

Comparison tables: BBOB 2010 noisy testbed with BBOB 2009 as reference in 10-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: 10-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}	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	0.10	0.10	2.6	4.0	18	19	19	20	21	23	ERT _{best} /D
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	50	13	14	4.3	5.1	6.0	6.7	7.4	8.8	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	14	7.1	7.8	2.4	3.2	3.8	4.2	4.6	5.5	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	29	5.6	5.8	1.9	2.5	3.0	3.4	3.8	4.5	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	54	14	13	4.2	5.2	6.1	6.9	7.8	9.3	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	10	5.1	6.0	2.0	2.6	3.0	3.5	3.8	4.7	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	10	4.0	5.0	1.6	2.2	2.6	3.0	3.3	4.1	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	12	3.0	3.9	1.3	1.7	2.0	2.3	2.6	3.2	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	14	4.7	5.4	1.7	2.2	2.6	3.0	3.3	4.0	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	20	2.9	3.4	0.99	1.2	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.4	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	153	253	33	32	8.5	10	11	12	12	14	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	6.6	5.1	7.2	2.4	3.2	3.8	4.5	5.0	6.1	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	11	5.6	7.4	2.5	3.4	4.1	4.7	5.2	6.1	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	5.9	17	33	8.8	12	15	16	18	22	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	1	15	2.1	3.0	1.0	1.6	1.9	2.1	2.3	2.9	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1	7.1	28	63	28	46	121	229	288	377	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	104	177	4405	5820	2316	4151	5693	6382	7916	<i>34e-5/1e5</i>	SPSA [9]

Table 2: 10-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{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}	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	0.10	0.10	2.6	4.1	20	21	23	24	27	30	ERT _{best} /D	
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	50	15	15	4.4	5.2	5.7	6.4	6.8	7.9	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]	
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	25	7.3	7.7	2.3	2.8	3.1	3.6	3.7	4.1	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]	
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	23	4.9	6.3	1.9	2.3	2.6	2.9	3.1	3.5	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]	
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	26	22	21	5.8	6.6	7.4	8.2	8.6	12	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]	
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	21	5.8	6.4	2.0	2.5	2.9	3.2	3.4	3.8	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]	
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	7.7	4.6	5.1	1.6	1.9	2.2	2.6	2.7	3.1	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]	
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	14	3.6	4.4	1.3	1.6	1.9	2.1	2.2	2.5	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]	
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	17	4.7	4.9	1.6	2.0	2.2	2.5	2.7	3.0	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]	
avg NEWUOA	1	31	2.9	3.2	0.89	1.1	1.2	1.3	1.4	1.7	avg NEWUOA [16]	
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	147	242	35	32	8.9	10	10	11	11	11	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]	
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	10	5.0	6.9	2.2	2.8	3.3	3.7	4.0	4.4	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]	
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	6.0	5.3	7.2	2.3	2.9	3.3	3.8	4.0	4.4	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]	
CMA+DE-MOS	1	5.9	19	32	8.3	11	13	13	15	16	CMA+DE-MOS [13]	
NEWUOA	1	18	3.5	7.9	8.0	30	48	81	146	547	NEWUOA [16]	
Basic RCGA	1	4.1	26	57	26	42	102	193	234	285	Basic RCGA [17]	
SPSA	124	183	1.56e5	3.44e5	<i>21e+0/1e5</i>	SPSA [9]	

Table 3: 10-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{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}	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	0.10	0.10	2.6	4.7	13	14	36	36	36	36	ERT _{best} /D
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	34	14	12	6.4	7.4	3.6	4.3	5.2	6.8	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	27	6.8	6.4	3.3	4.0	2.1	2.5	3.0	3.8	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	16	6.1	6.0	3.0	3.5	1.7	2.1	2.4	3.1	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	26	12	11	5.5	6.3	3.1	3.8	4.7	6.1	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	16	5.8	5.7	3.0	3.6	1.8	2.2	2.6	3.5	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	13	4.7	4.6	2.6	3.1	1.5	1.9	2.2	2.9	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	14	3.5	3.4	1.9	2.2	1.1	1.4	1.6	2.1	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	17	4.8	4.4	2.4	2.8	1.4	1.7	2.1	2.7	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	31	3.0	2.9	1.8	6.8	25	100	1518	<i>39e-6/8e3</i>	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	121	223	32	25	12	12	5.5	6.6	7.7	10	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	7.8	4.9	6.0	3.5	4.2	2.1	2.6	3.1	4.0	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	11	5.0	6.0	3.4	4.2	2.1	2.6	3.1	4.0	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	5.9	16	28	13	17	8.4	11	13	18	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	1	15	2.3	3.6	5.2	29	95	243	1050	<i>15e-5/6e3</i>	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1	5.3	33	55	43	74	83	157	201	253	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	105	725	112	109	57	88	1065	4244	<i>18e-5/1e5</i>	.	SPSA [9]

