

Lexicase-based Selection Methods with Down-sampling for Symbolic Regression Problems: Overview and Benchmark

ALINA GEIGER, Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz, Germany

DOMINIK SOBANIA, Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz, Germany

FRANZ ROTHLAUF, Johannes Gutenberg University Mainz, Germany

In recent years, several new lexicase-based selection variants have emerged due to the success of standard lexicase selection in various application domains. For symbolic regression problems, variants that use an ϵ -threshold or batches of training cases, among others, have led to performance improvements. Lately, especially variants that combine lexicase selection and down-sampling strategies have received a lot of attention. This paper evaluates random as well as informed down-sampling in combination with the relevant lexicase-based selection methods on a wide range of symbolic regression problems. In contrast to most work, we not only compare the methods over a given evaluation budget, but also over a given time as time is usually limited in practice. We find that for a given evaluation budget, ϵ -lexicase selection in combination with random or informed down-sampling outperforms all other methods. Only for a rather long running time of 24h, the best performing method is tournament selection in combination with informed down-sampling. If the given running time is very short, lexicase variants using batches of training cases perform best.

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Symbolic Regression, Genetic Programming, Lexicase Selection, Down-sampling

1 INTRODUCTION

Symbolic regression searches for a mathematical expression that best describes a given problem [Poli et al. 2008]. Applications of symbolic regression range from finance [Chen 2012], and medicine [La Cava et al. 2023] to materials science [Hernandez et al. 2019a]. Genetic Programming (GP) [Koza 1992] is an evolutionary computation technique that has often been used successfully to solve even complex symbolic regression tasks [La Cava et al. 2021]. In GP, a population of individuals evolves in an evolutionary process guided by selection and modified through variation operators. Recent work has shown that especially the choice of the selection method has a major impact on the solution quality [Helmuth and Abdelhady 2020].

Traditional selection methods like tournament selection evaluate the quality of individuals based on an aggregated fitness score leading to a loss of information about the structure of the training data [Krawiec and O'Reilly 2014]. Therefore, lexicase selection [Helmuth et al. 2014; Spector 2012] has been proposed that uses the error values of individuals on each training case. This allows lexicase selection to select specialists that perform particularly well for certain parts of the problem, which has been found to be beneficial for search towards better solutions [Helmuth et al. 2019, 2020].

Due to the successful application of lexicase selection in many problem domains [Aenugu and Spector 2019; Helmuth and Spector 2015; La Cava et al. 2016; Moore and Stanton 2017], several variants of lexicase selection have been proposed. In the domain of symbolic regression, ϵ -lexicase selection outperformed standard lexicase selection and tournament selection on the considered problems [La Cava et al. 2019, 2016]. Others suggested to use batches of training cases instead of single training cases to evaluate the quality of individuals [Aenugu and Spector 2019; De Melo et al. 2019; Sobania and Rothlauf 2022].

Recently, especially variants combining lexicase selection with down-sampling strategies received much attention because it led to higher problem-solving success in different applications [Boldi et al. 2024b; Ferguson et al. 2020; Geiger et al. 2023; Hernandez et al. 2019b]. Down-sampling uses only a subset of the training cases in each generation to evaluate the quality of the individuals. For a fixed evaluation budget, the saved evaluations can be allocated to a longer search which allows the exploration of more individuals. The simplest down-sampling strategy is to randomly sample a percentage of the training cases in each generation [Ferguson et al. 2020; Hernandez et al. 2019b]. However, this might cause the exclusion of important training cases for several generations [Boldi et al. 2024b]. Therefore, Boldi et al. [2024b] proposed informed down-sampling as a strategy to create more diverse subsets.

In preliminary work [Geiger et al. 2024], we analyzed and compared several relevant lexicase-based selection methods in combination with random down-sampling. We used tournament selection as baseline and also studied the combination of lexicase variants with batches of training cases. The paper at hand builds upon this work and presents a more comprehensive and more detailed comparison. Geiger et al. [2024] analyzed selection methods only in combination with random down-sampling. The paper at hand also adds selection variants using informed down-sampling. For the comparison, we use a wide range of symbolic regression problems to provide researchers as well as practitioners with a comprehensive guide for choosing the appropriate selection method.

We find that ϵ -lexicase selection in combination with random or informed down-sampling performs best for a given evaluation budget. For a time budget of 24h, the best performing method is tournament selection in combination with informed down-sampling, followed by ϵ -lexicase selection in combination with random down-sampling. For almost all studied selection methods, the combination with informed down-sampling outperformed random down-sampling for a given time budget of 24h. We observe that the relative performance of each selection method depends on the given running time. For example, if the running time is very short (15 minutes), batch-tournament selection and batch- ϵ -lexicase selection perform best. Additionally, the detailed analysis for each problem shows that while there are general trends, the relative performance of the methods varies between problems.

Sect. 2 provides a brief overview of the related work. In Sect. 3, we describe the selection methods analyzed in this study, followed by a description of the applied down-sampling strategies in Sect. 4. Section 5 presents our experimental setting and the benchmark problems. In Sect. 6 we present our results, followed by the conclusions in Sect. 7.

2 RELATED WORK

We briefly discuss prior work on lexicase selection. More detailed descriptions of the lexicase-based selection methods and down-sampling strategies are given in Sec. 3 and 4.

Traditional selection methods (e.g., tournament selection) evaluate the quality of individuals based on an aggregated fitness value. This leads to a loss of information about the structure of the training data [Krawiec and O'Reilly 2014]. Lexicase selection [Helmuth et al. 2014; Spector 2012] has been proposed as an alternative considering the errors of individuals on each training case separately. Lexicase selection is able to select specialists as parents, meaning individuals that solve some part of a problem better than others while performing worse on average [Helmuth et al. 2019, 2020; Pantridge et al. 2018]. In addition, prior work has found that lexicase selection maintains a higher population diversity compared to tournament selection [Helmuth et al. 2016a,b].

For continuous problems, standard lexicase selection is not able to achieve the same performance improvements due to the selection of strictly elite individuals on training cases [La Cava et al. 2016]. Therefore, lexicase variants with a relaxed pass condition have been proposed [La Cava et al. 2016; Spector et al. 2018], with ϵ -lexicase selection [La Cava et al. 2019, 2016] being the best

known. Additionally, variants using batches of training cases have been introduced [Aenugu and Spector 2019; De Melo et al. 2019; Sobania and Rothlauf 2022]. It has been found that the use of batches can increase the generalizability of the found solution [Aenugu and Spector 2019; Sobania and Rothlauf 2022]. Batch-tournament selection [De Melo et al. 2019] uses batches in combination with tournament selection to improve the efficiency of lexicase selection. Another idea to improve the runtime of lexicase selection is to combine lexicase selection and weighted shuffle with partial evaluation [Ding et al. 2022a,b]. Plexicase selection [Ding et al. 2023] improves the runtime of lexicase selection by sampling individuals from a probability distribution instead of doing the actual selection procedure. Ni et al. [2024] proposed DALex to improve the runtime by performing all calculations as matrix multiplications. In other studies, the combination of lexicase selection and novelty search has been explored to prevent premature convergence [Jundt and Helmuth 2019; Kelly et al. 2019].

Recently, the combination of lexicase variants with down-sampling strategies has been found to lead to higher performance [Boldi et al. 2024b; Ferguson et al. 2020; Geiger et al. 2023; Hernandez et al. 2019b]. Therefore, the influence of down-sampling has been analyzed in several studies [Boldi et al. 2023b; Helmuth and Spector 2020, 2021; Hernandez et al. 2022; Schweim et al. 2022]. Down-sampling reduces the number of evaluations per generations by sampling a subset of training cases from the training set allowing the evaluation of more individuals with the same evaluation budget [Helmuth and Spector 2020]. While random down-sampling [Ferguson et al. 2020; Hernandez et al. 2019b] randomly creates subsets, informed down-sampling [Boldi et al. 2024b] creates subsets that includes distinct training cases. It has been found that informed down-sampling outperforms random down-sampling in combination with lexicase selection on program synthesis problems [Boldi et al. 2024b]. Therefore, informed down-sampling has been further studied in combination with tournament and fitness-proportionate selection for program synthesis problems and synthetic regression problems with an exact solution [Boldi et al. 2023a, 2024a]. However, to our knowledge, there is no study that analyzes the influence of informed down-sampling for continuous symbolic regression problems.

