Computational results for an automatically tuned CMA-ES with increasing population size on the CEC'05 benchmark set: Supplementary material

Tianjun Liao¹, Marco A. Montes de Oca², and Thomas Stützle¹

 ¹ IRIDIA, CoDE, Université Libre de Bruxelles, Brussels, Belgium {tliao,stuetzle}@ulb.ac.be
² Dept. of Mathematical Sciences, University of Delaware, Newark, DE, USA mmontes@math.udel.edu

Abstract. This document is the supplementary material for the article: Computational results for an automatically tuned CMA-ES with increasing population size on the CEC'05 benchmark set.

- 1. The qualified run-length distributions (RLDs, for short) over 100 independent runs obtained by iCMA-ES-dp and iCMA-ES-tsc on the 50 dimensional versions of functions f_{cec4} , f_{cec5} , f_{cec11} , f_{cec12} , f_{cec16} and f_{cec17} .
- 2. The average errors obtained by Sep-iCMA-ES-tsc and iCMA-ES-tsc over 25 independent runs for CEC'05 functions.
- 3. The data obtained by different variations of the tuning setups over 25 independent runs for CEC'05 functions of dimension 50.



Fig. 1. The qualified run-length distributions (RLDs, for short) over 100 independent runs obtained by iCMA-ES-dp and iCMA-ES-tsc on the 50 dimensional versions of functions f_{cec4} , f_{cec5} , f_{cec11} , f_{cec12} , f_{cec16} and f_{cec17} . The required solution qualities are 1.00E+03, 1.00E-08, 1.00E-08, 1.00E+05, 1.00E+00 and 1.00E+02, respectively.

	10 dimensions		30 dimensions		50 dimensions		
f_{cec}	Mean	Mean Errors		Mean Errors		Mean Errors	
	Sep-iCMA-ES-t	sc iCMA-ES-tsc	Sep-iCMA-ES-ts	c iCMA-ES-tsc	Sep-iCMA-ES-ts	c iCMA-ES-tsc	
f_1	1.00E-08	1.00E - 08	1.00E-08	1.00E - 08	1.00E-08	1.00E - 08	
f_2	1.00E - 08	1.00 E - 08	1.00E - 08	1.00E - 08	1.00E - 08	1.00E - 08	
f_3	3.45E + 04	1.00E - 08	1.07E + 05	1.00E - 08	1.17E + 05	1.00E - 08	
f_4	1.00E - 08	1.00E - 08	1.40E + 03	1.00E - 08	1.54E + 04	1.00E - 08	
f_5	1.00E - 08	1.00E - 08	1.03E+03	1.00E - 08	2.80E + 03	1.00E - 08	
f_6	2.62E - 06	1.00 E - 08	4.78E - 01	1.00E - 08	7.97E - 01	1.00E - 08	
f_7	5.81E - 03	1.00E - 08	1.00E - 08	1.00E - 08	1.00E - 08	1.00E - 08	
f_8	2.00E + 01	2.02E + 01	$2.00E{+}01$	2.08E + 01	2.00E + 01	$2.10E{+}01$	
f_9	2.78E - 07	$4.81 \mathrm{E}{-02}$	5.57E - 01	$1.99E{+}00$	2.23E + 00	4.18E + 00	
f_{10}	1.81E - 05	3.73E - 03	1.27E + 00	1.59E + 00	1.31E + 00	$2.71E{+}00$	
f_{11}	2.22E + 00	1.00 E - 08	3.55E + 00	5.09 E - 05	3.82E + 00	6.03E - 02	
f_{12}	4.46E + 02	1.00E - 08	5.40E + 03	4.22E + 02	1.54E + 04	4.69E + 03	
f_{13}	6.95E - 01	7.14E - 01	2.72E + 00	2.53E + 00	4.95E + 00	4.70E + 00	
f_{14}	3.47E + 00	2.03E + 00	1.25E+01	1.10E + 01	2.16E + 01	$2.09E{+}01$	
f_{15}	2.04E+02	3.32E + 02	2.16E + 02	2.00E + 02	2.12E + 02	2.00E + 02	
f_{16}	1.07E + 02	8.86E + 01	5.17E + 01	1.11E + 01	4.15E + 01	5.34E + 00	
f_{17}	2.31E + 02	9.34E + 01	3.06E + 02	2.08E + 02	2.61E + 02	6.36E + 01	
f_{18}	7.11E + 02	3.60E + 02	9.06E + 02	9.04E + 02	9.19E + 02	9.13E + 02	
f_{19}	7.19E + 02	3.20E + 02	9.06E + 02	9.04E + 02	9.19E + 02	9.13E + 02	
f_{20}	7.18E + 02	3.40E + 02	9.06E + 02	9.04E + 02	$9.19E{+}02$	$9.13E{+}02$	
f_{21}	9.59E + 02	5.00E + 02	5.00E + 02	5.00E + 02	9.05E + 02	7.05E + 02	
f_{22}	7.84E + 02	7.28E + 02	8.40E + 02	8.17E + 02	8.61E + 02	$8.19E{+}02$	
f_{23}	5.92E+02	5.59E + 02	5.34E + 02	5.34E + 02	8.99E + 02	7.30E + 02	
f_{24}	2.43E+02	2.00E + 02	2.00E+02	2.00E + 02	2.00E + 02	2.00E + 02	
f_{25}	4.06E + 02	4.03E + 02	2.11E + 02	2.09E + 02	2.16E + 02	2.13E + 02	
V.S.	$(5, 4, 16)^{\dagger}$		$(3, 6, 16)^{\dagger}$		$(3, 4, 18)^{\dagger}$		

