

8 parameter combinations, 10 times run, dim = 400, budget = dim*1000.

It takes me half a month to complete the runs. The time cost is truly expensive. The program is the same as previous, but the dim is improved from 50 to 400, this leads to the increase of calculation, and finally resulting in more time cost.

so if budget = dim*10000, then the time cost would be more expensive.

1 no feasible solutions for F2

budget = dim*1000, dim=400.


	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K
1			590	579	588	589	569	558	542	562	
2	F1	Times1	14817.734	681603.84	518055.14	660195.89	504551.45	731595.65	695053.25	829761.8	
3	F1	Times2	1005.5342	649201.27	522900.16	767642.46	523263.73	737499.15	654450.85	805891.08	
4	F1	Times3	425.46763	653577.83	446075.07	710381.19	604658	845016	695650.74	775598.02	
5	F1	Times4	419.66475	726342.21	550197.95	708393.22	392682.2	808043.23	653409.06	871575.62	
6	F1	Times5	3749.2623	714983.75	722810.45	615825.14	587781.77	767351.57	732774.04	824382.65	
7	F1	Times6	273021.91	690960.06	344443.83	613328.65	458159.06	786774.51	718878.31	893836.65	
8	F1	Times7	27675.028	710400.14	349320.21	644401.23	420877.81	832211.2	665864.93	838941.68	
9	F1	Times8	101730.53	678729.38	451443.74	650136.07	483826.42	768590.49	715328.73	765597.52	
10	F1	Times9	389.95158	731153.05	444978.64	801025.31	457981.49	810123.04	675776.14	899461.48	
11	F1	Times10	61837.574	663626.95	214113.39	754215.05	585491.34	826992.6	678604.01	841292.25	
12	F2	Times1	inf								
13	F2	Times2	inf								
14	F2	Times3	inf								
15	F2	Times4	inf								
16	F2	Times5	inf								
17	F2	Times6	inf								
18	F2	Times7	inf								
19	F2	Times8	inf								
20	F2	Times9	inf								
21	F2	Times10	inf								
22	F3	Times1	234504.47	268708156	160135375	200323527	237320974	319543729	290508855	358516034	

SSGA_rawdata											
Home	Insert	Draw	Page Layout	Formulas	Data	Review	View	Automate	Tell me		
Paste	X		Calibri (Body)	12	A [^] A ^v	=	=	Wrap Text	General		
B	I	U						Merge & Center	\$ % ,	0.00	
✖ Possible Data Loss Some features might be lost if you save this workbook in the comma-delimited (.csv) format. To preserve these features, save it in an Excel file format.											
A1											
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	J	K
10	F1	Times9	218.269432	65.2068004	217.73428	242.90697	75.1031903	57.2665606	12.1102458	58.1207159	
11	F1	Times10	227.767075	68.4168833	225.726063	211.971302	73.0299142	61.6850287	12.4070369	60.3790387	
12	F2	Times1	inf	inf	inf	inf	inf	inf	inf	inf	
13	F2	Times2	inf	inf	inf	inf	inf	inf	inf	inf	
14	F2	Times3	inf	inf	inf	inf	inf	inf	inf	inf	
15	F2	Times4	inf	inf	inf	inf	inf	inf	inf	inf	
16	F2	Times5	inf	inf	inf	inf	inf	inf	inf	inf	
17	F2	Times6	inf	inf	inf	inf	inf	inf	inf	inf	
18	F2	Times7	inf	inf	inf	inf	inf	inf	inf	inf	
19	F2	Times8	inf	inf	inf	inf	inf	inf	inf	inf	
20	F2	Times9	inf	inf	inf	inf	inf	inf	inf	inf	
21	F2	Times10	inf	inf	inf	inf	inf	inf	inf	inf	
22	F3	Times1	86621.6732	20789.1012	87022.9767	80922.3520	28752.4757	22401.182	52523.23467	21175.1922	

2 compare with the last time


Last time, budget = 50,000. Different colors of bars represent different algorithms.

- The overall performance, SSGA and Lamarck are comparable, both of them performs better than Baldwin does.
- Sometimes Lamark is better(take F4 as an example), sometimes SSGA is better(take F9 for example.)



This time, budget = 400,000. Different colors of bars represent different algorithms.

- Given more budget, the final solutions are lower than the last time.
- The performance is quite clear, SSGA > Lamarck > Baldwin



The following picture shows the difference between SSGA and Lamarck clearly. (I did max min normalization for all the solutions produced by SSGA and Lamarck.) Obviously, SSGA performs better.

