# Progressive Archive in Adaptive jSO Algorithm

## Petr Bujok

Department of Informatics and Computers Faculty of Science, University of Ostrava petr.bujok@osu.cz ORCID: 0000-0003-2956-1226

Abstract—In this paper, a new variant of the adaptive variant Differential Evolution (DE) algorithm is proposed. The original variant of jSO uses an archive A for old successful individuals, which are inserted into random positions. A newly proposed variant of jSO uses a more progressive approach how to locate new individuals in the archive. When the archive is full, new individuals are inserted only into worse positions based on function value. Therefore,  $50\,\%$  of better individuals in the archive are not replaced. This enhanced variant of jSOa increases the performance of the original jSO in  $62\,\%$  of test problems CEC 2024.

Index Terms—Differential evolution, jSO, archive, experiments, optimisation

## I. NEW JSO VARIANT WITH PROGRESSIVE ARCHIVE

A newly proposed variant of jSO with a more progressive update of archive A is extended from the original jSO. Therefore, the steps of the original jSO are described before the newly employed approach is presented (see Algorithm 1). Initially, the population of N possible solutions is randomly located and evaluated by the objective function. The circle memories for F and CR parameters are allocated.

For each solution, mean values of F and CR parameters -  $M_F$  and  $M_{\rm CR}$  are selected using a roulette wheel. The control parameters of jSO are generated by the standard Gauss (CR) and Cauchy (F) distributions using the mean values. Further, the values of control parameters F and CR are truncated to certain values based on the current step of the search process.

After the settings of the jSO control parameters, a mutation point is generated using a novel weighted mutation variant (1):

$$\vec{u}_i = \vec{x}_i + F_w(\vec{x}_{\text{pBest}} - \vec{x}_i) + F(\vec{x}_{r_1} - \vec{x}_{r_2}),$$
 (1)

where  $\vec{x_i}$  is the current point,  $\vec{x_{\text{pBest}}}$  is randomly selected point from  $p \times N$  the best points of P,  $\vec{x_{r_1}}$  is selected randomly from P, and  $\vec{x_{r_2}}$  is selected randomly from population and archive,  $P \cup A$ . The newly introduced part is the newly used parameter  $F_w$ , computed using recommended rules (2):

$$F_{w} = \begin{cases} 0.7 \times F, & \textit{FES} < 0.2 \times \textit{maxFES} \\ 0.8 \times F, & \textit{FES} < 0.4 \times \textit{maxFES} \\ 1.2 \times F, & \textit{otherwise}. \end{cases} \tag{2}$$

The parameter controlling the portion of the best individuals to select  $\vec{x}_{\text{pBest}}$  point (p) is adapted during the search using the following formula (3):

$$p = \frac{p_{\text{max}} - p_{\text{min}}}{\textit{maxFES}} \times \textit{FES} + p_{\text{min}}, \tag{3}$$

## Algorithm 1 iSO algorithm

```
archive A \leftarrow \emptyset
initialise population P = \{\vec{x}_1, \vec{x}_2, \dots, \vec{x}_N\}
set all values of M_F to 0.5
set all values of M_{\rm CR} to 0.8
while stopping condition not reached do
   S_{\rm CR} \leftarrow \emptyset, \, S_F \leftarrow \emptyset
   for i = 1, 2, ..., N do
      r_i \leftarrow \text{select from } [1, H] \text{ randomly}
      if r_i = H then
          M_{F,r_i} \leftarrow 0.9
          M_{\text{CR},r_i} \leftarrow 0.9
      end if
      if M_{\mathrm{CR},r_i} < 0 then
          CR_i \leftarrow 0
      else
          CR_i \leftarrow N_i(M_{CR,r_i}, 0.1)
      if g < 0.25G_{\rm max} then
          CR_i \leftarrow max(CR_i, 0.7)
      else if g < 0.5G_{\rm max} then
          CR_i \leftarrow max(CR_i, 0.6)
      end if
       F_i \leftarrow C_i(M_{F,r_i}, 0.1)
      if g < 0.6G_{\text{max}} and F_i > 0.7 then
          F_i \leftarrow 0.7
      end if
      \vec{y_i} \leftarrow \text{current-to-}p\text{best}_w/1/\text{bin}
      compute f(\vec{y_i})
   end for
   for i = 1, 2, ..., N do
      if f(\vec{y_i}) \leq f(\vec{x_i}) then
          \vec{x}_i \leftarrow \vec{y}_i
      end if
      if f(\vec{y_i}) < f(\vec{x_i}) then
          \vec{x}_i \to A, CR_i \to S_{CR}, F_i \to S_F
       end if
       update M_{\rm CR} and M_F
       update population size
       update p
   end for
end while
```

