

Landscape-aware Automated Algorithm Design: An Efficient Framework for Real-world Optimization

Haoran Yin

h.yin@liacs.leidenuniv.nl
LIACS, Leiden University
Leiden, Netherlands

Shuaiqun Pan

s.pan@liacs.leidenuniv.nl
LIACS, Leiden University
Leiden, Netherlands

Zhao Wei

wei_zhao@a-star.edu.sg
Agency for Science, Technology and
Research (A*STAR)
Singapore

Jian Cheng Wong

wongj@a-star.edu.sg
Agency for Science, Technology and
Research (A*STAR)
Singapore

Yew-Soo Ong

ong_yew_soon@a-star.edu.sg
Agency for Science, Technology and
Research (A*STAR)
Singapore

Anna V. Kononova

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

Thomas Bäck

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

Niki van Stein

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

Abstract

The advent of Large Language Models (LLMs) has opened new frontiers in automated algorithm design, giving rise to numerous powerful methods. However, these approaches retain critical limitations: they require extensive evaluation of the target problem to guide the search process, making them impractical for real-world optimization tasks, where each evaluation consumes substantial computational resources. This research proposes an innovative and efficient framework that decouples algorithm discovery from high-cost evaluation. Our core innovation lies in combining a Genetic Programming (GP) function generator with an LLM-driven evolutionary algorithm designer. The evolutionary direction of the GP-based function generator is guided by the similarity between the landscape characteristics of generated proxy functions and those of real-world problems, ensuring that algorithms discovered via proxy functions exhibit comparable performance on real-world problems. Our method enables deep exploration of the algorithmic space before final validation while avoiding costly real-world evaluations. We validated the framework's efficacy across multiple real-world problems, demonstrating its ability to discover high-performance algorithms while substantially reducing expensive evaluations. This approach shows a path to apply LLM-based automated algorithm design to computationally intensive real-world optimization challenges.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

Conference acronym 'XX, Woodstock, NY

© 2018 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.
ACM ISBN 978-1-4503-XXXX-X/2018/06
<https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

CCS Concepts

- **Theory of computation** → *Optimization with randomized search heuristics*;
- **Computing methodologies** → **Heuristic function construction**; Natural language generation.

Keywords

Program synthesis, Simulation optimization, Genetic programming, Large language models, Landscape analysis

ACM Reference Format:

Haoran Yin, Shuaiqun Pan, Zhao Wei, Jian Cheng Wong, Yew-Soo Ong, Anna V. Kononova, Thomas Bäck, and Niki van Stein. 2018. Landscape-aware Automated Algorithm Design: An Efficient Framework for Real-world Optimization. In *Proceedings of Make sure to enter the correct conference title from your rights confirmation email (Conference acronym 'XX)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 10 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXX.XXXXXXX>

1 Introduction

Optimization problems are prevalent in real-world domains such as engineering, manufacturing, scientific simulation, and product design [1, 2, 10, 62]. These problems typically exhibit characteristics including high dimensionality, multimodality, noise, and expensive computation, which pose significant challenges to traditional optimization methods [11, 23]. With the continuous advancement of computational intelligence, automated algorithm design (AAD) has emerged as a crucial approach to deal with complex optimization problems [19]. Its objective is to generate or configure high-performance optimization algorithms using automated methods, thus reducing the work of manual design and improving the efficiency of problem-solving.

In recent years, AAD methods based on Large Language Models (LLMs) have emerged, demonstrating formidable capabilities in algorithm synthesis and code generation [31, 61]. For instance, frameworks such as the Large Language Model Evolutionary Algorithm (LLaMEA) can now automatically generate competitive

meta-heuristic algorithms through natural language interaction and iterative optimization using Evolution Strategy (ES) [48, 61]. Nevertheless, these approaches face a fundamental bottleneck: substantial evaluations of the target problem are typically required to guide algorithm discovery [68, 69]. In real-world settings, each evaluation can take minutes to days, so the resulting total evaluation time (or budget) can be prohibitive, making these methods difficult to implement in practice.

To reduce reliance on such expensive evaluations, landscape analysis offers powerful tools to understand the structural characteristics of optimization problems. By analyzing landscape features, attributes such as modality, ruggedness, and neutrality can be characterized, providing a basis for predicting algorithmic performance [26, 38]. Existing studies have shown that Genetic Programming (GP) can automatically generate mathematically complex expressions, allowing the construction of proxy functions for real-world problems that approximate key characteristics of the target landscape [30, 32, 33, 58].

To address the high computational cost of applying AAD methods to real-world single-objective continuous problems, this paper proposes a novel and highly efficient landscape-aware framework for AAD, which is highlighted in Figure 1. This framework jointly leverages a GP-based proxy function generator and an LLM-based algorithm designer to decouple algorithm discovery from expensive real-world evaluations. Specifically, we first use GP to generate a set of proxy functions that approximate key characteristics of the target landscape. By minimizing the Wasserstein distance between the empirical distributions of the landscape features of the proxy and the real-world problem [25], we encourage the proxy functions to match the landscape characteristics of the target problem. Subsequently, the LLM conducts algorithm discovery by evaluating candidate algorithms on proxy functions, drastically reducing the real-world evaluation budget. Only a small number of promising candidates are finally validated on the real problem, resulting in high-performance algorithms for practical optimization tasks.

Our main contributions can be summarized as follows:

- We propose a novel landscape-aware framework that effectively decouples algorithm discovery from costly real-world evaluations, enabling efficient exploration of the algorithmic space.
- We integrate a landscape-similarity-guided proxy mechanism into the LLamEA framework, bridging classical landscape theory with LLM-driven automated algorithm design. By minimizing the Wasserstein distance between GP-generated functions and LLM-specific search landscapes, we create a proxy that allows LLamEA to explore the algorithmic space.
- We demonstrate a practical and resource-efficient verification strategy, where only top-performing candidates undergo final real-world validation, allowing high-performance algorithm discovery under strictly constrained evaluation budgets.




Figure 1: An overview of the proposed landscape-aware AAD framework. It first generates low-cost proxy functions using GP to match the landscape of the real problem, then uses LLMs to discover algorithms on these proxies, and finally validates only top candidates on the real world problem.

