

Bayesian Optimization for Simultaneous Selection of Machine Learning Algorithms and Hyperparameters on Shared Latent Space

Kazuki Ishikawa¹, Ryota Ozaki¹, Yohei Kanzaki¹, Ichiro Takeuchi^{2,3}, and Masayuki Karasuyama^{*1}

¹Nagoya Institute of Technology

²Nagoya University

³RIKEN

Abstract

Selecting the optimal combination of a machine learning (ML) algorithm and its hyper-parameters is crucial for the development of high-performance ML systems. However, since the combination of ML algorithms and hyper-parameters is enormous, the exhaustive validation requires a significant amount of time. Many existing studies use Bayesian optimization (BO) for accelerating the search. On the other hand, a significant difficulty is that, in general, there exists a different hyper-parameter space for each one of candidate ML algorithms. BO-based approaches typically build a surrogate model independently for each hyper-parameter space, by which sufficient observations are required for all candidate ML algorithms. In this study, our proposed method embeds different hyper-parameter spaces into a shared latent space, in which a surrogate multi-task model for BO is estimated. This approach can share information of observations from different ML algorithms by which efficient optimization is expected with a smaller number of total observations. We further propose the pre-training of the latent space embedding with an adversarial regularization, and a ranking model for selecting an effective pre-trained embedding for a given target dataset. Our empirical study demonstrates effectiveness of the proposed method through datasets from OpenML.

1 Introduction

In recent years, machine learning (ML) has gained widespread adoption and has been utilized in various fields. However, to achieve high prediction performance, the precise selection of an appropriate ML algorithm and its hyper-parameters (HPs) is indispensable. There exist a large number of possible combinations of ML algorithms and HPs, which makes their efficient selection is challenging.

The simultaneous selection of an ML algorithm and HPs is called Combined Algorithm Selection and Hyper-parameter optimization (CASH) problem [Thornton et al.(2013), Feurer et al.(2015a)]. The CASH problem is formulated as the optimization of the prediction performance with respect to the pair of an ML algorithm and its HP setting. To solve a CASH

problem, Bayesian optimization (BO) [Brochu et al.(2010), Snoek et al.(2012), Bergstra et al.(2011)] is often used. BO constructs a probabilistic surrogate model (typically, the Gaussian process) to approximate the objective function in the search space (e.g., to predict the validation accuracy of an ML model in the HP space), by which a decision making considering the current uncertainty of the surrogate model becomes possible.

In general, since different ML algorithms have different HP spaces, different surrogate models are usually required to estimate for each one of ML algorithms [Nguyen et al.(2020)]. In this approach, each surrogate model is independently learned and information of observations is not shared across ML algorithms. Because of this observation separation, this approach requires sufficient observations for all candidate ML algorithms to build an effective surrogate model. On the other hand, applying BO in the joint (concatenated) space of different HP spaces [Hutter et al.(2011)] has been also studied. However, the joint space becomes high dimension and the default value setting is required for ‘non-active’ ML algorithms whose justification is unclear. Further details of related work is discussed in Section 4.

In this study, we propose a BO based CASH solver in which a surrogate model is learned in a shared latent space. The basic idea is to embed observations obtained by different ML algorithms into a common latent space. This approach enables the surrogate model 1) to be constructed by using information of all candidate ML algorithms, and 2) to avoid the difficulties in the joint space approach such as high dimensionality. Since most of HPs control the model flexibility in different manners, we assume that a common latent representation can be created for HP spaces of many different ML algorithms through an appropriate transformation. We further introduce a pre-training framework for the latent space construction so that the search can be stably accelerated even at the early iterations of BO.

Figure 1 illustrates the entire framework of the proposed method, which comprises three main components. Each of these components is a major contribution of this paper:

- The first component is the BO with a surrogate model in the shared latent space for the CASH optimization, illustrated in Fig. 1(a). By combining the multi-task Gaussian process [Álvarez et al.(2012)] and deep kernel [Wilson et al.(2016)], we build the surrogate model in such

*karasuyama@nitech.ac.jp




Figure 1: Overview of Proposed Framework.

a way that observations in different HP spaces can be shared.

- The second component is the pre-training of the latent space embedding, illustrated in Fig. 1(b). To encourage information sharing among different ML algorithms, we introduce domain adversarial learning [Ganin et al.(2016)] as a regularizer in the pre-training, which prevents observations from different ML algorithms from being isolated in the latent space.
- The pre-training can be performed for a variety of past datasets, called source datasets, beforehand. In the third component, shown as (c) in Fig 1, we construct a ranking model that recommends the best pre-trained embedding for a given target dataset by using a technique in learning to rank [Liu(2011)].

We empirically demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed framework through datasets in OpenML [Vanschoren et al.(2013)].

2 Problem Setting

We assume that there exist M candidate machine learning (ML) algorithms $\mathcal{A} = \{A^{(1)}, \dots, A^{(M)}\}$, in which the m -th ML algorithm $A^{(m)}$ has a hyper-parameter (HP) space $\Lambda^{(m)}$. This means that our search space consists of a pair of an ML algorithm $A^{(m)}$ and an HP vector $\lambda^{(m)}$, denoted as $\Xi = \{(A^{(m)}, \lambda^{(m)}) \mid A^{(m)} \in \mathcal{A}, \lambda^{(m)} \in \Lambda^{(m)}, m \in [M]\}$. A given dataset \mathcal{D} is partitioned into the training dataset $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$ and the validation dataset $\mathcal{D}_{\text{valid}}$, respectively. Suppose that $\text{Acc}(A^{(m)}, \lambda^{(m)}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{valid}})$ is an evaluation score (such as the validation classification accuracy) on $\mathcal{D}_{\text{valid}}$ of an ML algorithm $A^{(m)}$ trained by $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$ with an HP $\lambda^{(m)}$. The optimization problem for identifying the pair $(A^*, \lambda^*) \in \Xi$ that maximizes $\text{Acc}(A^{(m)}, \lambda^{(m)}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{valid}})$ is called Combined Algorithm Selection and Hyperparameter optimization (CASH) prob-

lem [Thornton et al.(2013), Feurer et al.(2015a)]:

$$(A^*, \lambda^*) = \underset{(A^{(m)}, \lambda^{(m)}) \in \Xi}{\text{argmax}} \text{Acc}(A^{(m)}, \lambda^{(m)}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{valid}}). \quad (1)$$

