

# Comparison tables: BBOB 2010 noisy testbed with BBOB 2009 as reference in 20-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 ( $\text{ERT}_{\text{best}}$  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 2: 20-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

	<b>102 Sphere moderate unif</b>										
$\Delta f_{\text{target}}$ $ERT_{\text{best}}/D$	1e+03 0.05	1e+02 0.29	1e+01 12	1e+00 20	1e-01 29	1e-02 38	1e-03 46	1e-04 49	1e-05 58	1e-07 70	$\Delta f_{\text{target}}$ $ERT_{\text{best}}/D$
(1,2)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	109	5.0	4.1	3.7	3.7	4.1	5.0	5.3	10	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	54	<b>2.5</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.8</b>	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	44	<b>1.9</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.5</b>	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	143	6.0	4.7	4.4	5.5	7.4	13	18	50	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	34	<b>2.0</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.8</b>	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	28	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.4</b>	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	19	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>0.99</b>	<b>0.97</b>	<b>0.97</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1.1</b>	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	28	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.6</b>	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	<b>1</b>	19	<b>0.92</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>0.93</b>	<b>0.90</b>	<b>0.88</b>	<b>0.99</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.3</b>	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	291	131	10	7.7	6.1	5.3	4.8	4.9	4.5	4.3	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.8</b>	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>15</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.8</b>	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	<b>1</b>	47	9.0	6.3	5.1	5.6	5.8	5.8	5.7	6.1	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	<b>1</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>2.9</b>	6.1	6.3	22	45	505	<i>31e-5/5e3</i>	.	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	<b>1</b>	30	11	15	56	152	178	203	200	195	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	218	212	<i>43e+0/1e5</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	SPSA [9]

Table 3: 20-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

	<b>103 Sphere moderate Cauchy</b>										
$\Delta f_{\text{target}}$ $ERT_{\text{best}}/D$	1e+03 0.05	1e+02 0.28	1e+01 3.3	1e+00 21	1e-01 31	1e-02 52	1e-03 66	1e-04 80	1e-05 95	1e-07 123	$\Delta f_{\text{target}}$ $ERT_{\text{best}}/D$
(1,2)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	119	18	3.7	3.1	<b>2.3</b>	<b>2.2</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>2.0</b>	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	51	7.7	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.1</b>	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	39	6.4	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.00</b>	<b>0.95</b>	<b>0.92</b>	<b>0.89</b>	<b>0.88</b>	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	103	15	3.1	<b>2.7</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>1.9</b>	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	36	6.3	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	28	5.1	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>0.93</b>	<b>0.91</b>	<b>0.90</b>	<b>0.88</b>	<b>0.87</b>	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	23	<b>4.3</b>	<b>0.99</b>	<b>0.92</b>	<b>0.70</b>	<b>0.67</b>	<b>0.66</b>	<b>0.65</b>	<b>0.63</b>	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	32	5.2	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>0.88</b>	<b>0.86</b>	<b>0.84</b>	<b>0.83</b>	<b>0.82</b>	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	<b>1</b>	19	<b>3.0</b>	<b>0.95</b>	<b>2.0</b>	20	655	<i>14e-4/1e4</i>	.	.	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	305	146	36	7.4	5.6	3.8	3.3	3.1	3.1	<b>3.0</b>	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>14</b>	5.4	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.2</b>	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	<b>1</b>	<b>13</b>	5.5	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.2</b>	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	<b>1</b>	33	23	6.0	4.6	4.0	4.1	4.3	4.2	4.4	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	<b>1</b>	<b>9.5</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>1.00</b>	5.9	44	1231	<i>48e-4/5e3</i>	.	.	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	<b>1</b>	26	32	13	72	230	212	195	179	151	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	352	615	125	31	30	34	84	17508	<i>37e-5/1e5</i>	.	SPSA [9]



Table 5: 20-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

	<b>105 Rosenbrock moderate unif</b>										
$\Delta f_{\text{target}}$	1e+03	1e+02	1e+01	1e+00	1e-01	1e-02	1e-03	1e-04	1e-05	1e-07	$\Delta f_{\text{target}}$
$ERT_{\text{best}}/D$	15	59	9594	30547	31585	32129	32475	32754	33011	33512	$ERT_{\text{best}}/D$
(1,2)-CMA-ES	3.7	4.0	16	4.9	<i>17e+0/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	<b>2.0</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<i>12e+0/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	<b>1.6</b>	<b>1.9</b>	6.9	<i>13e+0/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	4.9	6.7	16	<i>16e+0/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.5</b>	7.4	<i>13e+0/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	<b>1.4</b>	<b>3.0</b>	6.9	<i>13e+0/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<i>13e+0/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	<b>1.3</b>	<b>2.7</b>	4.9	<i>15e+0/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	<b>0.67</b>	<b>1.6</b>	7.2	<i>12e+0/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	6.4	<b>2.4</b>	70	<i>13e+0/1e5</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>0.43</b>	<b>0.43</b>	<b>0.44</b>	<b>0.44</b>	<b>0.44</b>	<b>0.44</b>	<b>0.44</b>	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	<b>1.4</b>	<b>2.6</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>0.76</b>	<b>0.76</b>	<b>0.77</b>	<b>0.77</b>	<b>0.77</b>	<b>0.77</b>	<b>0.76</b>	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	7.0	<b>2.2</b>	9.2	<b>2.9</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>2.8</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>2.7</b>	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	<b>0.98</b>	7.2	<i>24e+0/5e3</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	8.8	10	<i>18e+0/5e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	37	<i>14e+1/1e5</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	SPSA [9]



