

Comparison tables: BBOB 2010 noisy testbed with BBOB 2009 as reference in 2-D

The BBOBies

August 31, 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 [11, 7]. The experimental set-up is described in [10].

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 in BBOB-2009 (see [6]) if an algorithm from BBOB-2009 reached the given target function value. The ERT value is given otherwise (ERT_{best} is noted as infinite). See [10] 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: 02-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{best} 2009 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											
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
	0.50	0.50	0.90	4.0	5.0	5.6	7.2	8.4	10	11	
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1	3.8	2.5	4.2	6.6	8.1	9.5	10	12	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	1	3.8	2.4	4.8	7.4	8.3	8.7	11	12	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	2.4	1.4	4.3	7.0	7.3	7.9	8.9	11	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1	4.6	3.2	6.5	8.5	14	13	14	15	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1	5.0	2.5	5.0	7.0	7.0	7.7	7.9	9.1	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1	3.2	1.7	3.3	5.4	6.3	6.6	7.2	8.4	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	3.2	1.6	2.9	4.1	4.8	5.2	5.3	6.2	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1	4.6	2.5	3.3	5.2	5.5	6.4	6.0	7.3	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	1	3.2	1.7	2.1	2.3	2.0	1.9	1.7	1.6	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	10	13	14	9.3	13	19	40	49	92	2502	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1	5.2	2.5	3.8	7.7	8.1	8.9	10	12	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1	3.6	3.2	5.8	7.5	8.5	9.2	11	12	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1	2.3	3.1	10	22	30	35	38	46	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	1	1	2.4	1.8	2.1	2.3	2.5	2.3	2.0	1.9	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1	1	2.3	3.2	32	62	67	86	111	192	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	24	41	173	159	282	907	764	687	631	641	SPSA [9]

Table 2: 02-D, running time excess $ERT/ERT_{\text{best}}^{2009}$ 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	1e+02	1e+01	1e+00	1e-01	1e-02	1e-03	1e-04	1e-05	1e-07	Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D
	0.50	0.50	0.90	3.5	5.4	8.3	10	11	12	16	
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1	5.6	3.2	5.2	5.7	6.6	8.6	9.3	10	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	1	3.3	2.7	3.1	4.7	6.7	7.1	7.6	8.7	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	3.2	2.2	4.1	5.1	6.2	6.9	8.0	8.7	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1	3.1	2.8	4.0	5.0	7.5	7.6	10	12	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1	4.0	2.7	3.9	4.1	5.1	5.4	5.5	6.6	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1	4.0	2.3	3.2	4.2	4.8	5.6	6.0	6.6	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	3.1	2.5	2.6	3.0	3.7	3.8	4.3	4.7	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1	3.3	2.3	3.2	3.0	3.9	4.1	4.5	5.0	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	1.2	4.0	2.1	2.6	4.4	4.1	3.7	3.4	2.8	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	13	16	16	7.1	39	36	47	45	705	3827	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1	4.1	3.5	5.9	5.8	7.0	7.9	8.2	9.1	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1	2.8	3.4	5.6	5.2	5.9	7.4	8.0	8.4	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1	2.3	4.3	11	17	25	26	32	34	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	1	1	7.1	11	9.3	7.0	6.6	5.8	5.2	4.4	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1	1	2.0	3.3	24	47	56	75	103	146	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	9.1	16	27	239	265	255	254	873	870	4083	SPSA [9]

Table 3: 02-D, running time excess $ERT/ERT_{\text{best}}^{2009}$ 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 0.50	1e+02 0.50	1e+01 0.90	1e+00 3.9	1e-01 4.7	1e-02 4.7	1e-03 4.7	1e-04 4.9	1e-05 4.9	1e-07 6.8	Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1	3.4	3.3	5.3	9.3	13	17	22	23	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	1	3.0	1.9	4.0	8.0	13	16	19	21	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	2.5	2.0	4.2	8.0	12	15	19	20	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1	3.0	3.2	7.3	10	13	16	21	23	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1	4.0	2.1	4.4	6.4	9.3	12	15	16	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1	2.8	1.5	3.6	6.2	9.1	11	14	14	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	2.4	1.6	2.6	4.8	7.0	8.4	11	11	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1	4.3	2.3	3.5	5.4	8.1	10	13	13	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	1	3.1	1.8	2.1	3.0	4.1	4.4	7.1	6.9	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	12	19	19	6.9	12	19	35	75	82	189	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1	3.2	2.4	4.4	8.2	12	16	21	21	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1	4.0	3.3	5.7	8.5	14	17	22	23	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1	2.4	2.6	13	30	51	63	83	94	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	1	1	3.2	1.6	2.1	3.1	4.2	4.9	6.4	7.8	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1	1	1.6	3.9	22	52	110	167	268	423	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	22	38	369	195	256	375	1471	4060	11338	12346	SPSA [9]

Table 4: 02-D, running time excess $ERT/ERT_{\text{best}}^{2009}$ 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										
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	0.60	2.0	2.7	7.3	97	120	124	126	128	132	ERT_{best}/D
(1,2)-CMA-ES	4.3	4.2	7.5	28	9.3	16	19	20	20	29	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	2.5	4.0	5.8	22	4.9	8.6	10	10	10	11	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	3.2	1.9	4.8	14	4.4	8.5	11	12	12	13	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	11	4.8	9.2	37	11	22	29	57	58	74	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	4.2	3.6	6.6	13	2.8	2.8	3.0	3.2	3.3	3.4	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	4.6	3.2	5.6	18	2.3	2.5	2.6	2.7	2.9	3.0	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	2.6	1.3	2.9	7.5	1.7	1.8	2.0	2.1	2.1	2.3	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	2.8	1.7	3.6	12	2.9	3.8	3.9	4.0	4.0	4.1	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	5.2	2.8	4.3	7.8	1.2	3.5	5.3	6.4	6.8	8.7	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	45	18	20	19	26	72	199	197	305	392	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	2.8	2.2	3.5	5.8	1.2	1.8	2.1	2.3	2.4	2.7	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	5.3	3.2	5.1	15	2.7	3.2	3.9	4.1	4.4	4.6	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	2.8	2.3	6.6	11	3.1	4.3	5.1	5.8	6.5	7.5	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	7.3	2.9	6.4	13	3.4	6.5	10	13	12	13	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	3.2	2.0	7.7	19	34	89	245	514	1709	<i>10e-5/5e4</i>	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	611	294	840	1711	4319	<i>39e-2/1e5</i>	SPSA [9]

