

# Introducing Competitive Mechanism to Differential Evolution for Numerical Optimization

Rui Zhong, Yang Cao, Enzhi Zhang  
Graduate School of Information Science and Technology  
Hokkaido University  
Sapporo, Japan  
{rui.zhong.u5, yang.cao.y4, enzhi.zhang.n6}@elms.hokudai.ac.jp

Masaharu Munetomo  
Information Initiative Center  
Hokkaido University  
Sapporo, Japan  
munetomo@iic.hokudai.ac.jp

**Abstract**—This paper introduces a novel competitive mechanism into differential evolution (DE), presenting an effective DE variant named competitive DE (CDE). CDE features a simple yet efficient mutation strategy: DE/winner-to-best/1. Essentially, the proposed DE/winner-to-best/1 strategy can be recognized as an intelligent integration of the existing mutation strategies of DE/rand-to-best/1 and DE/cur-to-best/1. The incorporation of DE/winner-to-best/1 and the competitive mechanism provide new avenues for advancing DE techniques. Moreover, in CDE, the scaling factor  $F$  and mutation rate  $Cr$  are determined by a random number generator following a normal distribution, as suggested by previous research. To investigate the performance of the proposed CDE, comprehensive numerical experiments are conducted on CEC2017 and engineering simulation optimization tasks, with CMA-ES, JADE, and other state-of-the-art optimizers and DE variants employed as competitor algorithms. The experimental results and statistical analyses highlight the promising potential of CDE as an alternative optimizer for addressing diverse optimization challenges.

**Index Terms**—Evolutionary Computation (EC), Competitive Mechanism, Differential Evolution (DE), Novel Mutation Strategy, Numerical Optimization

## I. INTRODUCTION

Differential Evolution (DE) [1] is a potent optimization algorithm categorized within the evolutionary algorithm (EA) family. Unlike conventional mathematical optimization methods that hinge on gradients, DE is a stochastic optimization approach inspired by the principles of natural selection and evolution [2], [3]. By iteratively applying crossover, mutation, and selection operations, DE refines the population of candidate solutions for a given problem, progressively steering it towards more optimal solutions [4].

Due to its simplicity, robustness, and efficiency in addressing complex optimization problems across various domains, DE is particularly adept at handling scenarios where the objective function is non-linear, non-convex, noisy, or lacks derivative information [5]. These exceptional characteristics render DE a versatile tool for addressing real-world optimization challenges encountered in engineering [6]–[8], finance [9], [10], machine learning [11], [12], and numerous other fields [13]–[16]. Consequently, DE has garnered widespread attention from researchers and scholars. Concurrently, numerous variants of DE have been introduced to tackle diverse optimization tasks. While this paper does not delve into the

comprehensive history and evolution of DE, readers keen on exploring this topic further can refer to [17]–[19].

This paper introduces a novel competitive mechanism into DE and presents a mutation operator termed DE/winner-to-best/1. By integrating this innovative mutation strategy with the basic DE optimizer, we propose a simple yet efficient variant of DE, termed Competitive DE (CDE). To thoroughly investigate the performance of our proposed CDE, we conduct a comprehensive series of fair comparison experiments on the IEEE CEC2017 benchmark functions. Furthermore, we extend CDE to address real-world engineering simulation optimization problems. Through this straightforward modification, we achieve satisfactory performance across various optimization tasks, even when competing with state-of-the-art DE variants. The experimental results and statistical analyses highlight the efficacy and versatility of CDE in tackling diverse optimization challenges.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: Section II introduces the framework of basic DE and engineering simulation problems. Section III introduces our proposed CDE in detail. Section IV presents numerical experiments and statistical analyses, and the performance analyses are discussed in Section V. Finally, Section VI concludes this paper.

## II. BASIC DE

We begin the introduction of the basic DE by the definition of optimization problems. Without loss of generality, the minimization problem is mathematically defined by Eq. (1).

$$f(\mathbf{x}^*) = \min f(\mathbf{x}), s.t. \mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{R}^D \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathbf{x} = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_D\}$  is a solution vector with  $D$  dimensions. Optimization algorithms aim to find optimum  $\mathbf{x}^*$  with a limited computational budget.

Subsequently, we outline the four primary components of DE: initialization, mutation, crossover, and selection. It's important to note that all explanations are presented within the context of the minimization.

**Initialization:** The first step of DE implementation is population initialization, which is described in Eq. (2).

$$X = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{x}_1 \\ \mathbf{x}_2 \\ \mathbf{x}_3 \\ \vdots \\ \mathbf{x}_N \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} x_{11} & x_{12} & \cdots & x_{1D} \\ x_{21} & x_{22} & \cdots & x_{2D} \\ x_{31} & x_{32} & \cdots & x_{3D} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ x_{N1} & x_{N2} & \cdots & x_{ND} \end{bmatrix} \quad (2)$$

$$x_{ij} = r \cdot (\mathbf{ub}_j - \mathbf{lb}_j) + \mathbf{lb}_j$$

where  $\mathbf{x}_i$  denotes the  $i^{th}$  individual and  $x_{ij}$  represents the value in the  $j^{th}$  dimension of the  $\mathbf{x}_i$ .  $\mathbf{lb}_j$  and  $\mathbf{ub}_j$  are the lower and the upper bound of the  $j^{th}$  dimension, respectively, and  $r$  is a random number in  $(0, 1)$ .

