

Comparison tables: BBOB 2009 noisy testbed in 2-D

The BBOBies

November 20, 2009

Abstract

This document provides tabular results of the workshop for Black-Box Optimization Benchmarking at GECCO 2009, see <http://coco.gforge.inria.fr/doku.php?id=bbob-2009>. 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 [13, 8]. The experimental set-up is described in [12].

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. Consequently, the best (smallest) value is 1 and the value 1 appears in each column at least once. See [12] for details on how ERT is obtained. All numbers are computed with no more than two digits of precision.

Table 1: 02-D, running time excess $\text{ERT}/\text{ERT}_{\text{best}}$ 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

	$\Delta\text{ftarget}$	1e+03	1e+02	1e+01	1e+00	1e-01	1e-02	1e-03	1e-04	1e-05	1e-07	$\Delta\text{ftarget}$
	$\text{ERT}_{\text{best}}/D$	0.5	0.5	0.9	4	5	5.57	7.17	8.43	9.77	11.3	$\text{ERT}_{\text{best}}/D$
ALPS	1	1	1	1.6	4.9	32	78	120	160	190	250	ALPS [15]
AMaLGaM IDEA	1	1	1	2	2.6	5	7.4	8.1	8.8	9.6	12	AMaLGaM IDEA [4]
avg NEWUOA	1	1	1	3.2	1.7	2.1	2.3	2	1.9	1.7	1.6	avg NEWUOA [23]
BayEDA-cG	1	1	1	2	4.9	110	150	160	190	170	190	BayEDA-cG [9]
BFGS	1	1	1	1.40	250	1900	1e4	<i>14e-2/4e3</i>	.	.	.	BFGS [22]
BIPOP-CMA-ES	1	1	1	5.3	2.5	5.8	7.7	8.5	9.3	11	13	BIPOP-CMA-ES [14]
(1+1)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	3.3	2	3.9	5.5	5.8	6.3	6.1	7.2	(1+1)-CMA-ES [2]
DASA	1	1	1	57	33	40	46	49	45	46	51	DASA [18]
DEPSO	1	1	1	2.7	5.4	20	26	34	34	37	44	DEPSO [11]
EDA-PSO	1	1	1	1.4	3.9	13	18	22	27	31	59	EDA-PSO [5]
full NEWUOA	1	1	1	3.2	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.1	1	1	1	full NEWUOA [23]
GLOBAL	1	1	1	1.4	6.2	22	27	22	19	17	17	GLOBAL [20]
iAMaLGaM IDEA	1	1	1	2.5	1.9	4	5.9	6.5	6.6	7.2	8.4	iAMaLGaM IDEA [4]
MA-LS-Chain	1	1	1	2.4	5.1	13	22	29	30	27	26	MA-LS-Chain [19]
MCS (Neum)	1	1	1	1	1.1	1.2	1.5	1.2	21	210	1200	MCS (Neum) [16]
NEWUOA	1	1	1	2.4	1.8	2.1	2.3	2.5	2.3	2	1.9	NEWUOA [23]
(1+1)-ES	1	1	1	3.3	2.3	3.5	5.2	5.3	5.9	6	7.5	(1+1)-ES [1]
PSO	1	1	1	2.3	3.6	13	31	52	73	88	130	PSO [6]
PSO-Bounds	1	1	1	2.8	2.6	11	40	110	180	240	330	PSO-Bounds [7]
Monte Carlo	1	1	1	1.9	3.7	34	330	3100	1.864	3.1e5	<i>17e-6/1e6</i>	Monte Carlo [3]
IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES	1	1	1	2.9	1.9	4.3	6.3	6.2	7.3	7.8	9.2	IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES [21]
SNOBFIT	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	1.2	1.6	1.9	SNOBFIT [17]
VNS (Garcia)	1	1	1	2.6	6	14	17	16	15	15	15	VNS (Garcia) [10]

Table 2: 02-D, running time excess $\text{ERT}/\text{ERT}_{\text{best}}$ 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

	Δf_{target}	1e+03	1e+02	1e+01	1e+00	1e-01	1e-02	1e-03	1e-04	1e-05	1e-07	Δf_{target}
	$\text{ERT}_{\text{best}}/D$	0.5	0.5	0.9	3.53	5.37	8.3	9.57	11.1	12.5	15.5	$\text{ERT}_{\text{best}}/D$
ALPS	1	1	1	2.1	4.4	20	68	91	120	150	190	ALPS [15]
AMaLGaM IDEA	1	1.1	1.1	2.2	3.4	4.4	5	6	7.1	8.1	8.7	AMaLGaM IDEA [4]
avg NEWUOA	1	1.2	1.2	4	2.1	2.6	4.4	4.1	3.7	3.4	2.8	avg NEWUOA [23]
BayEDA-cG	1	1	1	1.8	5.8	9	71	98	92	88	77	BayEDA-cG [9]
BFGS	1	1	1	99	340	1e3	<i>11e-2/4e3</i>	BFGS [22]
BIPOP-CMA-ES	1	1	1	3.6	2.8	4.7	5.5	6.9	7.8	8.6	9.4	BIPOP-CMA-ES [14]
(1+1)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	2.4	1.9	3	3.8	4.3	4.5	4.9	5.3	(1+1)-CMA-ES [2]
DASA	1	13	13	70	57	50	43	44	44	44	47	DASA [18]
DEPSO	1	1	1	2.7	5	13	17	24	24	28	34	DEPSO [11]
EDA-PSO	1	1	1	1.7	3.6	9.9	12	17	22	27	43	EDA-PSO [5]
full NEWUOA	1	1	1	4	1.7	1.5	1	1	1	1	1	full NEWUOA [23]
GLOBAL	1	1	1	2.8	5	18	18	17	15	13	11	GLOBAL [20]
iAMaLGaM IDEA	1	1	1	2.7	3.3	4.1	4.3	4.8	5.5	6	6.7	iAMaLGaM IDEA [4]
MA-LS-Chain	1	1	1	2.4	5.8	11	15	21	22	21	19	MA-LS-Chain [19]
MCS (Neum)	1	1	1	1	1.2	1.1	1.2	1.4	200	350	3600	MCS (Neum) [16]
NEWUOA	1	1	1	7.1	11	9.3	7	6.6	5.8	5.2	4.4	NEWUOA [23]
(1+1)-ES	1	1	1	2.2	2.3	3.2	3.2	4	4.4	4.9	5.4	(1+1)-ES [1]
PSO	1	1	1	3	2.9	11	19	40	50	64	90	PSO [6]
PSO-Bounds	1	1.1	1.1	3.2	6.5	14	32	82	140	180	240	PSO-Bounds [7]
Monte Carlo	1	1	1	2	4.5	25	140	3100	1.1e4	2.6e5	<i>12e-6/1e6</i>	Monte Carlo [3]
IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES	1	1	1	5.3	3.2	4.9	5.8	6.2	6.6	6.8	7.5	IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES [21]
SNOBFIT	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	1.4	1.7	4.5	4.3	SNOBFIT [17]
VNS (Garcia)	1	1	1	2.6	7	12	12	12	11	12	12	VNS (Garcia) [10]

Table 3: 02-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{best} 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	0.5	0.5	0.9	3.93	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.9	4.9	6.77	ERT _{best} /D	
ALPS	1	1	3.1	4.6	44	110	190	310	420	6700	ALPS [15]	
AMaLGaM IDEA	1	1	1.5	2.3	5.6	7.8	12	16	180	340	AMaLGaM IDEA [4]	
avg NEWUOA	1	1	3.1	1.8	2.1	3	4.1	4.4	7.1	6.9	avg NEWUOA [23]	
BayEDAeG	1	1.1	2.6	2.5	8.1	180	190	200	210	270	BayEDAeG [9]	
BFGS	1	1	8.6	3.5	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.4	3.2	BFGS [22]	
BIPOP-CMA-ES	1	1	3.9	3.1	6	9.9	14	17	24	24	BIPOP-CMA-ES [14]	
(1+1)-CMA-ES	1	1	2.1	1.7	4	6	13	30	77	150	(1+1)-CMA-ES [2]	
DASA	1	1	42	22	37	130	260	1e3	3e3	1.9e4	DASA [18]	
DEPSO	1	1	1.6	2.7	13	24	34	62	89	230	DEPSO [11]	
EDA-PSO	1	1	2.2	3.4	8.9	20	31	60	200	1.3e4	EDA-PSO [5]	
full NEWUOA	1	1	3.3	1.5	1.5	1.6	1.6	1.6	1.7	1.2	full NEWUOA [23]	
GLOBAL	1	1	2	3.1	23	30	34	33	39	52	GLOBAL [20]	
iAMaLGaM IDEA	1	1	2.5	2.6	4.1	6.7	9.2	13	230	860	iAMaLGaM IDEA [4]	
MA-LS-Chain	1	1	2.7	3.8	14	27	47	60	72	63	MA-LS-Chain [19]	
MCS (Neum)	1	1	1	1.3	1.3	1.9	1.9	1.9	100	120	MCS (Neum) [16]	
NEWUOA	1	1	3.2	1.6	2.1	3.1	4.2	4.9	6.4	7.8	NEWUOA [23]	
(1+1)-ES	1	1	2.1	1.5	4.2	7.2	11	36	78	290	(1+1)-ES [1]	
PSO	1	1.1	3.4	3.4	11	37	100	240	770	2.8e4	PSO [6]	
PSO_Bounds	1	1	2.5	3.8	17	55	210	3400	5700	4.3e4	PSO_Bounds [7]	
Monte Carlo	1	1	2.4	3	34	320	3700	3.2e4	3.1e5	96e-7/1e6	Monte Carlo [3]	
IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES	1	1	4.2	3.3	5.3	7.9	11	14	18	19	IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES [21]	
SNOBFIT	1	1	2.4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	SNOBFIT [17]	
VNS (Garcia)	1	1	2.6	6.7	14	21	24	26	29	29	VNS (Garcia) [10]	

Table 4: 02-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{best} 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	0.6	2	2.7	7.27	96.9	120	124	126	128	132	ERT _{best} /D
ALPS	2.3	3.3	11	20	5.5	11	19	28	38	58	ALPS [15]
AMaLGaM IDEA	2.9	3.4	5.8	6.5	1.1	1.3	1.6	1.8	1.9	2.2	AMaLGaM IDEA [4]
avg NEWUOA	5.2	2.8	4.3	7.8	1.2	3.5	5.3	6.4	6.8	8.7	avg NEWUOA [23]
BayEDA-cG	3.1	2.8	5.8	28	32	<i>12e-2/2e3</i>	BayEDA-cG [9]
BFGS	1.40	110	190	390	220	<i>60e-2/3e3</i>	BFGS [22]
BIPOP-CMA-ES	4.7	2.3	24	12	2.5	3.5	3.8	4.3	4.6	4.9	BIPOP-CMA-ES [14]
(1+1)-CMA-ES	4.9	3.7	8.7	12	1.9	2.4	3	3	3.2	3.3	(1+1)-CMA-ES [2]
DASA	59	27	89	160	94	130	220	880	2100	4.4e4	DASA [18]
DEPSO	2.6	2.6	15	19	4.6	6.4	8.4	14	23	<i>64e-7/2e3</i>	DEPSO [11]
EDA-PSO	1.8	2.7	5.8	12	7.1	18	36	51	65	97	EDA-PSO [5]
full NEWUOA	4.9	2.5	6.2	10	1.1	1	1	1	1	1	full NEWUOA [23]
GLOBAL	2.2	2.4	9	14	1.4	1.3	1.4	1.4	1.4	1.5	GLOBAL [20]
iAMaLGaM IDEA	3.9	2.6	4.1	6.1	1	1.3	1.4	1.6	1.7	1.9	iAMaLGaM IDEA [4]
MA-LS-Chain	2.5	2.1	7.7	8.9	1.9	2.6	3.3	3.4	3.5	3.9	MA-LS-Chain [19]
MCS (Neum)	1	1	1	1	5.7	40	80	490	2900	<i>20e-5/3e4</i>	MCS (Neum) [16]
NEWUOA	7.3	2.9	6.4	13	3.4	6.5	10	13	12	13	NEWUOA [23]
(1+1)-ES	4.8	4	5.1	12	1.8	10	21	140	240	3e3	(1+1)-ES [1]
PSO	2.2	1.9	5.3	8.2	3.2	5	8.1	13	17	28	PSO [6]
PSO-Bounds	1.9	3.3	6.6	14	4.5	8.9	27	42	59	87	PSO-Bounds [7]
Monte Carlo	2.8	2.3	7	17	8.6	120	1600	1.3e4	1.1e5	<i>11e-5/1e6</i>	Monte Carlo [3]
IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES	3.3	2.1	4.9	21	7.7	7.7	7.7	7.7	7.7	7.7	IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES [21]
SNOBFIT	1.7	2	3.4	3.7	4.5	13	28	50	87	140	SNOBFIT [17]
VNS (Garcia)	9.5	3.9	8.2	14	2.3	2.3	2.5	2.6	2.7	3	VNS (Garcia) [10]