2 Related Work

To position our work within the broader literature, this section reviews three closely related areas: landscape analysis for characterizing optimization problems, GP-based function evolution, and automated algorithm design.

2.1 Landscape Analysis

Landscape analysis characterizes continuous black-box optimization problems using measurable properties of the fitness landscape, and has long been used to link instance structure with algorithm behavior [24, 37]. Common difficulty indicators include the fitness-distance correlation (FDC) [24] and ruggedness estimates derived from autocorrelation along random walks [67], while information-theoretic measures provide complementary signals of modality and smoothness [41]. Building on these ideas, Exploratory Landscape Analysis (ELA) defines a comprehensive feature set for continuous optimization that is widely used for feature-based benchmarking and performance modeling; toolkits such as *flacco* further enable standardized large-scale feature extraction [27, 38]. Landscape features are also central to algorithm selection and performance prediction under Rice’s framework [29, 49], including automated approaches that learn mappings from ELA features to algorithm performance or rankings [26]. Related instance-space analysis similarly embeds problem instances into a feature space to study how algorithm strengths vary across regions of that space [55].

2.2 Function Evolution

Evolving mathematical functions and executable structures is a central topic in GP and symbolic regression. Since Koza’s formulation, GP has been used to evolve tree-structured expressions without assuming a parametric model [30, 44]. Modularity is crucial for scaling expressivity: Automatically Defined Functions (ADFs) promote the reuse of evolved subroutines and support the construction of hierarchical programs [30]. Modern GP further emphasizes generalization and model simplicity through bloat control and parsimony mechanisms [45], alongside constrained representations that enforce syntactic or semantic validity, including grammar-based approaches and grammatical evolution [43], as well as strongly typed GP [40]. To reduce the cost of fitness evaluation, the surrogate-assisted GP replaces expensive evaluations with learned approximations when possible [16]. Most closely related to our goal, recent work uses landscape descriptors (e.g., ELA) to guide GP toward generating cheap proxy functions that resemble the characteristics of the target problem [33]. We extend this direction by generating proxies specifically to support transferable algorithm discovery under a limited budget of expensive target evaluations.

2.3 Automated Algorithm Design

AAD covers hyperparameter optimization, algorithm configuration, and meta-learning. Practical systems such as Sequential Model-Based Algorithm Configuration (SMAC) and Iterated Racing for Automatic Algorithm Configuration (*i*race) have shown strong results for tuning parameterized solvers [18, 26, 35]. Moving beyond parameter tuning, hyper-heuristics aim to automate the selection or construction of heuristics and search strategies, enabling higher-level control over the search process [8]. More recently, LLMs have been incorporated into heuristic-search pipelines to generate and iteratively improve algorithmic components, as demonstrated by FunSearch and LLaMEA [50, 61]. However, most of these approaches still depend on large numbers of task evaluations to provide feedback and selection pressure, which is impractical when each evaluation is costly. We address this limitation by separating

Table 1: Definitions of numbers, variables, and operators for constructing proxy functions.

Notation	Meaning	Type	Syntax
<i>a</i>	a real constant	Number	<i>a</i>
<i>rand</i>	a random number	Number	<i>rand</i>
<i>index</i>	index vector	Decision Variable	$(1, \dots, d)$
<i>x</i>	decision vector	Decision Variable	(x_1, \dots, x_d)
<i>add</i>	addition	Binary Operator	$x + a$
<i>sub</i>	subtraction	Binary Operator	$x - a$
<i>mul</i>	multiplication	Binary Operator	ax
<i>div</i>	division	Binary Operator	a/x
<i>neg</i>	negative	Unary Operator	$-x$
<i>rec</i>	reciprocal	Unary Operator	$1/x$
<i>multen</i>	multiplying by ten	Unary Operator	$10x$
<i>square</i>	square	Unary Operator	x^2
<i>abs</i>	absolute value	Unary Operator	$ x $
<i>sqrt</i>	square root	Unary Operator	$\sqrt{ x }$
<i>exp</i>	exponent	Unary Operator	e^x
<i>ln</i>	natural logarithm	Unary Operator	$\ln x $
<i>sin</i>	sine	Unary Operator	$\sin 2\pi x$
<i>cos</i>	cosine	Unary Operator	$\cos 2\pi x$
<i>round</i>	rounded value	Unary Operator	$\lceil x \rceil$
<i>sum</i>	sum of vector	Vector-Oriented Operator	$\sum_{i=1}^d x_i$
<i>mean</i>	mean of vector	Vector-Oriented Operator	$\frac{1}{d} \sum_{i=1}^d x_i$
<i>cum</i>	cumulative sum of vector	Vector-Oriented Operator	$(\sum_{i=1}^1 x_i, \dots, \sum_{i=1}^d x_i)$
<i>prod</i>	product of vector	Vector-Oriented Operator	$\prod_{i=1}^d x_i$
<i>max</i>	maximum value of vector	Vector-Oriented Operator	$\max_{i=1, \dots, d} x_i$

discovery from expensive target evaluations: proxy functions are evolved under landscape-similarity constraints and then used to guide LLM-driven synthesis, with only a small budget reserved for final validation on the real tasks.

3 Methodology

This section proposes an AAD framework based on landscape awareness, combining proxy function generation through GP with algorithm discovery driven by LLMs. We first describe how to extract ELA features and employ them as similarity bridges, then detail the proxy function generation workflow, and finally explain how to adapt LLM-based designers to the proxy function-driven discovery context.

3.1 Landscape Characterization

We strategically select 7 classic sets of ELA features that are low-cost and efficient to measure the landscape characteristics of single-objective continuous optimization problems based on current research [34, 42, 54], including *y-distribution*, *level set*, *meta model*, *dispersion*, *nearest better clusterin* (NBC), *principal component analysis* (PCA), and *Information Content of Fitness Sequences* (ICoFiS) [28]. To calculate the ELA feature, we sample $coef_{ELA} \times D$ points for the problem in dimension D , where $coef_{ELA}$ is the coefficient controlling the sample size, and randomly select $rate_{ELA}$ points from $coef_{ELA} \times D$ points to calculate the ELA feature and repeat it n_{ELA} times to build the distributions of ELA features and avoid the impact of data fluctuations. We compute the correlation coefficients between the features and remove any retained feature with an absolute correlation coefficient that exceeds $threshold_{corr}$ compared to any other retained feature. This reduces redundancy and enhances the robustness of subsequent similarity metrics.