Lexicase selection and its variants have been successfully applied and analyzed in several application domains, like program synthesis [Helmuth and Abdelhady 2020; Helmuth and Spector 2015; Sobania and Rothlauf 2021; Sobania et al. 2023], symbolic regression [Geiger et al. 2023; La Cava et al. 2019, 2016], evolutionary robotics [Moore and Stanton 2017, 2018], rule-based learning systems [Aenugu and Spector 2019; Wagner and Stein 2021], and deep learning [Ding and Spector 2021].

Prior work analyzed and compared several lexicase variants for program synthesis problems [Helmuth and Abdelhady 2020]. However, to our knowledge, a study that compares lexicase-based selection methods in combination with different down-sampling strategies, including informed down-sampling, on a wide range of symbolic regression problems is missing so far.

3 SELECTION METHODS FOR SYMBOLIC REGRESSION PROBLEMS

We provide a detailed description of tournament selection, lexicase selection, as well as the lexicase-based variants studied in this work in the context of symbolic regression.

3.1 Tournament Selection

With tournament selection, k individuals are randomly chosen to participate in a tournament. The participant with the best fitness wins the tournament and is selected as a parent [Poli et al. 2008]. Fitness is measured as an aggregated value, for example the mean squared error (MSE)

$$\text{MSE}(T) = \frac{1}{|T|} \sum_{t \in T} (y_t - \hat{y}_t)^2, \quad (1)$$

where \hat{y}_t is the predicted output of an individual and y_t the desired output for all training cases $t \in T$.

3.2 Lexicase Selection

In contrast to tournament selection, lexicase selection [Spector 2012] considers the error values e_t on each training case $t \in T$ separately rather than comparing individuals based on an aggregated fitness value. Algorithm 1 shows the procedure of a single selection event with lexicase selection with population P , the set of training cases T , the error e_t of an individual $i \in P$ for training case $t \in T$, and the minimal error e_t^* on cases $t \in T$.

Algorithm 1 Lexicase Selection

```

1:  $C :=$  all individuals  $i \in P$ 
2:  $T' :=$  randomly shuffled  $T$ 
3: while  $|T'| > 0$  and  $|C| > 1$  do
4:    $t :=$  first case of  $T'$ 
5:    $C :=$  all candidates with  $e_t = e_t^*$ 
6:   remove  $t$  from  $T'$ 
7: end while
8: return random choice from  $C$ 

```

With lexicase selection, all individuals $i \in P$ are considered as candidates for selection (line 1) and all training cases $t \in T$ are randomly ordered (line 2). Lexicase selection iterates through all training cases always keeping only the individuals in the candidate pool C with the lowest error e_t^* on the current case t (line 5). This is repeated until there is only one candidate left or there are no more training cases. In this case, one individual is randomly chosen from the remaining candidate pool C (line 8) [Helmuth et al. 2014; Spector 2012].

3.3 ϵ -Lexicase Selection

For continuous problems, the pass condition of standard lexicase selection that only candidates with the lowest error remain in the candidate pool (Algorithm 1, line 5) is too strict. Therefore, ϵ -lexicase selection has been proposed by La Cava et al. [2019, 2016] for solving symbolic regression problems.

ϵ -lexicase selection modifies the pass condition of standard lexicase selection in such a way that all candidates with an error $e_t \leq e_t^* + \epsilon_t$ remain in the candidate pool. ϵ_t is calculated for a training case t using the median absolute deviation [Pham-Gia and Hung 2001]

$$\epsilon_t = \text{median}(|\mathbf{e}_t - \text{median}(\mathbf{e}_t)|), \quad (2)$$

where \mathbf{e}_t is a vector of all errors on the current case t across the candidate pool C [La Cava et al. 2019].

3.4 ϵ -Plexicase Selection

Ding et al. [2023] proposed plexicase selection as a more efficient alternative to lexicase selection. The idea is to reduce the runtime of lexicase selection by sampling individuals from a probability distribution instead of doing the actual selections. However, Dolson [2023] has shown that the problem of calculating the actual selection probabilities using lexicase selection is \mathcal{NP} -hard. Therefore, Ding et al. [2023] only approximate the probability of individuals being selected with lexicase selection by finding the Pareto set boundaries through pairwise comparisons of individuals

and assigning selection probabilities to each individual based on these comparisons. In order to further improve the solution quality, [Ding et al. \[2023\]](#) introduce a hyperparameter α to manipulate the generated probability distribution. For symbolic regression problems, an ϵ -threshold like in ϵ -lexicase is used to calculate ϵ -relaxed Pareto set boundaries. They call this variant ϵ -plexicase selection.

3.5 Batch-Tournament Selection

The problem-solving performance of lexicase selection is superior to tournament selection [[Helmuth et al. 2014](#); [Spector 2012](#)]. However, lexicase selection is computationally expensive compared to tournament selection [[La Cava et al. 2019](#)]. Therefore, [De Melo et al. \[2019\]](#) proposed batch-tournament selection as well as the variant Batch Tournament Selection Shuffled (BTSS) which shuffles the cases in addition to grouping them in batches. Both approaches combine the good performance of lexicase selection with the low computational effort of tournament selection.

For BTSS, the training cases are randomly combined to batches of size b and the fitness values of the individuals are derived from their performance on each batch (e.g., in terms of the MSE). For each selection event, k individuals participate in a tournament. The individual with the lowest MSE on the current batch is selected as a parent. For each selection event, another batch is used to compare the quality of the individuals. If there are less batches than parent selection events, the batches are used multiple times.

3.6 Batch- ϵ -Lexicase Selection

Using lexicase selection, the outcome of a selection event highly depends on the ordering of training cases [[Aenugu and Spector 2019](#)]. Therefore, lexicase variants using batches of training cases instead of single training cases to compare the performance of individuals in the lexicase selection process have been proposed [[Aenugu and Spector 2019](#); [Sobania and Rothlauf 2022](#)]. It has been found that the generalization ability of the found solutions is better using batch-lexicase selection compared to standard lexicase selection [[Aenugu and Spector 2019](#); [Sobania and Rothlauf 2022](#)]. For continuous-valued problems, [Geiger et al. \[2024\]](#) proposed Batch- ϵ -lexicase selection to combine batches with ϵ -lexicase selection. In each generation, the training cases are randomly combined to batches of size b and the fitness values of the individuals are calculated on each batch (e.g., in terms of the MSE). The selection is then performed with ϵ -lexicase selection.

4 DOWN-SAMPLING STRATEGIES

We describe the down-sampling strategies random down-sampling and informed down-sampling.

4.1 Random Down-sampling

In application domains, like program synthesis [[Ferguson et al. 2020](#); [Helmuth and Spector 2021](#); [Hernandez et al. 2019b](#)] and symbolic regression [[Geiger et al. 2023](#)], it has been found that the combination of lexicase-based selection methods and random down-sampling improves the problem-solving success. Random down-sampling means that in each generation a random subset of training cases is used to evaluate the performance of the individuals. Therefore, the saved fitness evaluations in each generation can be used to search for more generations or to increase the population size. This is beneficial as more individuals can be explored with the same evaluation budget [[Helmuth and Spector 2020](#)]. Since a different random subset of training cases is used in each generation, the population is likely to be evaluated on a large proportion of the training cases over a few generations [[Hernandez et al. 2019b](#)].

The down-sampling rate is defined by a parameter d . For example, if $d = 0.1$, only 10% of the training cases are used in each generation, meaning the search can be performed 10 times longer or the population size can be increased by a factor of 10.

4.2 Informed Down-sampling

A problem of randomly creating subsets of training cases is that important cases might be excluded for several generations while training cases with redundant information might end up in the same subset [Boldi et al. 2024b; Ferguson et al. 2020]. Therefore, Boldi et al. [2024b] proposed informed down-sampling to create subsets consisting of more diverse training cases. The authors define synonymous cases as cases that are solved by the same individuals in a population. If two cases are solved by different individuals, this indicates that the cases measure a different functionality. Hence, it would be beneficial to have both cases in a subset.

