3.9	4.1	2.7	5.2	11	23	49	100	<i>14e-2/1e4</i>	.	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	2.7	4.1	2.6	2.5	9.2	30	48	47	95	92	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1.6	1.3	1	1.8	6.8	32	98	96	94	91	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1.9	1	1.6	2.8	12	32	99	97	<i>12e-2/1e4</i>	.	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1.4	2.5	1.7	1	1.5	6.2	21	66	65	<i>45e-4/7e3</i>	avg NEWUOA [15]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	22	8.2	5.6	418	1054	992	959	936	920	890	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [7]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	2.0	3.6	2.7	1.3	1	1	1	1	1	1	IPOP-aCMA-ES [11]
IPOP-CMA-ES	2.5	1.8	1.6	1.6	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	IPOP-CMA-ES [14]
CMA+DE-MOS	6.9	4.7	4.7	2.5	1.7	1.9	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.3	CMA+DE-MOS [12]
NEWUOA	1	1.9	1.6	1.1	2.6	7.1	<i>38e-3/5e3</i>	.	.	.	NEWUOA [15]
Basic RCGA	9.2	7.4	13	45	94	259	251	<i>51e-2/5e4</i>	.	.	Basic RCGA [16]
SPSA	550	172	<i>36e+0/1e5</i>	SPSA [8]

Table 6: 05-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{best} on f_{106} , in italics is given the median final function value and the median number of function evaluations to reach this value divided by dimension

	106 Rosenbrock moderate Cauchy											
Δf_{target}	1e+03	1e+02	1e+01	1e+00	1e-01	1e-02	1e-03	1e-04	1e-05	1e-07	Δf_{target}	
ERT_{best}/D	3.8	10	16	161	296	339	361	378	393	415	ERT_{best}/D	
(1,2)-CMA-ES	5.0	9.5	8.3	8.6	6.1	6.0	6.0	5.9	5.8	5.7	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]	
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	4.1	5.1	4.7	2.0	1.8	1.9	1.9	2.0	2.0	2.0	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]	
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	2.0	3.3	3.8	2.1	1.7	1.7	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]	
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	6.6	9.0	9.3	5.6	4.8	4.9	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]	
(1,4)-CMA-ES	2.2	3.2	3.1	2.3	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]	
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1.6	1.8	2.3	1.9	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]	
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1.5	1.3	1.5	1.3	1	1	1	1	1	1	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]	
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	2.2	1.6	2.5	1.2	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]	
avg NEWUOA	1.8	1.2	1	1	1.7	6.0	13	45	293	<i>21e-5/8e3</i>	avg NEWUOA [15]	
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	15	11	10	4.9	3.5	23	22	21	21	21	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [7]	
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1.9	2.3	2.8	1.2	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.4	IPOP-aCMA-ES [11]	
IPOP-CMA-ES	1.9	2.8	3.6	1.7	1.6	1.8	1.8	1.9	1.9	1.9	IPOP-CMA-ES [14]	
CMA+DE-MOS	5.5	6.3	10	3.5	2.9	2.9	3.0	3.1	3.2	3.5	CMA+DE-MOS [12]	
NEWUOA	1	1	1.1	1.5	3.5	28	87	<i>79e-4/7e3</i>	.	.	NEWUOA [15]	
Basic RCGA	7.1	10	25	238	339	512	977	<i>44e-2/5e4</i>	.	.	Basic RCGA [16]	
SPSA	568	1872	2419	<i>26e-1/1e5</i>	SPSA [8]	

Table 8: 05-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{best} on f_{108} , in italics is given the median final function value and the median number of function evaluations to reach this value divided by dimension

108 Sphere unif											
Δ_{ftarget} ERT_{best}/D	1e+03	1e+02	1e+01	1e+00	1e-01	1e-02	1e-03	1e-04	1e-05	1e-07	Δ_{ftarget} ERT_{best}/D
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1.7	55	<i>23e-1/1e4</i>	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	2.7	34	33	<i>18e-1/1e4</i>	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1.1	40	64	<i>19e-1/1e4</i>	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	2.8	114	101	<i>22e-1/1e4</i>	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1.7	7.5	23	80	<i>11e-1/1e4</i>	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1.4	31	11	<i>84e-2/1e4</i>	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	3.7	20	19	<i>94e-2/1e4</i>	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	2.7	31	100	<i>15e-1/1e4</i>	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	3.0	195	64	<i>27e-1/6e3</i>	avg NEWUOA [15]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	5825	9728	366	20	12	11	14	15	21	67	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [7]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	12	13	1	1	1.0	1	1.1	1.1	1.4	IPOP-aCMA-ES [11]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1.7	11	1.2	1.1	1	1.2	1	1	1	IPOP-CMA-ES [14]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1.1	3.1	139	195	247	418	288	227	<i>89e-2/1e5</i>	CMA+DE-MOS [12]
NEWUOA	1	48	97	93	<i>41e-1/5e3</i>	NEWUOA [15]
Basic RCGA	1	1	1	19	47	111	<i>16e-2/5e4</i>	.	.	.	Basic RCGA [16]
SPSA	436	1305	112	14	378	<i>15e-2/1e5</i>	SPSA [8]