Table 5: 02-D, running time excess $\text{ERT}/\text{ERT}_{\text{best}}$ 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

	$\Delta\text{ftarget}$ $\text{ERT}_{\text{best}}/D$	1e+03	1e+02	1e+01	1e+00	1e-01	1e-02	1e-03	1e-04	1e-05	1e-07	$\Delta\text{ftarget}$ $\text{ERT}_{\text{best}}/D$
ALPS	2.2	0.6	3	4.1	22	3.7	8	13	19	26	38	ALPS [15]
AMaLGaM IDEA	1.4	1.7	1.7	5.6	120	5.6	5.8	5.9	5.9	6	6	AMaLGaM IDEA [4]
avg NEWUOA	6.4	3.7	3.7	7	13	2.3	8.6	29	55	200	390	avg NEWUOA [23]
BayEDA-cG	3.9	2.3	2.3	8.7	29	14	71	<i>12e-2/2e3</i>	.	.	.	BayEDA-cG [9]
BFGS	64	54	54	140	340	71	220	<i>32e-2/3e3</i>	.	.	.	BFGS [22]
BIPOP-CMA-ES	3.8	1.6	1.6	5.5	5.7	1.1	2.6	3.6	3.6	3.8	4.1	BIPOP-CMA-ES [14]
(1+1)-CMA-ES	3.2	2.2	2.2	11	16	2	3.9	6.6	6.7	6.7	6.6	(1+1)-CMA-ES [2]
DASA	53	29	29	93	300	55	100	350	1200	2300	5.6e4	DASA [18]
DEPSO	2.3	3.4	3.4	5.8	14	1.5	3.3	5.8	7.4	18	150	DEPSO [11]
EDA-PSO	4.3	3.5	3.5	6.1	12	2	8.7	19	29	41	60	EDA-PSO [5]
full NEWUOA	4.8	3.3	3.3	4.8	19	2.7	8.3	11	14	17	48	full NEWUOA [23]
GLOBAL	3.3	2.8	2.8	4.7	15	1	1	1	1	1	1	GLOBAL [20]
iAMaLGaM IDEA	2.7	2.4	2.4	3.2	24	7.2	8	8	8	8	7.9	iAMaLGaM IDEA [4]
MA-LS-Chain	4.3	3	3	5.9	11	1.6	4.7	6.6	8.6	8.7	8.7	MA-LS-Chain [19]
MCS (Neum)	1	1	1	1	1	3.2	26	120	300	<i>4.3e-5/3e4</i>	.	MCS (Neum) [16]
NEWUOA	6.3	2.7	2.7	7.9	16	3.1	6.3	22	42	41	110	NEWUOA [23]
(1+1)-ES	3.9	2.3	2.3	9.8	18	3.1	10	31	82	220	2e3	(1+1)-ES [1]
PSO	3.2	2.5	2.5	4.7	11	1.8	3.6	6.4	9.1	13	19	PSO [6]
PSO-Bounds	2.9	2.8	2.8	4.9	8.8	2.3	8.7	19	31	39	52	PSO-Bounds [7]
Monte Carlo	3.7	2.6	2.6	7.3	32	8.3	68	550	7400	<i>1.4e-5/1e6</i>	.	Monte Carlo [3]
IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES	6	2.9	2.9	38	53	6.4	9.3	9.3	9.2	9.1	9	IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES [21]
SNOBFIT	2.3	1.8	1.8	3.1	6.1	1.6	5.6	7.6	12	22	34	SNOBFIT [17]
VNS (Garcia)	9.5	3.9	3.9	9	13	3.5	8.2	8.2	12	12	14	VNS (Garcia) [10]

Table 6: 02-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{best} 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}	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	ERT _{best} /D	ERT _{best} /D	ERT _{best} /D	ERT _{best} /D	ERT _{best} /D	ERT _{best} /D	ERT _{best} /D	ERT _{best} /D	ERT _{best} /D	ERT _{best} /D
ALPS	3.2	3.2	10	15	7.2	8.2	14	25	72	1400	ALPS [15]
AMaLGaM IDEA	2.6	1.9	4.6	5.8	16	13	11	11	17	27	AMaLGaM IDEA [4]
avg NEWUOA	4.6	2.2	3.7	4.5	2.1	2.1	3.2	3.3	4.3	5.9	avg NEWUOA [23]
BayEDA-cG	2.4	2.3	6.1	31	17	95	160	<i>66e-3/2e3</i>			BayEDA-cG [9]
BFGS	16	10	13	13	2.5	2.1	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.4	BFGS [22]
BIPOP-CMA-ES	4.1	2.1	8	17	3.3	2.8	2.6	2.6	2.4	2	BIPOP-CMA-ES [14]
(1+1)-CMA-ES	3.2	2.5	5	6.4	1.2	1.7	3	5	6.6	16	(1+1)-CMA-ES [2]
DASA	56	28	96	160	100	160	150	760	3100	<i>30e-7/8e5</i>	DASA [18]
DEPSO	4.4	6	17	19	5.1	5.6	10	18	40	<i>11e-5/2e3</i>	DEPSO [11]
EDA-PSO	3.1	1.9	5	9.3	5.1	12	19	27	43	1e3	EDA-PSO [5]
full NEWUOA	8.8	4	5	5.1	1	1	1	1.1	1	1	full NEWUOA [23]
GLOBAL	2.2	3.4	7.4	11	2.1	1.3	1.1	1	1.2	1.9	GLOBAL [20]
iAMaLGaM IDEA	2.7	2.5	5.2	61	16	17	16	15	20	43	iAMaLGaM IDEA [4]
MA-LS-Chain	4.2	2.8	5.7	10	2.9	2.5	2.3	2.4	2.4	2.1	MA-LS-Chain [19]
MCS (Neum)	1	1	1	1	8	39	76	210	750	<i>11e-5/3e4</i>	MCS (Neum) [16]
NEWUOA	3.1	2.1	2.6	6.1	2	2.3	3.2	3.2	4.8	5.7	NEWUOA [23]
(1+1)-ES	5.6	3.8	5.1	10	3.3	8.7	19	90	200	4400	(1+1)-ES [1]
PSO	2.8	1.8	3.3	9	4.1	5	8	37	140	510	PSO [6]
PSO-Bounds	3.3	3	10	11	7.3	11	52	66	150	930	PSO-Bounds [7]
Monte Carlo	3.2	2.2	6.3	22	20	130	1500	8300	5.9e4	<i>12e-5/1e6</i>	Monte Carlo [3]
IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES	4	2.7	5.2	11	4.4	2.9	2.5	2.3	2	1.6	IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES [21]
SNOBFIT	2.3	2.5	3.5	6.9	2.6	7.7	12	28	74	<i>63e-5/3e3</i>	SNOBFIT [17]
VNS (Garcia)	9.5	3.9	9.7	17	3.8	2.2	2.1	1.9	1.7	1.5	VNS (Garcia) [10]

Table 7: 02-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{best} 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	0.5	0.5	0.9	6.6	13.9	56.7	78.8	101	128	211	ERT _{best} /D
ALPS	1	1	1	2.6	3.5	12	9.9	12	15	16	15	ALPS [15]
AMaLGaM IDEA	1	1	1	2.3	1.7	2.3	1	1	1	1	1.9	AMaLGaM IDEA [4]
avg NEWUOA	1	1	1	14	32	24	13	15	31	45	80	avg NEWUOA [23]
BayEDAeG	1	1.1	1	2.4	1.2	4	4.2	4.4	4.7	4.7	4.4	BayEDAeG [9]
BFGS	1	1	1	98	110	300	880	660	520	410	<i>65e-3/4e3</i>	BFGS [22]
BIPOP-CMA-ES	1	1	1	12	3.6	2.9	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.2	1	BIPOP-CMA-ES [14]
(1+1)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	35	7.2	7.7	2.9	2.4	2.3	3.7	6.3	(1+1)-CMA-ES [2]
DASA	1	1	1	210	130	330	190	440	550	1400	4100	DASA [18]
DEPSO	1	1	1	2.9	4.8	6.5	3	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.1	DEPSO [11]
EDA-PSO	1	1.1	1	1.7	2.9	4.9	2.5	4.4	6.4	9.3	9.9	EDA-PSO [5]
full NEWUOA	1	1	1	12	9.7	21	6.9	9.6	18	19	28	full NEWUOA [23]
GLOBAL	1	1.1	1	2.6	2.7	6.9	4.8	4.4	4	4.6	8	GLOBAL [20]
iAMaLGaM IDEA	1	1	1	2.5	47	33	8.4	6.2	5	11	6.8	iAMaLGaM IDEA [4]
MA-LS-Chain	1	1	1	2.3	1.6	4.6	2.8	3.8	3.9	4.5	3	MA-LS-Chain [19]
MCS (Neum)	1	1	1	1	1	1	18	57	170	1400	<i>86e-6/9e4</i>	MCS (Neum) [16]
NEWUOA	1	1	1	26	20	31	17	20	37	82	83	NEWUOA [23]
(1+1)-ES	1	1	1	8.2	8.1	8.3	4.3	3.6	3.3	3.2	4.6	(1+1)-ES [1]
PSO	1	1	1	2	2.3	4.2	3.2	4.9	6.2	7.1	6.8	PSO [6]
PSO_Bounds	1	1	1	1.7	2.1	5.1	5.2	8.5	16	19	20	PSO_Bounds [7]
Monte Carlo	1	1	1	2.1	2.8	13	19	280	2400	1.8e4	7e4	Monte Carlo [3]
IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES	1	1	1	41	16	8.5	2.7	2.1	1.8	2.1	1.5	IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES [21]
SNOBFIT	1	1	1	2.1	1.1	6.6	6.6	6.5	6.2	6.4	7.3	SNOBFIT [17]
VNS (Garcia)	1	1	1	2.6	80	42	18	16	12	10	6.3	VNS (Garcia) [10]

Table 8: 02-D, running time excess $\text{ERT}/\text{ERT}_{\text{best}}$ 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

	$\Delta\text{f}_{\text{target}}$ $\text{ERT}_{\text{best}}/D$	1e+03	1e+02	1e+01	1e+00	1e-01	1e-02	1e-03	1e-04	1e-05	1e-07	$\Delta\text{f}_{\text{target}}$ $\text{ERT}_{\text{best}}/D$
ALPS	0.5	1	1	2.5	1	1.9	1.3	1.1	1.6	1.9	1.5	ALPS [15]
AMaLGaM IDEA	1	1.1	1.9	1.9	1	32	6.2	4.3	4.4	5.9	7.3	AMaLGaM IDEA [4]
avg NEWUOA	1	1	87	42	20	18	18	16	<i>14e-3/6e3</i>	.	.	avg NEWUOA [23]
BayEDAeG	1	1	3.1	10	18	18	18	16	<i>86e-3/2e3</i>	.	.	BayEDAeG [9]
BFGS	1	1	29	6.8	4.2	5	7	7	<i>43e-3/800</i>	.	.	BFGS [22]
BIPOP-CMA-ES	1	1	93	10	5.5	1.5	1	1	1	1	1	BIPOP-CMA-ES [14]
(1+1)-CMA-ES	1	1	55	14	8.8	4.5	11	11	<i>14e-4/1e4</i>	.	.	(1+1)-CMA-ES [2]
DASA	1	1	170	93	88	66	100	300	2300	99e-6/6e5	.	DASA [18]
DEPSO	1	1	2.4	2.9	1.9	2.4	5.4	<i>26e-4/2e3</i>	.	.	.	DEPSO [11]
EDA-PSO	1	1	1.9	1.1	1.7	1	1.2	1.3	1.6	1.2	1.2	EDA-PSO [5]
full NEWUOA	1	1	62	53	42	42	<i>22e-3/7e3</i>	full NEWUOA [23]
GLOBAL	1	1	1.7	1.3	1.3	1.2	4.8	11	<i>34e-4/2e3</i>	.	.	GLOBAL [20]
iAMaLGaM IDEA	1	1	2.5	48	20	8	9.8	11	9.9	8	8	iAMaLGaM IDEA [4]
MA-LS-Chain	1	1	2.7	1	1.6	1	1	1.4	1.4	1.2	1.2	MA-LS-Chain [19]
MCS (Neum)	1	1	1	3.3	2.8	5.5	11	140	<i>43e-5/3e4</i>	.	.	MCS (Neum) [16]
NEWUOA	1	1	120	56	24	22	25	<i>13e-3/6e3</i>	.	.	.	NEWUOA [23]
(1+1)-ES	1	1	36	9.4	9	3.4	3.9	14	31	400	400	(1+1)-ES [1]
PSO	1	1	2.4	1.1	1.3	1.3	1.9	3.3	2.6	1.8	1.8	PSO [6]
PSO_Bounds	1	1	2.7	1.1	1	1.3	5.6	5	4.6	2.8	2.8	PSO_Bounds [7]
Monte Carlo	1	1	3	1.3	1.8	1.7	8.9	66	480	<i>17e-6/1e6</i>	.	Monte Carlo [3]
IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES	1	1	600	73	29	6.5	4.5	4.5	5.5	19	19	IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES [21]
SNOBFIT	1	1	1.3	1.2	3.6	2.8	10	14	<i>58e-4/3e3</i>	.	.	SNOBFIT [17]
VNS (Garcia)	1	1	2.6	46	16	9.4	5.4	3.7	3	4.4	4.4	VNS (Garcia) [10]