Algorithm 1 Landscape-Guided Function Generation

Require: X : designed sampling points, t : target ELA feature vector, P : populations, n_{pop} : population size, n_{gen} : number of generations, p_c : crossover probability, p_m : mutation probability, min_{depth} : minimum depth of tree structures, max_{depth} : maximum depth of tree structures

Ensure: Best generated functions f^*

- 1: Initialize population P_0 using half-and-half method, the depth is randomly decided between min_{depth} and max_{depth} for each individual ind .
- 2: **for** $g = 1$ to n_{gen} **do**
- 3: **for** each individual ind in P_{g-1} **do**
- 4: Compile tree to function: $f \leftarrow \text{compile}(ind)$
- 5: Evaluate f on X : $y \leftarrow f(X)$
- 6: **if** y is invalid (NaN, Inf, or constant) **then**
- 7: $fitness \leftarrow \text{penalty}$
- 8: **else**
- 9: Compute ELA features: $c \leftarrow \text{ela_features}(X, y)$
- 10: $fitness \leftarrow \text{wasserstein_distance}(c, t)$
- 11: **end if**
- 12: $ind.fitness \leftarrow fitness$
- 13: **end for**
- 14: Select parents: $P' \leftarrow \text{tournament_selection}(P_{g-1})$
- 15: Create offspring P_g by applying:
 - One-point crossover with rate p_c
 - Subtree mutation with rate p_m
- 18: **end for**
- 19: Extract best functions f^*
- 20: **return** f^*

3.2 Proxy Function Generator

Based on current research on GP-based function generators [32, 33, 58], our proxy functions are defined by 2 types of numbers, 2 variables, and 20 operators, which are shown in Table 1. The proxy function generation system with which we are going to experiment is constructed on the basis of the Distributed Evolutionary Algorithms in Python (DEAP) framework [12]. This framework provides one-point crossover and subtree mutation operations for the implementation of the proxy function generator [30, 57]. The Algorithm 1 illustrates the system workflow, where the Half-and-Half initialization method randomly selects either the Growth rule or the Full rule when generating each initial individual [30]. The Growth approach allows random selection of terminal or non-terminal nodes before reaching maximum depth, yielding irregularly shaped trees; the Full approach selects only non-terminal nodes before reaching maximum depth, generating trees with uniform branch depths.

In terms of similarity metrics, we selected the Wasserstein distance as the measure of similarity between the ELA features of the proxy functions and those of real-world problems [63].

3.3 Proxy-Driven Algorithm Discovery

Research on the use of LLMs for AAD is booming. Our experiments focus on the LLaMEA framework, which has been demonstrated to be both reliable and superior [61]. LLM-based algorithm discovery, such as LLaMEA, requires extensive LLM conversations to iterate

the algorithm. And certainly, each iteration necessitates substantial evaluation based on real-world problems, which is not industrial-friendly, as most real-world problems' evaluations are expensive.

The core innovation lies in introducing GP as an offline, low-cost knowledge distillation module that generates reusable high-quality proxy functions that are then used by the LLM to automatically design algorithms with a significantly reduced need for expensive evaluations.

In our framework, task prompt is slightly different from commonly used one, as we need to inform LLM that the generated algorithm is evaluated based on proxy functions, not benchmark problems, such as BBOB, any more.

Enhanced prompt with primitive guidance

The optimization algorithm should handle a wide range of tasks, which is evaluated on the similar problems of a real-world problem. Your task is to write the optimization algorithm in Python code. The code should contain an `__init__(self, budget, dim)` function and the function `def __call__(self, func)`, which should optimize the black box function `func` using `self.budget` function evaluations.

The `func()` can only be called as many times as the budget allows, not more. Each of the optimization functions has a search space between `func.bounds.lb` (lower bound) and `func.bounds.ub` (upper bound). The dimensionality can be varied.

Give an excellent and novel heuristic algorithm to solve this task and also give it a one-line description with the main idea.

4 Real-world Problems

To validate the framework's robustness, we conducted benchmarks on complex optimization tasks within meta-surface design and photonic optimizations. These domains are characterized by computationally prohibitive evaluations and intricate landscapes, providing a rigorous environment to test the efficacy of our framework under high-cost constraints. The following sections detail the problem applications, parameter configurations, and their specific landscape challenges.

4.1 Meta-surface Design

A meta-surface is a two-dimensional planar material composed of subwavelength structures capable of precisely manipulating light waves (such as phase, amplitude, and polarization) akin to conventional optical elements. Its objective is: given a desired optical function (for instance, achieving total internal reflection of light at a specific frequency or bending it at a particular angle), how can one automatically design the microstructural pattern required to realize that function? The instance we obtain was originally developed by Jiang et al. and has been studied by Dai et al. recently, and both the real solver and the surrogate model are available [9, 22]. The task is to find a meta-surface structure whose physical properties closely match the target profile.

Table 2: The parameter settings for photonic instances. Different columns of thickness and permittivity correspond to different materials.

instances	<i>mini-Bragg</i>	Bragg	<i>ellipsometry</i>	<i>photovoltaic</i>
layers	10	20	1	10
materials	2	2	1	2
min thickness(nm)	0	0	0	50
max thickness(nm)	218	218	218	250
min permittivity	1.96	3.24	1.96	3.24
max permittivity			3.0	2.0
				3.0

4.2 Bragg Mirror Design

Bragg mirrors (also termed Bragg reflectors) comprise two or more semiconducting or dielectric materials arranged in alternating layers, achieving exceptionally high reflectivity within specific optical bands [7]. This structure finds significant applications in numerous fields, such as the construction of acoustic reflectors and filters [46], the analysis of the crystalline structure of materials [39], the improvement of the efficiency of solar cells [21], the monitoring of changes in physical quantities such as temperature and pressure [15], and the strengthening of light-matter interactions in quantum computing and quantum information fields [36]. We have two instances of this problem, called *mini-Bragg* and *Bragg*, which are from the testbed built by Bennet et al. [5] Their settings can be found in Table 2, where different columns, respectively, represent the parameters of the corresponding material. The goal is to maximize reflectivity at 600 nm wavelength.

