

Semantic Approximation for Reducing Code Bloat in Genetic Programming

Quang Uy Nguyen^{a,*}, Thi Huong Chu^a

^a*Faculty of IT, Le Quy Don Technical University, Hanoi, Vietnam*

Supplement 1: The supplement results of the paper.

Table 1: List of table results in the supplement

No	Content	Table/ Figure
1	Average of the population size with the maximum depth of $sTree=2$.	Table 2
2	Average execution time of pruning step and evaluating fitness step .	Table 3
3	Comparison of the training error of GP and non-GP systems.	Table 4
4	Mean of the best fitness with the maximum depth of $sTree=1$	Table 5
5	Median of testing error with the maximum depth of $sTree=1$	Table 6
6	Average size of solutions with the maximum depth of $sTree=1$	Table 7
7	Mean of the best fitness with the maximum depth of $sTree=1$	Table 8

*Thi Huong Chu; Mobile: 84-973080942
Email addresses: quanguyhn@gmail.com (Quang Uy Nguyen), huongkts@gmail.com (Thi Huong Chu)

8	Median of testing error with the maximum depth of $sTree=1$	Table 9
9	Average size of solutions with the maximum depth of $sTree=1$	Table 10
10	Mean of the best fitness with the maximum depth of $sTree=1$	Table 11
11	Median of testing error with the maximum depth of $sTree=1$	Table 12
12	Average size of solutions with the maximum depth of $sTree=1$	Table 13
13	Average bloat over generations on problems F2, F3, F4, F5, F6, F8, F9 and F10	Figure 1
14	Average bloat over generations on problems F12, F13, F14, F15, F16 and F18	Figure 2
15	Average overfitting over the generations on problems F2, F3, F4, F5, F6, F8, F9 and F10	Figure 3
16	Average overfitting over the generations on problems F12, F13, F14, F15, F16 and F18	Figure 4
17	Average complexity of the best individual over the generations on problems F2, F3, F4, F5, F6, F8 F9 and F10	Figure 5
18	Average complexity of the best individual over the generations on problems F12, F13, F14, F15, F16 and F18	Figure 6

Table 2: Average of the population size with the maximum depth of $sTree=2$.

Pro	GP	RDO	PP	TS-S	SA10	SA20	SAD	DA10	DA20	DAD
A. Benchmarking Problems										
F1	190.6	99.5	18.5	44.8	60.3	17.2	7.3	50.5	12.9	7.0
F2	149.3	70.3	13.3	60.3	59.8	18.3	7.4	56.0	18.7	7.4
F3	114.2	54.3	46.1	24.9	46.7	35.6	25.6	47.6	40.2	29.1
F4	113.6	45.3	9.3	30.8	47.0	12.9	7.1	42.6	10.8	7.4
F5	101.1	58.9	9.7	53.5	37.3	10.6	7.1	37.4	10.5	7.4
F6	137.9	43.2	12.8	60.4	58.9	18.9	6.1	49.7	11.7	6.0
F7	105.9	28.7	12.6	39.0	51.6	18.1	6.0	49.8	13.7	6.1
F8	102.1	69.0	9.6	73.6	38.4	10.4	7.0	39.7	11.3	7.1
F9	139.3	51.4	10.7	78.2	51.5	12.4	6.4	49.6	12.0	6.7
B. UCI Problems										
F10	108.5	77.5	9.3	83.2	25.6	6.3	5.5	46.0	11.4	6.5
F11	111.0	71.5	7.4	29.7	37.0	8.4	5.7	49.1	10.2	7.0
F12	96.3	84.9	12.0	66.6	40.6	12.6	10.2	53.4	19.0	11.7
F13	101.2	31.9	6.0	5.0	14.0	5.0	4.8	41.2	9.7	6.7
F14	107.3	45.0	7.8	42.5	36.8	8.7	5.5	43.1	9.8	6.9
F15	102.2	78.7	6.5	17.1	34.8	7.4	5.5	50.6	12.3	6.9
F16	98.5	79.6	7.0	15.4	34.4	8.1	6.2	51.1	11.7	7.3
F17	105.0	69.5	6.8	15.3	35.5	7.2	6.0	48.4	11.2	7.3
F18	100.0	81.6	7.2	59.0	28.9	7.4	5.6	45.7	11.2	7.1

Table 3: Average execution time of pruning step (shortened as Prune) and evaluating fitness step (shortened as Eval).

