

---

# The Potential of AutoML for Recommender Systems

---

Tobias Vente<sup>1</sup> Joeran Beel<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Siegen

---

**Abstract** Automated Machine Learning (AutoML) has greatly advanced applications of Machine Learning (ML) including model compression, machine translation, and computer vision. Recommender Systems (RecSys) can be seen as an application of ML. Yet, AutoML has found little attention in the RecSys community; nor has RecSys found notable attention in the AutoML community. Only few and relatively simple Automated Recommender Systems (AutoRecSys) libraries exist that adopt AutoML techniques. However, these libraries are based on student projects and do not offer the features and thorough development of AutoML libraries. We set out to determine how AutoML libraries perform in the scenario of an inexperienced user who wants to implement a recommender system. We compared the predictive performance of 60 AutoML, AutoRecSys, ML, and RecSys algorithms from 15 libraries, including a mean predictor baseline, on 14 explicit feedback RecSys datasets. To simulate the perspective of an inexperienced user, the algorithms were evaluated with default hyperparameters. We found that AutoML and AutoRecSys libraries performed best. AutoML libraries performed best for six of the 14 datasets (43%), but it was not always the same AutoML library performing best. The single-best library was the AutoRecSys library Auto-Surprise, which performed best on five datasets (36%). On three datasets (21%), AutoML libraries performed poorly, and RecSys libraries with default parameters performed best. Although, while obtaining 50% of all placements in the top five per dataset, RecSys algorithms fall behind AutoML on average. ML algorithms generally performed the worst.

---

## 1 Introduction

The application of Machine Learning (ML) was made more accessible by Automated Machine Learning (AutoML) (Hutter et al., 2019). AutoML enables users with little ML knowledge to apply ML algorithms relatively easily and effectively in various fields. Sometimes, AutoML libraries may achieve even better performance than human experts with ML libraries (Hanussek et al., 2020).

ML is often used to implement Recommender Systems (RecSys) (Zhang et al., 2019). The goal of RecSys is, among others, to predict the rating that a customer would give to an item (e.g., a movie or e-commerce product); or to predict the preference of a customer for an item ("like" / "dislike"). Implementing RecSys with ML or non-ML algorithms is as challenging as implementing any other ML pipeline. Many different algorithms with many hyperparameters exist. A user of RecSys algorithms must select algorithms and features, tune hyperparameters, and conduct time-consuming evaluations. If the user is inexperienced and implements the pipeline sub-optimally, then the recommendations won't satisfy customers and harm the business's success.

The success of AutoML has resulted in the development of a few Automated Recommender Systems (AutoRecSys) libraries that adopt AutoML techniques to RecSys (Anand and Beel, 2020; Wang et al., 2020; Sonboli et al., 2021; Gupta and Beel, 2020). However, these AutoRecSys libraries are based on student projects and not developed as professionally as many AutoML libraries. A user could also use AutoML by formulating a RecSys task as a ML classification or regression task.

Using ML or RecSys libraries is challenging for inexperienced users. To satisfy customers, inexperienced users would need to find a suitable configuration. To do so, AutoML or AutoRecSys could help inexperienced users and make RecSys more accessible. AutoML for RecSys could have

potential because no holistic and easily usable (Auto)RecSys libraries exist. This is in stark contrast to the plenty holistic and easily usable AutoML libraries.

Many RecSys libraries exist. RecSys libraries are often designed for particular RecSys applications (e.g., only explicit feedback); built with a focus on specific types of algorithms (e.g., neural networks); and, depending on its community, actively maintained or not maintained at all. State-of-the-art algorithms could be too complicated to reproduce for an inexperienced user or not reproducible at all, see (Dacrema et al., 2019). Using AutoRecSys can be problematic since users’ needs, like implicit feedback, are not supported yet.

It is an open question whether an inexperienced user can achieve suitable performance with AutoML compared to AutoRecSys, ML, or RecSys algorithms. We understand an inexperienced user to be a user that only employs default hyperparameters. This motivates our research question: *What is the performance of AutoML algorithms on RecSys tasks compared to AutoRecSys, ML, and RecSys algorithms using default hyperparameters?*

In this study, we do not explore the reasons for the differences in performance between algorithms. So far, nobody investigated the potential of AutoML for RecSys. Hence, we are first interested in an assessment of the state-of-the-art for inexperienced users as an initial exploratory study. A detailed analysis of the performance differences is too extensive for this paper and left for future work.

To answer our research question, we compare 7 AutoML-, 28 ML-, 23 RecSys algorithms, 1 AutoRecSys algorithm, and a mean predictor baseline on 14 RecSys datasets. We used default values for all hyperparameters to simulate the perspective of an inexperienced user. We limit this comparison to explicit feedback, a RecSys rating prediction task, and offline evaluation.

We hope that this work directs the interest of the AutoML community towards RecSys. Moreover, we hope that this work shows the special application of automated approaches in RecSys and the need thereof. We contribute insights into the potential of AutoML for an applied field like RecSys. Furthermore, we collected and preprocessed 14 datasets for predicting explicit feedback. Code for the comparison and for preprocessing the datasets can be found in our GitHub repository<sup>1</sup>.

## 2 Related Work

To the best of our knowledge, no one has evaluated AutoML libraries on a relatively large number of RecSys datasets. The work closest to ours is the usage of AutoML to generate ensembles for RecSys (Gupta and Katarya, 2021). RecSys algorithms were used for AutoML in, for example, model selection (Yang et al., 2019). AutoML has been applied to other fields like computer vision (Yang et al., 2021; Saikia et al., 2019; Lopes et al., 2021), machine translation (Viswanathan et al., 2019), model compression (He et al., 2018), and education (Tsiakmaki et al., 2020; Lee et al., 2020). To compare different AutoML frameworks, an AutoML benchmark was created (Gijsbers et al., 2019). Moreover, in the AutoML community, large dataset collections exist (Bischi et al., 2017; Balaji and Allen, 2018). For example, benchmarking suites<sup>2</sup> on OpenML (Vanschoren et al., 2013). No such dataset collections exist in the recommender system community. Furthermore, there is no standardized benchmark framework to compare RecSys algorithms.