Table 9: 02-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{best} 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	0.5	0.5	0.9	4.77	6.3	33.6	34	48.2	48.2	7.5e4	ERT _{best} /D
ALPS	1	1	3.1	4.3	25	11	60	330	2400	7.5e4	ALPS [15]
AMaLGaM IDEA	1	1	2.5	3	4.6	14	36	54	100	290	AMaLGaM IDEA [4]
avg NEWUOA	1	1	3.3	2.6	15	7	9	11	15	31	avg NEWUOA [23]
BayEDAeG	1	1	2.7	4.5	12	9.2	13	12	17	28	BayEDAeG [9]
BFGS	1	1	15	8.3	7.6	1.4	1.4	1	1	1	BFGS [22]
BIPOP-CMA-ES	1	1	3.2	2	4.1	1.5	2.3	2.1	3.4	5.4	BIPOP-CMA-ES [14]
(1+1)-CMA-ES	1	1	4	2.5	9.3	16	61	240	3e3	<i>49e-6/1e4</i>	(1+1)-CMA-ES [2]
DASA	1	1	96	210	470	440	5700	4.2e4	1.9e5	<i>15e-5/6e5</i>	DASA [18]
DEPSO	1	1	2.8	5.6	18	7.5	13	23	75	<i>15e-6/2e3</i>	DEPSO [11]
EDA-PSO	1	1	2.3	3.1	8.8	4.8	45	490	3800	<i>13e-6/1e5</i>	EDA-PSO [5]
full NEWUOA	1	1	4	1.2	3.3	1	1	1.5	1.5	1.5	full NEWUOA [23]
GLOBAL	1	1	2.1	2.7	18	7.8	12	21	61	<i>15e-6/2e3</i>	GLOBAL [20]
iAMaLGaM IDEA	1	1	2.8	1.8	3	13	29	35	100	320	iAMaLGaM IDEA [4]
MA-LS-Chain	1	1	2.2	2.4	10	4.5	9.4	11	16	23	MA-LS-Chain [19]
MCS (Neum)	1	1	1	1	1	15	35	31	38	87	MCS (Neum) [16]
NEWUOA	1	1	3.3	3.6	12	5.6	10	13	22	36	NEWUOA [23]
(1+1)-ES	1	1	3.4	1.8	4.6	3.1	31	140	850	5e4	(1+1)-ES [1]
PSO	1	1	3	2.5	12	9.4	510	1100	4700	<i>17e-6/1e5</i>	PSO [6]
PSO_Bounds	1	1	1.7	2.1	12	230	1500	8500	1.4e4	2.9e4	PSO_Bounds [7]
Monte Carlo	1	1	2.5	2.7	23	58	490	3e3	6.7e4	<i>15e-6/1e6</i>	Monte Carlo [3]
IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES	1	1	3.3	2.5	3.8	1.4	2.4	2.4	3.3	4.5	IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES [21]
SNOBFIT	1	1	1.7	1	2.6	1.6	16	24	39	210	SNOBFIT [17]
VNS (Garcia)	1	1	2.6	5	11	3	4.1	3.8	4.7	6.2	VNS (Garcia) [10]

Table 10: 02-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{best} 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

	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
ALPS	0.6	2.2	3.57	17.1	312	651	1160	2180	4200	4580	ALPS [15]
AMaLGaM IDEA	2.8	2	6.8	7.1	1.5	2.1	2.3	1.8	1.4	2.4	AMaLGaM IDEA [4]
avg NEWUOA	3.8	10	11	5.1	2.5	3	6.8	11	5.9	<i>1.2e-4/5e3</i>	avg NEWUOA [23]
BayEDAeG	2.4	1.7	5.7	19	10	44	<i>1.3e-2/2e3</i>	.	.	.	BayEDAeG [9]
BFGS	41	34	62	89	43	41	<i>5.2e-2/2e3</i>	.	.	.	BFGS [22]
BIPOP-CMA-ES	6.2	3.5	4.1	13	4	5.5	3.4	2.4	1.3	1.5	BIPOP-CMA-ES [14]
(1+1)-CMA-ES	3.4	2.5	3.2	9.3	1.7	2.8	2.4	5.8	5.8	32	(1+1)-CMA-ES [2]
DASA	130	140	150	110	32	47	100	190	270	2100	DASA [18]
DEPSO	2.2	1.6	11	6.9	1	1	1	1	1.4	<i>1.7e-6/2e3</i>	DEPSO [11]
EDA-PSO	2.2	1.7	5.3	6.4	1.6	3.2	3.3	2.9	1.9	2.6	EDA-PSO [5]
full NEWUOA	21	17	26	17	2.8	8.5	<i>6.2e-4/6e3</i>	.	.	.	full NEWUOA [23]
GLOBAL	2.7	2	4.9	4.7	1.3	2	6.1	<i>1.0e-3/800</i>	.	.	GLOBAL [20]
iAMaLGaM IDEA	2.4	1.8	100	22	9	6.6	4.1	2.5	1.4	1.3	iAMaLGaM IDEA [4]
MA-LS-Chain	3	2.4	6.1	5.8	1.2	2.1	2.2	1.8	1	1.9	MA-LS-Chain [19]
MCS (Neum)	1	1	1	1	1.9	10	93	<i>1.8e-4/3e4</i>	.	.	MCS (Neum) [16]
NEWUOA	22	15	16	15	2.9	4.4	9.1	36	<i>1.9e-4/5e3</i>	.	NEWUOA [23]
(1+1)-ES	3.9	5.9	4.9	6.9	1.6	2.8	6.4	7.2	9.8	49	(1+1)-ES [1]
PSO	3.1	1.9	5.8	6.6	1.1	1.5	1.4	1.3	1.2	1.6	PSO [6]
PSO_Bounds	2.9	2.1	7.5	12	2	2.8	3.1	2.8	2.2	3	PSO_Bounds [7]
Monte Carlo	3.1	2.7	5.5	11	5.9	22	180	660	3600	<i>6.5e-6/1e6</i>	Monte Carlo [3]
IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES	4.3	4.2	4.8	28	4.5	4.4	3.8	2.1	1.1	1	IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES [21]
SNOBFIT	3.1	2.4	5.6	7.8	2.8	3.4	5.3	16	<i>5.7e-4/3e3</i>	.	SNOBFIT [17]
VNS (Garcia)	9.5	3.5	5.9	5.3	7.3	9	5.5	3.3	2.3	3.2	VNS (Garcia) [10]

Table 11: 02-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{best} 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

	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
ALPS	2.9	1.8	1.9	4.1	2.7	1.1	1	1	1	1	ALPS [15]
AMaLGaM IDEA	2.5	1	1	7.6	8.3	6.3	5.5	5.5	3.2	2.1	AMaLGaM IDEA [4]
avg NEWUOA	72	48	45	29	53	33	<i>26e-2/6e3</i>	.	.	.	avg NEWUOA [23]
BayEDAeG	2.8	1.1	2	6.4	36	10	<i>35e-2/2e3</i>	.	.	.	BayEDAeG [9]
BFGS	7.8	8.4	7.7	8.2	<i>59e-2/700</i>	BFGS [22]
BIPOP-CMA-ES	4.5	2.6	7.3	6	2.4	1.5	4.2	3.1	3.1	1.3	BIPOP-CMA-ES [14]
(1+1)-CMA-ES	4.1	1.8	7.4	6.5	4	3.6	7.6	10	<i>64e-4/1e4</i>	.	(1+1)-CMA-ES [2]
DASA	230	110	120	91	88	39	110	290	<i>90e-5/6e5</i>	.	DASA [18]
DEPSO	1.7	2.6	3.3	5.7	5.7	11	<i>28e-3/2e3</i>	.	.	.	DEPSO [11]
EDA-PSO	2.1	1.7	1.4	2.1	2.2	1.1	4.7	5.1	6.4	17	EDA-PSO [5]
full NEWUOA	94	37	26	27	31	35	<i>15e-2/7e3</i>	.	.	.	full NEWUOA [23]
GLOBAL	1.7	1.4	1.9	2.2	2.4	1.8	3.5	<i>54e-3/2e3</i>	.	.	GLOBAL [20]
iAMaLGaM IDEA	1.9	1.6	1.4	28	21	10	6.2	4	3.1	3.1	iAMaLGaM IDEA [4]
MA-LS-Chain	3.4	1.8	1.7	1.3	2.2	1	1.2	2.1	2.2	<i>24e-5/1e4</i>	MA-LS-Chain [19]
MCS (Neum)	1	2.4	1.4	1	4.3	5.5	56	<i>75e-4/3e4</i>	.	.	MCS (Neum) [16]
NEWUOA	140	33	21	25	19	11	<i>68e-3/6e3</i>	.	.	.	NEWUOA [23]
(1+1)-ES	46	12	14	11	5.6	2.1	5.7	10	21	82	(1+1)-ES [1]
PSO	2.5	1.2	1.9	2	1	4.2	4.6	6.4	5.6	8.2	PSO [6]
PSO_Bounds	2.6	1.6	1.7	1.3	21	3.2	2.3	2.6	2.3	1.5	PSO_Bounds [7]
Monte Carlo	3.9	1.6	1.5	2.7	5.5	4.3	28	1.30	480	<i>14e-5/1e6</i>	Monte Carlo [3]
IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES	4.6	1.8	11	16	7.4	2.6	2.8	4.8	4.6	<i>11e-4/1e4</i>	IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES [21]
SNOBFIT	5	2.4	2.8	4.2	10	6.4	5.6	2.5	1.2	<i>10e-2/3e3</i>	SNOBFIT [17]
VNS (Garcia)	9.5	2.1	78	62	22	5.6	4.1	2.9	2.5	47	VNS (Garcia) [10]

Table 12: 02-D, running time excess $\text{ERT}/\text{ERT}_{\text{best}}$ 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