Boldi et al. [2024b] define the distance between two cases as the Hamming distance between their two solve vectors (a solve vector contains the output of each individual for that case). Then, they use the Farthest First Traversal Algorithm [Hochbaum and Shmoys 1985] to select a subset of training cases with a large pairwise distance. However, evaluating all individuals on all training cases in each generation to create informed subsets would mean that we lose the benefit of down-sampling as we do not save any fitness evaluations. Therefore, Boldi et al. [2024b] propose to sample a fraction s of the parents that are evaluated on all training cases in order to calculate the distance between training cases. In addition, the distance calculation is only performed every g generations to further reduce the number of fitness evaluations required to create the informed subsets.

Since Boldi et al. [2024b] study informed down-sampling for program synthesis problems, solve vectors are binary. In the domain of symbolic regression, the solve vectors contain continuous errors values. Therefore, we calculate the distances between two cases in this work using Euclidean distances instead of Hamming distances.

5 EXPERIMENTAL SETTING

We present our experimental setup, followed by a description of the used benchmark problems.

5.1 Setup

All experiments were implemented within the DEAP framework [Fortin et al. 2012] (version 1.4.1). Table 1 summarizes the parameter values of our GP setting which is in line with previous work [Geiger et al. 2023, 2024].

Table 1. Parameter setting of our GP approach.

Parameter	Value
Population size	500
Primitive set	{ \mathbf{x} , ERC, +, -, *, AQ, sin, cos, neg}
ERC values	{-1, 0, 1}
Initialization method	Ramped half-and-half
Maximum tree depth	17
Crossover probability	80%
Mutation probability	5%
Runs	30

The primitive set consists of all input features \mathbf{x} , an ephemeral random constant (ERC) where $\text{ERC} \in \{-1, 0, 1\}$, and the arithmetic functions addition, subtraction, multiplication, analytic quotient (AQ) [Ni et al. 2013], sine, cosine, and negative. The population is initialized using ramped half-and-half with tree depths between 0 and 4 and a population size of 500. In each generation, crossover is applied with a probability of 80% and mutation with a probability of 5%. We restrict the maximum tree depth to 17 [Koza 1992]. Each configuration is repeated 30 times.

Usually, selection methods are compared for a given evaluation budget that depends on the number of training cases, the population size and the number of generations [Geiger et al. 2023; Helmuth and Spector 2020]. If down-sampling is applied, we allocate the saved evaluations to a longer search. Table 2 shows the number of generations given to each run depending on the down-sampling strategy applied.

Table 2. Generational limit for runs without down-sampling, with random down-sampling, and with informed down-sampling.

Down-sampling Strategy	# Generations
No down-sampling ($d = 1.0$)	100
Random down-sampling ($d = 0.1$)	1,000
Informed down-sampling ($d = 0.1, s = 0.01, g = 10$)	991

If there is no down-sampling used ($d = 1.0$), we set the number of generations to $G = 100$. For random down-sampling we set a down-sampling rate of $d = 0.1$ as suggested by Geiger et al. [2023], meaning we can search for $\hat{G} = 1,000$ generations with the same evaluation budget. For runs with informed down-sampling, the down-sampling rate is set to $d = 0.1$ as well. The parent sampling rate is set to $s = 0.01$ and the distance calculation scheduling parameter is set to $g = 10$ as suggested by Boldi et al. [2024b]. This means that every 10 generations, 5 individuals are evaluated on all training cases to calculate the distance between the cases. The generational limit for informed down-sampling is calculated as

$$\hat{G} = \frac{G}{d + \frac{s(1-d)}{g}} \quad (3)$$

where G is the number of generations for runs without down-sampling, d is the down-sampling rate, s the parent sampling rate and g the distance calculation scheduling parameter [Boldi et al. 2024b]. In our case, this leads to limit of $\hat{G} = 991$ for runs using informed down-sampling.

For each problem, we randomly split all cases into 70% training cases, 15% validation cases, and 15% test cases. All individuals are evaluated on the training cases to perform the selection process. In each generation, the individual with the lowest MSE on the validation cases is stored as the current best solution to avoid solutions that are overfitted on the training cases. After a run, this individual is evaluated on the unseen test cases in terms of the MSE.

The calculation of the fitness of individuals during the search depends on the selection method. As tournament selection evaluates individuals based on an aggregated value, we use the MSE as the fitness measure. For ϵ -lexicase selection and ϵ -plexicase selection it is necessary to evaluate the performance of individuals on each training case separately. Therefore, we calculate for each individual the squared error on each training case. For batch-tournament selection and batch- ϵ -lexicase selection, the performance of individuals is measured in terms of the MSE on each batch of training cases.

The parameter settings of the selection methods are shown in Table 3. They are carefully chosen according to the recommendations from the literature.

Table 3. Parameter settings of the selection methods.

Selection Method	Parameter	Value
Tournament selection	tournament size k	5
ϵ -Plexicase selection	alpha α	1.0
Batch- ϵ -lexicase selection	batch size b	{0.05, 0.075, 0.1}
Batch-Tournament selection	tournament size k	64
	batch size b	{0.05, 0.075, 0.1}

For tournament selection, we set a tournament size of $k = 5$ [Fang and Li 2010]. The parameter of ϵ -plexicase selection is set to $\alpha = 1.0$ as suggested by Ding et al. [2023]. For batch- ϵ -lexicase selection, we study batch sizes $b \in \{0.05, 0.075, 0.1\}$ [Aenugu and Spector 2019], which means that a single batch consists of 5%, 7.5% or 10% of the training cases. For batch-tournament selection, we set a tournament size of $k = 64$ [De Melo et al. 2019] and we study batch sizes $b \in \{0.05, 0.075, 0.1\}$ as well.

In addition to runs given a fixed evaluation budget, we also study the performance over a running time of 24h. Here, we measure time in terms of wall clock time. In each generation, we track the performance of the current best individual on the test cases, the median tree size across the population and the time. We conducted the experiments on a high performance computing cluster using Intel 2630v4 2,20GHz CPUs. All processes were executed single threaded.

5.2 Benchmark Problems

The selection methods are evaluated on 20 symbolic regression problems that are sampled without replacement from SR bench [La Cava et al. 2021]. Due to limited computational resources, we want to ensure that all experiments finish within 24h. Therefore, we only considered problems with less than or equal to 1,000 instances. Table 4 shows all considered problems with the number of instances and the number of features.

The number of instances range from 100 to 1,000 and the number of features range from 2 to 50 for the studied problems.

6 RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

To develop a guideline for choosing the right selection method for the problem at hand, we compare state-of-the-art selection methods on a wide range of symbolic regression problems under various conditions. In detail, we compare tournament selection (denoted as *tourn*), ϵ -lexicase selection (*ϵ -lex*), ϵ -plexicase selection (*ϵ -plex*), batch-tournament selection (*batch-tourn*), and batch- ϵ -lexicase selection (*batch- ϵ -lex*) in combination with no down-sampling (*nds*), with random down-sampling (*rds*) and with informed down-sampling (*ids*).

For the sake of simplicity, only the results for the best batch size found are shown for batch-tournament selection and batch- ϵ -lexicase selection, meaning the batch size with the lowest average MSE on the validation cases for each problem.

First, we show and discuss the results achieved by using a given evaluation budget. Then, we present the results comparing the selection methods over different running times. A statistical analysis of the results is given in Appendix D.

Table 4. All benchmark problems used to evaluate the selection methods with the number of instances and the number of features.

Problem	# Instances	# Features
1027_ESL	488	4
1030_ERA	1,000	4
207_autoPrice	159	15
230_machine_cpu	209	6
519_vinnie	380	2
523_analcatdata_neavote	100	2
581_fri_c3_500_25	500	25
589_fri_c2_1000_25	1,000	25
591_fri_c1_100_10	100	10
606_fri_c2_1000_10	1,000	10
607_fri_c4_1000_50	1,000	50
615_fri_c4_250_10	250	10
617_fri_c3_500_5	500	5
621_fri_c0_100_10	100	10
623_fri_c4_1000_10	1,000	10
624_fri_c0_100_5	100	5
641_fri_c1_500_10	500	10
647_fri_c1_250_10	250	10
654_fri_c0_500_10	500	10
665_sleuth_case2002	147	6

6.1 Results for runs with a given maximum number of evaluations

Usually, selection methods are compared over a fixed evaluation budget because fitness evaluations are considered the most expensive operation [Boldi et al. 2024b]. This means for runs without down-sampling that each selection method searches for 100 generations to find a solution. For runs with random down-sampling ($d = 0.1$) the search is performed for 1,000 generations, and for runs with informed down-sampling ($d = 0.1, s = 0.01, g = 10$) for 991 generations (see Sect. 5.1 for further explanations).