## 3 Methods

We evaluated the predictive performance of 7 AutoML-, 28 ML-, 23 RecSys algorithms, 1 AutoRecSys algorithm, and a mean predictor baseline on 14 RecSys datasets. Each RecSys dataset contains explicit feedback, which represents a rating prediction task. Our implementation made the datasets usable by (Auto)RecSys and (Auto)ML algorithms. To capture the predictive performance, we computed the Root Mean Squared Error (RMSE) using hold-out validation (random test

---

<sup>1</sup>[https://github.com/ISG-Siegen/AutoML\\_for\\_Recommender\\_Systems](https://github.com/ISG-Siegen/AutoML_for_Recommender_Systems)

<sup>2</sup><https://docs.openml.org/benchmark/>

split: 25%). For our inexperienced-user-scenario, the algorithms are evaluated with default hyperparameters. To compare the 60 algorithms, we created a Docker-based evaluation tool. Moreover, we created preprocessing scripts for all 14 RecSys datasets. All 840 evaluation runs (60 algorithms times 14 datasets) were done on a workstation with an AMD Ryzen Threadripper PRO 3975WX CPU, 32 Cores (64 threads), SSD storage, and 528 GB RAM. The evaluations were run sequentially to guarantee that each run can utilize all resources. In total, it took 25 days to run all evaluations.

We did not reuse the AutoML benchmark (Gijsbers et al., 2019) for two reasons. First, the benchmark’s support for regression is a work in progress, which is, however, required for the task of predicting ratings. Second, the benchmark does not fully control runtime and memory limits independently from the evaluated frameworks. It assumes that the frameworks constrain the resources themselves. For example, the maximum runtime for an evaluation is passed to the framework and only if this constraint is not respected after twice the maximum runtime, the evaluation is aborted<sup>3</sup>. Moreover, it is not a requirement that the frameworks limit memory. For our use case of regression and our need of resource limits due to budget constraints, the AutoML benchmark was not appropriate.

All 14 RecSys datasets are publicly available. However, we can not redistribute the datasets due to their licenses. We only provide our preprocessing scripts so that others can replicate the evaluated datasets. RecSys datasets for explicit feedback differ from normal ML datasets in that RecSys datasets contain customer-, item-IDs, and timestamps as features. The timestamp, or a feature that can be transformed into a timestamp (e.g.: date of rating), represents the point in time a customer rated an item. Additional features are optional and not necessarily used by RecSys algorithms. The 23 RecSys algorithms included in our comparison only use customer-, item-IDs, and optionally timestamps. Consequently, we compare (Auto)RecSys using two or three features with (Auto)ML algorithms using all features. RecSys datasets are not synthetic but derived from real-world applications including human-derived data. In the following, we first present the selected datasets. Then, we detail the compared libraries. Lastly, we talk about our experiment setup by detailing the preprocessing, hyperparameters, and resource limits.

### 3.1 Datasets

We selected the following 14 RecSys datasets for explicit feedback<sup>4</sup>. These datasets are some of the most common and public rating-related RecSys tasks, which we found through the dataset survey by Beel and Brunel (2019) and papers from RecSys conferences.

- **MovieLens Data:** We have used the MovieLens 100k, MovieLens 1M, and MovieLens Latest 100k (9/2018) datasets (Harper and Konstan, 2016).
- **Amazon Review Data:** The datasets based on the following categories were used: Electronics; Digital Music; Toys and Games; Movies and TV; Fashion; Appliances; Industrial and Scientific; Software. We used the 5-core versions combined with meta-data (Ni et al., 2019).
- **Other:** We have also used the Yelp Open Dataset (Yelp, 2014); the Netflix Prize Dataset (Bennett et al., 2007)<sup>5</sup>; and the Food.com Recipes and Interactions Dataset (Majumder et al., 2019).

### 3.2 Libraries

All selected libraries are open source and can predict explicit feedback<sup>6</sup>.

- **RecSys:** Surprise (Hug, 2020), LensKit (Ekstrand, 2020), Spotlight (Kula, 2017), AutoRec (Wang et al., 2020)

---

<sup>3</sup><https://github.com/openml/automlbenchmark/blob/master/docs/HOWTO.md>

<sup>4</sup>The URLs to and licenses of all datasets can be found in the appendix A.

<sup>5</sup>We randomly subsampled this dataset to ten million instances due to our budget constraints.

<sup>6</sup>The versions, URLs to, and licenses of all libraries can be found in the appendix A.

- **AutoRecSys**: Auto-Surprise (Anand and Beel, 2020)
- **ML**: scikit-learn (Pedregosa et al., 2011), XGBoost (Chen and Guestrin, 2016), ktrain (Maiya, 2020)
- **AutoML**: Auto-sklearn (Feurer et al., 2015), FLAML (Wang et al., 2021), GAMA (Gijsbers and Vanschoren, 2019), H2O (LeDell and Poirier, 2020), TPOT (Olson et al., 2016; Le et al., 2020), AutoGluon (Erickson et al., 2020), Auto-PyTorch (Zimmer et al., 2021; Mendoza et al., 2018)

The Auto-Surprise (Anand and Beel, 2020) library is an extension of the Surprise (Hug, 2020) library. Auto-Surprise uses the Tree of Parzen Estimators of Hyperopt (Bergstra et al., 2015) to solve the Combined Algorithm and Hyper-parameter Selection (CASH) problem for a search space created from the algorithms and hyperparameter of Surprise. Auto-Surprise is currently the only library that we labeled as AutoRecSys because it is automated and sophisticated enough.

We labeled the library AutoRec as a RecSys library and not as an AutoRecSys library. AutoRec provides an interface to use AutoKeras (Jin et al., 2019; Chollet et al., 2015) without automating the additional overhead of the interface itself. For example, AutoRec does not enable the usage of a time limit for the neural architecture search nor does it automatically setup the input interaction matrix. Hence, we deem AutoRec to be not automated enough to be called AutoRecSys. Besides Auto-Surprise and AutoRec, two other projects related to AutoRecSys exist: Librec-Auto<sup>7</sup> (Sonboli et al., 2021) and Auto-CaseRec<sup>8</sup> (Gupta and Beel, 2020).