where  $p_{\rm max}$ ,  $p_{\rm min}$  are input parameters, maxFES is the total number of function evaluation per run and FES is the current number of function evaluations. The authors of jSO recommended to use  $p_{\rm max}=0.25$ , and  $p_{\rm min}=0.125$ .

After mutation, the new trial solution point  $\vec{y_i}$  is generated using the current point  $\vec{x_i}$  and the mutation point  $\vec{u_i}$  in the binomial crossover. The new trial point is evaluated, and it replaces the old parent solution  $\vec{x_i}$  only if  $f(\vec{y_i}) \leq f(\vec{x_i})$ . In this case, the old solution is lost in the original DE algorithm. The variant of jSO uses an archive of old good solutions A where the parent solutions replaced by the trial solutions are stored. When the archive is full, the new outperformed parent individuals are located in randomly selected positions.

### A. Progressive Update of Archive individuals in jSO

A newly proposed approach introduces a more progressive approach to store outperformed parent individuals in the archive of the jSO algorithm. At the moment when the archive is full, the archive individuals are ordered based on the functional values to divide the archive into two parts better and worse individuals. The newly outperformed parent solution is inserted in the worse part of individuals to store the better solutions and refresh the worse individuals in the archive. It is possible to insert the newly outperformed parent point in the archive also if it is worse than the old solution of the archive.

This approach is very simple; it does not increase the complexity of the original jSO algorithm. The newly proposed method is called jSOa in the following text.

## II. EXPERIMENTS

In the experiment, 29 CEC 2024 problems were used. The functions are described in [1], including the experimental settings required for the competition. The source code of the functions is also available on the website given in the report [1]. The test functions CEC 2024 are divided into four categories based on their difficulty:

- unimodal functions simple problems: F1, F3,
- multimodal functions with many local minima: F4 –
  F10,
- hybrid functions difficult, considered as the real-world problems: F11 - F20,
- composition functions very difficult, composed of several different functions: F21 F30.

The *jSOa* algorithm is implemented in Matlab 2020b, and this environment was also used for the experiments. All computations were carried out on a standard PC with Windows 11, Intel(R) Core(TM)i7-4790 CPU 3.6 GHz, 16 GB RAM.

Our tests were carried out at four levels of dimension,  $D=10,\,30,\,50\,100$ , where 25 independent runs per each test function were performed. The function-error value is computed as the difference between the function value of the best-searched point and the known best function value of each test problem. The run of the algorithm stops if the prescribed amount of function evaluation  $MaxFES=D\times 10^4$  is reached. The population size of all algorithms in the comparison are

initialised at the same value  $N_{\rm init} = 25 \times \log(D) \times \sqrt{D}$  as recommended by the authors of jSO. The size of the archive A is set to  $2.6 \times N$ , where N is the current population size in jSO.