	$\Delta\text{f}_{\text{target}}$ $\text{ERT}_{\text{best}}/D$	1e+03	1e+02	1e+01	1e+00	1e-01	1e-02	1e-03	1e-04	1e-05	1e-07	$\Delta\text{f}_{\text{target}}$ $\text{ERT}_{\text{best}}/D$
ALPS		0.6	2	2.7	7.3	312	522	577	618	686	766	
AMaLGaM IDEA	2.3	2.9	2.9	9.2	15	1.6	3.5	7.6	78	880	4.7e4	ALPS [15]
avg NEWUOA	2.7	1.7	1.7	4.3	64	14	11	26	32	56	91	AMaLGaM IDEA [4]
BayEDA _{cG}	4.7	2.5	5.1	1.1	1.1	4.6	22	22	120	<i>1.9e-4/5e3</i>	.	avg NEWUOA [23]
BFGS	2.4	2.2	4.5	27	4.8	<i>88e-3/2e3</i>	12	16	29	39	<i>14e-3/4e3</i>	BayEDA _{cG} [9]
BIPOP-CMA-ES	33	27	36	47	3.4	1.7	1.6	1.3	110	1.7	1.7	BFGS [22]
(1+1)-CMA-ES	3.4	2	4.3	13	1.9	3	71	270	3400	<i>52e-5/1e4</i>	.	BIPOP-CMA-ES [14]
DASA	43	23	140	160	26	1.2	3.8	8.7	<i>34e-4/2e3</i>	<i>1.9e-5/7e5</i>	.	(1+1)-CMA-ES [2]
DEPSO	3.6	4	7.4	13	1.2	6	23	23	290	2100	.	DASA [18]
EDA-PSO	3	2.5	8.1	9.2	1.9	3	6	8.7	290	2100	.	DEPSO [11]
full NEWUOA	6.9	3	3.1	16	1.3	2.5	7.4	7.4	13	25	<i>12e-5/1e5</i>	EDA-PSO [5]
GLOBAL	3.3	2.2	8.1	16	1.2	3	2.9	2.9	7.7	7	53	full NEWUOA [23]
iAMaLGaM IDEA	1.9	1.7	4	100	14	19	35	35	65	67	<i>10e-3/1e3</i>	GLOBAL [20]
MA-LS-Chain	2.1	2.2	6.3	7.7	1	1.7	2.8	2.8	3.8	3.9	100	iAMaLGaM IDEA [4]
MCS (Neum)	1	1	1	1	7.7	31	87	87	<i>11e-4/3e4</i>	.	9.5	MA-LS-Chain [19]
NEWUOA	5.1	2.7	5	13	1.2	1.7	9.9	9.9	110	100	.	MCS (Neum) [16]
(1+1)-ES	2.8	2.1	3.4	15	1.9	4.5	16	16	95	800	<i>70e-5/5e3</i>	NEWUOA [23]
PSO	1.8	2.1	8.1	9.5	1.6	4.6	89	89	360	970	<i>18e-7/1e6</i>	(1+1)-ES [1]
PSO_Bounds	2.5	2.1	6.2	8.8	1.7	6.2	46	46	230	1100	<i>41e-5/1e5</i>	PSO [6]
Monte Carlo	3.1	2.4	5.9	14	5.6	28	300	300	2800	9800	<i>10e-5/1e5</i>	PSO_Bounds [7]
IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES	3.4	2.7	5.4	9.4	1.1	1	1	1	1.1	1	<i>17e-5/1e6</i>	Monte Carlo [3]
SNOBFIT	2.9	2	2.9	10	2.5	7	7	62	58	<i>12e-3/3e3</i>	.	IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES [21]
VNS (Garcia)	9.5	3.9	9.2	14	1.3	1	1	1	1	1	1	SNOBFIT [17]
												VNS (Garcia) [10]

Table 13: 02-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{best} 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

	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	0.5	1.07	2.37	15.7	43.7	69.8	87.1	87.1	87.1	438	ERT_{best}/D
ALPS	1	1.6	2.2	2.2	4.3	12	11	13	13	13	4.1	ALPS [15]
AMaLGaM IDEA	1.3	1.6	2.3	1.1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	AMaLGaM IDEA [4]
avg NEWUOA	2.1	13	9.5	6.1	9.7	19	19	33	33	33	13	avg NEWUOA [23]
BayEDAeG	1.3	1.3	2.4	2.3	30	26	26	69	69	69	20	BayEDAeG [9]
BFGS	26	24	81	91	260	<i>60e-2/3e3</i>	BFGS [22]
BIPOP-CMA-ES	1.1	4.1	5.1	6.4	13	14	14	12	12	12	2.5	BIPOP-CMA-ES [14]
(1+1)-CMA-ES	40	21	12	7.4	11	17	17	19	19	19	4.4	(1+1)-CMA-ES [2]
DASA	9.5	120	220	180	380	600	600	770	770	770	380	DASA [18]
DEPSO	1.7	1.8	4.3	5.4	5.2	5.8	5.8	7.1	7.1	7.1	1.6	DEPSO [11]
EDA-PSO	1.7	1.9	2.5	2.5	6.8	6.8	19	25	25	25	7.3	EDA-PSO [5]
full NEWUOA	2.2	11	11	4.8	17	26	26	47	47	47	15	full NEWUOA [23]
GLOBAL	2	1.9	4.2	4.1	5.5	5.7	5.7	7.6	7.6	7.6	1.7	GLOBAL [20]
iAMaLGaM IDEA	1.6	1.6	2.9	1	20	13	13	10	10	10	2.1	iAMaLGaM IDEA [4]
MA-LS-Chain	1.1	1	2.6	2.6	5.6	7.2	7.2	9.9	9.9	9.9	2.3	MA-LS-Chain [19]
MCS (Neum)	1.4	1.3	1	1.2	6.1	6.1	37	76	76	76	57	MCS (Neum) [16]
NEWUOA	2.4	8.7	12	5.8	16	29	29	42	42	42	14	NEWUOA [23]
(1+1)-ES	9.3	10	13	5.7	6.4	8.9	8.9	15	15	15	3.7	(1+1)-ES [1]
PSO	1.4	1.8	4.7	2.6	3.6	5.1	5.1	5.9	5.9	5.9	1.6	PSO [6]
PSO_Bounds	1.2	1.6	3.4	2	4.3	11	11	13	13	13	5	PSO_Bounds [7]
Monte Carlo	1.6	1.6	2.9	4.7	18	54	54	160	160	160	130	Monte Carlo [3]
IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES	1.8	3.3	4.2	1.3	32	27	27	27	27	27	5.3	IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES [21]
SNOBFIT	1	1.1	1.8	4	10	20	20	20	20	20	5.1	SNOBFIT [17]
VNS (Garcia)	1	2.2	2.7	25	63	52	43	43	43	43	8.6	VNS (Garcia) [10]

Table 14: 02-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{best} 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

	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	0.5	0.833	4.43	21.3	349	1240	2670	2670	2670	4340	ERT_{best}/D
ALPS [15]		1.2	1	1.6	3.1	1.8	1.3	1	1	1	1	ALPS [15]
AMaLGaM IDEA		1.2	1.8	1.8	1.5	6.1	3.1	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.8	AMaLGaM IDEA [4]
avg NEWUOA		1.5	66	29	16	26	21	33	33	33	20	avg NEWUOA [23]
BayEDA-cG		1.5	1.9	2.1	38	37	23	<i>60e-2/2e3</i>	.	.	.	BayEDA-cG [9]
BFGS		8.8	18	9.6	7.2	6.9	<i>49e-2/800</i>	BFGS [22]
BIPOP-CMA-ES		4.1	6.5	3.3	7.8	2.3	1.7	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.5	BIPOP-CMA-ES [14]
(1+1)-CMA-ES		1.2	27	19	8.1	6.2	4.5	4	4	4	7.9	(1+1)-CMA-ES [2]
DASA		100	250	220	220	110	90	120	120	120	160	DASA [18]
DEPSO		1.8	1.7	1.3	7.8	3.3	3.1	5.5	5.5	5.5	7	DEPSO [11]
EDA-PSO		1.3	1.6	1.6	2.2	1.6	2	1.1	1.1	1.1	1	EDA-PSO [5]
full NEWUOA		2.3	67	91	95	40	18	18	18	18	<i>11e-2/7e3</i>	full NEWUOA [23]
GLOBAL		1.2	2.4	2.4	2.6	2	2.6	3.1	3.1	3.1	6.5	GLOBAL [20]
iAMaLGaM IDEA		1.3	2.3	29	65	23	10	5.2	5.2	5.2	3.5	iAMaLGaM IDEA [4]
MA-LS-Chain		1.2	1.5	1.9	2.8	1	1	1.2	1.2	1.2	1.3	MA-LS-Chain [19]
MCS (Neum)		1.4	3.4	1.2	5.5	3.4	7	17	17	17	<i>38e-4/3e4</i>	MCS (Neum) [16]
NEWUOA		1.9	41	69	53	38	71	33	33	33	<i>21e-2/6e3</i>	NEWUOA [23]
(1+1)-ES		2.2	18	25	13	7.2	7	6.4	6.4	6.4	6.4	(1+1)-ES [1]
PSO		1.3	1.8	1	1.8	23	22	12	12	12	7.4	PSO [6]
PSO_Bounds		1.5	2.3	1	1	73	30	15	15	15	9.6	PSO_Bounds [7]
Monte Carlo		1.5	1.7	1.2	1.6	1.9	4.3	4.7	4.7	4.7	20	Monte Carlo [3]
IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES		2.1	10	15	29	4.6	5.3	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.1	IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES [21]
SNOBFFT		1.7	2.7	1.5	3.8	2.6	2.5	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.6	SNOBFFT [17]
VNS (García)		1	2.9	1.4	91	12	7.9	6.1	6.1	6.1	4.1	VNS (García) [10]

Table 15: 02-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{best} 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	0.5	1.03	1.6	6.37	112	180	197	197	197	271	ERT_{best}/D
ALPS	1.3	2	2.7	11	4.4	6.6	10	10	10	16	ALPS [15]
AMaLGaM IDEA	1.3	1.3	2.5	3.1	7.5	4.8	4.4	4.4	4.4	11	AMaLGaM IDEA [4]
avg NEWUOA	1.5	2.8	6.5	7.3	2.9	6.1	7.1	7.1	7.1	12	avg NEWUOA [23]
BayEDAeG	1.4	1.1	7.4	31	28	160	140	140	140	100	BayEDAeG [9]
BFGS	13	23	92	140	200	<i>49e-2/2e3</i>	BFGS [22]
BIPOP-CMA-ES	3.4	3.5	4.9	4.7	1.2	2.2	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.1	BIPOP-CMA-ES [14]
(1+1)-CMA-ES	1.7	2.7	5	14	2.4	4.2	16	16	16	25	(1+1)-CMA-ES [2]
DASA	16	39	140	420	110	230	580	580	580	1600	DASA [18]
DEPSO	1	1.4	5.4	9	1.6	3.4	3.9	3.9	3.9	4.3	DEPSO [11]
EDA-PSO	1.3	1.2	3.3	4.3	2.1	4.3	17	17	17	64	EDA-PSO [5]
full NEWUOA	1.7	2.5	3	7.1	1.8	2.9	8	8	8	9.3	full NEWUOA [23]
GLOBAL	1.9	1.9	4.7	6.6	1.9	3.1	4.6	4.6	4.6	13	GLOBAL [20]
iAMaLGaM IDEA	1.2	1.4	3.1	28	14	8.8	12	12	12	14	iAMaLGaM IDEA [4]
MA-LS-Chain	1.5	2	4.2	3.9	1.3	2.9	3.4	3.4	3.4	4.7	MA-LS-Chain [19]
MCS (Neum)	1.4	1.4	1	4.4	2.5	52	87	87	87	450	MCS (Neum) [16]
NEWUOA	2	2.5	4.5	12	2.9	4.4	11	11	11	11	NEWUOA [23]
(1+1)-ES	1.9	3.4	5.8	16	2.4	3.7	5.5	5.5	5.5	14	(1+1)-ES [1]
PSO	1.3	2.5	4.6	6.2	66	72	120	120	120	280	PSO [6]
PSO_Bounds	1.6	2.1	6.4	5.8	3	44	170	170	170	380	PSO_Bounds [7]
Monte Carlo	1.3	1	3	4.7	5.6	23	89	89	89	260	Monte Carlo [3]
IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES	1.8	4.1	4.8	7.3	1	1	1	1	1	1	IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES [21]
SNOBFIT	1.5	1.4	2.1	1	2.1	7.4	22	22	22	63	SNOBFIT [17]
VNS (Garcia)	1	2.3	3.9	26	2.1	1.6	1.7	1.7	1.7	1.4	VNS (Garcia) [10]

Table 16: 02-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{best} 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

	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
ALPS	1.8	3.1	3.6	14	23	33	45	56	66	80	27	ALPS [15]
AMaLGaM IDEA	1.7	1.6	1.2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	AMaLGaM IDEA [4]
avg NEWUOA	7.9	6.2	12	15	32	98	130	480	<i>1.4e-3/5e3</i>			avg NEWUOA [23]
BayEDAacG	2.8	5.2	9.7	63	110	280	<i>28e-1/2e3</i>					BayEDAacG [9]
BFGS	30	35	60	410	<i>53e-1/1e3</i>							BFGS [22]
BIPOP-CMA-ES	1.9	9.4	15	61	62	51	39	33	11	11	6.5	BIPOP-CMA-ES [14]
(1+1)-CMA-ES	1.7	1.7	8.1	11	29	49	110	420	270	160	160	(1+1)-CMA-ES [2]
DASA	48	47	43	130	500	1e3	1900	1.3e4	1.8e4	<i>29e-5/7e5</i>		DASA [18]
DEPSO	1.4	4.2	6.8	13	15	24	31	41	18	16	16	DEPSO [11]
EDA-PSO	1.9	3.6	5.1	18	30	46	64	76	29	27	27	EDA-PSO [5]
full NEWUOA	8.3	15	11	17	44	110	320	<i>11e-3/6e3</i>				full NEWUOA [23]
GLOBAL	1.4	4.1	3.5	8.3	12	37	28	31	9.8	18	18	GLOBAL [20]
iAMaLGaM IDEA	1.2	1.8	6.7	24	23	19	14	12	4.1	4.1	2.5	iAMaLGaM IDEA [4]
MA-LS-Chain	2.4	3.7	3.3	11	23	43	49	51	22	15	15	MA-LS-Chain [19]
MCS (Neum)	1	1	1	13	86	730	<i>24e-3/3e4</i>					MCS (Neum) [16]
NEWUOA	5.4	4.6	6.3	18	38	110	570	<i>50e-3/5e3</i>				NEWUOA [23]
(1+1)-ES	5.9	3.7	3.2	12	20	64	130	500	350	1500	1500	(1+1)-ES [1]
PSO	2.3	3.7	5.9	35	120	100	84	79	28	20	20	PSO [6]
PSO_Bounds	3.4	3	13	410	280	230	190	180	82	63	63	PSO_Bounds [7]
Monte Carlo	2	2.5	5.5	29	280	2700	9200	4.1e4	<i>80e-5/1e6</i>			Monte Carlo [3]
IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES	11	8.1	17	40	41	32	24	20	6.5	3.9	3.9	IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES [21]
SNOBFIT	1.7	1.6	5	8.9	48	100	120	<i>12e-2/3e3</i>				SNOBFIT [17]
VNS (Garcia)	1.8	4	67	75	55	50	39	35	13	16	16	VNS (Garcia) [10]

