

---

# TabRepo: A Large Scale Repository of Tabular Model Evaluations and its AutoML Applications

---

David Salinas<sup>1,\*</sup> Nick Erickson<sup>2,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Freiburg, work started at Amazon Web Services

<sup>2</sup>Amazon Web Services

\*Equal contribution

---

**Abstract** We introduce TabRepo, a new dataset of tabular model evaluations and predictions. TabRepo contains the predictions and metrics of 1310 models evaluated on 200 classification and regression datasets. We illustrate the benefit of our dataset in multiple ways. First, we show that it allows to perform analysis such as comparing Hyperparameter Optimization against current AutoML systems while also considering ensembling at marginal cost by using precomputed model predictions. Second, we show that our dataset can be readily leveraged to perform transfer-learning. In particular, we show that applying standard transfer-learning techniques allows to outperform current state-of-the-art tabular systems in accuracy, runtime and latency.

---

## 1 Introduction

Machine learning on structured tabular data has a long history due to its wide range of practical applications. Significant progress has been achieved through improving supervised learning models, with key method landmarks including SVM (Hearst et al., 1998), Random Forest (Breiman, 2001) and Gradient Boosted Trees (Friedman, 2001). Recent methods include pretraining transformer models (Hollmann et al., 2022; Zhu et al., 2023) and combining non-parametric and deep-learning techniques (Gorishniy et al., 2023).

AutoML methods build upon base models to achieve superior performance and ease of use for ML practitioners (Thornton et al., 2013). Auto-Sklearn (Feurer et al., 2015, 2022) was an early approach that proposed to select pipelines to ensemble from the Sklearn library and meta-learn the hyperparameter optimization (HPO) with offline evaluations. The approach was successful and won several AutoML competitions. Several frameworks followed with other AutoML approaches such as TPOT (Olson and Moore, 2019), H2O AutoML (LeDell and Poirier, 2020), and AutoGluon (Erickson et al., 2020). AutoGluon showed particularly strong performance by combining bagging (Breiman, 1996), ensembling (Caruana et al., 2004), and multi-layer stacking (Wolpert, 1992).

The proliferation of supervised learning models and AutoML systems led to several works focusing on benchmarking tabular methods. Recently, Gijsbers et al. (2024) proposed the AutoML-Benchmark (AMLB), a unified benchmark to compare tabular methods. Because AMLB evaluates across 1040 tasks, evaluating a single method on AMLB requires 40000 CPU hours of compute<sup>1</sup>. Due to this cost, the benchmark is only run once a year, with heavy consideration taken to which methods should be included to mitigate compute concerns. This makes it expensive to perform thorough ablations and explore research directions. For instance, measuring the impact of ensembling requires running the ablated method on the entire benchmark for every setting tested.

To address this issue, we introduce TabRepo<sup>2</sup>, a dataset of model evaluations and predictions. The main contributions of this paper are:

---

<sup>1</sup>The CPU hour requirement is based on running the full 104 datasets in AMLB across 10 folds for both 1 hour and 4 hour time limits on an 8 CPU machine.

<sup>2</sup>The dataset and code to reproduce all our experiments are available at <https://github.com/autogluon/tabrepo>

- A large scale evaluation of tabular models comprising 786000 model predictions with 1310 models from 10 different families densely evaluated across 200 datasets and 3 seeds.
- We show how the repository can be used to study at marginal cost the performance of tuning models while considering ensembles by leveraging precomputed model predictions.
- We show that TabRepo combined with transfer learning achieves state-of-the-art results compared to AutoML systems in accuracy and training time.

This paper first reviews related work before describing the TabRepo dataset. We then illustrate how TabRepo can be leveraged to compare HPO with ensemble against AutoML systems. Finally, we use transfer-learning to achieve a new state-of-the-art on tabular data.

## 2 Related work

Acquiring and re-using offline evaluations to eliminate redundant computation has been proposed in multiple compute intensive fields of machine learning. In HPO, several works proposed to acquire a large number of evaluations to simulate the performance of different optimizers across many seeds which can easily become prohibitive otherwise, in particular when the blackbox function optimized involves training a large neural network (Klein and Hutter, 2019; Eggensperger et al., 2021). Similarly, tabular benchmarks were acquired for Neural Architecture Search (Ying et al., 2019; Dong and Yang, 2020) as it was observed that, due to the large cost of comparisons, not enough seeds were used to distinguish methods properly from random-search (Yang et al., 2020).

While the cost of tabular methods can be orders of magnitude lower than training large neural networks, it can still be significant in particular when considering many methods, datasets, and seeds. Several works proposed to provide benchmarks with precomputed results, in particular Gorishniy et al. (2021); Grinsztajn et al. (2022); McElfresh et al. (2023). One key differentiator with those works is that TabRepo exposes model *predictions* which enables to simulate nearly instantaneously not only the errors of single models but also *ensembles* of any subset of available models. To the best of our knowledge, the only prior works that considered providing a dataset compatible with ensemble predictions is Borchert et al. (2022) in the context of time-series and Purucker and Beel (2022, 2023) in the context of tabular prediction. Our work differs from Purucker and Beel (2022, 2023) as they train a different number of models per dataset (sparse) and focus on evaluating the performance of ensembling algorithms, whereas we obtain results for all models on all datasets (dense) and use transfer-learning to create a model portfolio. Additionally they consider 31 classification datasets whereas we include 200 datasets both from regression and classification.

An important advantage of acquiring offline evaluations is that it allows to perform transfer-learning, e.g. to make use of the offline data to speed up the tuning of model hyperparameters. In particular, a popular transfer-learning approach is called Portfolio learning, or Zeroshot HPO, and consists of selecting greedily a set of models that are complementary and are then likely to perform well on a new dataset (Xu et al., 2010). Due to its performance and simplicity, the method has been applied in a wide range of applications ranging from HPO (Wistuba et al., 2015), time-series (Borchert et al., 2022), computer vision (Arango et al., 2023), tabular deep-learning (Winkelmolen et al., 2020; Zimmer et al., 2021), and AutoML (Feurer et al., 2015, 2022).

The current state-of-the-art for tabular methods in terms of accuracy is arguably AutoGluon (Erickson et al., 2020) in light of recent large scale benchmarks (Gijsbers et al., 2024). The method trains models from different families with bagging: each model is trained on several distinct non-overlapping random splits of the training dataset to generate out-of-fold predictions whose scores are likely to align well with performance on the test set. Then, another layer of models is trained whose inputs are both the original inputs concatenated with the predictions of the models in the previous layers. Finally, an ensemble is built on top of the last layer model predictions using ensemble selection (Caruana et al., 2004). Interestingly, this work showed that excellent

performance could be achieved without performing HPO and instead using a fixed list of manually selected model configurations. However, the obtained solution can be expensive for inference due to the use of model stacking and requires human experts to select default model configurations. Our work shows that using TabRepo, one can alleviate both caveats by learning default configurations which improves accuracy and latency when matching compute budget.

### 3 TabRepo

We now describe TabRepo and our notations to define its set of evaluations and predictions. In what follows, we denote  $[n] = \{1, \dots, n\}$  to be the set of the first  $n$  integers.

**Model bagging.** All models are trained with *bagging* to better estimate their hold-out performance and improve their accuracy. Given a dataset split into a training set  $(X^{(\text{train})}, y^{(\text{train})})$  and a test set  $(X^{(\text{test})}, y^{(\text{test})})$  and a model  $f^\lambda$  with parameters  $\lambda$ , we train  $\mathcal{B}$  models on  $\mathcal{B}$  non-overlapping cross-validation splits of the training set denoted  $\{(X^{(\text{train})}[b], y^{(\text{train})}[b]), (X^{(\text{val})}[b], y^{(\text{val})}[b])\}_{b=1}^{\mathcal{B}}$ . Each of the  $\mathcal{B}$  model parameters are fitted by ERM, i.e. by minimizing the loss

$$\lambda_b = \arg \min_{\lambda} \mathcal{L}(f^\lambda(X^{(\text{train})}[b]), y^{(\text{train})}[b]), \quad \text{for } b \in [\mathcal{B}].$$

where the loss  $\mathcal{L}$  is calculated via root mean-squared error (RMSE) for regression, the area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUC) for binary classification and log loss for multi-class classification. We choose these evaluation metrics to be consistent with AMLB defaults (Gijsbers et al., 2024).

One can then construct *out-of-fold predictions*<sup>3</sup> denoted as  $\tilde{y}^{(\text{train})}$  that are computed on unseen data for each bagged model, i.e. predictions are obtained by applying the model on the validation set of each split i.e.  $f^{\lambda_b}(X^{(\text{val})}[b])$  which allows to estimate the performance on the training set for unseen data. To predict on a test dataset  $X^{(\text{test})}$ , we average the predictions of the  $\mathcal{B}$  fitted models,

$$\tilde{y}^{(\text{test})} = \frac{1}{\mathcal{B}} \sum_{b=1}^{\mathcal{B}} f^{\lambda_b}(X^{(\text{test})}). \quad (1)$$

**Datasets, predictions and evaluations.** We collect evaluations on  $\mathcal{D} = 200$  datasets from OpenML (Vanschoren et al., 2014). For selecting the datasets, we combined two prior tabular dataset suites. The first is from the AutoMLBenchmark (Gijsbers et al., 2024), and the second is from the Auto-Sklearn 2 paper (Feurer et al., 2022). Refer to Appendix C for a detailed description of the datasets.

For each dataset, we generate  $\mathcal{S} = 3$  tasks by selecting the first three of ten cross-validation fold as defined in OpenML’s evaluation procedure, resulting in  $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{D} \times \mathcal{S}$  tasks in total. The list of  $\mathcal{T}$  tasks’ features and labels are denoted

$$\{((X_i^{(\text{train})}, y_i^{(\text{train})}), (X_i^{(\text{test})}, y_i^{(\text{test})}))\}_{i=1}^{\mathcal{T}}$$

where  $X_i^s \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{N}_i^s \times d_i}$  and  $y_i \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{N}_i^s \times o_i}$  for each split  $s \in \{\text{train}, \text{test}\}$ ,  $\mathcal{N}_i^s$  denotes the number of rows available in each split. Feature and label dimensions are denoted with  $d_i$  and  $o_i$  respectively. We use a loss  $\mathcal{L}_i$  for each task depending on its type, in particular we use AUC for binary classification, log loss for multi-class classification and RMSE for regression.

For each task, we fit each model on  $\mathcal{B} = 8$  cross-validation splits before generating predictions with Eq. 1. The predictions on the training and test splits for any task  $i \in [\mathcal{T}]$  and model  $j \in [\mathcal{M}]$  are denoted as

$$\tilde{y}_{ij}^{(\text{train})} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{N}_i^{(\text{train})} \times o_i}, \quad \tilde{y}_{ij}^{(\text{test})} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{N}_i^{(\text{test})} \times o_i}. \quad (2)$$

---

<sup>3</sup>Note that for classification tasks, we refer to *prediction probabilities* as simply *predictions* for convenience.

