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ABSTRACT
Derandomization by means of mirrored samples has been recently introduced to enhance the performances of (1,λ)-Evolution-Strategies (ESs) with the aim of designing fast and robust stochastic local search algorithms. This paper compares on the BBOB-2010 noiseless benchmark testbed two variants of the (1,4)-CMA-ES where the mirrored samples are used. Independent restarts are conducted up to a total budget of $10^4D$ function evaluations, where $D$ is the dimension of the search space.

The results show that the improved variants are significantly faster than the baseline (1,4)-CMA-ES on 4 functions in 20D (respectively 7 when using sequential selection in addition) by a factor of up to 3 (on the attractive second target function value in 5D and 20D).

Categories and Subject Descriptors
G.1.6 [Numerical Analysis]: Optimization—global optimization, unconstrained optimization; F.2.1 [Analysis of Algorithms and Problem Complexity]: Numerical Algorithms and Problems

General Terms
Algorithms

1. INTRODUCTION
Evolution Strategies (ESs) are robust stochastic search algorithms for numerical optimization where the function to be minimized, $f$, maps the continuous search space $\mathbb{R}^D$ into $\mathbb{R}$ where $D$ is the dimension of the search space. Recently, a new derandomization technique replacing the independent sampling of new solutions by mirrored sampling has been introduced to enhance the performances of ESs [1]. In this paper, we assess quantitatively the improvements that can be brought when using mirrored samples instead of independent ones. To do so, we compare on the BBOB-2010 noiseless testbed the (1,4)-CMA-ES that in addition to the dependent sampling of new solutions by mirrored sampling was recently introduced to enhance the performances of ESs [1]. In this paper, we assess quantitatively the improvements that can be brought when using mirrored samples instead of independent ones. To do so, we compare on the BBOB-2010 noiseless testbed the (1,4)-CMA-ES that in addition to the dependent sampling of new solutions by mirrored sampling was recently introduced to enhance the performances of ESs [1].
Covariance matrix and step-size are updated using the selected steps [9, 1].

**Independent Restarts.**

Similar to [3], we independently restarted all algorithms as long as function evaluations were left, where maximally $10^3 \cdot D$ function evaluations have been used.

**Parameter setting.**

We used the default parameter and termination settings (cf. [1, 5, 8]) found in the source code on the WWW\(^1\) with two exceptions. We rectified the learning rate of the random update of the covariance matrix for small values of $\lambda$, setting $c_1 = \min(2, \lambda/3)/((D + 1.3)^2 + \mu_{\text{eff}})$. The original value was not designed to work for $\lambda < 5$. We modified the damping parameter for the step-size to $d_0 = 0.3 + 2\mu_{\text{eff}}/\lambda + c_{\alpha}$. The setting was found by performing experiments on the sphere function, $f_1$: $d_0$ was set as large as possible while still showing close to optimal performance, but, at least as large such that decreasing it by a factor of two did not lead to unacceptable performance. For $\mu_{\text{eff}}/\lambda = 0.35$ and $\mu_{\text{eff}} \leq D + 2$ the former setting of $d_0$ is recovered. For a smaller ratio of $\mu_{\text{eff}}/\lambda$ or for $\mu_{\text{eff}} > D + 2$, the new setting allows larger (i.e. faster) changes of $\sigma$. Here, $\mu_{\text{eff}} = 1$. For $\lambda \geq 3$, the new setting might be harmful in a noisy or too rugged landscape. Finally, the step-size multiplier was clamped from above at $1$, while we do not believe this had any effect in the presented experiments. Each initial solution $X_0$ was uniformly sampled in $[-4, 4]^D$ and the step-size $c_\alpha$ was initialized to 2. The source code used for the experiments is available at\(^2\).

As the same parameter setting has been used for all test functions, the crafting effort $\text{CrE}$ of all algorithms is 0.