**Mutation:** When DE enters the main loop, the mutation operation is first activated to construct the mutant vector, and the representative mutation schemes are listed in Eq. (3).

$$\begin{aligned} \text{DE/rand/1} : \mathbf{v}_i^t &= \mathbf{x}_{r_1}^t + F \cdot (\mathbf{x}_{r_2}^t - \mathbf{x}_{r_3}^t) \\ \text{DE/cur/1} : \mathbf{v}_i^t &= \mathbf{x}_i^t + F \cdot (\mathbf{x}_{r_1}^t - \mathbf{x}_{r_2}^t) \\ \text{DE/best/1} : \mathbf{v}_i^t &= \mathbf{x}_{best}^t + F \cdot (\mathbf{x}_{r_1}^t - \mathbf{x}_{r_2}^t) \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where  $\mathbf{x}_{r_1}^t$ ,  $\mathbf{x}_{r_2}^t$ , and  $\mathbf{x}_{r_3}^t$  are randomly selected individuals from the population and mutually distinct in the  $t^{th}$  iteration,  $\mathbf{x}_{best}^t$  denotes the best solution found so far, and  $F$  is the scaling factor to control the amplification of differential vector.

**Crossover:** Although many novel crossover strategies such as exponential crossover [20] and blending crossover [21] have been proposed, the most commonly utilized binomial crossover is expressed in Eq. (4).

$$\mathbf{v}_{i,j}^t = \begin{cases} \mathbf{u}_{i,j}^t, & \text{if } r \leq Cr \text{ or } j = j_{rand} \\ \mathbf{x}_{i,j}^t, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

$Cr$  represents the crossover rate to control the probability of inherited genes between the mutant vector  $\mathbf{u}_{i,j}^t$  and the parent individual  $\mathbf{x}_{i,j}^t$ .  $j_{rand}$  is a random integer in  $\{1, 2, \dots, D\}$ .

**Selection:** The selection mechanism in basic DE ensures the survival of elite individuals to the next iteration, as formulated in Eq. (5).

$$\mathbf{x}_{i,j}^{t+1} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{u}_{i,j}^t, & \text{if } f(\mathbf{u}_{i,j}^t) \leq f(\mathbf{x}_{i,j}^t) \\ \mathbf{x}_{i,j}^t, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

The one-to-one greedy selection mechanism in DE can survive the elites while maintaining population diversity. In summary, the pseudocode of the basic DE is presented in Algorithm 1.

### III. COMPETITIVE DIFFERENTIAL EVOLUTION (CDE)

This section introduced the proposed CDE in detail. Based on the simple yet effective architecture of DE, the main flowchart of CDE is presented in Fig. 1. The novel component in CDE is highlighted in red.

#### Algorithm 1 Basic DE

---

**Require:** Population size: $N$ , Dimension: $D$ , Max. iteration: $T$   
**Ensure:** Optimum:  $\mathbf{x}_{best}^t$

- 1:  $X \leftarrow \mathbf{initial}(N, D)$  # Population initialization
- 2:  $t = 0$
- 3:  $\mathbf{x}_{best}^t \leftarrow \mathbf{best}(X)$
- 4: **while**  $t < T$  **do**
- 5:     **for**  $i = 0$  **to**  $N$  **do**
- 6:         Construct the mutant vector using Eq. (3)
- 7:         Crossover using Eq. (4)
- 8:     **end for**
- 9:     Selection using Eq. (5)
- 10:      $\mathbf{x}_{best}^t \leftarrow \mathbf{best}(X)$
- 11:      $t \leftarrow t + 1$
- 12: **end while**
- 13: **return**  $\mathbf{x}_{best}^t$

---




Fig. 1: The flowchart of CDE.

We introduce the competitive mechanism to CDE and propose a novel DE/winner-to-best/1 mutation operation, as formulated in Eq. (6).

$$\mathbf{v}_i^g = \begin{cases} \mathbf{x}_{r_1}^g + F_1 \cdot (\mathbf{x}_{best}^g - \mathbf{x}_{r_1}^g) + F_2 \cdot (\mathbf{x}_{r_2}^g - \mathbf{x}_{r_3}^g), & (a) \\ \mathbf{x}_i^g + F_1 \cdot (\mathbf{x}_{best}^g - \mathbf{x}_i^g) + F_2 \cdot (\mathbf{x}_{r_2}^g - \mathbf{x}_{r_3}^g), & (b) \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

where  $F_1$  and  $F_2$  are two random values following a normal distribution  $N(0.5, 0.3)$  as recommended in [22]. Simply, the proposed DE/winner-to-best/1 strategy randomly selects a competitor individual  $\mathbf{x}_{r_1}^g$  first, and if it has a better fitness value,  $\mathbf{x}_{r_1}^g$  will replace the current individual  $\mathbf{x}_i^g$  and act as the base vector in the mutation operator to construct the mutant vector  $\mathbf{v}_i^g$  using the DE/rand-to-best/1 scheme, as expressed in Eq. (6) (a); otherwise, the current individual  $\mathbf{x}_i^g$  will survive and the DE/cur-to-best/1 mutation scheme in Eq. (6) (b) is

activated to construct the mutated vector  $v_i^g$ .

The structure of the proposed DE/winner-to-best/1 strategy resembles a fusion of the DE/cur-to-best/1 and DE/rand-to-best/1 strategies. However, incorporating a competitive mechanism enables the automatic selection of the most suitable mutation strategy, ensuring the utilization of superior knowledge to construct the mutated vector. Furthermore, CDE can benefit from the proposed DE/winner-to-best/1 mutation strategy from (i). Strengthened convergence: By leveraging a superior base vector, the optimization process experiences rapid convergence and contributes to accelerating the approach to optimal solutions. (ii). The prevention of premature optimization: The inclusion of the random differential vector  $F_2 \cdot (x_{r2}^g - x_{r3}^g)$  serves to mitigate premature optimization and promote the exploration of diverse search spaces. (iii). Versatile scaling factor: The utilization of a simple yet effective random generator-based scaling factor  $F_i$  facilitates the generation of differential vectors with varying scales, thereby enhancing the adaptability and robustness of the mutation strategy.