We can then obtain losses for all tasks and models with

$$\ell_{ij}^{(\text{train})} = \mathcal{L}_i(\tilde{y}_{ij}^{(\text{train})}, y_i^{(\text{train})}), \quad \ell_{ij}^{(\text{test})} = \mathcal{L}_i(\tilde{y}_{ij}^{(\text{test})}, y_i^{(\text{test})}). \quad (3)$$

For all tasks and models, we use the AutoGluon featurizer to preprocess the raw data prior to fitting the models (Erickson et al., 2020).

**Models available.** For base models, we consider Linear models, KNearestNeighbors, RandomForest (Breiman, 2001), ExtraTrees (Geurts et al., 2006), XGBoost (Chen and Guestrin, 2016), LightGBM (Ke et al., 2017), CatBoost (Prokhorenkova et al., 2018), and Multi-layer perceptron (MLP). We evaluate all *default* configurations used by AutoGluon for those base models together with 50 random configurations for Linear models and KNN and 200 random configurations for the remaining families. We also include a single default configuration each of TabPFN (Hollmann et al., 2022) and FT-Transformer (Gorishniy et al., 2021) which use GPUs to accelerate training. In total, this yields  $\mathcal{M} = 1310$  configurations. All configurations are run for one hour. For the models that are not finished in one hour, we early stop them and use the best checkpoint according to the validation score to generate predictions.

In addition, we evaluate 6 AutoML frameworks: Auto-Sklearn 1 and 2 (Feurer et al., 2015, 2022), FLAML (Wang et al., 2021), LightAutoML (Vakhrushev et al., 2021), H2O AutoML (LeDell and Poirier, 2020) and AutoGluon (Erickson et al., 2020). We run all model configurations and AutoML frameworks via the AutoMLBenchmark (Gijsbers et al., 2024) for both 1h and 4h fitting time budget, using the implementations provided by the AutoML system authors.

For every task and model combination, we store losses defined in Eq. 3 and predictions defined in Eq. 2. Storing evaluations for every ensemble would be clearly infeasible given the large set of base models considered. However, given that we also store base model predictions, an ensemble can be fit and evaluated on the fly for any set of configurations by querying lookup tables as we will now describe.

**Ensembling.** Given the predictions from a set of models on a given task, we build ensembles by using the Caruana et al. (2004) approach. The procedure selects models by iteratively picking the model such that the average of selected models' predictions minimizes the error. Formally, given  $\mathcal{M}$  model predictions  $\{\tilde{y}_1, \dots, \tilde{y}_{\mathcal{M}}\} \in \mathbb{R}^{\mathcal{M}}$ , the strategy selects  $\mathcal{C}$  models  $j_1, \dots, j_{\mathcal{C}}$  iteratively as follows

$$j_1 = \arg \min_{j_1 \in \mathcal{M}} \mathcal{L}(\tilde{y}_{j_1}, y^{(\text{train})}), \quad j_n = \arg \min_{j_n \in \mathcal{M}} \mathcal{L}\left(\frac{1}{n} \sum_{c=1}^n \tilde{y}_{j_c}, y^{(\text{train})}\right).$$

The final predictions are obtained by averaging the selected models  $j_1, \dots, j_{\mathcal{C}}$ :

$$\frac{1}{\mathcal{C}} \sum_{c=1}^{\mathcal{C}} \tilde{y}_{j_c}. \quad (4)$$

Note that the sum is performed over the vector of model indices which allow to potentially select a model multiple times and justifies the term "weight".

Critically, the performance of any ensemble of configurations can be calculated by summing the predictions of base models obtained from lookup tables. This is particularly fast as it does not require any retraining but only recomputing losses between weighted predictions and target labels. While we could leverage other ensembling methods in future, we prioritize Caruana et al. (2004) in this work due to its widespread adoption, strong performance, and fast training time.

## 4 Comparing HPO and AutoML systems

We now show how TabRepo can be used to analyze the performance of base model families and the effect of tuning hyperparameters with ensembling against recent AutoML systems. All experiments are done at marginal costs given that they just require querying precomputed evaluations and predictions.




Figure 1: Cluster map of model rank for all datasets (left), correlation of model ranks (middle) and average runtime distribution over every dataset (right). For readability, only the first 3 configurations of each model family are displayed in the left and middle figures. The performance of models that could not be fitted successfully are represented in black.

**Model error and runtime distributions.** In Fig. 1, we start by analyzing the performance of different base models<sup>4</sup>. In particular, the rank of model losses over datasets shows that while some model families dominate in performance on aggregate such as gradient boosted methods CatBoost and LightGBM, in some tasks MLP are better suited. Looking at model correlations, we see interesting patterns as some model families are negatively correlated between each other such as MLP and XGBoost which hints at the potential benefit of ensembling.

Next, we plot the distribution of runtime configurations over all 200 datasets. We see that an order of magnitude separates respectively the training runtime of CatBoost from MLP, XGBoost and LightGBM, with the remaining methods being faster still. Importantly, while CatBoost obtains the strongest average rank among model families, it is also the most expensive which is an important aspect to take into account when considering possible training runtime constraints as we will see later in our experiments. We provide further analysis of model runtimes in Appendix H.

**Effect of tuning and ensembling on model error.** We now compare methods across all tasks by using both ranks and normalized errors. Ranks are computed over the  $\mathcal{M}$  different models and all AutoML frameworks. Normalized errors are computed by reporting the relative distance to a topline loss compared to a baseline with  $\frac{l_{\text{method}} - l_{\text{topline}}}{l_{\text{baseline}} - l_{\text{topline}}}$  while clipping the denominator to 1e-5 and the final score value to  $[0, 1]$ . We use respectively the top and median score among all scores to set the topline and baseline. The median allows to avoid having scores collapse when one model loss becomes very high which can happen frequently for regression cases in presence of overfitting or numerical instabilities.

**Comparison.** In Fig. 2, we show the aggregate of the normalized error across all tasks. For each model family, we evaluate the default hyperparameters, the best hyperparameter obtained after a random search of 4 hours and an ensemble built on top of the best 20 configurations obtained by this search. In Fig. 2, we see that CatBoost dominates other models while FT-Transformer and LightGBM are the runner-ups. Tuning model hyperparameters and ensembling improves all models and ensembling allows LightGBM to match CatBoost’s accuracy. No model is able to beat state-of-the-art AutoML systems even with tuning and ensembling. This is unsurprising as all state-of-the-art tabular methods considered multiple model families in order to reach good performance and echoes the finding of Erickson et al. (2020).

<sup>4</sup>All models considered run successfully except for TabPFN, FT-Transformer and KNN where failures are depicted in black in Fig. 1 left which are due to memory or implementation issues.




Figure 2: Normalized error for all model families when using default hyperparameters, tuned hyperparameters, and ensembling after tuning. All methods are run with a 4h budget.




Figure 3: Hyperparameter importance for each model family using the fANOVA method from Hutter et al. (2014). Y-axis is in log-space.

**Hyperparameters importance.** We just saw how tuning and ensembling can improve the performance of each model family. In Fig. 3, we show the importance of hyperparameters for each family that can be evaluated on CPU. We use the fANOVA method proposed by Hutter et al. (2014) on each task and numerize features to fit random forest models using the search space provided in section E.1. The importance are computed on each task and then aggregated.

We observe that hyperparameter importance mostly follows practitioner intuition. For instance, the number of neighbors, the regularization, and the depth are the top hyperparameters respectively for KNN, Linear model and CatBoost as expected. For MLP, the most important hyperparameters are the activation and whether to use batch-normalization. For this model family, some options such as using batch-normalization dominate. One could consider model-based or multi-fidelity approaches to generate configurations for model families as opposed to random-search as proposed in (Winkelmann et al., 2020) to exploit parts of the search-space that are better suited.

## 5 Portfolio learning with TabRepo

We just saw how TabRepo can be leveraged to analyze the performance of frameworks when performing tuning and ensembling. In particular, we saw that ensembling a model family after tuning does not outperform current AutoML systems. We now show how TabRepo can be combined with transfer learning techniques to perform the tuning search offline and outperform current AutoML methods.

**Portfolio learning.** To leverage offline data and speed-up model selection, Xu et al. (2010) proposed an approach to learn a portfolio of complementary configurations that performs well on average when evaluating all the configurations of the portfolio and selecting the best one.

Table 1: Normalized error, rank, training and inference time averaged over all tasks given 4h training budget. Inference time is calculated as the prediction time on the test data divided by the number of rows in the test data.

method	normalized-error	rank	time fit (s)	time infer (s)
<b>Portfolio (ensemble) (ours)</b>	<b>0.365</b>	<b>168.7</b>	6275.5	0.050
AutoGluon	0.389	208.2	5583.1	0.062
Portfolio (ours)	0.434	232.5	6275.5	0.012
Autosklearn2	0.455	243.5	14415.9	0.013
Lightautoml	0.466	246.1	9173.9	0.298
Flaml	0.513	317.8	14267.0	0.002
CatBoost (tuned + ensemble)	0.524	267.3	9065.2	0.012
H2oautoml	0.526	337.0	13920.1	0.002
CatBoost (tuned)	0.534	284.7	9065.2	0.002
LightGBM (tuned + ensemble)	0.534	268.7	3528.9	0.010
LightGBM (tuned)	0.566	304.2	3528.9	0.001
CatBoost (default)	0.586	341.2	456.8	0.002
MLP (tuned + ensemble)	0.594	402.5	5771.8	0.098
XGBoost (tuned + ensemble)	0.628	357.9	4972.7	0.013
MLP (tuned)	0.634	451.9	5771.8	0.014
XGBoost (tuned)	0.638	376.5	4972.7	0.002
FTTransformer (default)	0.690	532.1	567.4	0.003
LightGBM (default)	0.714	491.5	55.7	0.001
XGBoost (default)	0.734	522.2	75.1	0.002
MLP (default)	0.772	629.4	38.2	0.015
ExtraTrees (tuned + ensemble)	0.782	544.2	538.3	0.001
ExtraTrees (tuned)	0.802	572.5	538.3	0.000
RandomForest (tuned + ensemble)	0.803	578.3	1512.2	0.001
RandomForest (tuned)	0.816	598.0	1512.2	0.000
TabPFN (default)	0.837	731.9	3.8	0.016
LinearModel (tuned + ensemble)	0.855	873.8	612.4	0.038
LinearModel (tuned)	0.862	891.6	612.4	0.006
ExtraTrees (default)	0.883	788.6	3.0	0.000
RandomForest (default)	0.887	773.9	13.8	0.000
LinearModel (default)	0.899	940.1	7.1	0.014
KNeighbors (tuned + ensemble)	0.928	980.8	12.0	0.001
KNeighbors (tuned)	0.937	1016.5	12.0	0.000
KNeighbors (default)	0.973	1149.1	0.6	0.000

Similarly to Caruana ensemble selection described in Eq. 4, the method iteratively selects  $\mathcal{N} < \mathcal{M}$  configurations as follows

$$j_1 = \arg \min_{j_1 \in [\mathcal{M}]} \mathbb{E}_{i \sim [\mathcal{T}]} [\ell_{ij_1}^{(train)}], \quad j_n = \arg \min_{j_n \in [\mathcal{M}]} \mathbb{E}_{i \sim [\mathcal{T}]} [\min_{k \in [n]} \ell_{ijk}^{(train)}].$$

At each iteration, the method greedily picks the configuration that has the lowest average error when combined with previously selected configurations.