### 3. CPU TIMING EXPERIMENTS

For the timing experiment, all three algorithms were run on $f_8$ with a maximum of $10^4 D$ function evaluations and restarted until at least 30 seconds have passed (according to Figure 2 in [6]). The experiments have been conducted with an 8 core Intel Xeon E5520 machine with 2.27 GHz under Ubuntu 9.1 Linux and Matlab R2008a. The time per function evaluation was 3.3; 3.3; 3.0; 3.1; 3.4; 4.0 times $10^{-4}$ seconds for (1,4)-CMA-ES, 3.1; 3.0; 3.2; 3.4; 4.0 times $10^{-4}$ seconds for (1,4\(_m\))-CMA-ES, and 7.1; 7.3; 7.7; 8.1; 7.1; 8.1 times $10^{-4}$ seconds for (1,4\(_m\))-CMA-ES in dimensions 2; 3; 5; 10; 20; 40 respectively. Note that MATLAB distributes the computations over all 8 cores only for 20D and 40D.

### 4. RESULTS

In this section, experiments according to [6] on the benchmark functions given in [4, 7] are presented. The **expected running time (ERT)**, used in the figures and table, depends on a given target function value, $f_1 = f_{\text{opt}} + \Delta f_1$, and is computed over all relevant trials as the number of function evaluations executed during each trial while the best function value did not reach $f_1$, summed over all trials and divided by the number of trials that actually reached $f_1$ [6, 11].

**Statistical significance** is tested with the rank-sum test for a given target $\Delta f_1$ using, for each trial, either the number of needed function evaluations to reach $\Delta f_1$ (inverted and multiplied by $-1$), or, if the target was not reached, the best $\Delta f$-value achieved, measured only up to the smallest number of overall function evaluations for any unsuccessful trial under consideration.

#### 4.1 Comparing (1,4\(_m\))-CMA-ES

The (1,4\(_m\))-CMA-ES is compared with the (1,4)-CMA-ES in Figures 1 and 2 and in Table 1. Mirroring within the (1,4\(_m\))-CMA-ES seems to have an important positive impact compared to the baseline (1,4)-CMA-ES. In 20D, we observe a slight worsening only on the Gallagher functions $f_{21}$ and $f_{22}$ which are not statistically significant. On the other hand, the (1,4\(_m\))-CMA-ES outperforms the (1,4)-CMA-ES on 10 functions of which 4 show statistically significant differences (in 20D and for a target of $10^{-7}$): on the sphere function ($f_1$), the expected running time is 15% lower, on the separable ellipsoid ($f_2$) it is 18% lower, on the non-separable ellipsoid ($f_{10}$) 19% lower and on the attractive sector function ($f_6$) the expected running times even differ by a factor of about 3. These differences are less significant in 5D (Table 1), but Fig. 1 shows similar improvements also for 10D and smaller dimensions.

#### 4.2 Comparing (1,4\(_m\))-CMA-ES

Results comparing the (1,4\(_m\))-CMA-ES and the (1,4\(_m\))-CMA-ES are presented in Figures 3 and 4 and in Table 2. The results show that the (1,4\(_m\))-CMA-ES is statistically significantly better than the (1,4\(_m\))-CMA-ES on five functions in 20D with expected running times that are about 26% smaller on $f_1$ and $f_2$, 25% smaller on $f_{10}$, 20% smaller on $f_{11}$, and about 20% smaller on $f_{14}$ than the ones for the (1,4\(_m\))-CMA-ES. Contrary, there are only two functions where the (1,4\(_m\))-CMA-ES is worse than the (1,4\(_m\))-CMA-ES (13% on $f_6$ and about 70% on $f_{22}$) but these differences are not statistically significant. To conclude, the (1,4\(_m\))-CMA-ES should be clearly preferred over the (1,4\(_m\))-CMA-ES on the BBOB-2010 testbed and, according to Sec. 4.1, also over the (1,4)-CMA-ES. Worth to mention is also the fact, that the (1,4\(_m\))-CMA-ES shows better performance than the best algorithm from the BBOB-2009 benchmarking on the attractive sector function ($f_6$) in 5D by about 30% and a slightly better performance on the ellipsoid ($f_{10}$) in 20D, see [2].