Table 5: 02-D, running time excess $ERT/ERT_{\text{best}}^{2009}$ 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										
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	5.8	4.7	7.3	35	9.3	18	32	54	68	66	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	4.8	3.4	12	17	2.3	8.4	17	35	36	38	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	2.4	1.8	4.3	8.3	3.3	13	22	32	41	40	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	4.7	3.3	12	36	4.4	16	42	119	121	156	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	4.4	4.0	5.6	35	2.9	4.9	6.4	6.4	6.3	6.3	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	2.7	2.4	4.1	23	1.8	3.6	4.0	4.3	4.3	4.4	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	5.4	2.8	5.6	17	2.6	4.5	5.4	5.9	6.8	6.7	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	3.3	5.8	5.2	24	3.1	6.2	7.3	7.8	7.8	7.7	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	6.4	3.7	7.0	13	2.3	8.6	29	55	196	388	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	50	21	18	17	41	238	959	2211	3364	6907	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	8.3	3.1	6.6	8.3	1.0	1.5	1.9	2.0	2.0	2.2	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	6.5	3.7	5.5	16	2.3	5.4	5.7	5.8	5.9	6.1	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	2.6	2.3	6.2	7.4	1.6	2.9	3.4	3.7	4.0	4.7	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	6.3	2.7	7.9	16	3.1	6.3	22	42	41	115	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	3.3	3.9	8.1	11	13	50	165	465	1153	<i>18e-5/5e4</i>	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	519	302	320	1513	1483	8005	<i>34e-2/1e5</i>	.	.	.	SPSA [9]

Table 6: 02-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{best} 2009 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} 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	8.0	7.2	28	53	13	9.3	8.4	7.5	6.5	5.1	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	5.1	4.8	6.8	12	4.8	3.8	3.8	3.6	3.3	2.7	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	3.8	3.2	5.4	3.9	4.8	3.1	3.2	3.0	2.6	2.1	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	4.8	3.3	3.9	84	30	21	18	20	18	16	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	5.4	3.2	6.1	11	2.7	1.7	1.6	1.4	1.3	1.1	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	2.8	1.7	4.2	6.3	2.0	1.4	1.3	1.3	1.1	0.97	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	4.7	3.0	3.0	2.8	1.3	1.1	1.0	1.0	0.91	0.76	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	2.8	1.7	2.6	10	2.9	1.8	1.7	1.5	1.3	1.1	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	4.6	2.2	3.7	4.5	2.1	2.1	3.2	3.3	4.3	5.9	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	54	36	96	91	15	10	8.7	7.7	35	30	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	3.4	3.5	8.3	7.7	2.1	1.7	1.5	1.5	1.4	1.2	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	3.1	2.2	3.9	9.2	3.4	2.6	2.6	2.5	2.3	2.0	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	2.6	2.2	6.1	13	3.9	3.6	3.7	3.5	3.6	3.3	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	3.1	2.1	2.6	6.1	2.0	2.3	3.2	3.2	4.8	5.7	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	2.4	3.2	6.8	12	18	103	308	384	658	2206	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	1018	895	2614	6207	3396	10059	<i>40e-2/1e5</i>	.	.	.	SPSA [9]

Table 7: 02-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{best} 2009 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

107 Sphere Gauss											
Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D	1e+03 0.50	1e+02 0.50	1e+01 0.90	1e+00 6.6	1e-01 14	1e-02 57	1e-03 79	1e-04 101	1e-05 128	1e-07 211	Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1	30	14	10	3.9	5.1	7.8	11	13	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	1	4.4	5.2	4.0	1.8	1.6	1.5	1.5	1.6	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	2.3	2.2	1.9	1.4	1.6	1.9	1.6	2.0	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1	5.4	2.4	5.2	6.0	7.2	8.7	7.6	9.1	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1	11	3.6	7.7	2.6	2.2	2.1	2.1	1.8	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1	7.3	2.2	4.4	1.5	1.3	1.3	1.7	1.4	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	2.1	1.8	1.6	0.66	0.75	0.75	1.4	1.2	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1	6.1	11	7.7	2.4	2.5	2.1	2.0	2.0	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	1	14	32	24	13	15	31	45	80	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	9.2	14	20	6.9	11	3.6	25	84	153	303	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1	5.2	2.7	2.7	1.3	1.2	1.2	1.1	0.98	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1	5.6	1.9	2.7	1.2	1.1	1.2	1.1	1.00	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1	2.5	2.0	6.1	4.5	6.0	5.9	5.7	4.5	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	1	1	26	20	31	17	20	37	82	83	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1	1	1.8	2.0	9.1	8.6	10	8.8	13	20	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	16	21	483	1439	3795	4061	3907	14051	<i>27e-3/1e5</i>	.	SPSA [9]

∞

Table 8: 02-D, running time excess $ERT/ERT_{\text{best}}^{2009}$ 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											
Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D	1e+03 0.50	1e+02 0.50	1e+01 0.90	1e+00 15	1e-01 101	1e-02 713	1e-03 1711	1e-04 2608	1e-05 3684	1e-07 7989	Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1.2	17	13	5.6	3.7	14	<i>26e-4/1e4</i>	.	.	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	1	30	17	8.8	6.5	41	<i>29e-4/1e4</i>	.	.	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	30	7.8	5.5	10	38	<i>60e-4/1e4</i>	.	.	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1	17	12	10	8.9	<i>56e-4/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1	49	12	4.1	2.1	7.5	54	38	<i>61e-5/1e4</i>	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1	86	14	5.8	2.4	4.7	17	<i>50e-5/1e4</i>	.	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	14	14	6.1	5.7	5.7	17	<i>48e-5/1e4</i>	.	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1	145	26	8.7	3.8	4.8	18	40	<i>51e-5/1e4</i>	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	1	87	42	20	18	16	<i>14e-3/6e3</i>	.	.	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	1612	6028	4047	310	143	67	53	61	188	184	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1.2	5.7	6.0	3.5	0.82	0.68	0.99	1.0	0.79	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1	3.7	3.8	1.6	0.97	0.93	1.0	1.1	0.76	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1	2.4	1.0	2.3	1.8	1.6	4.1	4.5	3.7	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	1	1	121	56	24	22	25	<i>13e-3/6e3</i>	.	.	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1	1	2.3	1.3	12	20	21	28	46	<i>21e-5/5e4</i>	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	27	126	204	101	101	88	<i>28e-4/1e5</i>	.	.	.	SPSA [9]