Librec-Auto takes as input one or more algorithms and their configurations defined in a XML-file and evaluates them. It can optionally optimize the algorithms’ numeric hyperparameters. Librec-Auto, however, does not return a trained model nor does it perform algorithm selection. It is an evaluation tool for a set of predefined algorithms. Auto-CaseRec is an early prototype of an AutoRecSys framework. It solves the CASH problems the Case Recommender library (da Costa et al., 2018). Yet, it does not offer the features and thorough development of a normal automated library. Mainly, its file-based usage and missing installation support (like a requirements file) are problematic. As a result, it was not usable as a part of our comparison without first reimplementing some of its functionalities. Consequently, Auto-CaseRec and Librec-Auto are not sophisticated enough to be AutoRecSys.

All algorithms in a library are integrated into our comparison if possible. We have used 10 algorithms from LensKit, 11 from Surprise, 26 from scikit-learn, and 1 algorithm from each other library. Details on which algorithms are used per library are listed in the Appendix B. Additionally, a baseline  $B_{mean}$  was added.  $B_{mean}$  always predicts the mean of the ratings calculated using the training data.  $B_{mean}$  is part of its own category "Baseline". In total, 60 algorithms are compared.

### 3.3 Experiment Setup

**Preprocessing.** We preprocessed the RecSys datasets such they are usable by (Auto)RecSys and (Auto)ML algorithms and as close as possible to the original dataset. Details on the chosen preprocessing steps can be found in the Appendix C. To present an overview of the resulting datasets, see Table 1 for details on the datasets’ statistics. Table 1 shows the number of customers, items, and instances of each preprocessed dataset. It also shows the number of additional features. Additional features are all features excluding customer-, item-ID and timestamp. Furthermore, the table details how many ratings each customer has done on average and the minimum/maximum number of ratings by a single customer.

**Hyperparameter Settings.** For all algorithms, the default values for hyperparameters are used. If an implementation does not provide default parameters, the parameter values of the sample code from the implementation’s documentation were used, e.g., values in the getting started section.

<sup>7</sup><https://github.com/that-recsys-lab/librec-auto>

<sup>8</sup><https://github.com/BeelGroup/Auto-CaseRec>

Table 1: **Dataset Statistics** For each dataset, the number of customers, items, instances, and additional features are shown. Additional features represent the number of features besides customer-, item-ID, and timestamp. Statistics about the Ratings per Customer (RpC) are also shown.

Dataset	#customers	#items	#instances	#add <sub>features</sub>	Avg. RpC	Min. RpC	Max. RpC
amazon-appliances	$4.70 \times 10^1$	$4.70 \times 10^1$	$1.90 \times 10^2$	4	4.04	1	8
amazon-digital-music	$1.49 \times 10^3$	$1.85 \times 10^2$	$2.24 \times 10^3$	4	1.51	1	14
amazon-fashion	$4.06 \times 10^2$	$3.10 \times 10^1$	$3.08 \times 10^3$	4	7.58	1	16
amazon-software	$1.83 \times 10^3$	$8.02 \times 10^2$	$1.20 \times 10^4$	4	6.56	1	52
amazon-industrial-and-scientific	$1.10 \times 10^4$	$5.33 \times 10^3$	$7.24 \times 10^4$	4	6.56	1	92
movielens-100K	$9.43 \times 10^2$	$1.68 \times 10^3$	$1.00 \times 10^5$	44	106.04	20	737
movielens-latest-small	$6.10 \times 10^2$	$9.72 \times 10^3$	$1.01 \times 10^5$	20	165.30	20	2698
movielens-1M	$6.04 \times 10^3$	$3.71 \times 10^3$	$9.98 \times 10^5$	22	165.27	19	2314
foodCom	$2.27 \times 10^5$	$2.32 \times 10^5$	$1.13 \times 10^6$	12	5.00	1	7671
amazon-toys-and-games	$2.08 \times 10^5$	$7.87 \times 10^4$	$1.76 \times 10^6$	4	8.45	1	718
amazon-movies-and-tv	$2.98 \times 10^5$	$6.01 \times 10^4$	$3.29 \times 10^6$	4	11.07	1	3398
amazon-electronics	$7.29 \times 10^5$	$1.60 \times 10^5$	$6.54 \times 10^6$	4	8.97	1	576
yelp	$2.19 \times 10^6$	$1.61 \times 10^5$	$8.64 \times 10^6$	58	3.94	1	6073
netflix	$4.58 \times 10^5$	$1.78 \times 10^4$	$1.00 \times 10^7$	1	21.82	1	1779

For automated libraries, resource parameters were set to have the same memory, job count, time passed to the framework (called search time), and optimization metrics across all libraries. We set the memory to all available memory (528 GB), the number of jobs to the maximal number of cores (64 - one for each CPU thread), the search time to 4 hours elapsed real (wall-clock) time, and the metric to the RMSE. Not all automated libraries support the RMSE. In such cases, the library was adjusted to optimize the MSE. Furthermore, not all libraries provide parameters to control memory or job count. In these cases, the behavior of the library is to use all memory or cores.

RecSys and ML libraries do not necessarily allow a user to set a time limit or tolerance for stopping the training of an algorithm. Instead, libraries rely on a user-controlled parameter to define the maximum number of trials or epochs for training. The default training parameters are not necessarily representative for the given algorithm while being faithful to our use case of an inexperienced user. To include an alternative in our analysis, we made an exception for AutoRec and set it to use 75 search trials and 1000 epochs with early stopping for all datasets.

**Resource Limits.** We implemented a runtime limit. If an algorithm takes more than 4 hours and 30 minutes for its evaluation, its execution is terminated. For automated libraries, this runtime limit is extended by the search time. Hence, totaling a limit of 8 hours and 30 minutes. An algorithm is also terminated if its evaluation exceeds 528 GB, the maximal available memory of our system.

**Predictive Performance Evaluation.** To compare the predictive accuracy across datasets, we transformed the RMSE into a rank. A lower rank is better (e.g.: 1 is the best rank). All algorithms that ran into a limit were ranked last. Equally well-performing algorithms are assigned the average of their combined ranks.

## 4 Results

We first present the impact of our chosen resource limits. Next, we evaluate the predictive performance of the algorithms and their associated categories.

### 4.1 Impacts of Resource Limits

Each evaluation run was limited in terms of memory and time. 7.50% of all evaluation runs failed. The memory limit was reached in 3.81% and the time limit in 3.69% of all runs. This, however, depends very much on the dataset. See Table 2 for an overview over the different datasets.

