

Comparison tables: BBOB 2010 noisy testbed with BBOB 2009 as reference in 3-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: 03-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
	0.33	0.33	1.2	4.4	6.3	6.7	9.3	11	11	13	
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1	5.6	4.9	7.3	12	10	10	12	13	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.6	2.8	6.0	7.7	7.6	8.3	9.3	11	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1.2	4.7	3.1	5.7	7.0	6.4	7.3	8.5	10	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1	6.9	5.3	7.4	10	10	11	12	14	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1	3.6	3.0	4.2	5.9	5.5	6.2	7.4	8.2	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1	2.6	2.9	3.6	5.2	5.1	5.7	6.4	7.4	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	3.3	2.6	3.1	4.1	3.9	4.2	4.9	5.5	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1	3.6	3.2	3.6	5.0	4.5	4.8	5.5	6.5	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	2.1	3.4	1.6	1.7	1.9	1.5	1.4	1.4	1.4	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	14	21	16	12	112	384	484	694	1414	1256	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1	4.0	3.8	5.0	7.6	7.2	7.9	9.2	11	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1	3.8	3.0	5.1	7.5	7.2	8.1	9.3	11	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1.1	2.5	10	21	28	28	30	36	42	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	1	1.5	2.8	2.0	2.5	2.9	2.4	2.2	2.3	2.2	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1	1.1	2.4	10	36	73	88	132	182	315	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	30	46	198	295	846	1989	1524	1398	1375	3664	SPSA [9]

Table 2: 03-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 0.33	1e+02 0.33	1e+01 1.2	1e+00 4.0	1e-01 7.6	1e-02 9.3	1e-03 11	1e-04 12	1e-05 13	1e-07 16	Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1	5.6	5.6	5.9	7.2	8.1	9.5	11	11	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	1	3.3	3.9	4.6	5.4	6.2	7.1	7.6	8.6	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	3.1	3.1	4.1	4.9	5.4	6.5	7.1	7.6	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1	4.3	5.8	5.3	7.4	8.1	8.9	8.6	14	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1	3.2	2.7	2.9	3.6	4.3	5.1	5.6	6.0	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1	4.2	3.3	3.3	4.0	4.7	5.2	5.7	6.0	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	2.6	2.2	2.2	3.1	3.4	3.9	4.1	4.5	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1	3.0	2.6	2.5	3.4	3.9	4.3	4.6	5.1	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	1.9	3.6	2.8	2.9	2.6	2.8	2.7	2.5	2.2	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	28	45	21	14	15	19	21	149	1947	4298	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1	4.2	3.9	4.1	5.3	6.4	7.2	7.7	8.5	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1	4.4	4.2	4.4	5.6	6.7	7.8	8.4	8.8	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1.1	2.5	11	17	21	25	29	30	34	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	1	1.5	5.9	5.7	5.4	7.2	6.8	8.1	9.1	10	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1	1.1	1.7	17	29	43	77	115	167	242	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	24	38	470	396	697	2079	2142	2293	5383	87971	SPSA [9]

Table 3: 03-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 0.33	1e+02 0.33	1e+01 1.2	1e+00 4.3	1e-01 6.4	1e-02 6.4	1e-03 6.4	1e-04 6.6	1e-05 7.7	1e-07 14	Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1	6.2	5.1	6.7	10	14	18	19	14	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	1	2.5	2.8	4.5	7.5	10	12	13	10	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	2.7	3.0	4.4	7.2	8.7	11	12	9.1	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1	3.9	4.3	5.2	7.7	12	15	17	13	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1	4.0	3.5	4.0	6.1	7.8	10	11	8.5	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1	2.5	2.1	3.9	5.8	7.8	9.4	10	7.3	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.9	2.0	2.6	4.1	5.1	6.8	6.9	5.3	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1	3.8	2.3	3.3	5.0	6.7	8.5	8.0	6.1	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	1.9	3.3	1.7	1.6	2.0	5.6	9.2	10	9.0	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	17	30	19	16	22	27	34	1298	2202	2619	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1	2.4	2.9	4.6	7.8	10	13	13	10	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1	4.0	3.5	4.8	7.9	11	14	14	11	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1.1	2.5	11	20	31	42	53	62	51	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	1	1	3.4	2.1	2.6	3.4	4.8	5.9	5.8	10	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1	1.1	2.3	13	39	69	140	225	281	291	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	40	142	360	216	228	400	565	1216	4576	11577	SPSA [9]

Table 4: 03-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	1.4	7.2	10	69	201	212	216	218	219	223	ERT_{best}/D
(1,2)-CMA-ES	4.2	3.1	6.6	10	14	36	50	88	88	86	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	2.5	1.4	3.9	4.5	5.7	8.2	8.4	8.9	9.0	9.1	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	3.5	1.6	2.4	2.5	6.5	11	11	11	11	11	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	15	9.1	17	15	23	62	116	115	145	143	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	2.7	1.5	2.2	5.3	3.3	3.3	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.6	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	3.6	1.3	2.0	2.0	1.2	1.4	1.5	1.6	1.6	1.7	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	2.1	1.1	1.5	1.8	1.1	1.3	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.5	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	3.9	1.5	2.1	5.6	4.3	5.8	5.8	5.9	5.9	5.9	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	2.5	0.83	0.89	3.0	2.6	3.3	3.4	4.1	4.1	4.1	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	61	19	29	138	255	242	239	314	312	315	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	2.4	1.2	2.7	1.9	1.3	1.5	1.7	1.8	1.9	2.0	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	2.7	2.1	3.3	2.7	2.0	2.5	2.8	2.9	3.1	3.3	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	3.4	3.3	8.6	3.2	3.0	3.9	4.6	5.1	5.4	6.1	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	2.8	0.92	0.95	0.95	2.7	8.2	18	28	34	40	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	3.4	4.0	11	40	169	561	1528	1543	<i>66e-3/5e4</i>	.	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	611	299	28922	<i>15e+0/1e5</i>	SPSA [9]