Table 9: 02-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{best} 2009 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												
$\frac{\Delta f_{\text{target}}}{ERT_{\text{best}}/D}$	1e+03	1e+02	1e+01	1e+00	1e-01	1e-02	1e-03	1e-04	1e-05	1e-07	$\frac{\Delta f_{\text{target}}}{ERT_{\text{best}}/D}$	
	0.50	0.50	0.90	4.8	6.3	34	34	48	48	48		
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1.5	2.5	3.4	4.5	1.5	4.3	3.8	5.1	9.2	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]	
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	1	2.6	2.0	2.8	1.4	2.3	2.3	3.3	5.3	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]	
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.7	1.4	2.8	1.1	1.9	1.7	2.3	3.7	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]	
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1	6.6	3.7	5.0	6.4	9.4	7.4	8.2	15	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]	
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1	4.3	2.1	3.0	0.97	1.8	1.7	2.5	3.7	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]	
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1	5.1	2.6	4.0	1.1	1.9	1.8	2.3	3.5	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]	
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	2.5	1.9	3.0	0.96	1.4	1.3	1.8	2.4	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]	
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1	2.2	1.4	2.9	0.96	1.7	1.5	1.9	2.6	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]	
avg NEWUOA	1	1	3.3	2.6	15	7.0	9.0	11	15	31	avg NEWUOA [16]	
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	14	21	21	6.9	11	7.0	116	95	889	29122	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]	
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1	3.2	2.0	3.4	1.2	2.0	2.4	3.1	4.8	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]	
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1	2.0	1.4	3.8	1.2	2.1	2.2	3.4	5.4	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]	
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1	2.3	2.3	8.6	5.9	8.8	11	14	24	CMA+DE-MOS [13]	
NEWUOA	1	1	3.3	3.6	12	5.6	10	13	22	36	NEWUOA [16]	
Basic RCGA	1	1	1.8	2.5	15	10	19	24	36	67	Basic RCGA [17]	
SPSA	19	32	282	131	273	349	1660	2432	9217	<i>72e-6/1e5</i>	SPSA [9]	

Table 10: 02-D, running time excess $ERT/ERT_{\text{best}} 2009$ on f_{110} , in italics is given the median final function value and the median number of function evaluations to reach this value divided by dimension

110 Rosenbrock 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
(1,2)-CMA-ES	3.4	1.7	23	11	3.4	6.1	6.9	15	34	<i>22e-5/1e4</i>	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	15	7.2	7.7	5.7	2.1	3.3	4.4	5.5	4.6	15	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	3.1	3.3	5.2	5.6	1.5	3.2	8.2	8.0	17	32	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	5.3	15	17	18	4.2	4.7	6.3	8.9	7.6	31	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	3.2	2.2	3.7	6.0	4.1	5.9	5.4	4.6	3.5	5.0	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	4.8	3.0	3.2	1.8	1.7	1.7	1.9	1.6	1.1	1.3	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	4.9	2.3	7.3	5.3	2.1	4.4	3.9	4.0	2.6	3.3	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	4.2	2.6	3.9	8.2	2.8	3.3	2.9	2.8	2.8	2.7	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	3.8	10	11	5.1	2.5	3.0	6.8	11	5.9	<i>12e-4/5e3</i>	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	211	120	89	24	13	201	1238	<i>99e-4/1e5</i>	.	.	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	3.3	2.3	3.7	3.7	6.1	5.3	3.2	1.7	0.94	0.90	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	7.3	3.6	4.6	8.0	4.2	5.1	3.2	1.9	0.99	0.96	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	2.6	2.2	6.6	285	16	15	9.1	5.1	2.7	2.6	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	22	15	16	15	2.9	4.4	9.1	36	<i>19e-4/5e3</i>	.	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	2.4	2.0	3.1	4.1	5.1	22	33	39	55	157	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	531	198	339	832	1381	<i>38e-2/1e5</i>	SPSA [9]

Table 11: 02-D, running time excess $ERT/ERT_{\text{best}} 2009$ on f_{111} , in italics is given the median final function value and the median number of function evaluations to reach this value divided by dimension

	111 Rosenbrock unif										
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	0.60	3.7	12	59	359	2707	6359	14589	30930	84555	ERT_{best}/D
(1,2)-CMA-ES	18	7.2	5.9	8.5	12	6.2	<i>21e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	3.4	8.2	9.0	3.6	11	26	<i>30e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	20	16	11	8.9	7.3	12	<i>17e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	36	7.8	8.9	10	6.8	12	<i>15e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	62	21	12	4.7	5.5	3.5	5.1	4.9	4.8	<i>61e-4/1e4</i>	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	58	15	11	6.7	5.8	2.9	11	<i>47e-4/1e4</i>	.	.	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	20	5.4	3.6	4.5	6.3	6.9	11	<i>12e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	8.7	16	11	7.6	9.2	3.4	7.3	<i>17e-4/1e4</i>	.	.	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	72	48	45	29	53	33	<i>26e-2/6e3</i>	.	.	.	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	570	605	196	64	22	15	33	101	48	<i>22e-4/1e5</i>	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	4.6	2.7	7.5	3.3	3.9	3.2	3.9	2.4	1.3	0.51	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	3.3	4.3	5.0	3.3	4.8	2.0	4.3	2.6	1.3	0.55	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	2.7	1.4	2.0	2.2	44	23	12	6.1	3.3	1.3	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	137	33	21	25	19	11	<i>68e-3/6e3</i>	.	.	.	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	2.5	1.1	1.1	1.5	9.1	4.0	5.7	16	24	<i>32e-5/5e4</i>	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	73	23	52	152	173	544	<i>51e-3/1e5</i>	.	.	.	SPSA [9]

Table 12: 02-D, running time excess $ERT/ERT_{\text{best}} 2009$ on f_{112} , in italics is given the median final function value and the median number of function evaluations to reach this value divided by dimension