Table 9: 05-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{best} on f_{109} , in italics is given the median final function value and the median number of function evaluations to reach this value divided by dimension

109 Sphere Cauchy											
Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D	1e+03 0.20	1e+02 0.20	1e+01 4.2	1e+00 13	1e-01 24	1e-02 39	1e-03 57	1e-04 74	1e-05 91	1e-07 127	Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	2.7	2.9	2.4	3.2	3.7	3.9	4.8	4.7	5.1	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	3.3	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.0	2.1	2.0	1.9	2.0	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1.3	1.8	1.9	1.8	1.6	1.6	1.7	1.7	1.6	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1	3.1	3.1	3.6	3.8	4.5	4.6	4.6	5.1	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1.1	1.8	2.0	1.8	1.9	2.0	2.1	2.2	2.1	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.5	1.2	1.4	1.6	1.6	1.7	1.8	1.8	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1.6	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1.2	1.6	1.2	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.3	1.3	1.3	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	1.5	2.2	3.1	46	90	<i>67e-4/6e3</i>	.	.	.	avg NEWUOA [15]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	41	62	11	7.3	5.5	210	4881	<i>17e-4/1e5</i>	.	.	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [7]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1.1	1.6	1.7	1.9	2.0	1.9	2.0	2.2	2.3	IPOP-aCMA-ES [11]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1	1.5	1.9	2.0	2.1	2.1	2.2	2.2	2.2	IPOP-CMA-ES [14]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1.1	3.2	7.7	8.6	9.3	9.4	10	10	11	CMA+DE-MOS [12]
NEWUOA	1	1.7	2.6	11	148	1690	<i>41e-3/5e3</i>	.	.	.	NEWUOA [15]
Basic RCGA	1	1.3	4.7	18	22	27	32	38	48	80	Basic RCGA [16]
SPSA	50	101	73	839	6210	<i>13e-2/1e5</i>	SPSA [8]

Table 14: 05-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{best} on f_{114} , in italics is given the median final function value and the median number of function evaluations to reach this value divided by dimension

	114 Step-ellipsoid unif										
Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D	1e+03	1e+02	1e+01	1e+00	1e-01	1e-02	1e-03	1e-04	1e-05	1e-07	Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D
	0.20	2.9	490	1317	5378	9801	10047	10047	10047	10293	
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1.3	116	32	<i>11e+0/1e4</i>	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1.5	70	7.9	<i>63e-1/1e4</i>	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1.3	112	17	<i>79e-1/1e4</i>	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	38	45	18	<i>73e-1/1e4</i>	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	2.3	44	5.7	<i>46e-1/1e4</i>	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	2.3	14	4.3	<i>30e-1/1e4</i>	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	53	21	5.9	112	<i>21e-1/1e4</i>	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1.4	18	6.6	<i>53e-1/1e4</i>	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1.3	91	23	<i>11e+0/6e3</i>	avg NEWUOA [15]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	1787	581	47	135	<i>19e-1/1e5</i>	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [7]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1.3	28	1.0	1.4	1.0	1	1	1	1	1	IPOP-aCMA-ES [11]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1.3	33	1	1	1	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	IPOP-CMA-ES [14]
CMA+DE-MOS	1.5	2.0	19	290	71	52	79	79	79	78	CMA+DE-MOS [12]
NEWUOA	1	121	14	<i>89e-1/5e3</i>	NEWUOA [15]
Basic RCGA	1.2	1	3.7	35	65	<i>41e-2/5e4</i>	Basic RCGA [16]
SPSA	1025	428	57	548	<i>29e-1/1e5</i>	SPSA [8]