Pro	SA10		SA20		SAD		DA10		DA20		DAD	
	Prune	Eval	Prune	Eval	Prune	Eval	Prune	Eval	Prune	Eval	Prune	Eval
A. Benchmarking Problems												
F1	0.10	0.63	0.19	0.24	0.17	0.52	0.17	0.49	0.16	0.13	0.65	0.12
F2	0.10	0.56	0.14	0.19	0.21	0.76	0.17	0.44	0.17	0.15	0.55	0.09
F3	0.17	1.44	0.40	1.64	0.38	7.92	0.67	1.76	0.75	0.90	2.32	0.70
F4	0.93	15.04	1.29	4.44	3.02	4.55	3.67	14.13	3.02	3.62	8.10	1.42
F5	0.99	15.34	1.37	3.75	3.04	3.79	3.53	15.37	3.08	3.43	8.73	1.31
F6	1.19	31.42	1.67	8.87	3.37	3.80	4.57	24.84	3.36	6.12	7.84	1.47
F7	1.12	25.67	1.47	9.47	3.24	4.35	5.87	25.66	5.28	6.74	8.58	2.07
F8	1.08	19.44	1.40	4.18	3.74	3.56	4.41	21.33	3.28	4.70	9.21	1.15
F9	1.00	21.22	1.44	4.99	3.14	3.32	5.08	20.83	3.90	4.67	7.84	1.08
B. UCI Problems												
F10	0.58	6.22	1.35	1.55	1.79	2.81	3.08	11.43	2.56	2.84	5.43	0.81
F11	0.21	2.36	0.43	0.57	1.70	0.90	0.91	4.16	0.58	0.60	3.15	0.19
F12	0.79	11.55	1.40	4.32	1.91	5.44	3.66	14.80	3.52	5.04	9.37	1.46
F13	0.19	0.74	0.26	0.71	0.73	1.82	0.90	3.10	0.71	0.59	3.11	0.25
F14	1.08	15.35	1.51	3.85	5.04	2.18	3.59	17.11	2.57	3.20	9.69	0.85
F15	0.14	0.84	0.22	0.36	0.44	0.64	0.58	1.67	0.45	0.34	1.77	0.13
F16	0.13	0.87	0.16	0.18	0.46	0.55	0.48	1.66	0.16	0.18	0.71	0.05
F17	0.13	0.87	0.15	0.20	0.44	0.63	0.53	1.81	0.17	0.18	0.81	0.05
F18	0.41	4.79	1.06	1.24	3.68	1.30	1.84	7.54	1.54	1.74	6.54	0.50

Table 4: Comparison of the training error of GP and non-GP systems. The best results is underlined.