Table 1. The average errors obtained by Sep-iCMA-ES-tsc and iCMA-ES-tsc over 25 independent runs for CEC'05 functions. The numbers in parenthesis represent the times of $\langle , =,$ and \rangle , respectively, when the corresponding algorithms are compared with iCMA-ES-tsc on the average errors.

[†] denotes there is a significant difference over the distribution of average errors between Sep-iCMA-ES-tsc with iCMA-ES-tsc by a two-sided Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks test at 0,05 α -level.

Table 2. The average errors obtained by iCMA-ES- \oplus , iCMA-ES-uni,multi, iCMA-ES-uni and iCMA-ES-multi for each CEC'05 function. Error values lower than 10^{-8} are approximated to 10^{-8} . The lowest average errors values are highlighted.

	1			
f_{cec}	$iCMA-ES-\oplus$	iCMA-ES-uni,multi	iCMA-ES-uni	iCMA-ES-multi
f_1	1.00E - 08	1.00 E - 08	1.00E - 08	1.00 E - 08
f_2	1.00E - 08	1.00 E - 08	1.00E - 08	1.00 E - 08
f_3	1.00E - 08	1.00 E - 08	1.00E - 08	1.00 E - 08
f_4	1.27E - 08	1.82E + 03	1.00E - 08	2.05E + 04
f_5	4.88E - 07	1.00 E - 08	1.00E - 08	4.51E + 01
f_6	1.79E - 01	1.00 E - 08	1.00E - 08	1.59E - 01
f_7	1.00E - 08	1.00 E - 08	1.00E - 08	1.00 E - 08
f_8	2.08E + 01	2.08E + 01	2.09E + 01	2.07E + 01
f_9	3.66E + 00	6.92E + 00	3.38E + 00	7.80E + 00
f_{10}	2.19E + 00	5.57E + 00	1.59E + 00	7.28E + 00
f_{11}	4.45E - 04	3.47 E - 05	8.50 E - 02	$8.91 \mathrm{E}{-04}$
f_{12}	3.45E + 03	6.03E + 03	3.58E + 03	2.94E + 04
f_{13}	4.72E + 00	4.44E + 00	4.23E + 00	4.47E + 00
f_{14}	1.79E + 01	2.10E + 01	2.00E + 01	2.26E + 01
f_{15}	2.00E + 02	2.00E + 02	2.00E + 02	2.00E + 02
f_{16}	5.12E + 00	8.36E + 00	5.23E + 00	1.81E + 01
f_{17}	1.36E + 02	2.30E + 02	1.24E + 02	2.55E + 02
f_{18}	9.13E + 02	9.15E + 02	9.15E + 02	9.12E + 02
f_{19}	9.13E + 02	9.14E + 02	9.16E + 02	9.16E + 02
f_{20}	9.13E + 02	9.15E + 02	9.16E + 02	9.17E + 02
f_{21}	7.25E + 02	9.67E + 02	8.57E + 02	8.44E + 02
f_{22}	8.21E + 02	8.64E + 02	8.49E + 02	8.44E + 02
f_{23}	7.49E + 02	9.23E + 02	8.78E + 02	9.26E + 02
f_{24}	2.00E + 02	2.00E + 02	2.00E + 02	2.00E + 02
f_{25}	2.13E + 02	2.13E + 02	2.13E + 02	2.15E + 02

