

Symbolic Regression as Feature Engineering Method for Machine and Deep Learning Regression Tasks

Assaf Shmuel^{1,*}, Oren Glickman¹, Teddy Lazebnik^{2,3}

¹ Department of Computer Science, Bar Ilan University, Ramat Gan, Israel

² Department of Mathematics, Ariel University, Ariel, Israel

³ Department of Cancer Biology, Cancer Institute, University College London, London, UK

* Corresponding author: assafshmuel91@gmail.com

Abstract

In the realm of machine and deep learning regression tasks, the role of effective feature engineering (FE) is pivotal in enhancing model performance. Traditional approaches of FE often rely on domain expertise to manually design features for machine learning models. In the context of deep learning models, the FE is embedded in the neural network’s architecture, making it hard for interpretation. In this study, we propose to integrate symbolic regression (SR) as an FE process before a machine learning model to improve its performance. We show, through extensive experimentation on synthetic and real-world physics-related datasets, that the incorporation of SR-derived features significantly enhances the predictive capabilities of both machine and deep learning regression models with 34-86% root mean square error (RMSE) improvement in synthetic datasets and 4-11.5% improvement in real-world datasets. In addition, as a realistic use-case, we show the proposed method improves the machine learning performance in predicting superconducting critical temperatures based on Eliashberg theory by more than 20% in terms of RMSE. These results outline the potential of SR as an FE component in data-driven models.

Keywords: symbolic regression; neural network; data-driven physics; feature engineering; data science

1 Introduction

Machine and deep learning, achieving optimal performance and interpretability in regression tasks stands as a fundamental computational challenge, critical for applications spanning various fields of science and engineering [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7]. The efficacy of the machine learning (ML) pipeline hinges on numerous components that govern its performance [8, 9, 10], explainability [11, 12], and development efficiency [13, 14]. Arguably, feature selection and feature engineering (FE) are the most important steps [15] as they are commonly one of the first steps in the ML pipeline and therefore determine the performance of everything computed afterward [16]. Moreover, the FE process is instrumental in transforming raw data into meaningful representations that empower models to capture underlying patterns effectively [17, 18].

Traditionally, crafting relevant features necessitates domain expertise, a labor-intensive approach that may not fully harness the intricate relationships within complex datasets [19, 20, 21]. In contrast, contemporary deep learning (DL) models treat feature extraction as an inherent “black box” process, relinquishing some degree of interpretability and control in favor of automated extraction [3, 22]. Between these extremes, alternative FE methods aim to furnish meaningful features that improve a down-the-line objective [23, 24]. While intuitive and promising, the last group is usually the most time-consuming and computationally intensive, making it challenging or even unrealistic to be efficiently utilized for many cases [24].

To address this challenge, this paper proposes a paradigm shift by advocating the integration of Symbolic Regression (SR) as an FE method. SR empowers models to autonomously evolve mathematical expressions,

capturing intricate data relationships and uncovering latent features that elude manual construction [25, 26, 27]. By incorporating SR-derived features before applying ML or DL models.

To evaluate this method’s performance, we employ an “off-the-shelf” SR model (GPIearn [28]), automatic ML (TPOT [29]), and automatic DL models (AutoKeras [30]) on both synthetic and real-world datasets. We investigate how the introduction of SR-derived features impacts the performance of data-driven models while reducing the reliance on developer expertise. Our results demonstrate that integrating SR-derived features significantly enhances ($p < 0.01$) the predictive capabilities of both ML and DL regression models across a wide range of synthetic ($n = 1250$) and real-world ($n = 1000$) datasets, yielding performance gains of up to 86.0% and 34.4% for synthetic datasets and 4.0% and 11.5% for real-world datasets, respectively.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows: Section 2 provides an overview of related work in the field of FE, discussing both traditional methods and recent advances in automated feature extraction. Section 3 delves into our proposed methodology for integrating SR into the FE process. In Section 4, we detail our experimental setup and present the datasets used. Section 5 presents and thoroughly analyzes our results. Finally, Section 6 explores the implications and insights drawn from our findings, discussing the advantages, limitations, and potential applications of our proposed approach.

2 Related Work

FE has long been a pivotal aspect in bolstering the performance and interpretability of ML and DL regression tasks [19, 20]. Traditional approaches have relied on the manual crafting of features by domain experts, yielding potent but labor-intensive methods [25, 26, 27]. Conversely, recent advancements in DL have introduced automated feature extraction within the model architecture, often at the expense of interpretability [3, 22]. In this section, we provide an overview of existing research, commencing with a spectrum of FE methodologies and their implications. Subsequently, we provide an overview of the main groups of SR methods and recent developments in the field, highlighting its potential as an automated FE method.

2.1 Feature Engineering

Informally, FE involves the creation, selection, transformation, and manipulation of features in a dataset to enhance the performance of a down-the-line data-driven model. The importance of FE in ML and regression tasks is widely acknowledged [31, 32]. As such, a growing body of work explores automated FE methods [33, 34]. Given the complexity of this task, researchers have employed diverse strategies to tackle this challenge. These include genetic programming [35], evolutionary algorithms [36], neural architecture search for automatic feature construction [10, 37], and wrapper feature selection [24], among others. While these approaches alleviate the manual burden, they often fall short in terms of interpretability. Notably, FE often accompanies feature selection, and for readers seeking further details on feature selection, we provide a brief overview of feature selection in the Appendix.

Traditional FE methods typically necessitate domain-specific expertise to devise relevant features tailored to specific problem domains. These methods have been extensively employed in various fields, including natural language processing, computer vision, and sensor data analysis [38, 39, 40]. For instance, in the context of stroke risk prediction (as exemplified in [41]), it is common practice to incorporate a feature encompassing Body Mass Index ($BMI = \text{weight}/\text{height}^2$), effectively amalgamating weight and height parameters.