**Anytime portfolio.** Fitting portfolio configurations can be done in an *any-time* fashion given a fitting time budget. To do so, we evaluate portfolio configurations sequentially until the budget is exhausted and use only models trained up to this point to select an ensemble. In cases where the first configuration selected by the portfolio takes longer to run than the constraint, we instead report the result of a fast baseline as in Gijsbers et al. (2024).




Figure 4: Top: scatter plot of average normalized error (left) and rank (right) against fitting training time budget. Bottom: Critical difference (CD) diagram showing average rank between method selected and which methods are tied statistically by a horizontal bar.




Figure 5: Impact on normalized error when varying the (a) number of configurations per family, (b) number of training datasets, (c) portfolio size and (d) number of ensemble members.

**Evaluations.** We evaluate the anytime portfolio approach in a standard leave-one-out setting. When evaluating on the  $i$ -th dataset, we compute portfolio configurations on  $\mathcal{D} - 1$  training datasets by excluding the  $i$ -th test dataset to avoid potential leakage.

Results are reported in Tab. 1 when considering a 4h fitting budget constraint. Given that all AutoML baselines require only CPUs, we consider only CPU models and report results with portfolios including TabPFN and FT-Transformer separately in Appendix I.

We report both the performance of the best model according to validation error (Portfolio) and when ensembling the selected portfolio configurations (Portfolio (ensemble)). The portfolio combined with ensembling outperforms AutoGluon for both accuracy and latency given the same 4h fitting budget even without stacking. When picking the best model without ensembling, the portfolio still retains good performance and outperforms all frameworks other than AutoGluon.

In Fig. 4, we report the performance for different fitting budgets. Ensembles of portfolio configurations can beat all AutoML frameworks for all metrics for 1h, 4h and 24h budget without requiring stacking which allows to obtain a lower latency compared to AutoGluon. Critical difference (CD) diagrams from Demšar (2006) show that while Portfolio has better aggregate performance than other methods, AutoGluon and Portfolio are tied statistically and are the only methods that are statistically better than all baselines. Interestingly, a baseline consisting of tuning and ensembling CatBoost models is surprisingly strong and outperforms multiple AutoML methods. As in the previous section, all evaluations are obtained from pre-computed results in TabRepo.

**How much data is needed?** We have seen that TabRepo allows to learn portfolio configurations that can outperform state-of-the-art AutoML systems. Next, we analyze the question of how much data is needed for transfer learning to achieve strong results in two dimensions, namely: how many offline configurations and datasets are required to reach good performance? While important, these dimensions are rarely analyzed in previous transfer learning studies due to their significant cost.

In Fig. 5, we vary both of those dimensions independently with a budget of 4h for all methods. When evaluating on a test dataset, we pick a random subset of configurations  $\mathcal{M}'$  per model family in the first case (5a) and a random subset of  $\mathcal{D}' < \mathcal{D}$  datasets in the second case (5b) and report mean and standard error over 10 different seeds. Portfolio with ensembling starts outperforming AutoGluon at around 10 configurations or training datasets. Having more datasets or more configurations in offline data both improve the final performance up to a certain point with a saturating effect around 150 offline configurations or offline datasets.

Next, we investigate the impact of the portfolio size in Fig. 5c. We observe that a portfolio of size 3 is sufficient to outperform all AutoML systems except AutoGluon, and a portfolio of size 15 is sufficient to outperform AutoGluon, with consistent benefit with increasing portfolio size. An in-depth analysis of model family pick order in the Portfolio is provided in Appendix G.

Finally, we investigate the impact of the number of selected models in the ensemble defined in Eq. 4 in Fig. 5d. While AutoML systems typically use large values (for instance AutoGluon uses 100 iterations), we demonstrate that the best performance is achieved at a mere 15 iterations, with more iterations having no measurable improvement.

## 6 Conclusion

In this paper, we introduced TabRepo, a benchmark of tabular models on a large number of datasets. Critically, the repository contains not only model evaluations but also predictions which allows to efficiently evaluate ensemble strategies. We showed that the benchmark can be used to analyze the performance of different tuning strategies combined with ensembling at marginal cost. We also showed how the dataset can be used to learn portfolio configurations that outperforms state-of-the-art tabular methods for accuracy, training time and latency.

The repository can also be used to improve real-world systems. To illustrate this, we report the 2023 AMLB results (Gijsbers et al., 2024) in Tab. 2. In addition, we evaluated AutoGluon using portfolio configurations learned from TabRepo. Combining AutoGluon with a fixed learned portfolio outperforms all current systems with a win-rate of 67% compared to the best system, establishing a new state-of-the-art. This illustrates a key application of TabRepo: to improve AutoML systems. AutoGluon 1.0 has adopted TabRepo’s learned portfolio as its new default<sup>5</sup>, replacing the prior hand-crafted default configuration.

The code for accessing evaluations from TabRepo and evaluating any ensemble together with the scripts used to generate all the paper results are available in the [GitHub repository](#). We hope this paper will facilitate future research on new methods combining ideas from CASH, multi-fidelity and transfer-learning to further improve the state-of-the-art in tabular prediction.

Table 2: Performance of AutoGluon combined with portfolios on AMLB.

method	win-rate	loss reduc.
AG + Portfolio (ours)	-	0%
AG	67%	2.8%
MLJAR	81%	22.5%
lightautoml	83%	11.7%
GAMA	86%	15.5%
FLAML	87%	16.3%
autosklearn	89%	11.8%
H2OAutoML	92%	10.3%
CatBoost	94%	18.1%
TunedRandomForest	94%	22.9%
RandomForest	97%	25.0%
XGBoost	98%	20.9%
LightGBM	98%	23.6%

<sup>5</sup> [AutoGluon 1.0 Portfolio](#) | [AutoGluon 1.0 TabRepo Release Highlight](#)

## 7 Broader Impact Statement

Generating initial results for offline configurations is expensive. In total, 219136 CPU hours were needed to complete all model evaluations of TabRepo. However, performing the analysis done in this paper without leveraging precomputed evaluations and predictions would have required 4066576 CPU hours which is  $\sim 18.6$  times more expensive. Using precomputed predictions from TabRepo enables researchers to obtain results requiring model interactions (such as ensembling) 10000x cheaper than retraining the base models from scratch. We hope that the research community will use TabRepo to experiment on more ideas which would further amortize its cost.

Collecting results on more models and datasets improves final performance as seen in Fig. 5. This incentivizes researchers to use even larger collections of datasets which makes checking the ethical aspect of each dataset more challenging. This is a burning issue in the case of foundation models which requires gathering large datasets and is in tension with checking thoroughly ethical aspects for all datasets (Birhane et al., 2021). For TabRepo, we checked the license and ethic aspects for each dataset but finding a solution to verify a large collection of datasets is an open problem.

One limitation of our work is that we are not taking advantage of dataset features as opposed to previous work (Jomaa et al., 2021). We believe future work could leverage our repository and improve results further by looking at advanced techniques to exploit dataset statistics in the context of ensembling.

Finally, we considered random configurations for each model family which restricts the performance given that model-based approaches can be more efficient. Future work could investigate more efficient approaches such as model-based or multi-fidelity as in Winkelmolen et al. (2020) to generate more performant configurations for all model families.

**Acknowledgements** We thank Garrett Idler for his contribution to make the computation of the receiver operating characteristic curve much faster in C++ and also Wenming Ye, Cedric Archambeau and Jacek Golebiovski for their support. Finally, we thank OpenML and AutoMLBenchmark which were very important for this work.

## References

Arango, S. P., Ferreira, F., Kadra, A., and Grabocka, F. H. J. (2023). Quick-tune: Quickly learning which pretrained model to finetune and how. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.03828*.

Birhane, A., Prabhu, V. U., and Kahembwe, E. (2021). Multimodal datasets: misogyny, pornography, and malignant stereotypes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.01963*.

Borchert, O., Salinas, D., Flunkert, V., Januschowski, T., and Günnemann, S. (2022). Multi-objective model selection for time series forecasting.

Breiman, L. (1996). Bagging predictors. *Machine learning*, 24:123–140.

Breiman, L. (2001). Random forests. *Machine learning*, 45:5–32.

Caruana, R., Niculescu-Mizil, A., Crew, G., and Ksikes, A. (2004). Ensemble selection from libraries of models. In *Proceedings of the twenty-first international conference on Machine learning*, page 18.

Chen, T. and Guestrin, C. (2016). Xgboost: A scalable tree boosting system. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 785–794.

Demšar, J. (2006). Statistical comparisons of classifiers over multiple data sets. *The Journal of Machine learning research*, 7:1–30.

Dong, X. and Yang, Y. (2020). NAS-Bench-201: Extending the scope of reproducible neural architecture search. Technical Report arXiv:2001.00326 [cs.CV].

Eggensperger, K., Müller, P., Mallik, N., Feurer, M., Sass, R., Klein, A., Awad, N., Lindauer, M., and Hutter, F. (2021). Hpobench: A collection of reproducible multi-fidelity benchmark problems for hpo. In *Thirty-fifth Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track (Round 2)*.

Erickson, N., Mueller, J., Shirkov, A., Zhang, H., Larroy, P., Li, M., and Smola, A. (2020). Autogluon-tabular: Robust and accurate automl for structured data.

Feurer, M., Eggensperger, K., Falkner, S., Lindauer, M., and Hutter, F. (2022). Auto-sklearn 2.0: Hands-free automl via meta-learning. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 23(261):1–61.

Feurer, M., Klein, A., Eggensperger, K., Springenberg, J., Blum, M., and Hutter, F. (2015). Efficient and robust automated machine learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 28.

Friedman, J. H. (2001). Greedy function approximation: a gradient boosting machine. *Annals of statistics*, pages 1189–1232.

Geurts, P., Ernst, D., and Wehenkel, L. (2006). Extremely randomized trees. *Machine learning*, 63:3–42.

Gijsbers, P., Bueno, M. L. P., Coors, S., LeDell, E., Poirier, S., Thomas, J., Bischl, B., and Vanschoren, J. (2024). Amlb: an automl benchmark. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 25(101):1–65.

Gijsbers, P. and Vanschoren, J. (2021). *GAMA: A General Automated Machine Learning Assistant*, page 560–564. Springer International Publishing.

Gorishniy, Y., Rubachev, I., Kartashev, N., Shlenskii, D., Kotelnikov, A., and Babenko, A. (2023). Tabr: Tabular deep learning meets nearest neighbors in 2023.

Gorishniy, Y., Rubachev, I., Khrulkov, V., and Babenko, A. (2021). Revisiting deep learning models for tabular data. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:18932–18943.

Grinsztajn, L., Oyallon, E., and Varoquaux, G. (2022). Why do tree-based models still outperform deep learning on tabular data?