112 Rosenbrock 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	0.60	2.0	2.7	7.3	312	522	577	618	686	766	ERT_{best}/D	
(1,2)-CMA-ES	6.1	4.1	9.2	25	6.2	4.8	5.2	5.7	6.6	6.2	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]	
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	2.9	2.5	34	81	3.8	3.4	4.2	4.1	3.9	3.6	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]	
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	4.6	3.7	7.8	46	2.1	2.0	2.2	2.2	2.1	2.0	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]	
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	12	6.8	8.2	104	8.9	15	24	36	33	56	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]	
(1,4)-CMA-ES	6.4	3.7	5.0	11	0.83	0.93	1.00	1.1	1.0	1.0	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]	
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	7.1	3.9	4.5	4.3	0.62	0.72	0.82	0.86	0.83	0.86	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]	
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	4.1	2.4	6.3	15	0.88	0.70	0.72	0.72	0.69	0.69	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]	
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	3.2	2.3	4.5	12	1.1	0.95	0.97	0.99	0.94	0.91	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]	
avg NEWUOA	4.7	2.5	5.1	11	1.1	4.6	22	118	<i>19e-4/5e3</i>	.	avg NEWUOA [16]	
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	36	28	27	44	5.0	79	309	<i>12e-4/1e5</i>	.	.	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]	
IPOP-aCMA-ES	3.1	1.7	4.9	16	1.0	0.88	0.91	0.94	0.90	0.91	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]	
IPOP-CMA-ES	2.7	2.2	4.0	5.1	0.64	0.92	1.1	1.2	1.1	1.3	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]	
CMA+DE-MOS	2.6	2.3	6.7	11	1.1	1.8	2.1	2.2	2.3	2.7	CMA+DE-MOS [13]	
NEWUOA	5.1	2.7	5.0	13	1.2	1.7	10	112	101	<i>70e-5/5e3</i>	NEWUOA [16]	
Basic RCGA	4.6	3.0	8.9	9.0	4.2	43	85	114	240	447	Basic RCGA [17]	
SPSA	12128	3760	2996	3330	671	2693	2435	<i>21e-2/1e5</i>	.	.	SPSA [9]	

Table 13: 02-D, running time excess $ERT/ERT_{\text{best}} 2009$ on f_{113} , in italics is given the median final function value and the median number of function evaluations to reach this value divided by dimension

113 Step-ellipsoid Gauss											
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	8.4	8.0	7.3	13	23	34	34	34	12	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	2.3	4.6	4.4	3.9	7.6	7.8	10	10	10	4.0	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	2.8	4.9	4.5	6.6	12	19	22	22	22	5.0	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	14	8.4	10	9.3	14	18	39	39	39	11	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	2.0	2.0	2.9	15	14	13	16	16	16	4.2	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1.8	16	8.8	6.5	12	12	16	16	16	3.5	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	3.4	3.8	3.6	7.0	15	12	10	10	10	2.1	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	2.9	5.6	13	8.4	16	17	14	14	14	4.0	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	2.1	13	10	6.1	10	19	33	33	33	13	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	35	29	17	41	350	978	1184	1184	1184	556	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	2.4	3.0	2.2	10	17	12	14	14	14	2.8	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1.3	2.6	3.8	19	15	11	9.4	9.4	9.4	2.4	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	1.4	2.1	3.1	3.9	6.3	6.9	7.4	7.4	7.4	1.9	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	2.4	8.7	12	5.8	16	29	42	42	42	14	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1.5	1.6	4.7	3.7	85	177	212	212	212	52	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	17	18	19	1040	901	3536	2899	2899	2899	761	SPSA [9]

Table 14: 02-D, running time excess $ERT/ERT_{\text{best}} 2009$ 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
	0.50	0.83	4.4	21	349	1237	2671	2671	2671	4340	
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1.5	28	7.0	15	6.3	9.2	25	25	25	33	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	17	43	14	12	4.6	6.2	6.9	6.9	6.9	<i>32e-4/1e4</i>	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	8.8	41	26	19	5.7	6.6	17	17	17	<i>63e-4/1e4</i>	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	17	33	12	13	8.3	7.4	7.8	7.8	7.8	16	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1.9	43	17	12	3.8	4.1	4.8	4.8	4.8	17	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1.5	19	7.6	15	5.7	6.4	5.1	5.1	5.1	8.0	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	4.5	71	31	20	4.5	3.4	7.0	7.0	7.0	10	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1.4	44	14	19	7.1	13	7.6	7.6	7.6	4.7	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1.5	66	29	16	26	21	33	33	33	20	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	618	605	211	197	60	33	21	21	21	45	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1.8	14	8.6	10	2.8	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.3	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1.9	4.2	2.6	5.6	1.6	0.73	0.84	0.84	0.84	0.83	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	1.4	2.8	1.3	3.8	8.9	4.3	2.2	2.2	2.2	5.0	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	1.9	41	69	53	38	71	33	33	33	<i>21e-2/6e3</i>	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1.8	1.8	1.1	6.3	18	22	20	20	20	17	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	99	270	107	184	81	88	118	118	118	<i>63e-4/1e5</i>	SPSA [9]

Table 15: 02-D, running time excess $ERT/ERT_{\text{best}}^{2009}$ 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}	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	0.50	1.0	1.6	6.4	112	180	197	197	197	271	ERT_{best}/D
(1,2)-CMA-ES	2.0	3.8	5.0	7.0	1.8	4.3	6.9	6.9	6.9	19	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1.2	2.4	6.2	5.1	1.6	2.3	5.5	5.5	5.5	16	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1.9	2.1	5.3	4.9	1.5	2.9	6.0	6.0	6.0	13	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1.7	1.9	5.2	7.3	1.6	7.4	9.1	9.1	9.1	18	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1.4	2.2	4.7	4.9	1.1	2.2	2.5	2.5	2.5	3.0	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	2.3	2.5	3.1	4.9	1.3	2.3	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.4	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1.9	2.2	3.4	5.9	0.91	1.2	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.8	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	2.5	4.3	6.1	3.9	0.89	1.9	2.2	2.2	2.2	2.6	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1.5	2.8	6.5	7.3	2.9	6.1	7.1	7.1	7.1	12	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	14	12	14	18	99	325	551	551	551	1224	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1.3	3.3	3.8	5.4	1.4	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	2.7	4.5	5.2	14	2.2	2.4	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.2	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	1.4	2.1	4.1	5.6	1.9	2.0	6.3	6.3	6.3	5.3	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	2.0	2.5	4.5	12	2.9	4.4	11	11	11	11	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1.6	1.9	5.2	59	24	101	113	113	113	136	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	47	48	110	435	151	268	778	778	778	2416	SPSA [9]

Table 16: 02-D, running time excess $ERT/ERT_{\text{best}} 2009$ on f_{116} , in italics is given the median final function value and the median number of function evaluations to reach this value divided by dimension