Pro	GP	SA10	SA20	SAD	DA10	DA20	DAD	LR	SVR	DT	RF	ORNN
A. Benchmarking Problems												
F1	0.47	0.52	0.89	1.30	<u>0.41</u>	0.97	1.17	1.42	1.71	0.55	0.58	1.64
F2	1.91	1.08	2.33	4.12	<u>0.96</u>	2.20	3.58	4.72	6.50	1.72	2.58	7.20
F3	0.10	0.12	0.14	0.12	0.09	0.12	0.11	0.21	0.13	0.10	<u>0.06</u>	0.28
F4	0.51	<u>0.06</u>	0.83	1.88	0.13	0.37	1.04	3.21	2.78	1.70	1.31	3.24
F5	1.13	0.95	1.75	2.64	<u>0.92</u>	1.54	2.39	13.22	13.11	9.37	5.81	13.29
F6	0.26	0.25	0.25	0.26	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.25	0.19	<u>0.17</u>	0.25
F7	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	<u>0.03</u>	0.03
F8	9.90	10.45	26.50	37.12	<u>7.57</u>	17.06	26.35	52.92	53.09	37.50	22.20	53.13
F9	0.38	0.35	0.48	0.49	0.35	0.46	0.48	0.50	0.50	0.35	<u>0.22</u>	0.50
B. UCI Problems												
F10	0.41	0.17	0.22	0.22	0.14	0.17	0.18	0.14	0.11	0.04	<u>0.02</u>	0.24
F11	0.47	0.48	0.52	0.53	0.46	0.50	0.51	0.48	<u>0.03</u>	0.16	0.20	0.65
F12	0.40	0.19	0.27	0.30	0.15	0.16	0.17	0.14	<u>0.00</u>	0.06	0.05	0.76
F13	3.28	3.34	3.43	3.44	3.07	3.26	3.29	2.86	<u>0.01</u>	1.06	1.44	3.57
F14	0.17	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.17	0.17	0.17	0.16	<u>0.00</u>	0.08	0.06	0.23
F15	0.82	0.65	0.87	0.98	0.45	0.52	0.57	0.37	1.07	<u>0.22</u>	0.23	1.64
F16	1.68	1.70	1.99	2.05	1.51	1.83	1.93	1.86	1.50	<u>0.52</u>	0.83	2.88
F17	0.91	0.90	1.11	1.11	0.84	1.01	1.04	1.07	1.18	<u>0.33</u>	0.44	1.53
F18	0.53	0.50	0.64	0.66	0.41	0.55	0.61	0.51	0.75	0.11	<u>0.11</u>	0.89

Table 5: Mean of the best fitness with the maximum depth of $sTree=1$: bold face is better than GP, underline is the best result.

Pro	GP	SA10	SA20	SAD	DA10	DA20	DAD
A. Benchmarking Problems							
F1	0.47	0.52	0.85	1.34	<u>0.41</u>	0.95	1.16
F2	1.91	1.11	2.27	4.25	<u>1.03</u>	2.33	3.54
F3	0.10	0.11	0.13	0.12	<u>0.10</u>	0.12	0.11
F4	0.51	0.19	0.43	1.98	<u>0.17</u>	0.35	1.28
F5	1.13	0.95	1.62	2.68	<u>0.88</u>	1.54	2.40
F6	0.26	0.25	0.25	0.25	<u>0.25</u>	0.25	0.25
F7	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	<u>0.03</u>	0.03	0.03
F8	<u>9.90</u>	11.58	24.61	41.36	10.56	23.17	30.25
F9	0.38	0.37	0.49	0.49	<u>0.32</u>	0.47	0.48
F10	0.41	0.17	0.23	0.23	<u>0.14</u>	0.17	0.18
B. UCI Problems							
F11	0.47	0.48	0.52	0.53	<u>0.46</u>	0.50	0.51
F12	0.40	0.19	0.26	0.31	<u>0.15</u>	0.16	0.17
F13	3.28	3.33	3.41	3.44	<u>3.08</u>	3.28	3.29
F14	0.17	0.17	0.18	0.18	<u>0.17</u>	0.17	0.17
F15	0.82	0.54	0.80	0.87	<u>0.45</u>	0.54	0.58
F16	1.68	1.70	2.01	2.05	<u>1.61</u>	1.84	1.93
F17	0.91	0.94	1.11	1.11	<u>0.83</u>	1.00	1.03
F18	0.53	0.49	0.64	0.66	<u>0.42</u>	0.55	0.60

Table 6: Median of testing error with the maximum depth of $sTree=1$: bold face is better than GP, underline is the best result.