Hearst, M. A., Dumais, S. T., Osuna, E., Platt, J., and Scholkopf, B. (1998). Support vector machines. *IEEE Intelligent Systems and their applications*, 13(4):18–28.

Herbold, S. (2020). Autorank: A python package for automated ranking of classifiers. *Journal of Open Source Software*, 5(48):2173.

Hollmann, N., Müller, S., Eggensperger, K., and Hutter, F. (2022). TabPFN: A transformer that solves small tabular classification problems in a second. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.01848*.

Hutter, F., Hoos, H., and Leyton-Brown, K. (2014). An efficient approach for assessing hyperparameter importance. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 754–762. PMLR.

Jomaa, H. S., Schmidt-Thieme, L., and Grabocka, J. (2021). Dataset2vec: Learning dataset meta-features. *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, 35:964–985.

Ke, G., Meng, Q., Finley, T., Wang, T., Chen, W., Ma, W., Ye, Q., and Liu, T.-Y. (2017). Lightgbm: A highly efficient gradient boosting decision tree. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30.

Klein, A. and Hutter, F. (2019). Tabular benchmarks for joint architecture and hyperparameter optimization. Technical Report arXiv:1905.04970 [cs.LG].

LeDell, E. and Poirier, S. (2020). H2o automl: Scalable automatic machine learning. In *Proceedings of the AutoML Workshop at ICML*, volume 2020. ICML.

McElfresh, D., Khandagale, S., Valverde, J., Ramakrishnan, G., Prasad, V., Goldblum, M., and White, C. (2023). When do neural nets outperform boosted trees on tabular data? In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.

Mohr, F. and Wever, M. (2022). Naive Automated Machine Learning. *Machine Learning*, 112:1131–1170.

Olson, R. S. and Moore, J. H. (2019). *TPOT: A Tree-Based Pipeline Optimization Tool for Automating Machine Learning*, pages 151–160. Springer International Publishing, Cham.

Płońska, A. and Płoński, P. (2021). Mljar: State-of-the-art automated machine learning framework for tabular data. version 0.10.3.

Prokhorenkova, L., Gusev, G., Vorobev, A., Dorogush, A. V., and Gulin, A. (2018). Catboost: unbiased boosting with categorical features. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 31.

Purucker, L. and Beel, J. (2022). Assembled-openML: Creating efficient benchmarks for ensembles in autoML with openML. In *First International Conference on Automated Machine Learning (Late-Breaking Workshop)*.

Purucker, L. and Beel, J. (2023). CMA-ES for post hoc ensembling in autoML: A great success and salvageable failure. In *AutoML Conference 2023*.

Thornton, C., Hutter, F., Hoos, H. H., and Leyton-Brown, K. (2013). Auto-WEKA: Combined selection and hyperparameter optimization of classification algorithms. In *Proc. of KDD-2013*, pages 847–855.

Vakhrushev, A., Ryzhkov, A., Savchenko, M., Simakov, D., Damdinov, R., and Tuzhilin, A. (2021). Lightautoml: Automl solution for a large financial services ecosystem. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.01528*.

Vanschoren, J., van Rijn, J. N., Bischl, B., and Torgo, L. (2014). Openml: Networked science in machine learning. *SIGKDD Explor. Newsl.*, 15(2):49–60.

Wang, C., Wu, Q., Weimer, M., and Zhu, E. (2021). Flaml: A fast and lightweight automl library. *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems*, 3:434–447.

Winkelmolen, F., Ivkin, N., Bozkurt, H. F., and Karnin, Z. (2020). Practical and sample efficient zero-shot hpo. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.13382*.

Wistuba, M., Schilling, N., and Schmidt-Thieme, L. (2015). Learning hyperparameter optimization initializations. In *2015 IEEE International Conference on Data Science and Advanced Analytics (DSAA)*, pages 1–10.

Wolpert, D. H. (1992). Stacked generalization. *Neural networks*, 5(2):241–259.

Xu, L., Hoos, H., and Leyton-Brown, K. (2010). Hydra: Automatically configuring algorithms for portfolio-based selection. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 24, pages 210–216.

Yang, A., Esperança, P. M., and Carlucci, F. M. (2020). Nas evaluation is frustratingly hard.

Ying, C., Klein, A., Christiansen, E., Real, E., Murphy, K., and Hutter, F. (2019). NAS-bench-101: Towards reproducible neural architecture search. In Chaudhuri, K. and Salakhutdinov, R., editors, *Proceedings of the 36th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 97 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 7105–7114. PMLR.

Zhu, B., Shi, X., Erickson, N., Li, M., Karypis, G., and Shoaran, M. (2023). Xtab: Cross-table pretraining for tabular transformers.

Zimmer, L., Lindauer, M., and Hutter, F. (2021). Auto-pytorch tabular: Multi-fidelity metalearning for efficient and robust autodl.

## Submission Checklist

### 1. For all authors...

- (a) Do the main claims made in the abstract and introduction accurately reflect the paper’s contributions and scope? **[Yes]** We demonstrate the benefits of TabRepo in our work, and show state-of-the-art results.
- (b) Did you describe the limitations of your work? **[Yes]** Refer to the Conclusion and Broader Impact Statement sections.
- (c) Did you discuss any potential negative societal impacts of your work? **[Yes]** Refer to the Broader Impact Statement section.
- (d) Did you read the ethics review guidelines and ensure that your paper conforms to them? <https://2022.automl.cc/ethics-accessibility/> **[Yes]** We have read and followed the ethics review guidelines and ensure our paper conforms to them.

### 2. If you ran experiments...

- (a) Did you use the same evaluation protocol for all methods being compared (e.g., same benchmarks, data (sub)sets, available resources)? **[Yes]** For all methods except for FT-Transformer which requires a GPU to provide results in reasonable budget. Results with FT-Transformer are presented separately in the appendix as they require a GPU as opposed to other methods. Similarly, TabPFN also used GPU and results are presented in the Appendix.
- (b) Did you specify all the necessary details of your evaluation (e.g., data splits, pre-processing, search spaces, hyperparameter tuning)? **[Yes]** In the main text and additionally in Appendix A
- (c) Did you repeat your experiments (e.g., across multiple random seeds or splits) to account for the impact of randomness in your methods or data? **[Yes]** Refer to Fig. 5 where we used 10 random seeds. We also used 3 folds for all datasets.
- (d) Did you report the uncertainty of your results (e.g., the variance across random seeds or splits)? **[Yes]** Refer to Fig. 5.
- (e) Did you report the statistical significance of your results? **[Yes]** We reported critical diagrams which shows statistical significance between different methods.
- (f) Did you use tabular or surrogate benchmarks for in-depth evaluations? **[Yes]** TabRepo is a Tabular benchmark.
- (g) Did you compare performance over time and describe how you selected the maximum duration? **[Yes]** Refer to Fig. 4 for runtime comparisons. We use 4 hours as the typical max duration to align with AutoMLBenchmark. We use 24 hours for ablation studies in some cases.
- (h) Did you include the total amount of compute and the type of resources used (e.g., type of GPUs, internal cluster, or cloud provider)? **[Yes]** Refer to the Broader Impact Statement section.
- (i) Did you run ablation studies to assess the impact of different components of your approach? **[Yes]** Refer to Fig. 5

### 3. With respect to the code used to obtain your results...

- (a) Did you include the code, data, and instructions needed to reproduce the main experimental results, including all requirements (e.g., requirements.txt with explicit versions), random

seeds, an instructive README with installation, and execution commands (either in the supplemental material or as a URL)? [\[Yes\]](#) The full code and reproduction instructions are available in the main README.md at <https://github.com/autogluon/tabrepo>

- (b) Did you include a minimal example to replicate results on a small subset of the experiments or on toy data? [\[Yes\]](#) Minimal example scripts are available in this directory and can be executed quickly on a laptop: <https://github.com/autogluon/tabrepo/tree/main/examples>. We further provide a colab notebook to simplify reproducibility: [https://colab.research.google.com/github/autogluon/tabrepo/blob/main/examples/TabRepo\\_Reproducibility.ipynb](https://colab.research.google.com/github/autogluon/tabrepo/blob/main/examples/TabRepo_Reproducibility.ipynb)
- (c) Did you ensure sufficient code quality and documentation so that someone else can execute and understand your code? [\[Yes\]](#) Our code is heavily tested and includes an automated CI/CD pipeline: <https://github.com/autogluon/tabrepo/tree/main/tst>
- (d) Did you include the raw results of running your experiments with the given code, data, and instructions? [\[Yes\]](#) Refer to Appendix D.
- (e) Did you include the code, additional data, and instructions needed to generate the figures and tables in your paper based on the raw results? [\[Yes\]](#) Refer to Appendix D.

4. If you used existing assets (e.g., code, data, models)...

- (a) Did you cite the creators of used assets? [\[Yes\]](#) We cite all datasets, models, and code sources.
- (b) Did you discuss whether and how consent was obtained from people whose data you're using/curating if the license requires it? NA
- (c) Did you discuss whether the data you are using/curating contains personally identifiable information or offensive content? [\[Yes\]](#) The data does not contain personally identifiable information. All datasets are sourced from OpenML and have had their licenses and content checked for safety.

5. If you created/released new assets (e.g., code, data, models)...

- (a) Did you mention the license of the new assets (e.g., as part of your code submission)? [\[Yes\]](#) TabRepo is available under the Apache 2.0 license, along with the raw data.
- (b) Did you include the new assets either in the supplemental material or as a URL (to, e.g., GitHub or Hugging Face)? [\[Yes\]](#) It is available at <https://github.com/autogluon/tabrepo>

6. If you used crowdsourcing or conducted research with human subjects...

- (a) Did you include the full text of instructions given to participants and screenshots, if applicable? NA
- (b) Did you describe any potential participant risks, with links to Institutional Review Board (IRB) approvals, if applicable? NA
- (c) Did you include the estimated hourly wage paid to participants and the total amount spent on participant compensation? NA

7. If you included theoretical results...

- (a) Did you state the full set of assumptions of all theoretical results? NA
- (b) Did you include complete proofs of all theoretical results? NA

## A Additional experiment details

**Number of Caruana Steps.** In all our experiments, we set the number of Caruana steps to  $\mathcal{C} = 40$  when building ensembles of base models or portfolio configurations. We observe that values beyond 40 provide negligible benefit while linearly increasing the runtime of simulations in TabRepo. We also note that in our ablations in Fig. 5d we observe that  $\mathcal{C} = 15$  achieves the best normalized-error value, and values between 25 and 200 achieve nearly identical results.

**Fallback method.** We use the default configuration of Extra-trees as a backup when the first configuration of a portfolio does not finish under the constraint which takes just a few seconds to evaluate.

**Number of portfolio configurations.** When reporting results on a portfolio, we apply the anytime procedure described in Sec 5 and run at most  $\mathcal{N} = 200$  portfolio configurations. Setting this bound serves mostly as an upper-bound as all configurations are almost never evaluated given that all configurations have to be trained under the fitting budget.