	116 Ellipsoid Gauss										
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	3.3	6.8	25	50	78	103	138	165	521	894	ERT_{best}/D
(1,2)-CMA-ES	12	12	13	23	31	70	102	194	131	160	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	2.0	9.4	22	28	48	128	116	159	64	50	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1.4	4.4	11	10	35	69	88	189	135	166	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	13	40	16	26	39	165	<i>12e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1.9	2.2	15	20	35	44	42	36	16	9.4	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1.9	2.5	10	25	34	49	48	46	18	12	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	2.8	8.0	15	20	21	34	35	37	14	9.4	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	2.5	2.3	6.4	24	30	49	51	50	19	14	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	7.9	6.2	12	15	32	98	125	479	<i>14e-3/5e3</i>	.	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	67	132	512	1079	3593	6360	10202	<i>34e-2/1e5</i>	.	.	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	3.2	2.9	25	22	19	15	14	12	3.9	2.4	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1.7	3.8	28	42	36	36	30	26	8.4	5.1	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	2.2	3.7	33	83	70	56	44	38	13	7.9	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	5.4	4.6	6.3	18	38	107	571	<i>50e-3/5e3</i>	.	.	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1.9	4.5	4.6	102	476	859	1611	2102	670	817	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	20	19	61	307	1150	4537	10864	<i>43e-3/1e5</i>	.	.	SPSA [9]

Table 17: 02-D, running time excess $ERT/ERT_{\text{best}} 2009$ on f_{117} , in italics is given the median final function value and the median number of function evaluations to reach this value divided by dimension

117 Ellipsoid unif											
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	4.8	17	84	673	3227	6957	14112	14949	18210	21616	ERT_{best}/D
(1,2)-CMA-ES	9.2	8.6	8.9	6.0	5.6	<i>12e-2/1e4</i>	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	6.6	7.5	8.0	5.4	5.7	21	11	<i>11e-2/1e4</i>	.	.	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	8.8	7.7	10	3.7	6.9	<i>14e-2/1e4</i>	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	10	8.4	9.4	8.6	13	<i>31e-2/1e4</i>	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	11	9.3	10	3.8	2.0	10	<i>36e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	14	6.2	7.3	3.3	6.0	10	<i>12e-2/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	15	13	10	4.6	3.3	6.0	10	<i>59e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	7.9	8.7	4.8	4.5	2.7	3.9	11	<i>33e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	15	32	24	10	8.4	<i>78e-2/6e3</i>	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	50	112	115	32	62	103	103	<i>17e-2/1e5</i>	.	.	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	5.5	5.5	5.0	3.6	1.8	0.99	0.67	0.67	0.61	0.63	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	3.2	4.8	10	4.5	2.0	1.5	0.95	0.96	0.95	0.93	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	1.1	1.2	1.6	3.7	4.2	4.3	2.4	2.6	2.4	2.9	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	43	25	29	12	26	<i>97e-2/6e3</i>	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1.7	1.6	5.9	22	15	13	11	<i>73e-3/5e4</i>	.	.	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	58	41	80	129	131	214	105	<i>35e-2/1e5</i>	.	.	SPSA [9]

Table 18: 02-D, running time excess $ERT/ERT_{\text{best}}^{2009}$ on f_{118} , in italics is given the median final function value and the median number of function evaluations to reach this value divided by dimension

118 Ellipsoid 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	2.1	2.5	10	52	66	252	292	326	388	486	ERT_{best}/D
(1,2)-CMA-ES	7.5	12	55	19	18	5.4	5.1	5.5	5.1	4.6	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	2.6	5.5	45	18	17	4.7	4.3	4.0	3.6	3.2	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	4.4	11	20	8.4	7.7	2.8	2.7	2.7	2.4	2.1	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	3.2	14	131	52	64	24	25	23	20	16	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	3.6	6.6	12	4.7	4.1	1.4	1.3	1.2	1.1	1.0	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	3.7	6.6	9.1	3.5	3.9	1.2	1.1	1.2	1.0	1.0	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	3.6	7.3	5.9	2.0	2.2	0.68	0.65	0.65	0.60	0.56	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	2.4	3.9	4.8	2.8	3.2	0.93	0.93	0.91	0.82	0.72	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	2.4	2.3	2.8	3.8	12	9.0	21	221	<i>90e-5/5e3</i>	.	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	42	142	61	44	533	615	1377	1231	3617	2888	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	3.0	8.1	7.9	3.4	3.7	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	3.8	6.5	12	4.8	5.7	2.4	2.5	2.4	2.2	1.9	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	2.5	10	8.6	4.8	6.0	2.0	2.2	2.5	2.5	2.9	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	2.1	2.6	5.6	4.2	11	10	35	71	187	<i>11e-4/5e3</i>	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	4.0	5.4	76	100	462	253	280	1078	907	<i>16e-3/5e4</i>	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	61	400	1210	755	4425	5579	<i>20e-2/1e5</i>	.	.	.	SPSA [9]

Table 19: 02-D, running time excess $ERT/ERT_{\text{best}} 2009$ on f_{119} , in italics is given the median final function value and the median number of function evaluations to reach this value divided by dimension

	119 Sum of diff powers Gauss										
Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D	1e+03 0.50	1e+02 0.50	1e+01 0.70	1e+00 5.4	1e-01 36	1e-02 88	1e-03 520	1e-04 950	1e-05 2384	1e-07 5041	Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1.1	2.5	4.0	6.4	6.7	3.9	7.4	7.7	29	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	2.0	3.1	8.4	4.0	2.8	1.2	2.2	3.3	14	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1.2	2.0	5.4	2.8	2.4	2.1	3.1	2.9	8.7	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1.6	2.2	4.9	4.4	7.0	4.8	15	61	<i>90e-6/1e4</i>	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	2.1	3.3	4.0	3.9	1.9	1.1	1.5	1.9	8.8	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1.1	2.1	6.8	2.3	1.5	1.5	2.0	1.6	6.1	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1.9	3.0	5.6	1.4	1.6	0.70	1.3	1.3	14	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1.4	3.0	13	3.6	3.1	1.0	2.2	2.1	9.0	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	1.4	2.9	18	8.0	14	5.9	6.6	6.8	<i>67e-6/5e3</i>	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	12	20	17	3.7	1.8	13	81	83	183	<i>34e-6/1e5</i>	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1.1	1.7	6.6	1.7	1.3	0.78	1.6	1.0	0.76	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1.7	3.8	7.9	2.2	1.5	1.1	2.5	1.6	1.9	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1.2	1.9	2.8	5.1	5.7	1.5	1.2	0.67	0.55	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	1	2.6	3.1	15	8.6	23	7.1	19	33	15	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1	1.2	1.4	2.2	3.2	8.8	4.5	11	10	19	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	15	32	35	933	1158	2645	838	<i>21e-3/1e5</i>	.	.	SPSA [9]