Pro	GP	SA10	SA20	SAD	DA10	DA20	DAD
A. Benchmarking Problems							
F1	1.69	1.17	<u>0.93</u>	1.38	0.98	1.83	2.01
F2	10.17	4.77	5.10	5.61	<u>4.41</u>	4.63	5.66
F3	0.06	0.05	0.06	0.06	0.05	0.05	<u>0.05</u>
F4	0.31	0.16	0.25	3.52	<u>0.01</u>	<u>0.01</u>	2.94
F5	33.01	12.72	6.55	19.39	14.87	<u>3.56</u>	8.87
F6	0.26	0.25	0.25	<u>0.25</u>	0.25	0.25	0.25
F7	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	<u>0.03</u>
F8	45.88	44.21	44.63	44.23	44.94	44.25	<u>43.90</u>
F9	2.19	2.18	2.18	<u>2.18</u>	2.19	2.18	2.18
B. UCI Problems							
F10	0.75	0.27	0.27	0.27	<u>0.24</u>	0.25	0.25
F11	0.61	0.59	0.58	0.58	0.59	0.58	<u>0.58</u>
F12	0.36	0.20	0.29	0.32	<u>0.16</u>	0.17	0.18
F13	5.18	3.87	3.84	3.90	4.00	3.77	<u>3.74</u>
F14	0.18	0.17	0.18	0.18	<u>0.17</u>	0.17	0.17
F15	1.44	0.55	0.65	0.86	<u>0.52</u>	0.53	0.53
F16	2.69	2.40	2.09	2.04	2.23	<u>2.04</u>	2.07
F17	1.77	1.31	1.14	<u>1.12</u>	1.54	1.30	1.32
F18	0.73	0.60	0.68	0.67	<u>0.55</u>	0.62	0.62

Table 7: Average size of solutions with the maximum depth of $sTree=1$: bold face is better than GP, underline is the best result.

Pro	GP	SA10	SA20	SAD	DA10	DA20	DAD
A. Benchmarking Problems							
F1	295.5	93.2	26.8	23.4	78.2	19.6	<u>17.1</u>
F2	228.3	81.5	22.8	13.5	77.2	27.1	<u>12.7</u>
F3	180.9	64.6	43.5	<u>31.6</u>	63.5	43.8	36.0
F4	187.3	75.5	24.2	14.9	44.2	<u>11.3</u>	11.9
F5	162.5	59.1	12.8	<u>11.2</u>	57.6	12.3	12.5
F6	216.9	84.0	24.3	<u>10.6</u>	68.2	21.6	16.7
F7	153.6	68.8	22.5	23.4	72.3	<u>17.5</u>	20.9
F8	161.0	60.1	<u>14.1</u>	20.2	62.3	17.7	17.6
F9	237.8	79.2	12.1	<u>10.5</u>	73.6	11.8	11.9
B. UCI Problems							
F10	196.4	55.7	10.9	<u>9.6</u>	58.5	15.7	11.4
F11	192.0	62.8	10.6	<u>6.7</u>	82.0	19.2	16.5
F12	151.7	65.5	21.2	<u>12.4</u>	72.7	21.1	15.3
F13	200.8	24.8	7.9	<u>6.7</u>	70.6	11.9	7.2
F14	170.5	58.0	10.1	<u>7.3</u>	62.3	11.7	10.8
F15	187.4	58.3	9.9	<u>7.7</u>	68.9	13.8	8.8
F16	192.6	60.1	9.7	<u>9.1</u>	72.4	19.2	14.9
F17	177.5	63.5	10.7	<u>8.5</u>	84.3	17.6	12.5
F18	181.8	50.6	8.7	<u>7.2</u>	61.3	16.5	11.4

Table 8: Mean of the best fitness with the maximum depth of $sTree=3$: bold face is better than GP, underline is the best result.