Figure 1 plots the performance rankings of the selection methods for all 20 problems following the approach of Orzechowski et al. [2018] for comparing multiple algorithms over many datasets. For each method, we measured the relative performance on a problem by comparing the median MSE on the test cases over all 30 runs. The down-sampling strategy is indicated by a prefix (*nds* for no down-sampling, *rds* for random down-sampling and *ids* for informed down-sampling).

We observe that batch-tourn, tourn, ϵ -lex, and ϵ -plex perform better in combination with down-sampling. For batch-tourn and tourn, the variant with informed down-sampling performed best according to the median ranking. The overall best result is achieved by ϵ -lex in combination with random down-sampling and the second best by ϵ -lex in combination with informed down-sampling. Interestingly, we observe that *ids*-tourn performs significantly better than *nds*-tourn and *rds*-tourn, with *ids*-tourn being the third best method in terms of the median ranking.




Fig. 1. **Performance** ranking of the selection methods for a given evaluation budget. The performance on each problem is measured in terms of the median MSE on the test cases (smaller is better).




Fig. 2. Ranking of the median **tree size** for all selection methods for a given evaluation budget. The tree size is measured in terms of the median tree size of the final population (smaller is better).

Table 5. Median MSE on the test cases for each selection method on all 20 problems. The results refer to the best solution found for a given evaluation budget. Best results are shown in bold font. The results are rounded to two decimal places.

problem	batch-tourn			batch- ϵ -lex			tourn			ϵ -lex			ϵ -plex		
	nds	rds	ids	nds	rds	ids	nds	rds	ids	nds	rds	ids	nds	rds	ids
1027	0.40	0.33	0.37	0.35	0.36	0.36	0.57	0.39	0.38	0.53	0.51	0.38	0.51	0.46	0.40
1030	2.78	2.81	2.99	2.83	2.75	2.77	2.78	2.71	2.88	2.85	2.81	2.96	3.20	2.95	3.06
207	1.14e+07	1.14e+07	1.06e+07	1.22e+07	8.92e+06	1.16e+07	9.32e+06	1.14e+07	1.02e+07	1.19e+07	1.05e+07	1.36e+07	1.15e+07	1.25e+07	1.05e+07
230	6131.70	5600.98	5339.38	6049.93	5527.29	4262.77	7565.13	7669.26	4829.54	4270.43	3567.15	4268.94	8685.30	4436.89	4022.64
519	2.84	2.84	3.17	2.74	2.71	2.99	2.50	2.55	2.84	2.90	3.10	3.00	2.90	2.95	3.31
523	1.05	1.01	1.15	1.06	1.15	1.07	1.03	1.11	1.12	1.12	1.11	1.25	1.12	1.05	1.11
581	0.21	0.19	0.13	0.18	0.23	0.15	0.58	0.44	0.11	0.13	0.09	0.08	0.47	0.12	0.15
589	0.24	0.20	0.15	0.24	0.21	0.20	0.29	0.23	0.17	0.20	0.07	0.07	0.31	0.18	0.16
591	0.42	0.34	0.39	0.32	0.36	0.41	0.42	0.44	0.30	0.32	0.26	0.41	0.43	0.45	0.63
606	0.22	0.22	0.12	0.23	0.22	0.14	0.30	0.32	0.11	0.19	0.08	0.07	0.33	0.17	0.14
607	0.21	0.20	0.12	0.25	0.14	0.13	0.56	0.32	0.13	0.13	0.07	0.08	0.51	0.11	0.12
615	0.21	0.19	0.17	0.17	0.20	0.19	0.54	0.38	0.16	0.19	0.14	0.15	0.63	0.15	0.22
617	0.18	0.18	0.11	0.18	0.17	0.12	0.33	0.24	0.09	0.16	0.10	0.08	0.38	0.15	0.12
621	0.57	0.50	0.63	0.36	0.46	0.57	0.51	0.59	0.42	0.39	0.52	0.54	0.51	0.53	0.60
623	0.15	0.13	0.08	0.15	0.15	0.10	0.43	0.20	0.09	0.15	0.06	0.07	0.36	0.12	0.11
624	0.41	0.43	0.53	0.35	0.42	0.53	0.42	0.50	0.40	0.44	0.28	0.48	0.50	0.52	0.66
641	0.23	0.21	0.16	0.22	0.16	0.18	0.29	0.27	0.16	0.16	0.07	0.07	0.35	0.17	0.16
647	0.22	0.28	0.21	0.19	0.25	0.18	0.35	0.29	0.18	0.21	0.13	0.16	0.44	0.17	0.21
654	0.27	0.18	0.10	0.23	0.26	0.23	0.34	0.32	0.13	0.27	0.09	0.09	0.36	0.25	0.16
665	76.31	94.13	94.13	70.86	79.19	83.57	61.02	62.76	92.08	81.60	81.58	96.96	79.03	75.41	101.67

Since studying the ranking of each method only provides a summarized overview of their performance, we also show their actual performance in terms of the median MSE on the test cases for each problem in Table 5. The problems are abbreviated by their prefix number (see Table 4 for the full names). Boxplots of the distribution of the results for each problem can be found in Appendix A.

According to the median MSE on the test cases, $\text{rds-}\epsilon\text{-lex}$ is the best performing method on 10 out of 20 problems and $\text{ids-}\epsilon\text{-lex}$ performs best on 6 out of 20 problems (on three problems, $\text{rds-}\epsilon\text{-lex}$ and $\text{ids-}\epsilon\text{-lex}$ perform equally well).

La Cava et al. [2023] argue that for symbolic regression tasks one should not only take into account the performance of a model but also its simplicity, which is typically approximated by the size of a model. Therefore, we measured the median tree size of the final population for each run. Then, we compared the median population tree size of each method to derive their ranking for each problem (smaller median tree size is better), which is shown in Figure 2.

Tournament selection generates populations with a large median tree size, especially rds-tourn . Apart from that, we found that the trees generated by the best performing methods $\text{rds-}\epsilon\text{-lex}$ and $\text{ids-}\epsilon\text{-lex}$ are relatively large while the ones generated by the worst performing method $\text{nds-}\epsilon\text{-plex}$ are small. We observed that $\text{rds-batch-}\epsilon\text{-lex}$, $\text{ids-batch-}\epsilon\text{-lex}$, and ids-batch-tourn generate populations with relatively small individuals.

Furthermore, we observed that the tree size usually increases over time for all selection methods [Geiger et al. 2024]. However, evaluating the performance of individuals is more expensive if their tree size is large. As trees grow over time, generations get more expensive. This is not taken into account when comparing methods only for a given evaluation budget.

Additionally, the run time of the selection methods varies greatly. In Figure 3, we can see the ranking of the median time each method required to perform the runs for each problem (less time is better).

For all methods, the variants without down-sampling are faster. We can see that the fastest method is $\text{nds-}\epsilon\text{-plex}$, followed by nds-batch-tourn and nds-tourn . The slowest methods are the $\epsilon\text{-lex}$ variants. This means that some methods could perform more generations in the same time than others. Therefore, we are not only comparing the selection methods over a given evaluation budget but also over a given time period.

To sum up, we found that $\epsilon\text{-lexicase}$ selection in combination with random and informed down-sampling perform best for a given evaluation budget. For four out of five selection methods the combination with down-sampling improved the performance. We observed that the median tree size of the generated populations as well as the run time varies greatly between methods. Therefore, we are not only comparing the methods for a given maximum number of evaluations but also for a given amount of time.

6.2 Results for runs with a given maximum running time

Now, we compare all methods for a given running time instead of a given maximum number of evaluations. This means that some methods run for more generations than others. We analyze the results for different run times to observe if there are differences in the relative performance of each method depending on the given time. First, we compare the best solution found within a running time of 24h. In Figure 4, the performance ranking of each method is shown after a running time of 24h. To get a more detailed view at the results, we show the median MSE of all methods on all problems in Table 6. The distributions of the results for each problem are shown in Appendix B (Figures 11- 13).




Fig. 3. Ranking of the median **run time** of each selection method **for a given evaluation budget** (less is better).