**Hardware details.** All model configuration and AutoML framework results were obtained on AWS EC2 machines via AutoMLBenchmark’s AWS mode functionality. For all model and AutoML evaluations, we used m6i.2xlarge EC2 instances with 100 GB of gp3 storage. These instances have 8 virtual CPUs (4 physical CPUs) and 32 GB of memory. The Python version used for all experiments was 3.9.18. We chose m6i.2xlarge instances to align with AutoMLBenchmark’s choice of m5.2xlarge instances. m5 instances have the same number of CPUs and memory, but the m6i instances were more cost-efficient due to faster CPUs.

All simulation paper experiments in Sec. 4 and 5 were done on a m6i.32xlarge and takes less than 3 hours of compute. It can also be done with an m6i.4xlarge which takes less than 24 hours.

**Critical difference diagrams.** We use Autorank (Herbold, 2020) to compute critical difference diagrams.

**Data-structure.** TabRepo takes 107 GB on disk. To avoid requiring large memory cost, we use a memmap data-structure which loads model evaluations on the fly from disk to memory when needed. This allows to reduce the RAM requirement to  $\sim 20$ GB of RAM.

## B API

In Listing 1, we show an example of calling TabRepo to retrieve the ensemble performance of a list of models. Because we store all model predictions, we are able to reconstruct the metrics of any ensemble among the  $\mathcal{M} = 1310$  models considered.

```

1 from tabrepo import EvaluationRepository
2
3 # load TabRepo with 200 datasets, 3 folds and 1530 configurations
4 repository = EvaluationRepository.from_context(version="D244_F3_C1530_200")
5
6 # returns in ~2s the tensor of metrics for each dataset/fold obtained after
7 # ensembling the given configurations
8 metrics = repository.evaluate_ensemble(
9     datasets=["balance-scale", "page-blocks"], # dataset to report results on
10    folds=[0, 1, 2], # which folds to consider for each dataset
11    configs=["CatBoost_r42_BAG_L1", "NeuralNetTorch_r40_BAG_L1"], # configs that
12    # are ensembled
13    ensemble_size=40, # maximum number of Caruana steps
14 )
15
16 # returns the predictions on the val data for a given task and config

```

```

15 val_predictions = repository.predict_val(
16     dataset="page-blocks", fold=2, config="ExtraTrees_r7_BAG_L1"
17 )
18
19 # returns the predictions on the test data for a given task and config
20 test_predictions = repository.predict_test(
21     dataset="page-blocks", fold=2, config="ExtraTrees_r7_BAG_L1"
22 )

```

Listing 1: Example of calling TabRepo to obtain performance scores on an ensemble configuration or model predictions on validation/test splits.

## C Dataset details

For selecting the datasets, we combined two prior tabular dataset suites. The first is from AutoML-Benchmark (Gijsbers et al., 2024), containing 104 datasets. The second is from the Auto-Sklearn 2 paper (Feurer et al., 2022), containing 208 datasets.

All datasets are publicly available via OpenML. After de-duplicating, the union contains 289 datasets. The AutoMLBenchmark datasets have been previously filtered from a larger set via a specific inclusion criteria detailed in section 5.1.1 of Gijsbers et al. (2024). Notably, they filter out datasets that are trivial, such that simple methods such as a random forest cannot perfectly solve them. We perform a similar operation by fitting a default Random Forest configuration on all 289 datasets and filtering any dataset that is trivial ( $AUC > 0.999$ ,  $\log \text{loss} < 0.001$ , or  $r^2 > 0.999$ ). After filtering trivial datasets, we are left with 244 datasets.

We then run all AutoML baselines and model configurations on the 244 datasets (3 folds, for a total of 732 tasks). We performed re-runs on failed tasks when necessary to attempt to get results on all models and AutoML systems for every dataset, but sometimes this was not possible due to problems such as out-of-memory errors or AutoML system implementation errors outside our control. For datasets with model or AutoML system failures, we exclude them. We exclude datasets rather than impute missing values to ensure the results being computed are fully verifiable and replicable in practice. After excluding datasets with model or AutoML system failures, we have 211 datasets remaining.

We make an exception to this exclusion criteria for the following cases:

- KNN fails due to the dataset not having numeric features.
- TabPFN fails due to the dataset having greater than 100 features or greater than 10 classes.
- FT-Transformer fails due to out-of-memory errors.

In the above special cases, we instead keep the dataset and will impute the result of the failed model using our default Extra-trees configuration.

Finally, we filter out the 11 largest datasets for practical usability purposes of TabRepo. This is because loading the prediction probabilities of 1310 model configurations on large (multi-class) datasets leads to significant challenges. As an example, the total size of the predictions for 211 datasets is 455 GB. By reducing to 200 datasets, the size decreases dramatically to 107 GB (The full 244 datasets is 4.5 TB).

In total, we use 105 binary classification datasets, 68 multi-class classification datasets and 27 regression datasets. We provide a table of dataset summary statistics in Tab. 3 and an exhaustive list of the 200 datasets used in TabRepo separated by problem type in Tab. 4, Tab. 5 and Tab. 6 where we list for each dataset the TaskID OpenML identifier, the dataset name, the number of rows  $n$ , the number of features  $f$  and the number of classes  $C$  which is always 2 for binary classification.

Table 3: Statistics of the 200 datasets in TabRepo

	n	f
mean	15097	570
std	38065	2161
min	100	3
5%	500	3
10%	575	5
25%	1107	10
50%	3800	20
75%	10027	60
90%	41173	506
95%	70472	1787
max	400000	10936

### C.1 Train-test splits

For all datasets we use the OpenML 10-fold Cross-validation estimation procedure and select the first 3 folds for our experiments. For each task (a particular dataset fold), we use 90% of the data as training and 10% as test. We use identical splits to Gijsbers et al. (2024).

## D Raw Results and Reproducibility

- To reproduce all paper results and to get the predictions of all model configs on all tasks, follow the README instructions here: <https://github.com/autogluon/tabrepo>
- The raw results for all model configs on all tasks are available here: [https://tabrepo.s3.us-west-2.amazonaws.com/contexts/2023\\_11\\_14/configs.csv](https://tabrepo.s3.us-west-2.amazonaws.com/contexts/2023_11_14/configs.csv)
- The raw results for all baselines and AutoML systems on all tasks are available here: [https://tabrepo.s3.us-west-2.amazonaws.com/contexts/2023\\_11\\_14/baselines.csv](https://tabrepo.s3.us-west-2.amazonaws.com/contexts/2023_11_14/baselines.csv)
- The raw results for all TabRepo experiments are available here: <https://tabrepo.s3.us-west-2.amazonaws.com/paper/automl2024/results.zip>
- To generate the raw results of new model configs on new datasets, refer to this example script: [https://github.com/autogluon/tabrepo/blob/main/examples/run\\_quickstart\\_from\\_scratch.py](https://github.com/autogluon/tabrepo/blob/main/examples/run_quickstart_from_scratch.py)
- To regenerate all of the pre-computed results for all model configs and AutoML baselines (minimum 500,000 CPU hours across 92,000 EC2 instances), refer to these instructions: [https://github.com/autogluon/tabrepo/blob/main/examples/run\\_quickstart\\_from\\_scratch.py](https://github.com/autogluon/tabrepo/blob/main/examples/run_quickstart_from_scratch.py)
- The script used to generate Fig. 2 is available here: [https://github.com/Innixma/autogluon-benchmark/blob/master/v1\\_results/run\\_eval\\_tabrepo\\_v1.py](https://github.com/Innixma/autogluon-benchmark/blob/master/v1_results/run_eval_tabrepo_v1.py)

## E Model details

For each model type, we used the latest available package versions when possible. The precise versions used for each model are documented in Tab. 7.

For each model family, we choose 201 configurations, 1 being the default hyperparameters, as well as 200 randomly selected hyperparameter configs.

Table 4: Binary classification datasets used in TabRepo.

Task ID	name	n	f	C	Task ID	name	n	f	C
3593	2dplanes	40768	10	2	3783	fri_c2_500_50	500	50	2
168868	APSFailure	76000	170	2	3606	fri_c3_1000_10	1000	10	2
359979	Amazon_employee_acce	32769	9	2	3581	fri_c3_1000_25	1000	25	2
146818	Australian	690	14	2	3799	fri_c3_500_10	500	10	2
359967	Bioresponse	3751	1776	2	3800	fri_c3_500_50	500	50	2
359992	Click_prediction_sma	39948	11	2	3608	fri_c4_500_100	500	100	2
361331	GAMETES_Epistasis_2-	1600	1000	2	3764	fried	40768	10	2
361332	GAMETES_Epistasis_2-	1600	20	2	189922	gina	3153	970	2
361333	GAMETES_Epistasis_2-	1600	20	2	9970	hill-valley	1212	100	2
361334	GAMETES_Epistasis_3-	1600	20	2	3892	hiva_agnostic	4229	1617	2
361335	GAMETES_Heterogeneity	1600	20	2	3688	houses	20640	8	2
361336	GAMETES_Heterogeneity	1600	20	2	9971	ilpd	583	10	2
359966	Internet-Advertiseeme	3279	1558	2	168911	jasmine	2984	144	2
359990	MiniBooNE	130064	50	2	3904	jm1	10885	21	2
3995	OVA_Colon	1545	10935	2	359962	kc1	2109	21	2
3976	OVA_Endometrium	1545	10935	2	3913	kc2	522	21	2
3968	OVA_Kidney	1545	10935	2	3704	kdd_el_nino-small	782	8	2
3964	OVA_Lung	1545	10935	2	3844	kdd_internet_usage	10108	68	2
4000	OVA_Ovary	1545	10935	2	359991	kick	72983	32	2
3980	OVA_Prostate	1545	10936	2	3672	kin8nm	8192	8	2
359971	PhishingWebsites	11055	30	2	190392	madeline	3140	259	2
361342	Run_or_walk_informat	88588	6	2	9976	madelon	2600	500	2
359975	Satellite	5100	36	2	3483	mammography	11183	6	2
125968	SpeedDating	8378	120	2	3907	mc1	9466	38	2
361339	Titanic	2201	3	2	3623	meta	528	21	2
190411	ada	4147	48	2	3899	mozilla4	15545	5	2
359983	adult	48842	14	2	3749	no2	500	7	2
3600	aileron	13750	40	2	35980	nomao	34465	118	2
190412	arcene	100	10000	2	167120	numerai28.6	96320	21	2
3812	arsenic-female-bladd	559	4	2	190137	ozone-level-8hr	2534	72	2
9909	autoUniv-au1-1000	1000	20	2	361341	parity5_plus_5	1124	10	2
359982	bank-marketing	45211	16	2	3667	pbcseq	1945	18	2
3698	bank32nh	8192	32	2	3918	pc1	1109	21	2
3591	bank8FM	8192	8	2	3919	pc2	5589	36	2
359955	blood-transfusion-se	748	4	2	3903	pc3	1563	37	2
3690	boston_corrected	506	20	2	359958	pc4	1458	37	2
359968	churn	5000	20	2	190410	philippine	5832	308	2
146819	climate-model-simula	540	20	2	168350	phoneme	5404	5	2
3793	colleges_usnews	1302	33	2	3616	pm10	500	7	2
3627	cpu_act	8192	21	2	3735	pollen	3848	5	2
3601	cpu_small	8192	12	2	3618	puma32H	8192	32	2
168757	credit-g	1000	20	2	3681	puma8NH	8192	8	2
14954	cylinder-bands	540	39	2	359956	qsar-biodeg	1055	41	2
3668	delta_aileron	7129	5	2	9959	ringnorm	7400	20	2
3684	delta_elevators	9517	6	2	3583	rmftsa_ladata	508	10	2
37	diabetes	768	8	2	43	spambase	4601	57	2
125920	dresses-sales	500	12	2	359972	sylvine	5124	20	2
9983	eeg-eye-state	14980	14	2	361340	tokyo1	959	44	2
219	electricity	45312	8	2	9943	twonorm	7400	20	2
3664	fri_c0_1000_5	1000	5	2	3786	visualizing_soil	8641	4	2
3747	fri_c0_500_5	500	5	2	146820	wilt	4839	5	2
3702	fri_c1_1000_50	1000	50	2	3712	wind	6574	14	2
3766	fri_c2_1000_25	1000	25	2					

The search spaces used are based on the search spaces defined in AutoGluon. We expanded the search range of various hyperparameters for increased model variety. Note that selecting the appropriate search space is a complex problem, and is not the focus of this work. TabRepo is built to work with arbitrary model configurations, and we welcome the research community to improve upon our initial baselines.