Pro	GP	SA10	SA20	SAD	DA10	DA20	DAD
A. Benchmarking Problems							
F1	<u>0.47</u>	0.51	1.00	1.36	0.49	0.95	1.16
F2	1.91	1.18	2.54	4.20	<u>0.95</u>	2.20	3.39
F3	0.10	0.10	0.12	0.12	<u>0.09</u>	0.12	0.11
F4	0.51	0.23	0.72	1.91	<u>0.08</u>	0.31	0.53
F5	1.13	0.99	1.56	2.75	<u>0.83</u>	1.49	2.66
F6	0.26	0.25	0.25	0.26	<u>0.25</u>	0.25	0.25
F7	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	<u>0.03</u>	0.03	0.03
F8	9.90	11.28	20.92	37.54	<u>7.56</u>	15.66	21.01
F9	0.38	0.38	0.48	0.49	<u>0.36</u>	0.46	0.48
B. UCI Problems							
F10	0.41	0.16	0.22	0.22	<u>0.14</u>	0.17	0.18
F11	0.47	0.48	0.52	0.53	<u>0.47</u>	0.50	0.51
F12	0.40	0.20	0.26	0.32	<u>0.16</u>	0.16	0.17
F13	3.28	3.31	3.43	3.44	<u>3.07</u>	3.26	3.28
F14	0.17	0.17	0.18	0.18	<u>0.17</u>	0.17	0.17
F15	0.82	0.54	0.89	0.93	<u>0.49</u>	0.52	0.56
F16	1.68	1.72	2.01	2.06	<u>1.56</u>	1.80	1.94
F17	0.91	0.91	1.10	1.12	<u>0.87</u>	1.01	1.04
F18	0.53	0.50	0.65	0.66	<u>0.42</u>	0.55	0.60

Table 9: Median of testing error with the maximum depth of $sTree=3$: bold face is better than GP, underline is the best result

Pro	GP	SA10	SA20	SAD	DA10	DA20	DAD
A. Benchmarking Problems							
F1	1.69	1.19	<u>1.11</u>	1.52	1.54	1.33	2.08
F2	10.17	5.37	4.83	5.19	<u>4.26</u>	4.27	5.68
F3	0.06	<u>0.05</u>	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05	0.05
F4	0.31	0.08	0.57	3.31	<u>0.00</u>	0.01	0.02
F5	33.01	24.12	6.56	23.32	10.36	<u>5.08</u>	19.74
F6	0.26	0.25	0.25	<u>0.25</u>	0.25	0.25	0.25
F7	0.03	0.03	0.03	<u>0.03</u>	0.03	0.03	0.03
F8	45.88	45.05	45.05	<u>44.29</u>	45.97	45.58	44.60
F9	2.19	2.18	2.18	<u>2.18</u>	2.20	2.18	2.18
B. UCI Problems							
F10	0.75	0.27	0.28	0.26	<u>0.24</u>	0.25	0.25
F11	0.61	0.58	0.57	0.58	0.58	<u>0.57</u>	0.57
F12	0.36	0.20	0.27	0.33	<u>0.16</u>	0.17	0.18
F13	5.18	3.86	3.90	3.97	3.99	<u>3.73</u>	3.75
F14	0.18	0.17	0.18	0.18	0.17	<u>0.17</u>	0.17
F15	1.44	0.56	0.89	0.94	0.56	<u>0.51</u>	0.54
F16	2.69	2.31	2.10	2.06	2.17	2.10	<u>1.97</u>
F17	1.77	1.28	1.16	<u>1.13</u>	1.29	1.29	1.31
F18	0.73	0.59	0.69	0.69	<u>0.53</u>	0.57	0.64

Table 10: Average size of solutions with the maximum depth of $sTree=3$: bold face is better than GP, underline is the best result