#### III. RESULTS

 $\label{eq:table I} \mbox{TABLE I} \\ \mbox{Basic Characteristics of JSOa, } D = 10 \\ \mbox{}$ 

| Fun | min      | max      | median   | mean     | SD       |
|-----|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 1   | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        |
| 3   | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        |
| 4   | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        |
| 5   | 0        | 2.98E+00 | 1.99E+00 | 2.03E+00 | 7.31E-01 |
| 6   | 0        | 1.14E-13 | 0        | 5.46E-14 | 5.80E-14 |
| 7   | 10.8893  | 13.0551  | 11.963   | 11.98666 | 0.554072 |
| 8   | 0        | 3.97984  | 1.98992  | 1.950121 | 0.929813 |
| 9   | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        |
| 10  | 0.187363 | 1.30E+02 | 6.95483  | 1.74E+01 | 3.29E+01 |
| 11  | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        | 0        |
| 12  | 2.08E-01 | 120.154  | 0.416286 | 9.970332 | 33.13042 |
| 13  | 0        | 5.39E+00 | 4.83714  | 3.80E+00 | 2.08E+00 |
| 14  | 0.00E+00 | 2.27E-13 | 0        | 3.64E-14 | 8.51E-14 |
| 15  | 0.000523 | 0.5      | 0.471777 | 0.348918 | 0.207297 |
| 16  | 0.000689 | 0.708124 | 0.272581 | 0.328383 | 0.1954   |
| 17  | 0.056954 | 1.47346  | 0.397721 | 0.520482 | 0.402452 |
| 18  | 0.000106 | 5.00E-01 | 0.142704 | 2.17E-01 | 2.23E-01 |
| 19  | 0        | 0.029352 | 2.50E-12 | 0.008959 | 0.010493 |
| 20  | 0        | 0.312173 | 0        | 0.012487 | 0.062435 |
| 21  | 100      | 205.291  | 202.397  | 153.788  | 52.74632 |
| 22  | 100      | 100      | 100      | 100      | 0        |
| 23  | 300      | 304.135  | 300      | 301.3629 | 1.746531 |
| 24  | 100      | 332.193  | 329.544  | 292.8325 | 85.90924 |
| 25  | 397.743  | 443.357  | 398.009  | 410.6832 | 20.78669 |
| 26  | 300      | 300      | 300      | 300      | 0        |
| 27  | 389.006  | 389.518  | 389.006  | 389.2313 | 0.259391 |
| 28  | 300      | 611.822  | 300      | 346.5214 | 108.9052 |
| 29  | 228.625  | 239.351  | 234.794  | 234.4264 | 2.838202 |
| 30  | 394.501  | 394.667  | 394.502  | 394.5145 | 0.032763 |

### IV. CONCLUSION

The new variant of a successful iSO optimiser with a progressive archive approach was introduced and evaluated by a set of 29 test problems CEC 2024. The results of the Wilcoxon rank-sum tests show that replacing worse individuals in the archive of the old good parent solution substantially increases the performance of the iSO algorithm. The efficiency of the jSOa variant is lower for lower dimension D=10, and it increases for higher dimensions. The new ¡SOa algorithm is better in 62 % of test problems compared to the median values, and it is worse in 29 \% of the test problems. Using the Wilcoxon rank-sum test, the jSOa performs significantly better in 19 \% of test problems, and it is worse in 3 \% of the cases. The approach is very simple, it does not increase the complexity of the original iSO. Moreover, this approach can be used in any optimisation where an archive of old solutions is employed. The aforementioned results promised further research into the enhanced mechanisms of adaptive DE variants.

 $\label{eq:table_iv} \begin{array}{c} \text{TABLE IV} \\ \text{Basic characteristics of JSOa, } D = 100 \end{array}$ 

