

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 $\text{ERT}/\text{ERT}_{\text{best}}$ 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}
$\text{ERT}_{\text{best}}/D$	0.10	0.10	2.6	4.0	18	19	19	20	21	23		$\text{ERT}_{\text{best}}/D$
(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

	Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D	1e+03 0.10	1e+02 0.10	1e+01 2.6	1e+00 4.7	1e-01 13	1e-02 14	1e-03 36	1e-04 36	1e-05 36	1e-07 36	Δf_{target} ERT_{best}/D
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	34	14	12	6.4	7.4	3.6	4.3	5.2	6.8	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	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	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	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	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	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	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	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>	1518	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	121	223	32	25	12	12	5.5	6.6	7.7	10	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	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	4.0	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	5.9	16	28	13	17	8.4	11	13	18	18	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	1	15	2.3	3.6	5.2	29	95	243	1050	<i>15e-5/6e3</i>	1050	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1	5.3	33	55	43	74	83	157	201	253	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												
	$\Delta\text{ftarget}$	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	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]

51

Table 5: 10-D, running time excess $\text{ERT}/\text{ERT}_{\text{best}} 2009$ 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

	1e+03	1e+02	1e+01	1e+00	1e-01	1e-02	1e-03	1e-04	1e-05	1e-07	$\Delta \text{ftarget}$ $\text{ERT}_{\text{best}}/D$
$\Delta \text{ftarget}$ $\text{ERT}_{\text{best}}/D$	9.0	33	95	2149	7015	7257	7422	7734	7819	7973	$\text{ERT}_{\text{best}}/D$
(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 $ERT/ERT_{\text{best}} 2009$ 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	5.6	6.9	8.3	4.6	2.5	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.6	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	2.4	2.5	3.2	2.2	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	2.4	3.2	3.2	1.5	0.85	0.89	0.90	0.91	0.91	0.90	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	4.8	8.0	8.1	7.9	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.0	4.0	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	2.0	2.3	2.5	1.5	0.85	0.88	0.90	0.91	0.91	0.92	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1.8	2.1	2.2	1.4	0.77	0.80	0.81	0.82	0.82	0.82	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1.2	1.1	1.8	0.84	0.48	0.50	0.51	0.51	0.52	0.52	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1.9	2.3	2.5	1.6	0.85	0.86	0.86	0.87	0.87	0.87	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	0.56	0.67	1.3	5.4	19	162	<i>13e-2/9e3</i>	.	.	.	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	9.2	6.6	6.6	3.0	1.6	1.7	1.7	1.8	1.9	2.1	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1.9	1.9	2.4	1.7	0.96	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1.8	2.4	2.8	2.0	1.2	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	1.3	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	7.3	6.9	7.9	3.3	1.8	1.8	1.9	1.9	2.0	2.1	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	0.38	0.86	1.6	7.5	14	26	<i>11e-2/7e3</i>	.	.	.	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	7.5	15	138	463	443	888	<i>66e-1/5e4</i>	.	.	.	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	165	1194	22845	<i>16e+0/1e5</i>	SPSA [9]

Table 8: 10-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

	$\Delta\text{ftarget}$ ERT_{best}/D	1e+03 0.10	1e+02 0.10	1e+01 1002	1e+00 3143	1e-01 4759	1e-02 7751	1e-03 10929	1e-04 13571	1e-05 17900	1e-07 30809	$\Delta\text{ftarget}$ 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 $ERT/ERT_{\text{best } 2009}$ 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	$\frac{\Delta f_{\text{target}}}{ERT_{\text{best}}/D}$
	0.10	0.10	2.8	29	50	82	116	146	179	242	
(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 21: 10-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 0.10	1e+02 0.10	1e+01 7.2	1e+00 32	1e-01 63	1e-02 148	1e-03 368	1e-04 694	1e-05 999	1e-07 1821	Δf_{target} 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 25: 10-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 0.10	1e+02 0.10	1e+01 0.10	1e+00 0.10	1e-01 0.10	1e-02 1.05e5	1e-03 2.97e5	1e-04 6.38e5	1e-05 6.40e5	1e-07 6.44e5	Δf_{target} 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 27: 10-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 0.10	1e+02 0.10	1e+01 0.10	1e+00 0.10	1e-01 0.10	1e-02 79920	1e-03 1.35e5	1e-04 2.06e5	1e-05 2.08e5	1e-07 2.11e5	Δf_{target} 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	4.77e5	<i>18e-2/1e4</i>	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	131	1.43e6	<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	2.11e5	<i>15e-2/1e4</i>	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	78	1.59e5	<i>11e-2/1e4</i>	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	99	1.46e5	<i>12e-2/1e4</i>	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	122	4.70e5	<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	4.47e5	<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	2.25e5	<i>25e-3/5e4</i>	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	112	144	652	1.34e5	1.41e7	<i>59e-2/1e5</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.