Table 5: 03-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	4.1	7.1	8.6	4.9	14	13	27	40	40	131	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	2.6	7.5	6.2	1.7	6.9	8.4	18	22	30	29	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	2.7	2.5	2.9	1.1	4.6	5.5	13	40	40	40	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	5.9	7.2	7.0	3.8	12	13	25	42	133	<i>91e-4/1e4</i>	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	3.5	2.3	3.8	3.3	5.6	4.0	7.0	7.3	7.4	7.3	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	3.7	3.1	3.2	1.9	2.8	2.2	2.2	2.7	2.7	2.7	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	2.0	1.5	1.6	1.9	5.3	2.4	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.5	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	4.0	2.6	2.3	2.2	9.1	4.6	8.1	13	16	16	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	2.7	1.8	1.8	0.75	1.6	3.2	8.2	35	75	<i>20e-4/6e3</i>	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	20	9.1	14	126	410	392	603	601	1289	1279	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	3.0	2.6	3.5	1.7	1.9	0.77	0.81	0.84	0.85	0.89	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	2.9	2.8	4.2	2.4	4.4	1.6	1.7	1.7	1.8	1.8	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	3.5	4.2	10	1.4	1.7	0.71	0.78	0.86	0.93	1.1	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	5.0	2.2	1.5	0.67	1.9	2.0	7.5	21	69	70	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1.4	5.0	14	11	104	109	220	675	<i>26e-3/5e4</i>	.	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	514	176	1.51e5	<i>18e+0/1e5</i>	SPSA [9]

Table 6: 03-D, running time excess $ERT/ERT_{\text{best}}^{2009}$ 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	5.2	3.6	4.0	11	12	5.8	4.1	4.1	2.7	2.6	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	3.1	2.0	3.8	13	10	4.3	2.8	2.8	1.9	1.8	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	3.0	2.3	4.1	8.3	6.5	2.9	2.0	2.0	1.3	1.3	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	12	9.2	10	40	29	13	8.8	8.8	5.7	5.3	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	5.3	2.6	3.1	9.5	6.6	2.8	1.9	1.8	1.2	1.1	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	2.8	1.6	3.3	9.0	6.1	2.6	1.7	1.6	1.1	1.0	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	2.7	1.2	2.1	5.0	3.8	1.6	1.1	1.0	0.69	0.67	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	3.3	1.4	2.3	7.3	5.4	2.3	1.5	1.5	0.98	0.92	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	3.1	1.1	1.1	2.4	1.9	1.0	2.1	3.3	5.0	7.5	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	40	17	17	40	24	10	7.1	7.0	4.8	5.4	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	2.8	1.5	2.7	3.7	4.3	2.0	1.3	1.3	0.90	0.90	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	3.2	2.3	3.3	5.1	6.5	3.1	2.1	2.1	1.4	1.4	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	3.4	3.9	10	8.6	10	4.8	3.0	3.2	2.2	2.4	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	3.0	0.95	1.0	3.3	5.6	4.4	7.4	14	13	33	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	3.2	4.6	14	145	911	1110	2842	<i>43e-3/5e4</i>	.	.	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	1188	595	815	9052	<i>19e-1/1e5</i>	SPSA [9]

Table 7: 03-D, running time excess $ERT/ERT_{\text{best}}^{2009}$ 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											
$\Delta f_{\text{target}}/ERT_{\text{best}}/D$		1e+03	1e+02	1e+01	1e+00	1e-01	1e-02	1e-03	1e-04	1e-05	1e-07	$\Delta f_{\text{target}}/ERT_{\text{best}}/D$	
		0.33	0.33	2.0	16	51	77	108	138	168	228		
	(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1	22	12	10	22	27	45	203	<i>28e-6/1e4</i>	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]	
	(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	1	7.4	1.9	1.9	2.1	2.1	2.7	3.2	4.1	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]	
	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	7.0	2.2	2.2	3.5	4.7	4.6	7.3	8.2	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]	
	(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1	5.9	8.4	13	17	48	115	95	642	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]	
	(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1	8.9	3.4	2.9	3.3	3.5	4.4	6.2	5.8	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]	
	(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1	3.7	1.2	0.71	0.82	0.96	1.2	1.1	1.5	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]	
	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1.1	14	2.5	1.2	1.6	1.6	1.9	3.1	4.2	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]	
	(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.1	2.2	1.5	3.7	3.3	3.9	4.4	10	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]	
	avg NEWUOA	1	1	17	20	45	115	360	592	<i>16e-3/6e3</i>	.	avg NEWUOA [16]	
	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	24	37	13	5.0	6.1	14	49	226	555	6150	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]	
	IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	2.0	5.4	1.4	0.99	0.97	0.96	1.0	1.0	1.0	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]	
	IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1	1.7	1.2	0.80	0.96	1.0	0.95	0.98	1.0	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]	
	CMA+DE-MOS	1	1.1	1.6	3.3	5.3	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.0	CMA+DE-MOS [13]	
	NEWUOA	1	1.1	12	29	61	65	150	532	<i>57e-4/5e3</i>	.	NEWUOA [16]	
	Basic RCGA	1	1	1.6	7.8	9.2	11	13	20	26	31	Basic RCGA [17]	
	SPSA	36	53	199	8554	13692	18097	13131	<i>11e-1/1e5</i>	.	.	SPSA [9]	