Table 4: 10-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{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	9.4	30	61	999	1664	1842	1936	2015	2076	2201	ERT _{best} /D	
(1,2)-CMA-ES	4.6	3.5	3.8	43	<i>24e-1/1e4</i>	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]	
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	2.4	2.7	2.1	11	41	78	74	71	<i>72e-2/1e4</i>	.	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]	
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	2.0	2.0	1.5	15	26	76	72	70	<i>16e-1/1e4</i>	.	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]	
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	7.1	4.9	3.2	26	<i>15e-1/1e4</i>	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]	
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1.8	2.5	2.1	7.4	87	<i>56e-2/1e4</i>	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]	
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1.5	0.98	1.3	32	41	77	73	70	68	64	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]	
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1.1	1.8	1.2	13	43	<i>92e-2/1e4</i>	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]	
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1.6	1.8	1.4	8.2	26	77	<i>40e-2/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]	
avg NEWUOA	0.51	0.78	0.74	7.1	22	<i>67e-2/8e3</i>	avg NEWUOA [16]	
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	10	4.7	3.5	38	23	21	20	19	18	17	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]	
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1.9	1.2	1.2	2.0	1.3	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.1	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]	
IPOP-CMA-ES	1.9	1.9	2.2	1.6	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.0	0.99	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]	
CMA+DE-MOS	6.3	4.4	3.9	3.5	2.5	2.6	2.8	2.7	2.7	2.7	CMA+DE-MOS [13]	
NEWUOA	0.51	1.6	5.4	4.6	47	<i>55e-2/5e3</i>	NEWUOA [16]	
Basic RCGA	8.1	11	74	<i>73e-1/5e4</i>	Basic RCGA [17]	
SPSA	41	24	<i>70e+0/1e5</i>	SPSA [9]	

Table 5: 10-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{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}	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	9.0	33	95	2149	7015	7257	7422	7734	7819	7973	ERT _{best} /D	
(1,2)-CMA-ES	5.5	5.1	4.5	15	20	<i>21e-1/1e4</i>	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]	
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	2.7	1.9	1.7	10	<i>19e-1/1e4</i>	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]	
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1.9	2.7	1.8	7.5	6.2	20	<i>14e-1/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]	
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	5.5	6.0	5.6	32	21	<i>35e-1/1e4</i>	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]	
(1,4)-CMA-ES	2.0	1.9	1.3	7.5	9.5	<i>15e-1/1e4</i>	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]	
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1.6	1.9	1.1	12	10	<i>20e-1/1e4</i>	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]	
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1.2	1.9	1.4	6.6	10	<i>59e-2/1e4</i>	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]	
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1.6	1.6	1.1	6.2	3.8	10	19	<i>38e-2/1e4</i>	.	.	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]	
avg NEWUOA	0.64	1.7	2.5	5.1	3.7	16	<i>88e-2/8e3</i>	.	.	.	avg NEWUOA [16]	
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	11	5.0	2.5	304	93	90	88	85	84	176	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]	
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1.8	1.2	1.0	2.0	0.64	0.63	0.63	0.61	0.61	0.61	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]	
IPOP-CMA-ES	2.1	1.4	2.2	2.4	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.80	0.80	0.81	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]	
CMA+DE-MOS	7.5	3.9	2.4	13	3.9	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.5	CMA+DE-MOS [13]	
NEWUOA	0.35	1.2	11	10	<i>52e-1/5e3</i>	NEWUOA [16]	
Basic RCGA	10	10	45	328	<i>61e-1/5e4</i>	Basic RCGA [17]	
SPSA	29	20	<i>70e+0/1e5</i>	SPSA [9]	

