

A Functional Analysis Approach to Symbolic Regression

Kirill Antonov

LIACS, Leiden University
Leiden, The Netherlands
k.antonov@liacs.leidenuniv.nl

Roman Kalkreuth

CNRS, LIP6, Sorbonne Université
Paris, France
roman.kalkreuth@lip6.fr

Kaifeng Yang

University of Applied Sciences Upper
Austria
Hagenger, Austria
kaifeng.yang@fh-hagenberg.at

Thomas Bäck

LIACS, Leiden University
Leiden, The Netherlands
t.h.w.baeck@liacs.leidenuniv.nl

Niki van Stein

LIACS, Leiden University
Leiden, The Netherlands
n.van.stein@liacs.leidenuniv.nl

Anna V. Kononova

LIACS, Leiden University
Leiden, The Netherlands
a.kononova@liacs.leidenuniv.nl

ABSTRACT

Symbolic regression (SR) poses a significant challenge for randomized search heuristics due to its reliance on the synthesis of expressions for input-output mappings. Although traditional genetic programming (GP) algorithms have achieved success in various domains, they exhibit limited performance when tree-based representations are used for SR. To address these limitations, we introduce a novel SR approach called Fourier Tree Growing (FTG) that draws insights from functional analysis. This new perspective enables us to perform optimization directly in a different space, thus avoiding intricate symbolic expressions. Our proposed algorithm exhibits significant performance improvements over traditional GP methods on a range of classical one-dimensional benchmarking problems. To identify and explain limiting factors of GP and FTG, we perform experiments on a large-scale polynomials benchmark with high-order polynomials up to degree 100. To the best of the authors' knowledge, this work represents the pioneering application of functional analysis in addressing SR problems. The superior performance of the proposed algorithm and insights into the limitations of GP open the way for further advancing GP for SR and related areas of explainable machine learning.

1 INTRODUCTION

Symbolic regression (SR) can be considered a major problem domain for search heuristics that focus on the synthesis of symbolic expressions. SR as a black-box optimization domain, aims at the derivation of mathematical expressions that are able to fit the input-output mapping of an unknown objective function to a predefined degree. In the wider domain of search heuristics, SR defines a diverse problem domain that has often been used to benchmark the performance of symbolic search algorithms but also offers a real-world application domain for such methods. Quite recently, it has been proven that SR is an NP-hard problem in view of the fact that it is not always possible to find the best-fitting mathematical expression for a given data set in polynomial time [44]. GP has been applied to SR problems since its early days. J. Koza [20, 22, 23] reported a series of results for the synthesis of symbolic expressions that can fit the functional behavior of polynomials of lower degrees by using a parse-tree representation model inspired by LISP s-expressions, which is now known as tree-based GP in the wider family of GP representations. Based on Koza's experiments, SR evolved to a major application domain for GP and was found to

be the most popular problem in the first survey on benchmarking standards in GP at that time [30]. Besides the works that reported practical-oriented results by using GP, different aspects of GP have been analyzed since the early days of GP to understand its search behavior. Moreover, even if GP has been found to be a suitable method for SR, drawbacks and shortcomings that impede the effectiveness of the heuristic search in GP have been identified and studied in the past. Both, empirical and theoretical results, have been proposed to understand various properties of the evolutionary-inspired search mechanism, such as evolvability [2], locality [11], fitness landscapes & problem hardness [41], neutrality [15, 42] and search & runtime complexity [26, 27, 29]. Overall, works in these areas has made a significant contribution to the understanding of the heuristic search performed by GP.

Despite recent advancements, the challenge of disruptive mutations and recombinations persists in SR, hindering the development of more efficient randomized search heuristics (RSH) in this domain. In this paper, therefore, we take a step forward in the understanding of SR by considering the search from a general perspective of functional analysis (FA). We start by reformulating the SR problem as a classical norm-minimization problem in Hilbert Space. To solve this problem, we propose a novel method called Fourier Tree Growing (FTG) that is inspired by mutation-based GP as performed with a $(1+\lambda)$ evolutionary algorithm (EA) and ramped half-and-half initialization that allows us to navigate in the considered Hilbert space.

Our experiments demonstrate that this method significantly outperforms the compared GP algorithms on classical one-dimensional benchmarking problems. We explain the observed gap in performance by considering the dynamics of the GP search process. To enable a detailed study, we propose a novel benchmark with high-order polynomials, which we call a large-scale polynomial benchmark (LSP). We apply our proposed FTG method, conventional recombination-based GP as well as mutation-only GP to solve instances of LSP to identify and analyze shortcomings and limitations in the SR domain. We address the observed shortcomings and limitations of GP and FTG and discuss ways to overcome these drawbacks. Moreover, based on our theoretical and empirical findings, we discuss how some aspects of FA in general could be used in GP to benefit its application to SR.

The work presented in this paper aims at the following objectives:

- Reformulation of the SR problem by means of FA
- Optimization in Hilbert space

- Evaluation of GP and FTG in the SR domain
- Identification of aspects that could benefit GP in addressing SR problems

The results of this work can be easily adapted to canonical GP-based SR with a dimensionality reduction technique.

The paper is structured as follows: In Section 2 we briefly describe GP and SR and provide the preliminaries for the proposed FTG algorithm. In Section 3 we briefly formalize the corresponding SR problem statement and establish the framework for reformulation of the SR search problem as an optimization problem in Hilbert space. In Section 4 we propose FTG that performs SR search in Hilbert space and rigorously study FTG’s properties, and provide intuition on how it addresses SR. Section 5 is devoted to the presentation of empirical comparisons of the proposed algorithms against traditional GP search heuristics on conventional benchmarks and our proposed LSP benchmark. In Section 6 we then discuss the results of our experiments. Finally, Section 7 concludes our work and outlines our future work.

2 RELATED WORK

2.1 Genetic Programming

Genetic Programming (GP) is a evolutionary-inspired search heuristic originally invented to enable the synthesis of computer programs for problem-solving. The main paradigm of GP is to evolve a population of *computer programs* towards an algorithmic solution of a predefined problem. To accomplish this, GP transforms populations of candidate genetic programs, that are traditionally represented as parse-trees, iteratively from generation to generation into new populations of programs with (hopefully) better fitness. However, since GP is a stochastic optimization process, it can consequently not guarantee to achieve the optimal solution.

The first significant work in the field of GP was done by Forsyth [10], Cramer [7], and Hicklin [13]. However, GP gained significantly more popularity when Koza applied his parse tree representation model, inspired by LISP S expressions, to several types of problems, for instance, symbolic regression, algorithm construction, logic synthesis, or classification [20, 22, 23]. Besides the traditional tree-based representation model, GP variants with linear sequence representations [33, 34], graph-based [31, 35] representations, or grammar-based representations [37] have been proposed. Traditional GP models variate candidate programs on a syntactical level while one of the most recently introduced GP models, Geometric Semantic GP, focuses on variation of candidate programs on a semantic level [32].

However, among the different forms of GP, tree-based GP can be considered the most popular representation model since it gained significant recognition in the evolutionary computation (EC) domain due to the experiments of Koza in problem domains that were practically relevant. However, despite its reputation in the field of EC for achieving practical results, GP suffers from drawbacks and shortcomings that have been found to hinder the effectiveness of the heuristic search. In the tree-based subdomain of GP, the most well-known drawback is *Bloat* that is characterized by an uncontrolled growth of the average size of candidate trees in the population [38]. Unlike most heuristic methods for numerical optimization in the EC domain, standard GP search operators such

as subtree crossover and mutation provide only limited locality features [11], and have been found to be disruptive [3].

2.2 Symbolic Regression in Genetic Programming

Symbolic regression can be classified in the taxonomy of regression analysis, where a symbolic search on a space of mathematical functions is performed to find candidate functions that fit the ideal input-output mapping of a given dataset as close as possible, where the quality of the fit is typically measured on a given, finite set of data points. Symbolic regression in GP can therefore be considered a black-box problem that forms a major problem domain in the application scope of GP since its very early days. In general, SR by means of GP relates to the application of GP models to synthesize mathematical expressions that represent the (unknown) function’s input-output mapping as closely as possible. Symbolic regression gained prominence through Koza’s pioneering efforts in the 1990s; however, the problem of finding a mathematical expression to explain empirical measurements was already introduced in the previous works [9, 12, 25]. In the early works of SR-based GP, Koza showed that GP can be used to discover SR models by encoding mathematical expressions as computational trees. Even though SR can be addressed by other algorithms (such as Monte Carlo tree search [5, 39], enumeration algorithms [17], greedy algorithms [8], mixed-integer nonlinear programming [6]), GP remains a popular choice. So far, SR through GP has been applied in different areas, such as economics [43], medicine [45], engineering [24] and more [46]. However, SR via GP still has some limitations, such as its gray-box property [19], model’s over complexity [16], and various models (with different structural properties, utilized variables) [1].

2.3 Preliminaries

Functional Analysis is a branch of mathematical analysis that studies functions, spaces of functions, and relationships between those spaces. One of the fruitful ideas used in FA is the notion of a Banach Space of which Hilbert Space is an important special case. We will briefly introduce this notion, and some relevant facts about it in this section because the notion of a Hilbert Space plays an important role in our work.

Definition 1 (Metric Space). *A metric space is a pair (X, d) , where X is a set and d is a real-value function on $X \times X$ which satisfies that, for any $x, y, z \in X$,*

- (1) $d(x, y) \geq 0$ and $d(x, y) = 0 \iff x = y$,
- (2) $d(x, y) = d(y, x)$,
- (3) $d(x, z) \leq d(x, y) + d(y, z)$.

The function d is called the metric on X .

Definition 2 (Normed Vector Space). *A vector space V over field \mathbb{R} is called a normed vector space if there is real-value function $\|\cdot\|$ on V , called the norm, such that for any $x, y \in V$ and any $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$,*

- (1) $\|x\| \geq 0$
- (2) $\|x\| = 0 \iff x = 0$,
- (3) $\|\alpha x\| = |\alpha| \|x\|$,
- (4) $\|x + y\| \leq \|x\| + \|y\|$.

Definition 3 (Cauchy Sequence). *A sequence $\{x_n\}$ in a metric space (X, d) is a Cauchy Sequence if*

$$\forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists N \in \mathbb{N} : d(x_n, x_m) < \varepsilon \quad \forall n, m > N.$$

Definition 4 (Complete Space). *A normed space is called complete if every Cauchy sequence in the space converges to an element from this space.*

Definition 5 (Inner Product Space). *An inner product space is a vector space V over the field \mathbb{R} together with an inner product, that is a map:*

$$\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle_V : V \times V \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$$

with the following properties:

- (1) $\langle \alpha(x + y), z \rangle_V = \alpha \langle x, z \rangle_V + \alpha \langle y, z \rangle_V$,
- (2) $\langle x, y \rangle_V = \langle y, x \rangle_V$,
- (3) $\langle x, x \rangle_V \geq 0$,
- (4) $\langle x, x \rangle_V = 0 \iff x = 0_V$.