Table 3. The average errors obtained by iCMA-ES-uni+, iCMA-ESmulti+ and iCMA-ES-tsc++ for each CEC'05 function. Error values lower than 10^{-8} are approximated to 10^{-8} . The lowest average errors values are highlighted.

f_{cec}	iCMA-ES-uni+	iCMA-ES-multi+	iCMA-ES-tsc++
f_1	1.00 E - 08	1.00 E - 08	1.00 E - 08
f_2	1.00 E - 08	1.00E - 08	1.00 E - 08
f_3	1.00E - 08	1.00E - 08	1.00 E - 08
f_4	1.00 E - 08	1.70E + 04	1.00 E - 08
f_5	1.01E - 08	9.30E - 01	1.00E - 08
f_6	1.00 E - 08	1.00 E - 08	1.00 E - 08
f_7	1.00 E - 08	1.00E - 08	1.00 E - 08
f_8	2.10E + 01	2.06E + 01	2.10E + 01
f_9	7.00E + 00	5.33E + 00	3.70E + 00
f_{10}	5.01E + 00	4.78E + 00	1.79E + 00
f_{11}	4.35E - 02	1.00 E - 08	3.63 E - 03
f_{12}	5.86E + 03	1.46E + 04	1.44E + 04
f_{13}	4.30E + 00	4.68E + 00	4.51E + 00
f_{14}	2.06E + 01	2.28E + 01	2.15E + 01
f_{15}	2.00E + 02	2.00E + 02	2.00E + 02
f_{16}	1.55E + 01	8.75E + 00	3.14E + 00
f_{17}	1.48E + 02	2.34E + 02	7.77E+01
f_{18}	9.16E + 02	9.20E + 02	9.13E + 02
f_{19}	9.15E + 02	9.22E + 02	9.13E + 02
f_{20}	9.15E + 02	9.20E + 02	9.13E + 02
f_{21}	9.66E + 02	5.41E + 02	7.06E + 02
f_{22}	8.18E + 02	8.71E + 02	8.55E + 02
f_{23}	9.05E + 02	6.21E + 02	8.68E + 02
f_{24}	2.00E + 02	2.00E + 02	2.00E + 02
f_{25}	2.13E + 02	2.14E + 02	2.13E + 02

Table 4. The average and median errors obtained by tuning setup (i) t-test and (ii) 25000 runs over 25 independent runs for CEC'05 functions of dimension 50. The numbers in parenthesis represent the times of $\langle , =,$ and \rangle , respectively, when the iCMA-ES-dp are compared with iCMA-ES-(i), iCMA-ES-(ii) on the average and median errors.