Table 6: 10-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

Table 7: 10-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}	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	0.10	0.10	95	225	387	521	735	960	1134	1430	ERT _{best} /D	
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	512	199	<i>11e+0/1e4</i>	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]	
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	22	15	632	<i>35e-1/1e4</i>	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]	
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	53	22	646	<i>54e-1/1e4</i>	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]	
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	415	702	<i>14e+0/1e4</i>	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]	
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	127	36	<i>54e-1/1e4</i>	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]	
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	30	12	139	<i>21e-1/1e4</i>	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]	
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	170	10	<i>34e-1/1e4</i>	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]	
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	20	36	299	<i>54e-1/1e4</i>	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]	
avg NEWUOA	1	32	227	<i>15e+0/7e3</i>	avg NEWUOA [16]	
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	113	194	1.3	1.3	2.1	3.4	3.3	5.2	5.9	17	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]	
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	6.1	0.97	1.1	1.4	1.3	1.1	0.89	0.96	0.94	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]	
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	10	0.85	0.86	0.93	1.1	1.0	0.96	0.90	0.82	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]	
CMA+DE-MOS	1	5.9	16	64	45	36	30	24	21	17	CMA+DE-MOS [13]	
NEWUOA	1	15	130	<i>23e+0/4e3</i>	NEWUOA [16]	
Basic RCGA	1	2.4	3.3	3.4	2.9	3.4	4.7	5.7	6.3	6.4	Basic RCGA [17]	
SPSA	82	145	14817	<i>28e+0/1e5</i>	SPSA [9]	

Table 8: 10-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{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												
Δt_{target} ERT _{best} /D	1e+03	1e+02	1e+01	1e+00	1e-01	1e-02	1e-03	1e-04	1e-05	1e-07	Δt_{target} ERT _{best} /D	
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1016	<i>28e+0/1e4</i>	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]	
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	1587	<i>26e+0/1e4</i>	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]	
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	926	<i>29e+0/1e4</i>	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]	
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	758	<i>27e+0/1e4</i>	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]	
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	924	67	<i>18e+0/1e4</i>	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]	
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	965	149	<i>17e+0/1e4</i>	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]	
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	707	33	<i>16e+0/1e4</i>	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]	
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	896	<i>22e+0/1e4</i>	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]	
avg NEWUOA	1	1432	<i>27e+0/7e3</i>	avg NEWUOA [16]	
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	11234	22743	4.5	3.5	4.3	4.4	4.6	4.9	7.5	12	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]	
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	376	1.0	0.63	0.98	0.88	0.98	1.0	1.1	0.88	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]	
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	63	0.78	0.64	0.69	0.77	0.70	0.82	0.78	0.77	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]	
CMA+DE-MOS	1	5.9	46	479	<i>74e-1/1e5</i>	CMA+DE-MOS [13]	
NEWUOA	1	593	<i>28e+0/4e3</i>	NEWUOA [16]	
Basic RCGA	1	5.1	4.6	225	<i>21e-1/5e4</i>	Basic RCGA [17]	
SPSA	3022	8166	5.7	22	<i>78e-2/1e5</i>	SPSA [9]	

Table 9: 10-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}	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
	ERT _{best} /D	0.10	0.10	2.8	29	50	82	116	146	179	242	ERT _{best} /D
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	55	15	2.5	2.8	2.3	2.2	2.2	2.3	2.5	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]	
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	31	6.0	1.2	1.1	1.1	0.98	1.0	1.0	1.1	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]	
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	28	5.8	1.0	0.94	0.83	0.77	0.79	0.78	0.75	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]	
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	55	14	2.6	2.4	1.9	1.8	1.8	2.0	2.1	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]	
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	16	5.4	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.2	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]	
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	13	4.2	0.84	0.83	0.83	0.82	0.81	0.83	0.87	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]	
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	12	3.4	0.69	0.66	0.55	0.52	0.52	0.52	0.53	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]	
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	19	4.4	0.99	0.94	0.83	0.77	0.77	0.76	0.77	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]	
avg NEWUOA	1	20	11	38	665	<i>31e-2/7e3</i>	avg NEWUOA [16]	
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	125	202	31	4.7	3.5	485	<i>49e-4/1e5</i>	.	.	.	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]	
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	10	4.5	1.2	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.2	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]	
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	6.3	4.4	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.0	1.1	1.1	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]	
CMA+DE-MOS	1	5.9	16	4.6	4.8	4.5	4.9	5.0	5.3	5.6	CMA+DE-MOS [13]	
NEWUOA	1	16	12	77	<i>57e-2/4e3</i>	NEWUOA [16]	
Basic RCGA	1	4.4	28	10	12	23	47	48	46	41	Basic RCGA [17]	
SPSA	101	733	495	368	13065	<i>36e-2/1e5</i>	SPSA [9]	

