

## Comparison of Results on the 2010 CEC Benchmark Function Set

*presented by*

**P. N. Suganthan**

*Associate Professor*

*School of Electrical and Electronics Engineering*

*Nanyang Technological University, Singapore.*

*Email: epnsugan@ntu.edu.sg*

*July 2010*



### Evaluation Criteria

- **Problems:** 10D and 30D versions of 18 scalable minimization problems with constraints
- Minimize  $f(X)$ ,  $X = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_D)$  and  $X \in S$
- Subject to 
$$\begin{aligned} g_i(X) &\leq 0, & i &= 1, \dots, p \\ h_j(X) &= 0, & j &= p+1, \dots, m \end{aligned}$$
- Equality constraints are transformed into inequalities of the form 
$$|h_j(X)| - \varepsilon \leq 0, \text{ for } j = p+1, \dots, m$$
- In this special session  $\varepsilon$  is set to 0.0001
- **Reference:**

R. Mallipeddi, P. N. Suganthan, "Problem Definitions and Evaluation Criteria for the CEC 2010 Competition on Constrained Real-Parameter Optimization", *Technical Report*, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore, 2010

## Evaluation Criteria – Problem Properties

Problem/Search Range	Type of Objective	Number of Constraints		Feasibility Region ( $\rho$ )	
		$E$	$I$	10D	30D
C01 [0,10] <sup>D</sup>	Non Separable	0	2 Non Separable	0.997689	1.000000
C02 [-5.12,5.12] <sup>D</sup>	Separable	1 Separable	2 Separable	0.000000	0.000000
C03 [-1000,1000] <sup>D</sup>	Non Separable	1 Non Separable	0	0.000000	0.000000
C04 [-50,50] <sup>D</sup>	Separable	4 2 Non Separable, 2 Separable	0	0.000000	0.000000
<b>C05</b> [-600,600] <sup>D</sup>	Separable	2 Separable	0	0.000000	0.000000
<b>C06</b> [-600,600] <sup>D</sup>	Separable	2 Rotated	0	0.000000	0.000000
<b>C07</b> [-140,140] <sup>D</sup>	Non Separable	0	1 Separable	0.505123	0.503725
<b>C08</b> [-140,140] <sup>D</sup>	Non Separable	0	1 Rotated	0.379512	0.375278
<b>C09</b> [-500500] <sup>D</sup>	Non Separable	1 Separable	0	0.000000	0.000000



## Evaluation Criteria- Problem Properties

Problem/Search Range	Type of Objective	Number of Constraints		Feasibility Region ( $\rho$ )	
		$E$	$I$	10D	30D
<b>C10</b> [-500,500] <sup>D</sup>	Non Separable	1 Rotated	0	0.000000	0.000000
C11 [-100,100] <sup>D</sup>	Rotated	1 Non Separable	0	0.000000	0.000000
C12 [-1000,1000] <sup>D</sup>	Separable	1 Non Separable	1 Separable	0.000000	0.000000
C13 [-500,500] <sup>D</sup>	Separable	0	3 2 Separable, 1 Non Separable	0.000000	0.000000
<b>C14</b> [-1000,1000] <sup>D</sup>	Non Separable	0	3 Separable	0.003112	0.006123
<b>C15</b> [-1000,1000] <sup>D</sup>	Non Separable	0	3 Rotated	0.003210	0.006023
C16 [-10,10] <sup>D</sup>	Non Separable	2 Separable	2 1 Separable, 1 Non Separable	0.000000	0.000000
C17 [-10,10] <sup>D</sup>	Non Separable	1 Separable	2 Non Separable	0.000000	0.000000
C18 [-50,50] <sup>D</sup>	Non Separable	1 Separable	1 Separable	0.000010	0.000000



## Evaluation Criteria

- $D$  is the number of decision variables
- $\rho = |F|/|S|$  is the estimated ratio between the feasible region and the search space
- $I$  is the number of inequality constraints
- $E$  is the number of equality constraints
- Runs/problem: 25
- Max\_FES : 200000 for 10D and 600000 for 30D
- Feasible Run: A run during which at least one feasible solution is found within Max FES.
- Feasible Rate = (# of feasible runs) / Total runs.
- The above quantity is computed for each problem separately.