Table 15: 05-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{best} on f_{115} , in italics is given the median final function value and the median number of function evaluations to reach this value divided by dimension

	115 Step-ellipsoid Cauchy										
Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D	1e+03	1e+02	1e+01	1e+00	1e-01	1e-02	1e-03	1e-04	1e-05	1e-07	Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1.9	3.3	4.9	7.0	58	<i>13e-2/1e4</i>	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1.5	2.2	1.7	3.0	5.8	50	99	99	99	159	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	2.6	2.6	2.1	1.9	6.6	41	64	64	64	164	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1.2	2.6	4.4	13	44	<i>17e-2/1e4</i>	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1.7	1.5	1.6	2.1	4.9	21	97	97	97	79	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1.4	1.2	1.1	1.7	2.2	12	19	19	19	46	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1.5	1.2	2.7	2.0	4.1	23	35	35	35	37	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1.5	1.4	1.8	2.2	6.1	41	65	65	65	<i>11e-3/1e4</i>	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	1.3	1	5.2	24	<i>10e-2/6e3</i>	avg NEWUOA [15]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	55	11	7.9	521	1588	2865	2019	2019	2019	<i>31e-2/1e5</i>	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [7]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1.1	1.7	1.6	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	IPOP-aCMA-ES [11]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1.1	1	1.5	2.9	2.4	2.7	2.2	2.2	2.2	1.8	IPOP-CMA-ES [14]
CMA+DE-MOS	1.4	2.1	4.9	23	28	23	17	17	17	13	CMA+DE-MOS [12]
NEWUOA	1.9	1.1	2.7	17	37	<i>34e-2/4e3</i>	NEWUOA [15]
Basic RCGA	1.2	1.5	68	84	96	707	511	511	511	400	Basic RCGA [16]
SPSA	51	55	204	2021	3406	<i>12e-1/1e5</i>	SPSA [8]

Table 20: 05-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{best} on f_{120} , in italics is given the median final function value and the median number of function evaluations to reach this value divided by dimension

	120 Sum of diff powers unif										
Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D	1e+03	1e+02	1e+01	1e+00	1e-01	1e-02	1e-03	1e-04	1e-05	1e-07	Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D
	0.20	0.21	2.8	443	2447	5038	9959	16295	28976	72546	
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1.4	89	43	<i>14e-1/1e4</i>	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	32	53	104	61	<i>11e-1/1e4</i>	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1.6	40	34	<i>10e-1/1e4</i>	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	59	59	44	<i>14e-1/1e4</i>	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	10	41	21	<i>77e-2/1e4</i>	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	2.7	15	8.6	<i>66e-2/1e4</i>	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	52	74	13	<i>69e-2/1e4</i>	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1.8	44	20	<i>83e-2/1e4</i>	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	40	109	64	<i>15e-1/6e3</i>	avg NEWUOA [15]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	1223	2046	778	111	51	33	72	<i>13e-3/1e5</i>	.	.	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [7]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	2.1	21	1	1	1.1	1.2	1.2	1	1	IPOP-aCMA-ES [11]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1	7.0	2.1	1.0	1	1	1	1.3	1.3	IPOP-CMA-ES [14]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1.1	2.9	83	199	97	49	47	55	22	CMA+DE-MOS [12]
NEWUOA	1	31	150	72	<i>24e-1/5e3</i>	NEWUOA [15]
Basic RCGA	1	1.2	1	22	18	32	<i>50e-3/5e4</i>	.	.	.	Basic RCGA [16]
SPSA	194	1014	318	217	<i>84e-2/1e5</i>	SPSA [8]

Table 21: 05-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{best} on f_{121} , in italics is given the median final function value and the median number of function evaluations to reach this value divided by dimension