Table 10: 10-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{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

Table 11: 10-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{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

Table 12: 10-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{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}
(1,2)-CMA-ES	5.2	3.0	2.0	6.3	5.8	5.9	7.3	7.3	8.4	9.4	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]	
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	2.0	1.4	1.4	1.6	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	1.5	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]	
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1.6	1.1	1.8	0.83	0.78	0.81	0.82	0.82	0.81	0.81	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]	
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	3.6	2.5	10	8.6	9.4	13	15	15	14	24	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]	
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1.6	1.5	1.5	2.1	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.8	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]	
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1.4	1.0	1.1	1.3	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	1.1	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]	
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1.0	0.92	0.81	0.56	0.50	0.51	0.51	0.51	0.51	0.51	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]	
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1.6	1.2	0.87	1.1	0.99	0.98	0.99	0.98	0.98	0.98	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]	
avg NEWUOA	0.54	0.83	10	98	71	<i>42e-1/8e3</i>	avg NEWUOA [16]	
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	9.0	3.3	2.2	<i>77e-1/1e5</i>	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]	
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1.6	0.92	0.83	0.95	0.92	0.97	0.98	0.99	0.99	0.98	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]	
IPOP-CMA-ES	1.6	0.88	0.76	1.2	1.1	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]	
CMA+DE-MOS	6.4	3.4	2.8	1.9	1.9	2.4	3.0	3.0	3.0	3.0	CMA+DE-MOS [13]	
NEWUOA	0.37	0.39	27	<i>81e-1/5e3</i>	NEWUOA [16]	
Basic RCGA	7.8	9.2	52	646	<i>77e-1/5e4</i>	Basic RCGA [17]	
SPSA	127	468	16041	<i>29e+0/1e5</i>	SPSA [9]	

Table 13: 10-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{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

Table 14: 10-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{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

Table 15: 10-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{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	0.10	3.8	40	290	859	1232	1260	1260	1260	1281	ERT _{best} /D	
(1,2)-CMA-ES	22	6.7	11	253	$23e-1/1e4$	(1,2)-CMA-ES	[4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	2.8	4.3	2.5	16	174	$69e-2/1e4$	(1,2m)-CMA-ES	[4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	11	3.1	2.0	14	$65e-2/1e4$	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	[4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	7.5	9.3	14	$27e-1/1e4$	(1,2s)-CMA-ES	[2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	4.1	2.5	3.1	15	173	$75e-2/1e4$	(1,4)-CMA-ES	[5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	4.5	1.8	1.2	15	78	$61e-2/1e4$	(1,4m)-CMA-ES	[5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	2.7	1.9	1.6	10	50	$39e-2/1e4$	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	[1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	6.9	2.5	2.7	18	164	$69e-2/1e4$	(1,4s)-CMA-ES	[3]
avg NEWUOA	7.0	2.6	4.2	386	$24e-1/7e3$	avg NEWUOA	[16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	185	13	3.9	953	$13e-1/1e5$	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	[8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	3.5	1.9	0.91	1.3	1.5	1.5	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.5	IPOP-aCMA-ES	[12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	3.5	2.0	1.0	3.7	5.3	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	IPOP-CMA-ES	[15]
CMA+DE-MOS	2.6	8.1	3.4	53	93	122	120	120	120	118	CMA+DE-MOS	[13]
NEWUOA	11	2.4	19	$41e-1/4e3$	NEWUOA	[16]
Basic RCGA	2.6	6.2	37	45	269	579	566	566	566	557	Basic RCGA	[17]
SPSA	177	41	34	$31e-1/1e5$	SPSA	[9]

Table 16: 10-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{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

Table 17: 10-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{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