Furthermore, the conventional constant crossover rate in basic DE is replaced by a random value sampled from a normal distribution  $N(0.5, 0.3)$ , as recommended in [23]. This simple modification in CDE yields two significant benefits. First, it enhances the balance between exploration and exploitation. By introducing a randomly chosen crossover rate, CDE can explore a broader search space by occasionally performing crossover operations, potentially leading to the discovery of new promising solutions. Simultaneously, it retains the capability to exploit current best solutions by occasionally abstaining from crossover operations. Second, this modification strengthens the robustness of CDE. Introducing randomness into the crossover rate helps prevent the algorithm from becoming trapped in specific regions of the search space, thereby improving its robustness when tackling complex optimization problems.

#### IV. NUMERICAL EXPERIMENTS

This section introduces the details of the designed numerical experiments to evaluate the performance of CDE. Section IV-A details the experimental setting, and Section IV-B presents the experimental results and statistical analyses for further discussion.

##### A. Experiment settings

1) *Benchmark functions*: We conduct comprehensive numerical experiments on CEC2017 benchmark functions and six engineering simulation optimization tasks [24]. The details of engineering problems are presented in the following contexts. These benchmarks are accessed via the OpFuNu library [25] and the ENOPPY library [26] using Python 3.11.

Six engineering simulation models adopted in our numerical experiments include cantilever beam design (CBD), corrugated bulkhead design (CBHD), gear train design (GTD), three-bar truss design (TBTD), tubular column design (TCD), and welded beam design (WBD). In the following mathematical

models,  $f(x)$  denotes the objective function, and  $g_i(x)$  represents the  $i^{th}$  constraint function.

**Cantilever beam design problem (CBD)**: CBD aims to minimize the overall mass of the cantilever beam while ensuring it meets the specified bearing capacity requirements. Eq. (7) describes the mathematical model and Fig. 2(a) presents a demonstration.

$$\begin{aligned} \min f(X) &= 0.0624(x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + x_4 + x_5) \\ \text{s.t. } g(X) &= \frac{61}{x_1^3} + \frac{37}{x_2^3} + \frac{19}{x_3^3} + \frac{7}{x_4^3} + \frac{1}{x_5^3} - 1 \leq 0 \\ \text{where } &0.01 \leq x_i \leq 100, i \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\} \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

**Corrugated bulkhead design (CBHD)**: CBHD aims to design a bulkhead that can efficiently resist certain forces or loads, in which the design variables are the width  $x_1$ , depth  $x_2$ , length  $x_3$ , and plate thickness  $x_4$ . The mathematical model of the CBHD is presented in Eq. (8).

$$\begin{aligned} \min f(X) &= \frac{5.885x_4(x_1 + x_3)}{x_1 + \sqrt{|x_3^2 - x_2^2|}} \\ \text{s.t. } g_1(X) &= -x_4x_2(0.4x_1 + \frac{x_3}{6}) + \\ &8.94(x_1 + \sqrt{|x_3^2 - x_2^2|}) \leq 0 \\ g_2(X) &= -x_4x_2^2(0.2x_1 + \frac{x_3}{12}) + \\ &2.2(8.94(x_1 + \sqrt{|x_3^2 - x_2^2|}))^{4/3} \leq 0 \\ g_3(X) &= -x_4 + 0.0156x_1 + 0.15 \leq 0 \\ g_4(X) &= -x_4 + 0.0156x_3 + 0.15 \leq 0 \\ g_5(X) &= -x_4 + 1.05 \leq 0 \\ g_6(X) &= -x_3 + x_2 \leq 0 \\ \text{where } &0 \leq x_1, x_2, x_3 \leq 100 \\ &0 \leq x_4 \leq 5 \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

**Gear train design problem (GTD)**: GTD aims to minimize the gear ratio, defined as the ratio of the output shaft's angular velocity to the input shaft's angular velocity. The design variables include the number of teeth of gears  $n_A = x_1$ ,  $n_B = x_2$ ,  $n_C = x_3$ , and  $n_D = x_4$ , as expressed in Eq. (9) and demonstrated in Fig. 2(b).

$$\begin{aligned} \min f(X) &= \left( \frac{1}{6.931} - \frac{x_3x_2}{x_1x_4} \right)^2 \\ \text{where } &x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 \in \{12, 13, 14, \dots, 60\} \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

**Three-bar truss design problem (TBTD)**: The objective of TBTD is to find the optimal configuration of a truss made up of three bars subject to the optimal cross-sectional areas  $A_1 = x_1$  and  $A_2 = x_2$ . The mathematical model and demonstration are

presented in Eq. (10) and Fig. 2(c).

$$\begin{aligned}
\min f(X) &= (2\sqrt{2}x_1 + x_2) \cdot l \\
\text{s.t. } g_1(X) &= \frac{\sqrt{2}x_1 + x_2}{\sqrt{2}x_1^2 + 2x_1x_2} P - \sigma \leq 0 \\
g_2(X) &= \frac{x_2}{\sqrt{2}x_1^2 + 2x_1x_2} P - \sigma \leq 0 \\
g_3(X) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}x_2 + x_1} P - \sigma \leq 0 \\
l &= 100\text{cm}, P = 2kN/\text{cm}^3, \sigma = 2kN/\text{cm}^3 \\
\text{where } 0 &\leq x_1, x_2 \leq 1
\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