Table 8: 03-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 0.33	1e+02 0.33	1e+01 1.9	1e+00 33	1e-01 655	1e-02 1842	1e-03 3608	1e-04 5060	1e-05 5729	1e-07 10727	Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1	34	29	53	<i>15e-2/1e4</i>	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	23	24	25	13	37	<i>84e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	54	25	23	81	<i>10e-2/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1	30	41	19	79	<i>88e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1.1	30	10	6.0	38	<i>42e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1	30	19	5.9	14	<i>18e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1.1	10	14	9.3	38	<i>38e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1	35	20	8.6	77	<i>39e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	1.5	121	82	126	<i>39e-2/6e3</i>	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	1294	1758	2673	269	44	25	17	25	44	68	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1	14	8.4	1.8	1.1	0.96	0.80	1.1	0.81	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1.1	97	11	1.3	1.0	0.89	0.92	1.1	1.0	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1.1	1.6	66	138	91	61	49	45	29	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	1	1	108	56	36	<i>41e-2/5e3</i>	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1	1	2.1	10	24	20	22	33	129	<i>18e-4/5e4</i>	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	111	264	275	166	58	390	<i>28e-3/1e5</i>	.	.	.	SPSA [9]

Table 9: 03-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										
Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D	1e+03 0.33	1e+02 0.33	1e+01 1.2	1e+00 6.8	1e-01 31	1e-02 48	1e-03 64	1e-04 65	1e-05 84	1e-07 84	Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1	5.4	3.5	2.0	1.9	2.8	3.6	3.9	6.8	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	1	3.9	2.9	1.3	1.6	1.7	2.3	2.4	3.7	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	3.5	1.8	0.83	0.96	1.1	1.4	1.5	2.4	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1	8.9	7.6	2.5	3.1	3.5	4.5	6.1	8.3	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1	2.4	1.9	0.92	1.1	1.2	1.8	1.7	3.0	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1	4.1	2.0	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.8	1.7	2.6	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	2.1	1.3	0.66	0.72	0.72	0.99	0.94	1.3	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1	2.2	1.6	0.75	0.84	0.90	1.2	1.2	1.8	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	1.5	3.4	7.6	5.9	8.9	17	58	112	262	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	15	30	21	9.5	4.4	33	403	3363	<i>20e-5/1e5</i>	.	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1	2.6	2.6	1.3	1.4	1.6	2.0	2.1	3.1	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1	4.5	2.3	1.2	1.3	1.7	2.3	2.4	3.6	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1.1	2.5	6.1	4.2	5.6	6.4	10	12	16	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	1	1.3	5.3	6.2	6.4	12	34	146	181	<i>17e-5/5e3</i>	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1	1.1	3.4	11	11	14	20	27	33	51	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	37	157	448	231	1467	1620	3769	6888	<i>43e-4/1e5</i>	.	SPSA [9]

Table 12: 03-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	1.4	7.2	10	113	523	826	950	993	1035	1178	ERT_{best}/D	
(1,2)-CMA-ES	7.7	7.6	17	28	10	8.7	8.0	7.8	8.5	7.8	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]	
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	3.0	2.6	3.3	5.8	2.5	2.0	1.9	2.0	2.0	1.9	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]	
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	5.1	2.2	3.5	5.1	1.7	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.3	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]	
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	4.5	4.4	8.7	27	12	16	17	21	31	28	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]	
(1,4)-CMA-ES	2.9	1.4	2.2	1.3	0.95	0.88	0.88	0.93	0.93	0.89	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]	
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	3.0	1.3	2.3	3.1	1.1	0.90	0.87	0.87	0.86	0.83	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]	
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	2.9	1.2	1.9	2.1	0.76	0.58	0.56	0.56	0.56	0.52	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]	
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	3.1	1.6	2.7	4.6	1.5	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.0	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]	
avg NEWUOA	2.8	0.93	2.1	2.2	1.8	10	85	<i>20e-3/6e3</i>	.	.	avg NEWUOA [16]	
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	57	24	23	306	571	1699	<i>26e-2/1e5</i>	.	.	.	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]	
IPOP-aCMA-ES	3.0	1.8	3.8	1.6	0.79	0.70	0.72	0.74	0.76	0.76	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]	
IPOP-CMA-ES	4.2	2.3	3.7	4.6	1.8	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]	
CMA+DE-MOS	3.4	4.0	10	2.4	1.9	1.6	1.6	1.8	1.9	2.0	CMA+DE-MOS [13]	
NEWUOA	2.0	0.89	1.3	1.7	1.4	8.7	37	73	<i>44e-4/5e3</i>	.	NEWUOA [16]	
Basic RCGA	2.7	3.6	11	18	72	93	365	713	<i>23e-3/5e4</i>	.	Basic RCGA [17]	
SPSA	1314	1782	2830	12462	<i>29e-1/1e5</i>	SPSA [9]	

