

# Comparison tables: BBOB 2010 noisy testbed in 20-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 2: 20-D, running time excess  $ERT/ERT_{\text{best}}$  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

	<b>102 Sphere moderate unif</b>										
$\Delta f_{\text{target}}$ $ERT_{\text{best}}/D$	1e+03 0.05	1e+02 2.8	1e+01 11	1e+00 21	1e-01 27	1e-02 34	1e-03 40	1e-04 49	1e-05 60	1e-07 79	$\Delta f_{\text{target}}$ $ERT_{\text{best}}/D$
(1,2)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	11	5.5	3.9	4.0	4.1	4.6	5.1	5.1	8.7	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	5.5	<b>2.7</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.6</b>	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	4.5	<b>2.1</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.3</b>	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	15	6.5	4.5	4.7	6.1	8.4	13	18	44	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	3.5	<b>2.2</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.6</b>	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.3</b>	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.4</b>	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	<b>1</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.1</b>	avg NEWUOA [15]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	291	13	11	7.4	6.6	5.8	5.4	4.9	4.4	3.9	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [7]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.6</b>	IPOP-aCMA-ES [11]
IPOP-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.6</b>	IPOP-CMA-ES [14]
CMA+DE-MOS	<b>1</b>	4.8	10	6.1	5.5	6.1	6.6	5.9	5.4	5.4	CMA+DE-MOS [12]
NEWUOA	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	3.1	5.9	6.8	24	52	509	<i>31e-5/5e3</i>	.	NEWUOA [15]
Basic RCGA	<b>1</b>	3.1	12	14	61	168	202	205	193	173	Basic RCGA [16]
SPSA	218	22	<i>43e+0/1e5</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	SPSA [8]

Table 3: 20-D, running time excess  $ERT/ERT_{\text{best}}$  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

	<b>103 Sphere moderate Cauchy</b>										
$\Delta f_{\text{target}}$ $ERT_{\text{best}}/D$	1e+03 0.05	1e+02 2.7	1e+01 7.6	1e+00 20	1e-01 29	1e-02 36	1e-03 44	1e-04 53	1e-05 61	1e-07 77	$\Delta f_{\text{target}}$ $ERT_{\text{best}}/D$
(1,2)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	13	7.6	3.9	3.4	3.3	3.3	3.2	3.2	3.2	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	5.4	3.3	<b>1.8</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.7</b>	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	4.1	<b>2.8</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.4</b>	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	11	6.3	3.3	<b>2.9</b>	<b>3.0</b>	3.1	3.0	3.0	<b>3.0</b>	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	3.9	<b>2.7</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.6</b>	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.4</b>	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>2.4</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</b>	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	3.3	<b>2.2</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.3</b>	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	<b>1</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2.2</b>	29	977	<i>14e-4/1e4</i>	.	.	avg NEWUOA [15]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	305	15	16	7.8	6.1	5.4	4.9	4.7	4.7	4.8	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [7]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>1.9</b>	IPOP-aCMA-ES [11]
IPOP-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>1.8</b>	IPOP-CMA-ES [14]
CMA+DE-MOS	<b>1</b>	3.5	10	6.3	5.1	5.7	6.2	6.5	6.6	6.9	CMA+DE-MOS [12]
NEWUOA	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.1</b>	6.4	63	1836	<i>48e-4/5e3</i>	.	.	NEWUOA [15]
Basic RCGA	<b>1</b>	<b>2.7</b>	14	14	78	329	316	295	276	241	Basic RCGA [16]
SPSA	352	65	54	32	33	48	125	26503	<i>37e-5/1e5</i>	.	SPSA [8]

Table 4: 20-D, running time excess  $ERT/ERT_{\text{best}}$  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