Table 20: 02-D, running time excess $ERT/ERT_{\text{best}}^{2009}$ 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 0.50	1e+02 0.50	1e+01 0.70	1e+00 5.7	1e-01 187	1e-02 1257	1e-03 2862	1e-04 12965	1e-05 37703	1e-07 94320	Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1.7	19	34	6.0	7.5	<i>76e-4/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	1.1	19	19	4.7	14	<i>12e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	2.9	22	19	4.9	8.2	<i>52e-4/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1.1	12	33	9.3	13	52	<i>15e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1.3	2.6	41	4.4	7.4	15	<i>56e-4/1e4</i>	.	.	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1.5	36	26	5.0	4.3	49	<i>25e-4/1e4</i>	.	.	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1.5	17	26	4.9	4.3	<i>54e-4/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.6	9.5	3.9	7.9	<i>79e-4/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	9.5	37	74	42	15	<i>94e-3/6e3</i>	.	.	.	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	423	709	620	222	37	66	247	<i>53e-4/1e5</i>	.	.	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1.2	2.0	8.7	2.4	0.94	1.1	0.68	0.53	0.56	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1.5	3.5	23	3.5	1.5	1.5	0.78	0.45	0.64	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1.3	1.9	4.5	3.0	4.4	16	11	4.1	5.7	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	1	3.1	48	61	41	34	<i>98e-3/6e3</i>	.	.	.	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1	1.3	2.0	1.6	6.8	13	19	16	19	<i>31e-5/5e4</i>	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	57	173	152	151	107	254	<i>13e-3/1e5</i>	.	.	.	SPSA [9]

Table 21: 02-D, running time excess $ERT/ERT_{\text{best } 2009}$ 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										
Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D	1e+03 0.50	1e+02 0.50	1e+01 0.70	1e+00 3.5	1e-01 21	1e-02 72	1e-03 164	1e-04 376	1e-05 560	1e-07 851	Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1.6	2.3	3.8	2.5	4.1	6.6	5.9	7.5	10	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	1.3	2.2	2.5	2.0	1.1	1.5	2.9	3.5	4.9	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1.3	2.5	3.4	1.0	1.1	1.3	1.7	2.2	2.7	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1.3	4.1	5.0	1.8	3.4	16	18	30	84	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1.2	3.1	3.2	1.5	0.99	0.92	0.85	1.1	1.4	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1.5	2.9	3.2	1.6	1.3	1.3	1.4	1.3	1.4	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1.2	2.2	2.0	0.97	0.68	0.70	0.72	0.71	0.71	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1.7	2.7	2.8	1.1	0.78	0.69	0.72	0.73	0.79	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	1.6	2.6	5.7	4.4	6.3	22	35	<i>31e-5/5e3</i>	.	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	15	25	22	31	10	10	61	339	2516	<i>13e-5/1e5</i>	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1.3	2.7	3.1	1.4	1.2	1.3	1.1	1.2	1.4	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	2.0	4.1	3.7	1.6	1.0	1.6	2.0	2.2	2.6	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1.2	2.1	4.1	5.7	3.8	3.9	2.9	2.9	3.3	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	1	1.6	2.7	4.4	3.0	7.6	14	57	121	<i>40e-5/5e3</i>	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1	1.3	1.7	2.0	8.0	6.2	14	15	37	104	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	33	60	126	806	2749	1758	1936	<i>13e-3/1e5</i>	.	.	SPSA [9]

Table 22: 02-D, running time excess $ERT/ERT_{\text{best}}^{2009}$ on f_{122} , in italics is given the median final function value and the median number of function evaluations to reach this value divided by dimension

122 Schaffer F7 Gauss											
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
	0.50	0.50	1.5	48	261	705	1122	1676	2176	4781	
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	2.9	14	5.0	4.8	12	61	<i>53e-4/1e4</i>	.	.	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	1.3	2.3	3.3	1.6	4.9	10	19	32	<i>98e-5/1e4</i>	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1.7	12	3.7	3.1	4.1	38	<i>32e-4/1e4</i>	.	.	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1.6	23	4.2	7.0	22	<i>16e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1.3	5.7	5.9	3.3	3.1	4.7	14	32	<i>23e-5/1e4</i>	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1.1	4.7	3.8	2.5	2.8	3.3	6.0	7.6	31	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1.4	31	2.2	2.1	2.4	5.9	14	20	<i>38e-5/1e4</i>	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1.9	36	4.4	5.7	7.3	20	27	67	<i>32e-4/1e4</i>	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	1.3	14	10	33	55	<i>11e-2/5e3</i>	.	.	.	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	12	16	16	21	37	91	195	<i>53e-4/1e5</i>	.	.	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1.3	3.5	1.2	0.81	0.78	0.75	0.69	0.90	0.60	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1.3	29	3.9	2.5	1.2	1.1	1.00	0.98	0.74	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1.4	2.1	30	21	10	7.5	5.8	5.1	2.9	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	1	1.7	10	16	30	54	<i>99e-3/5e3</i>	.	.	.	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1	1	2.2	10	22	14	21	25	45	<i>25e-6/5e4</i>	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	21	38	60	803	<i>44e-2/1e5</i>	SPSA [9]

Table 23: 02-D, running time excess $ERT/ERT_{\text{best}}^{2009}$ on f_{123} , in italics is given the median final function value and the median number of function evaluations to reach this value divided by dimension

123 Schaffer F7 unif											
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	0.50	0.50	1.6	106	3186	12428	19367	28294	50007	1.09e5	ERT_{best}/D
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1.8	26	7.1	47	<i>24e-2/1e4</i>	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1.2	2.8	18	4.8	7.2	<i>13e-2/1e4</i>	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1.1	6.1	30	7.5	45	<i>23e-2/1e4</i>	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1.2	48	10	22	<i>18e-2/1e4</i>	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1.8	21	8.6	3.5	<i>83e-3/1e4</i>	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1.3	7.3	4.7	11	<i>13e-2/1e4</i>	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	2.0	29	6.3	4.4	12	<i>98e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	2.8	78	6.8	11	<i>11e-2/1e4</i>	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	10	66	24	28	<i>46e-2/6e3</i>	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	261	1354	557	126	20	25	<i>48e-3/1e5</i>	.	.	.	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	2.0	19	5.7	0.88	0.54	0.71	0.81	0.67	0.82	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1.6	18	3.7	0.74	0.69	1.0	0.90	0.75	0.72	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1.5	1.9	40	39	18	15	11	7.9	5.2	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	1	1	56	32	28	<i>44e-2/6e3</i>	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1	1.5	2.9	21	23	<i>11e-2/5e4</i>	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	32	64	137	76	221	<i>22e-2/1e5</i>	SPSA [9]