Table 7: 20-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 0.05	1e+02 8.8	1e+01 429	1e+00 679	1e-01 811	1e-02 1055	1e-03 1368	1e-04 2174	1e-05 2624	1e-07 3253	$\Delta f_{\text{target}}$ $ERT_{\text{best}}/D$
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	433	<i>83e+0/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	151	<i>67e+0/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	215	<i>61e+0/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	998	<i>87e+0/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	205	<i>67e+0/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	123	<i>54e+0/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	148	<i>56e+0/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	259	<i>70e+0/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	108	<i>64e+0/9e3</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	327	<b>5.3</b>	<b>0.69</b>	<b>0.82</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>2.6</b>	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	8.6	<b>0.81</b>	<b>0.97</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.1</b>	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	<b>4.3</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>0.95</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>0.96</b>	<b>0.72</b>	<b>0.68</b>	<b>0.65</b>	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	25	109	160	140	109	87	55	46	37	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	1	96	<i>57e+0/4e3</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.9</b>	4.7	7.0	6.8	5.1	4.7	4.4	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	213	812	<i>65e+0/1e5</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	.	SPSA [9]

∞





Table 9: 20-D, running time excess  $\text{ERT}/\text{ERT}_{\text{best}}$  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										
$\Delta f_{\text{target}}$ $\text{ERT}_{\text{best}}/D$	1e+03 0.05	1e+02 0.28	1e+01 17	1e+00 32	1e-01 57	1e-02 84	1e-03 114	1e-04 150	1e-05 179	1e-07 248	$\Delta f_{\text{target}}$ $\text{ERT}_{\text{best}}/D$
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	107	3.6	3.5	<b>2.7</b>	<b>2.7</b>	<b>2.4</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>2.2</b>	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	56	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.5</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>0.96</b>	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	35	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>0.97</b>	<b>0.90</b>	<b>0.84</b>	<b>0.77</b>	<b>0.77</b>	<b>0.72</b>	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	107	3.4	<b>2.8</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>2.0</b>	<b>1.9</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>1.8</b>	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	34	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.4</b>	<b>1.3</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.2</b>	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	20	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>0.96</b>	<b>0.95</b>	<b>0.91</b>	<b>0.91</b>	<b>0.88</b>	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	25	<b>0.92</b>	<b>0.81</b>	<b>0.67</b>	<b>0.62</b>	<b>0.57</b>	<b>0.53</b>	<b>0.52</b>	<b>0.50</b>	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	33	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>0.89</b>	<b>0.79</b>	<b>0.73</b>	<b>0.68</b>	<b>0.70</b>	<b>0.68</b>	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	19	17	<i>25e-1/9e3</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	325	141	7.1	5.4	3.7	16693	<i>19e-3/1e5</i>	.	.	.	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	<b>12</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.1</b>	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	<b>15</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1.00</b>	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	50	6.2	4.1	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.0	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	1	<b>10</b>	17	<i>33e-1/4e3</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1	34	7.4	10	117	127	111	97	87	70	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	311	551	54	2319	5124	<i>30e-2/1e5</i>	.	.	.	.	SPSA [9]











Table 15: 20-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**























Table 25: 20-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

	<b>125 Griewank-Rosenbrock Gauss</b>										
$\Delta f_{\text{target}}$ $ERT_{\text{best}}/D$	1e+03 0.05	1e+02 0.05	1e+01 0.05	1e+00 0.05	1e-01 0.05	1e-02 6.24e5	1e-03 1.25e6	1e-04 3.12e6	1e-05 4.01e6	1e-07 4.03e6	$\Delta f_{\text{target}}$ $ERT_{\text{best}}/D$
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	9.05e5	<i>12e-1/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	1.46e5	<i>94e-2/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	1.22e5	<i>96e-2/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	<i>13e-1/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	1.61e5	<i>95e-2/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	81397	<i>88e-2/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	81829	<i>95e-2/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	2.36e5	<i>10e-1/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	1	1	<b>493</b>	<i>45e-2/9e3</i>	.	.	.	.	.	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	283	321	364	738	9.45e6	<i>23e-2/1e5</i>	.	.	.	.	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1	1	827	<b>3.85e6</b>	<b>0.47</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>0.81</b>	<b>1.7</b>	<b>1.7</b>	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1	1	957	7.10e6	<b>0.70</b>	<b>0.79</b>	<b>0.56</b>	<b>1.8</b>	<b>1.8</b>	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1	1.1	1527	6.76e6	<i>18e-2/1e5</i>	.	.	.	.	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	1	1	1	<b>414</b>	<i>49e-2/4e3</i>	.	.	.	.	.	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1	1	1.1	<b>322</b>	<b>2.34e6</b>	<i>33e-2/5e4</i>	.	.	.	.	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	1.00e6	1.00e6	1.00e6	1.00e6	<b>3.44e6</b>	<i>12e-2/1e5</i>	.	.	.	.	SPSA [9]