The majority of AutoML tools failed on the yelp dataset. The yelp dataset requires at least ~1.6 GB memory. This was too much for AutoPyTorch, AutoSklearn, and TPOT. Both AutoPyTorch and AutoSklearn limit the memory per job. For the yelp dataset, the memory limit per job is

Table 2: **Failure of Algorithms per Category per Datasets** Shown are the absolute failure counts and the failure frequencies for each dataset per category. The number next to the category name shows the number of algorithms in this category. The baseline  $B_{mean}$  is not shown, it did not run into any limits. However, it is part of the total count of algorithms for the last column.

Dataset	AutoML (7)	AutoRecSys (1)	ML (28)	RecSys (23)	Total (60)
amazon-appliances	-	-	-	-	-
amazon-digital-music	-	-	-	-	-
amazon-fashion	-	-	-	-	-
amazon-software	-	-	-	-	-
amazon-industrial-and-scientific	-	-	-	-	-
movielens-100K	-	-	1 (3.57%)	-	1 (1.67%)
movielens-latest-small	-	-	1 (3.57%)	-	1 (1.67%)
movielens-1M	-	-	3 (10.71%)	-	3 (5.00%)
foodCom	-	-	3 (10.71%)	2 (8.70%)	5 (8.33%)
amazon-toys-and-games	1 (14.29%)	-	3 (10.71%)	5 (21.74%)	9 (15.00%)
amazon-movies-and-tv	-	-	3 (10.71%)	5 (21.74%)	8 (13.33%)
amazon-electronics	-	-	3 (10.71%)	6 (26.09%)	9 (15.00%)
yelp	4 (57.14%)	-	4 (14.29%)	8 (34.78%)	16 (26.67%)
netflix	1 (14.29%)	-	4 (14.29%)	6 (26.09%)	11 (18.33%)

quickly exceeded if the memory (528 GB) is split between all 64 jobs. TPOT also runs in a job-related memory limit. All other AutoML failures were timeouts. In these cases, GAMA, TPOT, and AutoGluon were not able to build a model from the training data and generate the final predictions for the test data in the provided 4 hours and 30 minutes after the 4-hour-long search.

Assuming an inexperienced user would randomly pick an algorithm to solve a dataset, the algorithm would not produce any result within our resource limitations in 7.50% of all cases. For yelp, this would occur with a probability of 26.67%.

Recall, we made an exception for AutoRec, a RecSys library, and let it run for more epochs and trials than the default values. This made AutoRec run in a timeout for all six datasets with more than a million instances. Another deep learning RecSys library, Spotlight, which only runs for ten iterations by default, did run in a timeout for netflix and yelp. Yet, in all eight cases where both did not run into a limit, AutoRec and Spotlight are tied for the number of better predictive accuracy scores. In other words, neither default values nor static custom values are dominant.

## 4.2 Predictive Performance

To inspect the categories’ performance, see Table 3 for the categories’ average rank. This data indicates the category ranking:  $AutoRecSys(3.57) > AutoML(18.64) > RecSys(28.03) > ML(36.20) > Baseline(37.64)$ . Since the AutoRecSys category contains only one library (AutoSurprise), the average of the AutoRecSys category equals the result of AutoSurprise. AutoSurprise did run on all datasets and did neither experience memory limits nor timeouts. Next, we switch to an algorithm-specific perspective.

Refer to Table 4 for an overview of the top 10 ranked algorithms. The top 10 includes all categories except for the baseline. The AutoRecSys library Auto-Surprise allocates the first place with a substantial average rank difference to the second place. Auto-Surprise is followed by the two AutoML tools FLAML and H2O. The majority of algorithms within the top 10 are from RecSys libraries. One ML algorithm, XGBoost, reached the top 10. FLAML’s average rank is exactly twice the average rank of Auto-Surprise. In contrast, the rest of the average ranks differ only marginally between subsequent placings.

For more detailed ranking information per dataset, see Figure 1 for a rank plot of algorithms per dataset. The datasets’ top 5 are dominated by RecSys algorithms, which are most often a

Table 3: Average Rank per Category The number next to the category shows the amount of algorithms in the category.

Category	Average rank	Failure %
AutoRecSys (1)	3.57	-
AutoML (7)	18.64	6.12%
RecSys (23)	28.03	9.94%
ML (28)	36.20	6.38%
Baseline (1)	37.64	-

Table 4: Top 10 Average Ranked Algorithms

Algorithm	Average rank
Auto-Surprise	3.571
FLAML	7.143
H2OAutoML	7.214
SVDpp (Surprise)	8.071
FunkSVD (LensKit)	9.357
BiasedSVD (LensKit)	11.179
SVD (Surprise)	11.286
BaselineOnly (Surprise)	13.071
ALSBiasedMF (LensKit)	13.571
XGBoostRegressor	15.500

variation of SVD. 35 out of 70 are RecSys algorithms and 11 out of 70 are AutoRecSys. In total, 46 out of 70 are RecSys or AutoRecSys (65.7%). Yet, RecSys algorithms are only able to secure the first place three times. The first place is dominated by AutoRecSys (5 times) and AutoML (6 times).

Datasets with a lot of additional features, like yelp or movielens-latest-small, are mostly dominated by ML approaches except for movielens-1M and movielens-100k. Movielens-1M and movielens-100k are extremely popular evaluation datasets in the RecSys community (Beel and Brunel, 2019) and thus a lot of tools are tuned to work best on these datasets by default. Similar, datasets with almost no additional features like netflix are dominated by RecSys algorithms. For datasets with some additional features, the results are mixed.

Besides an algorithm rank perspective, a category rank perspective is relevant. See Figure 2 for a rank plot of categories per dataset. Our chosen baseline is, as expected, always the worst category. This is closely followed by ML, which is in the fourth place 10 out of 14 times. Automated libraries are never in the fourth place. The first and second place are dominated by AutoRecSys and AutoML, with AutoRecSys being in the first or second place 11 times and AutoML 7 times. This follows the category ranking indicated by the tables above, while the first place is more disputed.

**Comparison to the Baseline.** Many outliers exist in the collected error values<sup>9</sup>. Such outliers are expected since all algorithms with default values within a library were used. However, it is unexpected that the baseline  $B_{mean}$ , which only predicts the mean, outperforms other algorithms frequently. On average across all datasets,  $B_{mean}$  outperforms 26.90% of all algorithms.