Definition 6 (Hilbert Space). *A complete inner product space is a Hilbert space.*

THEOREM 1 (PROJECTION THEOREM [18]). *Consider Hilbert space \mathcal{X} and its complete linear subspace \mathcal{Y} .*

- (1) *For all elements $x \in \mathcal{X}$, there exists a unique element $y^* \in \mathcal{Y}$ such that*

$$\|x - y^*\| = \min_{z \in \mathcal{Y}} \|x - z\|$$

This element y^ is called the closest to x in the subspace \mathcal{Y} .*

- (2) *Given the closest element y^* to x in the subspace \mathcal{Y} , for all $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $z \in \mathcal{Y}$, we have $\langle x - y^*, z \rangle = 0$.*

Definition 7 (Linear Independence). *Elements $\{v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k\}$ of a vector space over the field \mathbb{R} are linearly independent if for every set of constants $\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_k\}$ either $\sum_{i=1}^k \alpha_i v_i \neq \mathbf{0}$ or $\forall i : \alpha_i = 0$. Otherwise, they are linearly dependent.*

Consider linear independent elements from Hilbert space \mathcal{H} : h_1, h_2, \dots, h_k and element $g \in \mathcal{H}$. We can formulate a *linear least squares approximation problem* (LLSQ) in this Hilbert space as finding such constants $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_k$ that $\|g - \alpha_1 h_1 - \alpha_2 h_2 - \dots - \alpha_k h_k\|$ is minimized. Due to Theorem 1, there exists a unique element $h^* \in \text{span}\{h_1, h_2, \dots, h_k\}$ closest to g . It is clear, that this h^* is the solution of the stated LLSQ. Due to the second statement of Theorem 1, all of the following equalities hold simultaneously:

$$\langle g - h^*, h_1 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = 0, \langle g - h^*, h_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = 0, \dots, \langle g - h^*, h_k \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} = 0$$

It is equivalent to the following matrix equation:

$$\left(\langle g, h_1 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}, \langle g, h_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}, \dots, \langle g, h_k \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right)^{\top} = \mathbf{G} \cdot (\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_k)^{\top} \quad (1)$$

where $1 \leq i, j \leq k$ and $\mathbf{G} = \left(\langle h_i, h_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \right)$ is the *Gram matrix*.

For arbitrary $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}^k$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha^{\top} \mathbf{G} \alpha &= \sum_{1 \leq i, j \leq k} \alpha_i \alpha_j \langle h_i, h_j \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &= \left\langle \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} \alpha_i h_i, \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} \alpha_i h_i \right\rangle_{\mathcal{H}} \\ &= \left\| \sum_{1 \leq i \leq k} \alpha_i h_i \right\|^2 \geq 0 \end{aligned}$$

The equality is attained for $\alpha \neq 0_{\mathbb{R}^k}$ if and only if elements h_1, h_2, \dots, h_k are linearly dependent. So, the Gram matrix is positive definite for the considered linearly independent elements. It implies that all its eigenvalues $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_k$ are real positive constants, so $\det(\mathbf{G}) = \lambda_1 \cdot \lambda_2 \cdot \dots \cdot \lambda_k > 0$. Then its inverse exists, and we obtain the following solution of the matrix equation Eq. (1):

$$(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \dots, \alpha_k)^{\top} = \mathbf{G}^{-1} \cdot (\langle g, h_1 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}, \langle g, h_2 \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}, \dots, \langle g, h_k \rangle_{\mathcal{H}})^{\top} \quad (2)$$

3 ANALYSIS OF SYMBOLIC REGRESSION IN THE GENERAL CASE

Building upon the concepts introduced in Sec. 2.3, this section reframes the optimization of the SR problem through functional analysis. We start by formulating the conventional SR problem more formally.

3.1 Problem Formalization

We formalize Symbolic Regression in the following form.

Let us consider:

- (1) Domain $\mathbb{X} := \prod_{i=1}^n [a_i, b_i] \subset \mathbb{R}^n$;
- (2) An unknown arbitrary function $F : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is to be approximated. We refer to this function F as *target function*;
- (3) Ordered set of points $\mathbf{X} := \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N\} \subset \mathbb{X}$, which we consider as *training data*. It is used as the set of points where the values of the function F are known;
- (4) Unary operators $\mathcal{U} \subseteq \{u \mid u : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}$, binary operators $\mathcal{B} \subseteq \{b \mid b : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}$, constants $\mathcal{C} \subseteq \mathbb{R}$ and orthogonal projection operators $\Pi := \{(p_i)_{i=1}^n\}$, $p_i : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $p_i(x) = (0, \dots, 1, 0, \dots) \cdot x$, where 1 is in the i -th position. We will refer to them as *elementary operators*.

The goal of Symbolic Regression is to obtain an *estimated function* $\widehat{F} : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that:

- (1) \widehat{F} is a composition of operators from $\mathcal{U} \cup \mathcal{B} \cup \Pi$;
- (2) \widehat{F} is a minimizer of the following functional (*loss function*):

$$\mathcal{L}(\widehat{F}) := \frac{1}{N} \cdot \sum_{i=1}^N \text{fitness}(F(x_i), \widehat{F}(x_i)),$$

where $\text{fitness}(\cdot)$ is the fitness function in GP. Commonly, $\text{fitness}(\cdot)$ can be chosen as MSE, NMSE, R2. In this paper, we choose $\text{fitness}(\cdot)$ as squared error (SE), that is $\text{fitness}(x, y) := (x - y)^2$.

- (3) Among all such estimated functions that satisfy goals (1) and (2), \widehat{F} has the smallest length of the description.

GP algorithms that address the formulated problem in practice are usually limited in terms of resources and so can not afford to work infinitely long. Conventionally, *the number of traverses* over the dataset \mathbf{X} is considered as an indication of time spent on solving the problem. For example, the computation of the loss function costs one time unit. In this work, *the number of traverses* is used as well to analyze the algorithms' performance on generating a sufficiently accurate function \widehat{F} .

3.2 Problem Reformulation

Let us consider a vector space of all functions $\mathcal{F} := \{f : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}$. Since we are working with the fixed set of training data \mathbf{X} , two different functions in \mathcal{F} are seen as the same function when an instance of SR is approached. This motivates the following relation for the set \mathcal{F} .

Definition 8. Functions $f, g : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ are called \mathbf{X} -identical, $f \sim g$ if $\forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X} : f(\mathbf{x}) = g(\mathbf{x})$

It is easy to see that this relation \sim is an equivalence relation. Let us denote the set of all equivalence classes of functions $\mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as \mathbb{F} . By construction, we obtained the *quotient space* $\mathbb{F} = \mathcal{F} / \sim$. To not mix up functions with classes of equivalent functions, we will use the notation $[\cdot]$, which is defined as $[f] := \{g : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \mid f \sim g\}$. Now we propose Theorem 2 that collects several statements about the set \mathbb{F} and introduces an inner product, which plays a crucial role in this work.

THEOREM 2. \mathbb{F} is a vector space over field \mathbb{R} when equipped with:

- (1) operator + : $[f] + [g] = [\forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X} : \mathbf{x} \mapsto f(\mathbf{x}) + g(\mathbf{x})]$
- (2) scalar mult.: $r[f] = [\forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X} : \mathbf{x} \mapsto rf(\mathbf{x})]$
- (3) neutral element: $\mathbf{0} = [\forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X} : \mathbf{x} \mapsto 0]$

Moreover, this vector space \mathbb{F} is a N -dimensional Hilbert space with inner product:

$$\langle [f], [g] \rangle := \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}} f(\mathbf{x})g(\mathbf{x})$$

See [proof](#) in the appendix.

The defined inner product induces the following norm and distance in Hilbert space \mathbb{F} :

$$\| [f] \| = \sqrt{\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}} f^2(\mathbf{x})} \quad (3)$$

$$d([f], [g]) = \sqrt{\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}} (f(\mathbf{x}) - g(\mathbf{x}))^2} \quad (4)$$

It is convenient to consider one particular distance between an arbitrary element $[f] \in \mathbb{F}$ and the equivalence class which contains the target function F , i.e., $d^2([f], [F]) = \mathcal{L}(f)$. Now, we can transform the goal 2 listed before to an optimization problem in Hilbert space \mathbb{F} :

$$\widehat{F}^* = \arg \min_{\widehat{F}} d([\widehat{F}], [F]) \quad (5)$$

In the following section, we propose an approach to solve this optimization problem by generating a solution as a composition of elementary operators. However, we do not directly address the goal 3 defined before and mostly focus only on the accuracy of the obtained functions. Minimizing the length of the produced expression is left for future works.

4 OPTIMIZATION IN HILBERT SPACE

Depending on the chosen elementary operators, some functions in \mathbb{F} might be not representable by a finite composition of elementary operators. This implies that achieving the global minimum value of zero for the optimization problem in Eq. (5) may not be reachable. In practical cases, it is relevant to support a rich set representable functions, so it is reasonable to assume that the set of elementary

operators is big. Hence, we assume that basic operators are included in elementary operators. Particularly, we consider that addition and multiplication belong to the binary operators \mathfrak{B} , and all real constants \mathbb{R} belong to the set \mathfrak{C} . Given these minimalistic assumptions on elementary operators, we look for a minimizer of Eq. (5) in the form:

$$\widehat{F} : \mathbf{x} \mapsto \alpha_1 v_1(\mathbf{x}) + \alpha_2 v_2(\mathbf{x}) + \dots + \alpha_k v_k(\mathbf{x}),$$

where functions v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k are some compositions of elementary operators, that is $v_i \in \mathfrak{U} \cup \mathfrak{B} \cup \Pi \cup \mathfrak{C}, i \in \mathbb{Z}_k$.

Let us assume that elements $[v_1], [v_2], \dots, [v_k]$ are linearly independent. The linear combination $\sum_i^k \alpha_i v_i(\mathbf{x})$ of elements from \mathcal{F} still belongs to the space \mathcal{F} , so we can consider element $[\sum_i^k \alpha_i v_i(\mathbf{x})]$ of space \mathbb{F} . Based on the properties of quotient space, $[\sum_i^k \alpha_i v_i(\mathbf{x})] = \sum_i^k \alpha_i [v_i(\mathbf{x})]$. Since all the constants are allowed, elements $[v_1], [v_2], \dots, [v_k]$ span a complete subspace of quotient space \mathbb{F} . From the projection theorem and Eq. (2), we obtain that in this case, there exists a single closest element in this subspace to the element F . However, when functions v_1, v_2, \dots, v_k are linearly dependent, the determinant of the corresponding Gram matrix is zero, and so the coefficients $\alpha_i, i = 1, \dots, k$, which gives the closest point to F , can not be computed.

We propose the following Algorithm 1 as a general heuristic algorithm for solving SR instances. In Theorem 2 we showed that space \mathbb{F} is finite-dimensional, however, the following algorithm does not require this property. In this regard, we formulate the algorithm in the general case of Hilbert space, which might be infinitely dimensional. The main idea of the algorithm is to generate compositions of elementary operators and ensure that all of the generated functions are linearly independent. It allows us to apply the projection theorem and get the best possible approximation of F in the subspace spanned by the functions.

Algorithm 1 iteratively generates functions v_k and uses their linear combination as \widehat{F} . The algorithm uses the Gram matrix in line 8 to obtain the coefficients α for the linear combination. If the Gram matrix is the identity, then elements of α are called Fourier coefficients. In our case, the Gram matrix is almost never identity, but we still use the word Fourier to refer to those coefficients. Since GP uses trees to represent the composition of functions, the tree that represents the obtained \widehat{F} contains coefficients α in some nodes. This is the reason to call the algorithm Fourier Tree Growing.