#### 4.3 Comparing (1,4\(_m\))-CMA-ES

Regarding this comparison, we refrain from showing the plots and tables due to space limitations. Not surprisingly when considering Sec. 4.2, the results show a statistically significant improvement for the (1,4\(_m\))-CMA-ES over the (1,4)-CMA-ES on 7 functions in 20D: $f_1$ (37% faster), $f_2$ (39% faster), $f_3$ (faster by a factor of about 2), $f_6$ (about 3 times faster), $f_{10}$ (39% faster), $f_{11}$ (25% faster), and $f_{14}$ (about 30% faster). Only on the Gallagher function with 21 peaks ($f_{22}$), an increase of the expected running time by a factor of about 2 can be observed which is, however, not statistically significant due to the low number of successful runs.

### 5. CONCLUSIONS

The idea behind derandomization by means of mirroring introduced in [1] is to use only one random sample from a multivariate normal distribution to create two (negatively correlated or mirrored) offspring. Thereby, one offspring is generated by adding a random sample to the parent solution

\(^1\)CMAES.m, version 3.41.beta, from http://www.lri.fr/~hansen/cmaes_inmatlab.html

\(^2\)http://coco.gforge.inria.fr/doku.php?id=bbob-2010-results
Figure 1: Expected running time (ERT in log10 of number of function evaluations) of (1,4ₙ)-CMA-ES versus (1,4)-CMA-ES for 46 target values $\Delta f \in [10^{-8}, 10]$ in each dimension for functions $f_1$–$f_{24}$. Markers on the upper or right edge indicate that the target value was never reached by (1,4ₙ)-CMA-ES or (1,4)-CMA-ES respectively. Markers represent dimension: 2:+, 3:▽, 5:⋆, 10:◦, 20:□.
Figure 2: Empirical cumulative distributions (ECDF) of run lengths and speed-up ratios in 5-D (left) and 20-D (right). Left sub-columns: ECDF of the number of function evaluations divided by dimension $D$ (FEvals/D) to reach a target value $f_{opt} + \Delta f$ with $\Delta f = 10^k$, where $k \in \{-1, -4, -8\}$ is given by the first value in the legend, for (1,4$_w$)-CMA-ES (solid) and (1,4)-CMA-ES (dashed). Light beige lines show the ECDF of FEvals for target value $\Delta f = 10^{-8}$ of algorithms benchmarked during BBOB-2009. Right sub-columns: ECDF of FEvals ratios of (1,4$_w$)-CMA-ES divided by (1,4)-CMA-ES, all trial pairs for each function. Pairs where both trials failed are disregarded, pairs where one trial failed are visible in the limits being $>0$ or $<1$. The legends indicate the number of functions that were solved in at least one trial ((1,4$_w$)-CMA-ES first).
Figure 3: Expected running time (ERT in log10 of number of function evaluations) of (1,4 time)-CMA-ES versus (1,4 mean)-CMA-ES for 46 target values $\Delta f \in [10^{-8}, 10]$ in each dimension for functions $f_1$–$f_{24}$. Markers on the upper or right edge indicate that the target value was never reached by (1,4 time)-CMA-ES or (1,4 mean)-CMA-ES respectively. Markers represent dimension: 2: ●, 3: ▽, 5: ⋆, 10: ◦, 20: □.
Table 1: Expected running time (ERT in number of function evaluations) divided by the best ERT measured during BBOB-2009 (given in the respective first row) for the algorithms (1,4)-CMA-ES and (1,4)-CMA-ES for different $\Delta f$ values for functions $f_1$–$f_{24}$. The median number of conducted function evaluations is additionally given in italics, if ERT($10^{-7}$) = $\infty$. 

and a second offspring then equals the solution which is symmetric to the first one with respect to the parent (by adding the negative sample to the parent). Here, this concept of mirroring has been integrated into two variants of a simple (1,4)-CMA-ES (of which the (1,4)-CMA-ES uses sequential selection [1] in addition and the (1,4)-CMA-ES does not) and compared on the noiseless BBOB-2010 testbed.