4.3 Ellipsometry Inverse Problem

Ellipsometry is a non-destructive optical measurement technique capable of determining parameters such as film thickness, refractive index, and absorption coefficient [51]. In semiconductor fabrication, the properties of the films critically influence the performance of the circuit [70]. Solving the ellipsometry inverse problem improves the precision of the process control [59]. This technique is also extensively applied in the fields of new energy and chemical engineering to investigate solar cell materials, nanostructured films, and chemical coating properties [13]. Solving the ellipsometry inverse problem not only advances data analysis methods in materials science but also enhances the industrial applicability of thin-film technologies [14, 17, 52]. The instance *ellipsometry* is from the same testbed as *mini-Bragg* and *Bragg*. Its setting is shown in Table 2.

4.4 Photovoltaic Design

This problem aims at finding the design of precision anti-reflective (AR) coatings for solar cells. Such coatings typically comprise dielectric layers with alternating refractive indices. By suppressing surface reflection losses, carefully engineered AR coatings can substantially enhance the photovoltaic conversion efficiency of solar cells [20]. The challenge lies in achieving broadband, omnidirectional anti-reflection: single-layer coatings only eliminate reflection within narrow bands, necessitating multi-layer or gradient refractive index designs to reduce reflectance across the entire solar spectrum. Optimizing such coatings constitutes a complex inverse photonic design problem, with the performance space containing

numerous local minima due to wave interference effects at multiple wavelengths [6]. Table 2 shows the setting for *photovoltaic*, which is from the same testbed as *mini-Bragg*, *Bragg*, and *ellipsometry*. The goal is to maximize absorption within the desired wavelength range.

5 Experimental Setup

In this section, we detail an experimental framework designed to evaluate the synergy between the GP-based proxy function generator and the LLM-based algorithm designer. Our primary investigation focuses on whether synthetic proxy functions can effectively guide algorithm discovery, thereby mitigating the prohibitive computational costs typically associated with direct real-world evaluations.

5.1 Research Hypotheses

We test the following three hypotheses:

- H1 (Performance Efficacy): Algorithms discovered through landscape-aware proxy functions will demonstrate superior performance on real-world optimization tasks compared to those evolved using standardized artificial benchmarks, such as the BBOB suite.
- H2 (Computational Efficiency): The proposed framework significantly curtails the search overhead, requiring at least a tenfold reduction (one order of magnitude) in high-cost real-world evaluations compared to direct-optimization discovery methods.
- H3 (Competitive Parity and Superiority): We hypothesize that the algorithms discovered by our framework will demonstrate optimization capabilities that are commensurate with or superior to established meta-heuristics, specifically Differential Evolution (DE) and its state-of-the-art variant, LSHADE [4, 56], when evaluated on diverse real-world instances.

5.2 Experimental Configuration

To evaluate these hypotheses, we compare LLaMEA’s performance across three distinct environments:

- Real-World Direct: LLaMEA optimizes directly on real-world problem instances.
- Proxy-Driven: LLaMEA optimizes on the top 3 proxy functions identified by our GP generator as most similar to the target real-world landscape.
- Benchmark-Driven: LLaMEA optimizes on the top 3 most similar instances from the BBOB test suite (24 standard functions).

To study the importance of landscape fidelity in proxy-driven algorithm discovery, we include a mismatched proxy condition based on standard BBOB benchmark functions. While widely used for algorithm development, these instances are not constructed to match the landscape characteristics of the real-world problems considered here. They therefore serve as low-similarity proxy landscapes in contrast to our ELA-guided GP-generated proxies.

For each experimental configuration, the candidate algorithm that achieves the highest Area Over Convergence Curve (AOCC) –




Figure 2: The distribution of AOCC values across 10 runs of different algorithms on real-world problems, where higher values are better. The x-axis represents different algorithms, and the y-axis represents the AOCC value. The algorithms in Figure 2a run on the surrogate model of *meta-surface*, while the algorithms in Figure 2b run on the real solver of *meta-surface*.

a performance metric commonly used in previous LLaMEA studies [61, 69] – is selected from the pool of 500 generated algorithms for final evaluation. Subsequently, these champion algorithms are compared against established baselines, including Random Search (RS), DE and LSHADE [4, 47, 56]. To maintain experimental consistency, the DE and LSHADE baselines are implemented using the Modular DE framework [64], with hyperparameter configurations aligned with established benchmarks in the prior literature [65, 66]. To account for stochastic variability, results are reported over 10 independent trials. Each execution is restricted to a stringent budget of $50 \times D$ evaluations, representing a highly resource-constrained optimization scenario.

5.3 Implementation Details

The ELA features serve as the bridge connecting real-world problems to proxy functions. For each problem of dimension D , we sample points $N_{\text{sample}} = \text{coef}_{\text{ELA}} \times D = 150 \times D$. This coefficient ensures sufficiently dense sampling across different dimensions to capture landscape characteristics. To mitigate fluctuations from single-sample randomness, we randomly select 80% (i.e., $\text{rate}_{\text{ELA}} = 0.8$) of the total sampling points to compute the ELA feature vector, repeating this process $n_{\text{ELA}} = 5$ times. And then remove the features that are highly correlated with other remaining features, which have higher correlation than $\text{threshold}_{\text{corr}} = 0.9$.

For the proxy function generator, we set $n_{\text{pop}} = 50$ and $n_{\text{gen}} = 50$. This setting balances search breadth with computational cost, permitting sufficient generations for optimization without becoming excessively time-consuming. A crossover probability of $p_c = 0.5$ and a subtree mutation probability of $p_m = 0.1$ represent common

GP settings, designed to maintain a balance between population diversity and convergence. The minimum depth of individual trees is set to $\text{min}_{\text{depth}} = 3$, with a maximum depth of $\text{max}_{\text{depth}} = 12$. This permits the generation of sufficiently expressive complex functions while avoiding the creation of excessively large trees that would be difficult to interpret or evaluate through the depth constraint.

We employ the LLaMEA framework as the engine for algorithm generation, integrating it into our framework and utilizing gpt-4o-2024-05-13 as the main LLM [61]. Its robust code generation and reasoning capabilities have proven suitable for the synthesis task of meta-heuristic algorithms. Each run of LLaMEA to generate and iterate algorithms is capped at 100 iterations, and for each iteration, only the $50 \times D$ evaluation budget is allowed for the algorithm generated to find the best solution. AOCC is selected as feedback for LLaMEA, which has been shown to be efficient in guiding the discovery of the algorithm [61]. Internally, LLaMEA employs a (1+1) ES to iteratively refine the algorithm generated. This search strategy has been extensively validated through experimentation. All experimental data are publicly available [3].