**Tubular column design problem (TCD):** TCD through optimizing two decision variables: the mean diameter of the column  $d = x_1$  and the thickness of tube  $t = x_2$  to determine the optimum of a tubular column. Eq. (11) formulates the model and Fig. 2(d) presents a demonstration.

$$\begin{aligned}
\min f(X) &= 9.8x_1x_2 + 2x_1 \\
\text{s.t. } g_1(X) &= \frac{P}{\pi x_1x_2\sigma_y} - 1 \leq 0 \\
g_2(X) &= \frac{8PL^2}{\pi^3 E x_1x_2(x_1^2 + x_2^2)} - 1 \leq 0 \\
\text{where } 2 &\leq x_1 \leq 14 \\
0.2 &\leq x_2 \leq 8
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

**Welded beam design (WBD):** The objective of WBD is to design a welded beam subjected to the weld thickness  $h = x_1$ , height  $l = x_2$ , length  $t = x_3$ , and bar thickness  $b = x_4$ , as formulated in Eq. (12) and visualized in Fig. 2(e).

$$\begin{aligned}
\min f(X) &= 1.10471x_1^2 + 0.04811x_3x_4(14 + x_2) \\
\text{s.t. } g_1(X) &= \tau(X) - \tau_{max} \leq 0 \\
g_2(X) &= \sigma(X) - \sigma_{max} \leq 0 \\
g_3(X) &= \theta(X) - \theta_{max} \leq 0 \\
g_4(X) &= x_1 - x_4 \leq 0 \\
g_5(X) &= P - P_c(X) \leq 0 \\
g_6(X) &= 0.125 - x_1 \leq 0 \\
g_6(X) &= 1.10471x_1^2 + 0.04811x_3x_4(14 + x_2) - 5 \leq 0 \\
\text{where } 0.1 &\leq x_1, x_4 \leq 2 \\
0.1 &\leq x_2, x_3 \leq 10
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

2) *Competitor algorithms:* We compare CDE with state-of-the-art optimizers and DE variants. The specific algorithms and corresponding parameter settings are listed in Table I.

Except for L-SHADE and L-SHADE-PWI, the population size for the rest of the algorithms is fixed at 100. The maximum fitness evaluation (FE) for CEC2017 benchmark functions and engineering simulation optimization tasks are set to  $500 \times D$  and 10,000, respectively. Each single algorithm is implemented with 30 trial runs to alleviate the effect of randomness. Additionally, the Holm multiple comparison test [31] is employed to determine the significance between every pair of compared algorithms. The symbols +,  $\approx$ , and -

TABLE I: The compared optimizers and parameter settings

Method	Parameters	Value
CDE	$\mu_F$ and $\sigma_F$	0.5 and 0.3
	$\mu_{Cr}$ and $\sigma_{Cr}$	0.5 and 0.3
DE [1]	scale factor $F$	0.5
	crossover rate $Cr$	0.8
	mutation strategy	DE/rand/1/bin
CMA-ES [27]	$\sigma$	1.3
SaDE [22]	$\mu_F$ and $\sigma_F$	0.5 and 0.3
	$\mu_{Cr}$ and $\sigma_{Cr}$	0.5 and 0.1
JADE [28]	$\mu_F$ and $\mu_{Cr}$	0.5 and 0.5
L-SHADE [29]	population size $N$	$18 \times D$
	$\mu_F$ and $\mu_{Cr}$	0.5 and 0.5
L-SHADE-PWI [30]	population size $N$	$18 \times D$
	$N_{min}$	4
	$\mu_F$ and $\mu_{Cr}$	0.5 and 0.5
GTDE [23]	$\mu_F$ and $\sigma_F$	0.7 and 0.5
	$\mu_{Cr}$ and $\sigma_{Cr}$	0.5 and 0.3

denote that the proposed CDE is significantly better, has no significant difference, and is significantly worse than the compared algorithm.

## B. Experimental results and statistical analyses

We summarize the experimental results and statistical analyses on the CEC2017 benchmark functions and engineering simulation optimization tasks in Tables II and III, respectively. The convergence curves on engineering tasks are demonstrated in Fig. 3.

## V. DISCUSSION

### A. Performance analysis on CEC2017

Since the CEC2017 benchmark suite contains test functions with various characteristics such as unimodal, multimodal, hybrid, and composite, thus the optimization in these test functions can fully reflect the performance of optimizers and support us in investigating the features of involved algorithms thoroughly.

Initially,  $f_1$  is unimodal functions, and the optimization in these functions allows the performance evaluation in the aspect of the exploitative capacity. The superiority of CDE is apparent in CEC2017  $f_1$  compared with state-of-the-art optimizers. Therefore, we conclude that CDE has a remarkable exploitation ability and robust performance across various problem domains.

Subsequently,  $f_3$  to  $f_9$  are multimodal functions. These functions contain more than one local optima and evaluate the performance of optimizers in escaping from local optima and global convergence. Through the experimental results and statistical analyses summarized in Table II, the competitiveness of our proposed CDE is observable. As the state-of-the-art DE variant, GTDE outperforms CDE in some instances such as  $f_3$ ,  $f_5$ , and  $f_8$ . However, the excellent performance of CDE cannot




Fig. 2: The demonstration of engineering simulation tasks.




Fig. 3: Convergence curves of eight algorithms on six engineering simulation optimization tasks.

TABLE II: Experimental results and statistical analyses on 30-D CEC2017.  $f_1$ : Unimodal function;  $f_3 - f_9$ : Simple multimodal functions;  $f_{10} - f_{19}$ : Hybrid functions;  $f_{20} - f_{30}$ : Composite functions.