Table 13: 03-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	2.5	11	6.6	11	2.6	6.0	11	11	11	15	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1.4	1.3	2.6	4.1	0.84	2.9	4.1	4.1	4.1	6.4	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1.2	2.4	8.6	7.4	1.3	1.8	7.3	7.3	7.3	13	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	2.7	24	12	8.7	3.6	18	41	41	41	125	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1.6	3.0	4.2	4.9	2.0	2.3	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.8	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	2.1	2.5	1.1	5.7	1.9	2.6	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1.3	4.4	6.3	4.9	1.6	2.7	2.8	2.8	2.8	3.2	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1.3	2.8	2.4	4.6	1.7	2.2	3.3	3.3	3.3	5.8	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1.6	5.6	8.2	15	8.0	25	75	75	75	<i>57e-3/6e3</i>	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	28	14	22	19	82	292	392	392	392	1280	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	20	8.4	2.0	7.7	0.88	0.60	0.77	0.77	0.77	0.75	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1.7	2.7	1.8	6.6	1.9	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	1.1	1.7	1.3	4.1	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.5	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	1.5	14	7.7	14	5.1	12	70	70	70	<i>74e-3/5e3</i>	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1.1	1.6	2.1	11	19	39	38	38	38	38	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	40	24	18	1660	1007	1374	<i>71e-2/1e5</i>	.	.	.	SPSA [9]

Table 14: 03-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
	0.33	0.98	8.5	338	2093	6295	9441	9441	9441	10860	
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1.1	5.1	34	11	21	<i>31e-2/1e4</i>	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1.1	8.2	17	6.9	21	<i>30e-2/1e4</i>	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1.1	63	32	22	23	<i>22e-2/1e4</i>	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1.1	35	30	12	<i>52e-2/1e4</i>	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1.3	67	21	3.6	7.6	23	<i>11e-2/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1.8	2.2	6.7	2.5	5.7	10	15	15	15	<i>83e-3/1e4</i>	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1.8	27	25	4.0	12	<i>16e-2/1e4</i>	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	17	14	19	6.4	10	<i>22e-2/1e4</i>	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	143	104	26	<i>11e-1/6e3</i>	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	877	2294	553	127	148	<i>14e-2/1e5</i>	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1.4	34	25	1.4	0.88	0.61	0.42	0.42	0.42	0.39	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1.1	12	7.1	2.4	1.6	0.81	0.60	0.60	0.60	0.59	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	1.1	1.9	1.9	9.3	31	20	13	13	13	14	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	1	50	71	31	<i>11e-1/5e3</i>	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1.5	1.8	1.6	8.0	12	14	12	12	12	20	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	271	204	223	63	685	<i>29e-2/1e5</i>	SPSA [9]

Table 15: 03-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} 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	1.7	3.2	4.9	2.7	7.9	41	63	63	63	<i>54e-4/1e4</i>	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1.5	2.1	1.7	2.1	2.8	5.8	12	12	12	21	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1.1	1.5	2.9	1.4	1.6	5.0	13	13	13	39	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1.5	3.8	4.3	3.4	3.4	23	50	50	50	169	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1.5	3.6	2.9	1.4	1.6	2.8	4.3	4.3	4.3	6.5	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1.4	2.9	2.7	0.88	1.3	1.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	4.1	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1.1	1.4	2.1	1.2	0.87	1.4	1.6	1.6	1.6	2.1	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1.1	1.9	4.5	1.9	1.6	2.5	3.1	3.1	3.1	5.3	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1.5	3.1	1.1	2.6	4.9	19	45	45	45	59	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	24	17	20	122	392	1637	4763	4763	4763	3402	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1.2	2.7	2.0	0.88	0.91	0.80	0.90	0.90	0.90	0.78	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1.7	3.2	6.4	2.4	1.8	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.4	1.9	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	1.1	2.0	2.3	2.1	5.0	7.4	7.6	7.6	7.6	5.6	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	2.4	2.8	0.96	4.0	8.3	66	215	215	215	154	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1.1	0.95	6.1	56	96	145	138	138	138	129	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	52	44	49	576	560	1532	<i>43e-3/1e5</i>	.	.	.	SPSA [9]