6 Results and Discussions

This section presents the experimental results of the proposed landscape-aware AAD framework for multiple real-world single-objective continuous optimization problems. We focus on evaluating whether algorithms discovered on proxy functions can be effectively transferred to the original real-world problems under a tight evaluation budget.

Table 3 shows the average Wasserstein distance between the ELA features of the real-world instances and those of their corresponding top-3 most similar proxy functions, as well as the top-3 most similar




Figure 3: Benchmark results of the generated and baseline algorithms. The x -axis represents the evaluations of the problem and the y -axis represents the normalized fitness value, which are all smaller, the better. Each curve is averaged over 10 runs. For most real-world problems, algorithms generated with proxy functions demonstrate performance similar to algorithms derived from real-world problems while simultaneously exhibiting marked superiority over algorithms based on artificially designed problem discovery.

Table 3: Average Wasserstein distance: real-world instances vs. top-3 proxy functions and vs. top-3 BBOB instances. Compared to BBOB instances, proxy functions share much similar landscape characteristics with real-world instances.

	meta-surface	mini-Bragg	Bragg	ellipsometry	photovoltaic
proxy	4.46	2.21	3.04	2.16	0.99
BBOB	50.81	24.46	81.85	705.67	17.77

BBOB instances. The results clearly show that the proxy functions achieve smaller Wasserstein distances to real-world problems than the BBOB instances. This structural closeness confirms that our proxy generation successfully captures key landscape features of

the target problems, whereas the BBOB suite — included here as an ablative reference — exhibits substantially lower similarity.

Figure 2 presents the violin plots of the AOCC distributions for three baseline methods alongside three LLaMEA-generated algorithms under varying configurations. In this context, higher AOCC values signify superior optimization performance. Across the majority of the five real-world optimization problems, algorithms evolved via proxy functions consistently outperformed RS, DE, LSHADE and BBOB-derived variants, aligning with our primary objectives, with the *ellipsometry* real-world problem being the sole outlier. The consistently inferior performance of BBOB-driven discovery compared to ELA-matched proxies highlights that algorithm transfer critically depends on landscape similarity rather than merely the availability of cheap proxy problems. Furthermore, the “direct discovery” method generally yielded the highest efficacy, except

in the case of the *meta-surface* problem. A detailed examination of the 20-layer Bragg reflector (*Bragg*, Figure 2d) reveals that the proxy-driven algorithm achieved substantially higher AOCC values than RS, DE, and LSHADE, indicating better convergence. These results underscore the framework's capacity to autonomously design novel optimization strategies that match or exceed the efficiency of established metaheuristics.

However, a few exceptions are also interesting to discuss. As illustrated in Figure 2e, the AOCC of the proxy-driven algorithm trails behind the BBOB-driven variant in the *ellipsometry* instance. Given that AAD is inherently a stochastic process, and LLM further amplifies this stochasticity, the occasional suboptimal performance observed across all instances remains consistent with our expectations. Moreover, as *ellipsometry* is a low-dimensional problem, the proxy functions might prioritize complex landscape features that are less relevant here, suggesting that the framework's relative advantage in low-dimensional spaces requires more targeted investigation. Intriguingly, the proxy-driven method outperformed direct discovery on the *meta-surface* problem. This phenomenon suggests that proxy functions may serve as an effective "information filter." While direct discovery is exposed to the raw, often noisy feedback of real-world instances, the proxy-driven approach utilizes a distilled abstraction of the problem space. By filtering out empirical noise, this method prevents the LLM from over-specializing on specific problem artifacts, thereby yielding a more robust and generalized optimization strategy for complex tasks like the *meta-surface* design.

Figure 3 illustrates the optimization trajectory by plotting the best-attained fitness against total evaluations. While AOCC serves as a useful summary, these convergence curves, averaged over ten independent runs, provide a more granular perspective on the optimization dynamics and the efficiency of the generated algorithms. Firstly, the current evaluation limit of $50 \times D$ appears to be a restrictive threshold which many generated algorithms maintain a downward trajectory at the cut-off point, suggesting potential for further improvement with extended budgets. Notably, proxy-driven algorithms consistently outperform BBOB-driven alternatives, delivering faster convergence and higher-quality final solutions. Within the *meta-surface* and *Bragg* instances, the proxy approach provides a "rapid-start" benefit, achieving major fitness reductions well ahead of other baselines. The strong correlation between Figures 3(a) and 3(b) reinforces the theory that proxy functions act as robust filters; consequently, these algorithms transition seamlessly from clean surrogate environments to noisy, real-world applications without a loss in efficiency.

Figure 4 displays the optimal solutions found by proxy-driven algorithms on multiple real-world problems. As shown, the resulting solutions satisfy all physical and engineering constraints while achieving or approaching theoretical optimal values for optical performance metrics such as reflectance and absorptance. For example, in Figure 4a, the resulting microstructure patterns precisely control the phase and amplitude to perform the target profile. In optimization of the photovoltaic anti-reflective coating, as shown in Figure 4d, the solution enhances the efficiency of light absorption within the target spectral band. These results not only validate the effectiveness of proxy functions in capturing problems' landscape characteristics but also demonstrate that proxy-driven discovery




Figure 4: Best solutions found by proxy-driven algorithms.

algorithms can generate reasonable, stable, and high-performance solutions for real-world problems. Consequently, they offer high reliability and practical value in real-world applications.

7 Conclusions and Future Work

This paper proposes a landscape-aware automated algorithm design framework that streamlines how LLMs discover optimization algorithms for expensive real-world challenges. By decoupling discovery from high-cost evaluations, it employs a Genetic Programming proxy generator to replicate the target's landscape. By minimizing the Wasserstein distance between Exploratory Landscape Analysis features, the system generates low-cost proxies that preserve the essential structural characteristics of real-world problems. Empirical validation in photonics and optical engineering confirms that algorithms evolved via these GP proxies transfer seamlessly to complex, real-world tasks, consistently outperforming those derived from conventional manual benchmarks. Even under stringent evaluation constraints, this framework produces optimization strategies that rival or exceed established baselines such as DE and LSHADE. These findings validate the applicability of our framework for computationally intensive real-world optimization problems, where direct evaluation-driven discovery is often impractical.