Fig. 4. **Performance** ranking of the selection methods **given 24h**. The performance on each problem is measured in terms of the median MSE on the test cases (smaller is better).

Table 6. Median MSE on the test cases for each selection method on all 20 problems. The results refer to the best solution found after **24h**. Best results are shown in bold font. The results are rounded to two decimal places.

problem	batch-tourn			batch- ϵ -lex			tourn			ϵ -lex			ϵ -plex		
	nds	rds	ids	nds	rds	ids	nds	rds	ids	nds	rds	ids	nds	rds	ids
1027	0.37	0.33	0.34	0.35	0.32	0.34	0.36	0.38	0.34	0.59	0.45	0.36	0.43	0.36	0.39
1030	2.61	2.64	2.76	2.67	2.73	2.87	2.65	2.71	2.80	2.86	2.82	2.84	2.81	2.80	2.75
207	8.90e+06	6.83e+06	7.51e+06	1.02e+07	8.35e+06	9.54e+06	8.14e+06	7.17e+06	8.22e+06	9.49e+06	1.01e+07	1.20e+07	9.39e+06	9.16e+06	1.15e+07
230	8421.04	4316.76	5056.89	4683.25	4322.90	5403.67	5003.36	3494.20	3733.44	4297.13	3247.03	3419.23	4920.95	4263.54	4705.39
519	2.81	2.93	3.07	2.68	3.01	3.23	2.58	2.80	3.03	3.23	2.91	3.51	2.85	3.05	3.26
523	1.08	1.07	1.10	1.11	1.16	1.17	1.06	1.05	1.12	1.10	1.06	1.12	1.10	1.09	1.09
581	0.07	0.08	0.05	0.11	0.08	0.05	0.30	0.31	0.05	0.08	0.06	0.06	0.09	0.10	0.07
589	0.15	0.14	0.04	0.14	0.12	0.12	0.21	0.20	0.13	0.11	0.05	0.04	0.11	0.08	0.05
591	0.23	0.19	0.31	0.24	0.20	0.20	0.39	0.36	0.14	0.25	0.17	0.30	0.27	0.31	0.43
606	0.14	0.18	0.04	0.17	0.10	0.05	0.23	0.26	0.05	0.11	0.06	0.06	0.10	0.08	0.07
607	0.08	0.10	0.05	0.09	0.08	0.05	0.26	0.18	0.06	0.08	0.06	0.05	0.09	0.08	0.06
615	0.10	0.10	0.08	0.11	0.09	0.07	0.45	0.30	0.08	0.11	0.09	0.07	0.11	0.08	0.07
617	0.08	0.10	0.05	0.10	0.10	0.05	0.24	0.19	0.04	0.08	0.07	0.06	0.09	0.08	0.06
621	0.34	0.12	0.39	0.36	0.17	0.24	0.56	0.53	0.12	0.33	0.12	0.42	0.38	0.57	0.63
623	0.07	0.08	0.04	0.07	0.08	0.04	0.20	0.16	0.05	0.09	0.05	0.05	0.09	0.07	0.06
624	0.32	0.16	0.37	0.25	0.13	0.26	0.40	0.38	0.14	0.24	0.14	0.36	0.29	0.39	0.61
641	0.14	0.10	0.03	0.11	0.06	0.04	0.21	0.20	0.06	0.07	0.05	0.04	0.08	0.07	0.04
647	0.13	0.11	0.07	0.17	0.08	0.06	0.25	0.21	0.05	0.08	0.09	0.06	0.12	0.06	0.06
654	0.09	0.07	0.07	0.12	0.08	0.07	0.27	0.25	0.07	0.10	0.07	0.08	0.12	0.09	0.09
665	103.81	82.36	89.56	86.34	91.18	92.17	71.15	80.85	110.90	93.82	76.34	116.30	78.78	87.83	108.50

For all methods, the combination with down-sampling improved the performance. For 4 out of 5 methods the combination with informed down-sampling performed best. Overall, the best result according to the median ranking was achieved by `ids-tourn`, followed by `rds- ϵ -lex`, `ids-batch-tourn`, and `ids-batch- ϵ -lex`. The worst performing methods are `nds-tourn` and `rds-tourn`.

It is interesting to note that informed down-sampling has the greatest influence on the performance of tournament selection, with `ids-tourn` performing significantly better than `nds-tourn` and `rds-tourn`. Tournament selection without down-sampling or with random down-sampling performed worst while the combination with informed down-sampling outperformed all other methods in this setting. We assume that this is because informed down-sampling includes only distinct cases in a subset. As a result, the average error on a informed subset weights the performance for different problem parts more equally than for the full training set, since training cases that test the same behavior are excluded. This leads to the observed higher performance of informed down-sampling.

Although `ids-tourn` performed best according to the median ranking, it was only the best performing method on 6 out of 20 problems. `Rds- ϵ -lex` performed best on 3 problems, `ids-batch-tourn` on 7 problems, and `ids-batch- ϵ -lex` on 5 problems. All in all, variants using informed down-sampling achieved the best results on 12 out of 20 problems.

As before, we are not only analyzing the performance but also at the tree sizes generated by each method. Figure 5 shows the ranking of the median population tree size.




Fig. 5. Ranking of the median **tree size** for all selection methods **given 24h**. The tree size is measured in terms of the median tree size of the final population (smaller is better).

The populations with the smallest individuals are generated by `rds-batch- ϵ -lex` and `ids-batch- ϵ -lex`, followed by `ids-batch-tourn`, `rds- ϵ -plex`, and `ids- ϵ -plex`. Of those methods, `ids-batch- ϵ -lex` and `ids-batch-tourn` performed best, suggesting that they offer a good compromise between size and performance. Interestingly, the variants using down-sampling always generate populations with smaller individuals than their counterpart without down-sampling.

For practitioners, the time to find a solution for a problem is often strictly limited. Therefore, we also analyze the results found after a shorter running time. Figures 6 and 7 show the performance ranking of each method for solutions found after 1h and 15 minutes, respectively. For the detailed results we point to the figures and tables in Appendix B.




Fig. 6. **Performance** ranking of the selection methods **given 1h**. The performance on each problem is measured in terms of the median MSE on the test cases (smaller is better).

The rankings of the results found within 1h differ only slightly from the ones for 24h. For example, the relative performance of batch-tourn and batch- ϵ -lex without down-sampling is better now. However, the best performing methods are still ids-tourn and rds- ϵ -lex, followed now by rds-batch-tourn and ids-batch-tourn.

We observed further changes in the performance rankings when we limited the time even more. Looking at the results after 15 minutes, we can see that nds-batch-tourn is the best performing method now, followed by ids-batch-tourn and nds-batch- ϵ -lex. This indicates that the use of batches of training cases is especially useful if the given time to find a solution is very short. We assume that this is because the batch variants evaluate individuals from the beginning on several training cases, making the selection process less dependent on the order of the training cases [Aenugu and Spector 2019].

The rankings of the tree sizes for the populations given 1h or 15 minutes are shown in Appendix C. Again, tournament selection generates larger trees compared to the other methods. The populations with the smallest median tree size are generated by nds- ϵ -lex.

To sum up, we observed that the relative performance of the selection methods as well as the influence of the down-sampling strategies depends on the given running time. Given 24h or 1h, the best performing methods are tournament selection in combination with informed down-sampling and ϵ -lexicase selection in combination with random down-sampling. However, if the available running time is even more limited the variants using batches of training cases outperform the other




Fig. 7. **Performance** ranking of the selection methods **given 15 minutes**. The performance on each problem is measured in terms of the median MSE on the test cases (smaller is better).

selection methods. For a given time of 15 minutes we observed that batch-tournament selection and batch- ϵ -lexicase selection perform best.

For a time budget of 24h, down-sampling improves the performance of all selection methods, with informed down-sampling outperforming random down-sampling in 4 out of 5 cases. For less time, the advantage of down-sampling is lower. For example, given 15 minutes, only tournament selection, ϵ -lexicase selection and ϵ -plexicase selection increase their performance in combination with a down-sampling strategy.

Furthermore, we analyzed the trade-off between performance and size. Given 24h, we found that informed down-sampled batch-tournament selection and informed down-sampled batch- ϵ -lexicase selection generate populations with relatively small individuals while still performing reasonably well.