Feature transformation is a common FE practice involving data modification to enhance modeling suitability. This may include scaling, normalization, or applying mathematical functions like logarithms to address skewed distributions. As datasets grow larger and more complex, practitioners resort to computationally intensive FE techniques. Feature extraction methods create new features by transforming or combining existing ones. Common techniques include Principal Component Analysis [42, 43], Independent Component Analysis [44], and autoencoders [45]. These methods can automatically generate new features or reduce data dimensionality while preserving essential information, proving valuable for a wide range of ML and DL models [46, 47, 48]. For example, [49] applied Principal Component Analysis to data derived from a socioeconomic questionnaire regarding barriers to healthcare.

2.2 Symbolic Regression

SR is approached via various strategies, broadly classified into four primary categories based on computational techniques: brute-force search, sparse regression, DL, and genetic algorithms [50, 51]. Each category has its unique merits and limitations, with no single approach prevailing over others, as demonstrated in a recent comparative survey [52].

Brute-force SR models theoretically possess the capability to solve any SR task by exhaustively testing all possible equations to identify the best-performing one [53]. Nevertheless, the practical application of brute-force methods frequently proves unfeasible due to their substantial computational requirements, which persist as a challenge even when dealing with small datasets. Moreover, these models tend to overfit when confronted with large and noisy data [54], a common scenario in many real-world datasets [55, 56]. DL SR models excel in handling noisy data due to neural networks' intrinsic resistance to outliers [57]. Nonetheless, empirical studies indicate limited generalization capabilities, constraining their utility [52]. Notably, [58] introduced a Deep SR (DSR) model catering to general SR tasks, employing reinforcement learning to train a generative Recurrent Neural Network (RNN) model for symbolic expressions. Moreover, DSR integrates a variant of the Monte Carlo policy gradient approach to customize the generative model for exact formulas. Sparse regression methods significantly narrow the exploration scope by identifying concise models through sparsity-driven optimization [59]. A notable algorithm tailored for scientific contexts is *SINDy* [60]. Leveraging a Lasso linear model, *SINDy* identifies sparser representations of nonlinear dynamical systems underlying time-series data. The algorithm iterates between a partial least-squares fit and a thresholding step to promote sparsity. Over time, *SINDy* has undergone improvements: [61] enhanced its performance with noisy data, [62] introduced optimal model selection over varying threshold values, and [63] developed *PySINDy*, an open-source Python package for applying *SINDy*. That said, *SINDy* is best performed when the features are associated with physical data and it underperforms for other cases.

Finally, genetic algorithms (GA) SR models efficiently incorporate prior knowledge to constrain the function search space [64]. For instance, SR can adhere to predefined solution shapes [65, 66, 67, 68], or employ probabilistic models to sample grammar rules governing solution generation [69, 70, 71, 72]. An effective yet simple GA-based SR implementation is the *gplearn* Python Library [73]. It commences by generating a population of basic random formulas, structured as tree-like relationships between independent variables (features) and dependent variables (targets). Subsequently, through stochastic optimization, it iterates on subtree replacement, recombination, fitness evaluation by executing trees, and stochastic survival of the fittest. This technique demonstrates proficiency in solving linear real-world problems [51] and can serve as a foundational framework for more intricate models, as we present in this work.

2.3 Automated Machine Learning

AutoML (Automated Machine Learning) [74] has emerged as a transformative technology in the field of artificial intelligence and machine learning. It aims to automate and simplify the intricate process of building, training, and deploying machine learning models. Two notable frameworks within the AutoML domain are TPOT and AutoKeras, each offering unique approaches to streamline and optimize the machine learning pipeline.

TPOT (Tree-based Pipeline Optimization Tool) [29]: TPOT is a widely recognized AutoML framework that leverages genetic programming to automatically search and construct effective machine learning pipelines. Genetic programming involves evolving a population of machine learning pipelines over generations, with each generation improving upon the previous one. TPOT explores a wide range of preprocessing techniques, feature engineering methods, and machine learning algorithms, evolving optimal combinations tailored to a specific problem. It assesses the performance of these pipelines using cross-validation and selects the best-performing model. TPOT is particularly valuable when dealing with structured data and tabular datasets.

AutoKeras [30]: AutoKeras is another prominent AutoML framework that specializes in the automation of deep learning model construction. It simplifies the process of neural network architecture search and hyperparameter tuning. AutoKeras employs a technique known as neural architecture search (NAS) to automatically discover the most suitable neural network architectures for a given task. This involves exploring a wide range of neural network configurations, including various layers and hyperparameters, to identify the architecture that yields the best performance. AutoKeras is especially beneficial when working with unstructured data types such as images,

text, and sequences, where deep learning approaches excel.

Both TPOT and AutoKeras exemplify the power of AutoML in terms of automating complex decision-making processes in machine learning. By minimizing the need for manual intervention, they make machine learning accessible to a broader audience, accelerate model development, and enable non-experts to harness the potential of artificial intelligence for their specific applications. In a recent benchmark study [75] AutoKeras and TPOT showed the best results for wave data classification.

3 Symbolic Regression as Feature Engineering

In this study, our objective is to investigate the role of SR as a preliminary layer in ML and DL models, essentially functioning as a FE step, generating more intricate features for data-driven models to leverage. To achieve this, we incorporate an SR model into our workflow, introducing its output as an additional feature for subsequent ML and DL models. Formally, this technique involves the simultaneous training of two models: the SR model and the subsequent ML/DL model. The SR model is trained on the input features, denoted as X , and produces a new SR-derived feature, which is appended to X to create X^* . Subsequently, the ML/DL model is trained on X^* . Both models address the same regression task with respect to a specified target feature, denoted as y .