	121 Sum of diff powers Cauchy										
$\Delta\text{ftarget}$ ERT_{best}/D	1e+03	1e+02	1e+01	1e+00	1e-01	1e-02	1e-03	1e-04	1e-05	1e-07	$\Delta\text{ftarget}$ ERT_{best}/D
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1.1	2.6	4.0	3.3	4.7	5.7	6.6	7.5	16	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	1.4	1.4	1.6	1.6	1.7	2.1	2.9	3.2	5.0	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.2	1.7	1.7	1.9	2.4	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	3.9	3.1	4.1	3.9	4.0	11	9.4	16	48	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1.8	1	1.7	1.6	1.6	1.9	1.9	2.0	2.3	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1.5	2.0	1.6	1.5	1.5	1.8	1.6	1.7	2.1	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1.1	1.2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	2.7	1.5	1.4	1.3	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.4	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	2.9	2.5	4.6	78	1122	<i>38e-3/6e3</i>	.	.	.	avg NEWUOA [15]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	46	55	9.4	6.0	5.1	686	8809	<i>55e-4/1e5</i>	.	.	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [7]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	2.9	1.8	1.6	1.8	1.6	1.5	1.4	1.4	1.5	IPOP-aCMA-ES [11]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1.4	1.1	1.6	1.8	1.6	2.1	2.9	3.5	4.1	IPOP-CMA-ES [14]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1.1	2.0	6.8	7.1	5.7	4.4	4.1	3.8	4.4	CMA+DE-MOS [12]
NEWUOA	1	3.5	2.8	21	132	<i>86e-3/4e3</i>	NEWUOA [15]
Basic RCGA	1	1.2	1.2	16	20	16	59	2413	<i>22e-5/5e4</i>	.	Basic RCGA [16]
SPSA	42	66	69	9513	<i>11e-1/1e5</i>	SPSA [8]

Table 24: 05-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{best} on f_{124} , in italics is given the median final function value and the median number of function evaluations to reach this value divided by dimension

	124 Schaffer F7 Cauchy										
Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D	1e+03	1e+02	1e+01	1e+00	1e-01	1e-02	1e-03	1e-04	1e-05	1e-07	Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D
	0.20	0.21	3.3	50	443	1531	3792	4933	8445	11261	
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1	6.5	103	328	<i>52e-2/1e4</i>	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	1.1	2.0	2.2	14	97	<i>65e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1.2	2.5	4.5	10	<i>60e-3/1e4</i>	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1.7	57	225	<i>88e-2/1e4</i>	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	2.9	1.7	17	56	<i>13e-2/1e4</i>	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.4	2.1	7.1	46	<i>41e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1.2	1.1	6.1	8.4	93	<i>46e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1.6	10	16	34	<i>10e-2/1e4</i>	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	1.9	3.6	72	<i>63e-2/6e3</i>	avg NEWUOA [15]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	54	71	11	4.6	38	<i>44e-3/6e4</i>	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [7]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1.2	1.6	1	1	1	1	1	1.0	1	IPOP-aCMA-ES [11]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1.7	1.6	1.0	1.9	1.2	1.3	1.2	1	1.1	IPOP-CMA-ES [14]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1	1	4.8	6.8	4.0	2.6	2.3	3.6	3.2	CMA+DE-MOS [12]
NEWUOA	1	1.1	1.8	129	<i>11e-1/4e3</i>	NEWUOA [15]
Basic RCGA	1	1	1.4	52	19	11	11	71	<i>55e-5/5e4</i>	.	Basic RCGA [16]
SPSA	59	90	306	13461	<i>39e-1/1e5</i>	SPSA [8]

Table 25: 05-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{best} on f_{125} , in italics is given the median final function value and the median number of function evaluations to reach this value divided by dimension

	125 Griewank-Rosenbrock Gauss										
Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D	1e+03 0.20	1e+02 0.20	1e+01 0.20	1e+00 3.1	1e-01 162	1e-02 18741	1e-03 25208	1e-04 27184	1e-05 27488	1e-07 28028	Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	7.8	73	<i>92e-3/1e4</i>	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.3	4.5	18	<i>69e-3/1e4</i>	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	2.4	41	<i>81e-3/1e4</i>	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	16	128	<i>11e-2/1e4</i>	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	1.3	16	<i>58e-3/1e4</i>	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	1.5	16	<i>58e-3/1e4</i>	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	1.3	15	<i>54e-3/1e4</i>	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	3.1	29	<i>82e-3/1e4</i>	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	1	2.0	5.3	12	<i>36e-3/6e3</i>	avg NEWUOA [15]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	49	65	70	10	4.2	7.6	<i>10e-3/1e5</i>	.	.	.	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [7]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1	1	1.7	3.9	1	1	1	1	1	IPOP-aCMA-ES [11]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1	1	1.7	3.2	1.1	1.5	2.2	2.2	2.2	IPOP-CMA-ES [14]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1	1.2	2.2	1	6.6	31	28	28	28	CMA+DE-MOS [12]
NEWUOA	1	1	3.9	1	7.5	3.7	<i>40e-3/5e3</i>	.	.	.	NEWUOA [15]
Basic RCGA	1	1	1.1	1.7	1.9	1.8	<i>82e-4/5e4</i>	.	.	.	Basic RCGA [16]
SPSA	41	60	35786	2327	65	75	<i>51e-3/1e5</i>	.	.	.	SPSA [8]