7 CONCLUSIONS

We compared relevant lexicase variants in combination with different down-sampling strategies on a wide range of symbolic regression problems. We significantly extended a previous conference paper by including random as well as informed down-sampling and by providing detailed results for all studied problems. To our knowledge, this is the first work studying the influence of informed down-sampling on various lexicase-based selection methods on a wide range of symbolic regression problems. We not only compared the selection method over a fixed number of evaluations, as usually done in the literature, but also over different running times as users usually have limited time to solve their problems. Therefore, this work provides users with a comprehensive guide for choosing the best selection method for their individual problem. Furthermore, we analyzed the influence of the selection methods on the solution size.

We found that the relative performance of each selection method depends on the given setting. For a fixed number of evaluations, ϵ -lexicase selection in combination with random or informed down-sampling performed best. For almost all selection methods, the combination with a down-sampling strategy increased the performance. Furthermore, we observed that the median population tree size as well as the median runtime differs between methods. This highlights the importance of comparing the selection methods also for a given running time and not just for a given evaluation budget, as it is usually the case in literature.

Therefore, we studied the solutions found after 24h, as well as after 1h and 15 minutes. For a given running time of 24h or 1h, the best performing methods are tournament selection in combination with informed down-sampling and ϵ -lexicase selection in combination with random down-sampling. Given 24h, the variants with informed down-sampling outperformed the variants with no down-sampling or with random down-sampling most of the times. If running time is limited to 15 minutes lexicase variants using batches of training cases outperform all other methods.

To sum up, choosing the right selection method depends on the given setting. For a given evaluation budget, we recommend using ϵ -lexicase selection in combination with a down-sampling strategy. If the search can be performed for a few hours, tournament selection in combination with informed down-sampling should be the preferred choice. If there is a need for a quick solution, batch- ϵ -lexicase selection or batch-tournament selection lead to the best solution. However, the detailed results shows that while there are general trends, the performance of each method depends on the problem at hand.

In future work, we will extend this study by including more problems and by analyzing other population dynamics next to tree size like diversity or specialist selection. Additionally, we will study the influence of informed down-sampling on tournament selection in the domain of symbolic regression further.

REFERENCES

- Sneha Aenugu and Lee Spector. 2019. Lexicase selection in learning classifier systems. In *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference*. ACM, 356–364.
- Ryan Boldi, Ashley Bao, Martin Briesch, Thomas Helmuth, Dominik Sobania, Lee Spector, and Alexander Lalejini. 2023a. The Problem Solving Benefits of Down-sampling Vary by Selection Scheme. In *Proceedings of the Companion Conference on Genetic and Evolutionary Computation (Lisbon, Portugal) (GECCO '23 Companion)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 527–530.
- Ryan Boldi, Ashley Bao, Martin Briesch, Thomas Helmuth, Dominik Sobania, Lee Spector, and Alexander Lalejini. 2024a. Untangling the Effects of Down-Sampling and Selection in Genetic Programming. In *ALIFE 2024: Proceedings of the 2024 Artificial Life Conference*. MIT Press.
- Ryan Boldi, Martin Briesch, Dominik Sobania, Alexander Lalejini, Thomas Helmuth, Franz Rothlauf, Charles Ofria, and Lee Spector. 2024b. Informed Down-Sampled Lexicase Selection: Identifying productive training cases for efficient problem solving. *Evolutionary computation* (2024), 1–31.
- Ryan Boldi, Alexander Lalejini, Thomas Helmuth, and Lee Spector. 2023b. A Static Analysis of Informed Down-Samples. In *Proceedings of the Companion Conference on Genetic and Evolutionary Computation (Lisbon, Portugal) (GECCO '23 Companion)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 531–534.
- Shu-Heng Chen. 2012. *Genetic algorithms and genetic programming in computational finance*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Vinícius V De Melo, Danilo Vasconcellos Vargas, and Wolfgang Banzhaf. 2019. Batch tournament selection for genetic programming: the quality of lexicase, the speed of tournament. In *Proceedings of the genetic and evolutionary computation conference (GECCO '19)*. ACM, 994–1002.
- Janez Demšar. 2006. Statistical comparisons of classifiers over multiple data sets. *The Journal of Machine learning research* 7 (2006), 1–30.
- Li Ding, Ryan Boldi, Thomas Helmuth, and Lee Spector. 2022a. Going faster and hence further with lexicase selection. In *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference Companion*. ACM, 538–541.
- Li Ding, Ryan Boldi, Thomas Helmuth, and Lee Spector. 2022b. Lexicase selection at scale. In *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference Companion*. ACM, 2054–2062.

- Li Ding, Edward Pantridge, and Lee Spector. 2023. Probabilistic Lexicase Selection. In *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference (Lisbon, Portugal) (GECCO '23)*. ACM, 1073–1081.
- Li Ding and Lee Spector. 2021. Optimizing neural networks with gradient lexicase selection. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- Emily Dolson. 2023. Calculating lexicase selection probabilities is NP-Hard. In *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference*. 1575–1583.
- Yongsheng Fang and Jun Li. 2010. A Review of Tournament Selection in Genetic Programming. In *Advances in Computation and Intelligence*. Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 6382. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 181–192.
- Austin J. Ferguson, Jose Guadalupe Hernandez, Daniel Junghans, Alexander Lalejini, Emily Dolson, and Charles Ofria. 2020. Characterizing the Effects of Random Subsampling on Lexicase Selection. In *Genetic Programming Theory and Practice XVII*. Springer International Publishing, 1–23.
- Félix-Antoine Fortin, François-Michel de Rainville, Marc-André Gardner, Marc Parizeau, and Christian Gagné. 2012. DEAP: Evolutionary algorithms made easy. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* 13, 1 (2012), 2171–2175.
- Alina Geiger, Dominik Sobania, and Franz Rothlauf. 2023. Down-Sampled Epsilon-Lexicase Selection for Real-World Symbolic Regression Problems. In *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference (Lisbon, Portugal) (GECCO '23)*. ACM, 1109–1117.
- Alina Geiger, Dominik Sobania, and Franz Rothlauf. 2024. A Comprehensive Comparison of Lexicase-Based Selection Methods for Symbolic Regression Problems. In *European Conference on Genetic Programming (Part of EvoStar)*. Springer, 192–208.
- Thomas Helmuth and Amr Abdelhady. 2020. Benchmarking parent selection for program synthesis by genetic programming. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference Companion (GECCO '20)*. ACM, 237–238.
- Thomas Helmuth, Nicholas Freitag McPhee, and Lee Spector. 2016a. Effects of Lexicase and Tournament Selection on Diversity Recovery and Maintenance. In *Proceedings of the 2016 on Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference Companion (GECCO '16 Companion)*. ACM, 983–990.
- Thomas Helmuth, Nicholas Freitag McPhee, and Lee Spector. 2016b. Lexicase selection for program synthesis: a diversity analysis. In *Genetic Programming Theory and Practice XIII*. Springer International Publishing, 151–167.
- Thomas Helmuth, Edward Pantridge, and Lee Spector. 2019. Lexicase selection of specialists. In *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference (GECCO '19)*. ACM, 1030–1038.
- Thomas Helmuth, Edward Pantridge, and Lee Spector. 2020. On the importance of specialists for lexicase selection. *Genetic Programming and Evolvable Machines* 21, 3 (2020), 349–373.
- Thomas Helmuth and Lee Spector. 2015. General Program Synthesis Benchmark Suite. In *Proceedings of the 2015 Annual Conference on Genetic and Evolutionary Computation (GECCO '15)*. ACM, 1039–1046.
- Thomas Helmuth and Lee Spector. 2020. Explaining and exploiting the advantages of down-sampled lexicase selection. In *ALIFE 2020: The 2020 Conference on Artificial Life*. MIT Press, 341–349.
- Thomas Helmuth and Lee Spector. 2021. Problem-Solving Benefits of Down-Sampled Lexicase Selection. *Artificial life* 27, 3-4 (2021), 183–203.
- Thomas Helmuth, Lee Spector, and James Matheson. 2014. Solving Uncompromising Problems with Lexicase Selection. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation* 19, 5 (2014), 630–643.
- Alberto Hernandez, Adarsh Balasubramanian, Fenglin Yuan, Simon AM Mason, and Tim Mueller. 2019a. Fast, accurate, and transferable many-body interatomic potentials by symbolic regression. *npj Computational Materials* 5, 1 (2019), 112.
- Jose Guadalupe Hernandez, Alexander Lalejini, Emily Dolson, and Charles Ofria. 2019b. Random subsampling improves performance in lexicase selection. In *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference Companion (GECCO '19)*. ACM, 2028–2031.
- Jose Guadalupe Hernandez, Alexander Lalejini, and Charles Ofria. 2022. An Exploration of Exploration: Measuring the ability of lexicase selection to find obscure pathways to optimality. In *Genetic Programming Theory and Practice XVIII*. 83–107.
- Dorit S Hochbaum and David B Shmoys. 1985. A best possible heuristic for the k-center problem. *Mathematics of operations research* 10, 2 (1985), 180–184.
- Lia Jundt and Thomas Helmuth. 2019. Comparing and combining lexicase selection and novelty search. In *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference*. ACM, 1047–1055.
- Jonathan Kelly, Eric Hemberg, and Una-May O'Reilly. 2019. Improving Genetic Programming with Novel Exploration - Exploitation Control. In *European Conference on Genetic Programming*. Springer, 64–80.
- John R. Koza. 1992. *On the programming of computers by means of natural selection*. A Bradford book, Vol. 1. MIT Press.
- Krzysztof Krawiec and Una-May O'Reilly. 2014. Behavioral programming: a broader and more detailed take on semantic GP. In *Proceedings of the 2014 Annual Conference on Genetic and Evolutionary Computation (GECCO '14)*. ACM, 935–942.
- William La Cava, Thomas Helmuth, Lee Spector, and Jason H. Moore. 2019. A probabilistic and multi-objective analysis of lexicase selection and epsilon-lexicase selection. *Evolutionary Computation* 27, 3 (2019), 377–402.