The generation of the composition of function in line 6 is performed using a heuristic algorithm, which samples elementary operators from a parameterized probability distribution, and creates their compositions. This heuristic and the distribution are discussed later in Section 4.2.

We can consider the generation of the function v_k as the application of mutation operator to the current approximation \widehat{F}_{k-1} of the target function F . Using an evolutionary metaphor, we can define \widehat{F}_k as the k -th candidate solution. It turns out, that the mutation which violates the predicate in line 7 increases the quality of the produced individual \widehat{F}_k , which is shown rigorously in Theorem 3. In this case, Algorithm 1 can be seen as an adaptation of a (1+1)-EA for optimization in Hilbert space.

Algorithm 1 General scheme of Fourier Tree Growing (FTG) algorithm in Hilbert space \mathcal{H}

```

1:  $v_1 \leftarrow (\forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X} : \mathbf{x} \mapsto 1)$ 
2:  $\widehat{F}_1 \leftarrow (\forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X} : \mathbf{x} \mapsto \langle [v_1], [v_1] \rangle^{-1} \langle [F], [v_1] \rangle)$ 
3: for  $k \leftarrow 2, 3, \dots$  do
4:   if  $\mathcal{L}(\widehat{F}_{k-1}) = 0$  then return  $\widehat{F}_{k-1}$  end if
5:   do
6:      $v_k \leftarrow \text{GENERATE-COMPOSITION}(\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, \Pi, p, l, u)$ 
7:     while  $\langle [F] - [\widehat{F}_{k-1}], [v_k] \rangle = 0$ 
8:        $\mathbf{G} \leftarrow \begin{pmatrix} \langle [v_1], [v_1] \rangle & \langle [v_1], [v_2] \rangle & \dots & \langle [v_1], [v_k] \rangle \\ \langle [v_2], [v_1] \rangle & \langle [v_2], [v_2] \rangle & \dots & \langle [v_2], [v_k] \rangle \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \langle [v_k], [v_1] \rangle & \langle [v_k], [v_2] \rangle & \dots & \langle [v_k], [v_k] \rangle \end{pmatrix}$ 
9:        $\alpha \leftarrow \mathbf{G}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} \langle [F], [v_1] \rangle \\ \langle [F], [v_2] \rangle \\ \vdots \\ \langle [F], [v_k] \rangle \end{pmatrix}$ 
10:       $\widehat{F}_k \leftarrow (\forall \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{X} : \mathbf{x} \mapsto \alpha_1 v_1(\mathbf{x}) + \alpha_2 v_2(\mathbf{x}) + \dots + \alpha_k v_k(\mathbf{x}))$ 
11:    end for
12:  return  $\widehat{F}_k$ 

```

THEOREM 3. Consider sequence of functions $(\widehat{F}_k)_{k=1}^N$ constructed by Algorithm 1. For every $i > j$: $\mathcal{L}(\widehat{F}_i) < \mathcal{L}(\widehat{F}_j)$. Moreover, if \mathcal{H} is finite dimensional with N dimensions, then algorithm returns function \widehat{F} such that $\mathcal{L}(\widehat{F}) = 0$.

See [proof](#) in the appendix.

Due to the unordinary definition of the time that the algorithm takes to solve an SR instance, we say explicitly where the algorithm spends the computational budget. We defined that the algorithm spends one time unit when the set of training data \mathbb{X} is traversed one time. This traverse happens when the inner product is computed or the loss function is computed. Computation of the inner product is performed twice in the line 2. On every iteration of the loop in line 3 the FTG algorithm computes the value of loss directly in line 4 and it computes the inner product in lines 7, 8 and 9. In line 7 only one computation of the inner product is made. In line 8 algorithm makes $2k - 1$ evaluations of the inner product to add the last row and last column to the Gram matrix. In line 9 algorithm makes another evaluation of the inner product $\langle [F], [v_k] \rangle$.

4.1 Geometrical Interpretation of FTG

In this section, we provide an example of FTG execution and give a visually intuitive scheme of what FTG algorithm does.

Example 1 (First two steps of FTG on a one-dimensional domain). FTG starts in line 1 of Algorithm 1 with a single element, which is a constant 1. The class of equivalent functions that this constant represents is $[1]$. This case is shown in Figure 1 (a), where the $\text{span}\{[1]\}$ is shown with an orange line in the considered Hilbert space F . The solution of LLSQ with only one function $v_1(\mathbf{x}) = 1$ gives the constant α such that $\|F - \alpha\|$ is the smallest possible. Substitution of this v_1 to Eq. (2) gives the following solution: $\alpha = N^{-1} \sum_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{X}} F(\mathbf{y})$. The point




Figure 1: Visualization of the first (a) and second (b) steps that FTG can make for a one-dimensional domain.

$\alpha \cdot [1]$ belongs to $\text{span}\{[1]\}$ and it is closest point to $[F]$ in this subspace. Moreover, the vector $[F] - \alpha \cdot [1]$ is orthogonal to the subspace $\text{span}\{[1]\}$ as shown in Figure 1 (a).

After finding \widehat{F}_1 , FTG proceeds with $k = 2$ and enters a while loop in line 3 to generate a composition of elementary functions. Assume that this composition is $v_2(x) = \sin(x^2 + 1)\sqrt{|x|}$ and the data set is chosen in such a way, that $[v_2] \notin \text{span}\{[v_1]\}$. This situation is shown in Figure 1 (b), where element $[v_2]$ is not located on the orange line. In this case, elements $[v_1]$ and $[v_2]$ are linearly independent, and hence the subspace which they span increases. This subspace $\text{span}\{[v_1], [v_2]\}$ is shown as orange plane. The condition in line 7 of Algorithm 1 checks if vectors $[F] - \alpha \cdot [v_1]$ and $[v_2]$ are perpendicular. Since they are not perpendicular, the algorithm leaves the while loop and proceeds with the computation of the Gram matrix. The next best approximation of F is found in the plane shown in orange in Figure 1 (b). $\widehat{F}_2 = \alpha_1 \cdot [v_1] + \alpha_2 \cdot [v_2]$, with constants α_1, α_2 obtained by application of Eq. (2) in line 9 of Algorithm 1.

Example 1 demonstrates how FTG handles randomly generated compositions of elementary operators. FTG proceeds in this fashion, spanning greater subspaces, until the class of the target function F is included in the spanned space. The crucial point of the algorithm is the linear independence of the newly generated function with the

previously generated ones. Intuitive interpretation is that such a function adds new information about the target function. Following this intuition, the predicate in line 7 of Algorithm 1 checks if the generated composition adds any new information about the function. When it is added, the known information is not lost, meaning the quality of the approximation is not reduced, which is guaranteed by Theorem 3.

4.2 Implementation Details

Algorithm 2 Generate composition of elementary operators $\{\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, \Pi\}$ given the minimal l and maximal u numbers of nested operators and a constant $p \in [0, 1]$. This is our adaptation of the classical algorithm for tree initialization, called “ramped half-and-half”, see [21, 28].

```

1: procedure GENERATE-COMPOSITION( $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{C}, \Pi, p, l, u$ )
2:    $\tilde{p} \sim U(\{p, 1\})$ 
3:    $\tilde{u} \sim U(\mathbb{Z}_u \setminus \mathbb{Z}_{l-1})$ 
4:    $d_1 \leftarrow 0; i \leftarrow 1; j \leftarrow 2$ 
5:    $f_i \sim E(\tilde{p}, d_i, l, \tilde{u})$ 
6:   while  $i < j$  do
7:      $d_j \leftarrow d_i + 1$ 
8:      $d_{j+1} \leftarrow d_i + 1$ 
9:     if  $f_i \in \mathcal{U}$  then
10:       $f_j \sim E(\tilde{p}, d_i + 1, l, \tilde{u})$ 
11:       $f_i \leftarrow f_i \circ f_j$ 
12:       $j \leftarrow j + 1$ 
13:     end if
14:     if  $f_i \in \mathcal{B}$  then
15:       $f_j \sim E(\tilde{p}, d_i + 1, l, \tilde{u})$ 
16:       $f_{j+1} \sim E(\tilde{p}, d_i + 1, l, \tilde{u})$ 
17:       $f_i \leftarrow f_i(f_j, f_{j+1})$ 
18:       $j \leftarrow j + 2$ 
19:     end if
20:      $i \leftarrow i + 1$ 
21:   end while
22:   return  $f_1$ 
23: end procedure

```

In this section, we describe the practical aspects of the implementation of the proposed FTG algorithm. We start by introducing the family of probability distributions parameterized by four real values p, d, l, u . Every particular distribution in this family defines the distribution over elementary operators. They are used to sample a particular elementary operator in our procedure to generate compositions. Every sampled operator has associated depth d , which denotes the number of functions in which the operator is nested. The constants l, u limit the minimal and maximal number of nested operators accordingly. The constant p defines the probability with which a unary or binary function will be sampled when this choice is possible.

$$E(p, d, l, u) = \begin{cases} U(\mathcal{U} \cup \mathcal{B}), & \text{if } d < l \\ U(\mathcal{U} \cup \mathcal{B}), & \text{with prob. } p \text{ if } l \leq d < u \\ U(U(\{\Pi, \mathcal{C}\})), & \text{with prob. } 1 - p \text{ if } l \leq d < u \\ U(U(\{\Pi, \mathcal{C}\})), & \text{if } d \geq u \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

Given this family of distribution E , we are ready to formulate the algorithm that generates a composition of functions. FTG utilizes our adaptation of ramped half-and-half initialization as a well-established tree-initialization method commonly used in GP to generate new compositions [21, 28]. We summarize this conventional methodology in Algorithm 2.

Application of Algorithm 2 as function GENERATE-COMPOSITION is one of the possible ways to generate the composition of functions. We choose this implementation, because of its simplicity and unbiasedness between operators.

When a matrix is ill-conditioned, meaning it has a high condition number, the computation of its inverse is prone to numerical errors. However, in the area of approximation theory, it is known that arbitrary choice of linearly independent elements of Hilbert space will likely lead to a Gram matrix with a very high condition number [14, 40]. In our work, the functions, that specify elements of Hilbert space are produced randomly and independently from each other, so it is very likely that FTG struggles with such ill-conditioned Gram matrices. In order to address this practical limitation, we compute the inverse using Singular Value Decomposition (SVD) and check if the inverse of the Gram matrix is close to its actual inverse. If this condition is not satisfied, then we do not include the generated $[v_k]$ to the set of linearly independent elements and return to the line 7 of Algorithm 1 to generate another v_k . The check for closeness to the inverse is implemented as follows. When an approximation \widehat{G}^{-1} of matrix G^{-1} is obtained, we consider $\widehat{I} := G \cdot \widehat{G}^{-1}$ and validate that every element of this product is close to the corresponding element of the identity matrix I . More precisely, for every i, j we check that $|\widehat{I}_{i,j} - I_{i,j}| < \varepsilon_1$. In this paper, we use $\varepsilon_1 = 10^{-4}$.

Such a procedure with a generation of v_k adds additional computational complexity, but helps to avoid significant numerical errors with ill-conditioned matrices. In our work, FTG was dealing with condition numbers up to $3.7 \cdot 10^{17}$ in average across all the considered conventional benchmarks and runs.