To be exact, let us assume a given dataset $D \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times m}$ with n rows and m features such that the features are divided into source (X) and target (y) features. Consistent with common data-driven model development practices, we initially divide the rows into training and validation subsets. Focusing on the training subset to avoid data leakage [76], we employ the well-known GPLEarn SR model [28] to create multiple SR models for the training data, each one contributing a potential feature to X^* . Each instance of the SR model is characterized by a distinct parsimony coefficient. These SR models generate multiple solutions during the search for the optimal equation. Consequently, we select the equation with the lowest Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) score across the entire search process, which may not necessarily be the latest one. Subsequently, we train either an ML model using an automatic ML model - Tree-based Pipeline Optimization Tool (TPOT) [29] or a DL model using an automatic DL model - Autokeras (AK) [30].

Once the models are trained, we compare the performance of the TPOT model on the original data X (referred to as TPOT) and the SR-enhanced data X^* (referred to as SRTPOT). Similarly, we assess the performance of the AK model on the original data X (referred to as AK) and the SR-enriched data X^* (referred to as SRAK). In both cases, we calculate the RMSE score of the TPOT or AK models divided by the score of the SRTPOT or SRAK models, respectively. We then subtract 1 from the result and multiply by 100 to express the change in percentages. Thus, in this proposed metric, values greater than zero indicate a favorable performance for the SRTPOT or SRAK models in comparison to the TPOT or AK models, respectively.

In order to study the influence of the SR FE layer, for each dataset, we initially trained the ML/DL model on the original features (X), treating it as the control sample. Subsequently, we train the model on the SR-enhanced features (X^*), considering it as the case sample. We then compute the relative difference in RMSE between the control and case samples, ensuring the metric is unit-free and comparable across various datasets. Fig. 1 provides a schematic representation of this methodology and experiment.

Table 1 demonstrates the results of one synthetic dataset. We begin by randomly generating the polynomial $x_1^3 * x_2^3 + x_3^3 + x_1^3$. As we add 5% Gaussian noise, the true polynomial prediction RMSE is nonzero and equals 0.29. We fit the SR model, which provides the polynomial $x_1^3 * x_2^3 + x_3^3 + 2 * x_1$. While the first two terms are correct, the third term is not accurate, resulting in an RMSE score of 1.31. Even though both the TPOT and AK models outperform the SR model with RMSE scores of 0.99 and 0.70, adding the SR-derived feature substantially improves these models. When training the SRTPOT and SRAK models with the SR-derived feature, the TPOT RMSE score improves from 0.99 to 0.79 and the AK RMSE score improves from 0.70 to 0.36.

4 Experimental Setup

To provide a comprehensive analysis of the proposed method, we used both synthetic and real-world datasets, focusing exclusively on regression tasks with numerical features.

Table 1: Example of one synthetic dataset

True polynomial	$x_1^3 * x_2^3 + x_3^3 + x_1^3$
Fitted SR	$x_1^3 * x_2^3 + x_3^3 + 2 * x_1$
Baseline – true polynomial RMSE (noise only)	0.29
LR RMSE	9.38
SR RMSE	1.31
TPOT RMSE	0.99
S RTPOT RMSE	0.79
AK RMSE	0.70
SRAK RMSE	0.36




Figure 1: A schematic view of this method and experiment. We begin by either generating synthetic datasets or using real-world datasets. We then train the SR model and create the SR-based feature. Next, we train AutoML models on both the SR-enhanced data as the case sample, and the original data as control. We compare the RMSE scores in the testing data of both models.

4.1 Generating Synthetic Datasets

We initiated the experiment with synthetic datasets. To generate these datasets, we followed a procedure of randomly creating polynomials and introducing Gaussian noise. The polynomial generation process involved random selection of the number of features, ranging between 2 and 5, and the highest exponent for each variable in each term, fluctuating between 1 and 3. Once a polynomial was randomly generated, we produced a predefined number of n data samples (equivalent to the number of rows in the dataset). These samples were generated by assigning a value between -2 and 2 to each feature, following a uniform distribution. This range was chosen to ensure clear differentiation between symmetric and asymmetric functions, which exhibit different behaviors around zero. Additionally, higher-order polynomials tend to yield values closer to zero in the range of -1 to 1, while larger values between [-2, -1] and [1, 2] allow for rich samples of polynomials, focusing on a relatively small value range to prevent numerical issues such as float overflow. We computed the target feature (y) for each row based on the polynomial, adding Gaussian noise with a mean value of zero and a standard deviation of 5% of the original y value.

4.2 Real-world Datasets

For the real-world datasets, we utilized datasets from a recent benchmarking study on automatic ML regression tasks [77]. Specifically, we analyzed a total of 20 datasets from nine studies [78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86]. The only modification applied to these datasets was the removal of categorical variables, as this study exclusively focused on numerical variables. This alteration did not impact our ability to evaluate the S RTPOT and SRAK methods, as we compared their results to TPOT and AK models trained on the exact same datasets, specifically using an identical train-test split in each case.

In addition, inspired by [87], we examined the method’s performance in predicting superconducting critical temperatures based on Eliashberg theory. Estimation of superconducting critical temperatures is an extremely active field of research which has drawn extensive scholarly interest [88]. [87] developed an SR model for this purpose using artificially generated $\alpha^2 F$ functions and computed critical temperatures T_c using numerical solu-

tions of the Eliashberg equations. They tested their model on hydride superconductors and found a substantial improvement compared to traditional equations in the field. As [87] had already developed an SR model for this purpose, we extended their findings by training AutoML models either with or without the SR feature based on their work. We decided to use this case due to its physical importance and relatively large dataset.

4.3 Evaluation Methodology

To ensure comprehensive evaluation, we repeated the assessment process 50 times, each time with a different split between the training and validation cohorts, for each dataset, resulting in a total of 1000 runs. For both synthetic and real-world datasets, the training cohort comprised 80% of the dataset, while the validation cohort contained the remaining 20%.