| Fun | min      | max      | median   | mean     | SD       |
|-----|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 1   | 6.82E-13 | 1.87E-09 | 1.09E-10 | 3.53E-10 | 5.05E-10 |
| 3   | 1.21E-10 | 9.98E-09 | 1.86E-09 | 2.71E-09 | 2.67E-09 |
| 4   | 9.06E+01 | 212.277  | 192.068  | 194.3091 | 23.69604 |
| 5   | 2.30E+01 | 61.8196  | 4.40E+01 | 4.45E+01 | 8.006467 |
| 6   | 9.37E-08 | 6.03E-06 | 1.72E-06 | 2.17E-06 | 1.50E-06 |
| 7   | 1.33E+02 | 165.489  | 1.48E+02 | 147.9765 | 8.345096 |
| 8   | 3.19E+01 | 6.30E+01 | 4.51E+01 | 4.57E+01 | 7.60187  |
| 9   | 1.14E-13 | 1.14E-13 | 1.14E-13 | 1.14E-13 | 0        |
| 10  | 8273.66  | 10420.2  | 9623.37  | 9499.556 | 578.3018 |
| 11  | 47.5279  | 161.508  | 88.3205  | 96.07919 | 34.60926 |
| 12  | 6531.1   | 28775.9  | 11768.4  | 13940.85 | 5793.004 |
| 13  | 109.163  | 276.353  | 197.979  | 193.3524 | 44.09903 |
| 14  | 45.3358  | 69.8102  | 57.8118  | 57.31728 | 7.214057 |
| 15  | 99.2398  | 232.411  | 167.799  | 166.4265 | 40.13612 |
| 16  | 1382.36  | 2459.54  | 1841.99  | 1874.871 | 337.6773 |
| 17  | 933.663  | 1725.38  | 1321.67  | 1323.099 | 219.4104 |
| 18  | 125.864  | 208.794  | 160.641  | 168.4092 | 26.75587 |
| 19  | 63.4428  | 117.607  | 86.9284  | 90.51551 | 15.33583 |
| 20  | 892.586  | 1838.93  | 1326.38  | 1343.666 | 224.6785 |
| 21  | 258.56   | 280.459  | 271.32   | 270.2358 | 6.364778 |
| 22  | 9347.35  | 11401.5  | 10360.7  | 10242.65 | 557.0251 |
| 23  | 534.088  | 567.317  | 555.183  | 555.8448 | 8.972217 |
| 24  | 893.984  | 920.684  | 908.049  | 907.7644 | 7.343302 |
| 25  | 637.418  | 773.533  | 707.671  | 723.0916 | 40.2414  |
| 26  | 3029.87  | 3494.26  | 3302.35  | 3276.804 | 117.1983 |
| 27  | 531.118  | 611.771  | 575.786  | 574.2104 | 19.51622 |
| 28  | 478.472  | 576.861  | 518.742  | 519.5048 | 23.72568 |
| 29  | 1100.31  | 1770.89  | 1418.9   | 1426.518 | 208.2236 |
| 30  | 2128.74  | 3028.16  | 2496.02  | 2526.256 | 204.5526 |

TABLE V MEAN VALUES OF JSOA AND JSO WITH RESULTS OF THE WILCOXON RANK-SUM TESTS,  $D=10\,$ 

| Fun | jSO      | sign.     | jSOa     |
|-----|----------|-----------|----------|
| 1   | 0        | ≈         | 0        |
| 3   | 0        | $\approx$ | 0        |
| 4   | 0        | $\approx$ | 0        |
| 5   | 1.99E+00 | 6.74E-01  | 2.03E+00 |
| 6   | 7.28E-14 | 2.64E-01  | 5.46E-14 |
| 7   | 1.21E+01 | 4.97E-01  | 1.20E+01 |
| 8   | 2.11E+00 | 5.06E-01  | 1.95E+00 |
| 9   | 0        | ≈         | 0        |
| 10  | 26.75115 | 0.907227  | 17.39475 |
| 11  | 9.09E-15 | 0.337055  | 0        |
| 12  | 15.3147  | 0.854784  | 9.970332 |
| 13  | 3.825212 | 0.87435   | 3.798012 |
| 14  | 2.73E-14 | 0.698509  | 3.64E-14 |
| 15  | 0.264498 | 0.145397  | 0.348918 |
| 16  | 0.380916 | 0.726901  | 0.328383 |
| 17  | 0.53515  | 0.969045  | 0.520482 |
| 18  | 0.290768 | 0.443376  | 0.216754 |
| 19  | 0.012056 | 0.289968  | 8.96E-03 |
| 20  | 0        | 0.337055  | 0.012487 |
| 21  | 149.631  | 0.835687  | 153.788  |
| 22  | 100      | $\approx$ | 100      |
| 23  | 301.6558 | 0.500693  | 301.3629 |
| 24  | 311.5011 | 0.137271  | 292.8325 |
| 25  | 408.8677 | 0.580893  | 410.6832 |
| 26  | 300      | $\approx$ | 300      |
| 27  | 3.89E+02 | 7.85E-01  | 3.89E+02 |
| 28  | 4.42E+02 | 1.55E-02  | 3.47E+02 |
| 29  | 2.35E+02 | 6.14E-01  | 2.34E+02 |
| 30  | 3.31E+04 | 4.04E-01  | 3.95E+02 |