In our implementation, we used static parameters $p = 0.5, l = 1, u = 9$ for Algorithm 2. We assumed that the inner product defined in line 7 of Algorithm 1 is zero when its absolute value is less than $\varepsilon_2 = 10^{-3}$. The bigger this constant is, the more difficult it is for the algorithm to generate the composition that satisfies the defined predicate. On the other hand, the greater the constant, the more new element generated from the span of elements v_1, v_2, \dots, v_{k-1} , and thus the less ill-conditioned the Gram matrix is. Therefore, the trade-off between ε_1 and ε_2 exists and must be identified. In our work, we selected those constants by trying multiple values. We leave a more detailed investigation of this trade-off for future works. The full code of the Algorithm 1, Algorithm 2, conventional GP algorithms that we considered, and all experiments we performed can be found online at [4].

5 EXPERIMENTS

5.1 Experimental Setup

We performed experiments on classical one-dimensional symbolic regression problems. To evaluate the search performance for GP and our proposed algorithm, we measured the number evaluations of loss functions before the computational budget was exceeded. In addition to the mean values of the measurements, we calculated the standard deviation (SD) and the standard error of the mean (SEM). Binary tournament selection was used to select new parent individuals. The configuration for canonical GP was adopted from [36].

We performed 100 independent runs with different random seeds. We used the function defined in goal 2 as the fitness function. When the difference of all absolute values becomes less than ε , the algorithm is classified as converged. We considered the following values of ε from 10^0 to 10^{-8} to evaluate different tolerance levels. In our experiments we used a function set

$$\mathfrak{B} = \{+, -, *, /, \sin, \cos, \ln\}$$

and for each run we allowed a budget of 10^5 fitness evaluations. Besides evaluating the conventional recombination-based GP, which we refer to as canonical GP, we also considered mutation-only GP that is used with a $(1 + \lambda)$ -EA and is referred to as $(1 + \lambda)$ -GP. Ramped half-and-half initialization has been used for all tested algorithms. The configuration of the respective GP algorithms is shown in Table 3 (in the Appendix). We divide our experiments into two parts. We evaluate the search performance for GP and FTG on conventional benchmarks that have been proposed for SR.

5.2 Conventional Benchmarks

We selected nine well-known symbolic regression benchmarks from the work of McDermott et al. [30]. The objective functions and dataset configuration of the respective problems are shown in Table 2 (in the Appendix).

5.3 Large-Scale Polynomial Benchmark

We propose a type of benchmark for SR to address the following two points that are missing in our conventional SR benchmark.

- (1) Finite training data set leaves a chance that the obtained expression with a small value of the loss function approximate value of $F(\mathbf{x})$ well only for $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}$, but give high *fitness* value for points in $\mathbb{X} \setminus \mathbf{X}$;
- (2) GP applied to conventional benchmarking problems generates a function more complicated than the target function very quickly. The span of such candidate solutions already includes the target function. This hinders observing the capabilities of algorithms to iteratively span subspaces that are getting closer to the target function F .

The proposed Large-Scale Polynomial (LSP) benchmark addresses Point 1 by considering the whole domain as the training data. This makes the computation of the loss function technically more difficult. Point 2 is addressed by considering a target function as a polynomial of a high degree, for example, 100. This entails problems for the computations of the loss values for candidate solutions, because of limitations in floating point precision on the computer.

Now we show how both mentioned difficulties, namely computation of the loss function over an infinite data set and possible numerical errors, are tackled in the proposed LSP benchmarks.

Given constants $a, b, k, c_0, c_1, \dots, c_k$, we define LSP benchmark, as SR instance, where $\mathfrak{B} = \{+, *\}$, $\mathfrak{U} = \emptyset$, $\Pi = \{1\}$, $\mathbb{X} = [a, b]$, $\mathbf{X} = \mathbb{X}$, $F = \sum_{i=0}^k c_i x^i$. We focus on a particular case of our general setup when sets $\mathfrak{U}, \mathfrak{B}$ are the smallest that satisfy our assumptions. I.e. we consider $\mathfrak{B} = \{+, *\}$, $\mathfrak{U} = \emptyset$, $\Pi = \{1\}$ which implies that the dimension of the problem is $n = 1$. We denote such a one-dimensional domain as $\mathbb{X} = [a, b]$. Regardless of the set of constants \mathfrak{C} , all the compositions of elementary operators belong to the class of polynomials. A polynomial of degree k can always be written down in the form $\sum_{i=0}^k c_i x^i$, where $c_k \neq 0$. We will denote this as *normal form* of a polynomial.

Up until now, we considered only finite sets \mathbf{X} . Now, we propose to consider infinite \mathbf{X} which equals the whole domain where the target function F is defined, i.e. $\mathbf{X} = \mathbb{X}$. In this case, we define \mathbb{F} as space of square-integrable functions over the segment (a, b) , which we denote as $L_2(a, b)$. Due to the fact that all the polynomials are square-integrable functions, such \mathbb{F} includes all compositions of the considered elementary operators. $L_2(a, b)$ is a Hilbert space with inner product $\langle f, g \rangle = \int_a^b f(x)g(x)dx \quad \forall f, g \in L_2(a, b)$. It induces the following norm: $\|f\| = \sqrt{\langle f, f \rangle}$.

For this benchmark, we choose the target function F as a polynomial. So the target function $F \in L_2(a, b)$, hence the loss of SR, can be computed as $\mathcal{L}(\widehat{F}) = \|F - \widehat{F}\|^2 = \langle F - \widehat{F}, F - \widehat{F} \rangle$.

It is clear, that being able to compute the value of the inner product automatically, is sufficient for automatic computation of loss value. To implement this computation, we transform a tree to a polynomial in the form using a recursive algorithm. Then we automatically do the subtraction of polynomials in normal form, if needed, and do the multiplication of polynomials in normal form. After this, the resulting polynomial under the integral is obtained in normal form, and the computation of the inner product boils down to the computation of the following integral:

$$\int_a^b \sum_{i=0}^k c_i x^i dx = \sum_{i=0}^k \frac{c_i}{i+1} (b^{i+1} - a^{i+1}) \quad (7)$$

5.4 Results

Figure 2 shows the results of our experiments with conventional benchmarks. On each heatmap, the X-axis shows the tolerance value and the Y-axis shows the benchmark problem. In subfigure (a) every cell shows the difference between the success rate (in percent) of FTG and the maximal success rate that GP algorithms achieved. In subfigure (b) every cell shows a ratio between median function evaluations of FTG and minimal value across medians of function evaluations that GP algorithms made to reach the given tolerance of the solution. The more red the cell is, the better the performance of FTG relative to the considered GP algorithms. It is clearly visible that FTG performs considerably better and more robust for the tested problems when compared to conventional GP. The complete results are available in the Appendix in Table 4 and Table 5.




Figure 2: Comparison of success rate (a) and median of function evaluations to reach the given tolerance (b) of FTG with three standard GP algorithms: $(1 + 1)$ -GP, $(1 + \lambda)$ -GP, Canonical-GP across a range of benchmark problems and tolerance levels.

Figure 3 shows the results of the LSP evaluation. A column displays results for a different configuration of the benchmark, characterized by the polynomial degree k . The target function is $\sum_{i=0}^k x^i$. Rows represent the tracked quantity for each generation of the algorithm. Each chart depicts the averaged tracked quantity on the Y-axis and the generation number on the X-axis. The lines represent the mean value and the shaded areas represent the standard deviation. Finally, the last two rows with numbers show the means and standard deviations of the number of individuals that simultaneously achieved better fitness than the best-so-far solution and spanned a larger subspace. For every configuration of the experiment, we used the same random seeds and made 100 independent runs to obtain statistically robust results.

In the further discussion, we say that a polynomial has the span of size k when a polynomial in a normal form is $\sum_{i=0}^k c_i x^i$ such that $\forall i \in \mathbb{Z}_k : c_i \neq 0$. The size of the span is measured automatically by transforming a tree to a polynomial in normal form and counting the number of terms with different degrees.

6 DISCUSSION

Figure 2 exhibits that FTG significantly outperforms GP in terms of the number of function evaluations needed to reach the desired precision of the solution. We highlight, that FTG reaches an almost absolute success rate even for very small tolerance levels. If the tolerance of the solution is infinitely large, then all the compositions of functions are accepted as sufficient approximation \hat{F} . However, when the tolerance is reduced, the set of functions with sufficiently small loss values does not increase, and, for practically relevant elementary operators, it reduces. Hence, for the minimal tolerance levels, the set of candidate solutions of sufficient quality is relatively small, which makes it harder for conventional GP to find any element from this set. This results in a small success rate

of GP observed in Figure 2. At the same time, FTG manages to overcome this challenge because it has an almost perfect success rate and spends a much smaller budget to find solutions for such tolerance. We rigorously prove in Theorem 3 that, with the absence of numerical errors, FTG improves the quality of the approximation every time it manages to find a linearly independent function v_k . GP search takes advantage of randomness and naturally evolves functions, which could be considered as a random walk in Hilbert space \mathbb{F} within the framework proposed in this work. Element $[f]$ that is encountered during the random walk may be decomposed to the sum of elements if f has addition as the upper functions in the composition. Even if the top function in the composition is already not addition, element $[f]$ belongs to the space $\text{span}\{[f]\}$. We can observe that when an element $[f]$ is encountered during the random walk it may belong to a space that was already spanned earlier by element $[g]$. In this case, FTG filters out the function f , but GP may include it in the population. Such suboptimal choice reduces the selective pressure towards more promising candidate solutions, which reduces the speed of convergence.

The first row of results on the LSP benchmark in Figure 3 exhibit that FTG quickly reduces loss value at the beginning, but then stagnates. FTG appears to struggle with the ill-conditionality of the Gram matrix, which is a hindrance for the accurate computation of its inverse, and in this way, numerical errors are caused. According to our implementation of FTG as explained in Section 4.2, we loop until the inverse of the Gram matrix can be computed accurately, which causes stagnation of FTG when the Gram matrix becomes bigger.

In the first and second rows of Figure 3 we can see that GP spans greater subspaces and, at the same time, reduces loss value at a slower pace than FTG. For the polynomial of degree 100, GP manages to eventually overcome FTG. We propose the following




Figure 3: Performance Comparison of Canonical-GP (grey) and $(1+\lambda)$ -GP (light red) and FTG (red) on the proposed Large-Scale Polynomial Benchmarks.

explanation of the observed results: In general, mutation and recombination with certain non-zero probability change constants are hidden inside the candidate solution function f , while preserving the structure of this function. Consider an individual as a function of the domain variable \mathbf{x} and the vector of all constants Θ , i.e., $f(\mathbf{x}, \Theta)$. For changing Θ , elements $[f(\cdot, \Theta)]$ span some subspace \mathcal{S} , which, in the general case, can be neither convex nor complete in \mathbb{F} . However, in \mathcal{S} , there might be many points such that $[F]$ is closer to them than to the projection of F to the linear subspace span $\{f(\cdot, \Theta_1)\}$ for some fixed Θ_1 . The mechanism that GP uses to generate new individuals allows it to obtain such points.

Surprisingly, we can observe that $(1+\lambda)$ -GP, which uses only mutation to variate candidate solutions, suffers less from bloat, but converges faster than Canonical-GP, while having approximately the same loss and span of \mathbb{F} at the end of optimization. It means that the mutation-only variation operator is beneficial for polynomials, but the study of how well it generalizes on other problems is left for future work.

LSP with a polynomial of degree 10 is used to see the performance of algorithms in the absence of overfitting. The proposed FTG algorithm performs better than conventional GP on this instance

of LSP but does not reach a loss value of zero. At the same time, in the last row of Figure 3 we see that FTG produces trees with a significantly greater number of nodes on both considered cases of polynomials. This is due to the method that we used for the generation of compositions of functions in FTG.