Table 18: 10-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{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}	11	31	135	324	434	530	610	651	707	806	ERT _{best/D}	
(1,2)-CMA-ES	12	11	7.4	8.4	9.1	9.4	11	14	13	22	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]	
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	6.3	5.0	2.9	2.7	2.4	2.2	2.0	2.0	1.9	1.8	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]	
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	5.1	4.2	2.5	1.7	1.6	1.5	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.3	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]	
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	11	12	15	12	17	22	25	41	38	43	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]	
(1,4)-CMA-ES	4.7	4.1	2.4	2.0	1.9	1.9	1.8	2.0	1.9	1.9	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]	
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	3.9	2.9	2.0	1.6	1.5	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.3	1.3	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]	
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	3.2	2.3	1.3	0.87	0.85	0.81	0.75	0.75	0.72	0.68	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]	
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	4.2	3.6	2.1	1.5	1.3	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.1	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]	
avg NEWUOA	1.0	3.2	17	<i>37e-1/9e3</i>	avg NEWUOA [16]	
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	18	13	377	1238	3227	<i>60e-1/1e5</i>	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]	
IPOP-aCMA-ES	4.2	3.5	1.4	0.89	0.89	0.88	0.87	0.88	0.88	0.88	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]	
IPOP-CMA-ES	4.8	5.2	2.9	2.2	2.2	2.1	2.0	2.0	2.0	1.9	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]	
CMA+DE-MOS	12	8.6	3.4	1.9	1.8	1.9	2.0	2.1	2.2	2.4	CMA+DE-MOS [13]	
NEWUOA	1.2	3.9	57	<i>99e-1/5e3</i>	NEWUOA [16]	
Basic RCGA	31	433	1202	<i>22e+0/5e4</i>	Basic RCGA [17]	
SPSA	26	133	11012	<i>29e+0/1e5</i>	SPSA [9]	

Table 19: 10-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{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

Table 20: 10-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{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}	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}
ERT _{best/D}	0.10	0.10	47	3991	7463	15677	43945	93047	1.27e5	2.50e5	ERT _{best/D}	
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	307	893	<i>12e+0/1e4</i>	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]	
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	397	315	<i>11e+0/1e4</i>	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]	
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	463	251	<i>97e-1/1e4</i>	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]	
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	704	275	<i>95e-1/1e4</i>	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]	
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	22	108	<i>67e-1/1e4</i>	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]	
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	233	57	<i>57e-1/1e4</i>	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]	
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	168	57	<i>65e-1/1e4</i>	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]	
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	82	129	<i>69e-1/1e4</i>	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]	
avg NEWUOA	1	439	157	<i>97e-1/7e3</i>	avg NEWUOA [16]	
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	5333	13323	200	10	13	7.6	<i>34e-4/1e5</i>	.	.	.	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]	
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	112	6.2	0.69	0.70	0.75	0.54	0.44	0.57	0.54	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]	
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	42	6.6	0.60	0.57	0.74	0.64	0.60	0.63	0.55	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]	
CMA+DE-MOS	1	3.0	38	188	<i>44e-1/1e5</i>	CMA+DE-MOS [13]	
NEWUOA	1	179	152	<i>11e+0/4e3</i>	NEWUOA [16]	
Basic RCGA	1	2.3	6.6	13	<i>80e-2/5e4</i>	Basic RCGA [17]	
SPSA	2288	9582	300	<i>55e-1/1e5</i>	SPSA [9]	

Table 21: 10-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{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}	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	0.10	0.10	7.2	32	63	148	368	694	999	1821	ERT _{best} /D
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	20	5.8	3.3	3.0	2.7	2.3	2.7	4.0	80	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	10	2.4	1.3	1.2	1.0	0.95	1.1	1.4	2.0	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	5.1	1.7	0.92	0.93	0.71	0.66	0.70	0.89	1.3	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	17	4.5	2.9	2.4	2.1	2.6	4.1	5.8	81	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	9.1	1.5	1.2	1.3	1.1	1.0	1.1	1.5	1.4	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	13	1.3	0.91	0.93	0.85	0.77	0.83	1.0	1.1	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	10	1.1	0.71	0.61	0.48	0.44	0.46	0.51	0.57	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	11	1.1	1.00	0.90	0.75	0.65	0.61	0.74	0.81	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	15	2.1	153	1671	<i>76e-2/7e3</i>	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	142	200	8.6	5.0	4.1	9513	<i>20e-3/1e5</i>	.	.	.	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	7.1	1.4	1.0	1.1	0.94	0.78	0.70	0.72	0.69	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	4.3	1.2	1.1	1.2	1.0	1.2	1.5	1.7	2.0	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	3.0	4.2	4.0	4.2	3.7	2.9	2.5	2.6	2.3	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	1	7.9	3.4	215	<i>11e-1/4e3</i>	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1	1.9	3.3	12	12	23	423	<i>22e-4/5e4</i>	.	.	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	100	206	236	20545	<i>46e-1/1e5</i>	SPSA [9]