TABLE VI MEAN VALUES OF JSOA AND JSO WITH RESULTS OF THE WILCOXON RANK-SUM TESTS,  $D=30\,$ 

| Fun | jSO      | sign.     | jSOa     |
|-----|----------|-----------|----------|
| 1   | 9.66E-15 | 0.050575  | 5.68E-15 |
| 3   | 4.77E-14 | 5.74E-01  | 4.32E-14 |
| 4   | 5.86E+01 | $\approx$ | 5.86E+01 |
| 5   | 1.12E+01 | 2.40E-01  | 1.08E+01 |
| 6   | 6.84E-09 | 0.819724  | 2.74E-09 |
| 7   | 4.21E+01 | 4.97E-01  | 4.17E+01 |
| 8   | 11.38485 | 0.66168   | 11.1702  |
| 9   | 4.55E-15 | 0.571444  | 9.09E-15 |
| 10  | 1278.249 | 0.029771  | 1437.121 |
| 11  | 8.577837 | 0.697967  | 15.07073 |
| 12  | 250.5509 | 0.528277  | 221.8658 |
| 13  | 19.09217 | 0.449223  | 19.01671 |
| 14  | 16.74014 | 0.509448  | 16.36046 |
| 15  | 3.660004 | 0.341737  | 3.162764 |
| 16  | 37.15934 | 0.484863  | 43.96345 |
| 17  | 31.0951  | 0.130172  | 34.18114 |
| 18  | 20.52259 | 0.00167   | 19.20896 |
| 19  | 5.12033  | 0.953583  | 5.013231 |
| 20  | 27.38717 | 0.922715  | 28.16902 |
| 21  | 212.3881 | 0.020947  | 211.0444 |
| 22  | 100      | $\approx$ | 100      |
| 23  | 357.0464 | 0.011657  | 353.7243 |
| 24  | 430.4798 | 0.022048  | 428.6836 |
| 25  | 3.87E+02 | 2.86E-01  | 3.87E+02 |
| 26  | 9.68E+02 | 2.83E-02  | 9.47E+02 |
| 27  | 5.05E+02 | 4.08E-03  | 4.99E+02 |
| 28  | 3.04E+02 | 1.00E+00  | 3.05E+02 |
| 29  | 4.30E+02 | 8.08E-02  | 4.28E+02 |
| 30  | 1.98E+03 | 0.022042  | 1.96E+03 |