In both considered cases of polynomials, Canonical-GP spans approximately the same number of dimensions that the target function spans. Hence, GP found the approximate shape of the target polynomial but struggled to find the right constants.

Our analyses of GP on this benchmark demonstrate that GP excels in generating solutions that effectively span subspaces of the considered Hilbert space.

7 CONCLUSIONS AND FUTURE WORK

In this work, we considered SR from the perspective of functional analysis and proposed a novel algorithm that is able to navigate and optimize in Hilbert space. Our consideration of SR in Hilbert space allows us to achieve insight into the principles of conventional GP. To the best of our knowledge, our work represents a pioneering application of functional analysis in the SR domain, for which we proposed first theoretical and experimental results. Our proposed FTG algorithm demonstrates significant performance gains over considered GP algorithms on conventional benchmarks. FTG manages to find solutions of minimal tolerance, which shows that it can efficiently navigate in a large search space. However, it is susceptible to numerical errors when the Gram matrix is inverted. We propose to address this issue by employing the Gram-Schmidt orthogonalization algorithm to transform linearly independent vectors into an orthonormal basis. The better performance of FTG on conventional benchmarks can be explained by the fact that FTG filters out a priori suboptimal functions, while GP does not. However, the working principles of GP allow it to be more beneficial for polynomials of high degree, which we show in the proposed LSP benchmarks. In future work, we plan to hybridize GP and FTG to obtain an algorithm that can simultaneously substantially span the subspaces of the Hilbert space and effectively optimize the constants.

Acknowledgments. We are grateful to Dr. André Deutz, Leiden University, for the insightful discussions during the writing process and for his valuable detailed feedback on the paper. We also deeply appreciate the stimulating conversation with Prof. Dr. Günter Rudolph, TU Dortmund University, whose general view on our work greatly benefited our research. This work is supported by the Austrian Science Fund (FWF – Der Wissenschaftsfonds) under the project (I 5315, ‘ML Methods for Feature Identification Global Optimization). The project was financially supported by ANR project HQI ANR-22-PNCQ-0002.

REFERENCES

- [1] Michael Affenzeller, Stephan M Winkler, Gabriel Kronberger, Michael Komenda, Bogdan Burlacu, and Stefan Wagner. 2014. Gaining deeper insights in symbolic regression. *Genetic Programming Theory and Practice XI* (2014), 175–190.
- [2] Lee Altenberg. 1994. The Evolution of Evolvability in Genetic Programming. In *Advances in Genetic Programming*, Kenneth E. Kinneer, Jr. (Ed.). MIT Press, Chapter 3, 47–74. <https://doi.org/doi:10.7551/mitpress/1108.003.0009>
- [3] Peter J. Angeline. 1997. Comparing Subtree Crossover with Macromutation. In *Evolutionary Programming VI, 6th International Conference, EP97, Indianapolis,*

- Indiana, USA, April 13-16, 1997, *Proceedings (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 1213)*, Peter J. Angeline, Robert G. Reynolds, John R. McDonnell, and Russell C. Eberhart (Eds.). Springer, 101-112. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BFB0014804>
- [4] Kirill Antonov, Roman Kalkreuth, Kaifeng Yang, Thomas Bäck, Niki van Stein, and Anna V. Kononova. 2024. Source code of Fourier Tree Growing (FTG) and related experiments with Genetic Programming (GP). <https://anonymous.4open.science/r/fourier-tree-growing-46EB/README.md>
- [5] Tristan Cazenave. 2013. Monte-carlo expression discovery. *International Journal on Artificial Intelligence Tools* 22, 01 (2013), 1250035.
- [6] Alison Cozad and Nikolaos V. Sahinidis. 2018. A global MINLP approach to symbolic regression. *Mathematical Programming* 170 (2018), 97-119.
- [7] Michael Lynn Cramer. 1985. A representation for the Adaptive Generation of Simple Sequential Programs. In *Proceedings of an International Conference on Genetic Algorithms and the Applications*, John J. Grefenstette (Ed.). Carnegie-Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA, USA, 183-187. http://www.cs.ucl.ac.uk/staff/W.Langdon/ftp/papers/icga1985/icga85_cramer.pdf
- [8] Fabricio Olivetti de França. 2018. A greedy search tree heuristic for symbolic regression. *Information Sciences* 442 (2018), 18-32.
- [9] Brian C Falkenhainer and Ryszard S Michalski. 1986. Integrating quantitative and qualitative discovery: the ABACUS system. *Machine Learning* 1 (1986), 367-401.
- [10] Richard Forsyth. 1981. BEAGLE A Darwinian Approach to Pattern Recognition. *Kybernetes* 10, 3 (1981), 159-166. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1108/eb005587>
- [11] Edgar Galván-López, James McDermott, Michael O'Neill, and Anthony Brabazon. 2010. Towards an Understanding of Locality in Genetic Programming. In *Proceedings of the 12th Annual Conference on Genetic and Evolutionary Computation (Portland, Oregon, USA) (GECCO '10)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 901-908. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1830483.1830646>
- [12] Donald Gerwin. 1974. Information processing, data inferences, and scientific generalization. *Behavioral Science* 19, 5 (1974), 314-325.
- [13] Joseph Hicklin. 1986. *Application of the Genetic Algorithm to Automatic Program Generation*. Master's thesis. University of Idaho.
- [14] Richard B Holmes. 1991. On random correlation matrices. *SIAM journal on matrix analysis and applications* 12, 2 (1991), 239-272.
- [15] Ting Hu and Wolfgang Banzhaf. 2016. Neutrality, Robustness, and Evolvability in Genetic Programming. In *Genetic Programming Theory and Practice XIV, [GPTP 2016, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, USA, May 19-21, 2016] (Genetic and Evolutionary Computation)*, Rick L. Riolo, Bill Worzel, Brian Goldman, and Bill Tozier (Eds.). Springer, 101-117. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-97088-2_7
- [16] David Jackson. 2010. The identification and exploitation of dormancy in genetic programming. *Genetic Programming and Evolvable Machines* 11 (2010), 89-121.
- [17] Lukas Kammerer, Gabriel Kronberger, Bogdan Burlacu, Stephan M Winkler, Michael Kommenda, and Michael Affenzeller. 2020. Symbolic regression by exhaustive search: Reducing the search space using syntactical constraints and efficient semantic structure deduplication. *Genetic programming theory and practice XVII* (2020), 79-99.
- [18] Leonid Vital'evich Kantorovich and Gleb Pavlovich Akilov. 2016. *Functional analysis*. Elsevier.
- [19] Mark E Kotanchek, Ekaterina Vladislavleva, and Guido Smits. 2013. Symbolic regression is not enough: it takes a village to raise a model. *Genetic Programming Theory and Practice X* (2013), 187-203.
- [20] J. Koza. 1990. *Genetic Programming: A paradigm for genetically breeding populations of computer programs to solve problems*. Technical Report STAN-CS-90-1314. Dept. of Computer Science, Stanford University.
- [21] JRGP Koza. 1992. On the programming of computers by means of natural selection. *Genetic programming* (1992).
- [22] John R. Koza. 1992. *Genetic Programming: On the Programming of Computers by Means of Natural Selection*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, USA. <http://mitpress.mit.edu/books/genetic-programming>
- [23] John R. Koza. 1994. *Genetic Programming II: Automatic Discovery of Reusable Programs*. MIT Press, Cambridge Massachusetts. <http://www.genetic-programming.org/gpbook2toc.html>
- [24] Gabriel Kronberger, Michael Kommenda, Andreas Promberger, and Falk Nickel. 2018. Predicting friction system performance with symbolic regression and genetic programming with factor variables. In *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference*. 1278-1285.
- [25] Pat Langley. 1981. Data-driven discovery of physical laws. *Cognitive Science* 5, 1 (1981), 31-54.
- [26] Andrei Lissovoi and Pietro S. Oliveto. 2018. On the Time and Space Complexity of Genetic Programming for Evolving Boolean Conjunctions. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI-18), the 30th Innovative Applications of Artificial Intelligence (IAAI-18), and the 8th AAAI Symposium on Educational Advances in Artificial Intelligence (EAAI-18)*, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA, February 2-7, 2018, Sheila A. McIlraith and Kilian Q. Weinberger (Eds.). AAAI Press, 1363-1370. <https://doi.org/10.1609/AAAI.V32I1.11517>
- [27] Andrei Lissovoi and Pietro S. Oliveto. 2020. Computational Complexity Analysis of Genetic Programming. In *Theory of Evolutionary Computation - Recent Developments in Discrete Optimization*, Benjamin Doerr and Frank Neumann (Eds.). Springer, 475-518. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-29414-4_11
- [28] Sean Luke and Liviu Panait. 2001. A Survey and Comparison of Tree Generation Algorithms. *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference (GECCO-2001)* (06 2001).
- [29] Andrea Mambrini and Pietro S. Oliveto. 2016. On the Analysis of Simple Genetic Programming for Evolving Boolean Functions. In *Genetic Programming - 19th European Conference, EuroGP 2016, Porto, Portugal, March 30 - April 1, 2016, Proceedings (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 9594)*, Malcolm I. Heywood, James McDermott, Mauro Castelli, Ernesto Costa, and Kevin Sim (Eds.). Springer, 99-114. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-30668-1_7
- [30] James McDermott, David Robert White, Sean Luke, Luca Manzoni, Mauro Castelli, Leonardo Vanneschi, Wojciech Jaskowski, Krzysztof Krawiec, Robin Harper, Kenneth A. De Jong, and Una-May O'Reilly. 2012. Genetic programming needs better benchmarks. In *Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference, GECCO '12, Philadelphia, PA, USA, July 7-11, 2012*, Terence Soule and Jason H. Moore (Eds.). ACM, 791-798. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2330163.2330273>
- [31] Julian F. Miller. 1999. An empirical study of the efficiency of learning boolean functions using a Cartesian Genetic Programming approach. In *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference*, Wolfgang Banzhaf, Jason Daida, Agoston E. Eiben, Max H. Garzon, Vasant Honavar, Mark Jakiela, and Robert E. Smith (Eds.), Vol. 2. Morgan Kaufmann, Orlando, Florida, USA, 1135-1142. <http://citeseer.ist.psu.edu/153431.html>
- [32] Alberto Moraglio, Krzysztof Krawiec, and Colin G. Johnson. 2012. Geometric Semantic Genetic Programming. In *Parallel Problem Solving from Nature - PPSN XII - 12th International Conference, Taormina, Italy, September 1-5, 2012, Proceedings, Part I (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 7491)*, Carlos A. Coello Coello, Vincenzo Cutello, Kalyanmoy Deb, Stephanie Forrest, Giuseppe Nicosia, and Mario Pavone (Eds.). Springer, 21-31. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-32937-1_3
- [33] S. Openshaw and I. Turton. 1994. Building new spatial interaction models using genetic programming. In *Evolutionary Computing, Lecture Notes in Computer Science*. Springer-Verlag, 11-13.
- [34] Tim Perkis. 1994. Stack-Based Genetic Programming. In *Proceedings of the 1994 IEEE World Congress on Computational Intelligence*, Vol. 1. IEEE Press, Orlando, Florida, USA, 148-153. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1109/ICEC.1994.350025>
- [35] Riccardo Poli. 1996. *Parallel Distributed Genetic Programming*. Technical Report CSRP-96-15. School of Computer Science, University of Birmingham, B15 2TT, UK. <ftp://ftp.cs.bham.ac.uk/pub/tech-reports/1996/CSRP-96-15.ps.gz>
- [36] Johannes Reiter, Dirk Schweim, and David Wittenberg. 2023. Pretraining Reduces Runtime in Denoising Autoencoder Genetic Programming by an Order of Magnitude. In *Proceedings of the Companion Conference on Genetic and Evolutionary Computation (Lisbon, Portugal) (GECCO '23 Companion)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2382-2385. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3583133.3596332>
- [37] Conor Ryan, J. J. Collins, and Michael O'Neill. 1998. Grammatical Evolution: Evolving Programs for an Arbitrary Language. In *Proceedings of the First European Workshop on Genetic Programming (LNCS, Vol. 1391)*, Wolfgang Banzhaf, Riccardo Poli, Marc Schoenauer, and Terence C. Fogarty (Eds.). Springer-Verlag, Paris, 83-96. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1007/BFB0055930>
- [38] Terence Soule, James A. Foster, and John Dickinson. 1996. Code Growth in Genetic Programming. In *Proceedings of the 1st Annual Conference on Genetic Programming (Stanford, California)*. MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, USA, 215-223.
- [39] Fangzheng Sun, Yang Liu, Jian-Xun Wang, and Hao Sun. 2022. Symbolic physics learner: Discovering governing equations via monte carlo tree search. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.13134* (2022).
- [40] James M Taylor. 1978. The condition of Gram matrices and related problems. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh Section A: Mathematics* 80, 1-2 (1978), 45-56.
- [41] Leonardo Vanneschi, Manuel Clergue, Philippe Collard, Marco Tomassini, and Sébastien Verel. 2004. Fitness Clouds and Problem Hardness in Genetic Programming. In *Genetic and Evolutionary Computation - GECCO-2004, Part II (Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Vol. 3103)*, Kalyanmoy Deb, Riccardo Poli, Wolfgang Banzhaf, Hans-Georg Beyer, Edmund Burke, Paul Darwin, Dipankar Dasgupta, Dario Floreano, James Foster, Mark Harman, Owen Holland, Pier Luca Lanzi, Lee Spector, Andrea Tettamanzi, Dirk Thierens, and Andy Tyrrell (Eds.). Springer-Verlag, Seattle, WA, USA, 690-701. https://doi.org/doi:10.1007/978-3-540-24855-2_76
- [42] Leonardo Vanneschi, Yuri Pirola, Giancarlo Mauri, Marco Tomassini, Philippe Collard, and Sébastien Verel. 2012. A study of the neutrality of Boolean function landscapes in genetic programming. *Theoretical Computer Science* 425 (30 March 2012), 34-57. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1016/j.tcs.2011.03.011>
- [43] Sergiy Verstyuk and Michael R Douglas. 2022. Machine learning the gravity equation for international trade. *Available at SSRN 4053795* (2022).
- [44] Marco Virgolin and Solon P. Pissis. 2022. Symbolic Regression is NP-hard. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research* 2022 (2022). <https://openreview.net/forum?id=LTiaPxqe2e>
- [45] Marco Virgolin, Ziyuan Wang, Tanja Alderliesten, and Peter AN Bosman. 2020. Machine learning for the prediction of pseudorealistic pediatric abdominal phantoms for radiation dose reconstruction. *Journal of Medical Imaging* 7, 4 (2020),