Func.		DE	CMA-ES	SaDE	JADE	L-SHADE	L-SHADE-PWI	GTDE	CDE
$f_1$	mean	5.103e+10 +	3.727e+10 +	6.658e+06 +	2.557e+05 +	2.247e+05 +	2.005e+05 +	4.846e+05 +	<b>3.935e+03</b>
	std	4.548e+09	4.131e+09	3.586e+06	1.062e+05	8.170e+04	9.129e+04	7.482e+05	2.858e+03
$f_3$	mean	2.570e+05 +	8.737e+04 +	1.256e+05 +	1.097e+05 +	7.925e+04 ≈	9.514e+04 +	<b>5.365e+04</b> -	6.566e+04
	std	3.839e+04	1.087e+04	1.324e+04	1.553e+04	2.571e+04	2.334e+04	1.578e+04	1.017e+04
$f_4$	mean	5.598e+03 +	1.040e+04 +	5.155e+02 +	4.971e+02 ≈	5.119e+02 +	5.069e+02 ≈	5.229e+02 +	<b>4.947e+02</b>
	std	1.001e+03	1.669e+03	1.121e+01	9.735e+00	1.317e+01	1.516e+01	5.260e+01	2.754e+01
$f_5$	mean	9.157e+02 +	8.647e+02 +	7.067e+02 +	6.830e+02 ≈	6.812e+02 ≈	6.961e+02 +	<b>6.188e+02</b> -	6.793e+02
	std	1.467e+01	2.180e+01	8.716e+00	1.230e+01	8.704e+00	1.070e+01	2.373e+01	2.163e+01
$f_6$	mean	6.854e+02 +	6.841e+02 +	6.039e+02 +	6.030e+02 +	6.017e+02 +	6.016e+02 +	6.094e+02 +	<b>6.000e+02</b>
	std	4.509e+00	6.360e+00	6.699e-01	6.214e-01	2.573e-01	1.715e-01	6.514e+00	6.747e-02
$f_7$	mean	2.885e+03 +	1.316e+03 +	9.519e+02 +	9.257e+02 +	9.164e+02 ≈	9.245e+02 ≈	<b>9.008e+02</b> ≈	9.177e+02
	std	1.479e+02	5.799e+01	1.039e+01	1.219e+01	1.091e+01	1.012e+01	4.178e+01	1.398e+01
$f_8$	mean	1.225e+03 +	1.108e+03 +	1.010e+03 +	9.816e+02 ≈	9.784e+02 -	9.940e+02 ≈	<b>9.204e+02</b> -	9.891e+02
	std	2.398e+01	2.175e+01	1.576e+01	1.171e+01	9.673e+00	1.037e+01	3.005e+01	1.463e+01
$f_9$	mean	2.034e+04 +	9.916e+03 +	1.080e+03 +	9.334e+02 +	9.227e+02 +	9.204e+02 +	2.833e+03 +	<b>9.121e+02</b>
	std	3.367e+03	1.739e+03	3.154e+01	1.779e+01	6.416e+00	7.894e+00	1.252e+03	2.395e+01
$f_{10}$	mean	8.535e+03 +	8.965e+03 +	8.526e+03 +	7.857e+03 -	7.788e+03 -	8.264e+03 ≈	<b>6.230e+03</b> -	8.288e+03
	std	1.251e+02	3.064e+02	2.501e+02	5.205e+02	4.083e+02	4.103e+02	1.218e+03	3.137e+02
$f_{11}$	mean	5.459e+03 +	7.084e+03 +	1.580e+03 +	1.418e+03 +	1.330e+03 +	1.331e+03 +	1.336e+03 +	<b>1.211e+03</b>
	std	9.216e+02	1.281e+03	7.087e+01	1.369e+02	2.471e+01	1.982e+01	7.101e+01	3.607e+01
$f_{12}$	mean	2.890e+09 +	9.017e+09 +	8.847e+06 +	2.351e+06 +	2.646e+06 +	2.455e+06 +	1.394e+06 +	<b>3.315e+05</b>
	std	7.294e+08	1.469e+09	3.007e+06	1.061e+06	9.611e+05	1.091e+06	1.272e+06	2.678e+05
$f_{13}$	mean	3.517e+08 +	8.504e+09 +	1.856e+06 +	7.919e+05 +	8.107e+05 +	6.539e+05 +	1.891e+05 +	<b>1.791e+04</b>
	std	1.550e+08	2.622e+09	1.525e+06	4.738e+05	3.963e+05	3.435e+05	8.023e+05	1.141e+04
$f_{14}$	mean	1.545e+05 +	3.709e+06 +	4.919e+04 +	5.594e+04 +	9.363e+03 +	1.253e+04 +	<b>3.568e+03</b> -	5.788e+03
	std	8.448e+04	3.375e+06	2.024e+04	1.000e+05	3.375e+03	6.404e+03	3.773e+03	4.171e+03
$f_{15}$	mean	1.099e+07 +	1.057e+08 +	2.662e+05 +	2.278e+05 +	7.902e+04 +	8.338e+04 +	1.527e+04 +	<b>7.296e+03</b>
	std	5.523e+06	7.358e+07	2.447e+05	1.815e+05	3.691e+04	2.115e+04	1.292e+04	4.826e+03
$f_{16}$	mean	4.100e+03 +	6.112e+03 +	3.283e+03 ≈	3.146e+03 ≈	3.137e+03 ≈	3.202e+03 ≈	<b>2.717e+03</b> -	3.121e+03