## 5 Discussion

Given our results, we can answer the research question: *What is the performance of AutoML algorithms on RecSys tasks compared to AutoRecSys, ML, and RecSys algorithms using default hyperparameters?* The results indicate the following performance ranking for default hyperparameters:  $AutoRecSys \geq AutoML > RecSys > ML > Baseline$  whereby the first place is disputed between AutoRecSys and AutoML. In other words, we recommend AutoML or AutoRecSys libraries to an inexperienced user. AutoML is a promising approach to RecSys with a lot of potential considering that AutoML is not (over)fitted to RecSys tasks and much more accessible than RecSys libraries.

Given that RecSys algorithms often outperform ML algorithms but AutoML still outperforms RecSys, the need for more sophisticated AutoRecSys libraries is shown. Likewise, extensions of AutoML frameworks to RecSys have a lot of potential, given that AutoML is able to outperform the application-specific AutoRecSys or RecSys in 6 of 14 RecSys datasets. Moreover, the accessibility

<sup>9</sup>See Appendix D for more details.



Figure 1: **Top 5 Algorithms per Dataset** For each dataset, the top 5 algorithms are shown. They are color coded for their category. Moreover, the RMSE and name of the algorithm are shown. A larger, more readable version of this figure is located in the appendix.



Figure 2: **Order of Categories per Dataset** For each dataset, the 5 categories are shown sorted by their best performing algorithm's RMSE. They are color coded for their category. Moreover, the RMSE and name of the best performing algorithm are shown. A larger, more readable version of this figure is located in the appendix.

of RecSys libraries is in stark contrast to the accessibility of AutoRecSys or AutoML libraries (see our code for examples).

In general, the percentage of failed runs and bad performances is surprisingly high. Assuming an inexperienced user would randomly pick an algorithm, the algorithm would not produce any result within our resource limits or perform worse than the simple baseline  $B_{mean}$  in 34.40% of all cases. While this perspective is biased by bad performing algorithms and our resource limits, it is still truthful to our inexperienced-user-scenario. An inexperienced user does not know which algorithms are inappropriate or badly implemented. Furthermore, an inexperienced user has almost no guidelines about which algorithm to use in RecSys. Likewise, the impact of hyperparameter values on the performance and failure, like the number of training iterations for AutoRec and Spotlight, further illustrates the need for automated libraries to make RecSys more accessible.

Using benchmarking suites is a standard practice in AutoML. In RecSys, methods are evaluated on a few (potentially not diverse) datasets. However, we can see that a difference in performance of methods between such common datasets (like movielens-1M, movielens-100k, netflix) and more uncommon datasets (like Food.com and Yelp with our preprocessing) exist. The need for a diverse and complete benchmarking suite for RecSys is apparent.

## 6 Conclusion

To conclude our work, we first recap and discuss the broader impact of our work. Then, we detail the potential directions of improvement. Next, the limitations of our work are explicitly stated. Finally, the future work is addressed.

**Summary and Broader Impact Statement.** We compared the predictive performance of 60 AutoML, AutoRecSys, ML, and RecSys algorithms, including a baseline, on 14 RecSys datasets with explicit feedback. The open-source implementation of our comparison tool allows others to evaluate algorithms' performance on RecSys datasets. We presented algorithm performance through a ranking calculated using RMSEs obtained by hold-out validation. The presented results allow users to compare algorithms for a real-world RecSys application. Specifically, the results indicated  $AutoRecSys \geq AutoML > RecSys > ML > Baseline$  as a performance ranking. Moreover, we have shown that it is likely to encounter worse-than-baseline performing algorithms.

A positive impact of the presented results is that users are able to select an appropriate algorithm or category of algorithms without being RecSys experts. The results could lead more users to AutoML or AutoRecSys. AutoML or AutoRecSys can help users to create real-world RecSys applications without deep RecSys knowledge. Yet, if users do not know the risks of RecSys, their models could lead to biased, unfair, or offensive recommendations. Such misuse could create filter bubbles and bubbles that support malicious content.

Generally, our work is a first step towards fair and comparable benchmarking in RecSys. Initiatives to make data more standardized and easily shareable would be highly impactful for the RecSys community. Likewise, extending AutoML libraries to RecSys applications can create a positive impact. Alternatively, an initiative to support and produce sophisticated AutoRecSys libraries would help as well. The downsides of comparing different algorithms and making it easier to select appropriate algorithms, like automated approaches, could be reduced by increasing the awareness about the risks of automated approaches in RecSys.

**Limitations.** Our comparison focused on RecSys datasets with explicit feedback. Therefore, we did not include datasets with implicit feedback. The preprocessed datasets used for evaluation are basic by design and without natural language processing. These preprocessed datasets are not redistributed. Only scripts to preprocess the original datasets are provided. The selected RecSys algorithms can only use a user-ID, item-ID, rating, and optionally timestamps from a dataset. We did not constrain (Auto)ML algorithms to use a subset of the available features. As a result,

RecSys algorithms use fewer features than ML algorithms. We worked with resource limitations and not all evaluations were able to finish within our limits. Additional datasets, libraries, and more expensive validation methods (like cross-validation) are missing in this first version of our comparison.

**Directions of Improvement.** Our results hint at the effectiveness of automated libraries for inexperienced users in RecSys. Moreover, we have only found one suitable automated library that explicitly focused on RecSys. Consequently, there is a clear need for better and more sophisticated automated libraries for RecSys. We think that the sophisticated AutoML libraries need to get extensions for RecSys or better AutoRecSys libraries need to be made. Improvements in these directions shall end the manual and not systematically automated search for suitable configurations in RecSys. Thus, bringing the advances from the AutoML community to the RecSys community. Such that, in turn, the RecSys community will focus more on AutoML in the future.

**Future Work.** In future work, a better comparison between AutoML, AutoRecSys, ML, and RecSys algorithms can be achieved. Firstly, extending our comparison to perform cross-validation with a bigger resource budget is necessary. Thus, reducing the noise of randomness and to get more meaningful results. Secondly, the comparison needs to include more datasets and algorithms. Lastly, the comparison of algorithms and categories must be extended to implicit feedback datasets. Besides achieving a better comparison, a detailed analysis of such a comparison is future work. Determining the reason for the difference in the performance of compared algorithms can help to improve existing algorithms or foster the creation of new algorithms.