f	iCMA-ES-dp		iCMA-ES-(i)		iCMA-ES-(ii)	
Jcec	Mean and Median		Mean and Median		Mean and Median	
f_1	1.00E - 08	1.00E - 08	1.00E - 08	1.00E - 08	1.00E - 08	1.00E - 08
f_2	1.00E - 08	1.00E - 08	1.00E - 08	1.00E - 08	1.00E - 08	1.00E - 08
f_3	1.00E - 08	1.00E - 08	1.00E - 08	1.00E - 08	1.00E - 08	1.00E - 08
f_4	1.43E + 04	1.27E + 04	1.00E - 08	1.00E - 08	1.00E - 08	1.00E - 08
f_5	7.41E - 02	8.61 E - 08	1.00E - 08	1.00E - 08	1.00E - 08	1.00E - 08
f_6	1.00E - 08	1.00E - 08	2.79E - 03	1.00E - 08	$1.59E{-}01$	1.00E - 08
f_7	1.00E - 08	1.00E - 08	1.00E - 08	1.00E - 08	1.00E - 08	1.00E - 08
f_8	$2.09E{+}01$	2.11E + 01	2.10E+01	2.11E + 01	2.10E + 01	2.11E + 01
f_9	4.36E + 00	3.98E + 00	4.10E + 00	3.98E + 00	2.92E + 00	2.99E + 00
f_{10}	2.89E + 00	$1.99E{+}00$	2.55E+00	2.98E + 00	2.40E + 00	1.99E + 00
f_{11}	$9.94 \mathrm{E}{-02}$	1.00E - 08	4.17E - 04	1.00E - 08	6.00 E - 02	5.33E - 07
f_{12}	4.25E + 04	2.78E + 04	3.34E + 03	2.27E + 03	3.95E + 03	3.40E + 03
f_{13}	4.44E + 00	4.37E + 00	4.64E + 00	4.70E + 00	4.59E + 00	4.60E + 00
f_{14}	2.28E + 01	$2.30E{+}01$	2.06E+01	$2.09E{+}01$	2.09E + 01	2.11E + 01
f_{15}	2.00E + 02	2.00E + 02	2.00E+02	2.00E + 02	2.00E + 02	2.00E + 02
f_{16}	$1.10E{+}01$	$1.14E{+}01$	5.14E + 00	5.54E + 00	8.78E + 00	8.66E + 00
f_{17}	1.91E + 02	1.62E + 02	5.47E + 01	$4.81E{+}01$	1.34E + 02	5.28E + 01
f_{18}	$9.13E{+}02$	9.16E + 02	9.13E + 02	9.13E + 02	9.14E + 02	9.13E + 02
f_{19}	$9.13E{+}02$	9.15E + 02	9.13E + 02	9.13E + 02	9.14E + 02	9.13E + 02
f_{20}	9.15E + 02	9.15E + 02	9.13E + 02	9.13E + 02	9.14E + 02	9.13E + 02
f_{21}	6.64E + 02	5.00E + 02	8.07E + 02	1.01E + 03	6.63E + 02	5.00E + 02
f_{22}	8.19E + 02	8.18E + 02	8.60E + 02	8.63E + 02	8.22E + 02	8.21E + 02
f_{23}	6.97E + 02	5.40E + 02	6.55E + 02	5.40E + 02	6.55E + 02	5.40E + 02
f_{24}	2.00E + 02	2.00E + 02	2.00E+02	2.00E + 02	2.00E + 02	2.00E + 02
f_{25}	2.14E + 02	2.14E + 02	2.13E+02	$2.13E{+}02$	2.13E + 02	2.13E + 02
Mean: iCMA-ES-dp vs.			(<, =, >): $(5, 8, 12)^{\dagger}$	(<, =, >)): $(6, 6, 13)^{\dagger}$
Median: iCMA-ES-dp vs.			(<, =, >)	$(4, 11, 10)^{\dagger}$	(<, =, >)	$(3, 11, 11)^{\dagger}$

 † denotes there is a significant difference over the distribution of mean or median errors between iCMA-ES-dp with the corresponding algorithm by a two-sided Wilcoxon matched-pairs signed-ranks test at the 0,05 α -level.