	std	2.520e+02	7.003e+02	2.261e+02	1.656e+02	2.096e+02	1.460e+02	2.888e+02	1.890e+02
$f_{17}$	mean	2.902e+03 +	3.591e+03 +	2.302e+03 +	2.278e+03 +	2.201e+03 +	2.202e+03 +	2.241e+03 +	<b>2.071e+03</b>
	std	1.397e+02	4.381e+02	1.375e+02	1.029e+02	9.999e+01	8.212e+01	1.897e+02	1.211e+02
$f_{18}$	mean	8.635e+06 +	2.787e+07 +	2.636e+06 +	3.552e+05 -	8.008e+05 ≈	9.985e+05 +	<b>2.694e+05</b> -	6.445e+05
	std	2.858e+06	1.867e+07	1.543e+06	7.014e+05	3.289e+05	3.210e+05	3.029e+05	2.997e+05
$f_{19}$	mean	5.534e+07 +	1.479e+08 +	3.885e+05 +	2.783e+05 +	1.231e+05 +	1.098e+05 +	2.082e+04 ≈	<b>1.071e+04</b>
	std	1.531e+07	6.526e+07	1.993e+05	3.473e+05	5.324e+04	4.258e+04	2.342e+04	8.252e+03
$f_{20}$	mean	2.895e+03 +	2.980e+03 +	2.753e+03 +	2.645e+03 +	2.685e+03 +	2.679e+03 +	<b>2.422e+03</b> -	2.574e+03
	std	1.522e+02	1.782e+02	1.530e+02	1.059e+02	9.051e+01	1.390e+02	1.717e+02	1.038e+02
$f_{21}$	mean	2.703e+03 +	2.702e+03 +	2.497e+03 +	2.482e+03 +	2.477e+03 ≈	2.480e+03 ≈	<b>2.421e+03</b> -	2.473e+03
	std	1.745e+01	3.178e+01	1.541e+01	1.360e+01	7.071e+00	2.119e+01	2.781e+01	1.477e+01
$f_{22}$	mean	1.007e+04 +	9.432e+03 +	4.272e+03 +	3.152e+03 +	2.380e+03 +	2.332e+03 +	6.922e+03 +	<b>2.302e+03</b>
	std	2.811e+02	6.399e+02	2.839e+03	2.109e+03	1.794e+02	4.572e+01	2.150e+03	4.604e+00
$f_{23}$	mean	3.048e+03 +	3.864e+03 +	2.850e+03 +	2.845e+03 +	2.835e+03 +	2.836e+03 +	<b>2.791e+03</b> ≈	2.800e+03
	std	2.042e+01	1.486e+02	1.184e+01	1.235e+01	1.104e+01	1.078e+01	2.802e+01	3.928e+01
$f_{24}$	mean	3.168e+03 +	4.123e+03 +	3.021e+03 +	3.014e+03 +	3.003e+03 +	3.002e+03 +	<b>2.965e+03</b> -	2.981e+03
	std	1.452e+01	1.231e+02	1.162e+01	1.262e+01	9.793e+00	1.587e+01	3.329e+01	3.151e+01
$f_{25}$	mean	7.916e+03 +	4.393e+03 +	2.896e+03 ≈	<b>2.888e+03</b> ≈	2.889e+03 ≈	2.890e+03 ≈	2.908e+03 +	2.896e+03
	std	7.414e+02	2.358e+02	5.233e+00	1.622e+00	1.329e+00	3.488e+00	2.653e+01	1.487e+01
$f_{26}$	mean	8.009e+03 +	1.022e+04 +	5.733e+03 +	5.441e+03 +	5.381e+03 +	5.432e+03 +	5.082e+03 +	<b>4.319e+03</b>
	std	1.622e+02	4.395e+02	1.563e+02	1.552e+02	1.210e+02	1.653e+02	6.734e+02	9.410e+02
$f_{27}$	mean	3.319e+03 +	5.137e+03 +	3.237e+03 ≈	<b>3.227e+03</b> -	3.229e+03 ≈	3.231e+03 ≈	3.245e+03 ≈	<b>3.234e+03</b>
	std	1.968e+01	3.727e+02	6.785e+00	4.321e+00	3.571e+00	7.636e+00	2.469e+01	1.278e+01
$f_{28}$	mean	5.625e+03 +	6.320e+03 +	3.273e+03 +	3.243e+03 ≈	3.253e+03 ≈	3.244e+03 ≈	3.374e+03 +	<b>3.235e+03</b>
	std	7.238e+02	4.928e+02	1.409e+01	2.169e+01	1.408e+01	1.688e+01	2.394e+02	2.565e+01
$f_{29}$	mean	4.892e+03 +	7.512e+03 +	4.229e+03 +	4.071e+03 +	4.070e+03 +	4.122e+03 +	4.009e+03 +	<b>3.846e+03</b>
	std	2.164e+02	6.220e+02	2.283e+02	1.605e+02	1.524e+02	1.161e+02	2.031e+02	1.855e+02
$f_{30}$	mean	3.759e+07 +	1.003e+09 +	1.192e+06 +	3.945e+05 +	4.913e+05 +	5.271e+05 +	1.283e+05 ≈	<b>5.083e+04</b>
	std	1.225e+07	4.249e+08	7.053e+05	2.741e+05	1.892e+05	1.731e+05	2.266e+05	3.913e+04
+/-/:-		29/0/0	29/0/0	26/3/0	20/6/3	18/9/2	20/9/0	14/5/10	-
Avg. rank:		7.3	7.5	5.7	3.8	3.2	3.7	2.9	<b>1.9</b>