To explore the robustness of our proposed method, we conducted two additional experiments. First, we performed a total of 1250 repetitions of the synthetic dataset analysis, varying sample sizes (100, 500, 1000, 5000, 10000) and noise levels (1-5%). Each configuration consisted of 50 repetitions. Second, we investigated the influence of the number of terms and the non-linearity of the data on our method’s performance. Non-linearity was measured in two ways: by dividing the RMSE of a Linear Regression (LR) model by the standard deviation of the target variable and by using $1 - R^2$ of the linear regression model trained on the training dataset.

5 Results

In this section, we present the outcomes of our experiments. We begin by reporting the performance of our proposed method on both synthetic and real-world datasets. Subsequently, we demonstrate the robustness of our approach through various assessments.

5.1 Performance

Fig. 2 provides a comprehensive overview of the model performances. Figs. 2a and 2b pertain to the synthetic datasets, showcasing the relative improvements achieved by the SRTPOT model over the TPOT model and the SRAK model over the AK model, respectively. These synthetic datasets encompassed 5000 samples in each run and 5% noise level. Additional datasets are analyzed in Section 5.2. On average, the TPOT model displayed a mean RMSE of 86.0% higher than that of the SRTPOT model, with a median difference of 6.5%. Similarly, the AK model exhibited a mean RMSE of 34.4% higher than that of the SRAK model, with a median difference of 6.9%. Notably, the results displayed considerable positive skewness. Fig. 2 presents values up to 100%, due to visual convenience, allowing an easier review of the results. The full range plot is provided as supplementary materials.

Figs. 2c and 2d detail the results for the real-world datasets. The advantage of the SRTPOT and SRAK models in these datasets is comparatively more modest compared to the synthetic datasets. Nonetheless, it remains substantial in both magnitude and statistical significance ($p < 0.01$). In particular, the TPOT model was outperformed by 4.0% ($p < 0.01$), with a positive median difference slightly above zero. In contrast, the SRAK model outperformed the AK model by 11.5% ($p < 0.01$), with a median difference of 1.2%.

Fig. 3 presents the relative performances for superconducting critical temperature prediction. The SR-based TPOT and AK models exhibited improvements in mean RMSE by 20.3% and 23.4%, respectively. In absolute terms, the SR model developed in [87] obtained an RMSE score of 12.12 degrees. The TPOT and AK models obtained 11.71 and 11.13 degrees RMSE respectively; when integrating the SR model into the TPOT and AK training process, the RMSE scores improved to 9.81 and 9.06 degrees, respectively.

5.2 Robustness

In addition, Fig. 4 presents robustness tests encompassing various sample sizes and noise levels. Across all 25 configurations, which varied in sample size (100, 500, 1000, 5000, 10000) and noise levels (1-5%) the SRTPOT and SRAK models consistently improved mean RMSE scores. As expected, the most significant improvements




Figure 2: Summary of model performances. (a) and (b) illustrate the relative improvement of the SRTPOT and SRAK models compared to the TPOT and AK models, respectively, in the synthetic datasets. (c) and (d) illustrate the relative improvement of the SRTPOT and SRAK models compared to the TPOT and AK models, respectively, in the real datasets. Values above 100% are not presented, encompassing approximately 25% of the observations in subfigures (a) and (b), 1% of the observations in subfigure (c) and 3% of the observations in subfigure (d).




Figure 3: Summary of model performances predicting superconducting critical temperature. (a) and (b) illustrate the relative improvement of the SRTPOT and SRAK models compared to the TPOT and AK models, respectively.

were observed in datasets with lower noise levels and smaller sample sizes, aligning with SR’s known advantage in such scenarios. Despite a decrease in improvement percentages by 143.7% (ML) or 25.1% (DL) for each 1% increase in noise level, and by 0.05% (ML) or 0.02% (DL) for each additional observation, substantial improvements were still observed in datasets with 5% noise and 10000 observations, showing a mean improvement of 36% for ML and 23% for DL, respectively.




Figure 4: Robustness tests for synthetic data noise and sample size. (a) illustrates the relative improvement of the SRT POT model compared to the TPOT model. (b) illustrated the relative improvement of the SRAK model compared to the AK model.

Moreover, Fig. 5 presents robustness tests for the complexity of the generated polynomials. The horizontal axis presents the number of terms in the polynomial expression and the vertical axis presents the non-linearity, measured either with the RMSE score of the LR model divided by the standard deviation of the target variable, or by $1 - R^2$ of the LR model. While the number of terms has no statistically significant effect, in all four models it is evident that the contribution of the SR layer is more substantial in non-linear datasets. The Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) coefficients of both robustness tests are summarized in Table 2.

Table 2: Summary of robustness tests

Variable	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5	Model 6
Model Type	TPOT	AK	TPOT	AK	TPOT	AK
# Samples	-0.05 (0.01)	-0.02 (0.00)				
Noise	-143.7 (0.00)	-25.1 (0.00)				
# Terms			-10.78 (0.49)	-0.27 (0.96)	-17.29 (0.29)	0.15 (0.45)
Non-linearity (LR/STD)			356.72 (0.00)	132.19 (0.00)		
Non-linearity ($1-R^2$)					391.50 (0.00)	145.05 (0.00)
R^2	0.48	0.69	0.76	0.80	0.78	0.88

Note: P-values are shown in parentheses.




Figure 5: Robustness tests for synthetic data non-linearity. In subfigures (a) and (b), non-linearity is defined as the LR RMSE divided by the standard deviation of the target variable in each dataset. (a) illustrates the relative improvement of the SRTPOT model compared to the TPOT model. (b) illustrates the relative improvement of the SRAK model compared to the AK model. In subfigures (c) and (d), non-linearity is defined as $1 - R^2$ of the LR model in each dataset. (c) illustrates the relative improvement of the SRTPOT model compared to the TPOT model. (d) illustrates the relative improvement of the SRAK model compared to the AK model.