Table 16: 03-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											
$\Delta\text{ftarget}$	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	6.2	25	56	881	1473	2051	2381	3153	3205	3790	ERT_{best}/D
(1,2)-CMA-ES	14	14	17	9.4	96	<i>68e-2/1e4</i>	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	6.3	11	14	4.0	8.4	10	14	10	46	<i>54e-3/1e4</i>	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	11	12	27	5.6	6.8	34	<i>45e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	14	36	40	13	46	34	63	<i>61e-2/1e4</i>	.	.	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	2.4	2.3	12	3.8	11	15	18	15	15	19	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	4.6	5.9	10	3.1	4.3	4.9	5.4	7.6	14	12	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	11	8.9	11	1.8	4.0	4.5	5.5	7.9	10	<i>96e-5/1e4</i>	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	17	7.0	8.2	2.2	3.9	7.1	13	14	<i>18e-3/1e4</i>	.	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	19	24	65	28	<i>30e-1/6e3</i>	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	1443	1318	1980	1701	<i>97e-1/1e5</i>	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	6.8	6.2	5.9	1.3	1.2	1.0	0.90	0.71	0.71	0.63	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	4.5	7.4	11	2.8	2.5	2.1	1.9	1.5	1.5	1.3	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	2.2	2.8	7.3	4.4	3.0	2.4	2.2	1.9	2.0	1.9	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	12	18	45	41	50	<i>49e-1/5e3</i>	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	2.6	18	61	26	52	65	<i>67e-3/5e4</i>	.	.	.	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	98	863	4071	1622	<i>20e+0/1e5</i>	SPSA [9]

Table 18: 03-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} 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	11	18	9.4	15	7.2	6.5	6.1	5.8	5.6	6.5	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	4.1	8.8	4.2	7.5	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.0	3.0	2.7	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	4.0	7.4	5.5	5.5	2.0	1.8	2.0	1.9	1.8	1.6	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	6.9	13	30	46	23	24	27	23	21	20	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	4.1	6.5	2.6	3.2	1.3	1.3	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.0	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	2.5	6.8	3.2	3.5	1.2	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.1	0.99	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	2.4	3.4	2.0	2.3	0.92	0.83	0.78	0.71	0.71	0.66	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1.6	6.0	3.3	3.0	1.1	1.0	0.93	0.85	0.82	0.75	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	0.98	1.4	1.0	5.0	5.4	26	77	<i>43e-4/6e3</i>	.	.	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	38	81	715	2979	2747	4936	<i>21e-1/1e5</i>	.	.	.	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	3.3	4.9	3.4	3.0	1.0	0.98	0.95	0.89	0.94	0.94	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	4.3	7.9	6.2	6.7	2.6	2.4	2.2	2.0	2.0	1.9	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	3.3	10	6.0	5.2	1.9	2.0	2.3	2.5	2.8	3.1	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	1.3	1.4	1.7	3.7	6.5	43	109	<i>19e-3/5e3</i>	.	.	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	2.3	78	142	542	672	1269	2227	<i>75e-2/5e4</i>	.	.	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	126	254	1406	6641	<i>41e-1/1e5</i>	SPSA [9]

Table 19: 03-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 0.33	1e+02 0.33	1e+01 0.73	1e+00 22	1e-01 140	1e-02 203	1e-03 668	1e-04 1894	1e-05 4013	1e-07 5240	Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1.3	6.6	4.3	5.3	17	48	<i>24e-4/1e4</i>	.	.	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	1	4.8	3.2	1.7	4.2	3.2	8.2	17	<i>14e-5/1e4</i>	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1.1	2.2	1.5	1.4	2.9	4.5	35	<i>18e-5/1e4</i>	.	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1.1	28	6.9	3.7	39	110	<i>50e-4/1e4</i>	.	.	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	2.1	9.2	4.3	1.5	3.0	2.4	4.1	18	<i>63e-6/1e4</i>	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1.3	4.7	3.2	0.92	1.5	2.3	3.0	3.9	28	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1.8	12	1.7	0.96	1.8	2.6	2.9	6.1	<i>48e-6/1e4</i>	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	3.7	43	3.7	2.0	3.2	4.9	9.3	35	<i>18e-5/1e4</i>	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	1	23	8.2	16	51	<i>13e-3/6e3</i>	.	.	.	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	24	36	25	24	25	136	193	367	<i>11e-4/1e5</i>	.	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	2.1	5.5	1.1	0.55	0.92	0.77	0.87	0.72	0.79	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1.9	8.4	0.93	0.38	0.69	0.91	1.2	1.0	1.7	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1.1	1.2	1.2	2.6	4.6	2.1	1.0	0.68	1.0	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	1	2.2	13	18	27	116	114	<i>31e-3/5e3</i>	.	.	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1	1.3	2.4	6.6	6.2	7.6	9.3	8.9	24	<i>17e-6/5e4</i>	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	35	55	187	5891	10571	7294	<i>10e-1/1e5</i>	.	.	.	SPSA [9]

Table 20: 03-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 0.33	1e+02 0.33	1e+01 0.73	1e+00 27	1e-01 601	1e-02 2312	1e-03 10645	1e-04 25282	1e-05 40067	1e-07 88603	Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D	
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	41	43	31	31	<i>11e-2/1e4</i>	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]	
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	4.0	58	7.8	15	<i>54e-3/1e4</i>	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]	
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1.1	65	31	29	63	<i>14e-2/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]	
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1.3	22	37	28	29	<i>13e-2/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]	
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	3.1	9.0	11	13	62	<i>71e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]	
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1.4	27	12	7.1	<i>44e-3/1e4</i>	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]	
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1.7	5.3	17	10	61	<i>31e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]	
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1	54	18	14	<i>51e-3/1e4</i>	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]	
avg NEWUOA	1	24	120	66	40	<i>36e-2/6e3</i>	avg NEWUOA [16]	
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	779	1826	2111	847	151	74	43	58	<i>11e-3/1e5</i>	.	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]	
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	2.2	14	8.3	1.9	1.6	0.66	0.49	0.57	0.50	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]	
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1.3	8.6	11	1.9	0.97	0.60	0.54	0.53	0.77	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]	
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1.1	1.2	3.5	78	38	15	10	10	4.4	CMA+DE-MOS [13]	
NEWUOA	1	1.7	120	62	62	<i>42e-2/5e3</i>	NEWUOA [16]	
Basic RCGA	1	1.5	3.0	5.5	19	26	32	<i>85e-4/5e4</i>	.	.	Basic RCGA [17]	
SPSA	99	281	549	247	338	<i>12e-2/1e5</i>	SPSA [9]	