Table 22: 10-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{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

Table 23: 10-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{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	0.10	0.10	4.0	9439	38928	66490	1.29e5	1.99e5	3.33e5	1.03e6	ERT _{best} /D	
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1	1677	<i>82e-1/1e4</i>	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]	
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	85	591	<i>67e-1/1e4</i>	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]	
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1.2	674	<i>65e-1/1e4</i>	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]	
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1	1094	<i>71e-1/1e4</i>	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]	
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1	143	<i>56e-1/1e4</i>	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]	
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	32	215	<i>46e-1/1e4</i>	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]	
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1.3	157	<i>52e-1/1e4</i>	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]	
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1.1	238	<i>61e-1/1e4</i>	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]	
avg NEWUOA	1	1.3	181	<i>68e-1/7e3</i>	avg NEWUOA [16]	
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	9772	12675	709	<i>63e-1/5e3</i>	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]	
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1	27	0.66	0.65	0.76	0.79	0.79	0.79	0.72	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]	
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	2.0	22	0.67	0.63	0.72	0.61	0.74	0.82	0.96	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]	
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1.4	202	<i>42e-1/1e5</i>	CMA+DE-MOS [13]	
NEWUOA	1	31	192	<i>64e-1/4e3</i>	NEWUOA [16]	
Basic RCGA	1	1.3	3.7	<i>23e-1/5e4</i>	Basic RCGA [17]	
SPSA	1.14e6	1.15e6	3.51e5	<i>66e+2/1e5</i>	SPSA [9]	

Table 24: 10-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												
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
ERT _{best} /D	0.10	0.10	3.7	61	1045	3430	5289	7378	13712	33136	ERT _{best} /D	
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1.3	45	<i>45e-1/1e4</i>	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]	
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	1.3	4.8	192	<i>77e-2/1e4</i>	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]	
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1.1	4.3	153	<i>85e-2/1e4</i>	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]	
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1	361	<i>47e-1/1e4</i>	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]	
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	4.1	2.7	302	<i>12e-1/1e4</i>	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]	
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1.6	2.3	112	<i>65e-2/1e4</i>	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]	
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	3.1	1.7	74	<i>55e-2/1e4</i>	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]	
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	3.1	24	1113	<i>15e-1/1e4</i>	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]	
avg NEWUOA	1	3.5	12	<i>24e-1/7e3</i>	avg NEWUOA [16]	
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	112	177	14	3.5	33	<i>13e-2/5e3</i>	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]	
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1	1.9	1.2	1.1	1.1	1.0	1.2	0.83	0.51	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]	
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	3.9	1.8	1.2	1.5	1.1	1.2	1.1	1.2	1.0	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]	
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1.4	3.1	257	15	7.2	5.4	4.6	3.0	1.6	CMA+DE-MOS [13]	
NEWUOA	1	5.0	11	<i>34e-1/4e3</i>	NEWUOA [16]	
Basic RCGA	1	1.2	3.5	13	13	11	14	<i>10e-4/5e4</i>	.	.	Basic RCGA [17]	
SPSA	71512	71549	4897	<i>76e-1/1e5</i>	SPSA [9]	