Table 24: 02-D, running time excess $ERT/ERT_{\text{best}} 2009$ 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										
$\Delta\text{ftarget}$ 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
	0.50	0.50	1.8	32	158	340	996	1737	2798	4510	
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	2.1	3.9	13	14	26	69	<i>60e-4/1e4</i>	.	.	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	1.8	3.0	3.4	1.9	4.5	12	<i>98e-5/1e4</i>	.	.	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1.9	3.1	2.8	4.5	5.5	8.4	82	<i>89e-5/1e4</i>	.	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1.7	15	12	13	44	<i>16e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	3.9	3.3	7.8	4.5	6.4	8.0	25	<i>23e-5/1e4</i>	.	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1.4	3.2	4.5	1.4	2.7	3.2	10	50	<i>23e-5/1e4</i>	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1.8	26	5.1	1.8	1.6	1.7	11	51	<i>23e-5/1e4</i>	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1.1	1.5	1.8	10	4.6	5.0	8.0	85	<i>42e-5/1e4</i>	.	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	1.7	12	9.3	22	61	<i>98e-3/5e3</i>	.	.	.	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	14	20	36	11	38	142	226	814	<i>19e-4/1e5</i>	.	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1.8	2.2	1.0	0.89	1.5	1.1	1.1	1.5	2.0	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1.4	3.5	1.2	0.69	0.81	1.3	1.4	2.0	2.5	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1.5	1.9	3.1	15	20	10	6.2	7.8	7.4	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	1	2.2	5.6	6.5	14	46	<i>33e-3/5e3</i>	.	.	.	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1	1.1	1.2	3.0	23	25	33	56	130	<i>19e-5/5e4</i>	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	48	90	4547	844	468	2050	<i>37e-3/1e5</i>	.	.	.	SPSA [9]

Table 25: 02-D, running time excess $ERT/ERT_{\text{best 2009}}$ 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 0.50	1e+02 0.50	1e+01 0.50	1e+00 0.50	1e-01 0.50	1e-02 74	1e-03 575	1e-04 1228	1e-05 1927	1e-07 3778	Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1	5.6	14	105	4.4	4.1	4.0	6.1	<i>63e-7/1e4</i>	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	5.8	54	1.6	2.8	3.1	5.5	12	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	3.9	34	2.6	3.4	4.4	7.0	18	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.1	11	137	3.2	5.5	4.4	7.6	38	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	4.5	25	1.9	5.7	5.2	7.9	12	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.1	5.9	49	2.5	4.0	3.5	3.8	4.1	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	5.5	61	3.1	3.4	2.1	3.1	6.5	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.2	5.2	31	1.8	6.1	6.0	6.2	18	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	1	2.3	6.9	46	1.8	2.7	2.4	2.3	6.2	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	14	20	25	34	87	5.0	5.4	6.8	14	40	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1	1.1	4.7	53	1.4	1.5	1.0	1.4	0.94	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1	1.2	5.9	34	2.1	2.0	1.3	1.9	1.4	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1	1.1	5.8	44	1.2	0.47	3.3	2.2	1.2	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	1	1	2.0	6.1	77	1.4	2.6	2.1	2.6	10	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1	1	1.2	6.4	58	1.9	2.7	4.7	5.0	13	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	22	32	37	61	169	2.2	98	230	344	<i>45e-5/1e5</i>	SPSA [9]

Table 26: 02-D, running time excess $ERT/ERT_{\text{best}} 2009$ 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 0.50	1e+02 0.50	1e+01 0.50	1e+00 0.50	1e-01 0.50	1e-02 151	1e-03 1709	1e-04 3408	1e-05 5528	1e-07 18193	Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1	2.3	53	300	7.2	6.8	20	26	<i>75e-5/1e4</i>	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.1	4.2	141	6.3	4.8	6.0	8.0	<i>23e-5/1e4</i>	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	3.5	236	4.0	8.9	7.9	27	<i>81e-5/1e4</i>	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.1	39	246	9.1	8.5	12	25	<i>12e-4/1e4</i>	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	6.3	336	4.4	3.6	9.0	12	7.7	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	7.4	111	3.3	3.9	3.8	5.6	<i>64e-6/1e4</i>	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.1	41	113	2.3	3.1	3.6	5.5	8.0	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	12	256	3.4	4.8	4.7	<i>18e-5/1e4</i>	.	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	1	26	95	667	15	11	7.8	<i>18e-4/6e3</i>	.	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	284	472	608	704	1604	57	22	40	37	<i>32e-6/1e5</i>	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1	1	4.5	230	1.9	1.4	1.0	0.97	1.5	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1	1	4.2	73	1.9	1.1	2.0	2.2	1.6	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1	1.1	3.9	49	0.58	12	18	20	19	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	1	1	2.1	200	595	15	52	<i>32e-4/6e3</i>	.	.	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1	1	1.1	4.6	47	0.72	0.98	1.3	1.4	2.0	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	16	50	86	193	1851	88	111	95	80	<i>18e-4/1e5</i>	SPSA [9]

Table 27: 02-D, running time excess $ERT/ERT_{\text{best}} 2009$ 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 0.50	1e+02 0.50	1e+01 0.50	1e+00 0.50	1e-01 0.50	1e-02 93	1e-03 593	1e-04 2014	1e-05 3386	1e-07 3638	Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	10	53	2.5	5.1	2.8	2.7	4.9	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.1	6.4	39	1.2	2.0	0.95	0.86	1.6	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	4.9	33	1.1	2.7	1.6	1.4	1.6	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.2	11	86	2.5	8.2	3.6	3.7	19	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	3.5	17	2.7	3.5	2.1	1.3	1.6	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	4.3	21	2.6	3.0	1.7	1.4	1.4	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.1	4.3	21	2.7	2.7	1.2	0.81	0.97	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	3.3	82	2.1	2.4	0.94	0.72	0.69	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	1	1.3	7.2	72	1.6	3.5	1.8	2.5	<i>16e-6/5e3</i>	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	12	17	19	28	70	1.6	2.2	4.6	12	66	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1	1.4	6.1	39	2.5	2.7	1.1	0.77	0.85	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1	1	4.2	78	1.2	1.7	1.0	0.72	1.6	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1	1.1	3.9	31	0.89	0.88	1.5	2.6	3.5	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	1	1	2.1	6.2	95	1.8	4.9	3.8	2.8	9.0	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1	1	1.2	3.7	41	1.4	4.0	2.6	2.5	29	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	26	39	94	636	4930	125	181	165	<i>40e-5/1e5</i>	.	SPSA [9]