TABLE VII MEAN VALUES OF JSOA AND JSO WITH RESULTS OF THE WILCOXON RANK-SUM TESTS,  $D=50\,$ 

| Fun | jSO      | sign.    | jSOa     |
|-----|----------|----------|----------|
| 1   | 6.54E-14 | 5.65E-07 | 3.52E-14 |
| 3   | 1.57E-13 | 1.05E-03 | 1.16E-13 |
| 4   | 3.48E+01 | 0.422759 | 5.37E+01 |
| 5   | 20.97433 | 0.586937 | 21.65092 |
| 6   | 5.20E-08 | 9.84E-01 | 1.15E-08 |
| 7   | 7.33E+01 | 0.697974 | 7.25E+01 |
| 8   | 21.79043 | 0.785894 | 21.57034 |
| 9   | 6.37E-14 | ≈        | 6.37E-14 |
| 10  | 2993.602 | 0.415118 | 3055.127 |
| 11  | 28.72246 | 0.365629 | 27.92883 |
| 12  | 1907.216 | 0.509448 | 1842.178 |
| 13  | 51.23089 | 0.023199 | 34.23463 |
| 14  | 23.41872 | 0.341737 | 23.87574 |
| 15  | 24.45275 | 0.077453 | 23.24126 |
| 16  | 350.5859 | 0.415118 | 412.9931 |
| 17  | 281.2902 | 0.785899 | 272.271  |
| 18  | 25.07339 | 0.14561  | 24.31945 |
| 19  | 10.4773  | 0.277231 | 9.861877 |
| 20  | 128.2331 | 0.393257 | 114.1555 |
| 21  | 222.439  | 0.322396 | 223.2138 |
| 22  | 1.88E+03 | 4.89E-01 | 2.02E+03 |
| 23  | 4.39E+02 | 2.07E-01 | 4.37E+02 |
| 24  | 516.5796 | 0.000846 | 512.2685 |
| 25  | 4.81E+02 | 1.10E-01 | 4.81E+02 |
| 26  | 1.21E+03 | 6.25E-02 | 1.18E+03 |
| 27  | 518.1559 | 0.000113 | 506.4695 |
| 28  | 4.59E+02 | 3.37E-01 | 4.61E+02 |
| 29  | 3.50E+02 | 2.52E-01 | 3.54E+02 |
| 30  | 620086   | 0.297148 | 609742.7 |

 $\label{eq:table II} {\it Basic Characteristics of JSOA, } D = 30$ 

| Fun | min      | max      | median   | mean     | SD       |
|-----|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 1   | 0        | 1.42E-14 | 0        | 5.68E-15 | 7.11E-15 |
| 3   | ő        | 5.68E-14 | 5.68E-14 | 4.32E-14 | 2.48E-14 |
| 4   | 5.86E+01 | 5.86E+01 | 5.86E+01 | 5.86E+01 | 0        |
| 5   | 5.96975  | 1.39E+01 | 1.09E+01 | 1.08E+01 | 1.80E+00 |
| 6   | 1.14E-13 | 3.42E-08 | 1.14E-13 | 2.74E-09 | 9.47E-09 |
| 7   | 35.7333  | 49.4485  | 41.9991  | 41.73943 | 3.00416  |
| 8   | 7.95967  | 1.69E+01 | 10.9446  | 1.12E+01 | 1.99E+00 |
| 9   | 0        | 1.14E-13 | 0        | 9.09E-15 | 3.15E-14 |
| 10  | 952.868  | 1943.97  | 1408.73  | 1437.121 | 260.8179 |
| 11  | 2.12E-05 | 63.959   | 5.03045  | 15.07073 | 23.73379 |
| 12  | 3.93315  | 622.323  | 139.032  | 221.8658 | 180.2231 |
| 13  | 7.57682  | 23.1013  | 18.5728  | 19.01671 | 3.416751 |
| 14  | 0.065422 | 23.823   | 21.7599  | 16.36046 | 9.047931 |
| 15  | 0.532021 | 6.19504  | 2.9159   | 3.162764 | 2.162506 |
| 16  | 8.34245  | 165.391  | 25.2335  | 43.96345 | 45.89018 |
| 17  | 22.5677  | 43.257   | 35.359   | 34.18114 | 6.321498 |
| 18  | 0.620108 | 21.7909  | 20.5996  | 19.20896 | 5.356961 |
| 19  | 2.38885  | 7.19191  | 4.99597  | 5.013231 | 1.174222 |
| 20  | 8.99207  | 41.0492  | 30.4499  | 28.16902 | 7.781739 |
| 21  | 207.562  | 213.772  | 211.199  | 211.0444 | 1.703539 |
| 22  | 100      | 100      | 100      | 100      | 0        |
| 23  | 347.18   | 362.534  | 353.361  | 353.7243 | 4.459579 |
| 24  | 424.282  | 432.11   | 429.14   | 428.6836 | 2.249486 |
| 25  | 386.688  | 386.718  | 386.695  | 386.6978 | 0.00778  |
| 26  | 868.22   | 1047.95  | 945.421  | 947.1272 | 39.21903 |
| 27  | 484.625  | 509.602  | 498.73   | 499.0251 | 7.057737 |
| 28  | 300      | 413.975  | 300      | 304.559  | 22.795   |
| 29  | 365.143  | 442.659  | 429.637  | 428.1    | 14.55697 |
| 30  | 1941.62  | 1987.92  | 1969.75  | 1963.319 | 11.34524 |