Pro	GP	SA10	SA20	SAD	DA10	DA20	DAD
A. Benchmarking Problems							
F1	295.5	97.2	18.7	<u>15.2</u>	75.9	21.8	15.8
F2	228.3	81.5	20.4	20.9	76.1	25.4	<u>15.4</u>
F3	180.9	67.3	42.4	30.9	76.6	43.7	<u>28.4</u>
F4	187.3	66.4	20.5	11.9	54.3	13.3	<u>9.5</u>
F5	162.5	59.1	16.1	<u>11.4</u>	54.6	13.4	12.3
F6	216.9	79.1	21.9	<u>11.0</u>	65.6	21.7	16.8
F7	153.6	69.6	21.8	21.5	63.9	<u>20.5</u>	24.8
F8	161.0	61.3	15.6	24.6	63.3	16.7	<u>11.6</u>
F9	237.8	85.0	16.3	<u>7.8</u>	60.3	15.9	11.3
B. UCI Problems							
F10	196.4	58.5	<u>8.6</u>	12.0	70.7	16.5	15.5
F11	192.0	66.1	10.8	<u>8.1</u>	75.0	17.3	12.8
F12	151.7	57.5	16.9	<u>12.4</u>	74.0	21.1	13.6
F13	200.8	26.9	7.9	<u>7.7</u>	55.7	13.1	8.1
F14	170.5	52.9	8.5	<u>6.7</u>	65.4	12.8	9.9
F15	187.4	51.6	10.8	<u>8.7</u>	68.9	15.9	9.2
F16	192.6	61.1	10.0	<u>8.4</u>	74.3	20.3	13.7
F17	177.5	68.0	8.8	<u>7.6</u>	76.0	16.3	13.5
F18	181.8	46.0	9.2	<u>8.1</u>	61.3	17.1	15.5

Table 11: Mean of the best fitness with the maximum depth of $sTree=4$: bold face is better than GP, underline is the best result

Pro	GP	SA10	SA20	SAD	DA10	DA20	DAD
A. Benchmarking Problems							
F1	0.47	0.48	0.89	1.34	<u>0.43</u>	0.90	1.17
F2	1.91	1.17	2.35	4.18	<u>0.99</u>	2.24	3.51
F3	0.10	0.10	0.13	0.14	<u>0.10</u>	0.12	0.12
F4	0.51	0.16	0.52	1.94	<u>0.07</u>	0.10	1.41
F5	1.13	1.07	1.61	2.85	<u>1.01</u>	1.42	2.79
F6	0.26	0.25	0.25	0.26	<u>0.25</u>	0.25	0.25
F7	0.03	<u>0.03</u>	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03
F8	9.90	9.72	22.97	36.76	<u>8.84</u>	15.01	22.07
F9	0.38	0.38	0.48	0.50	<u>0.32</u>	0.45	0.48
B. UCI Problems							
F10	0.41	0.16	0.23	0.23	<u>0.14</u>	0.16	0.18
F11	0.47	0.48	0.52	0.53	<u>0.46</u>	0.50	0.51
F12	0.40	0.18	0.27	0.30	<u>0.16</u>	0.16	0.17
F13	3.28	3.31	3.42	3.44	<u>3.10</u>	3.27	3.27
F14	0.17	0.17	0.18	0.18	<u>0.17</u>	0.17	0.17
F15	0.82	0.58	0.81	0.89	<u>0.50</u>	0.53	0.58
F16	1.68	1.64	2.01	2.06	<u>1.55</u>	1.80	1.92
F17	0.91	0.94	1.10	1.11	<u>0.85</u>	1.01	1.04
F18	0.53	0.48	0.65	0.66	<u>0.41</u>	0.54	0.60

Table 12: Median of testing error with the maximum depth of $sTree=4$: bold face is better than GP, underline is the best result