Table 26: 05-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{best} on f_{126} , in italics is given the median final function value and the median number of function evaluations to reach this value divided by dimension

	126 Griewank-Rosenbrock unif										
Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D	1e+03	1e+02	1e+01	1e+00	1e-01	1e-02	1e-03	1e-04	1e-05	1e-07	Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D
	0.20	0.20	0.20	6.5	114	1.04e5	2.42e6	3.74e6	3.76e6	3.78e6	
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.1	62	1304	<i>25e-2/1e4</i>	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	19	<i>22e-2/1e4</i>	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	22	<i>20e-2/1e4</i>	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1	32	18	1262	<i>26e-2/1e4</i>	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	16	<i>15e-2/1e4</i>	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	11	410	<i>12e-2/1e4</i>	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	2.5	202	<i>12e-2/1e4</i>	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.2	8.6	629	<i>18e-2/1e4</i>	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	1	22	50	800	<i>26e-2/6e3</i>	avg NEWUOA [15]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	1548	1777	5228	242	176	14	<i>23e-3/1e5</i>	.	.	.	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [7]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1	1	1.9	14	2.4	<i>51e-4/4e5</i>	.	.	.	IPOP-aCMA-ES [11]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1	1	1.9	18	2.0	1	1	1	1	IPOP-CMA-ES [14]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1	1.2	1.0	1	<i>23e-3/1e5</i>	CMA+DE-MOS [12]
NEWUOA	1	1	1.2	32	611	<i>26e-2/5e3</i>	NEWUOA [15]
Basic RCGA	1	1	1.1	1	2.5	1	<i>11e-3/5e4</i>	.	.	.	Basic RCGA [16]
SPSA	1.00e6	2.00e6	3.25e6	99552	12626	<i>16e+2/1e5</i>	SPSA [8]

Table 27: 05-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{best} on f_{127} , in italics is given the median final function value and the median number of function evaluations to reach this value divided by dimension

	127 Griewank-Rosenbrock Cauchy										
Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D	1e+03 0.20	1e+02 0.20	1e+01 0.20	1e+00 2.9	1e-01 131	1e-02 16697	1e-03 33988	1e-04 34990	1e-05 35477	1e-07 36152	Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	5.9	21	8.9	<i>55e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	2.2	7.9	4.2	<i>44e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	1.8	6.9	8.9	<i>29e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.3	4.1	57	<i>64e-3/1e4</i>	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	1.2	12	<i>32e-3/1e4</i>	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	1.2	6.1	8.6	<i>24e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	1.7	12	<i>42e-3/1e4</i>	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	1.2	15	8.7	<i>29e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	1	2.0	1.3	8.0	<i>53e-3/6e3</i>	avg NEWUOA [15]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	44	62	77	13	3.0	5.5	<i>92e-4/1e5</i>	.	.	.	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [7]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1	1.1	2.1	4.7	1	1	1	1	1	IPOP-aCMA-ES [11]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1	1	1.0	2.4	1.1	1.2	1.4	1.4	1.4	IPOP-CMA-ES [14]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1	1.2	2.4	1	1.5	9.3	43	43	42	CMA+DE-MOS [12]
NEWUOA	1	1	2.5	1	11	<i>62e-3/4e3</i>	NEWUOA [15]
Basic RCGA	1	1	1.1	2.8	1.5	2.8	<i>95e-4/5e4</i>	.	.	.	Basic RCGA [16]
SPSA	45	56	122	1499	5186	<i>15e-2/1e5</i>	SPSA [8]

Table 30: 05-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{best} on f_{130} , in italics is given the median final function value and the median number of function evaluations to reach this value divided by dimension