6 Discussion

In this study, we have introduced a novel approach to FE by incorporating SR into ML and DL regression models. Our findings unequivocally demonstrate the potential of SR-derived features to significantly enhance the predictive performance of data-driven models while reducing the reliance on extensive domain expertise. By enabling models to autonomously evolve mathematical expressions that capture intricate data relationships, SR bridges the gap between interpretability and complexity.

As illustrated in Fig. 2, our results show that the proposed SR FE method can statistically improve the average performance of both synthetic and real-world datasets across both ML and DL-based models. As demonstrated in Table 1, the SR-derived feature improves the TPOT and AK models even though the SR model itself results in an inferior RMSE score. This improvement is independent of the data type or the specific data-driven model used. Moreover, the median value in all cases exceeds 0, indicating that the proposed method enhances the majority of the samples. In more complex real-world datasets, the mean improvement for ML models is 4.0%, while for DL models, it is 11.5%. It's important to note that in some cases, many models remain unchanged or experience only slight modifications, as evidenced by the large number of datasets with a relative performance of 0. This outcome is a result of both ML and DL models often performing feature selection, potentially disregarding the features generated by our method if they are found to be non-beneficial.

After establishing the effectiveness of the proposed method, we turned our attention to its robustness. We conducted extensive robustness tests that assessed the contribution of SR in 1250 ML and DL training processes under varying conditions. Based on this data, we computed a two-dimensional sensitivity analysis for the number of samples in a dataset, their noise levels, and the complexity of the regression task (indicated by the number of

terms in the mathematical equation) alongside the non-linearity coefficient, as presented in Figs. 4 and 5. Based on these results, and as indicated by Table (2), we observed a negative correlation between an increase in the number of samples, noise levels, and the relative performance of the proposed method. This observation aligns with the known notion that larger and cleaner datasets are generally easier to handle for data-driven models [89]. Nevertheless, even for datasets with 10,000 samples and 5% Gaussian noise, the proposed method demonstrates a relative average performance increase of 36% and 23% for ML and DL models, respectively, reaffirming its robustness to both noise and sample size. Additionally, as datasets become more complex, as depicted in Fig. 5, the proposed method continues to improve (or at least, not worsen) model performance. Notably, for linearly dependent datasets (i.e., with a non-linearity coefficient close to zero), the proposed method does not contribute to model performance. However, even with slight non-linearity, the proposed method demonstrates significant improvement on average.

While our study underscores the potential of SR-derived features, numerous challenges remain. The computational complexity of SR, particularly for larger datasets, necessitates further exploration of efficient optimization strategies [90]. Furthermore, the applicability of SR may vary depending on dataset characteristics, necessitating investigations into its adaptability to diverse domains and computational properties of the dataset [91, 52]. Additionally, this study solely employed one SR method - the GPLearn model [28]. Further exploration of other SR models (as proposed in [52]) could yield different results and pave the way for a meta-learning-based approach to select the best SR model based on dataset characteristics [9]. Moreover, exploring the potential of SR in time series, image analysis, and natural language processing tasks could extend its applicability across various domains.

Declarations

Funding

This research did not receive any specific grant from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Conflicts of interest/Competing interests

None.

Code and Data availability

The code and data that have been used in this study are publicly available in the research's GitHub repository: <https://github.com/AssafS91/Symbolic-Regression-as-Feature-Engineering-Method-for-Machine-and-Deep-Learning-Regression-Tasks>.

Acknowledgement

We express our gratitude to Amir Dalal for his invaluable support in managing the data related to superconducting critical temperatures. T.L. wishes to thank Alex Liberzon for encouraging him to pursue this line of work.

Author Contribution

Assaf Shmuel: Conceptualization, Methodology, Software, Formal Analysis, Investigation, Visualization, Writing - Original Draft.

Oren Gilckman: Conceptualization, Investigation, Supervision, Writing - Review & Editing.

Teddy Lazebnik: Conceptualization, Methodology, Investigation, Validation, Project Administration, Supervision, Writing - Original Draft, Writing - Review & Editing.