Table 17: 02-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{best} 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

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
	ALPS	4.77	17.4	83.7	673	3230	6960	14100	14900	18200	21600
AMaLGaM IDEA	1.6	1.8	1.6	1.1	1.1	1	1.3	2.4	2.8	7.9	AMaLGaM IDEA [4]
avg NEWUOA	1.7	1.3	4.9	9.9	4.5	4.6	2.6	2.5	2.9	4.1	avg NEWUOA [23]
BayEDAeG	15	32	24	10	8.4	<i>78e-2/6e3</i>	BayEDAeG [9]
BFGS	2.4	2.6	17	42	<i>78e-1/2e3</i>	BFGS [22]
BIPOP-CMA-ES	8.6	5.3	4.9	6.2	2.7	<i>40e-1/600</i>	BIPOP-CMA-ES [14]
(1+1)-CMA-ES	2.2	5.4	6.7	3.8	2.1	1.6	1	1	1	1	(1+1)-CMA-ES [2]
DASA	9.5	4.5	5	1.8	2.1	10	10	<i>32e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	DASA [18]
DEPSO	90	80	58	51	46	120	310	<i>71e-4/6e5</i>	.	.	DEPSO [11]
EDA-PSO	1	4.1	3.6	1.9	4.1	<i>46e-2/2e3</i>	EDA-PSO [5]
full NEWUOA	1.3	2.6	1.2	6	2.4	2.5	4.6	9.6	17	21	full NEWUOA [23]
GLOBAL	55	41	25	14	31	14	<i>87e-2/7e3</i>	.	.	.	GLOBAL [20]
iAMaLGaM IDEA	1.4	1	2.3	1.3	1.9	1.8	<i>25e-2/2e3</i>	.	.	.	iAMaLGaM IDEA [4]
MA-LS-Chain	43	12	11	5.7	4.5	3.4	2	2.5	3.3	6.5	MA-LS-Chain [19]
MCS (Neum)	1.3	1.1	1.2	1	1	1.7	1.9	12	<i>27e-4/1e4</i>	.	MCS (Neum) [16]
NEWUOA	1.4	1.2	1	1.4	4.2	8.4	<i>27e-3/3e4</i>	.	.	.	NEWUOA [23]
(1+1)-ES	43	25	29	12	26	<i>97e-2/6e3</i>	(1+1)-ES [1]
PSO	3.1	6	6.2	2.3	1.9	4	8.2	46	97	660	PSO [6]
PSO_Bounds	1.4	1.3	4.6	55	12	13	11	16	24	66	PSO_Bounds [7]
Monte Carlo	2.2	1.1	1.6	55	21	17	21	45	37	67	Monte Carlo [3]
IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES	1.5	1	2.8	3.2	4.4	31	120	940	<i>10e-4/1e6</i>	.	IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES [21]
SNOBFIT	22	27	10	5.3	2.8	1.9	1.2	1.9	4	<i>39e-4/1e4</i>	SNOBFIT [17]
VNS (Garcia)	2.1	1.2	3.5	2.6	5.1	2.5	<i>51e-2/3e3</i>	.	.	410	VNS (Garcia) [10]
	1.3	1.3	41	11	5.6	4.5	3.8	12	29	21	

117 Ellipsoid unif

Table 18: 02-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{best} 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

	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
ALPS	6.3	9.9	12	10.5	13	20	12	60	630	2400	<i>44e-7/2e6</i>	486
AMaLGaM IDEA	4.4	7.2	3	1	1	1	1.6	4	6.2	14	20	AMaLGaM IDEA [4]
avg NEWUOA	2.4	2.3	2.8	3.8	3.8	12	9	21	220	<i>90e-5/5e3</i>	.	avg NEWUOA [23]
BayEDAeG	3.1	7.7	5.9	28	16	66	110	<i>71e-2/2e3</i>	.	.	.	BayEDAeG [9]
BFGS	17	20	17	16	16	59	49	42	54	45	56	BFGS [22]
BIPOP-CMA-ES	3.5	5.7	15	7.7	7.4	2.4	2.2	2.2	2.3	2.1	1.9	BIPOP-CMA-ES [14]
(1+1)-CMA-ES	2.8	6.9	18	11	11	21	12	45	460	<i>98e-5/1e4</i>	.	(1+1)-CMA-ES [2]
DASA	16	19	130	110	240	240	120	1300	1.5e4	<i>43e-5/7e5</i>	.	DASA [18]
DEPSO	5.4	11	14	15	29	13	13	19	92	<i>30e-3/2e3</i>	.	DEPSO [11]
EDA-PSO	2.8	5.1	9	15	41	41	49	190	510	1800	<i>12e-5/1e5</i>	EDA-PSO [5]
full NEWUOA	2.3	2.6	2.3	2.8	7.3	3.5	3.5	7.5	60	220	<i>40e-5/6e3</i>	full NEWUOA [23]
GLOBAL	3.6	7.8	9.5	3.6	3.1	1.5	2.8	2.8	4.1	4.9	<i>64e-6/800</i>	GLOBAL [20]
iAMaLGaM IDEA	3.1	5.4	2.3	3.4	8.8	5	5	8.5	9.7	14	34	iAMaLGaM IDEA [4]
MA-LS-Chain	5.7	7.9	6.9	6.2	7.6	2.6	2.7	2.7	3	3.8	3.9	MA-LS-Chain [19]
MCS (Neum)	1	1	1.3	1.3	41	38	150	150	1100	<i>27e-4/3e4</i>	.	MCS (Neum) [16]
NEWUOA	2.1	2.6	5.6	4.2	11	10	10	35	71	190	<i>11e-4/5e3</i>	NEWUOA [23]
(1+1)-ES	3.6	7.8	17	19	41	43	43	140	1200	5400	<i>12e-6/1e6</i>	(1+1)-ES [1]
PSO	2.1	5	9.5	9.4	42	80	200	200	650	1200	<i>33e-5/1e5</i>	PSO [6]
PSO_Bounds	3.2	7.7	12	150	140	180	180	370	2200	<i>88e-5/1e5</i>	.	PSO_Bounds [7]
Monte Carlo	2.6	8.4	14	46	250	340	3500	64e-5/1e6	1.6	1.4	.	Monte Carlo [3]
IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES	4.1	9.3	17	6.2	6	1.9	1.7	1.7	1.6	1.4	1.3	IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES [21]
SNOBFIT	1.7	2.2	1	1	4.1	6.7	19	19	110	95	<i>32e-4/3e3</i>	SNOBFIT [17]
VNS (Garcia)	2.9	9.1	14	3.7	3.4	1	1	1	1	1	1	VNS (Garcia) [10]

Table 19: 02-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{best} 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

	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
ALPS	0.5	1	1.5	0.7	1.8	2.9	7	3	2.9	1.9	8.5	ALPS [15]
AMaLGaM IDEA	1	1	1.7	1.7	78	13	12	3.3	2.5	1.2	1	AMaLGaM IDEA [4]
avg NEWUOA	1	1.4	2.9	1.8	18	8	14	5.9	6.6	6.8	<i>67e-6/5e3</i>	avg NEWUOA [23]
BayEDAeG	1	1.3	1.4	6.3	4.4	4.4	4	2.1	4.4	3.9	<i>18e-5/2e3</i>	BayEDAeG [9]
BFGS	1	12	43	58	160	160	570	<i>13e-2/4e3</i>	.	.	.	BFGS [22]
BIPOP-CMA-ES	1	2.3	3.8	2.9	1.2	1	1	1.6	3	2	3	BIPOP-CMA-ES [14]
(1+1)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.5	12	7.9	7.2	7.2	1.6	3	2.4	6.6	(1+1)-CMA-ES [2]
DASA	1	1	91	280	170	360	200	200	330	600	1800	DASA [18]
DEPSO	1	1	1.6	2.5	3.6	3.7	1	1	1	1	<i>79e-7/2e3</i>	DEPSO [11]
EDA-PSO	1	1.3	1.2	2.3	2.6	4.9	3.1	4.4	4.4	2.9	32	EDA-PSO [5]
full NEWUOA	1	1.6	3.2	8.7	4.8	13	11	15	38	38	<i>32e-5/6e3</i>	full NEWUOA [23]
GLOBAL	1	1.3	1.6	2.3	4.1	4.3	1.6	1.6	2.2	2	<i>32e-5/700</i>	GLOBAL [20]
iAMaLGaM IDEA	1	1.1	1.4	2.1	7.8	12	4.5	4.5	3	2.1	1.6	iAMaLGaM IDEA [4]
MA-LS-Chain	1	1.2	1.7	2.6	4.3	4.3	1.4	1.4	1.3	1	2.1	MA-LS-Chain [19]
MCS (Neum)	1	1	1	1	1.2	40	150	<i>18e-4/3e4</i>	.	.	.	MCS (Neum) [16]
NEWUOA	1	2.6	3.1	15	8.6	23	7.1	19	33	33	15	NEWUOA [23]
(1+1)-ES	1	2	11	22	7.3	3.6	1.1	3.1	3.3	3.3	11	(1+1)-ES [1]
PSO	1	1.1	2	3	2.5	3.5	1.5	1.3	1.3	4.4	47	PSO [6]
PSO_Bounds	1	1.1	2	2	3.3	5.5	3.6	4.1	4	4	45	PSO_Bounds [7]
Monte Carlo	1	1.4	1.7	2.1	6.8	77	380	2500	<i>18e-5/1e6</i>	.	.	Monte Carlo [3]
IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES	1	1.2	1.7	2.2	1	3.8	1.3	2.8	1.7	1.7	1.2	IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES [21]
SNOBFIT	1	1.3	1.9	1.3	3.2	4	2.7	4	2.7	2.6	7.4	SNOBFIT [17]
VNS (Garcia)	1	1	2.1	4.2	2.8	1.8	2.5	2.9	2.4	2.4	6.6	VNS (Garcia) [10]

Table 20: 02-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{best} 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