- William La Cava, Patryk Orzechowski, Bogdan Burlacu, Fabrício Olivetti de França, Marco Virgolin, Ying Jin, Michael Kommenda, and Jason H. Moore. 2021. Contemporary Symbolic Regression Methods and their Relative Performance. In *Thirty-fifth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*.
- William La Cava, Lee Spector, and Kourosh Danai. 2016. Epsilon-Lexicase Selection for Regression. In *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference 2016 (GECCO '16)*. ACM, 741–748.
- William G La Cava, Paul C Lee, Imran Ajmal, Xiruo Ding, Priyanka Solanki, Jordana B Cohen, Jason H Moore, and Daniel S Herman. 2023. A flexible symbolic regression method for constructing interpretable clinical prediction models. *NPJ Digital Medicine* 6, 1 (2023), 107.
- Jared M. Moore and Adam Stanton. 2017. Lexicase selection outperforms previous strategies for incremental evolution of virtual creature controllers. In *ECAL 2017, the Fourteenth European Conference on Artificial Life*. 290–297.
- Jared M. Moore and Adam Stanton. 2018. Tiebreaks and Diversity: Isolating Effects in Lexicase Selection. In *The 2018 Conference on Artificial Life*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 590–597.
- Andrew Ni, Li Ding, and Lee Spector. 2024. DALex: Lexicase-Like Selection via Diverse Aggregation. In *European Conference on Genetic Programming (Part of EvoStar)*. Springer, 90–107.
- Ji Ni, Russ H. Driberg, and Peter I. Rockett. 2013. The Use of an Analytic Quotient Operator in Genetic Programming. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation* 17, 1 (2013), 146–152.
- Patryk Orzechowski, William La Cava, and Jason H. Moore. 2018. Where are we now? A large benchmark study of recent symbolic regression methods. In *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference*. ACM, 1183–1190.
- Edward Pantridge, Thomas Helmuth, Nicholas Freitag McPhee, and Lee Spector. 2018. Specialization and Elitism in Lexicase and Tournament Selection. In *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference Companion (GECCO '18)*. ACM, 1914–1917.
- Thu Pham-Gia and Tran Loc Hung. 2001. The Mean and Median Absolute Deviations. *Mathematical and Computer* 34, 7-8 (2001), 921–936.
- Riccardo Poli, William B. Langdon, and Nicholas Freitag McPhee. 2008. *A field guide to genetic programming*. Lulu Press.
- Dirk Schweim, Dominik Sobania, and Franz Rothlauf. 2022. Effects of the Training Set Size: A Comparison of Standard and Down-Sampled Lexicase Selection in Program Synthesis. In *2022 IEEE Congress on Evolutionary Computation (CEC)*. IEEE, 1–8.
- Dominik Sobania and Franz Rothlauf. 2021. A generalizability measure for program synthesis with genetic programming. In *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference (GECCO '21)*. ACM, 822–829.
- Dominik Sobania and Franz Rothlauf. 2022. Program Synthesis with Genetic Programming: The Influence of Batch Sizes. In *European Conference on Genetic Programming*. Springer, 118–129.
- Dominik Sobania, Dirk Schweim, and Franz Rothlauf. 2023. A Comprehensive Survey on Program Synthesis With Evolutionary Algorithms. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation* 27, 1 (2023), 82–97.
- Lee Spector. 2012. Assessment of Problem Modality by Differential Performance of Lexicase Selection in Genetic Programming: A Preliminary Report. In *Proceedings of the 14th Annual Conference Companion on Genetic and Evolutionary Computation (GECCO '12)*. ACM, 401–408.
- Lee Spector, William La Cava, Shanabrook S, Thomas Helmuth, and Edward Pantridge. 2018. Relaxations of Lexicase Parent Selection. In *Genetic Programming Theory and Practice XV*. Springer, 105–120.
- Alexander R. M. Wagner and Anthony Stein. 2021. Adopting lexicase selection for michigan-style learning classifier systems with continuous-valued inputs. In *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference Companion*. ACM, 171–172.

A RESULTS FOR A GIVEN MAXIMUM NUMBER OF EVALUATIONS




Fig. 8. MSE on the test cases for each selection method on 8 problems. The results refer to the best solution found **after a given evaluation budget**. Outliers are not shown to improve readability.




Fig. 9. MSE on the test cases for each selection method on 8 problems. The results refer to the best solution found **after a given evaluation budget**. Outliers are not shown to improve readability.




Fig. 10. MSE on the test cases for each selection method on 4 problems. The results refer to the best solution found **after a given evaluation budget**. Outliers are not shown to improve readability.

B RESULTS FOR A GIVEN RUN TIME




Fig. 11. MSE on the test cases for each selection method on 8 problems. The results refer to the best solution found **after 24h**. Outliers are not shown to improve readability.




Fig. 12. MSE on the test cases for each selection method on 8 problems. The results refer to the best solution found **after 24h**. Outliers are not shown to improve readability.




Fig. 13. MSE on the test cases for each selection method on 4 problems. The results refer to the best solution found **after 24h**. Outliers are not shown to improve readability.

Table 7. Median MSE on the test cases for each selection method on all 20 problems. The results refer to the best solution found after **1h**. Best results are shown in bold font. The results are rounded to two decimal places.