References

- [1] J. N. Kutz. Deep learning in fluid dynamics. *Journal of Fluid Mechanics*, 814:1–4, 2017.
- [2] M. Reichstein, G. Camps-Valls, B. Stevens, M. Jung, J. Denzler, N. Carvalhais, et al. Deep learning and process understanding for data-driven earth system science. *Nature*, 566(7743):195–204, 2019.
- [3] L. Alzubaidi, J. Zhang, Amjad J. Humaidi, A. Al-Dujaili, Y. Duan, O. Al-Shamma, J. Santamaría, M. A. Fadhel, M. Al-Amidie, and L. Farhan. Review of deep learning: Concepts, cnn architectures, challenges, applications, future directions. *Journal of big Data*, 8(1):1–74, 2021.
- [4] M. Raissi and G. E. Karniadakis. Hidden physics models: Machine learning of nonlinear partial differential equations. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 357:125–141, 2018.
- [5] M. Virgolin, Z. Wang, T. Alderliesten, and P. A. N. Bosman. Machine learning for the prediction of pseudorealistic pediatric abdominal phantoms for radiation dose reconstruction. *Journal of Medical Imaging*, 7(4):046501, 2020.
- [6] T. Lazebnik, Z. Bahouth, S. Bunimovich-Mendrazitsky, and S. Halachmi. Predicting acute kidney injury following open partial nephrectomy treatment using sat-pruned explainable machine learning model. *BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making*, 22, 2022.
- [7] E. Savchenko and T. Lazebnik. Computer aided functional style identification and correction in modern russian texts. *Journal of Data, Information and Management*, 4:25–32, 2022.
- [8] J. Zhong, X. Hu, J. Zhang, and M. Gu. Comparison of performance between different selection strategies on simple genetic algorithms. In *International conference on computational intelligence for modelling, control and automation and international conference on intelligent agents, web technologies and internet commerce (CIMCA-IAWTIC'06)*, volume 2, pages 1115–1121. IEEE, 2005.
- [9] T. Lazebnik and A. Rosenfeld. Fspl: A meta-learning approach for a filter and embedded feature selection pipeline. international. *Journal of Applied Mathematics and Computer Science*, 33(1), 2023.
- [10] X. He, K. Zhao, and X. Chu. Automl: A survey of the state-of-the-art. *Knowledge-Based Systems*, 212:106622, 2021.
- [11] M. F. Huber. A survey on the explainability of supervised machine learning. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 70, 2021.
- [12] R. Marcinkevics and J. E. Vogt. Interpretability and explainability: A machine learning zoo mini-tour. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 2023.
- [13] T. Li, J. Zhong, J. Liu, W. Wu, and C. Zhang. Ease. ml: Towards multi-tenant resource sharing for machine learning workloads. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, 11(5):607–620, 2018.
- [14] B. Dalessandro. Bring the noise: Embracing randomness is the key to scaling up machine learning algorithms. *Big Data*, 1(2):110–112, 2013.
- [15] G. Chandrashekar and F. Sahin. A survey on feature selection methods. *Computers & Electrical Engineering*, 40(1):16–28, 2014.
- [16] Jianyu Miao and Lingfeng Niu. A survey on feature selection. *Procedia Computer Science*, 91:919–926, 2016.
- [17] J. Heaton. An empirical analysis of feature engineering for predictive modeling. In *SoutheastCon 2016*, pages 1–6, 2016.

- [18] U. Khurana, D. Turaga, H. Samulowitz, and S. Parthasarathy. Cognito: Automated feature engineering for supervised learning. In *2016 IEEE 16th International Conference on Data Mining Workshops (ICDMW)*, pages 1304–1307, 2016.
- [19] V. Bolón-Canedo and A. Alonso-Betanzos. Ensembles for feature selection: A review and future trends. *Inf. Fusion*, 52:1–12, 2019.
- [20] I. Guyon and A. Elisseeff. An introduction to variable and feature selection. *Journal of machine learning research*, 3(Mar):1157–1182, 2003.
- [21] H. Liu, H. Motoda, R. Setiono, and Z. Zhao. Feature selection: An ever evolving frontier in data mining. In *Feature selection in data mining*, pages 4–13. PMLR, 2010.
- [22] D-T. Le, J. G. Ramas, Y. Grishina, and K. Rottmann. De-biasing training data distribution using targeted data enrichment techniques. In *KDD 2022 Workshop on Deep Learning Practice and Theory for High-Dimensional Sparse and Imbalanced Data (DLP)*, 2022.
- [23] Q. Zhu, L. Lin, M-L. Shyu, and S-C. Chen. Feature selection using correlation and reliability based scoring metric for video semantic detection. In *2010 IEEE Fourth International Conference on Semantic Computing*, pages 462–469. IEEE, 2010.
- [24] E. N. Aboudi and L. Benhlima. Review on wrapper feature selection approaches. In *2016 International Conference on Engineering & MIS (ICEMIS)*, pages 1–5, 2016.
- [25] S. M. Udrescu and M. Tegmark. Ai feynman: A physics-inspired method for symbolic regression. *Science Advances*, 6(16):eaay2631, 2020.
- [26] S. Stijven, E. Vladislavleva, A. Kordon, L. Willem, and M. E. Kotanchek. Prime-time: Symbolic regression takes its place in the real world. *Genetic Programming Theory and Practice XIII. Genetic and Evolutionary Computation*, 2016.
- [27] P. Mahouti, F. Gunes, M. A. Belen, and S. Demirel. Symbolic regression for derivation of an accurate analytical formulation using "big data": An application example. *The Applied Computational Electromagnetics Society Journal*, 32(5):372–380, 2021.
- [28] V. Sathia, V. Ganesh, and S. R. T. Nanditale. Accelerating genetic programming using gpus. *arXiv*, 2021.
- [29] R. S. Olson and J. H. Moore. Tpot: A tree-based pipeline optimization tool for automating machine learning. In *JMLR: Workshop and Conference Proceedings*, volume 64, pages 66–74, 2016.
- [30] H. Jin, Q. Song, and X. Hu. Auto-keras: An efficient neural architecture search system. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, page 1946–1956. Association for Computing Machinery, 2019.
- [31] J. Cai, J. Luo, S. Wang, and S. Yang. Feature selection in machine learning: A new perspective. *Neurocomputing*, 300:70–79, 2018.
- [32] P. Dhal and C. Azad. A comprehensive survey on feature selection in the various fields of machine learning. *Applied Intelligence*, 52:4543–4581, 2022.
- [33] Y. Wang, X. Zhao, T. Xu, and X. Wu. Autofield: Automating feature selection in deep recommender systems. In *Proceedings of the ACM Web Conference 2022*, page 1977–1986. Association for Computing Machinery, 2022.
- [34] M. Zivkovic, C. Stoean, A. Chhabra, N. Budimirovic, A. Petrovic, and N. Bacanin. Novel improved salp swarm algorithm: An application for feature selection. *Sensors*, 22(5), 2022.