For all models we re-use the AutoGluon implementation for data pre-processing, initial hyperparameters, training, and prediction. We do this because choosing the appropriate pre-processing logic for an individual model is complex and introduces a myriad of design questions and potential pitfalls.

For maximum training epochs / iterations, instead of searching for an optimal value directly, we instead rely on the early stopping logic implemented in AutoGluon which sets the iterations to 10,000 for gradient boosting models and epochs to 500 for MLP.

Table 5: Multi-class classification datasets used in TabRepo.

Task ID	name	n	f	C	Task ID	name	n	f	C
211986	Diabetes130US	101766	49	3	6	letter	20000	16	26
359970	GesturePhaseSegmenta	9873	32	5	359961	mfeat-factors	2000	216	10
360859	Indian_pines	9144	220	8	359953	micro-mass	571	1300	20
125921	LED-display-domain-7	500	7	10	189773	microaggregation2	20000	20	5
146800	MiceProtein	1080	81	8	359993	okcupid-stem	50789	19	3
361330	Traffic_violations	70340	20	3	28	optdigits	5620	64	10
168300	UMIST_Faces_Cropped	575	10304	20	30	page-blocks	5473	10	5
3549	analcatdata_authorsh	841	70	4	32	pendigits	10992	16	10
3560	analcatdata_dmft	797	4	6	359986	robert	10000	7200	10
14963	artificial-character	10218	7	10	2074	satimage	6430	36	6
9904	autoUniv-aug-750	750	40	8	359963	segment	2310	19	7
9906	autoUniv-augt-1100	1100	12	5	9964	semeion	1593	256	10
9905	autoUniv-augt-700	700	12	3	359987	shuttle	58000	9	7
11	balance-scale	625	4	3	41	soybean	683	35	19
2077	baseball	1340	16	3	45	splice	3190	60	3
359960	car	1728	6	4	168784	steel-plates-fault	1941	27	7
9979	cardiotocography	2126	35	10	3512	synthetic_control	600	60	6
359959	cmc	1473	9	3	125922	texture	5500	40	11
359957	cnae-9	1080	856	9	190146	vehicle	846	18	4
146802	collins	1000	23	30	9924	volcanoes-a2	1623	3	5
359977	connect-4	67557	42	3	9925	volcanoes-a3	1521	3	5
168909	dilbert	10000	2000	5	9926	volcanoes-a4	1515	3	5
359964	dna	3186	180	3	9927	volcanoes-b1	10176	3	5
359954	eucalyptus	736	19	5	9928	volcanoes-b2	10668	3	5
3897	eye_movements	10936	27	3	9931	volcanoes-b5	9989	3	5
168910	fabert	8237	800	7	9932	volcanoes-b6	10130	3	5
359969	first-order-theorem-	6118	51	6	9920	volcanoes-d1	8753	3	5
14970	har	10299	561	6	9923	volcanoes-d4	8654	3	5
3481	isolet	7797	617	26	9915	volcanoes-e1	1183	3	5
211979	jannis	83733	54	4	359985	volkert	58310	180	10
359981	jungle_chess_2pcs_ra	44819	6	3	9960	wall-robot-navigatio	5456	24	4
9972	kr-vs-k	28056	6	18	58	waveform-5000	5000	40	3
2076	kropt	28056	6	18	361345	wine-quality-red	1599	11	6
361344	led24	3200	24	10	359974	wine-quality-white	4898	11	7

Table 6: Regression datasets used in TabRepo.

Task ID	name	n	f	Task ID	name	n	f
233212	Allstate_Claims_Seve	188318	130	359952	house_16H	22784	16
359938	Brazilian_houses	10692	12	359951	house_prices_nominal	1460	79
360945	MIP-2016-regression	1090	144	359949	house_sales	21613	21
233215	Mercedes_Benz_Greene	4209	376	359946	pol	15000	48
167210	Moneyball	1232	14	359930	quake	2178	3
359941	OnlineNewsPopularity	39644	59	359931	sensory	576	11
359948	SAT11-HAND-runtime-r	4440	116	359932	socmb	1156	5
317614	Yolanda	400000	100	359933	space_ga	3107	6
359944	abalone	4177	8	359934	tecator	240	124
359937	black_friday	166821	9	359939	topo_2_1	8885	266
359950	boston	506	13	359945	us_crime	1994	126
359942	colleges	7063	44	359935	wine_quality	6497	11
233211	diamonds	53940	9	359940	yprop_4_1	8885	251
359936	elevators	16599	18				

Table 7: Model versions.

model	benchmarked	latest	package	# configs	compute type
LightGBM	3.3.5	4.3.0	lightgbm	201	CPU
XGBoost	1.7.6	2.0.3	xgboost	201	CPU
CatBoost	1.2.1	1.2.3	catboost	201	CPU
RandomForest	1.1.1	1.4.1	scikit-learn	201	CPU
ExtraTrees	1.1.1	1.4.1	scikit-learn	201	CPU
LinearModel	1.1.1	1.4.1	scikit-learn	51	CPU
KNeighbors	1.1.1	1.4.1	scikit-learn	51	CPU
MLP	2.0.1	2.2.1	torch	201	CPU
FTTransformer	2.0.1	2.2.1	torch	1	GPU
TabPFN	0.1.7	0.1.10	tabPFN	1	GPU

## E.1 Model Config Hyperparameters

For a comprehensive list of each config's model hyperparameters for each family, refer to the config files located at the following link: <https://github.com/autogluon/tabrepo/tree/main/data/configs>

To regenerate these files, execute this script: [https://github.com/autogluon/tabrepo/blob/main/scripts/run\\_generate\\_all\\_configs.py](https://github.com/autogluon/tabrepo/blob/main/scripts/run_generate_all_configs.py)

To see the exact search spaces used, refer to the files located here: <https://github.com/autogluon/tabrepo/tree/main/tabrepo/models>

## E.2 MLP

The MLP used in this work is the one introduced in Erickson et al. (2020) and is implemented in PyTorch. We use a max epochs of 500 and AutoGluon's default early stopping logic.

```
1 {
2     'learning_rate': Real(1e-4, 3e-2, default=3e-4, log=True),
3     'weight_decay': Real(1e-12, 0.1, default=1e-6, log=True),
4     'dropout_prob': Real(0.0, 0.4, default=0.1),
5     'use_batchnorm': Categorical(False, True),
6     'num_layers': Int(1, 5, default=2),
7     'hidden_size': Int(8, 256, default=128),
8     'activation': Categorical('relu', 'elu'),
9 }
```

## E.3 CatBoost

For CatBoost we use a max iterations of 10000 and AutoGluon's default early stopping logic.

```
1 {
2     'learning_rate': Real(lower=5e-3, upper=0.1, default=0.05, log=True),
3     'depth': Int(lower=4, upper=8, default=6),
4     'l2_leaf_reg': Real(lower=1, upper=5, default=3),
5     'max_ctr_complexity': Int(lower=1, upper=5, default=4),
6     'one_hot_max_size': Categorical(2, 3, 5, 10),
7     'grow_policy': Categorical("SymmetricTree", "Depthwise"),
8 }
```

## E.4 LightGBM

For LightGBM we use a max iterations of 10000 and AutoGluon's default early stopping logic.

```
1 {
2     'learning_rate': Real(lower=5e-3, upper=0.1, default=0.05, log=True),
3     'feature_fraction': Real(lower=0.4, upper=1.0, default=1.0),
4     'min_data_in_leaf': Int(lower=2, upper=60, default=20),
5     'num_leaves': Int(lower=16, upper=255, default=31),
6     'extra_trees': Categorical(False, True),
7 }
```

## E.5 XGBoost

For XGBoost we use a max iterations of 10000 and AutoGluon's default early stopping logic.

```
1 {
2     'learning_rate': Real(lower=5e-3, upper=0.1, default=0.1, log=True),
3     'max_depth': Int(lower=4, upper=10, default=6),
4     'min_child_weight': Real(0.5, 1.5, default=1.0),
5     'colsample_bytree': Real(0.5, 1.0, default=1.0),
6     'enable_categorical': Categorical(True, False),
7 }
```

## E.6 Extra-trees

For all Extra Trees models we use 300 trees.

```
1 {
2     'max_leaf_nodes': Int(5000, 50000),
3     'min_samples_leaf': Categorical(1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 20, 40, 80),
4     'max_features': Categorical('sqrt', 'log2', 0.5, 0.75, 1.0)
5 }
```

## E.7 Random-forest

For all Random Forest models we use 300 trees.

```
1 {
2     'max_leaf_nodes': Int(5000, 50000),
3     'min_samples_leaf': Categorical(1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10, 20, 40, 80),
4     'max_features': Categorical('sqrt', 'log2', 0.5, 0.75, 1.0)
5 }
```

## E.8 Linear

```
1 {
2     "C": Real(lower=0.1, upper=1e3, default=1),
3     "proc.skew_threshold": Categorical(0.99, 0.9, 0.999, None),
4     "proc.impute_strategy": Categorical("median", "mean"),
5     "penalty": Categorical("L2", "L1"),
6 }
```

## E.9 KNN

```
1 {
2     'n_neighbors': Categorical(3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 13, 15, 20, 30, 40, 50)
3     ,
4     'weights': Categorical('uniform', 'distance'),
5     'p': Categorical(2, 1),
6 }
```

## E.10 TabPFN

We use the default setting for TabPFN and did not run additional configs. We tested specifying `N_ensemble_configurations` to values above 1 which saw marginal improvement, but decided to keep only the default to simplify comparisons. TabPFN is intended for datasets with at most 1000 rows of training data, whereas TabRepo's dataset suite includes many datasets with far more than 1000 rows. Because of this, we emphasize that our findings are not representative of TabPFN's ideal usage scenario, but we include TabPFN to improve the comprehensiveness of our work.