Table 21: 03-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 0.33	1e+02 0.33	1e+01 0.73	1e+00 14	1e-01 39	1e-02 83	1e-03 233	1e-04 500	1e-05 766	1e-07 1107	Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D	
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1.3	2.7	1.6	1.6	2.4	3.1	2.9	3.9	5.3	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]	
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	1	3.0	1.1	1.1	1.4	1.7	2.0	2.2	3.0	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]	
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.9	1.1	1.1	0.88	1.1	1.4	1.4	1.8	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]	
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1.6	2.6	2.7	2.8	7.4	7.3	7.1	12	23	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]	
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1.3	1.5	0.78	0.78	1.2	1.1	1.1	0.95	1.1	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]	
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1.3	3.9	1.2	0.87	1.0	1.0	0.96	0.82	1.0	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]	
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1.4	2.3	0.99	0.64	0.66	0.66	0.54	0.52	0.56	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]	
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1.5	4.6	1.2	0.82	0.89	0.93	0.80	0.77	0.80	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]	
avg NEWUOA	1	2.3	2.9	3.5	5.3	27	319	<i>47e-4/5e3</i>	.	.	avg NEWUOA [16]	
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	18	34	29	7.9	4.6	266	886	2818	<i>11e-4/1e5</i>	.	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]	
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1	2.8	1.1	0.92	1.0	0.90	0.80	0.87	0.90	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]	
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1.1	4.3	1.3	1.2	1.5	1.6	1.7	1.9	2.6	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]	
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1.1	1.2	1.4	4.5	4.7	3.2	2.4	2.3	2.6	CMA+DE-MOS [13]	
NEWUOA	1	1.2	3.2	3.6	7.7	43	<i>62e-4/5e3</i>	.	.	.	NEWUOA [16]	
Basic RCGA	1	1.4	1.5	2.6	13	11	37	43	161	<i>19e-6/5e4</i>	Basic RCGA [17]	
SPSA	36	101	278	2723	3628	2262	6233	<i>24e-2/1e5</i>	.	.	SPSA [9]	

Table 22: 03-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											
$\Delta\text{ftarget}$	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	0.33	0.33	1.9	119	601	1439	2532	3458	4081	6336	ERT_{best}/D
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	5.3	7.0	6.8	53	<i>15e-2/1e4</i>	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	1.8	5.1	1.6	5.0	24	<i>21e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1.3	6.4	3.1	10	47	<i>35e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1.7	10	5.2	56	<i>16e-2/1e4</i>	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1.3	6.1	3.5	6.1	47	<i>20e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1	4.5	1.9	3.6	9.3	<i>85e-4/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1.3	3.0	0.74	5.3	11	58	<i>18e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	2.3	11	5.1	11	103	<i>61e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	2.1	13	22	<i>37e-2/6e3</i>	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	29	35	11	4.1	49	147	165	406	<i>52e-3/1e5</i>	.	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1.3	2.9	1.4	0.80	0.70	0.67	0.61	0.81	0.90	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1.1	1.9	1.1	1.1	0.69	0.76	0.84	0.96	1.1	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1.3	1.5	2.7	9.2	15	15	17	22	17	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	1	1.1	8.5	21	122	<i>65e-2/5e3</i>	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1.1	1.1	1.4	7.9	13	8.6	13	16	87	<i>67e-6/5e4</i>	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	69	158	103	2636	<i>20e-1/1e5</i>	SPSA [9]

Table 23: 03-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} 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
	0.33	0.33	1.6	515	7277	16727	31053	43067	63620	1.47e5	
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	5.9	29	11	<i>73e-2/1e4</i>	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	2.3	34	7.4	<i>62e-2/1e4</i>	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	20	48	5.0	<i>65e-2/1e4</i>	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1.2	49	15	<i>90e-2/1e4</i>	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1.5	27	7.2	19	<i>34e-2/1e4</i>	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1.4	4.6	3.1	<i>32e-2/1e4</i>	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1.4	30	5.2	<i>45e-2/1e4</i>	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	37	82	10	<i>59e-2/1e4</i>	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	12	118	33	<i>16e-1/6e3</i>	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	374	549	697	46	17	89	<i>75e-3/1e5</i>	.	.	.	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1.1	25	2.9	0.56	0.71	0.75	0.75	0.84	0.92	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1.4	8.5	1.7	0.90	0.98	0.89	0.82	0.85	1.2	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1.3	1.8	171	51	22	16	16	11	4.8	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	1	12	132	20	<i>12e-1/5e3</i>	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1	1.2	2.2	13	47	<i>36e-2/5e4</i>	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	64	46353	22910	1289	<i>14e-1/1e5</i>	SPSA [9]