	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	0.5	0.5	0.7	5.67	187	1260	2860	13000	37700	94300	ERT_{best}/D
ALPS	1	1.1	1.9	1.1	1.1	2	1.2	2	1	1.3	6.1	ALPS [15]
AMaLGaM IDEA	1	1.3	1.2	1.3	1.3	6.4	7.3	9.7	7.1	6.9	21	AMaLGaM IDEA [4]
avg NEWUOA	1	9.5	37	74	42	15	15	<i>94e-3/6e3</i>	.	.	.	avg NEWUOA [23]
BayEDAeG	1	1	1.1	3.1	22	22	<i>21e-2/2e3</i>	BayEDAeG [9]
BFGS	1	2	7.6	20	14	14	9.5	<i>13e-2/800</i>	.	.	.	BFGS [22]
BIPOP-CMA-ES	1	2	4.4	11	2.3	1.1	1	1	1.2	1	1	BIPOP-CMA-ES [14]
(1+1)-CMA-ES	1	1.1	2.6	13	3.4	9	9	52	<i>57e-4/1e4</i>	.	.	(1+1)-CMA-ES [2]
DASA	1	72	86	310	61	61	73	310	210	230	89e-5/6e5	DASA [18]
DEPSO	1	1	1.5	3.2	2.2	2.2	4	<i>14e-3/2e3</i>	.	.	.	DEPSO [11]
EDA-PSO	1	1.2	1.8	1	1.1	1.1	1.4	3	2.3	4.2	<i>10e-6/1e5</i>	EDA-PSO [5]
full NEWUOA	1	20	48	77	17	17	76	<i>44e-3/7e3</i>	.	.	.	full NEWUOA [23]
GLOBAL	1	1.1	1.5	2.1	1.1	1.1	3.8	<i>13e-3/2e3</i>	.	.	.	GLOBAL [20]
iAMaLGaM IDEA	1	1.2	1.3	57	26	26	14	15	14	17	160	iAMaLGaM IDEA [4]
MA-LS-Chain	1	1.2	1.6	2.2	2.2	1	1	1.8	1.1	3.9	<i>99e-6/1e4</i>	MA-LS-Chain [19]
MCS (Neum)	1	1	1	3.8	3.1	14	14	41	<i>38e-4/3e4</i>	.	.	MCS (Neum) [16]
NEWUOA	1	3.1	48	61	41	41	34	<i>98e-3/6e3</i>	.	.	.	NEWUOA [23]
(1+1)-ES	1	2	11	25	4.8	4.8	5.3	10	22	22	<i>50e-7/1e6</i>	(1+1)-ES [1]
PSO	1	1.3	2	2.4	39	39	7	5.8	3.1	4.2	<i>12e-6/1e5</i>	PSO [6]
PSO_Bounds	1	1.3	1.4	3	1.1	1.1	7	6.5	5.8	4.9	<i>29e-6/1e5</i>	PSO_Bounds [7]
Monte Carlo	1	1.3	1.5	2.2	2.2	2.2	5.9	26	250	16e-5/1e6	.	Monte Carlo [3]
IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES	1	1.3	3	35	14	14	5.1	5	11	<i>36e-5/1e4</i>	.	IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES [21]
SNOBFIT	1	1.3	1.7	2.6	2	2	3.9	<i>19e-3/3e3</i>	.	.	.	SNOBFIT [17]
VNS (Garcia)	1	1	2.1	4	4	20	5.9	4.9	3.3	8.1	260	VNS (Garcia) [10]

Table 21: 02-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{best} 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

	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
ALPS		1	1.4	2	5	9.5	18	90	680	3500	<i>50e-7/2e6</i>	ALPS [15]
AMaLGaM IDEA		1	1.1	1.4	2.7	1.4	22	30	29	38	160	AMaLGaM IDEA [4]
avg NEWUOA		1	1.6	2.6	5.7	4.4	6.3	22	35	<i>31e-5/5e3</i>	.	avg NEWUOA [23]
BayEDAeG		1	1.1	1.3	4.7	9.8	4.8	4.7	10	53	<i>28e-5/2e3</i>	BayEDAeG [9]
BFGS		1	9.6	22	34	16	15	27	46	48	<i>78e-5/4e3</i>	BFGS [22]
BIPOP-CMA-ES		1	1.5	3.1	3.5	1.4	1	1.3	1.4	2	2.6	BIPOP-CMA-ES [14]
(1+1)-CMA-ES		1	1.2	3.4	7.9	14	21	61	190	<i>62e-5/1e4</i>	.	(1+1)-CMA-ES [2]
DASA		1	14	160	270	230	880	5500	<i>12e-4/6e5</i>	.	.	DASA [18]
DEPSO		1	1.6	2.2	4.2	5.1	4.1	5.4	77	<i>38e-5/2e3</i>	.	DEPSO [11]
EDA-PSO		1	1	1.6	4	3.2	15	180	1800	<i>55e-5/1e5</i>	.	EDA-PSO [5]
full NEWUOA		1	2.1	4	1.6	1.7	1.5	8.9	15	25	<i>34e-6/5e3</i>	full NEWUOA [23]
GLOBAL		1	1.3	1.8	2.6	7.6	5.2	10	21	<i>59e-5/2e3</i>	.	GLOBAL [20]
iAMaLGaM IDEA		1	1.4	1.7	2.2	15	11	25	32	64	250	iAMaLGaM IDEA [4]
MA-LS-Chain		1	1.3	1.6	4.5	4	4.1	4.4	4.2	7.1	38	MA-LS-Chain [19]
MCS (Neum)		1	1	1	1	1	99	510	<i>23e-4/3e4</i>	.	.	MCS (Neum) [16]
NEWUOA		1	1.6	2.7	4.4	3	7.6	14	57	120	<i>40e-5/5e3</i>	NEWUOA [23]
(1+1)-ES		1	1.6	3.2	4.8	4.3	9.8	58	320	5500	<i>16e-6/1e6</i>	(1+1)-ES [1]
PSO		1	1.3	1.6	3.3	6.2	89	310	1900	2500	<i>32e-5/1e5</i>	PSO [6]
PSO_Bounds		1	1.2	2.2	3	7.4	240	400	410	1200	<i>21e-5/1e5</i>	PSO_Bounds [7]
Monte Carlo		1	1.3	1.6	2.6	9.4	70	830	1.3e4	2.7e4	<i>27e-5/1e6</i>	Monte Carlo [3]
IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES		1	1.2	3	5.2	1.8	1.1	1	1	1.2	1	IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES [21]
SNOBFIT		1	1.1	1.9	1.9	2.2	11	73	<i>24e-4/3e3</i>	.	.	SNOBFIT [17]
VNS (Garcia)		1	1	2.1	6.5	4.1	1.7	1.6	1.1	1	1.1	VNS (Garcia) [10]

Table 22: 02-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{best} 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

	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	0.5	0.5	1.47	47.7	261	705	1120	1680	2180	4780	ERT_{best}/D
ALPS	1	1.2	2	2.9	4.4	4.4	4	4.3	3.9	4.1	3.3	ALPS [15]
AMaLGaM IDEA	1	1.1	2.5	1.4	6.6	6.6	4.8	3.7	2.9	2.9	1.9	AMaLGaM IDEA [4]
avg NEWUOA	1	1.3	1.4	9.7	33	33	55	<i>11e-2/5e3</i>	.	.	.	avg NEWUOA [23]
BayEDAacG	1.1	1.1	1.7	3.2	3.4	3.4	9.7	<i>16e-3/2e3</i>	.	.	.	BayEDAacG [9]
BFGS	1	3.8	46	40	<i>47e-2/3e3</i>	BFGS [22]
BIPOP-CMA-ES	1	1.2	2.8	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	BIPOP-CMA-ES [14]
(1+1)-CMA-ES	1	1.9	16	5.1	9.2	9.3	9.3	<i>48e-4/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1+1)-CMA-ES [2]
DASA	1	30	320	170	300	300	960	<i>87e-4/6e5</i>	.	.	.	DASA [18]
DEPSO	1	1.3	1	2.6	2	1.5	1.9	1.9	2.1	6.9	<i>57e-6/2e3</i>	DEPSO [11]
EDA-PSO	1	1.6	2.8	1.2	8.9	8.6	8.6	9.7	8.7	9	5.7	EDA-PSO [5]
full NEWUOA	1	1.4	11	7	20	20	62	<i>59e-3/6e3</i>	.	.	.	full NEWUOA [23]
GLOBAL	1	1	1.8	1.7	3.3	3.3	<i>64e-3/1e3</i>	GLOBAL [20]
iAMaLGaM IDEA	1	1.3	1.7	1.9	6.6	6.6	7.8	7.5	6.3	6	3.8	iAMaLGaM IDEA [4]
MA-LS-Chain	1	1.4	1.7	2.1	3.6	3.6	3.1	2.7	2.4	2.7	3	MA-LS-Chain [19]
MCS (Neum)	1	1	1.4	1	23	23	240	<i>18e-3/3e4</i>	.	.	.	MCS (Neum) [16]
NEWUOA	1	1.7	9.7	16	30	30	54	<i>99e-3/5e3</i>	.	.	.	NEWUOA [23]
(1+1)-ES	1.1	40	21	3.5	7.2	7.2	16	65	570	2100	<i>29e-6/1e6</i>	(1+1)-ES [1]
PSO	1	1.1	2.2	3.5	11	7	7	5.6	4.8	4.8	3.1	PSO [6]
PSO_Bounds	1	1.1	1.7	1.3	3.6	3.6	6.1	6.9	6.2	7.8	6.5	PSO_Bounds [7]
Monte Carlo	1	1	2.4	2.9	58	58	1400	<i>79e-4/1e6</i>	.	.	.	Monte Carlo [3]
IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES	1	2.3	3.9	15	5	5	2.4	2.5	2	1.6	1.2	IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES [21]
SNOBFIT	1	1.3	1.8	2.5	3.2	3.1	3.1	6.1	<i>75e-4/3e3</i>	.	.	SNOBFIT [17]
VNS (Garcia)	1	1	2.2	27	15	15	6.9	6.1	6.9	16	59	VNS (Garcia) [10]

Table 23: 02-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{best} 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

	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	0.5	0.5	1.57	106	3190	12400	19400	28300	5e4	1.09e5	ERT_{best}/D
ALPS	ALPS [15]	1	1.1	1.6	1.2	1	1.6	7.6	40	340	<i>29e-6/2e6</i>	ALPS [15]
AMaLGaM IDEA	AMaLGaM IDEA [4]	1	1.3	1.7	22	6	13	50	240	<i>98e-5/1e6</i>	.	AMaLGaM IDEA [4]
avg NEWUOA	avg NEWUOA [23]	1	9.5	66	24	28	<i>46e-2/6e3</i>	avg NEWUOA [23]
BayEDAeG	BayEDAeG [9]	1	1.5	2.6	23	<i>10e-1/2e3</i>	BayEDAeG [9]
BFGS	BFGS [22]	1	1	6.4	7.1	<i>53e-2/800</i>	BFGS [22]
BIPOP-CMA-ES	BIPOP-CMA-ES [14]	1	1.1	52	5.2	1.2	1	1	1	1	1	BIPOP-CMA-ES [14]
(1+1)-CMA-ES	(1+1)-CMA-ES [2]	1	1.9	20	7.7	9.9	5.8	<i>16e-2/1e4</i>	.	.	.	(1+1)-CMA-ES [2]
DASA	DASA [18]	1	4.1	130	77	52	<i>40e-3/6e5</i>	DASA [18]
DEPSO	DEPSO [11]	1	1.2	1.7	2.7	2.1	<i>19e-2/2e3</i>	DEPSO [11]
EDA-PSO	EDA-PSO [5]	1	1.1	1.6	1.4	1.2	6.5	<i>81e-4/1e5</i>	.	.	.	EDA-PSO [5]
full NEWUOA	full NEWUOA [23]	1.1	11	73	27	31	<i>36e-2/7e3</i>	full NEWUOA [23]
GLOBAL	GLOBAL [20]	1	1.4	1.7	1.3	1.4	<i>16e-2/2e3</i>	GLOBAL [20]
iAMaLGaM IDEA	iAMaLGaM IDEA [4]	1.1	1.4	2.1	57	7.6	25	130	520	300	<i>11e-4/1e6</i>	iAMaLGaM IDEA [4]
MA-LS-Chain	MA-LS-Chain [19]	1	1.3	2.3	1.2	1.2	12	<i>32e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	.	MA-LS-Chain [19]
MCS (Neum)	MCS (Neum) [16]	1	1	1	1.8	8.7	<i>58e-3/3e4</i>	MCS (Neum) [16]
NEWUOA	NEWUOA [23]	1	1	56	32	28	<i>44e-2/6e3</i>	NEWUOA [23]
(1+1)-ES	(1+1)-ES [1]	1	2.5	66	8.7	4.9	38	350	<i>57e-4/1e6</i>	.	.	(1+1)-ES [1]
PSO	PSO [6]	1.1	1.1	2.4	3.2	3.9	7	36	51	<i>58e-4/1e5</i>	.	PSO [6]
PSO_Bounds	PSO_Bounds [7]	1.1	1.3	2.3	1.2	5.9	6.1	36	26	<i>47e-4/1e5</i>	.	PSO_Bounds [7]
Monte Carlo	Monte Carlo [3]	1	1.2	1.8	1	5.3	160	<i>12e-3/1e6</i>	.	.	.	Monte Carlo [3]
IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES	IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES [21]	1	1.3	7.4	23	4.7	<i>92e-3/1e4</i>	IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES [21]
SNOBFIT	SNOBFIT [17]	1	1.4	1.2	3	2.6	2.9	1.9	21e-2/3e3	.	.	SNOBFIT [17]
VNS (Garcia)	VNS (Garcia) [10]	1	1	2.1	46	5.1	5.7	45	930	<i>21e-5/1e7</i>	.	VNS (Garcia) [10]

Table 24: 02-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{best} 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