- [35] H. Vaddireddy, A. Rasheed, A. E. Staples, and O. San. Feature engineering and symbolic regression methods for detecting hidden physics from sparse sensor observation data. *Physics of Fluids*, 32:015113, 2020.
- [36] Y. Xue, X. Cai, and F. Neri. A multi-objective evolutionary algorithm with interval based initialization and self-adaptive crossover operator for large-scale feature selection in classification. *Applied Soft Computing*, 127:109420, 2022.
- [37] T. Lazebnik, A. Somech, and A. I. Weinberg. Substrat: A subset-based optimization strategy for faster automl. *Proc. VLDB Endow.*, 16(4):772–780, 2022.
- [38] T. Bekhuis, E. Tseytlin, K. J. Mitchell, and D. Demner-Fushman. Feature engineering and a proposed decision-support system for systematic reviewers of medical evidence. *PLOS ONE*, 9(1):1–10, 01 2014.
- [39] S. Khalid, T. Khalil, and S. Nasreen. A survey of feature selection and feature extraction techniques in machine learning. In *2014 Science and Information Conference*, pages 372–378, 2014.
- [40] Y. Xu, K. Hong, J. Tsujii, and E. I-C. Chang. Feature engineering combined with machine learning and rule-based methods for structured information extraction from narrative clinical discharge summaries. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 19(5):824–832, 2012.
- [41] Qiuyang Yin, Xiaoyan Ye, Binhua Huang, Lei Qin, Xiaoying Ye, and Jian Wang. Stroke risk prediction: Comparing different sampling algorithms. *International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications*, 14, 01 2023.
- [42] K. K. Vasani and B. Surendiran. Dimensionality reduction using principal component analysis for network intrusion detection. *Perspectives in Science*, 8:510–512, 2016.
- [43] G. Ivosev, L. Burton, and R. Bonner. Dimensionality reduction and visualization in principal component analysis. *Analytical Chemistry*, 80(13):4933–4944, 2008.
- [44] J. V. Stone. Independent component analysis: an introduction. *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, 6(2):59–64, 2002.
- [45] D. Bank, N. Koenigstein, and R. Giryes. *Autoencoders*, pages 353–374. 2023.
- [46] Q. Meng, D. Catchpole, D. Skillicom, and P. J. Kennedy. Relational autoencoder for feature extraction. In *2017 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*, pages 364–371, 2017.
- [47] S. Vyas and L. Kumaranayake. Constructing socio-economic status indices: how to use principal components analysis. *Health Policy and Planning*, 21(6):459–468, 2006.
- [48] L. Ben Amor, I. Lahyani, and M. Jmaiel. PCA-based multivariate anomaly detection in mobile healthcare applications. In *2017 IEEE/ACM 21st International Symposium on Distributed Simulation and Real Time Applications (DS-RT)*, pages 1–8, 2017.
- [49] H. Mona, L. M. C. Andersson, A. Hjern, and H. Ascher. Barriers to accessing health care among undocumented migrants in Sweden - a principal component analysis. *BMC Health Services Research*, 21:830, 2021.
- [50] Y. Wang, N. Wagner, and James M. Rondinelli. Symbolic regression in materials science. *MRS Communications*, 9(3):793–805, 2019.
- [51] W. La Cava, P. Orzechowski, B. Burlacu, F. O. de França, M. Virgolin, Y. Jin, M. Kommenda, and J. H. Moore. Contemporary symbolic regression methods and their relative performance. *arXiv*, page 2107.14351, 2021.
- [52] J. Zegklitz and P. Posik. Benchmarking state-of-the-art symbolic regression algorithms. *Genetic Programming and Evolvable Machines*, 22:5–33, 2021.

- [53] M. J. H. Heule and O. Kullmann. The science of brute force. *Communications of the ACM*, 60(8):70–79, 2017.
- [54] R. Riolo. *Genetic programming theory and practice X*. Springer, 2013.
- [55] L. S. Keren, A. Liberzon, and T. Lazebnik. A computational framework for physics-informed symbolic regression with straightforward integration of domain knowledge. *Scientific Reports*, 13:1249, 2023.
- [56] B. L. Miller, D. E. Goldberg, et al. Genetic algorithms, tournament selection, and the effects of noise. *Complex systems*, 9(3):193–212, 1995.
- [57] P. Orzechowski, W. La Cava, and J. H. Moore. Where are we now?: a large benchmark study of recent symbolic regression methods. *GECCO18: Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference*, 2018.
- [58] B. K. Petersen, M. L. Larma, T. N. Mundhenk, C. P. Santiago, S. K. Kim, and J. T. Kim. Deep symbolic regression: Recovering mathematical expressions from data via risk-seeking policy gradients. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.04871*, 2019.
- [59] M. Quade, M. Abel, J. Nathanutz, and Brunton. S. L. Sparse identification of nonlinear dynamics for rapid model recovery. *Chaos*, 28:063116, 2018.
- [60] S. L. Brunton, J. L. Proctor, and J. N. Kutz. Discovering governing equations from data by sparse identification of nonlinear dynamical systems. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(15):3932–3937, 2016.
- [61] E. Kaiser, J. N. Kutz, and S. L. Brunton. Sparse identification of nonlinear dynamics for model predictive control in the low-data limit. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 474(2219):20180335, 2018.
- [62] N. M. Mangan, J. N. Kutz, S. L. Brunton, and j. L. Proctor. Model selection for dynamical systems via sparse regression and information criteria. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 473(2204):20170009, 2017.
- [63] A. A. Kaptanoglu, B. M. de Silva, U. Fasel, K. Kaheman, J. L. Callahan, C. B. Delahunt, K. Champion, J.-C. Loiseau, J. N. Kutz, and S. L. Brunton. Pysindy: A comprehensive python package for robust sparse system identification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2111.08481*, 2021.
- [64] G. Kronberger, F. Olivetti de França, B. Burlacu, C. Haider, and M. Kommenda. Shape-constrained symbolic regression—improving extrapolation with prior knowledge. *Evolutionary Computation*, 30(1):75–98, 2022.
- [65] R. Salustowicz and J. Schmidhuber. Probabilistic incremental program evolution. *Evolutionary Computation*, 5(2):123–141, 1997.
- [66] K. Sastry and D. E. Goldberg. Probabilistic model building and competent genetic programming. In *Genetic Programming Theory and Practice*, pages 205–220. Springer, 2003.
- [67] K. Yanai and H. Iba. Estimation of distribution programming based on bayesian network. In *The 2003 Congress on Evolutionary Computation, 2003. CEC'03.*, volume 3, pages 1618–1625. IEEE, 2003.
- [68] E. Hemberg, K. Veeramachaneni, J. McDermott, C. Berzan, and U-M. O’Reilly. An investigation of local patterns for estimation of distribution genetic programming. In *Proceedings of the 14th Annual Conference on Genetic and Evolutionary Computation*, pages 767–774, 2012.
- [69] Y. Shan, R. I. McKay, R. Baxter, H. Abbass, D. Essam, and H. X. Nguyen. Grammar model-based program evolution. In *Proceedings of the 2004 Congress on Evolutionary Computation*, volume 1, pages 478–485. IEEE, 2004.