Table 26: 20-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

	<b>126 Griewank-Rosenbrock unif</b>										
$\Delta f_{\text{target}}$ $ERT_{\text{best}}/D$	1e+03 0.05	1e+02 0.05	1e+01 0.05	1e+00 0.05	1e-01 0.05	1e-02 $\infty$	1e-03 $\infty$	1e-04 $\infty$	1e-05 $\infty$	1e-07 $\infty$	$\Delta f_{\text{target}}$ $ERT_{\text{best}}/D$
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	<i>15e-1/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	<i>15e-1/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	<i>15e-1/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	<i>14e-1/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	<i>14e-1/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	<i>13e-1/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	.	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	2.92e6	<i>13e-1/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	2.86e6	<i>13e-1/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	1	122	2.60e6	<i>16e-1/9e3</i>	.	.	.	.	.	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	2514	3109	3338	13054	<i>33e-2/1e5</i>	.	.	.	.	.	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1	1	6417	<i>30e-2/2e5</i>	.	.	.	.	.	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1	1	<b>5759</b>	<i>28e-2/2e5</i>	.	.	.	.	.	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1	1.1	<b>1527</b>	<i>39e-2/1e5</i>	.	.	.	.	.	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	1	1	4.2	1.32e5	<i>12e-1/4e3</i>	.	.	.	.	.	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1	1	1.1	<b>335</b>	<b>4.18e6</b>	<i>32e-2/5e4</i>	.	.	.	.	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	2.80e7	2.80e7	2.80e7	2.80e7	<i>45e+3/1e5</i>	.	.	.	.	.	SPSA [9]

Table 27: 20-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

	<b>127 Griewank-Rosenbrock Cauchy</b>										
$\Delta f_{\text{target}}$ $ERT_{\text{best}}/D$	1e+03 0.05	1e+02 0.05	1e+01 0.05	1e+00 0.05	1e-01 0.05	1e-02 79507	1e-03 2.22e5	1e-04 3.40e5	1e-05 3.63e5	1e-07 3.71e5	$\Delta f_{\text{target}}$ $ERT_{\text{best}}/D$
(1,2)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	7537	<i>70e-2/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	(1,2)-CMA-ES [4, 2]
(1,2m)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	595	<i>52e-2/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	(1,2m)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	843	<i>48e-2/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	(1,2ms)-CMA-ES [4]
(1,2s)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	7404	<i>67e-2/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	(1,2s)-CMA-ES [2]
(1,4)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	1139	<i>44e-2/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	(1,4)-CMA-ES [5, 3]
(1,4m)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	756	2.91e6	<i>39e-2/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	(1,4m)-CMA-ES [5]
(1,4ms)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	654	<i>23e-2/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	(1,4ms)-CMA-ES [1, 5]
(1,4s)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	1149	<i>53e-2/1e4</i>	.	.	.	.	.	(1,4s)-CMA-ES [3]
avg NEWUOA	1	1	7.7	<b>219</b>	<i>43e-2/9e3</i>	.	.	.	.	.	avg NEWUOA [16]
CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1)	292	335	353	754	<i>28e-2/1e5</i>	.	.	.	.	.	CMA-EGS (IPOP,r1) [8]
IPOP-aCMA-ES	1	1	1	<b>193</b>	<b>2.82e5</b>	<b>0.75</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>1.1</b>	<b>1.1</b>	IPOP-aCMA-ES [12]
IPOP-CMA-ES	1	1	1	267	<b>9.58e5</b>	<b>1.0</b>	<b>0.81</b>	<b>0.89</b>	<b>0.84</b>	<b>0.85</b>	IPOP-CMA-ES [15]
CMA+DE-MOS	1	1	<b>1.1</b>	1526	<b>2.24e5</b>	<i>44e-3/1e5</i>	.	.	.	.	CMA+DE-MOS [13]
NEWUOA	1	1	3.7	<b>253</b>	<i>45e-2/4e3</i>	.	.	.	.	.	NEWUOA [16]
Basic RCGA	1	1	1	314	1.07e6	<i>59e-3/5e4</i>	.	.	.	.	Basic RCGA [17]
SPSA	226	276	960	2.30e6	8.02e6	<i>10e-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.