Table 24: 03-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{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
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1.4	43	7.4	34	<i>82e-3/1e4</i>	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	1.5	2.3	0.46	2.7	4.1	60	<i>70e-4/1e4</i>	.	.	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1.6	3.9	2.2	3.7	7.6	<i>73e-4/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1.3	6.4	10	78	<i>13e-2/1e4</i>	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1.9	34	17	8.5	11	60	<i>79e-4/1e4</i>	.	.	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1.1	2.8	0.89	2.1	2.9	6.5	46	<i>10e-4/1e4</i>	.	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1.4	3.7	2.4	1.2	1.5	5.7	<i>91e-5/1e4</i>	.	.	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	2.1	22	2.6	4.2	5.5	63	<i>45e-4/1e4</i>	.	.	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	1.5	11	7.7	59	<i>18e-2/5e3</i>	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	15	24	16	6.2	30	103	<i>11e-3/1e5</i>	.	.	.	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	2.0	4.2	0.54	0.82	0.50	0.55	0.87	1.2	1.4	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1.5	3.2	0.59	2.0	1.1	0.79	0.96	1.5	2.4	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1.3	2.4	2.5	27	10	5.8	5.0	5.0	5.0	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	1	1.5	5.6	13	36	<i>14e-2/5e3</i>	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1	1.2	1.8	4.5	22	11	18	50	170	<i>80e-5/5e4</i>	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	27	51	6155	2182	4845	<i>11e-1/1e5</i>	SPSA [9]

Table 25: 03-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	1e+02	1e+01	1e+00	1e-01	1e-02	1e-03	1e-04	1e-05	1e-07	Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D
	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.33	1473	8226	11656	12117	12667	
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	19	572	6.4	<i>69e-4/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	8.7	207	3.9	18	13	<i>38e-4/1e4</i>	.	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	10	289	2.8	18	13	<i>53e-4/1e4</i>	.	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.3	11	791	5.8	<i>68e-4/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	8.1	677	4.8	8.6	<i>55e-4/1e4</i>	.	.	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	10	508	3.1	8.6	13	12	<i>31e-4/1e4</i>	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	8.9	298	2.5	4.0	13	<i>31e-4/1e4</i>	.	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	14	556	5.3	18	<i>69e-4/1e4</i>	.	.	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	1	1.4	9.3	326	1.6	3.0	6.9	6.7	<i>40e-4/6e3</i>	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	30	38	49	79	569	1.8	21	38	57	115	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1	1.3	9.5	289	0.69	0.67	0.70	0.76	0.75	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1	1.2	11	243	1.4	1.1	0.98	0.97	0.99	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1	1.1	13	222	1.8	4.0	6.3	6.1	5.9	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	1	1	2.8	10	332	0.88	2.8	2.0	1.9	<i>19e-4/5e3</i>	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1	1	1.3	9.3	291	1.0	5.2	8.1	59	<i>54e-5/5e4</i>	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	25	38	41	66	21710	14	<i>36e-4/1e5</i>	.	.	.	SPSA [9]

Table 26: 03-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										
$\Delta\text{ftarget}$	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	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.33	0.33	4499	37712	1.11e5	2.08e5	3.20e5	ERT_{best}/D
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.1	135	3640	15	<i>26e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	87	3050	16	<i>22e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	148	1434	7.1	<i>20e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	209	5363	<i>38e-3/1e4</i>	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.2	15	1230	10	<i>18e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	11	1618	3.4	<i>10e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	6.5	1116	7.3	<i>12e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1	32	97	1584	5.4	<i>12e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	1	1.7	258	6248	<i>49e-3/6e3</i>	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	630	728	1797	2592	7997	8.5	4.1	6.1	<i>22e-4/1e5</i>	.	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1	1	74	933	0.68	0.89	0.66	0.49	0.49	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1	1	15	645	0.85	0.88	0.81	0.95	0.91	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1	1.1	16	237	0.11	15	<i>27e-4/1e5</i>	.	.	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	1	1	13	266	8605	17	<i>48e-3/5e3</i>	.	.	.	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1	1	1.1	7.1	350	0.31	0.65	1.1	3.5	<i>15e-5/5e4</i>	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	18	46208	75111	2.01e5	3.07e5	159	<i>54e-3/1e5</i>	.	.	.	SPSA [9]

Table 27: 03-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 0.33	1e+02 0.33	1e+01 0.33	1e+00 0.33	1e-01 0.33	1e-02 1168	1e-03 13028	1e-04 15016	1e-05 15116	1e-07 15332	Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.3	11	367	6.1	<i>76e-4/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.1	6.9	184	2.1	1.8	4.7	4.6	4.6	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	10	644	3.5	5.5	<i>54e-4/1e4</i>	.	.	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	12	644	7.3	11	<i>73e-4/1e4</i>	.	.	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	4.8	423	6.0	5.4	10	9.5	9.4	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.1	9.3	417	3.7	5.4	10	10	10	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	4.7	217	1.5	2.2	2.0	2.0	1.9	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	13	204	4.5	2.3	4.5	4.5	4.4	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	1	2.1	11	295	4.5	<i>61e-4/5e3</i>	.	.	.	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	14	24	30	55	224	10	24	94	<i>17e-4/1e5</i>	.	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1	1	6.4	179	3.7	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.1	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1	1	14	189	4.3	0.83	1.4	1.5	1.5	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1	1.1	12	190	0.19	1.9	2.7	2.7	2.8	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	1	1	2.1	18	278	1.6	2.3	4.3	4.2	<i>61e-4/4e3</i>	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1	1	1.1	12	293	1.1	2.3	8.3	15	46	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	31	47	82	1530	45810	582	<i>22e-3/1e5</i>	.	.	.	SPSA [9]