130 Gallagher Cauchy											
$\frac{\Delta\text{ftarget}}{ERT_{\text{best}}/D}$	1e+03	1e+02	1e+01	1e+00	1e-01	1e-02	1e-03	1e-04	1e-05	1e-07	$\frac{\Delta\text{ftarget}}{ERT_{\text{best}}/D}$
	0.20	0.20	11	689	2109	2125	2140	2154	2163	2188	
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1	14	11	6.5	7.7	8.9	8.9	8.9	11	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	1	7.2	4.0	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	5.2	3.3	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.4	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1	37	14	12	12	12	12	12	12	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1	5.3	5.9	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.8	3.8	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	3.6	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.9	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	6.8	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1	3.3	3.3	4.3	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.2	4.2	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	1	1.3	1.5	1.7	4.6	9.2	41	<i>14e-3/6e3</i>	.	avg NEWUOA [15]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	35	57	5.1	48	42	96	320	319	<i>31e-3/1e5</i>	.	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [7]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1	1.4	34	113	112	111	111	111	110	IPOP-aCMA-ES [11]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1	1.2	14	92	113	113	112	112	111	IPOP-CMA-ES [14]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1	2.4	69	63	93	92	92	92	91	CMA+DE-MOS [12]
NEWUOA	1	1	2.2	2.6	2.9	15	<i>62e-3/4e3</i>	.	.	.	NEWUOA [15]
Basic RCGA	1	1	2.5	59	21	23	23	29	29	31	Basic RCGA [16]
SPSA	40	62	141	460	<i>19e-1/1e5</i>	SPSA [8]

References

- [1] Anne Auger, Dimo Brockhoff, and Nikolaus Hansen. Benchmarking the (1, 4)-CMA-ES with mirrored sampling and sequential selection on the noisy BBOB-2010 testbed. In Pelikan and Branke [13], pages 1625–1632.
- [2] Anne Auger, Dimo Brockhoff, and Nikolaus Hansen. Investigating the impact of sequential selection in the (1, 2)-CMA-ES on the noisy BBOB-2010 testbed. In Pelikan and Branke [13], pages 1605–1610.
- [3] Anne Auger, Dimo Brockhoff, and Nikolaus Hansen. Investigating the impact of sequential selection in the (1, 4)-CMA-ES on the noisy BBOB-2010 testbed. In Pelikan and Branke [13], pages 1611–1616.
- [4] Anne Auger, Dimo Brockhoff, and Nikolaus Hansen. Mirrored variants of the (1, 2)-CMA-ES compared on the noisy BBOB-2010 testbed. In Pelikan and Branke [13], pages 1575–1582.
- [5] Anne Auger, Dimo Brockhoff, and Nikolaus Hansen. Mirrored variants of the (1, 4)-CMA-ES compared on the noisy BBOB-2010 testbed. In Pelikan and Branke [13], pages 1583–1590.
- [6] S. Finck, N. Hansen, R. Ros, and A. Auger. Real-parameter black-box optimization benchmarking 2010: Presentation of the noisy functions. Technical Report 2009/21, Research Center PPE, 2010.
- [7] Steffen Finck and Hans-Georg Beyer. Benchmarking CMA-EGS on the BBOB 2010 noisy function testbed. In Pelikan and Branke [13], pages 1641–1648.
- [8] Steffen Finck and Hans-Georg Beyer. Benchmarking SPSA on BBOB-2010 noisy function testbed. In Pelikan and Branke [13], pages 1665–1672.
- [9] N. Hansen, A. Auger, S. Finck, and R. Ros. Real-parameter black-box optimization benchmarking 2010: Experimental setup. Technical Report RR-7215, INRIA, 2010.
- [10] N. Hansen, S. Finck, R. Ros, and A. Auger. Real-parameter black-box optimization benchmarking 2009: Noisy functions definitions. Technical Report RR-6869, INRIA, 2009. Updated February 2010.
- [11] Nikolaus Hansen and Raymond Ros. Benchmarking a weighted negative covariance matrix update on the BBOB-2010 noisy testbed. In Pelikan and Branke [13], pages 1681–1688.
- [12] Antonio LaTorre, Santiago Muelas, and José María Peña. Benchmarking a MOS-based algorithm on the BBOB-2010 noisy function testbed. In Pelikan and Branke [13], pages 1725–1730.
- [13] 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.

- [14] Raymond Ros. Black-box optimization benchmarking the IPOP-CMA-ES on the noisy testbed: comparison to the BIPOP-CMA-ES. In Pelikan and Branke [13], pages 1511–1518.
- [15] Raymond Ros. Comparison of NEWUOA with different numbers of interpolation points on the BBOB noisy testbed. In Pelikan and Branke [13], pages 1495–1502.
- [16] Thanh-Do Tran and Gang-Gyoo Jin. Benchmarking real-coded genetic algorithm on noisy black-box optimization testbed. In Pelikan and Branke [13], pages 1739–1744.