## References

- Anand, R. and Beel, J. (2020). Auto-surprise: An automated recommender-system (autorecsys) library with tree of parzens estimator (TPE) optimization. In Santos, R. L. T., Marinho, L. B., Daly, E. M., Chen, L., Falk, K., Koenigstein, N., and de Moura, E. S., editors, *RecSys 2020: Fourteenth ACM Conference on Recommender Systems, Virtual Event, Brazil, September 22-26, 2020*, pages 585–587. ACM.
- Balaji, A. and Allen, A. (2018). Benchmarking automatic machine learning frameworks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1808.06492*.
- Beel, J. and Brunel, V. (2019). Data pruning in recommender systems research best-practice or malpractice. *ACM RecSys*.
- Bennett, J., Lanning, S., et al. (2007). The netflix prize. In *Proceedings of KDD cup and workshop*, volume 2007, page 35. New York, NY, USA.
- Bergstra, J., Komer, B., Eliasmith, C., Yamins, D., and Cox, D. D. (2015). Hyperopt: a python library for model selection and hyperparameter optimization. *Computational Science & Discovery*, 8(1):014008.
- Bischi, B., Casalicchio, G., Feurer, M., Hutter, F., Lang, M., Mantovani, R. G., van Rijn, J. N., and Vanschoren, J. (2017). Openml benchmarking suites and the openml100. *CoRR*, abs/1708.03731.
- Chen, T. and Guestrin, C. (2016). Xgboost: A scalable tree boosting system. In Krishnapuram, B., Shah, M., Smola, A. J., Aggarwal, C. C., Shen, D., and Rastogi, R., editors, *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, San Francisco, CA, USA, August 13-17, 2016*, pages 785–794. ACM.
- Chollet, F. et al. (2015). Keras. <https://keras.io>.

- da Costa, A., Fressato, E., Neto, F., Manzato, M., and Campello, R. (2018). Case recommender: A flexible and extensible python framework for recommender systems. In *Proceedings of the 12th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems, RecSys '18*, pages 494–495, New York, NY, USA. ACM.
- Dacrema, M. F., Cremonesi, P., and Jannach, D. (2019). Are we really making much progress? A worrying analysis of recent neural recommendation approaches. In Bogers, T., Said, A., Brusilovsky, P., and Tikk, D., editors, *Proceedings of the 13th ACM Conference on Recommender Systems, RecSys 2019, Copenhagen, Denmark, September 16-20, 2019*, pages 101–109. ACM.
- Ekstrand, M. D. (2020). Lenskit for python: Next-generation software for recommender systems experiments. In d’Aquin, M., Dietze, S., Hauff, C., Curry, E., and Cudré-Mauroux, P., editors, *CIKM '20: The 29th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management, Virtual Event, Ireland, October 19-23, 2020*, pages 2999–3006. ACM.
- Erickson, N., Mueller, J., Shirkov, A., Zhang, H., Larroy, P., Li, M., and Smola, A. (2020). Autoglountabular robust and accurate automl for structured data. *arXiv preprint arXiv2003.06505*.
- Feurer, M., Klein, A., Eggenberger, K., Springenberg, J. T., Blum, M., and Hutter, F. (2015). Efficient and robust automated machine learning. In Cortes, C., Lawrence, N. D., Lee, D. D., Sugiyama, M., and Garnett, R., editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 28: Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2015, December 7-12, 2015, Montreal, Quebec, Canada*, pages 2962–2970.
- Gijsbers, P., LeDell, E., Thomas, J., Poirier, S., Bischl, B., and Vanschoren, J. (2019). An open source automl benchmark. *arXiv preprint arXiv1907.00909*.
- Gijsbers, P. and Vanschoren, J. (2019). GAMA genetic automated machine learning assistant. *Journal of Open Source Software*, 4(33):1132.
- Gupta, G. and Katarya, R. (2021). Enpso: An automl technique for generating ensemble recommender system. *Arabian Journal for Science and Engineering*, 46(9):8677–8695.
- Gupta, S. and Beel, J. (2020). Auto-caserec: Automatically selecting and optimizing recommendation-systems algorithms. *OSF Preprints*.
- Hanussek, M., Blohm, M., and Kintz, M. (2020). Can automl outperform humans an evaluation on popular openml datasets using automl benchmark. *arXiv preprint arXiv2009.01564*.
- Harper, F. M. and Konstan, J. A. (2016). The movielens datasets: History and context. *ACM Trans. Interact. Intell. Syst.*, 5(4):19:1–19:19.
- He, Y., Lin, J., Liu, Z., Wang, H., Li, L., and Han, S. (2018). AMC: automl for model compression and acceleration on mobile devices. In Ferrari, V., Hebert, M., Sminchisescu, C., and Weiss, Y., editors, *Computer Vision - ECCV 2018 - 15th European Conference, Munich, Germany, September 8-14, 2018, Proceedings, Part VII*, volume 11211 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 815–832. Springer.
- Hug, N. (2020). Surprise a python library for recommender systems. *Journal of Open Source Software*, 5(52):2174.
- Hutter, F., Kotthoff, L., and Vanschoren, J., editors (2019). *Automated Machine Learning - Methods, Systems, Challenges*. The Springer Series on Challenges in Machine Learning. Springer.

