

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} ERT_{best}/D | 1e+03 0.10 | 1e+02 0.10 | 1e+01 2.6 | 1e+00 4.0 | 1e-01 18 | 1e-02 19 | 1e-03 19 | 1e-04 20 | 1e-05 21 | 1e-07 23 | Δf_{target} 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 $ERT/ERT_{\text{best}}^{2009}$ 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 0.10 | 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 | (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 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 $ERT/ERT_{\text{best}} 2009$ 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

| | 108 Sphere unif | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-----------------|---------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|---|
| Δf_{target} 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 | Δf_{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 $ERT/ERT_{\text{best}} 2009$ 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.