Table 28: 02-D, running time excess $ERT/ERT_{\text{best}}^{2009}$ on f_{128} , in italics is given the median final function value and the median number of function evaluations to reach this value divided by dimension

128 Gallagher Gauss											
Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D	1e+03 0.50	1e+02 0.50	1e+01 0.90	1e+00 21	1e-01 67	1e-02 157	1e-03 194	1e-04 205	1e-05 297	1e-07 310	Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1	4.1	10	9.4	6.2	6.9	7.2	5.6	6.8	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	1	0.93	5.6	6.1	5.3	6.2	5.9	4.6	5.7	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.7	2.7	3.7	3.9	4.8	5.7	4.5	4.7	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1	7.3	8.8	5.5	3.9	7.1	10	10	11	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.7	21	14	6.4	6.9	6.6	4.6	4.5	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1	2.1	12	12	7.1	6.1	5.8	4.0	4.4	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.8	14	10	4.2	3.6	3.7	2.6	2.5	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.2	6.7	10	5.9	5.2	7.2	5.6	5.4	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	1	2.9	21	9.3	7.9	7.4	8.7	10	32	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	13	19	15	16	44	20	48	76	244	563	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1	2.0	26	16	7.8	11	19	13	14	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1	0.78	9.4	11	8.9	7.3	7.3	5.2	5.2	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1	1.4	35	84	50	41	40	28	29	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	1	1	1.9	17	10	10	10	16	14	20	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1	1	1.1	1.8	18	16	30	66	57	149	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	10	22	35	309	656	812	2220	2096	<i>83e-4/1e5</i>	.	SPSA [9]

Table 29: 02-D, running time excess $ERT/ERT_{\text{best}} 2009$ on f_{129} , in italics is given the median final function value and the median number of function evaluations to reach this value divided by dimension

129 Gallagher 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
	0.50	0.50	0.90	33	110	261	951	1622	2972	5330	
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1	9.3	8.2	13	13	10	17	16	27	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.8	11	10	7.6	4.7	15	48	<i>12e-5/1e4</i>	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.3	11	11	11	3.9	12	8.3	27	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1	18	8.5	6.5	11	8.6	6.3	10	<i>60e-6/1e4</i>	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.3	8.1	8.9	8.3	3.8	4.6	3.3	6.4	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.7	7.0	5.7	4.3	3.0	4.9	3.7	8.5	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.6	11	9.2	5.0	4.3	5.2	5.6	13	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1	0.81	7.6	5.6	7.3	3.6	5.0	11	<i>31e-6/1e4</i>	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	1	52	25	31	27	9.4	25	29	16	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	288	439	273	92	53	95	39	69	56	274	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1	1.6	13	13	6.5	2.2	2.4	3.2	5.4	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1	1.7	7.4	12	9.3	5.6	8.2	4.7	3.2	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1	1.4	1.4	13	49	28	20	11	6.9	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	1	1	24	23	21	26	19	25	31	<i>37e-4/6e3</i>	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1	1	0.85	0.64	13	15	13	11	24	135	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	5.1	48	96	100	66	108	55	81	150	<i>86e-6/1e5</i>	SPSA [9]

Table 30: 02-D, running time excess $ERT/ERT_{\text{best}}^{2009}$ 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											
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	2.0	40	33	18	13	6.2	7.8	3.2	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.4	30	16	8.8	5.7	2.8	2.7	1.1	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.5	14	15	11	7.2	4.5	4.2	1.8	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1	2.6	41	54	32	20	10	10	4.3	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1	2.0	22	13	6.2	4.5	2.2	2.0	0.84	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1	2.4	15	10	7.0	4.6	2.3	2.2	0.89	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.4	6.5	8.8	5.2	3.3	1.6	1.9	0.76	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.3	9.0	13	5.3	3.4	1.6	1.5	0.63	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	1	3.2	8.2	3.7	2.6	3.6	3.9	7.5	6.9	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	8.8	12	11	7.8	22	18	30	71	130	127	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1	1.5	6.6	6.5	39	26	13	12	33	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1	1.2	8.3	18	8.7	5.8	3.1	3.0	1.2	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1	1.7	1.1	0.97	10	24	20	18	15	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	1	1	2.8	10	5.4	3.7	3.8	3.6	4.7	6.6	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1	1	2.0	1.1	8.5	21	37	45	63	76	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	22	34	84	662	510	298	243	285	486	311	SPSA [9]

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 [14], 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 [14], 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 [14], 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 [14], 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 [14], pages 1583–1590.
- [6] Anne Auger, Steffen Finck, Nikolaus Hansen, and Raymond Ros. BBOB 2009: Comparison tables of all algorithms on all noisy functions. Technical Report RT-0384, INRIA, 04 2010.
- [7] 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.
- [8] Steffen Finck and Hans-Georg Beyer. Benchmarking CMA-EGS on the BBOB 2010 noisy function testbed. In Pelikan and Branke [14], pages 1641–1648.
- [9] Steffen Finck and Hans-Georg Beyer. Benchmarking SPSA on BBOB-2010 noisy function testbed. In Pelikan and Branke [14], pages 1665–1672.
- [10] N. Hansen, A. Auger, S. Finck, and R. Ros. Real-parameter black-box optimization benchmarking 2010: Experimental setup. Technical Report RR-7215, INRIA, 2010.
- [11] 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.
- [12] Nikolaus Hansen and Raymond Ros. Benchmarking a weighted negative covariance matrix update on the BBOB-2010 noisy testbed. In Pelikan and Branke [14], pages 1681–1688.
- [13] Antonio LaTorre, Santiago Muelas, and José María Peña. Benchmarking a MOS-based algorithm on the BBOB-2010 noisy function testbed. In Pelikan and Branke [14], pages 1725–1730.

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