046501–046501.

- [46] Kaifeng Yang and Michael Affenzeller. 2023. Surrogate-assisted Multi-objective Optimization via Genetic Programming Based Symbolic Regression. In *Evolutionary Multi-Criterion Optimization*, Michael Emmerich, André Deutz, Hao Wang, Anna V. Kononova, Boris Naujoks, Ke Li, Kaisa Miettinen, and Iryna Yevseyeva (Eds.). Springer Nature Switzerland, Cham, 176–190.

A APPENDIX

A.1 Proof

PROOF OF THEOREM 2. To prove the theorem, it is sufficient to show the existence of a bijective mapping $\pi : \mathbb{F} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^N$ such that $\forall f \in \mathcal{F} : \pi([f]) := (f(\mathbf{x}_i))_{i=1}^N$. By definition (8) we see that if $g_1, g_2 \in [f]$ for any $f \in \mathcal{F}$, then $(g_1(\mathbf{x}_i))_{i=1}^N = (g_2(\mathbf{x}_i))_{i=1}^N$. It means that for every $v \in \mathbb{F}$, there exists a single $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ such that $\pi(v) = \mathbf{a}$. Now, to demonstrate that this π is a bijection, it is sufficient to show that for all $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{R}^N$ there exists a unique $v \in \mathbb{F}$ such that $\pi(v) = \mathbf{a}$. For any such $\mathbf{a} := (a_i)_{i=1}^N$, let us consider

$$v := \left[\forall \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{X} : \mathbf{y} \mapsto \begin{cases} a_i, & \text{if } \mathbf{x}_i = \mathbf{y} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \right]$$

It is obvious that $\pi(v) = \mathbf{a}$. Moreover, if there exists $f \in \mathcal{F} : \pi([f]) = \mathbf{a}$ then $\forall i \in \mathbb{Z}_N : f(\mathbf{x}_i) = a_i$, so $f \in v$, which means that $[f] = v^1$. It means that such v is unique for every \mathbf{a} . \square

PROOF OF THEOREM 3. Mathematical induction is used here to prove Theorem 3. We start by proving by induction that Algorithm 1 maintains the following invariant. For $1 \leq k \leq N$, element $[\widehat{F}_k]$ is the closest to the element $[F]$ among all the elements in the space $\text{span}\{[v_1], \dots, [v_k]\}$. We prove it by induction over k .

For $k = 1$ the element $[\widehat{F}_1] = \langle [v_1], [v_1] \rangle^{-1} \langle [F], [v_1] \rangle \cdot [v_1]$ is the solution of LLSQ, given by Eq. (2). Hence $[\widehat{F}_1]$ is closest to $[F]$ in the space $\text{span}\{[v_1]\}$. The statement is proven for $k = 1$.

Assume that the statement is correct for all values of k up to value t such that $1 < k \leq t < N$. Let us prove that it is correct for $k = t + 1$. Based on our assumption, $[\widehat{F}_t]$ is the closest to element $[F]$ among all elements in the space $S_t := \text{span}\{[v_1], \dots, [v_t]\}$. Using the projection theorem, we can conclude that $[F] - [\widehat{F}_t]$ is perpendicular to the space S_t . It means that if the condition in the line 7 is not satisfied, then the algorithm leaves the while loop and element $[v_{t+1}]$ does not lie in the space $\text{span}\{[v_1], \dots, [v_t]\}$. Now it is clear that for every $p > 1$ element $[v_p]$ does not lie in the space $\text{span}\{[v_1], \dots, [v_{p-1}]\}$. It implies that elements $[v_1], [v_2], \dots, [v_{t+1}]$ are linearly independent. Hence, the inverse of matrix \mathbf{G} , computed in line 8 for $k = t + 1$, exists, and so vector $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$, computed for $k = t + 1$, exists too. Then $[\widehat{F}_{t+1}] \in \text{span}\{[v_1], [v_2], \dots, [v_{t+1}]\}$ because $[\widehat{F}_{t+1}]$ is constructed as a linear combination of the corresponding elements in the line 10 of Algorithm 1. This vector $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ gives the closest element to the element $[F]$ because it is constructed in lines 8, 9 according to the Eq. (2). The transition of the induction is proven and so the statement is also proven.

Consider iteration t of Algorithm 1. As we already shown

$$\text{span}\{[v_1], [v_2], \dots, [v_{t-1}]\} \subset \text{span}\{[v_1], [v_2], \dots, [v_t]\}.$$

Hence, $d([F], [\widehat{F}_t]) \leq d([F], [\widehat{F}_{t-1}])$. If the equality is attained, then $[\widehat{F}_t] = [\widehat{F}_{t-1}]$ because both $[\widehat{F}_t], [\widehat{F}_{t-1}]$ belong to the same subspace $\text{span}\{[v_1], [v_2], \dots, [v_t]\}$ and the element $[\widehat{F}_t]$ closest to

$[F]$ in this subspace is unique. Hence, $\langle F - \widehat{F}_{t-1}, [v_t] \rangle = 0$, which means that such $[v_t]$ would not violate the condition in line 7 of Algorithm 1, and so would not be added. Contradiction with the assumption that equality is attained. Then $d([F], [\widehat{F}_t]) < d([F], [\widehat{F}_{t-1}])$, which implies that $\mathcal{L}(\widehat{F}_t) < \mathcal{L}(\widehat{F}_{t-1})$. It proves the first statement of the theorem.

If \mathcal{H} is N -dimensional, then $\text{span}\{[v_1], [v_2], \dots, [v_N]\} = \mathcal{H}$. Hence, for function $\widehat{F}_N : d([F], [\widehat{F}_N]) = 0 \implies \mathcal{L}(\widehat{F}_N) = 0$.

The second statement is also proven. \square

A.2 Tables

Table 1: Notation

Symbol	Definition	Domain
f, g	A function	$\mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$
$fitness$	A fitness function for SR problems	\mathbb{R}
\mathbf{x}	Features in training dataset	\mathbb{R}^N
\mathbf{X}	Training dataset	\mathbb{R}^{nN}
\widehat{F}	A SR function	$\mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$
U	Uniform distribution over the given set	n.a.
π	Bijective mapping	n.a.
\mathcal{U}	Unary operator space	$\{u u : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}$
\mathcal{B}	Binary operator space	$\{b b : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}$
Π	Orthogonal projector operator space	$\{(p_i)_{i=1}^n p_i : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}$
\mathbb{C}	Space of constants	$\subseteq \mathbb{R}$
\mathbb{X}	Domain of variables	$\subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$
\mathcal{F}	Function Space	$\{f f : \mathbb{X} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}$
\mathbb{F}	Quotient space	\mathcal{F}/\sim
$\text{span}\{x\}$	Linear span of x	n.a.

Table 2: Conventional symbolic regression benchmark

Problem	Objective Function	Vars	Training Set
koza1	$x^4 + x^3 + x^2 + x$	x	$x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{20} \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} U(-1, 1)$
koza2	$x^5 - 2x^3 + x$	x	$x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{20} \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} U(-1, 1)$
koza3	$x^6 - 2x^4 + x^2$	x	$x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{20} \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} U(-1, 1)$
nguyen3	$x^5 + x^4 + x^3 + x^2 + x$	x	$x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{20} \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} U(-1, 1)$
nguyen4	$x^6 + x^5 + x^4 + x^3 + x^2 + x$	x	$x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{20} \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} U(-1, 1)$
nguyen5	$\sin(x^2) \cos(x) - 1$	x	$x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{20} \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} U(-1, 1)$
nguyen6	$\sin(x) + \sin(x + x^2)$	x	$x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{20} \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} U(-1, 1)$
nguyen7	$\ln(x + 1) + \ln(x^2 + 1)$	x	$x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{20} \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} U(0, 2)$
nguyen8	\sqrt{x}	x	$x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{20} \stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} U(0, 4)$

Table 3: Configuration of the GP algorithms

Parameters	(1+1)-GP	(1+ λ)-GP	Canonical GP	
P	population size	1	1	500
λ	offspring size	1	500	500
M_t	mutation type	uniform subtree	uniform subtree	probabilistic subtree
M_p	mutation rate	1	1	0.1
C_t	crossover type	n.a.	n.a.	subtree crossover
C_p	crossover rate	n.a.	n.a.	0.9
T	tournament size	n.a.	n.a.	2

¹In this paper, we use notation \mathbb{Z}_m to represent an integer set $\{1, \dots, m\}$.