	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
ALPS		0.5	1.4	1.5	2.5	5.8	170	3900	<i>10e-4/2e6</i>	2800	4510	ALPS [15]
AMaLGaM IDEA		1	1.1	1.4	1.1	8.3	12	23	28	44	450	AMaLGaM IDEA [4]
avg NEWUOA		1	1.7	1.2	9.3	22	61	<i>98e-3/5e3</i>	.	.	.	avg NEWUOA [23]
BayEDA _{cG}		1	1.3	1.6	3.3	2.8	2.9	9.4	<i>15e-4/2e3</i>	.	.	BayEDA _{cG} [9]
BFGS		1	1.7	4.8	7.8	<i>53e-2/4e3</i>	BFGS [22]
BIPOP-CMA-ES		1	1.4	3.3	3	1	1	1	1.1	1.5	3.1	BIPOP-CMA-ES [14]
(1+1)-CMA-ES		1	2.7	1.9	4.9	5.7	88	140	<i>17e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	(1+1)-CMA-ES [2]
DASA		1.6	6	110	170	770	<i>32e-3/6e5</i>	DASA [18]
DEPSO		1	1.1	1.4	4	4.2	8.9	<i>79e-4/2e3</i>	.	.	.	DEPSO [11]
EDA-PSO		1	1.1	1	2	9.2	1300	<i>18e-3/1e5</i>	.	.	.	EDA-PSO [5]
full NEWUOA		1	1.8	2.5	5.4	9.1	49	<i>17e-3/5e3</i>	.	.	.	full NEWUOA [23]
GLOBAL		1	1	1.2	2.8	6.7	24	<i>98e-3/1e3</i>	.	.	.	GLOBAL [20]
iAMaLGaM IDEA		1.1	1.3	1.9	5.6	9.5	23	30	41	110	670	iAMaLGaM IDEA [4]
MA-LS-Chain		1	1.3	2	2.1	2.6	42	140	<i>14e-3/1e4</i>	.	.	MA-LS-Chain [19]
MCS (Neum)		1	1	1	1	95	<i>68e-3/3e4</i>	MCS (Neum) [16]
NEWUOA		1	2.2	5.6	6.5	14	46	<i>33e-3/5e3</i>	.	.	.	NEWUOA [23]
(1+1)-ES		1.1	1.6	10	5.6	6	36	2e3	<i>10e-4/1e6</i>	.	.	(1+1)-ES [1]
PSO		1	1.3	1.3	1.8	13	560	470	<i>13e-3/1e5</i>	.	.	PSO [6]
PSO_Bounds		1	1.3	1.4	1.8	110	430	<i>14e-3/1e5</i>	.	.	.	PSO_Bounds [7]
Monte Carlo		1	1.1	1.4	5.9	84	2900	1.5e4	<i>78e-4/1e6</i>	.	.	Monte Carlo [3]
IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES		1	1.1	4.9	2.2	1.5	1.6	1.3	1	1	1	IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES [21]
SNOBFIT		1	1.3	2.1	3.5	8.2	110	<i>32e-3/3e3</i>	.	.	.	SNOBFIT [17]
VNS (Garcia)		1	1	1.9	26	13	22	21	30	220	340	VNS (Garcia) [10]

Table 25: 02-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{best} 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	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	74.3	575	1230	1930	3780	ERT_{best}/D
ALPS	1	1	1	4.3	77	3.6	1.5	1.3	1.6	1.6	ALPS [15]
AMaLGaM IDEA	1	1	1.1	3.3	38	1	13	7.7	5.5	2.9	AMaLGaM IDEA [4]
avg NEWUOA	1	1	2.3	6.9	46	1.8	2.7	2.4	2.3	6.2	avg NEWUOA [23]
BayEDA-cG	1	1	1.3	5.5	32	1.5	1	2	3.4	<i>49e-6/2e3</i>	BayEDA-cG [9]
BFGS	1	1	11	87	730	40	49	46	<i>59e-4/4e3</i>	.	BFGS [22]
BIPOP-CMA-ES	1	1	1.1	5.1	34	1.9	3	2.2	1.9	1.3	BIPOP-CMA-ES [14]
(1+1)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	3.5	84	4	4.4	2.9	4	3.2	(1+1)-CMA-ES [2]
DASA	1	1	3.9	280	2400	64	91	89	120	220	DASA [18]
DEPSO	1	1	1.6	5.6	120	2.5	1.7	1	1	1	DEPSO [11]
EDA-PSO	1	1	1.2	3.9	52	1.4	1.9	1.9	2.4	2.1	EDA-PSO [5]
full NEWUOA	1	1	1.8	7.3	66	2.5	3.5	2.8	2.7	12	full NEWUOA [23]
GLOBAL	1	1	1.1	4.7	56	2.3	1.4	1	1.5	1.4	GLOBAL [20]
iAMaLGaM IDEA	1	1	1.2	4.7	500	1.3	20	11	7.2	4.2	iAMaLGaM IDEA [4]
MA-LS-Chain	1	1	1.2	5.6	44	2	4	2.3	2.1	1.9	MA-LS-Chain [19]
MCS (Neum)	1	1	1	1	1	1.2	8	10	13	15	MCS (Neum) [16]
NEWUOA	1	1	2	6.1	77	1.4	2.6	2.1	2.6	10	NEWUOA [23]
(1+1)-ES	1	1	3	22	130	5.5	4.2	3.7	3	6.5	(1+1)-ES [1]
PSO	1	1	1.1	5.1	43	2.2	7.4	5.8	6.1	3.5	PSO [6]
PSO-Bounds	1	1	1.3	4	32	1.6	2.5	2.5	1.8	2.2	PSO-Bounds [7]
Monte Carlo	1	1	1.1	4.1	53	3.2	4.4	6.5	12	160	Monte Carlo [3]
IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES	1	1	1	2.7	200	4.3	5.4	3.6	3.3	2.4	IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES [21]
SNOBFIT	1	1	1.2	4.9	31	4.2	4.3	2.9	2.4	1.6	SNOBFIT [17]
VNS (Garcia)	1	1	1.2	2.2	44	1.7	9.3	5.9	4	2.4	VNS (Garcia) [10]

Table 26: 02-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{best} 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

	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
ALPS	0.5	1	1	1	4.6	47	1.3	1.6	1.2	2	1.4	ALPS [15]
AMaLGaM IDEA	1	1	1	1.1	5	41	8.3	10	7.1	9.1	5.3	AMaLGaM IDEA [4]
avg NEWUOA	1	1	26	95	670	15	11	11	7.8	<i>18e-4/6e3</i>	.	avg NEWUOA [23]
BayEDAeG	1	1	1.1	3.6	340	37	7.6	7.6	8.2	5.1	<i>26e-3/2e3</i>	BayEDAeG [9]
BFGS	1	1	2	17	170	7.7	7.7	<i>95e-4/900</i>	.	.	.	BFGS [22]
BIPOP-CMA-ES	1	1	1	1	4.8	42	1.4	1.5	2	2.6	2.5	BIPOP-CMA-ES [14]
(1+1)-CMA-ES	1	1	1.1	2.8	230	1.9	1.9	3.9	7.4	6.2	<i>27e-5/1e4</i>	(1+1)-CMA-ES [2]
DASA	1	1	3.7	420	3400	50	59	60	60	68	79	DASA [18]
DEPSO	1	1	1.2	4.7	64	3.6	3.3	3.3	4.2	2.6	1.6	DEPSO [11]
EDA-PSO	1	1	1.2	3.5	33	1.2	1.2	1.5	2.2	2.8	3.2	EDA-PSO [5]
full NEWUOA	1	1	19	130	560	8.9	17	17	<i>27e-4/7e3</i>	.	.	full NEWUOA [23]
GLOBAL	1	1	1.1	3.7	57	1.7	2.4	2.4	1.3	1.5	<i>17e-4/2e3</i>	GLOBAL [20]
iAMaLGaM IDEA	1	1	1.1	4.7	960	20	9.8	10	10	14	8.4	iAMaLGaM IDEA [4]
MA-LS-Chain	1	1	1.3	6.3	53	1.3	1	1	1	1	1	MA-LS-Chain [19]
MCS (Neum)	1	1	1	1	1	1.6	1.6	3.4	4.3	7.1	<i>19e-6/3e4</i>	MCS (Neum) [16]
NEWUOA	1	1	2.1	200	600	15	52	52	<i>32e-4/6e3</i>	.	.	NEWUOA [23]
(1+1)-ES	1	1	2.1	39	230	2.5	4.7	4.7	6.8	8.3	8	(1+1)-ES [1]
PSO	1	1	1.3	5.2	57	1.2	1.2	1.1	7.8	6.9	4.2	PSO [6]
PSO_Bounds	1	1	1.1	6.7	51	1	1	4.6	4.4	4.1	2.6	PSO_Bounds [7]
Monte Carlo	1	1	1	2.9	31	1.8	1.8	1.6	2.4	4.2	13	Monte Carlo [3]
IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES	1	1	1.1	18	590	7.8	7.4	7.4	6.6	5	8.2	IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES [21]
SNOBFIT	1	1	1.3	6.9	56	5.9	10	10	5	3.1	2	SNOBFIT [17]
VNS (Garcia)	1	1	1.2	2.2	67	17	7	7	6.4	5.4	5.4	VNS (Garcia) [10]

Table 27: 02-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{best} 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	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	93	593	2010	3390	3640	ERT _{best} /D
ALPS [15]		1	1	1.1	6.3	43	2	3.7	4	7.1	90	ALPS [15]
AMaLGaM IDEA		1	1	1.3	4.7	28	11	16	8.4	9.6	17	AMaLGaM IDEA [4]
avg NEWUOA		1	1	1.3	7.2	72	1.6	3.5	1.8	2.5	<i>16e-6/5e3</i>	avg NEWUOA [23]
BayEDAeG		1	1	1.1	6.1	50	1	1	1	4.1	<i>62e-6/2e3</i>	BayEDAeG [9]
BFGS		1	1	5.2	54	580	15	45	27	<i>16e-4/4e3</i>	.	BFGS [22]
BIPOP-CMA-ES		1	1	1.1	5.3	32	1.9	2.8	2	1.7	2.2	BIPOP-CMA-ES [14]
(1+1)-CMA-ES		1	1	1.1	6.5	140	5.1	12	8.4	14	<i>25e-5/1e4</i>	(1+1)-CMA-ES [2]
DASA		1	1	1.4	170	2200	86	210	130	440	2400	DASA [18]
DEPSO		1	1	1.3	3.1	27	1.7	1.6	2.1	2	4	DEPSO [11]
EDA-PSO		1	1	1.3	3.7	40	2.1	6.4	7.9	12	120	EDA-PSO [5]
full NEWUOA		1	1	1.4	13	84	2	5.3	3.7	7.2	22	full NEWUOA [23]
GLOBAL		1	1	1.3	5.7	66	2.4	7.7	<i>16e-4/2e3</i>	.	.	GLOBAL [20]
iAMaLGaM IDEA		1	1	1.1	2.8	27	7.9	10	11	13	38	iAMaLGaM IDEA [4]
MA-LS-Chain		1	1	1.1	7.3	44	1.3	3.3	1.9	3.2	20	MA-LS-Chain [19]
MCS (Neum)		1	1	1	1	1	3.2	5.6	5.8	6.4	<i>42e-7/3e4</i>	MCS (Neum) [16]
NEWUOA		1	1	2.1	6.2	95	1.8	4.9	3.8	2.8	9	NEWUOA [23]
(1+1)-ES		1	1	1.9	6.3	64	2.2	7.1	5.4	8.4	88	(1+1)-ES [1]
PSO		1	1	1.4	4.3	35	2.2	30	19	16	86	PSO [6]
PSO_Bounds		1	1	1	7.5	44	1.4	89	47	37	130	PSO_Bounds [7]
Monte Carlo		1	1	1.1	4.4	56	2.7	6.1	4.9	11	110	Monte Carlo [3]
IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES		1	1	1.1	4.9	47	2.8	3.7	1.6	1	1	IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES [21]
SNOBFIT		1	1	1	4.7	36	3.8	11	5.5	11	10	SNOBFIT [17]
VNS (Garcia)		1	1	1.2	2.2	48	7.5	26	12	8	12	VNS (Garcia) [10]

Table 28: 02-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{best} 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