Future efforts will focus on enriching landscape characterization by integrating advanced ELA features and deep-learning-based representations [53, 60]. By drawing on Neural Architecture Search (NAS), we aim to formulate proxy generation as a differentiable task, enabling the creation of complex, non-linear proxies. On the algorithmic discovery front, we plan to transition toward multi-agent LLM architectures to facilitate iterative logic calibration and real-time error correction. Finally, rigorous interpretability studies of the evolved heuristics will be conducted to map the theoretical synergy between problem landscapes and algorithmic efficiency, ensuring the framework is as transparent as it is high-performing.

References

- [1] Laith Mohammad Abualigah, Mohamed Abd Elaziz, Ahmad M. Khasawneh, Mohammad Alshinwan, Rehab Ali Ibrahim, Mohammed Abdulaziz Aide Alqaness, Seyedali Mirjalili, Putra Sumari, and Amir H. Gandomi. 2022. Metaheuristic optimization algorithms for solving real-world mechanical engineering design problems: a comprehensive survey, applications, comparative analysis, and results. *Neural Comput. Appl.* 34, 6 (2022), 4081–4110. doi:10.1007/S00521-021-06747-4
- [2] Duarte Alemão, André Dionisio Rocha, and José Barata. 2021. Smart manufacturing scheduling approaches—Systematic review and future directions. *Applied Sciences* 11, 5 (2021), 2186.
- [3] Anonymous. 2026. *Landscape-aware Automated Algorithm Design: An Efficient Framework for Real-world Optimization*. doi:10.5281/zenodo.18385405
- [4] Itzel Aranguren, Arturo Valdivia, Bernardo Morales-Castaneda, Diego Oliva, Mohamed Abd Elaziz, and Marco Perez-Cisneros. 2021. Improving the segmentation of magnetic resonance brain images using the LSHADE optimization algorithm. *Biomedical signal processing and control* 64 (2021), 102259.
- [5] Pauline Bennet, Emmanuel Centeno, Jérémie Rapin, Olivier Teytaud, and Antoine Moreau. 2020. The photonics and ARCoating testbeds in Nevergrad. (May 2020). <https://hal.science/hal-02613161> working paper or preprint.
- [6] Pauline Bennet, Denis Langevin, Chaymae Essoual, Abdourahman Khaireh-Walieh, Olivier Teytaud, Peter Wiecha, and Antoine Moreau. 2024. Illustrated tutorial on global optimization in nanophotonics. *JOSA B* 41, 2 (2024), A126–A145.
- [7] WL Bragg, JJ Thomson, and Herren Friedrich. 1914. Diffraction of short electromagnetic waves. In *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society: Mathematical and physical sciences*, Vol. 17. 43.
- [8] Edmund K Burke, Michel Gendreau, Matthew Hyde, Graham Kendall, Gabriela Ochoa, Ender Özcan, and Rong Qu. 2013. Hyper-heuristics: A survey of the state of the art. *Journal of the Operational Research Society* 64, 12 (2013), 1695–1724.
- [9] Manna Dai, Yang Jiang, Feng Yang, Xinxing Xu, Weijiang Zhao, My Ha Dao, and Yong Liu. 2022. SLMGAN: Single-layer metasurface design with symmetrical free-form patterns using generative adversarial networks. *Applied Soft Computing* 130 (2022), 109646.
- [10] Kalyanmoy Deb. 2012. *Optimization for Engineering Design - Algorithms and Examples, Second Edition*. PHI Learning Private Limited. http://phindia.com/bookdetails/optimization_for_engineering_design_-_algorithms_and_examples_by-deb_kalyanmoy_-isbn-978-81-203-4678-9
- [11] Alexander Forrestor, Andras Sobester, and Andy Keane. 2008. *Engineering design via surrogate modelling: a practical guide*. John Wiley & Sons.
- [12] Félix-Antoine Fortin, François-Michel De Rainville, Marc-André Gardner, Marc Parizeau, and Christian Gagné. 2012. DEAP: Evolutionary Algorithms Made Easy. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 13 (jul 2012), 2171–2175.
- [13] Hiroyuki Fujiwara and Robert W Collins. 2018. *Spectroscopic ellipsometry for photovoltaics*. Vol. 1. Springer.
- [14] Débora Gonçalves and Eugene A Irene. 2002. Fundamentals and applications of spectroscopic ellipsometry. *Química Nova* 25 (2002), 794–800.
- [15] Michal Gryga, Dalibor Ciprian, and Petr Hlubina. 2022. Distributed Bragg reflectors employed in sensors and filters based on cavity-mode spectral-domain resonances. *Sensors* 22, 10 (2022), 3627.
- [16] Torsten Hildebrandt and Jürgen Branke. 2015. On Using Surrogates with Genetic Programming. *Evol. Comput.* 23, 3 (2015), 343–367. doi:10.1162/EVCO_A_00133
- [17] Karsten Hinrichs and Klaus-Jochen Eichhorn. 2018. *Ellipsometry of functional organic surfaces and films*. Vol. 52. Springer.
- [18] Frank Hutter, Holger H Hoos, and Kevin Leyton-Brown. 2011. Sequential model-based optimization for general algorithm configuration. In *International conference on learning and intelligent optimization*. Springer, 507–523.
- [19] Frank Hutter, Lars Kotthoff, and Joaquin Vanschoren. 2019. *Automated machine learning: methods, systems, challenges*. Springer Nature.
- [20] Chunxue Ji, Wen Liu, Yidi Bao, Xiaoling Chen, Guiqiang Yang, Bo Wei, Fuhua Yang, and Xiaodong Wang. 2022. Recent applications of antireflection coatings in solar cells. In *Photonics*, Vol. 9. MDPI, 906.
- [21] Yajie Jiang, Mark J Keevers, and Martin A Green. 2018. Design of Bragg Reflector in GaInP/GaInAs/Ga Triple-Junction Solar Cells for Spectrum Splitting Applications. In *2018 IEEE 7th World Conference on Photovoltaic Energy Conversion (WCPEC)(A Joint Conference of 45th IEEE PVSC, 28th PVSEC & 34th EU PVSEC)*. IEEE, 0901–0904.
- [22] Yang Jiang and Ke-Li Wu. 2018. Quasi-static surface-PEEC modeling of electromagnetic problem with finite dielectrics. *IEEE Transactions on Microwave Theory and Techniques* 67, 2 (2018), 565–576.
- [23] Yaochu Jin and Jürgen Branke. 2005. Evolutionary optimization in uncertain environments—a survey. *IEEE Transactions on evolutionary computation* 9, 3 (2005), 303–317.
- [24] Terry Jones and Stephanie Forrest. 1995. Fitness Distance Correlation as a Measure of Problem Difficulty for Genetic Algorithms. In *Proceedings of the 6th International Conference on Genetic Algorithms, Pittsburgh, PA, USA, July 15–19, 1995*, Larry J. Eshelman (Ed.). Morgan Kaufmann, 184–192.
- [25] Leonid V Kantorovich. 1960. Mathematical methods of organizing and planning production. *Management science* 6, 4 (1960), 366–422.
- [26] Pascal Kerschke and Heike Trautmann. 2019. Automated algorithm selection on continuous black-box problems by combining exploratory landscape analysis and machine learning. *Evolutionary computation* 27, 1 (2019), 99–127.
- [27] Pascal Kerschke and Heike Trautmann. 2019. Comprehensive feature-based landscape analysis of continuous and constrained optimization problems using the R-package flacco. In *Applications in statistical computing: from music data analysis to industrial quality improvement*. Springer, 93–123.
- [28] Pascal Kerschke and Heike Trautmann. 2019. Comprehensive Feature-Based Landscape Analysis of Continuous and Constrained Optimization Problems Using the R-package flacco. In *Applications in Statistical Computing – From Music Data Analysis to Industrial Quality Improvement*, Nadja Bauer, Katja Ickstadt, Karsten Lübke, Gero Szepannek, and Maurizio Vichi (Eds.). Springer, 93 – 123. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-25147-5_7
- [29] Lars Kotthoff. 2014. Algorithm Selection for Combinatorial Search Problems: A Survey. *AI Mag.* 35, 3 (2014), 48–60. doi:10.1609/AIMAG.V35I3.2460
- [30] John R Koza. 1994. Genetic programming as a means for programming computers by natural selection. *Statistics and computing* 4, 2 (1994), 87–112.
- [31] Fei Liu, Xialiang Tong, Mingxuan Yuan, Xi Lin, Fu Luo, Zhenkun Wang, Zhichao Lu, and Qingfu Zhang. 2024. Evolution of heuristics: Towards efficient automatic algorithm design using large language model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.02051* (2024).
- [32] Fu Xing Long, Bas van Stein, Moritz Frenzel, Peter Krause, Markus Gitterle, and Thomas Bäck. 2024. Generating cheap representative functions for expensive automotive crashworthiness optimization. *ACM Transactions on Evolutionary Learning and Optimization* 4, 2 (2024), 1–26.
- [33] Fu Xing Long, Diederick Vermetten, Anna V. Kononova, Roman Kalkreuth, Kaifeng Yang, Thomas Bäck, and Niki van Stein. 2023. Challenges of ELA-Guided Function Evolution Using Genetic Programming. In *Proceedings of the 15th International Joint Conference on Computational Intelligence, IJCCI 2023, Rome, Italy, November 13–15, 2023*, Niki van Stein, Francesco Marcelloni, H. K. Lam, Marie Cottrell, and Joaquim Filipe (Eds.). SCITEPRESS, 119–130. doi:10.5220/0012206200003595
- [34] Fu Xing Long, Diederick Vermetten, Bas van Stein, and Anna V Kononova. 2023. BBOB Instance Analysis: Landscape Properties and Algorithm Performance