## Evaluation Criteria

- Ranking is given to each algorithm on every problem based on the following criteria
  1. Algorithms giving 100% feasibility rate are ranked based on mean value of the 25 runs
  2. Algorithms having feasibility rate in the range  $>0\%$  -  $<100\%$  are ranked based on feasibility rate.
  3. Algorithms with  $0\%$  feasibility rate are ranked based on overall violation (normalized).
- Finally we add all the ranks of a particular algorithm over all problems to get the total rank
- Average Rank = Total rank/36



## Algorithms

- jDEsoco Janez Brest, *et al* (An Improved Self-adaptive Differential ...)
- DE-VPS M. Fatih Tasgetiren, *eta al* (An Ensemble of Differential ...)
- RGA Amit Saha, *et al* ( Hybrid Gradient Projection Genetic ...)
- E-ABC Efren Mezura Montes, *et al* (Elitist Artificial Bee Colony...)
- εDEg Tetsuyuki Takahama & Setsuko Sakai (Constrained ...)
- DCDE Zhihui Li, *et al* (Differential Evolution with Dynamic ...)
- Co-CLPSO J. J. Liang, *et al* (Coevolutionary Comprehensive Learning ...)
- CDEb6e6rl Josef Tvrdik & Radka Polakova (Competitive Differential ...)
- sp-MODE Gilberto Reynoso-Meza *et al* (Multiobjective optimization ...)
- MTS Lin-Yu Tseng and Chun Chen (Multiple Trajectory Search ...)
- IEMA Hemanth Kumar Singh, *et al* (Performance of Infeasibility ...)
- ECHT R. Mallipeddi & P. N. Suganthan (Differential Evolution ...)



## Algorithms' Parameters

Algorithm	Parameters
jDEsoco	$NP, p_0, \tau_1, \tau_2, F_l, F_u, \theta, \beta, c_p, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, G_c$
DE-VPS	$NP, CR, F, NFT_0, \lambda, \theta, t_c, c_p$
RGA	$N, p_c, \eta_c, p_m, \eta_m$
E-ABC	$SN, S, \varepsilon, MR, dec, FEs \text{ ratio}, \text{cycle limit}, \text{Step size variation}$
εDEg	$N, F_0, CR_0, T_c, \theta, P_g, R_g, M$
DCDE	$NP, F, CR, P, L, L\_FEs$
Co-CLPSO	$w, c, V_{\max}, p_s, R, L, L\_FES, T, P_c$
CDEb6e6rl	$NP, n_0, \delta$
sp-MODE	$F, Cr,  N_s(k) ,  P(0) , \alpha_\varepsilon$
MTS	$SSS, \text{Threshold}, M_1, M_2$
IEMA	$N, \text{Crossover Probability}, \text{Crossover Index}, \text{Mutation Probability}, \text{Mutation Index}, \alpha$
ECHT	$NP, CR, F, p_f, \theta, T_c, c_p$



## Algorithms' Comparison (10D)

Alg/Prob	C01	C02	C03	C04	C05	C06	C07	C08	C09
jDEsoco	6	12	8	1	9	4	1	2	3
DE-VPS	10	6	10	8	5	9	9	10	5
RGa	8	8	12	7	10	10	10	4	6
E-ABC	9	7	11	10	7	7	11	11	8
$\epsilon$ DEg	1	5	1	4	1	1	1	8	1
DCDE	11	4	1	9	1	1	7	9	4
Co-CLPSO	7	3	5	6	1	1	8	1	7
CDEb6e6rl	4	9	6	1	11	11	1	7	11
sp-MODE	1	11	9	12	12	12	1	6	12
MTS	12	10	7	11	6	6	12	12	9
IEMA	5	1	4	5	8	8	5	5	10
ECHE	1	2	1	1	4	5	6	3	2