	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	0.5	0.5	0.9	20.7	67.2	157	194	205	297	310	ERT_{best}/D
ALPS	1	1	1	1.3	2.2	2.2	2.3	2.7	4.9	4.5	6.2	ALPS [15]
AMaLGaM IDEA	1	1	1	1	47	32	14	12	13	9	9.9	AMaLGaM IDEA [4]
avg NEWUOA	1	1	2.9	21	9.3	7.9	7.4	7.4	8.7	9.7	32	avg NEWUOA [23]
BayEDAeG	1	1	1	1.1	4.8	3.4	5.2	11	14	18	45	BayEDAeG [9]
BFGS	1	1	1	12	65	59	60	270	<i>20e-3/4e3</i>	.	.	BFGS [22]
BIPOP-CMA-ES	1	1	1	1.3	7.8	8.4	5.1	7.9	7.7	5.4	5.5	BIPOP-CMA-ES [14]
(1+1)-CMA-ES	1	1	1	1.9	16	6.7	3	2.5	2.6	1.8	2	(1+1)-CMA-ES [2]
DASA	1	1	1	50	170	140	72	75	100	180	400	DASA [18]
DEPSO	1	1	1	1	3.9	4.4	2.4	2.2	2.4	1.9	2.4	DEPSO [11]
EDA-PSO	1	1	1	1.1	3.5	2.2	1.7	2.6	4.9	4.6	5.8	EDA-PSO [5]
full NEWUOA	1	1	1	3.1	21	13	10	10	13	11	15	full NEWUOA [23]
GLOBAL	1	1	1	1.5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	GLOBAL [20]
iAMaLGaM IDEA	1	1	1	1	110	79	41	33	32	22	21	iAMaLGaM IDEA [4]
MA-LS-Chain	1	1	1	1.7	1.5	2.1	1.8	3.2	3.7	3	3.2	MA-LS-Chain [19]
MCS (Neum)	1	1	1	1.4	2.1	1.9	1.1	1.1	1.9	8.8	82	MCS (Neum) [16]
NEWUOA	1	1	1	1.9	17	9.5	9.8	9.8	16	14	20	NEWUOA [23]
(1+1)-ES	1	1	1	1.8	11	7.5	3.7	3.7	3.5	2.7	3.4	(1+1)-ES [1]
PSO	1	1	1	1.5	2.4	1.6	1.2	1.2	1.5	1.5	2.3	PSO [6]
PSO_Bounds	1	1	1	1.3	1.9	110	46	38	38	28	29	PSO_Bounds [7]
Monte Carlo	1	1	1	1.1	1.4	1.8	3.2	8.8	24	31	540	Monte Carlo [3]
IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES	1	1	1	1	28	41	21	17	18	14	14	IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES [21]
SNOBFIT	1	1	1	1.9	4.7	3.3	3	2.8	4.4	3.6	5.6	SNOBFIT [17]
VNS (Garcia)	1	1	1	1	73	59	29	25	24	17	16	VNS (Garcia) [10]

Table 29: 02-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{best} 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

	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
ALPS [15]		1	1	1.1	1.1	1.5	1.9	1.4	1.5	1.2	1.2	ALPS [15]
AMaLGA μ IDEA		1	1	1.4	57	48	41	14	14	9.8	6.1	AMaLGA μ IDEA [4]
avg NEWUOA		1	1	52	25	31	27	9.4	25	29	16	avg NEWUOA [23]
BayEDA μ G		1	1	1.3	5.9	21	21	30	17	<i>16e-2/2e3</i>	.	BayEDA μ G [9]
BFGS		1	1	8	5.2	5.4	15	13	<i>39e-3/800</i>	.	.	BFGS [22]
BIPOP-CMA-ES		1	1	1.8	12	5.4	4.4	3.1	3.5	2.5	1.7	BIPOP-CMA-ES [14]
(1+1)-CMA-ES		1	1	1.2	10	7.2	7.7	3.1	2.4	2.4	6.3	(1+1)-CMA-ES [2]
DASA		1	1	18	87	120	80	36	40	48	130	DASA [18]
DEPSO		1	1	1.3	3.8	4.1	3.3	2.6	5.5	<i>93e-5/2e3</i>	.	DEPSO [11]
EDA-PSO		1	1	1.2	1.8	1	1	1	1.4	1.2	1	EDA-PSO [5]
full NEWUOA		1	1	32	38	18	59	22	18	32	<i>14e-3/7e3</i>	full NEWUOA [23]
GLOBAL		1	1	1.5	1	1.2	2	1.2	1.1	1	5.1	GLOBAL [20]
iAMaLGA μ IDEA		1	1	1.1	56	30	31	11	12	9.3	5.8	iAMaLGA μ IDEA [4]
MA-LS-Chain		1	1	1.2	1	1.2	1.9	1.9	1.8	1.5	1.7	MA-LS-Chain [19]
MCS (Neum)		1	1	1.6	3.2	2.1	2.9	2.1	4.8	7.7	<i>27e-7/3e4</i>	MCS (Neum) [16]
NEWUOA		1	1	24	23	21	26	19	25	31	<i>37e-4/6e3</i>	NEWUOA [23]
(1+1)-ES		1	1	1.4	7.3	6.1	7.9	3	2.6	3.8	6.1	(1+1)-ES [1]
PSO		1	1	1.4	220	140	62	29	28	15	11	PSO [6]
PSO_Bounds		1	1	1.6	1.2	66	140	53	32	18	10	PSO_Bounds [7]
Monte Carlo		1	1	1.1	1	1	1.3	1.6	2.6	3.5	21	Monte Carlo [3]
IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES		1	1	2.7	20	37	35	11	11	5.8	3.3	IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES [21]
SNOBFFT		1	1	1.3	3.6	2.7	1.9	1.3	1	1	1.6	SNOBFFT [17]
VNS (Garcia)		1	1	1	17	48	23	11	6.7	4.7	3	VNS (Garcia) [10]

Table 30: 02-D, running time excess ERT/ERT_{best} on $f_{1.30}$, 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	0.5	0.5	0.767	22.6	99.2	248	399	824	886	2220	ERT_{best}/D
ALPS		1	1	1.7	1	1	1.5	1.5	1.3	4.1	15	ALPS [15]
AMaLGaM IDEA		1	1	1.2	45	39	16	17	17	20	8.1	AMaLGaM IDEA [4]
avg NEWUOA		1	1	3.2	8.2	3.7	2.6	3.6	3.9	7.5	6.9	avg NEWUOA [23]
BayEDAacG		1	1	1.3	2.9	9	11	9.7	7.9	10	13	BayEDAacG [9]
BFGS		1	1	1.3	22	15	14	12	12	20	25	BFGS [22]
BIPOP-CMA-ES		1	1	1.4	24	21	10	6.5	3.2	3	1.2	BIPOP-CMA-ES [14]
(1+1)-CMA-ES		1	1	1.6	11	4.3	1.8	3.1	3.1	4	4.7	(1+1)-CMA-ES [2]
DASA		1	1	60	85	88	67	63	120	320	700	DASA [18]
DEPSO		1	1	2	2.3	2.6	1.8	1.8	1.2	2.5	2.3	DEPSO [11]
EDA-PSO		1	1	1.6	2	2.5	6.2	7.3	15	21	140	EDA-PSO [5]
full NEWUOA		1	1	2.3	10	5	3.1	3.9	2.1	3.8	6.2	full NEWUOA [23]
GLOBAL		1	1	1.3	2.3	1.4	1.5	1.4	1	1	1.1	GLOBAL [20]
iAMaLGaM IDEA		1	1	1.5	86	72	38	27	22	21	13	iAMaLGaM IDEA [4]
MA-LS-Chain		1	1	1.5	2.4	1.6	2.1	2.2	1.7	2.1	1	MA-LS-Chain [19]
MCS (Neum)		1	1	1.7	2.2	1.1	1	1	4.3	17	50	MCS (Neum) [16]
NEWUOA		1	1	2.8	9.8	5.4	3.7	3.8	3.6	4.7	6.6	NEWUOA [23]
(1+1)-ES		1	1	2.2	6.8	4.1	2.4	2.5	3.1	3.9	6	(1+1)-ES [1]
PSO		1	1	1.7	330	110	110	150	110	110	70	PSO [6]
PSO_Bounds		1	1	1.7	2	160	200	170	110	130	83	PSO_Bounds [7]
Monte Carlo		1	1	1.3	1.6	1.5	2.1	4.1	4	15	38	Monte Carlo [3]
IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES		1	1	1	7.8	14	7.9	5.9	2.9	2.8	1.1	IPOP-SEP-CMA-ES [21]
SNOBFIT		1	1	1	2.4	1.4	1.1	2	2.1	8.1	7.4	SNOBFIT [17]
VNS (Garcia)		1	1	1.2	160	60	34	24	14	17	11	VNS (Garcia) [10]

References

- [1] Anne Auger. Benchmarking the (1+1)-ES with one-fifth success rule on the BBOB-2009 noisy testbed. In Rothlauf [24], pages 2453–2458.
- [2] Anne Auger and Nikolaus Hansen. Benchmarking the (1+1)-CMA-ES on the BBOB-2009 noisy testbed. In Rothlauf [24], pages 2467–2472.
- [3] Anne Auger and Raymond Ros. Benchmarking the pure random search on the BBOB-2009 noisy testbed. In Rothlauf [24], pages 2485–2490.
- [4] Peter A. N. Bosman, Jörn Grahl, and Dirk Thierens. AMaLGaM IDEAs in noisy black-box optimization benchmarking. In Rothlauf [24], pages 2351–2358.
- [5] Mohammed El-Abd and Mohamed S. Kamel. Black-box optimization benchmarking for noiseless function testbed using an EDA and PSO hybrid. In Rothlauf [24], pages 2263–2268.
- [6] Mohammed El-Abd and Mohamed S. Kamel. Black-box optimization benchmarking for noiseless function testbed using particle swarm optimization. In Rothlauf [24], pages 2269–2274.
- [7] Mohammed El-Abd and Mohamed S. Kamel. Black-box optimization benchmarking for noiseless function testbed using PSO_Bounds. In Rothlauf [24], pages 2275–2280.
- [8] S. Finck, N. Hansen, R. Ros, and A. Auger. Real-parameter black-box optimization benchmarking 2009: Presentation of the noisy functions. Technical Report 2009/21, Research Center PPE, 2009.
- [9] Marcus R. Gallagher. Black-box optimization benchmarking: results for the BayEDAcG algorithm on the noisy function testbed. In Rothlauf [24], pages 2383–2388.
- [10] Carlos García-Martínez and Manuel Lozano. A continuous variable neighbourhood search based on specialised EAs: application to the noisy BBO-benchmark 2009 testbed. In Rothlauf [24], pages 2367–2374.
- [11] José García-Nieto, Enrique Alba, and Javier Apolloni. Particle swarm hybridized with differential evolution: black box optimization benchmarking for noisy functions. In Rothlauf [24], pages 2343–2350.
- [12] N. Hansen, A. Auger, S. Finck, and R. Ros. Real-parameter black-box optimization benchmarking 2009: Experimental setup. Technical Report RR-6828, INRIA, 2009.
- [13] 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.
- [14] Nikolaus Hansen. Benchmarking a bi-population CMA-ES on the BBOB-2009 noisy testbed. In Rothlauf [24], pages 2397–2402.

- [15] Gregory S. Hornby. The Age-Layered Population Structure (ALPS) evolutionary algorithm, July 2009. Noisy testbed.
- [16] Waltraud Huyer and Arnold Neumaier. Benchmarking of MCS on the noisy function testbed. <http://www.mat.univie.ac.at/~neum/papers.html>, 2009. P. 988.
- [17] Waltraud Huyer and Arnold Neumaier. Benchmarking of SNOBFIT on the noisy function testbed. <http://www.mat.univie.ac.at/~neum/papers.html>, 2009. P. 987.
- [18] Peter Korosec and Jurij Silc. A stigmergy-based algorithm for black-box optimization: noisy function testbed. In Rothlauf [24], pages 2375–2382.
- [19] Daniel Molina, Manuel Lozano, and Francisco Herrera. A memetic algorithm using local search chaining for black-box optimization benchmarking 2009 for noisy functions. In Rothlauf [24], pages 2359–2366.
- [20] László Pál, Tibor Csendes, Mihály Csaba Markót, and Arnold Neumaier. BBO-benchmarking of the GLOBAL method for the noisy function testbed. <http://www.mat.univie.ac.at/~neum/papers.html>, 2009. P. 985.
- [21] Raymond Ros. Benchmarking sep-CMA-ES on the BBOB-2009 noisy testbed. In Rothlauf [24], pages 2441–2446.
- [22] Raymond Ros. Benchmarking the BFGS algorithm on the BBOB-2009 noisy testbed. In Rothlauf [24], pages 2415–2420.
- [23] Raymond Ros. Benchmarking the NEWUOA on the BBOB-2009 noisy testbed. In Rothlauf [24], pages 2429–2434.
- [24] Franz Rothlauf, editor. *Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference, GECCO 2009, Proceedings, Montreal, Québec, Canada, July 8-12, 2009, Companion Material*. ACM, 2009.