Table 4: Results of the algorithm comparison for the problems evaluated by the number of fitness evaluations (FE) to termination.

Tolerance	Problem	Algorithm	Mean FE	SD	SEM	1Q	Median	3Q	Success rate (%)
$\sum_{x \in X} (F(x) - \tilde{F}(x))^2 < 10^{-2}$	koza1	(1 + 1)-GP	20535.662	22551.856	2570.023	4941.000	13087.000	24691.000	77
		(1 + λ)-GP	21470.880	18044.348	1980.624	8251.000	15501.000	29001.000	83
		Canonical-GP	25704.898	15474.615	1563.172	16062.500	21167.000	31749.500	98
		FTG	210.790	499.682	49.968	117.750	143.500	198.250	100
	koza2	(1 + 1)-GP	4988.459	7525.069	760.147	802.250	1975.000	4934.500	98
		(1 + λ)-GP	7883.653	8582.969	867.011	2501.000	4751.000	8376.000	98
		Canonical-GP	40612.589	24258.788	2488.899	16934.000	38846.000	60260.000	95
		FTG	135.350	70.287	7.029	96.250	121.000	171.000	100
	koza3	(1 + 1)-GP	12691.833	18547.045	2023.649	2149.250	6052.500	12831.250	84
		(1 + λ)-GP	18552.282	18159.124	2056.116	6001.000	12251.000	21251.000	78
		Canonical-GP	17425.927	19790.600	2185.506	4110.500	9464.000	21416.000	83
		FTG	90.090	46.833	4.683	59.000	94.000	118.000	100
	nguyen3	(1 + 1)-GP	24293.640	25123.029	2709.086	7748.250	14440.000	29669.250	86
		(1 + λ)-GP	36565.706	24355.189	2641.691	16001.000	32501.000	54001.000	85
		Canonical-GP	32333.692	14479.265	1517.839	21914.000	28388.000	40340.000	92
		FTG	187.400	85.965	8.596	122.750	168.000	231.250	100
	nguyen4	(1 + 1)-GP	27746.200	22266.350	2571.097	9702.500	23248.000	36785.000	75
		(1 + λ)-GP	37046.455	24427.627	2783.786	14501.000	33001.000	54001.000	77
		Canonical-GP	47868.974	19633.218	2252.085	32870.000	45818.000	60509.000	79
		FTG	251.070	485.937	48.594	142.000	190.000	253.000	100
	nguyen5	(1 + 1)-GP	8523.299	9957.890	1011.070	1817.000	6193.000	10616.000	97
		(1 + λ)-GP	13181.412	12216.936	1240.442	5001.000	9001.000	16501.000	97
		Canonical-GP	29768.818	17201.884	2117.406	17556.500	25898.000	39717.500	66
		FTG	87.590	44.434	4.443	56.250	79.000	118.000	100
nguyen6	(1 + 1)-GP	15678.733	19769.373	2131.786	3205.250	7522.000	20483.500	86	
	(1 + λ)-GP	22548.619	19765.082	2156.547	7251.000	17501.000	29126.000	84	
	Canonical-GP	19346.990	13967.329	1418.167	10460.000	14942.000	23906.000	97	
	FTG	153.590	221.710	22.171	97.000	122.500	168.000	100	
nguyen7	(1 + 1)-GP	12280.054	18832.320	1952.821	2204.000	4458.000	13355.000	93	
	(1 + λ)-GP	17016.306	15267.755	1542.276	6626.000	13001.000	22001.000	98	
	Canonical-GP	27446.780	12216.519	1221.652	18428.000	24653.000	33866.000	100	
	FTG	48.760	30.594	3.059	30.000	44.000	61.000	100	
nguyen8	(1 + 1)-GP	17749.125	21108.855	2250.211	4811.000	10081.500	21978.750	88	
	(1 + λ)-GP	19271.833	17180.099	1753.437	7876.000	12751.000	27626.000	96	
	Canonical-GP	52970.128	25733.585	3753.629	30131.000	56774.000	71216.000	49	
	FTG	68.520	35.965	3.597	44.000	60.000	94.250	100	
$\sum_{x \in X} (F(x) - \tilde{F}(x))^2 < 10^{-1}$	koza1	(1 + 1)-GP	10031.772	19916.297	2076.417	991.250	2412.500	6353.000	92
		(1 + λ)-GP	9141.625	11727.750	1196.958	3501.000	5501.000	9126.000	96
		Canonical-GP	17713.697	8298.540	834.035	12452.000	16436.000	20171.000	100
		FTG	105.920	49.117	4.912	75.750	99.000	127.750	100
	koza2	(1 + 1)-GP	622.031	737.291	74.478	216.250	383.000	853.500	98
		(1 + λ)-GP	2216.000	2657.306	265.731	1001.000	1501.000	2501.000	100
		Canonical-GP	2601.560	1674.910	167.491	1496.000	2492.000	3488.000	100
		FTG	78.540	44.565	4.456	45.000	77.000	98.000	100
	koza3	(1 + 1)-GP	77.130	102.375	10.237	21.000	37.000	67.000	100
		(1 + λ)-GP	621.000	224.944	22.494	501.000	501.000	501.000	100
		Canonical-GP	515.245	85.788	8.666	500.000	500.000	500.000	100
		FTG	3.000	0.000	0.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	100
	nguyen3	(1 + 1)-GP	5233.250	9750.193	995.125	1696.250	3073.500	6071.500	96
		(1 + λ)-GP	13332.633	13609.710	1374.788	5501.000	9251.000	14876.000	98
		Canonical-GP	20242.143	6818.682	688.791	15066.500	19424.000	23906.000	100
		FTG	128.330	67.033	6.703	96.750	121.000	166.500	100
	nguyen4	(1 + 1)-GP	9457.990	12994.070	1326.202	2262.000	4374.500	10826.750	96
		(1 + λ)-GP	13444.299	12402.169	1259.249	6001.000	9501.000	17501.000	97
		Canonical-GP	25303.613	9637.023	999.313	19424.000	24902.000	29882.000	96
		FTG	143.100	74.536	7.454	98.500	122.500	168.500	100
	nguyen5	(1 + 1)-GP	1278.020	1815.722	182.487	191.000	468.000	1682.500	99
		(1 + λ)-GP	2771.000	2831.448	283.145	1501.000	2001.000	3501.000	100
		Canonical-GP	2666.300	3414.388	341.439	1371.500	1994.000	2990.000	100
		FTG	37.080	24.411	2.441	19.000	30.500	58.000	100
nguyen6	(1 + 1)-GP	3683.396	6924.684	706.748	657.250	1480.000	3616.250	96	
	(1 + λ)-GP	6517.854	8730.500	925.431	2501.000	3501.000	7001.000	89	
	Canonical-GP	10908.200	8970.776	897.078	6476.000	8966.000	13074.500	100	
	FTG	73.630	37.696	3.770	44.000	60.500	97.000	100	
nguyen7	(1 + 1)-GP	563.640	579.752	57.975	140.250	366.500	774.500	100	
	(1 + λ)-GP	1391.000	829.397	82.940	1001.000	1001.000	1501.000	100	
	Canonical-GP	2093.600	1372.891	137.289	998.000	1994.000	2990.000	100	
	FTG	35.290	24.698	2.470	17.250	30.500	46.250	100	
nguyen8	(1 + 1)-GP	4221.566	7441.241	747.873	820.000	1789.000	3849.000	99	
	(1 + λ)-GP	5556.000	5739.728	573.973	2001.000	4001.000	6501.000	100	
	Canonical-GP	21288.733	24501.236	2582.657	3986.000	8966.000	34986.500	94	
	FTG	40.080	25.271	2.527	20.000	32.000	59.000	100	
$\sum_{x \in X} (F(x) - \tilde{F}(x))^2 < 1$	koza1	(1 + 1)-GP	1535.396	7268.502	741.838	162.750	435.500	818.000	96
		(1 + λ)-GP	2192.919	1419.039	142.619	1501.000	2001.000	2501.000	99
		Canonical-GP	4544.364	2427.620	243.985	2741.000	4484.000	5978.000	100
		FTG	57.780	36.299	3.630	31.000	45.000	77.000	100
	koza2	(1 + 1)-GP	16.420	26.715	2.672	5.000	11.000	18.500	100
		(1 + λ)-GP	456.000	143.091	14.309	501.000	501.000	501.000	100
		Canonical-GP	500.000	0.000	0.000	500.000	500.000	500.000	100
		FTG	3.250	1.915	0.192	3.000	3.000	3.000	100
	koza3	(1 + 1)-GP	13.520	14.876	1.488	4.000	8.500	16.250	100
		(1 + λ)-GP	446.000	156.445	15.644	501.000	501.000	501.000	100
		Canonical-GP	500.000	0.000	0.000	500.000	500.000	500.000	100
		FTG	3.000	0.000	0.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	100
	nguyen3	(1 + 1)-GP	862.610	1099.659	109.966	262.000	539.000	1077.750	100
		(1 + λ)-GP	3051.000	1854.050	185.405	1501.000	2501.000	4001.000	100
		Canonical-GP	8442.592	4089.553	413.107	5604.500	8468.000	10958.000	100
		FTG	72.450	42.992	4.299	43.750	59.500	96.250	100
	nguyen4	(1 + 1)-GP	1974.770	4756.862	475.686	409.750	677.500	1639.250	100
		(1 + λ)-GP	3456.000	3029.930	302.993	2001.000	3001.000	4001.000	100
		Canonical-GP	9780.438	5450.162	556.255	5480.000	9713.000	13448.000	100
		FTG	81.910	50.198	5.020	45.000	70.000	100.500	100
	nguyen5	(1 + 1)-GP	35.910	35.989	3.599	10.750	23.500	49.500	100
		(1 + λ)-GP	521.000	140.000	14.000	501.000	501.000	501.000	100
		Canonical-GP	500.000	0.000	0.000	500.000	500.000	500.000	100
		FTG	3.000	0.000	0.000	3.000	3.000	3.000	100
nguyen6	(1 + 1)-GP	766.505	3743.581	376.244	94.000	180.000	373.000	99	
	(1 + λ)-GP	2073.165	5258.273	533.897	1001.000	1501.000	1501.000	97	
	Canonical-GP	2013.920	1534.810	153.481	873.500	1496.000	2990.000	100	
	FTG	35.360	32.344	3.234	11.000	21.000	46.000	100	
nguyen7	(1 + 1)-GP	148.160	183.455	18.345	43.750	85.500	184.500	100	
	(1 + λ)-GP	756.000	278.343	27.834	501.000	501.000	1001.000	100	
	Canonical-GP	614.540	262.149	26.215	500.000	500.000	50		

Table 5: Results of the algorithm comparison for the problems evaluated by the number of fitness evaluations (FE) to termination.