## Algorithms' Comparison (10D)

Alg/Prob	C10	C11	C12	C13	C14	C15	C16	C17	C18
jDEsoco	4	3	4	3	4	7	8	9	9
DE-VPS	5	7	9	5	5	4	1	6	1
RGa	6	8	10	6	7	6	9	7	7
E-ABC	9	11	4	7	11	10	6	8	8
$\epsilon$ DEg	1	1	1	1	1	2	7	4	1
DCDE	3	5	8	11	2	1	5	2	5
Co-CLPSO	7	10	3	8	3	3	2	5	6
CDEb6e6rl	11	6	2	1	10	12	11	11	11
sp-MODE	12	12	12	12	9	8	12	12	12
MTS	8	9	11	10	12	11	10	10	10
IEMA	10	2	4	4	6	5	3	1	1
ECHE	2	4	4	9	8	9	4	3	1



## Algorithms' Comparison (30D)

Alg/Prob	C01	C02	C03	C04	C05	C06	C07	C08	C09
jDEsoco	5	8	3	3	8	2	1	6	2
DE-VPS	11	6	7	7	4	7	6	9	8
RGA	7	7	11	6	5	8	11	12	7
E-ABC	8	9	10	9	6	6	12	8	9
$\epsilon$ DEg	2	3	2	4	1	1	3	2	3
DCDE	10	2	1	8	9	9	5	3	12
Co-CLPSO	9	1	9	5	2	3	8	7	6
CDEb6e6rl	1	10	5	2	11	10	1	1	1
sp-MODE	3	11	8	12	12	12	10	10	11
MTS	12	12	6	10	7	5	7	11	10
IEMA	4	5	12	11	10	11	4	4	5
ECHE	6	4	4	1	3	4	9	5	4



## Algorithms' Comparison (30D)

Alg/Prob	C10	C11	C12	C13	C14	C15	C16	C17	C18
jDEsoco	2	3	1	1	4	6	7	9	9
DE-VPS	6	7	9	9	5	4	6	5	4
RGA	7	6	6	8	9	7	9	8	6
E-ABC	10	9	7	5	7	9	8	7	8
$\epsilon$ DEg	3	2	10	4	1	2	1	6	7
DCDE	1	5	2	7	3	1	5	4	3
Co-CLPSO	8	10	3	10	5	3	1	3	5
CDEb6e6rl	12	1	8	3	10	11	10	12	11
sp-MODE	11	12	12	12	12	10	12	10	10
MTS	9	8	4	11	11	12	11	11	12
IEMA	5	11	11	2	2	5	4	1	1
ECHE	4	4	5	6	8	8	1	2	1



## Comparison of Algorithms

Algorithm	Ranking			
	10D	30D	Overall	Average
jDEsoco	97	80	177	4.92
DE-VPS	115	120	235	6.53
RGA	141	140	281	7.81
E-ABC	155	147	302	8.39
$\epsilon$ DEg	42	57	99	2.75
DCDE	89	90	179	4.97
Co-CLPSO	86	98	184	5.11
CDEb6e6rl	136	120	256	7.11
sp-MODE	177	190	367	10.19
MTS	176	169	345	9.58
IEMA	87	108	195	5.42
ECHE	69	79	148	4.11



## Final Rank

Rank	Algorithm
1 <sup>st</sup>	$\epsilon$ DEg
2 <sup>nd</sup>	ECHE
3 <sup>rd</sup>	jDEsoco
4 <sup>th</sup>	DCDE
5 <sup>th</sup>	Co-CLPSO
6 <sup>th</sup>	IEMA
7 <sup>th</sup>	DE-VPS
8 <sup>th</sup>	CDEb6e6rl
9 <sup>th</sup>	RGA
10 <sup>th</sup>	E-ABC
11 <sup>th</sup>	MTS
12 <sup>th</sup>	sp-MODE