 $\label{eq:table_initial} \text{TABLE III} \\ \text{Basic characteristics of JSOa, } D = 50 \\$ 

| Fun | min      | max      | median   | mean     | SD       |
|-----|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| 1   | 2.84E-14 | 5.68E-14 | 2.84E-14 | 3.52E-14 | 8.33E-15 |
| 3   | 5.68E-14 | 1.71E-13 | 1.14E-13 | 1.16E-13 | 2.58E-14 |
| 4   | 0.603363 | 1.42E+02 | 2.85E+01 | 5.37E+01 | 5.10E+01 |
| 5   | 15.926   | 3.28E+01 | 2.19E+01 | 2.17E+01 | 3.76E+00 |
| 6   | 0        | 4.79E-08 | 2.27E-13 | 1.15E-08 | 2.09E-08 |
| 7   | 63.225   | 8.05E+01 | 73.2106  | 7.25E+01 | 3.81E+00 |
| 8   | 13.9294  | 2.70E+01 | 2.12E+01 | 2.16E+01 | 3.02E+00 |
| 9   | 0        | 1.14E-13 | 1.14E-13 | 6.37E-14 | 5.76E-14 |
| 10  | 2283.76  | 4026.34  | 3045.65  | 3055.127 | 353.0983 |
| 11  | 21.3186  | 33.1323  | 29.1525  | 27.92883 | 3.183197 |
| 12  | 1176.08  | 2502.12  | 1874.62  | 1842.178 | 368.5819 |
| 13  | 5.65498  | 51.8057  | 42.4076  | 34.23463 | 15.65656 |
| 14  | 22.3186  | 27.1443  | 23.8588  | 23.87574 | 0.935271 |
| 15  | 19.1107  | 27.9985  | 22.9371  | 23.24126 | 2.192637 |
| 16  | 133.684  | 826.418  | 407.364  | 412.9931 | 149.0083 |
| 17  | 77.8382  | 460.372  | 259.083  | 272.271  | 101.9506 |
| 18  | 20.5114  | 28.7967  | 24.2157  | 24.31945 | 1.877672 |
| 19  | 5.7708   | 13.5595  | 10.4087  | 9.861877 | 1.960145 |
| 20  | 46.2472  | 303.033  | 95.5593  | 114.1555 | 67.65573 |
| 21  | 215.774  | 229.966  | 223.297  | 223.2138 | 3.322049 |
| 22  | 100      | 4142.97  | 2916.32  | 2024.849 | 1763.861 |
| 23  | 427.271  | 449.515  | 436.163  | 437.0896 | 6.049041 |
| 24  | 504.414  | 521.455  | 512.109  | 512.2685 | 4.530173 |
| 25  | 480.231  | 491.837  | 480.243  | 480.7101 | 2.318147 |
| 26  | 1102.9   | 1329.34  | 1182.3   | 1180.312 | 47.52694 |
| 27  | 492.12   | 526.024  | 505.813  | 506.4695 | 8.71E+00 |
| 28  | 458.849  | 507.695  | 458.849  | 460.8028 | 9.7692   |
| 29  | 323.75   | 384.709  | 355.644  | 354.3049 | 16.67917 |
| 30  | 579411   | 665338   | 608409   | 609742.7 | 27783.98 |