TABLE III: Experimental results and statistical analyses on engineering optimization problems.

Func.		DE	CMA-ES	SaDE	JADE	L-SHADE	L-SHADE-PWI	GTDE	CDE
CBD	mean	2.015e+00 +	6.910e+00 +	1.341e+00 +	1.341e+00 +	1.340e+00 +	1.340e+00 +	1.344e+00 +	<b>1.340e+00</b>
	std	2.139e-01	1.248e+00	3.301e-04	3.767e-04	1.935e-04	1.705e-04	2.207e-03	3.705e-05
CBHD	mean	6.949e+00 +	1.064e+01 +	6.845e+00 +	6.847e+00 +	6.844e+00 +	6.844e+00 +	6.850e+00 +	<b>6.843e+00</b>
	std	3.671e-02	1.251e+00	1.237e-03	1.529e-03	3.915e-04	5.784e-04	3.810e-03	3.375e-04
GTD	mean	1.838e-10 +	3.924e-04 +	1.087e-11 +	1.805e-11 +	1.373e-11 +	1.200e-11 +	<b>5.568e-15</b> -	2.560e-12
	std	2.820e-10	7.737e-04	1.283e-11	3.519e-11	2.412e-11	2.425e-11	1.670e-14	5.844e-12
TBDT	mean	2.639e+02 +	2.646e+02 +	2.639e+02 +	<b>2.639e+02</b>				
	std	7.558e-06	6.359e-01	7.622e-07	1.574e-06	3.310e-07	4.045e-07	1.063e-04	5.984e-08
TCD	mean	3.015e+01 +	3.281e+01 +	3.015e+01 +	<b>3.015e+01</b>				
	std	8.503e-05	1.439e+00	2.198e-06	1.019e-05	2.300e-06	2.962e-06	1.013e-04	5.172e-07
WBP	mean	1.761e+00 +	1.932e+05 +	1.696e+00 +	1.692e+00 +	1.690e+00 +	1.689e+00 +	1.712e+00 +	<b>1.687e+00</b>
	std	2.811e-02	1.040e+06	9.128e-03	3.993e-03	2.950e-03	2.224e-03	4.087e-02	5.447e-03
	+/ $\approx$ /-:	6/0/0	6/0/0	6/0/0	6/0/0	6/0/0	6/0/0	5/0/1	-
	Avg. rank:	6.7	8.0	4.0	5.0	2.8	2.8	5.5	1.2

be neglected. Overall, CDE best performs in  $f_4$ ,  $f_6$ , and  $f_9$ , and the capacities in escaping from local optima and global convergence are experimentally verified through the results.

Finally, the rest of the functions are hybrid and composite. These functions have complex fitness landscapes and multiple optima, which challenges the abilities of optimizers in balancing exploitation and exploration, avoiding premature convergence, and achieving global optimization. Upon review of the result summary, it becomes evident that CDE consistently demonstrates superior performance across many test functions within this category, thereby highlighting its efficacy in complex optimization environments.

### B. Performance analysis on engineering tasks

The engineering simulation optimization tasks serve as real-world challenges to evaluate the performance of optimizers in complex optimization scenarios. This study introduces CDE as a novel approach to deal with engineering optimization tasks. Remarkably, our proposed CDE outperforms all other methods across all instances except for GTD when compared with GTDE, showcasing its superior performance in this domain.

In summary, our proposed CDE is a satisfactory variant of DE in both benchmark and engineering optimization. We owe this success to the integration of the competitive mechanism and the intelligent hyper-parameter adaptation inherited from the previous research [22], [23]. These elements collectively empower CDE with outstanding efficiency and effectiveness.

## VI. CONCLUSION

This paper proposes a novel competitive DE (CDE) to solve numerical optimization problems. We introduce a competitive mechanism to DE and propose a novel DE/winner-to-best/1 mutation strategy. Moreover, CDE inherits the hyper-parameter adaptation schemes recommended in [22], [23]. To assess the performance of CDE, we conduct comprehensive numerical experiments on CEC2017 benchmark functions and engineering simulation optimization problems. The experimental results and statistical analyses confirm the competitiveness of our

proposed CDE compared to state-of-the-art EAs and advanced variants of DE, including CMA-ES, JADE, L-SHADE, L-SHADE-PWI, and GTDE.

In conclusion, our proposed CDE exhibits significant potential as a powerful optimizer in real-world scenarios. In future research, we plan to further develop CDE and leverage its capabilities to address complex tasks across various application domains.

## VII. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 21A402 and JST SPRING Grant Number JPMJSP2119.

## REFERENCES

- [1] R. Storn and K. Price, "Differential evolution - a simple and efficient heuristic for global optimization over continuous spaces," *Journal of Global Optimization*, vol. 11, pp. 341–359, 01 1997.
- [2] Y. Li, S. Wang, H. Yang, H. Chen, and B. Yang, "Enhancing differential evolution algorithm using leader-adjoint populations," *Information Sciences*, vol. 622, pp. 235–268, 2023.
- [3] C. Ren, Z. Song, and Z. Meng, "Differential evolution with fitness-difference based parameter control and hypervolume diversity indicator for numerical optimization," *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 133, p. 108081, 2024.
- [4] Q. Yang, J.-Q. Yan, X.-D. Gao, D.-D. Xu, Z.-Y. Lu, and J. Zhang, "Random neighbor elite guided differential evolution for global numerical optimization," *Information Sciences*, vol. 607, pp. 1408–1438, 2022.
- [5] R. Zhong, E. Zhang, and M. Munetomo, "Cooperative coevolutionary surrogate ensemble-assisted differential evolution with efficient dual differential grouping for large-scale expensive optimization problems," *Complex & Intelligent System*, pp. 1–21, 2023.
- [6] S.-H. Wu, Z.-H. Zhan, K. C. Tan, and J. Zhang, "Transferable adaptive differential evolution for many-task optimization," *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, vol. 53, no. 11, pp. 7295–7308, 2023.
- [7] X. Yang, R. Wang, D. Zhao, F. Yu, A. A. Heidari, Z. Xu, H. Chen, A. D. Algarni, H. Elmannai, and S. Xu, "Multi-level threshold segmentation framework for breast cancer images using enhanced differential evolution," *Biomedical Signal Processing and Control*, vol. 80, p. 104373, 2023.
- [8] Y. Zhang, S. Li, Y. Wang, Y. Yan, J. Zhao, and Z. Gao, "Self-adaptive enhanced learning differential evolution with surprisingly efficient decomposition approach for parameter identification of photovoltaic models," *Energy Conversion and Management*, vol. 308, p. 118387, 2024.