- Jin, H., Song, Q., and Hu, X. (2019). Auto-keras: An efficient neural architecture search system. In Teredesai, A., Kumar, V., Li, Y., Rosales, R., Terzi, E., and Karypis, G., editors, *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining, KDD 2019, Anchorage, AK, USA, August 4-8, 2019*, pages 1946–1956. ACM.
- Kula, M. (2017). Spotlight. <https://github.com/maciejkula/spotlight>.
- Le, T. T., Fu, W., and Moore, J. H. (2020). Scaling tree-based automated machine learning to biomedical big data with a feature set selector. *Bioinformatics*, 36(1):250–256.
- LeDell, E. and Poirier, S. (2020). H2O AutoML scalable automatic machine learning. *7th ICML Workshop on Automated Machine Learning (AutoML)*.
- Lee, S. B., Gui, X., and Hamilton, E. (2020). Application of automl in the automated coding of educational discourse data. In *Interdisciplinarity in the Learning Sciences: Proceedings of the 14th International Conference of the Learning Sciences, ICLS 2020, [Nashville, Tennessee, USA], Online Conference, June 19-23, 2020*. International Society of the Learning Sciences.
- Lopes, V., Gaspar, A., Alexandre, L. A., and Cordeiro, J. (2021). An automl-based approach to multimodal image sentiment analysis. In *International Joint Conference on Neural Networks, IJCNN 2021, Shenzhen, China, July 18-22, 2021*, pages 1–9. IEEE.
- Maiya, A. S. (2020). ktrain: A low-code library for augmented machine learning. *CoRR*, abs/2004.10703.
- Majumder, B. P., Li, S., Ni, J., and McAuley, J. (2019). Generating personalized recipes from historical user preferences. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 5976–5982, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Mendoza, H., Klein, A., Feurer, M., Springenberg, J. T., Urban, M., Burkart, M., Dippel, M., Lindauer, M., and Hutter, F. (2018). Towards automatically-tuned deep neural networks. In Hutter, F., Kotthoff, L., and Vanschoren, J., editors, *AutoML Methods, Systems, Challenges*, chapter 7, pages 141–156. Springer.
- Ni, J., Li, J., and McAuley, J. (2019). Justifying recommendations using distantly-labeled reviews and fine-grained aspects. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 188–197, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Olson, R. S., Bartley, N., Urbanowicz, R. J., and Moore, J. H. (2016). Evaluation of a tree-based pipeline optimization tool for automating data science. In *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference 2016, GECCO '16*, pages 485–492, New York, NY, USA. ACM.
- Pedregosa, F., Varoquaux, G., Gramfort, A., Michel, V., Thirion, B., Grisel, O., Blondel, M., Prettenhofer, P., Weiss, R., Dubourg, V., Vanderplas, J., Passos, A., Cournapeau, D., Brucher, M., Perrot, M., and Duchesnay, E. (2011). Scikit-learn machine learning in Python. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 12:2825–2830.
- Saikia, T., Marrakchi, Y., Zela, A., Hutter, F., and Brox, T. (2019). Autodispnet: Improving disparity estimation with automl. In *2019 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision, ICCV 2019, Seoul, Korea (South), October 27 - November 2, 2019*, pages 1812–1823. IEEE.

- Sonboli, N., Mansoury, M., Guo, Z., Kadekodi, S., Liu, W., Liu, Z., Schwartz, A., and Burke, R. (2021). librec-auto: A tool for recommender systems experimentation. In Demartini, G., Zuccon, G., Culpepper, J. S., Huang, Z., and Tong, H., editors, *CIKM '21: The 30th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management, Virtual Event, Queensland, Australia, November 1 - 5, 2021*, pages 4584–4593. ACM.
- Tsiakmaki, M., Kostopoulos, G., Kotsiantis, S., and Ragos, O. (2020). Implementing automl in educational data mining for prediction tasks. *Applied Sciences*, 10(1):90.
- Vanschoren, J., van Rijn, J. N., Bischl, B., and Torgo, L. (2013). Openml networked science in machine learning. *SIGKDD Explorations*, 15(2):49–60.
- Viswanathan, A., Wang, V., and Kononova, A. (2019). Controlling formality and style of machine translation output using automl. In Lossio-Ventura, J. A., Condori-Fernández, N., and Valverde-Rebaza, J. C., editors, *Information Management and Big Data - 6th International Conference, SIMBig 2019, Lima, Peru, August 21-23, 2019, Proceedings*, volume 1070 of *Communications in Computer and Information Science*, pages 306–313. Springer.
- Wang, C., Wu, Q., Weimer, M., and Zhu, E. (2021). Flaml a fast and lightweight automl library. In *MLSys*.
- Wang, T., Hu, X., Jin, H., Song, Q., Han, X., and Liu, Z. (2020). Autorec: An automated recommender system. In Santos, R. L. T., Marinho, L. B., Daly, E. M., Chen, L., Falk, K., Koenigstein, N., and de Moura, E. S., editors, *RecSys 2020: Fourteenth ACM Conference on Recommender Systems, Virtual Event, Brazil, September 22-26, 2020*, pages 582–584. ACM.
- Yang, C., Akimoto, Y., Kim, D. W., and Udell, M. (2019). OBOE: collaborative filtering for automl model selection. In Teredesai, A., Kumar, V., Li, Y., Rosales, R., Terzi, E., and Karypis, G., editors, *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining, KDD 2019, Anchorage, AK, USA, August 4-8, 2019*, pages 1173–1183. ACM.
- Yang, J., Shi, R., and Ni, B. (2021). Medmnist classification decathlon: A lightweight automl benchmark for medical image analysis. In *18th IEEE International Symposium on Biomedical Imaging, ISBI 2021, Nice, France, April 13-16, 2021*, pages 191–195. IEEE.
- Yelp (2014). Yelp open dataset. [www.yelp.com/dataset](http://www.yelp.com/dataset). Accessed 2022-02-21.
- Zhang, S., Yao, L., Sun, A., and Tay, Y. (2019). Deep learning based recommender system: A survey and new perspectives. *ACM Comput. Surv.*, 52(1):5:1–5:38.
- Zimmer, L., Lindauer, M., and Hutter, F. (2021). Auto-pytorch tabular multi-fidelity metalearning for efficient and robust autodl. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, pages 3079 – 3090. also available under <https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.13799>.