		<b>104 Rosenbrock moderate Gauss</b>										
	$\Delta\text{ftarget}$	1e+03	1e+02	1e+01	1e+00	1e-01	1e-02	1e-03	1e-04	1e-05	1e-07	$\Delta\text{ftarget}$
	$ERT_{\text{best}}/D$	5.1	40	2089	6734	7032	7207	7310	7389	7451	7567	$ERT_{\text{best}}/D$
	(1,2)-CMA-ES	12	7.3	36	<i>14e+0/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
	(1,2m)-CMA-ES	5.8	<b>1.4</b>	16	22	<i>12e+0/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	4.8	<b>2.8</b>	7.2	<i>12e+0/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
	(1,2s)-CMA-ES	11	6.1	67	<i>14e+0/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
	(1,4)-CMA-ES	5.0	<b>2.3</b>	9.4	<i>13e+0/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
	(1,4m)-CMA-ES	3.7	<b>1</b>	6.9	<i>97e-1/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	<b>3.3</b>	<b>1.2</b>	5.5	22	21	<i>91e-1/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
	(1,4s)-CMA-ES	3.7	<b>1.4</b>	12	<i>12e+0/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
	avg NEWUOA	<b>1.8</b>	<b>1.7</b>	6.5	<i>98e-1/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	avg NEWUOA [15]
	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	20	3.8	<b>1</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>2.7</b>	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [7]
	IPOP-aCMA-ES	4.5	<b>1.1</b>	<b>2.8</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 [11]
	IPOP-CMA-ES	4.7	<b>1.2</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.6</b>	IPOP-CMA-ES [14]
	CMA+DE-MOS	20	3.6	20	6.2	6.0	5.9	5.8	5.7	5.7	5.6	CMA+DE-MOS [12]
	NEWUOA	<b>1</b>	<b>1.9</b>	39	<i>17e+0/6e3</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	NEWUOA [15]
	Basic RCGA	24	12	<i>18e+0/5e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	Basic RCGA [16]
	SPSA	71	<i>14e+1/1e5</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	SPSA [8]

51

Table 5: 20-D, running time excess  $ERT/ERT_{\text{best}}$  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

	<b>105 Rosenbrock moderate unif</b>										
$\Delta\text{ftarget}$ $ERT_{\text{best}}/D$	1e+03	1e+02	1e+01	1e+00	1e-01	1e-02	1e-03	1e-04	1e-05	1e-07	$\Delta\text{ftarget}$ $ERT_{\text{best}}/D$
(1,2)-CMA-ES	5.5	<b>3.0</b>	13	11	<i>17e+0/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	<b>3.0</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<i>12e+0/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	<b>2.4</b>	<b>1.4</b>	5.8	<i>13e+0/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	7.3	5.0	13	<i>16e+0/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	<b>2.6</b>	<b>1.2</b>	6.2	<i>13e+0/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	<b>2.1</b>	<b>2.2</b>	5.8	<i>13e+0/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<i>13e+0/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	<b>1.9</b>	<b>2.0</b>	4.1	<i>15e+0/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	<b>1</b>	<b>1.2</b>	6.1	<i>12e+0/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	avg NEWUOA [15]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	10	<b>1.8</b>	59	<i>13e+0/1e5</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [7]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	<b>2.2</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>	IPOP-aCMA-ES [11]
IPOP-CMA-ES	<b>2.1</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.7</b>	IPOP-CMA-ES [14]
CMA+DE-MOS	10	<b>1.6</b>	7.7	<b>6.8</b>	<b>6.6</b>	<b>6.4</b>	<b>6.4</b>	<b>6.3</b>	<b>6.2</b>	<b>6.1</b>	CMA+DE-MOS [12]
NEWUOA	<b>1.5</b>	5.4	<i>24e+0/5e3</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	NEWUOA [15]
Basic RCGA	13	7.3	<i>18e+0/5e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	Basic RCGA [16]
SPSA	55	<i>14e+1/1e5</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	SPSA [8]

Table 6: 20-D, running time excess  $ERT/ERT_{\text{best}}$  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

	<b>106 Rosenbrock moderate Cauchy</b>										
$\Delta\text{ftarget}$	1e+03	1e+02	1e+01	1e+00	1e-01	1e-02	1e-03	1e-04	1e-05	1e-07	$\Delta\text{ftarget}$
$ERT_{\text{best}}/D$	6.0	25	314	639	722	767	786	804	818	844	$ERT_{\text{best}}/D$
(1,2)-CMA-ES	10	6.2	4.2	6.6	6.4	6.7	6.7	6.7	6.6	6.6	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	4.8	<b>2.0</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>2.0</b>	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	4.2	<b>2.0</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>1.8</b>	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	8.9	4.2	4.0	6.6	6.4	6.3	6.2	6.2	6.2	6.2	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	4.0	3.3	<b>1.8</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>2.4</b>	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	3.6	<b>2.0</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.7</b>	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	<b>2.6</b>	<b>1.5</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>	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	<b>3.3</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.5</b>	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.6</b>	15	<i>74e-1/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	avg NEWUOA [15]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	17	5.8	3.9	4.2	4.1	4.0	4.1	4.1	4.2	23	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [7]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	3.6	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.5</b>	IPOP-aCMA-ES [11]
IPOP-CMA-ES	3.8	<b>1.8</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>2.5</b>	IPOP-CMA-ES [14]
CMA+DE-MOS	18	6.0	3.6	15	14	14	13	13	13	13	CMA+DE-MOS [12]
NEWUOA	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	13	53	<i>49e-1/8e3</i>	.	.	.	.	.	NEWUOA [15]
Basic RCGA	21	21	<i>17e+0/5e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	Basic RCGA [16]
SPSA	305	2006	<i>52e+0/1e5</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	SPSA [8]