- [9] Z. Xue, S. Yao, H. Ma, C. Zhang, K. Zhang, and Z. Chen, "Thermoeconomic optimization of an enhanced geothermal system (egs) based on machine learning and differential evolution algorithms," *Fuel*, vol. 340, p. 127569, 2023.
- [10] X. Zhang, C. Zhong, and L. Abualigah, "Foreign exchange forecasting and portfolio optimization strategy based on hybrid-molecular differential evolution algorithms," *Soft Computing*, vol. 27, pp. 1–19, 11 2022.
- [11] R. Zhong, E. Zhang, and M. Munetomo, "Cooperative coevolutionary differential evolution with linkage measurement minimization for large-scale optimization problems in noisy environments," *Complex & Intelligent System*, vol. 9, p. 4439–4456, 2023.
- [12] S. Agrawal, A. Tiwari, B. Yaduvanshi, and P. Rajak, "Differential evolution with nearest better clustering for multimodal multiobjective optimization," *Applied Soft Computing*, vol. 148, p. 110852, 2023.
- [13] H. Guo, G. Liu, Y. Zhang, C. Zhang, C. Xiong, and W. Li, "A hybrid differential evolution algorithm for a location-inventory problem in a closed-loop supply chain with product recovery," *Complex & Intelligent Systems*, vol. 9, 12 2022.
- [14] R. Biswas and D. Sharma, "A single-loop reliability-based design optimization using adaptive differential evolution," *Applied Soft Computing*, vol. 132, p. 109907, 2023.
- [15] M. H. H. Wahab, N. A. W. Abdul Hamid, S. Subramaniam, R. Latip, and M. Othman, "Decomposition-based multi-objective differential evolution for extractive multi-document automatic text summarization," *Applied Soft Computing*, vol. 151, p. 110994, 2024.
- [16] Y.-J. Zhang, Y.-F. Wang, Y.-X. Yan, J. Zhao, and Z.-M. Gao, "Self-adaptive hybrid mutation slime mould algorithm: Case studies on uav path planning, engineering problems, photovoltaic models and infinite impulse response," *Alexandria Engineering Journal*, vol. 98, pp. 364–389, 2024.
- [17] S. Das, S. S. Mullick, and P. Suganthan, "Recent advances in differential evolution – an updated survey," *Swarm and Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 27, pp. 1–30, 2016.
- [18] Bilal, M. Pant, H. Zaheer, L. Garcia-Hernandez, and A. Abraham, "Differential evolution: A review of more than two decades of research," *Engineering Applications of Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 90, p. 103479, 2020.
- [19] M. F. Ahmad, N. A. M. Isa, W. H. Lim, and K. M. Ang, "Differential evolution: A recent review based on state-of-the-art works," *Alexandria Engineering Journal*, vol. 61, no. 5, pp. 3831–3872, 2022.
- [20] Z. Meng and Y. Chen, "Differential evolution with exponential crossover can be also competitive on numerical optimization," *Applied Soft Computing*, vol. 146, p. 110750, 2023.
- [21] A. Ghosh, S. Das, R. Mallipeddi, A. K. Das, and S. S. Dash, "A modified differential evolution with distance-based selection for continuous optimization in presence of noise," *IEEE Access*, vol. 5, pp. 26 944–26 964, 2017.
- [22] A. Qin and P. Suganthan, "Self-adaptive differential evolution algorithm for numerical optimization," in *2005 IEEE Congress on Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 2, 2005, pp. 1785–1791 Vol. 2.
- [23] Z.-J. Wang, J.-R. Jian, Z.-H. Zhan, Y. Li, S. Kwong, and J. Zhang, "Gene targeting differential evolution: A simple and efficient method for large-scale optimization," *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 27, no. 4, pp. 964–979, 2023.
- [24] R. Zhong, J. Yu, C. Zhang, and M. Munetomo, "Srime: a strengthened rime with latin hypercube sampling and embedded distance-based selection for engineering optimization problems," *Neural Computing and Applications*, pp. 1–21, 2024.
- [25] T. Nguyen, "A framework of optimization functions using numpy (opfunu) for optimization problems," 2020.
- [26] N. V. Thieu, "Enoppy: A python library for engineering optimization problems," may 2023.
- [27] N. Hansen and A. Ostermeier, "Completely derandomized self-adaptation in evolution strategies," *Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 159–195, 2001.
- [28] J. Zhang and A. C. Sanderson, "Jade: Adaptive differential evolution with optional external archive," *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, vol. 13, no. 5, pp. 945–958, 2009.
- [29] R. Tanabe and A. S. Fukunaga, "Improving the search performance of shade using linear population size reduction," in *2014 IEEE Congress on Evolutionary Computation (CEC)*, 2014, pp. 1658–1665.
- [30] A. P. Piotrowski, "L-shade optimization algorithms with population-wide inertia," *Information Sciences*, vol. 468, pp. 117–141, 2018.
- [31] S. Holm, "A simple sequentially rejective multiple test procedure," *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, vol. 6, no. 2, pp. 65–70, 1979.