TABLE VIII MEAN VALUES OF JSOA AND JSO WITH RESULTS OF THE WILCOXON RANK-SUM TESTS,  $D=100\,$ 

|     |          |          | •~~      |
|-----|----------|----------|----------|
| Fun | jSO      | sign.    | jSOa     |
| 1   | 1.19E-08 | 2.00E-06 | 3.53E-10 |
| 3   | 7.47E-08 | 7.38E-09 | 2.71E-09 |
| 4   | 2.00E+02 | 9.22E-02 | 1.94E+02 |
| 5   | 4.46E+01 | 0.907322 | 4.45E+01 |
| 6   | 3.86E-05 | 0.148275 | 2.17E-06 |
| 7   | 147.015  | 0.830991 | 147.9765 |
| 8   | 43.3726  | 0.252305 | 45.73394 |
| 9   | 1.14E-13 | ≈        | 1.14E-13 |
| 10  | 8992.786 | 0.013007 | 9499.556 |
| 11  | 106.37   | 0.33681  | 96.07919 |
| 12  | 18161.11 | 0.018887 | 13940.85 |
| 13  | 278.8107 | 0.000331 | 193.3524 |
| 14  | 67.45224 | 0.005866 | 57.31728 |
| 15  | 196.3393 | 0.111602 | 166.4265 |
| 16  | 1759.578 | 0.268743 | 1874.871 |
| 17  | 1163.729 | 0.024403 | 1323.099 |
| 18  | 189.7944 | 0.047806 | 168.4092 |
| 19  | 101.208  | 0.107303 | 90.51551 |
| 20  | 1228.883 | 6.53E-02 | 1343.666 |
| 21  | 269.585  | 0.669479 | 270.2358 |
| 22  | 9910.666 | 0.087738 | 10242.65 |
| 23  | 565.8174 | 4.13E-04 | 555.8448 |
| 24  | 922.1768 | 2.21E-07 | 907.7644 |
| 25  | 718.4125 | 0.853753 | 723.0916 |
| 26  | 3352.596 | 0.045663 | 3276.804 |
| 27  | 596.7078 | 3.58E-05 | 574.2104 |
| 28  | 522.0698 | 0.433769 | 519.5048 |
| 29  | 1481.483 | 0.303785 | 1426.518 |
| 30  | 2394.615 | 0.00832  | 2526.256 |

TABLE IX Number of better, similar, and worse results of JSOa compared with JSO

| D   | jSOa | $\approx$ | jSO |
|-----|------|-----------|-----|
| 10  | 16   | 6         | 7   |
| 30  | 19   | 2         | 8   |
| 50  | 19   | 1         | 9   |
| 100 | 18   | 1         | 10  |
| Σ   | 72   | 10        | 34  |

TABLE X Number of significantly better, similar, and worse results of  ${\tt JSOa}$  compared with  ${\tt JSO}$ 

| D   | jSOa | $\approx$ | jSO |
|-----|------|-----------|-----|
| 10  | 1    | 28        | 0   |
| 30  | 7    | 21        | 1   |
| 50  | 4    | 25        | 0   |
| 100 | 10   | 16        | 3   |
| Σ   | 22   | 90        | 4   |

| D   | $T_1$  | $T_2$  | $(T_2 - T_1)/T_1$ |
|-----|--------|--------|-------------------|
| 10  | 0.0266 | 0.4497 | 15.9060           |
| 30  | 0.0758 | 1.5192 | 19.0422           |
| 50  | 2.0245 | 0.1564 | 11.9463           |
| 100 | 0.5399 | 9.2385 | 16.1116           |

## REFERENCES

[1] K. Qiao, X. Wen, X. Ban, P. Chen, K. V. Price, P. N. Suganthan, J. Liang, G. Wu, and C. Yue, "Evaluation criteria for cec 2024 competition and special session on numerical optimization considering accuracy and speed," Computational Intelligence Laboratory, Zhengzhou University, Zhengzhou China And Technical Report, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore, Tech. Rep., 2023, github.com/P-N-Suganthan.