Tolerance	Problem	Algorithm	Mean FE	SD	SEM	IQ	Median	3Q	Success rate (%)
$\sum_{i=1}^n (F(x_i) - \hat{F}(x_i))^2 < 10^{-8}$	koza1	(1 + λ)-GP	∞	0	0	∞	∞	∞	0
		(1 + λ)-GP	14438.500	25864.355	9144.430	2251.000	3751.000	7876.000	8
		Canonical-GP	22230.909	9264.695	1055.810	15938.000	19922.000	25898.000	77
	FTG	1288.930	2343.021	237.948	533.000	597.000	920.000	97	
	koza2	(1 + λ)-GP	∞	0	0	∞	∞	∞	0
		(1 + λ)-GP	90140.000	0.000	0.000	90140.000	90140.000	90140.000	1
		Canonical-GP	1561.629	3352.298	340.374	534.000	626.000	1038.000	97
	koza3	(1 + λ)-GP	∞	0	0	∞	∞	∞	0
		(1 + λ)-GP	∞	0	0	∞	∞	∞	0
		Canonical-GP	∞	0	0	∞	∞	∞	0
	FTG	1515.350	3482.339	348.234	542.500	633.000	999.250	100	
	nguyen3	(1 + λ)-GP	7001.000	0.000	0.000	7001.000	7001.000	7001.000	1
(1 + λ)-GP		26997.358	10211.628	1402.675	20420.000	24404.000	32372.000	54	
Canonical-GP		1962.102	4402.288	444.698	539.500	660.500	1235.750	98	
FTG	∞	0	0	∞	∞	∞	0		
nguyen4	(1 + λ)-GP	∞	0	0	∞	∞	∞	0	
	(1 + λ)-GP	37827.364	13533.309	2885.311	29259.500	35360.000	45320.000	22	
	Canonical-GP	2752.073	8105.071	827.220	538.000	601.500	1201.000	96	
FTG	∞	0	0	∞	∞	∞	0		
nguyen5	(1 + λ)-GP	∞	0	0	∞	∞	∞	0	
	(1 + λ)-GP	18428.000	0.000	0.000	18428.000	18428.000	18428.000	1	
	Canonical-GP	1393.950	3897.976	389.798	528.750	628.000	834.750	100	
FTG	∞	0	0	∞	∞	∞	0		
nguyen6	(1 + λ)-GP	2192.000	1468.974	656.945	956.000	1443.000	3384.000	5	
	(1 + λ)-GP	2701.000	678.233	303.315	2501.000	2501.000	2501.000	5	
	Canonical-GP	20408.933	14429.970	1521.052	10958.000	16934.000	24653.000	90	
FTG	2430.360	9119.704	921.229	527.750	605.000	989.000	90		
nguyen7	(1 + λ)-GP	∞	0	0	∞	∞	∞	0	
	(1 + λ)-GP	∞	0	0	∞	∞	∞	0	
	Canonical-GP	∞	0	0	∞	∞	∞	0	
FTG	1930.240	6211.331	621.133	552.250	670.000	911.500	100		
nguyen8	(1 + λ)-GP	∞	0	0	∞	∞	∞	0	
	(1 + λ)-GP	∞	0	0	∞	∞	∞	0	
	Canonical-GP	∞	0	0	∞	∞	∞	0	
FTG	1408.560	5689.417	568.942	478.000	559.500	718.500	100		
$\sum_{i=1}^n (F(x_i) - \hat{F}(x_i))^2 < 10^{-7}$	koza1	(1 + λ)-GP	∞	0	0	∞	∞	∞	0
		(1 + λ)-GP	14556.556	22807.704	7602.568	2501.000	4501.000	15001.000	9
		Canonical-GP	22217.974	9270.688	1056.493	15938.000	19922.000	25898.000	77
	FTG	971.580	2028.005	202.800	494.750	550.500	693.500	100	
	koza2	(1 + λ)-GP	∞	0	0	∞	∞	∞	0
		(1 + λ)-GP	90140.000	0.000	0.000	90140.000	90140.000	90140.000	1
		Canonical-GP	∞	0	0	∞	∞	∞	0
	FTG	968.990	1257.073	126.984	508.500	544.000	677.000	98	
	koza3	(1 + λ)-GP	∞	0	0	∞	∞	∞	0
		(1 + λ)-GP	∞	0	0	∞	∞	∞	0
		Canonical-GP	∞	0	0	∞	∞	∞	0
	FTG	1053.150	2248.115	224.812	511.000	561.000	785.500	100	
nguyen3	(1 + λ)-GP	7001.000	0.000	0.000	7001.000	7001.000	7001.000	1	
	(1 + λ)-GP	26997.358	10211.628	1402.675	20420.000	24404.000	32372.000	54	
	Canonical-GP	1410.818	2961.260	297.628	503.500	567.000	985.500	99	
FTG	∞	0	0	∞	∞	∞	0		
nguyen4	(1 + λ)-GP	∞	0	0	∞	∞	∞	0	
	(1 + λ)-GP	37827.364	13533.309	2885.311	29259.500	35360.000	45320.000	22	
	Canonical-GP	2078.031	5165.032	521.747	514.000	604.500	1032.750	98	
FTG	∞	0	0	∞	∞	∞	0		
nguyen5	(1 + λ)-GP	∞	0	0	∞	∞	∞	0	
	(1 + λ)-GP	15400.000	0.000	0.000	15400.000	15400.000	15400.000	1	
	Canonical-GP	∞	0	0	∞	∞	∞	0	
FTG	1158.660	3782.549	378.255	467.750	537.000	684.250	100		
nguyen6	(1 + λ)-GP	2192.000	1468.974	656.945	956.000	1443.000	3384.000	5	
	(1 + λ)-GP	2701.000	678.233	303.315	2501.000	2501.000	2501.000	5	
	Canonical-GP	20392.333	14420.492	1520.053	10958.000	16934.000	24653.000	90	
FTG	1056.337	1799.477	181.775	493.250	556.000	756.000	98		
nguyen7	(1 + λ)-GP	∞	0	0	∞	∞	∞	0	
	(1 + λ)-GP	∞	0	0	∞	∞	∞	0	
	Canonical-GP	∞	0	0	∞	∞	∞	0	
FTG	950.410	2804.880	280.488	403.250	504.000	609.750	100		
nguyen8	(1 + λ)-GP	∞	0	0	∞	∞	∞	0	
	(1 + λ)-GP	∞	0	0	∞	∞	∞	0	
	Canonical-GP	∞	0	0	∞	∞	∞	0	
FTG	959.320	5207.160	520.716	323.000	432.500	509.750	100		
$\sum_{i=1}^n (F(x_i) - \hat{F}(x_i))^2 < 10^{-6}$	koza1	(1 + λ)-GP	∞	0	0	∞	∞	∞	0
		(1 + λ)-GP	47988.000	36922.000	26107.797	29527.000	47988.000	66449.000	2
		Canonical-GP	22166.234	9258.335	1055.085	15938.000	19922.000	25400.000	77
	FTG	839.220	1998.643	199.864	403.750	499.000	559.250	100	
	koza2	(1 + λ)-GP	84218.000	13203.738	7623.297	77494.500	88715.000	91900.000	3
		(1 + λ)-GP	90001.000	2900.000	1767.567	88715.000	90001.000	91251.000	2
		Canonical-GP	90140.000	0.000	0.000	90140.000	90140.000	90140.000	1
	FTG	802.969	1206.168	121.841	419.750	506.500	593.750	98	
	koza3	(1 + λ)-GP	70642.500	22277.500	15752.371	59503.750	70642.500	81781.250	2
		(1 + λ)-GP	78501.000	0.000	0.000	78501.000	78501.000	78501.000	1
		Canonical-GP	∞	0	0	∞	∞	∞	0
	FTG	885.680	2248.385	224.838	440.500	507.500	559.250	100	
nguyen3	(1 + λ)-GP	7001.000	0.000	0.000	7001.000	7001.000	7001.000	1	
	(1 + λ)-GP	26865.811	10088.563	1385.771	20420.000	24404.000	32372.000	54	
	Canonical-GP	1252.354	2951.116	296.598	452.000	510.000	696.000	99	
FTG	∞	0	0	∞	∞	∞	0		
nguyen4	(1 + λ)-GP	∞	0	0	∞	∞	∞	0	
	(1 + λ)-GP	61501.000	0.000	0.000	61501.000	61501.000	61501.000	1	
	Canonical-GP	91927.478	14573.055	3038.692	29633.000	36356.000	46067.000	23	
FTG	1744.000	4936.152	498.627	466.250	522.500	779.000	98		
nguyen5	(1 + λ)-GP	98966.000	0.000	0.000	98966.000	98966.000	98966.000	1	
	(1 + λ)-GP	98001.000	0.000	0.000	98001.000	98001.000	98001.000	1	
	Canonical-GP	15440.000	0.000	0.000	15440.000	15440.000	15440.000	1	
FTG	911.430	3709.353	370.935	338.750	426.000	525.000	100		
nguyen6	(1 + λ)-GP	20049.714	32794.626	12395.204	1189.500	3364.000	19022.000	7	
	(1 + λ)-GP	2701.000	678.233	303.315	2501.000	2501.000	2501.000	5	
	Canonical-GP	21011.033	15667.276	1642.377	10958.000	16934.000	24902.000	91	
FTG	828.660	1140.343	114.034	410.000	502.500	594.250	100		
nguyen7	(1 + λ)-GP	94875.000	4763.204	2750.037	92492.500	96616.000	98128.000	3	
	(1 + λ)-GP	59001.000	1000.000	707.107	58501.000	59001.000	59501.000	2	
	Canonical-GP	∞	0	0	∞	∞	∞	0	
FTG	420.080	769.980	76.998	256.250	336.500	431.750	100		
nguyen8	(1 + λ)-GP	49606.000	917.000	648.417	49147.500	49606.000	50064.500	2	
	(1 + λ)-GP	∞	0	0	∞	∞	∞	0	
	Canonical-GP	∞	0	0	∞	∞	∞	0	
FTG	844.760	5214.687	521.469	210.750	322.500	431.250	100		
$\sum_{i=1}^n (F(x_i) - \hat{F}(x_i))^2 < 10^{-5}$	koza1	(1 + λ)-GP	53377.000	31411.295	12823.608	32432.500	61504.500	75989.000	6
		(1 + λ)-GP	23046.455	31240.602	9419.396	2751.000	5501.000	23751.000	11
		Canonical-GP	22108.026	9240.413	1053.043	15938.000	19424.000	25400.000	77
	FTG	712.440	1942.562	194.256	302.750	399.500	495.750	100	
	koza2	(1 + λ)-GP	64166.632	23640.045	5423.398	4201.500	69234.000	84645.500	19
		(1 + λ)-GP	61143.857	23647.281	6320.002	40376.000	65251.000	75126.000	14
		Canonical-GP	84662.000	1992.000	1408.357	83666.000	84662.000	85638.000	2
	FTG	640.850	1050.594	105.059	345.750	419.000	502.500	100	
	koza3	(1 + λ)-GP	58571.400	29133.534	13109.411	44579.000	64125.000	80018.000	3
		(1 + λ)-GP	66667.667	16483.999	9517.041	58001.000	71501.000	77751.000	5
		Canonical-GP	∞	0	0	∞	∞	∞	0
	FTG	476.000	416.455	41.645	335.000	417.000	480.250	100	
nguyen3	(1 + λ)-GP	49001.000	24713.357	12356.678	45501.000	61501.000			