Pro	GP	SA10	SA20	SAD	DA10	DA20	DAD
A. Benchmarking Problems							
F1	1.69	1.14	<u>0.99</u>	1.51	1.34	1.34	1.99
F2	10.17	4.72	<u>3.86</u>	5.74	4.44	4.34	5.70
F3	0.06	0.05	0.05	0.06	<u>0.05</u>	0.05	0.05
F4	0.31	0.14	0.21	3.99	0.01	<u>0.01</u>	3.02
F5	33.01	25.47	7.35	25.48	10.87	<u>6.77</u>	24.63
F6	0.26	0.26	0.25	<u>0.25</u>	0.25	0.25	0.25
F7	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	0.03	<u>0.03</u>
F8	45.88	45.59	45.51	<u>44.30</u>	46.74	45.37	45.11
F9	2.19	2.19	2.18	<u>2.18</u>	2.19	2.18	2.18
B. UCI Problems							
F10	0.75	0.26	0.28	0.28	0.24	<u>0.23</u>	0.25
F11	0.61	0.59	0.57	0.58	0.59	<u>0.57</u>	0.57
F12	0.36	0.19	0.26	0.32	<u>0.17</u>	0.17	0.18
F13	5.18	3.85	3.82	3.82	3.92	<u>3.72</u>	3.77
F14	0.18	0.17	0.18	0.18	<u>0.17</u>	0.17	0.17
F15	1.44	0.61	0.88	0.94	0.59	<u>0.51</u>	0.53
F16	2.69	2.17	2.05	2.04	2.43	2.04	<u>1.99</u>
F17	1.77	1.31	1.15	<u>1.13</u>	1.32	1.29	1.33
F18	0.73	0.60	0.65	0.69	<u>0.55</u>	0.59	0.60

Table 13: Average size of solutions with the maximum depth of $sTree=4$: bold face is better than GP, underline is the best result

Pro	GP	SA10	SA20	SAD	DA10	DA20	DAD
A. Benchmarking Problems							
F1	295.5	93.8	23.1	14.8	75.8	21.7	<u>14.4</u>
F2	228.3	77.4	21.6	<u>18.7</u>	79.5	27.6	18.9
F3	180.9	67.3	29.5	28.5	65.1	39.6	<u>28.4</u>
F4	187.3	65.4	19.0	<u>10.5</u>	51.3	12.2	12.1
F5	162.5	61.6	13.5	<u>10.4</u>	58.2	13.2	13.0
F6	216.9	77.1	17.7	<u>8.9</u>	66.5	18.4	20.7
F7	153.6	75.1	20.9	19.9	69.6	<u>18.5</u>	18.8
F8	161.0	67.4	15.7	21.9	57.6	15.8	<u>13.8</u>
F9	237.8	74.1	13.8	<u>10.6</u>	63.4	17.0	10.7
B. UCI Problems							
F10	196.4	60.1	<u>7.8</u>	9.6	65.7	15.9	15.8
F11	192.0	55.8	10.3	<u>7.2</u>	77.1	18.3	11.3
F12	151.7	55.7	14.0	<u>11.3</u>	71.4	21.0	12.4
F13	200.8	22.6	<u>7.2</u>	8.4	64.0	13.8	7.9
F14	170.5	48.3	8.9	<u>6.9</u>	65.7	15.5	9.9
F15	187.4	67.2	9.9	<u>7.7</u>	73.5	17.2	9.5
F16	192.6	63.2	9.2	<u>7.6</u>	75.7	19.5	15.3
F17	177.5	60.1	9.9	<u>8.3</u>	75.8	16.7	14.5
F18	181.8	58.7	8.4	<u>7.0</u>	66.6	18.6	14.8




Figure 1: Average bloat over generations on problems F2, F3, F4, F5, F6, F8, F9 and F10.




Figure 2: Average bloat over generations on problems F12, F13, F14, F15, F16 and F18.




Figure 3: Average overfitting over the generations on problems F2, F3, F4, F5, F6, F8, F9 and F10.




Figure 4: Average overfitting over the generations on problems F12, F13, F14, F15, F16 and F18.




Figure 5: Average complexity of the best individual over the generations on problems F2, F3, F4, F5, F6, F8, F9 and F10.




Figure 6: Average complexity of the best individual over the generations on problems F12, F13, F14, F15, F16 and F18.