The results show that using mirroring gives an improvement of at least 15% on 4 functions (stat. significant in 20D and $10^{-7}$ as target). Combining mirroring with sequential selection is even better—showing further improvements over the (1,4)-CMA-ES by at least 20% on 5 functions.
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Figure 4: Empirical cumulative distributions of run lengths of \((1,4^c_\mu)\)-CMA-ES (solid) and \((1,4^c_\mu)\)-CMA-ES (dashed) and speed-up ratios of the former divided by the latter in 5-D (left) and 20-D (right) as in Fig. 2.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>f1</th>
<th>f2</th>
<th>f3</th>
<th>f4</th>
<th>f5</th>
<th>f6</th>
<th>f7</th>
<th>f8</th>
<th>f9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>f1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1e-30</td>
<td>1e-20</td>
<td>1e-10</td>
<td>1e-0</td>
<td>1e+0</td>
<td>1e+1</td>
<td>1e+2</td>
<td>1e+3</td>
<td>1e+4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Table 2: Expected running time (ERT in number of function evaluations) divided by the best ERT measured during BBOB-2009 as in Table 1 but now comparing (1,4q)-CMA-ES and (1,4q)-CMA-ES. | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| $\Delta f$ | $l=1$ | $l=10$ | $l=1$ | $l=3$ | $l=5$ | $l=7$ | $\text{Genres}$ | $\Delta f$ | $l=1$ | $l=10$ | $l=1$ | $l=3$ | $l=5$ | $l=7$ | $\text{Genres}$ |
| f1 | 1 | 43 | 43 | 43 | 43 | 43 | 0/15 | (1,4q)-CMA-ES | 6.2 | 11 | 15 | 24 | 32 | 42 | 5/15 |
| f2 | 2 | 6.2 | 10 | 19 | 27 | 37 | 5/15 | (1,4q)-CMA-ES | 4.7 | 2 | 5 | 11 | 14 | 20 | 35/15 |
| f3 | 3 | 2 | 6.2 | 10 | 19 | 27 | 5/15 | (1,4q)-CMA-ES | 4.7 | 2 | 5 | 11 | 14 | 20 | 35/15 |
| f4 | 4 | 8 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 9 | 5/15 | (1,4q)-CMA-ES | 4.7 | 2 | 5 | 11 | 14 | 20 | 35/15 |
| f5 | 5 | 2 | 6.2 | 10 | 19 | 27 | 5/15 | (1,4q)-CMA-ES | 4.7 | 2 | 5 | 11 | 14 | 20 | 35/15 |
| f6 | 6 | 2 | 6.2 | 10 | 19 | 27 | 5/15 | (1,4q)-CMA-ES | 4.7 | 2 | 5 | 11 | 14 | 20 | 35/15 |
| f7 | 7 | 2 | 6.2 | 10 | 19 | 27 | 5/15 | (1,4q)-CMA-ES | 4.7 | 2 | 5 | 11 | 14 | 20 | 35/15 |
| f8 | 8 | 2 | 6.2 | 10 | 19 | 27 | 5/15 | (1,4q)-CMA-ES | 4.7 | 2 | 5 | 11 | 14 | 20 | 35/15 |
| f9 | 9 | 2 | 6.2 | 10 | 19 | 27 | 5/15 | (1,4q)-CMA-ES | 4.7 | 2 | 5 | 11 | 14 | 20 | 35/15 |