Across Problem Instances. In *International Conference on the Applications of Evolutionary Computation (Part of EvoStar)*. Springer, 380–395.

[35] Manuel López-Ibáñez, Jérémie Dubois-Lacoste, Leslie Pérez Cáceres, Mauro Birattari, and Thomas Stützle. 2016. The irace package: Iterated racing for automatic algorithm configuration. *Operations Research Perspectives* 3 (2016), 43–58.

[36] Maurine Malak. 2014. Beyond interferometers based on silicon-air bragg reflectors: Toward on-chip optical microinstruments—A review. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Quantum Electronics* 21, 4 (2014), 49–60.

[37] Katherine M. Malan and Andries P. Engelbrecht. 2013. A survey of techniques for characterising fitness landscapes and some possible ways forward. *Inf. Sci.* 241 (2013), 148–163. doi:10.1016/J.INS.2013.04.015

[38] Olaf Mersmann, Bernd Bischl, Heike Trautmann, Mike Preuss, Claus Weihs, and Günter Rudolph. 2011. Exploratory landscape analysis. In *Proceedings of the 13th annual conference on Genetic and evolutionary computation*. 829–836.

[39] AP Mihai, M Adabi, W Liu, H Hill, N Klein, and PK Petrov. 2015. Metallic multilayers for X-band Bragg reflector applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1506.07702* (2015).

[40] David J. Montana. 1995. Strongly Typed Genetic Programming. *Evol. Comput.* 3, 2 (1995), 199–230. doi:10.1162/EVCO.1995.3.2.199

[41] Mario A. Muñoz, Michael Kirley, and Saman K. Halgamuge. 2015. Exploratory Landscape Analysis of Continuous Space Optimization Problems Using Information Content. *IEEE Trans. Evol. Comput.* 19, 1 (2015), 74–87. doi:10.1109/TEVC.2014.232006

[42] Mario A Muñoz and Kate Smith-Miles. 2015. Effects of function translation and dimensionality reduction on landscape analysis. In *2015 IEEE Congress on Evolutionary Computation (CEC)*. IEEE, 1336–1342.

[43] Michael O'Neill and Conor Ryan. 2003. *Grammatical evolution - evolutionary automatic programming in an arbitrary language*. Genetic programming, Vol. 4. Kluwer.