Table 28: 03-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 0.33	1e+02 0.33	1e+01 1.8	1e+00 142	1e-01 375	1e-02 449	1e-03 639	1e-04 903	1e-05 905	1e-07 1447	Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D	
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1	4.7	3.7	2.3	4.7	4.7	6.8	7.1	7.7	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]	
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.9	1.6	2.3	2.5	1.8	1.4	1.7	1.1	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]	
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	2.3	2.9	4.0	3.7	3.1	2.3	2.6	1.9	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]	
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1	3.5	3.1	3.4	5.7	5.0	3.9	3.9	4.3	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]	
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1	2.6	2.7	2.4	2.5	1.8	1.3	1.3	0.91	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]	
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1	2.0	3.3	4.1	4.0	2.8	2.4	2.4	1.9	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]	
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	3.6	3.1	3.1	3.6	2.5	1.9	1.9	1.2	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]	
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1	2.7	3.1	4.8	4.8	3.7	2.7	2.8	2.4	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]	
avg NEWUOA	1	1	4.3	10	19	25	18	17	45	<i>45e-3/6e3</i>	avg NEWUOA [16]	
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	30	40	12	14	48	84	146	264	471	<i>90e-5/1e5</i>	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]	
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1	1.2	7.3	16	36	26	76	76	48	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]	
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1	2.2	7.3	12	11	15	11	11	7.3	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]	
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1	2.3	33	52	46	32	24	24	16	CMA+DE-MOS [13]	
NEWUOA	1	1	1.7	7.0	9.1	14	35	84	<i>89e-4/5e3</i>	.	NEWUOA [16]	
Basic RCGA	1	1	1.3	18	33	58	49	35	43	41	Basic RCGA [17]	
SPSA	20	31	150	1406	1931	3251	2283	<i>13e-1/1e5</i>	.	.	SPSA [9]	

Table 29: 03-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											
$\Delta\text{ftarget}$ ERT_{best}/D	1e+03 0.33	1e+02 0.33	1e+01 1.6	1e+00 121	1e-01 1131	1e-02 2617	1e-03 3861	1e-04 8261	1e-05 9454	1e-07 12845	$\Delta\text{ftarget}$ ERT_{best}/D
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1	53	15	5.2	54	<i>23e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	1	21	13	4.8	17	36	<i>61e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	31	18	7.9	18	38	<i>27e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1	28	25	11	28	<i>90e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1	14	14	4.0	5.7	11	18	15	<i>11e-3/1e4</i>	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1	5.1	7.3	3.2	5.3	12	8.5	<i>47e-4/1e4</i>	.	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	10	11	4.5	6.2	37	<i>30e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1	22	11	5.5	7.6	38	18	<i>14e-3/1e4</i>	.	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	1	51	34	12	15	21	10	<i>23e-2/6e3</i>	.	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	181	2286	6231	223	74	45	88	56	157	116	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1	1.4	5.9	5.0	2.8	12	10	9.1	6.9	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1	7.5	12	4.7	3.3	6.1	13	11	22	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1	2.4	239	81	72	77	51	45	48	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	1	1	56	63	21	30	21	<i>79e-2/5e3</i>	.	.	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1	1	1.6	11	12	11	24	14	13	27	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	54	279	1008	171	308	271	<i>14e-2/1e5</i>	.	.	.	SPSA [9]

Table 30: 03-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										
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
	0.33	0.33	1.8	82	172	305	501	2264	3981	4782	
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1	2.9	38	43	24	15	3.4	2.3	2.0	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	1	2.7	17	14	7.9	5.5	1.2	0.71	0.60	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.2	8.1	10	10	5.9	1.7	0.97	0.82	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1	4.0	32	53	31	19	5.0	2.8	2.4	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1	21	10	13	10	6.0	1.3	0.76	0.64	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1	2.1	11	15	8.6	5.2	1.2	0.67	0.56	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	14	8.5	7.6	5.2	3.2	0.70	0.40	0.34	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1	2.4	7.7	15	8.4	5.2	1.1	0.65	0.55	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	1	2.6	3.9	12	8.5	11	5.6	5.7	<i>90e-5/5e3</i>	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	22	37	12	54	155	216	204	131	104	<i>99e-5/1e5</i>	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1	2.3	19	46	51	57	35	20	17	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1	3.1	53	57	33	153	34	19	16	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1	1.8	90	332	398	389	86	87	73	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	1	1	2.0	3.0	9.4	18	21	6.6	17	<i>86e-4/5e3</i>	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1	1	1.3	15	84	132	139	31	23	26	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	15	30	103	523	486	574	1367	648	369	<i>51e-3/1e5</i>	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.