Table 25: 10-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{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}	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}
ERT _{best/D}	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	1.05e5	2.97e5	6.38e5	6.40e5	6.44e5	ERT _{best/D}	
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	2738	<i>50e-2/1e4</i>	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]	
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	1214	<i>39e-2/1e4</i>	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]	
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	469	<i>41e-2/1e4</i>	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]	
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	4806	<i>54e-2/1e4</i>	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]	
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	947	<i>38e-2/1e4</i>	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]	
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	381	<i>37e-2/1e4</i>	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]	
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	500	<i>34e-2/1e4</i>	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]	
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	1304	<i>40e-2/1e4</i>	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]	
avg NEWUOA	1	1	5.9	39	<i>19e-2/7e3</i>	avg NEWUOA [16]	
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	129	163	186	372	2.30e5	3.2	<i>14e-3/1e5</i>	.	.	.	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]	
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1	1	115	2.71e5	0.66	0.57	0.40	0.41	0.41	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]	
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1	1	94	2.69e5	0.82	0.70	0.43	0.43	0.44	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]	
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1	1.1	426	3.25e5	15	<i>26e-3/1e5</i>	.	.	.	CMA+DE-MOS [13]	
NEWUOA	1	1	3.8	84	<i>22e-2/4e3</i>	NEWUOA [16]	
Basic RCGA	1	1	1.1	178	4.66e5	<i>88e-3/5e4</i>	Basic RCGA [17]	
SPSA	71510	71522	71531	71588	2.87e6	<i>12e-2/1e5</i>	SPSA [9]	

Table 26: 10-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{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

Table 27: 10-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{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}	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
ERT _{best} /D	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	0.10	79920	1.35e5	2.06e5	2.08e5	2.11e5	ERT _{best} /D	
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	418	<i>30e-2/1e4</i>	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]	
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	137	<i>4.77e5</i>	<i>18e-2/1e4</i>	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]	
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	131	<i>1.43e6</i>	<i>22e-2/1e4</i>	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]	
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	534	<i>34e-2/1e4</i>	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]	
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	116	<i>2.11e5</i>	<i>15e-2/1e4</i>	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]	
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	78	<i>1.59e5</i>	<i>11e-2/1e4</i>	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]	
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	99	<i>1.46e5</i>	<i>12e-2/1e4</i>	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]	
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	122	<i>4.70e5</i>	<i>15e-2/1e4</i>	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]	
avg NEWUOA	1	1	1	40	<i>20e-2/7e3</i>	avg NEWUOA [16]	
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	115	148	159	397	<i>4.47e5</i>	<i>72e-3/1e5</i>	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]	
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1	1	78	75310	0.40	0.57	0.49	0.49	0.50	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]	
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1	1	66	1.08e5	0.63	0.80	0.62	0.63	0.64	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]	
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1	1.1	273	35137	1.0	<i>66e-4/1e5</i>	.	.	.	CMA+DE-MOS [13]	
NEWUOA	1	1	2.4	79	<i>25e-2/4e3</i>	NEWUOA [16]	
Basic RCGA	1	1	1.2	206	<i>2.25e5</i>	<i>25e-3/5e4</i>	Basic RCGA [17]	
SPSA	112	144	652	<i>1.34e5</i>	<i>1.41e7</i>	<i>59e-2/1e5</i>	SPSA [9]	

Table 28: 10-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{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

Table 29: 10-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{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

Table 30: 10-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{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}	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	1	12	40	8.1	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.2	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]	
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	1	10	6.4	1.6	0.83	0.83	0.82	0.82	0.81	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]	
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	4.4	2.4	0.84	0.45	0.45	0.45	0.44	0.44	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]	
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1	11	8.0	2.6	1.6	1.8	2.3	3.3	3.3	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]	
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1	5.1	5.9	1.5	0.82	0.82	0.82	0.81	0.81	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]	
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1	3.8	5.5	1.3	0.68	0.68	0.68	0.68	0.67	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]	
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	2.9	2.3	0.77	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.41	0.40	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]	
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1	5.0	5.7	1.7	0.89	0.88	0.88	0.87	0.86	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]	
avg NEWUOA	1	1	1.9	6.0	8.6	<i>41e-2/7e3</i>	avg NEWUOA [16]	
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	108	153	2.5	121	41	40	198	<i>15e-2/1e5</i>	.	.	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]	
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1	2.3	309	49	26	26	25	25	25	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]	
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1	3.6	582	126	67	67	66	66	65	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]	
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1	324	378	81	43	43	42	42	41	CMA+DE-MOS [13]	
NEWUOA	1	1	2.6	11	8.0	8.8	8.7	<i>14e-1/4e3</i>	.	.	NEWUOA [16]	
Basic RCGA	1	1	53	55	11	5.8	6.1	6.2	9.3	23	Basic RCGA [17]	
SPSA	121	152	1111	<i>73e-1/1e5</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.