[44] Riccardo Poli, William B. Langdon, and Nicholas Freitag McPhee. 2008. *A Field Guide to Genetic Programming*. lulu.com. <http://www.gp-field-guide.org.uk/>

[45] Riccardo Poli and Nicholas Freitag McPhee. 2014. Parsimony Pressure Made Easy: Solving the Problem of Bloat in GP. In *Theory and Principled Methods for the Design of Metaheuristics*, Yossi Borenstein and Alberto Moraglio (Eds.). Springer, 181–204. doi:10.1007/978-3-642-33206-7_9

[46] Pratyasha Priyadarshini, Arnab Goswami, and Bijoy Krishna Das. 2024. Distributed Bragg reflector-based resonance filters for silicon photonics: design and demonstration. *Journal of Optical Microsystems* 4, 4 (2024), 041403–041403.

[47] LA Rastrigin. 1963. The convergence of the random search method in the extremal control of a many parameter system. *Automaton & Remote Control* 24 (1963), 1337–1342.

[48] Ingo Rechenberg. 1978. Evolutionsstrategien. In *Simulationenmethoden in der Medizin und Biologie: Workshop, Hannover, 29. Sept.–1. Okt. 1977*. Springer, 83–114.

[49] John R. Rice. 1976. The Algorithm Selection Problem. *Adv. Comput.* 15 (1976), 65–118. doi:10.1016/S0065-2458(08)60520-3

[50] Bernardino Romera-Paredes, Mohammadamin Barekatain, Alexander Novikov, Matej Balog, M. Pawan Kumar, Emilien Dupont, Francisco J. R. Ruiz, Jordan S. Ellenberg, Pengming Wang, Omar Fawzi, Pushmeet Kohli, and Alhussein Fawzi. 2024. Mathematical discoveries from program search with large language models. *Nat.* 625, 7995 (2024), 468–475. doi:10.1038/S41586-023-06924-6

[51] Alexandre Rothen. 1945. The ellipsometer, an apparatus to measure thicknesses of thin surface films. *Review of Scientific Instruments* 16, 2 (1945), 26–30.

[52] Mathias Schubert. 2004. *Infrared ellipsometry on semiconductor layer structures: phonons, plasmons, and polaritons*. Vol. 209. Springer Science & Business Media.

[53] Moritz Vinzent Seiler, Pascal Kerschke, and Heike Trautmann. 2025. Deep-ela: Deep exploratory landscape analysis with self-supervised pretrained transformers for single-and multi-objective continuous optimization problems. *Evolutionary Computation* (2025), 1–27.

[54] Urban Skvrc, Tome Eftimov, and Peter Korosec. 2020. Understanding the problem space in single-objective numerical optimization using exploratory landscape analysis. *Applied Soft Computing* 90 (2020), 106138.

[55] Kate Smith-Miles, Davaatseren Baatar, Brendan Wreford, and Rhyd Lewis. 2014. Towards objective measures of algorithm performance across instance space. *Comput. Oper. Res.* 45 (2014), 12–24. doi:10.1016/J.COR.2013.11.015

[56] Rainer Storn and Kenneth Price. 1997. Differential evolution—a simple and efficient heuristic for global optimization over continuous spaces. *Journal of global optimization* 11, 4 (1997), 341–359.

[57] Gilbert Syswerda et al. 1989. Uniform crossover in genetic algorithms. In *ICGA*, Vol. 3.

[58] Ye Tian, Shichen Peng, Xingyi Zhang, Tobias Rodemann, Kay Chen Tan, and Yaochu Jin. 2020. A recommender system for metaheuristic algorithms for continuous optimization based on deep recurrent neural networks. *IEEE transactions on artificial intelligence* 1, 1 (2020), 5–18.

[59] Ryan G Toomey. 2024. Tackling the inverse problem in ellipsometry: analytic expressions for supported coatings with nonuniform refractive index profiles in the thin film and weak contrast limits. *Physica Scripta* 99, 3 (2024), 035529.

[60] Bas van Stein, Fu Xing Long, Moritz Frenzel, Peter Krause, Markus Gitterle, and Thomas Bäck. 2023. Doe2vec: Deep-learning based features for exploratory landscape analysis. In *Proceedings of the Companion Conference on Genetic and Evolutionary Computation*. 515–518.

[61] Niki van Stein and Thomas Bäck. 2024. Llamea: A large language model evolutionary algorithm for automatically generating metaheuristics. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation* (2024).

[62] Garret N Vanderplaats. 1996. Design Optimization—History and Prospects. In *Métodos numéricos en ingeniería [comunicaciones presentadas al III Congreso de Métodos Numéricos en Ingeniería, celebrado en Zaragoza durante los días 3-6 de junio de 1996]*. Sociedad Española de Métodos Numéricos en Ingeniería (SEMNI), 83–96.

[63] Leonid Nisonovich Vaserstein. 1969. Markov processes over denumerable products of spaces, describing large systems of automata. *Problemy Peredachi Informatsii* 5, 3 (1969), 64–72.

[64] Diederick Vermetten, Fabio Caraffini, Anna V Kononova, and Thomas Bäck. 2023. Modular differential evolution. In *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference*. 864–872.

[65] Diederick Vermetten, Carola Doerr, Haif Wang, Anna V Kononova, and Thomas Bäck. 2024. Large-scale benchmarking of metaphor-based optimization heuristics. In *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference*. 41–49.

[66] Diederick Vermetten, Furong Ye, Thomas Bäck, and Carola Doerr. 2025. MABBOB: A problem generator for black-box optimization using affine combinations and shifts. *ACM Transactions on Evolutionary Learning* 5, 1 (2025), 1–19.

[67] Edward Weinberger. 1990. Correlated and uncorrelated fitness landscapes and how to tell the difference. *Biological cybernetics* 63, 5 (1990), 325–336.

[68] Chengrun Yang, Xuezhi Wang, Yifeng Lu, Hanxiao Liu, Quoc V Le, Denny Zhou, and Xinyun Chen. 2023. Large language models as optimizers. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.

[69] Haoran Yin, Anna V Kononova, Thomas Bäck, and Niki van Stein. 2025. Optimizing photonic structures with large language model driven algorithm discovery. In *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference Companion*. 2354–2362.

[70] Stefan Zollner. 2013. Spectroscopic ellipsometry for inline process control in the semiconductor industry. In *Ellipsometry at the Nanoscale*. Springer, 607–627.