Table 7: 20-D, running time excess  $ERT/ERT_{\text{best}}$  on  $f_{107}$ , in italics is given the median final function value and the median number of function evaluations to reach this value divided by dimension

<b>107 Sphere Gauss</b>											
$\Delta f_{\text{target}}$ $ERT_{\text{best}}/D$	1e+03 0.05	1e+02 11	1e+01 295	1e+00 554	1e-01 876	1e-02 1131	1e-03 1310	1e-04 1573	1e-05 1795	1e-07 2120	$\Delta f_{\text{target}}$ $ERT_{\text{best}}/D$
(1,2)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	337	<i>83e+0/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	118	<i>67e+0/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	167	<i>61e+0/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	776	<i>87e+0/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	160	<i>67e+0/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	96	<i>54e+0/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	115	<i>56e+0/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	201	<i>70e+0/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	<b>1</b>	84	<i>64e+0/9e3</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	avg NEWUOA [15]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	327	<b>4.1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>3.0</b>	<b>3.1</b>	<b>4.0</b>	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [7]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	<b>1</b>	6.7	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>1.8</b>	IPOP-aCMA-ES [11]
IPOP-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>3.3</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	IPOP-CMA-ES [14]
CMA+DE-MOS	<b>1</b>	20	158	196	130	102	91	76	67	57	CMA+DE-MOS [12]
NEWUOA	<b>1</b>	75	<i>57e+0/4e3</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	NEWUOA [15]
Basic RCGA	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2.5</b>	<b>2.3</b>	4.4	6.5	7.1	7.0	6.9	6.7	Basic RCGA [16]
SPSA	213	632	<i>65e+0/1e5</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	SPSA [8]

∞



Table 9: 20-D, running time excess  $ERT/ERT_{\text{best}}$  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											
$\Delta f_{\text{target}}$ $ERT_{\text{best}}/D$	1e+03 0.05	1e+02 2.8	1e+01 15	1e+00 26	1e-01 38	1e-02 52	1e-03 65	1e-04 79	1e-05 94	1e-07 123	$\Delta f_{\text{target}}$ $ERT_{\text{best}}/D$	
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	11	3.9	4.3	4.1	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.5	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]	
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	5.7	<b>1.9</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>1.9</b>	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]	
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	3.6	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.4</b>	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]	
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	11	3.7	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.5	3.6	3.5	3.6	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]	
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	3.5	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>2.4</b>	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]	
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	<b>2.0</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.8</b>	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]	
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	<b>2.6</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>	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]	
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	3.3	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.4</b>	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]	
avg NEWUOA	1	<b>1.9</b>	19	<i>25e-1/9e3</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	avg NEWUOA [15]	
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	325	14	7.8	6.7	5.5	27060	<i>19e-3/1e5</i>	.	.	.	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [7]	
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>2.2</b>	IPOP-aCMA-ES [11]	
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>2.0</b>	IPOP-CMA-ES [14]	
CMA+DE-MOS	1	5.1	6.7	5.1	6.5	7.0	7.3	7.7	7.9	8.1	CMA+DE-MOS [12]	
NEWUOA	1	<b>1</b>	19	<i>33e-1/4e3</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	NEWUOA [15]	
Basic RCGA	1	3.5	8.1	13	176	206	195	183	167	140	Basic RCGA [16]	
SPSA	311	56	59	2870	7702	<i>30e-2/1e5</i>	.	.	.	.	SPSA [8]	































Table 25: 20-D, running time excess  $ERT/ERT_{\text{best}}$  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