## A Versions, URLs, and Licenses of all used Libraries and Datasets

### A.1 Libraries

Surprise, [github.com/NicolasHug/Surprise](https://github.com/NicolasHug/Surprise), 1.1.1, BSD 3-Clause; LensKit, [lenskit.org](https://lenskit.org), 0.13.1, Custom; Spotlight, [github.com/maciejkula/spotlight](https://github.com/maciejkula/spotlight), 0.1.6, MIT; AutoRec, [github.com/datamllab/AutoRec](https://github.com/datamllab/AutoRec), 0.0.2, None; Auto-Surprise, [github.com/BeelGroup/Auto-Surprise](https://github.com/BeelGroup/Auto-Surprise), 0.1.7, MIT; scikit-learn, [scikit-learn.org](https://scikit-learn.org), 1.0.1, BSD 3-Clause; XGBoost, [github.com/dmlc/xgboost](https://github.com/dmlc/xgboost), 1.5.1, Apache-2.0; ktrain, [github.com/amaiya/ktrain](https://github.com/amaiya/ktrain), 0.28.3, Apache-2.0; Auto-sklearn, [automl.github.io/auto-sklearn](https://automl.github.io/auto-sklearn), 0.14.2, BSD 3-Clause; FLAML, [github.com/microsoft/FLAML](https://github.com/microsoft/FLAML), 0.9.1, MIT; GAMA, [github.com/openml-labs/gama](https://github.com/openml-labs/gama), 21.0.1, Apache-2.0; H2O, [h2o.ai/products/h2o-automl](https://h2o.ai/products/h2o-automl), 3.34.0.3, Apache-2.0; TPOT, [github.com/EpistasisLab/tpot](https://github.com/EpistasisLab/tpot), 0.11.7, LGPL-3.0; AutoGluon, [auto.gluon.ai/stable/index.html](https://auto.gluon.ai/stable/index.html), 0.3.1, Apache-2.0; Auto-PyTorch, [github.com/automl/Auto-PyTorch](https://github.com/automl/Auto-PyTorch), 0.1.1, Apache-2.0;

### A.2 Datasets

MovieLens 100k, [grouplens.org/datasets/movielens/100k/](https://grouplens.org/datasets/movielens/100k/), Custom; MovieLens 1M [grouplens.org/datasets/movielens/1m/](https://grouplens.org/datasets/movielens/1m/), Custom; MovieLens Latest 100k (9/2018), [grouplens.org/datasets/movielens/latest/](https://grouplens.org/datasets/movielens/latest/), Custom; Amazon Review Data, [nijianmo.github.io/amazon/index.html](https://nijianmo.github.io/amazon/index.html), N/A; Yelp Open Dataset, [yelp.com/dataset](https://yelp.com/dataset), Custom; Netflix Prize Dataset, [www.kaggle.com/netflix-inc/netflix-prize-data](https://www.kaggle.com/netflix-inc/netflix-prize-data), Custom; Food.com Recipes and Interactions Dataset, <https://www.kaggle.com/shuyangli94/food-com-recipes-and-user-interactions>, Data files © Original Authors (ODC-ODbL);

## B Used Algorithms

The following algorithms of different libraries were used:

**Surprise:** SVD, KNNBasic, KNNBaseline, KNNWithZScore, KNNWithMeans, CoClustering, BaselineOnly, SlopeOne, SVDpp, NMF, NormalPredictor

**LensKit:** ItemItem, UserUser, Bias, ALSBiasedMF, FunkSVD, BiasedSVD, TFBiasedMF, BPR, IntegratedBiasMF, HPF

**Sklearn:** LinearRegression, Ridge, SGDRegressor, ElasticNet, LassoLars, OrthogonalMatchingPursuit, ARDRegression, BayesianRidge, Lars, Lasso, HuberRegressor, TheilSenRegressor, PoissonRegressor, GammaRegressor, TweedieRegressor, RANSACRegressor, RandomForestRegressor, AdaBoostRegressor, BaggingRegressor, ExtraTreesRegressor, GradientBoostingRegressor, SVR, KNeighborsRegressor, MLPRegressor, KernelRidge, DecisionTreeRegressor

All other libraries only have one relevant implementation for regression.

## C Preprocessing

The goal of all preprocessing steps was to keep the data as close to the original as possible. Only features that would cause errors were preprocessed. All datasets were converted into CSV files. Such a CSV file shall be usable by RecSys and ML libraries. To achieve this, several decisions on how to transform features had to be made.

In general, we differentiate between categorical and text features. Text features can contain any free-text input (e.g., text of a review), while categorical features are limited to a specific range of possible categories. For this paper, it was decided to not include any text features. In other words, Natural Language Processing was not used to transform text features into any type of usable tabular features. Categorical features have been One-Hot encoded.

Based on the assumption to keep the data as close to the original as possible, an already encoded feature was used and not reencoded. For example, if the gender of a user was encoded through a dummy variable, it was not transformed to one-hot encoding. This also applies to customer- and item-IDs. If the ID was given as an integer, it was used as an integer. Only if the dataset used a different format, like a UUID in the form of a string which would prompt errors in ML or RecSys algorithms, the IDs were encoded as increasing integers. Any other numeric feature is used without processing.

Similar to the previous assumption, we decided against creating new features from existing data to stick as close to the original data as possible. To illustrate, a feature representing URLs related to an item was removed instead of using these URLs to potentially fetch additional information about an item.

Sometimes features were in the dataset but not in the dataset's documentation. In such cases, the undocumented features were removed.

Removing features, like a review's text, can cause two reviews of an individual customer to become identical. Moreover, some datasets have multiple entries for the same review if a property of the review differs. For example, in the Amazon datasets the "summary" of a review can be different and thus result in two distinct entries. Likewise, (presumably) bugs can cause that the timestamp of a review and the timestamp of an edited version are the same. In the Yelp dataset, multiple duplicates exist, because all features (including the timestamp) are identical but the text differs. We drop duplicates such that the combination of resulting features from previous preprocessing steps is unique.

Several algorithms can not handle ratings to be zero. For these specific cases, we add a small  $\epsilon$  to all zero-ratings such that the algorithm is still usable.

The defined preprocessing steps were applied to all features. If features were spread across multiple files, all files are used.

## D Dataset Boxplot

Figure 3 shows the boxplots of the error values of the used algorithms for each category specific to each dataset. The error values of most algorithms are between 0.8 and 1.3. Some error values for datasets stick out. The error values of the amazon-fashion datasets are comparatively low. The lowest values for the amazon-fashion dataset shown in figure Dataset Boxplot are lower than 0.25. In comparison with the amazon-fashion- and other datasets, the error values of food.com are comparatively high.

## E Larger Plots




Figure 3: RMSE Boxplots for each category specific to each dataset The distribution of error values for each category specific to each dataset is visualized. The distribution is represented by boxplots. This excludes 61 error values that are greater than 2.




Figure 4: Top 5 Algorithms per Dataset For each dataset, the top 5 algorithms are shown. They are color coded for their category. Moreover, the RMSE and name of the algorithm are shown.




Figure 5: Order of Categories per Dataset For each dataset, the 5 categories are shown sorted by their best performing algorithm's RMSE. They are color coded for their category. Moreover, the RMSE and name of the best performing algorithm are shown.