## E.11 FT-Transformer

We use the default setting for FT-Transformer and did not run additional configs. We use the AutoGluon implementation of FT-Transformer, which may have slight differences from the original implementation. We ran FT-Transformer on a GPU instance to enable it to train on more datasets to completion. Because we used a GPU instance, our Portfolio reported in the main text does not include FT-Transformer. We did not run additional configs due to cost reasons, as GPU instances are significantly more expensive than CPU instances.

The default FT-Transformer hyperparameters are noted below.

```

1 {
2     "model.ft_transformer.n_blocks": 3,
3     "model.ft_transformer.d_token": 192,
4     "model.ft_transformer.adapter_output_feature": 192,
5     "model.ft_transformer.ffn_d_hidden": 192,
6     "optimization.learning_rate": 1e-4,
7     "optimization.weight_decay": 1e-5,
8 }

```

## F AutoML Framework Details

For each AutoML framework we attempted to use the latest available versions where possible. The precise versions used for each framework are documented in Tab. 8. All AutoML frameworks were ran with the configurations as in Gijsbers et al. (2024). For FLAML, version 2.0 released after we had ran the experiments.

### F.1 Excluded Frameworks

**MLJAR and GAMA.** We did not include the AutoML frameworks MLJAR (Płońska and Płoński, 2021) and GAMA (Gijsbers and Vanschoren, 2021) in the main results due to these frameworks having a significant number of implementation errors when running on the main TabRepo datasets in comparison to the other AutoML systems which had 0 failures. We did include them in Tab. 2 as we directly re-used the 2023 results from Gijsbers et al. (2024).

**NaiveAutoML.** NaiveAutoML (Mohr and Wever, 2022) is a recently introduced AutoML system that we did not include in TabRepo. This is because we ran AutoMLBenchmark using identical configurations to Gijsbers et al. (2024), which at the time had mentioned suboptimal settings related to NaiveAutoML's "EXECUTION\_TIMEOUT" parameter which they detail in their paper leading to poor results. In order to avoid misrepresenting NaiveAutoML's performance, we decided to exclude it due to the configuration issues. After running our experiments, we later learned from the NaiveAutoML authors that the issues within AMLB had been resolved, but due to a lack of compute budget to re-run experiments NaiveAutoML had not been re-run with the fixed version in Gijsbers et al. (2024). We will consider adding NaiveAutoML to the benchmarked frameworks in future iterations of TabRepo with the author's recommended configuration.

**Auto-WEKA.** As done in Gijsbers et al. (2024), we exclude Auto-WEKA (Thornton et al., 2013) due to its performance and lack of updates in prior iterations of AMLB.

**TPOT.** We exclude TPOT (Olson and Moore, 2019) due to performance and stability issues, which led it to having a similar amount of failures as MLJAR and GAMA in Gijsbers et al. (2024).

### F.2 AutoGluon

We run AutoGluon with the "best\_quality" preset for all comparisons, as done in Gijsbers et al. (2024). This setting is used to achieve the strongest predictive quality.

In Tab. 2, we use AutoGluon 1.0 for comparisons. The learned portfolio used in AutoGluon 1.0 is Portfolio with size 100 as opposed to the Portfolio with size 200 used for comparison in Tab. 1. The size 100 Portfolio is slightly worse in accuracy, but achieves faster latency, faster training time, and lower disk space usage, which is why it was chosen as the default for AutoGluon 1.0. We use an m5.2xlarge instance for training AutoGluon on AMLB to replicate the compute used by other systems.

Table 8: AutoML framework versions.

framework	benchmarked	latest	package
AutoGluon	0.8.2	1.0.0	autogluon
auto-sklearn	0.15.0	0.15.0	auto-sklearn
auto-sklearn 2	0.15.0	0.15.0	auto-sklearn
FLAML	1.2.4	2.1.1	flaml
H2O AutoML	3.40.0.4	3.44.0.3	h2o
LightAutoML	0.3.7.3	0.3.8.1	lightautoml

### F.3 Auto-Sklearn 2

**Meta-Learning.** Auto-Sklearn 2 uses meta-learning to improve the quality of its results. Since the datasets used to train its meta-learning algorithm are present in TabRepo, the performance of Auto-Sklearn 2 may be overly optimistic as it may be choosing to train model hyperparameters known to achieve strong test scores on a given dataset. This issue is detailed in section 5.3.3 of Gijsbers et al. (2024). Following Gijsbers et al. (2024), we ultimately decide to keep Auto-Sklearn 2’s results as a useful comparison point.

**Regression.** Auto-Sklearn 2 is incompatible with regression tasks. For regression tasks, we use the result from Auto-Sklearn 1.

## G Studying Portfolio Model Prioritization

Fig. 6 shows the Portfolio composition by model family averaged across all 200 leave-one-dataset-out evaluations. Interestingly, as can be seen in the top figure, the first 4 model family selections are identical across all leave-one-out evaluations.

CatBoost is picked first as it is the strongest individual model. The second pick is an MLP model, which is expected, as tree models are known to ensemble well with neural networks, which was observed in Fig 1a. The third pick is LightGBM. Referencing back to Fig. 5c, we observed that a Portfolio of size 3 is sufficient to outperform all AutoML methods besides AutoGluon. With this visualization, we now know that this size 3 portfolio is very consistently structured, and simply sequentially trains a CatBoost, MLP, and LightGBM model, followed by a simple weighted ensemble.

Going further, the fourth pick is CatBoost, the first model family repeat. The fifth pick shows the first instance where some of the leave-one-out Portfolios begin to select different families at the same Portfolio position. While roughly 90% pick LightGBM, the remaining 10% pick KNN. We see that the probabilities reverse with the 6th position, likely meaning that the two diverging groups have now converged back to the same overall composition, with slightly different pick orders.

For the 7th position, we see MLP picked a second time, followed by the first XGBoost pick in the 8th position, and the first ExtraTrees pick in the 9th position. CatBoost is picked for the 3rd and 4th time in the 10th and 11th positions. The last remaining unpicked families, Linear models and Random Forest, are picked for the first time at positions 12 and 13.

Beyond position 13, the leave-one-out Portfolios have diverged sufficiently that there is no more unanimous picks at a given position. However, looking at the bottom figure, we see that the overall proportion of each family’s inclusion in the Portfolio begins to stabilize. We observe that MLP becomes the most frequently picked family, followed by LightGBM and CatBoost.

Given that all 8 model families were picked at least once by position 13 shows that each family contributes meaningfully to the performance of the Portfolio, and no model family is irrelevant. KNN, which is by far the worst performing model in isolation, was the 4th model family picked by the portfolio, even ahead of the much stronger XGBoost. We suspect that this is due to the large




Figure 6: Visualization of the Portfolio composition and model selection order, averaged across all 200 leave-one-dataset-out evaluations. The top figure shows the percentage of the time each model family is picked at a given position N in the Portfolio. The bottom figure shows the cumulative percentage each model family is used in the Portfolio in the first N Portfolio positions.

Table 9: Models exceeding 2800 seconds training time per family.

Method	# Exceeding	% Exceeding
CatBoost	11851	9.8%
XGBoost	2532	2.1%
LightGBM	1025	0.8%
LinearModel	69	0.2%
FTTransformer	40	7.5%
MLP	14	0.0%

diversity contributed by KNN to the Portfolio, whereas XGBoost has to compete with CatBoost and LightGBM, which share very similar architectures and performance characteristics.

The current logic that picks the Portfolio composition is blind to model training times. We expect significant improvements can be made to the strength of the portfolio model order by incentivizing the Portfolio to pick cheaper models with higher priority, improving the any-time performance of the Portfolio. We leave further investigations to future work.

## H Impact of Time Limit

Here we analyze the impact of the one hour time limit used to avoid overly long training times for models. The number of models nearing or reaching the time limit ( $\geq 2800$ s) is 15531 (out of 782060), or 1.99% of models.

Table 10: Models exceeding 2800 seconds training time per dataset.

Task ID	Dataset	# Exceeding	% Exceeding
359986	robert	1797	45.8%
168909	dilbert	1389	35.4%
3481	isolet	1046	26.7%
168300	UMIST_Faces_Cropped	834	21.3%
359985	volkert	802	20.4%
233212	Allstate_Claims_Seve	667	17.0%
14970	har	619	15.8%
3980	OVA_Prostate	611	15.6%
3995	OVA_Colon	570	14.5%
317614	Yolanda	558	14.2%
359953	micro-mass	548	14.0%
3968	OVA_Kidney	510	13.0%
4000	OVA_Ovary	460	11.7%
211986	Diabetes130US	459	11.7%
3964	OVA_Lung	456	11.6%
9972	kr-vs-k	450	11.5%
2076	kropt	450	11.9%
360859	Indian_pines	420	10.7%
168910	fabert	356	9.1%
3976	OVA_Endometrium	334	8.5%
41	soybean	290	7.7%
359961	mfeat-factors	284	7.2%
361330	Traffic_violations	264	6.7%
9964	semeion	249	6.6%
359977	connect-4	190	5.0%
359993	okcupid-stem	173	4.4%
211979	jannis	134	3.4%
189922	gina	129	3.3%
146800	MiceProtein	127	3.2%
190412	arcene	120	3.1%
125922	texture	63	1.6%
3512	synthetic_control	50	1.3%
45	splice	39	1.0%
361331	GAMETES_Epistasis_2-	24	0.6%
359980	nomao	18	0.5%
359991	kick	13	0.3%
146802	collins	7	0.2%
359990	MiniBooNE	5	0.1%
359981	jungle_chess_2pcs_ra	3	0.1%
359937	black_friday	3	0.1%
9979	cardiotocography	3	0.1%
219	electricity	3	0.1%
168868	APSFailure	3	0.1%
9976	madelon	1	0.0%




Figure 7: Training time distribution across all datasets for (a) all configurations and (b) grouped by family, as well as the cumulative total training time across all datasets for (c) all configurations and (d) grouped by family.

We can see in Tab. 10 that the majority of cases where the time limit is reached is on large datasets with many features and many classes. For example, the robert dataset has 7200 features and 10 classes, leading to long training times for tree methods that train one-vs-all in multiclass classification. The same can be said for dilbert (2000 features, 5 classes), isolet (617 features, 26 classes), and UMIST\_Faces\_Cropped (10304 features, 20 classes). The families that are early stopped are almost exclusively GBMs, particularly CatBoost, as highlighted in Tab. 9. FT-Transformer, even with GPU, is early stopped in 7.5% of cases, reflecting its expensive compute requirement compared to other methods.

We see from Fig. 7c that the 10% most expensive models contribute 90% of the overall runtime cost, and the 40% most expensive models contribute 99% of the overall runtime cost. In Fig. 7d, we see that CatBoost’s overall runtime is larger than all other families combined. Note that LinearModel slightly exceeded 3600 seconds in a few cases due to the early stopping implementation.