	<b>125 Griewank-Rosenbrock Gauss</b>										
$\Delta f_{\text{target}}$ $ERT_{\text{best}}/D$	1e+03 0.05	1e+02 0.05	1e+01 0.05	1e+00 16	1e-01 1.17e5	1e-02 2.96e5	1e-03 9.83e5	1e-04 1.75e6	1e-05 6.98e6	1e-07 6.99e6	$\Delta f_{\text{target}}$ $ERT_{\text{best}}/D$
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	2812	<i>12e-1/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	453	<i>94e-2/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	379	<i>96e-2/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	<i>13e-1/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	501	<i>95e-2/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	253	<i>88e-2/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	254	<i>95e-2/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	733	<i>10e-1/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	1	1	1.5	<i>45e-2/9e3</i>	.	.	.	.	.	avg NEWUOA [15]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	283	321	364	2.3	4.0	<i>23e-2/1e5</i>	.	.	.	.	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [7]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1	1	2.6	1.6	1	1.3	1.4	1	1	IPOP-aCMA-ES [11]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1	1	3.0	3.0	1.5	1	1	1.0	1.0	IPOP-CMA-ES [14]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1	1.1	4.7	2.9	<i>18e-2/1e5</i>	.	.	.	.	CMA+DE-MOS [12]
NEWUOA	1	1	1	1.3	<i>49e-2/4e3</i>	.	.	.	.	.	NEWUOA [15]
Basic RCGA	1	1	1.1	1	1	<i>33e-2/5e4</i>	.	.	.	.	Basic RCGA [16]
SPSA	1.00e6	1.00e6	1.00e6	3109	1.5	<i>12e-2/1e5</i>	.	.	.	.	SPSA [8]

Table 26: 20-D, running time excess  $ERT/ERT_{\text{best}}$  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

<b>126 Griewank-Rosenbrock unif</b>											
$\Delta f_{\text{target}}$ $ERT_{\text{best}}/D$	1e+03 0.05	1e+02 0.05	1e+01 0.05	1e+00 17	1e-01 2.09e5	1e-02 $\infty$	1e-03 $\infty$	1e-04 $\infty$	1e-05 $\infty$	1e-07 $\infty$	$\Delta f_{\text{target}}$ $ERT_{\text{best}}/D$
(1,2)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<i>15e-1/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<i>15e-1/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<i>15e-1/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<i>14e-1/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<i>14e-1/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<i>13e-1/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	8707	<i>13e-1/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	8532	<i>13e-1/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	122	7763	<i>16e-1/9e3</i>	.	.	.	.	.	avg NEWUOA [15]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	2514	3109	3338	39	<i>33e-2/1e5</i>	.	.	.	.	.	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [7]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	19	<i>30e-2/2e5</i>	.	.	.	.	.	IPOP-aCMA-ES [11]
IPOP-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>17</b>	<i>28e-2/2e5</i>	.	.	.	.	.	IPOP-CMA-ES [14]
CMA+DE-MOS	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>4.6</b>	<i>39e-2/1e5</i>	.	.	.	.	.	CMA+DE-MOS [12]
NEWUOA	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	4.2	392	<i>12e-1/4e3</i>	.	.	.	.	.	NEWUOA [15]
Basic RCGA	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<i>32e-2/5e4</i>	.	.	.	.	Basic RCGA [16]
SPSA	2.80e7	2.80e7	2.80e7	83636	<i>45e+3/1e5</i>	.	.	.	.	.	SPSA [8]

Table 27: 20-D, running time excess  $ERT/ERT_{\text{best}}$  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

	<b>127 Griewank-Rosenbrock Cauchy</b>										
$\Delta f_{\text{target}}$ $ERT_{\text{best}}/D$	1e+03 0.05	1e+02 0.05	1e+01 0.05	1e+00 10	1e-01 11182	1e-02 59822	1e-03 1.80e5	1e-04 3.02e5	1e-05 3.07e5	1e-07 3.16e5	$\Delta f_{\text{target}}$ $ERT_{\text{best}}/D$
(1,2)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	39	<i>70e-2/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	3.1	<i>52e-2/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	4.4	<i>48e-2/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	38	<i>67e-2/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	5.9	<i>44e-2/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	3.9	13	<i>39e-2/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	3.4	<i>23e-2/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	6.0	<i>53e-2/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	7.7	<b>1.1</b>	<i>43e-2/9e3</i>	.	.	.	.	.	avg NEWUOA [15]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	292	335	353	3.9	<i>28e-2/1e5</i>	.	.	.	.	.	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [7]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.3</b>	IPOP-aCMA-ES [11]
IPOP-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>4.3</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	IPOP-CMA-ES [14]
CMA+DE-MOS	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.1</b>	7.9	<b>1</b>	<i>44e-3/1e5</i>	.	.	.	.	CMA+DE-MOS [12]
NEWUOA	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	3.7	<b>1.3</b>	<i>45e-2/4e3</i>	.	.	.	.	.	NEWUOA [15]
Basic RCGA	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>1.6</b>	4.8	<i>59e-3/5e4</i>	.	.	.	.	Basic RCGA [16]
SPSA	226	276	960	11890	36	<i>10e-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.