problem	batch-tourn			batch- ϵ -lex			tourn			ϵ -lex			ϵ -plex		
	nds	rds	ids	nds	rds	ids	nds	rds	ids	nds	rds	ids	nds	rds	ids
1027	0.38	0.32	0.36	0.35	0.36	0.36	0.38	0.39	0.38	0.64	0.47	0.44	0.52	0.45	0.40
1030	2.81	2.80	2.88	2.89	2.84	2.98	2.79	2.76	2.91	3.30	2.91	2.97	3.17	3.06	3.05
207	8.74e+06	9.61e+06	1.05e+07	8.38e+06	9.61e+06	1.16e+07	7.67e+06	9.70e+06	9.22e+06	1.19e+07	1.04e+07	1.17e+07	1.05e+07	1.02e+07	9.96e+06
230	6863.01	5601.98	5606.45	4890.56	5039.28	3719.03	5182.75	7564.11	5609.15	4597.58	5877.57	3353.63	6552.53	4266.53	3672.30
519	2.81	2.78	3.10	2.64	2.87	2.98	2.54	2.55	2.73	2.77	3.08	3.04	2.74	2.94	3.45
523	1.03	1.12	1.26	1.01	1.14	1.07	1.05	1.06	1.10	1.12	1.08	1.25	1.14	1.12	1.14
581	0.14	0.19	0.10	0.14	0.18	0.14	0.44	0.47	0.10	0.22	0.12	0.12	0.18	0.12	0.14
589	0.20	0.21	0.18	0.20	0.21	0.21	0.28	0.27	0.19	0.29	0.16	0.16	0.22	0.18	0.19
591	0.26	0.30	0.38	0.25	0.33	0.28	0.34	0.40	0.25	0.32	0.27	0.44	0.33	0.53	0.57
606	0.20	0.23	0.14	0.21	0.21	0.16	0.27	0.32	0.12	0.26	0.13	0.13	0.22	0.18	0.16
607	0.12	0.23	0.12	0.20	0.17	0.21	0.48	0.42	0.15	0.42	0.11	0.16	0.27	0.11	0.14
615	0.13	0.14	0.15	0.13	0.23	0.16	0.52	0.42	0.14	0.18	0.15	0.17	0.17	0.12	0.18
617	0.13	0.17	0.08	0.15	0.19	0.12	0.26	0.24	0.09	0.22	0.13	0.12	0.20	0.14	0.11
621	0.49	0.44	0.60	0.29	0.48	0.56	0.49	0.59	0.37	0.44	0.50	0.53	0.49	0.63	0.61
623	0.11	0.20	0.10	0.10	0.16	0.11	0.38	0.30	0.12	0.35	0.11	0.12	0.26	0.13	0.13
624	0.33	0.29	0.55	0.29	0.38	0.49	0.43	0.53	0.24	0.39	0.32	0.47	0.41	0.53	0.63
641	0.18	0.21	0.15	0.18	0.17	0.13	0.27	0.27	0.17	0.23	0.12	0.10	0.20	0.15	0.13
647	0.17	0.27	0.17	0.18	0.26	0.17	0.29	0.28	0.15	0.20	0.14	0.17	0.22	0.15	0.17
654	0.14	0.17	0.09	0.18	0.27	0.16	0.31	0.36	0.12	0.29	0.14	0.14	0.31	0.24	0.15
665	79.84	92.21	93.41	79.19	78.70	87.95	58.63	77.76	98.21	81.60	77.82	97.16	77.05	74.69	96.61




Fig. 14. MSE on the test cases for each selection method on 8 problems. The results refer to the best solution found **after 1h**. Outliers are not shown to improve readability.




Fig. 15. MSE on the test cases for each selection method on 8 problems. The results refer to the best solution found **after 1h**. Outliers are not shown to improve readability.




Fig. 16. MSE on the test cases for each selection method on 4 problems. The results refer to the best solution found **after 1h**. Outliers are not shown to improve readability.

Table 8. Median MSE on the test cases for each selection method on all 20 problems. The results refer to the best solution found after **15 minutes**. Best results are shown in bold font. The results are rounded to two decimal places.

problem	batch-tourn			batch- ϵ -lex			tourn			ϵ -lex			ϵ -plex		
	nds	rds	ids	nds	rds	ids	nds	rds	ids	nds	rds	ids	nds	rds	ids
1027	0.37	0.40	0.38	0.40	0.39	0.42	0.44	0.41	0.41	0.67	0.52	0.49	0.52	0.46	0.42
1030	2.80	2.92	3.03	3.06	2.95	2.98	2.90	2.88	2.94	4.62	3.07	3.12	3.17	2.99	3.13
207	9.87e+06	1.09e+07	9.50e+06	8.43e+06	1.37e+07	1.00e+07	7.83e+06	1.09e+07	9.57e+06	1.13e+07	1.07e+07	1.35e+07	1.17e+07	1.25e+07	1.03e+07
230	5371.53	6711.46	5551.55	5437.96	6827.64	5997.39	8405.18	7721.95	5411.92	7348.06	7693.86	3677.54	5991.03	6677.00	4293.60
519	2.92	2.81	3.06	2.76	2.57	2.98	2.52	2.49	2.83	2.72	2.85	3.04	2.79	2.93	3.16
523	1.04	1.01	1.06	1.05	1.09	1.10	1.02	1.06	1.10	1.08	1.04	1.12	1.12	1.09	1.11
581	0.19	0.23	0.17	0.18	0.35	0.32	0.50	0.57	0.18	0.53	0.14	0.21	0.36	0.17	0.21
589	0.24	0.26	0.25	0.27	0.29	0.26	0.30	0.29	0.23	0.45	0.22	0.26	0.31	0.21	0.25
591	0.31	0.33	0.49	0.29	0.32	0.46	0.41	0.40	0.33	0.32	0.33	0.49	0.31	0.48	0.54
606	0.24	0.27	0.20	0.24	0.26	0.24	0.30	0.32	0.16	0.46	0.21	0.23	0.31	0.23	0.23
607	0.22	0.38	0.26	0.31	0.42	0.52	0.59	0.50	0.36	0.83	0.24	0.34	0.49	0.31	0.27
615	0.15	0.25	0.18	0.15	0.33	0.26	0.53	0.50	0.24	0.45	0.23	0.26	0.31	0.16	0.23
617	0.14	0.24	0.14	0.19	0.24	0.20	0.31	0.26	0.12	0.46	0.21	0.19	0.30	0.22	0.21
621	0.46	0.49	0.54	0.31	0.53	0.68	0.50	0.57	0.42	0.41	0.60	0.62	0.49	0.59	0.58
623	0.18	0.25	0.14	0.13	0.23	0.21	0.46	0.40	0.21	0.66	0.19	0.27	0.39	0.22	0.22
624	0.39	0.42	0.47	0.31	0.53	0.55	0.41	0.51	0.38	0.46	0.37	0.60	0.46	0.55	0.81
641	0.20	0.22	0.21	0.21	0.25	0.29	0.29	0.32	0.22	0.40	0.19	0.21	0.28	0.20	0.19
647	0.20	0.29	0.18	0.18	0.31	0.26	0.32	0.36	0.23	0.37	0.24	0.26	0.28	0.19	0.23
654	0.21	0.30	0.17	0.26	0.35	0.37	0.36	0.40	0.27	0.40	0.27	0.28	0.36	0.33	0.25
665	83.15	95.31	108.45	72.53	72.67	89.64	57.45	64.67	83.87	76.18	79.66	95.18	73.40	75.41	99.01




Fig. 17. MSE on the test cases for each selection method on 8 problems. The results refer to the best solution found **after 15 minutes**. Outliers are not shown to improve readability.




Fig. 18. MSE on the test cases for each selection method on 8 problems. The results refer to the best solution found **after 15 minutes**. Outliers are not shown to improve readability.




Fig. 19. MSE on the test cases for each selection method on 4 problems. The results refer to the best solution found **after 15 minutes**. Outliers are not shown to improve readability.

C TREE SIZES FOR A GIVEN RUNNING TIME OF 1H OR 15 MINUTES




Fig. 20. Ranking of the median **tree size** for all selection methods **given 1h**. The tree size is measured in terms of the median tree size of the final population (smaller is better).




Fig. 21. Ranking of the median **tree size** for all selection methods **given 15 minutes**. The tree size is measured in terms of the median tree size of the final population (smaller is better).

D RESULTS OF THE STATISTICAL ANALYSIS

For our statistical analysis, we followed the recommendations of Demšar [2006] for comparing multiple methods over many datasets. For each configuration, we first use the Friedman test to test the null-hypothesis that all methods perform equivalent. We reject the null-hypothesis if $p < 0.05$. If the null-hypothesis is rejected, we use the Nemenyi post-hoc test for pairwise comparisons. The performance of two methods is significantly different if $p < 0.05$.

The p-values of the Friedman test for each configuration are reported in Table 9. We reject the null-hypothesis in all cases. Therefore, we conducted the Nemenyi test for all configurations. Figures 22- 25 report the corresponding p-values.

Table 9. Results of the Friedman test for all configurations.

Configuration	p-value
Given a fixed evaluation budget	4.61e-08
Given 24h	1.67e-05
Given 1h	1.16e-06
Given 15 minutes	1.24e-10




Fig. 22. Results of the Nemenyi test for the results **given a fixed evaluation budget**. P-values are rounded to two decimal places.




Fig. 23. Results of the Nemenyi test for the results given 24h. P-values are rounded to two decimal places.




Fig. 24. Results of the Nemenyi test for the results given 1h. P-values are rounded to two decimal places.




Fig. 25. Results of the Nemenyi test for the results **given 15 minutes**. P-values are rounded to two decimal places.