- [70] P. A. N. Bosman and E. D. de Jong. Learning probabilistic tree grammars for genetic programming. In *International Conference on Parallel Problem Solving from Nature*, pages 192–201. Springer, 2004.
- [71] P-K. Wong, L-Y. Lo, M-L. Wong, and K-S. Leung. Grammar-based genetic programming with bayesian network. In *2014 IEEE Congress on Evolutionary Computation*, pages 739–746. IEEE, 2014.
- [72] L. F. D. P. Sotito and V. V. de Melo. A probabilistic linear genetic programming with stochastic context-free grammar for solving symbolic regression problems. In *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference*, pages 1017–1024, 2017.
- [73] T. Stephens. Genetic programming in python with a scikit-learn inspired api: Gplearn, 2016.
- [74] Lorenzo Vaccaro, Giuseppe Sansonetti, and Alessandro Micarelli. An empirical review of automated machine learning. *Computers*, 10(1), 2021.
- [75] Evgenii A. Neverov, Iliia I. Viksnin, and Sergei S. Chuprov. The research of automl methods in the task of wave data classification. In *2023 XXVI International Conference on Soft Computing and Measurements (SCM)*, pages 156–158, 2023.
- [76] H. Hewamalage, K. Ackermann, and C. Bergmeir. Forecast evaluation for data scientists: common pitfalls and best practices. *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, 37(2):788–832, 2023.
- [77] F. Conrad, M. Mälzer, M. Schwarzenberger, H. Wiemer, and S. Ihlenfeldt. Benchmarking AutoML for regression tasks on small tabular data in materials design. *Scientific Reports*, 12(1):19350, 2022.
- [78] J. S. Huang, J. X. Liew, and K. M. Liew. Data-driven machine learning approach for exploring and assessing mechanical properties of carbon nanotube-reinforced cement composites. *Composite Structures*, 267:113917, 2021.
- [79] M. Su, Q. Zhong, H. Peng, and S. Li. Selected machine learning approaches for predicting the interfacial bond strength between FRPs and concrete. *Construction and Building Materials*, 270:121456, 2021.
- [80] U. Atici. Prediction of the strength of mineral admixture concrete using multivariable regression analysis and an artificial neural network. *Expert Systems with applications*, 38(8):9609–9618, 2011.
- [81] S. Guo, J. Yu, X. Liu, C. Wang, and Q. Jiang. A predicting model for properties of steel using the industrial big data based on machine learning. *Computational Materials Science*, 160:95–104, 2019.
- [82] B. P. Koya, S. Aneja, R. Gupta, and C. Valeo. Comparative analysis of different machine learning algorithms to predict mechanical properties of concrete. *Mechanics of Advanced Materials and Structures*, 29(25):4032–4043, 2022.
- [83] A. Dunn, Q. Wang, A. Ganose, D. Dopp, and A. Jain. Benchmarking materials property prediction methods: the Matbench test set and Automatminer reference algorithm. *Computational Materials*, 6(1):138, 2020.
- [84] J. Xiong, G. Zhang, J. Hu, and L. Wu. Bead geometry prediction for robotic GMAW-based rapid manufacturing through a neural network and a second-order regression analysis. *Journal of Intelligent Manufacturing*, 25:157–163, 2014.
- [85] B. B. Yin and K. M. Liew. Machine learning and materials informatics approaches for evaluating the interfacial properties of fiber-reinforced composites. *Composite Structures*, 273:114328, 2021.
- [86] R. Bachir, A. M. S. Mohammed, and T. Habib. Using artificial neural networks approach to estimate compressive strength for rubberized concrete. *Periodica Polytechnica Civil Engineering*, 62(4):858–865, 2018.
- [87] S.R. Xie, Y. Quan, A.C. Hire, B. Deng, J. M. DeStefano, I. Salinas, and R.G. Hennig. Machine learning of superconducting critical temperature from Eliashberg theory. *npj Computational Materials*, 8(1):14, 2022.

- [88] A. Jose, J.P.A. de Mendonça, E. Devijver, N. Jakse, V. Monbet, and R. Poloni. Regression tree-based active learning. *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, pages 1–41, 2023.
- [89] A. Jain, H. Patel, L. Nagalapatti, N. Gupta, S. Mehta, S. Guttula, S. Mujumdar, S. Afzal, R. Sharma Mittal, and V. Munigala. Overview and importance of data quality for machine learning tasks. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, page 3561–3562. Association for Computing Machinery, 2020.
- [90] Z-H. Zhou, Y. Jiang, and S-F. Chen. Extracting symbolic rules from trained neural network ensembles. *Ai Communications*, 16(1):3–15, 2003.
- [91] Q. Chen and B. Xue. *Generalisation in Genetic Programming for Symbolic Regression: Challenges and Future Directions*, pages 281–302. Springer International Publishing, 2022.