Given the slope of Fig. 7a prior to early stopping triggering, we expect that fully training the 2% most expensive models would over double the compute cost of the entire benchmark. Meanwhile, the most heavily impacted method, CatBoost, is still comfortably the best performing method in TabRepo, and therefore we expect that the one hour time limit does not alter our overall conclusions nor diminish the utility TabRepo provides to researchers. For future work that would tackle larger datasets a time limit greater than 1 hour, larger CPU core counts, and/or GPU acceleration should be considered.

## I Portfolio results when including models requiring GPU

Here, we report results when also including models that require a GPU. In addition to previous models, we also consider:

- TabPFN (Hollmann et al., 2022) which is transformer model for tabular data pretrained on a collection of artificial datasets that performs attention over rows
- FT-Transformer (Gorishniy et al., 2021) which is a transformer trained on a dataset at hand and performs attention over columns

For TabPFN and FT-Transformer, we measure results on a g4.2xlarge instance. We run only the default configuration for FT-Transformer due to the large training cost to obtain results on all tasks on a GPU machine, we also ran a single configuration for TabPFN.

We report those results separately because those models require an additional GPU as opposed to the models presented in the main sections which pose different hardware constraint cost.

Some of the models fail because of algorithm errors (for instance TabPFN only supports 100 features currently) or hardware errors (out-of-memory errors). In case of failure, we impute the model predictions with the baseline used when portfolio configuration times out (e.g. the default configuration of Extra-trees), this baseline always take less than 5 seconds to run.

As one can see in Tab. 14, FT-Transformer performs in-between MLPs and the best boosted tree methods. Regarding TabPFN, the method does not reach the performance of top methods yet which is due to high failure rates due to current method limitations on large datasets<sup>6</sup> and also due to the method not being able to currently effectively exploit large number of rows.

The results of portfolio improves slightly given the additional model diversity which can be seen by looking at Tab. 13 which reports the win-rate against AutoML baselines. In particular, the win rate is improved from 56.8% to 57.5%. We expect with additional configs for these model families that the performance of the portfolio would improve further.

---

<sup>6</sup>The failure rate is  $\approx 30\%$  as the method only supports 100 features and 10 classes.

Table 11: Win rate comparison for 4 hour time limit with the same methodology as Erickson et al. (2020). Win rate is computed against a portfolio ensemble (ties count as 0.5). The re-scaled loss is calculated by setting the best solution to 0 and the worst solution to 1 on each dataset, and then normalizing and taking the mean across all datasets. Rank, fit time, and infer time are averaged over all tasks.

method	winrate	>	<	=	time fit (s)	time infer (s)	loss (rescaled)	rank
<b>Portfolio (ensemble) (ours) (4h)</b>	<b>0.500</b>	0	0	200	6275.5	0.050	<b>0.233</b>	<b>3.042</b>
AutoGluon (4h)	0.432	84	111	5	5583.1	0.062	0.288	3.435
Autosklearn2 (4h)	0.330	65	133	2	14415.9	0.013	0.403	4.380
Lightautoml (4h)	0.270	52	144	4	9173.9	0.298	0.433	4.643
CatBoost (tuned + ensemble) (4h)	0.242	47	150	3	9065.2	0.012	0.508	5.010
Autosklearn (4h)	0.280	54	142	4	14413.6	0.009	0.516	5.055
Flaml (4h)	0.263	50	145	5	14267.0	0.002	0.535	5.122
H2oautoml (4h)	0.225	42	152	6	13920.1	0.002	0.562	5.312

Table 12: Win rate comparison for 1 hour time limit with the same approach used as for Tab. 11.

method	winrate	>	<	=	time fit (s)	time infer (s)	loss (rescaled)	rank
<b>Portfolio (ensemble) (ours) (1h)</b>	<b>0.500</b>	0	0	200	2318.2	0.022	<b>0.230</b>	<b>3.145</b>
AutoGluon (1h)	0.453	88	107	5	2283.7	0.033	0.273	3.310
Autosklearn2 (1h)	0.383	74	121	5	3611.2	0.010	0.393	4.272
Lightautoml (1h)	0.292	56	139	5	3002.7	0.099	0.408	4.435
CatBoost (tuned + ensemble) (1h)	0.247	48	149	3	2923.3	0.005	0.531	5.140
Autosklearn (1h)	0.305	60	138	2	3612.0	0.007	0.536	5.173
H2oautoml (1h)	0.203	39	158	3	3572.8	0.002	0.506	5.195
Flaml (1h)	0.263	50	145	5	3623.8	0.001	0.552	5.330

## J Additional results Portfolios

### J.1 Portfolio win-rate comparison

We calculate win-rates, re-scaled loss, and average ranks between the Portfolio and the AutoML systems in Tab. 12 and Tab. 11 for 1 and 4 hour time limits respectively with the same evaluation protocol as Erickson et al. (2020). In both cases, Portfolio achieves the best win-rate, re-scaled loss, and average rank across all methods at the given time constraint.

### J.2 Performance on lower fitting budgets

In section 5, we reported results for 1h, 4h fitting budgets which are standard settings (Erickson et al., 2020; Gijsbers et al., 2024). Given space constraint, we only showed the full table for 4h results in the main, the results for 1h results is shown in Tab. 15. Here the anytime portfolio strategy matches AutoGluon on normalized error and outperforms it on rank while having around 30% lower latency.

Table 13: Win rate comparison with additional models requiring a GPU defined in Section I for 4 hour time limit.

method	winrate	>	<	=	time fit (s)	time infer (s)	loss (rescaled)	rank
Portfolio-GPU (ensemble)	0.500	0	0	200	6597.5	0.061	0.239	3.115
AutoGluon best	0.425	80	110	10	5583.1	0.062	0.290	3.442
Autosklearn2	0.350	68	128	4	14415.9	0.013	0.404	4.360
Lightautoml	0.287	56	141	3	9173.9	0.298	0.434	4.625
CatBoost (tuned + ensemble)	0.245	47	149	4	9065.2	0.012	0.506	5.008
Autosklearn	0.290	56	140	4	14413.6	0.009	0.515	5.045
Flaml	0.295	56	138	6	14267.0	0.002	0.533	5.090
H2oautoml	0.223	41	152	7	13920.1	0.002	0.565	5.315

Table 14: Results with additional models defined in Section I. Normalized error, rank, training and inference time are averaged over all tasks given 4h training budget.

method	normalized-error	rank	time fit (s)	time infer (s)
Portfolio-GPU (ensemble)	0.362	174.6	6597.5	0.061
Portfolio (ensemble)	0.365	168.7	6275.5	0.050
AutoGluon best	0.389	208.2	5583.1	0.062
Portfolio	0.434	232.5	6275.5	0.012
Portfolio-GPU	0.437	236.6	6597.5	0.013
Autosklearn2	0.455	243.5	14415.9	0.013
Lightautoml	0.466	246.1	9173.9	0.298
Flaml	0.513	317.8	14267.0	0.002
CatBoost (tuned + ensemble)	0.524	267.3	9065.2	0.012
H2oautoml	0.526	337.0	13920.1	0.002
CatBoost (tuned)	0.534	284.7	9065.2	0.002
LightGBM (tuned + ensemble)	0.534	268.7	3528.9	0.010
LightGBM (tuned)	0.566	304.2	3528.9	0.001
CatBoost (default)	0.586	341.2	456.8	0.002
MLP (tuned + ensemble)	0.594	402.5	5771.8	0.098
XGBoost (tuned + ensemble)	0.628	357.9	4972.7	0.013
MLP (tuned)	0.634	451.9	5771.8	0.014
XGBoost (tuned)	0.638	376.5	4972.7	0.002
FTTransformer (default)	0.690	532.1	567.4	0.003
LightGBM (default)	0.714	491.5	55.7	0.001
XGBoost (default)	0.734	522.2	75.1	0.002
MLP (default)	0.772	629.4	38.2	0.015
ExtraTrees (tuned + ensemble)	0.782	544.2	538.3	0.001
ExtraTrees (tuned)	0.802	572.5	538.3	0.000
RandomForest (tuned + ensemble)	0.803	578.3	1512.2	0.001
RandomForest (tuned)	0.816	598.0	1512.2	0.000
TabPFN (default)	0.837	731.9	3.8	0.016
LinearModel (tuned + ensemble)	0.855	873.8	612.4	0.038
LinearModel (tuned)	0.862	891.6	612.4	0.006
ExtraTrees (default)	0.883	788.6	3.0	0.000
RandomForest (default)	0.887	773.9	13.8	0.000
LinearModel (default)	0.899	940.1	7.1	0.014
KNeighbors (tuned + ensemble)	0.928	980.8	12.0	0.001
KNeighbors (tuned)	0.937	1016.5	12.0	0.000
KNeighbors (default)	0.973	1149.1	0.6	0.000

Table 15: Normalized error, rank, training and inference time averaged over all tasks given 1h training budget.

method	normalized-error	rank	time fit (s)	time infer (s)
Portfolio (ensemble)	0.376	176.0	2318.2	0.022
AutoGluon	0.393	206.7	2283.7	0.033
Portfolio	0.444	242.3	2318.2	0.012
Autosklearn2	0.470	257.1	3611.2	0.010
Lightautoml	0.479	252.3	3002.7	0.099
H2oautoml	0.524	325.3	3572.8	0.002
Flaml	0.530	340.3	3623.8	0.001
LightGBM (tuned + ensemble)	0.537	271.8	1643.3	0.008
LightGBM (tuned)	0.570	307.2	1643.3	0.002
CatBoost (tuned + ensemble)	0.574	318.1	2923.3	0.005
CatBoost (tuned)	0.580	333.2	2923.3	0.002
CatBoost (default)	0.586	341.2	456.8	0.002
MLP (tuned + ensemble)	0.600	407.9	2559.8	0.120
XGBoost (tuned + ensemble)	0.638	371.6	1864.5	0.013
MLP (tuned)	0.638	454.4	2559.8	0.014
XGBoost (tuned)	0.648	390.2	1864.5	0.002
FTTransformer (default)	0.690	532.1	567.4	0.003
LightGBM (default)	0.714	491.5	55.7	0.001
XGBoost (default)	0.734	522.2	75.1	0.002
MLP (default)	0.772	629.4	38.2	0.015
ExtraTrees (tuned + ensemble)	0.782	544.3	382.6	0.001
ExtraTrees (tuned)	0.802	572.7	382.6	0.000
RandomForest (tuned + ensemble)	0.803	579.8	668.7	0.001
RandomForest (tuned)	0.815	597.5	668.7	0.000
TabPFN (default)	0.837	731.9	3.8	0.016
LinearModel (tuned + ensemble)	0.855	874.4	374.3	0.038
LinearModel (tuned)	0.862	892.5	374.3	0.006
ExtraTrees (default)	0.883	788.6	3.0	0.000
RandomForest (default)	0.887	773.9	13.8	0.000
LinearModel (default)	0.899	940.1	7.1	0.014
KNeighbors (tuned + ensemble)	0.928	980.8	12.0	0.001
KNeighbors (tuned)	0.937	1016.5	12.0	0.000
KNeighbors (default)	0.973	1149.1	0.6	0.000