In general, it is often difficult to analytically represent a relation between Acc and $(A^{(m)}, \lambda^{(m)})$, and therefore, this problem is often regarded as a black-box optimization problem.

3 Proposed Method

Here, we introduce our proposed framework for efficiently solving (1). In Section 3.1, we describe our BO with a latent space surrogate model (Fig. 1(a)). The pre-training (Fig. 1(b)) of the latent space embedding is described in Section 3.2. The ranking model (Fig. 1(c)) for the selection of a pre-trained model is shown in Section 3.3. The algorithm of the proposed method is shown in Algorithm 1, whose details are described throughout this section.

3.1 Bayesian Optimization on Shared Latent Space

3.1.1 Multi-task Gaussian Process on Latent Space

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, suppose that $y_n^{(m)} = \text{Acc}(A^{(m)}, \lambda_n^{(m)}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{valid}})$ is an observation for a pair $(A^{(m)}, \lambda_n^{(m)})$. The entire set of observations is written as

$$\mathcal{O} = \bigcup_{m \in [M]} \mathcal{O}^{(m)}, \quad (2)$$

where $\mathcal{O}^{(m)} = \{(A^{(m)}, \lambda_n^{(m)}, y_n^{(m)})\}_{n \in [N_m]}$ is a set of observations for the m -th ML algorithm $A^{(m)}$, and N_m is the number of observations from $A^{(m)}$.

We consider embedding an HP vector $\lambda_n^{(m)} \in \Lambda^{(m)}$ of $A^{(m)}$ into a shared latent space \mathcal{U} :

$$\mathbf{u}_n^{(m)} = \phi^{(m)}(\lambda_n^{(m)}), \quad (3)$$

where $\mathbf{u}_n^{(m)} \in \mathcal{U}$ is a latent variable and $\phi^{(m)} : \Lambda^{(m)} \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$ is an embedding function defined by a Multi-Layer Perceptron (MLP). The latent space \mathcal{U} is shared by all ML algorithms $A^{(m)}$.

Algorithm 1: Proposed Method

Require: Initial observations \mathcal{O} , Max iteration T ,
 Meta-features $\mathbf{x}_s^{\text{meta}}$ and pre-trained MLPs for
 source datasets $\{\mathcal{D}'_s\}_{s \in [S]}$, Ranking model f_{rank}

1 Compute meta-feature \mathbf{x}^{meta} for target dataset \mathcal{D}

2 Select the best source dataset $\mathcal{D}'_{s_{\text{best}}}$ by ranking model

f_{rank} :

$$s_{\text{best}} \leftarrow \underset{s \in [S]}{\operatorname{argmax}} f_{\text{rank}}(\mathbf{x}^{\text{meta}}, \mathbf{x}_s^{\text{meta}})$$

▷ Recommendation of pre-trained model (Fig. 1(c))

3 Set $\{\phi^{(m)}\}_{m \in [M]}$ as MLPs trained beforehand by $\mathcal{D}'_{s_{\text{best}}}$

4 **for** $t < T$ **do** ▷ Main loop of BO (Fig. 1(a))

5 Optimize MTGP with deep kernel via regularized
 marginal likelihood (5)

6 Select next observation by EI:

$$(A_{\text{next}}, \lambda_{\text{next}}) \leftarrow \max_{(A^{(m)}, \lambda^{(m)}) \in \Xi} a(A^{(m)}, \lambda^{(m)})$$

7 Compute validation accuracy:

$$y_{\text{next}} \leftarrow \operatorname{Acc}(A_{\text{next}}, \lambda_{\text{next}}, D_{\text{train}}, D_{\text{valid}})$$

8 **if** y_{next} is current best **then**

9 $(A_*, \lambda_*) \leftarrow (A_{\text{next}}, \lambda_{\text{next}})$

10 Update observations: $\mathcal{O} \leftarrow \mathcal{O} \cup \{(A_{\text{next}}, \lambda_{\text{next}}, y_{\text{next}})\}$

11 **return** (A_*, λ_*)

In Bayesian optimization (BO), the Gaussian process (GP) [Rasmussen and Williams(2006)] is typically used as a surrogate model of the objective function. Instead of separately modeling M different Acc created by $A^{(m)}$ for $m = 1, \dots, M$, we employ a multi-task GP (MTGP) [Bonilla et al.(2007), Álvarez et al.(2012)] in which M ML algorithms are seen as correlated M tasks. We assume that $y_n^{(m)}$ can be represented by a function $f_{A^{(m)}}$ on latent space:

$$y_n^{(m)} = f_{A^{(m)}}(\phi^{(m)}(\lambda_n^{(m)})) + \varepsilon = f_{A^{(m)}}(\mathbf{u}_n^{(m)}) + \varepsilon,$$

where $\varepsilon \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_{\text{noise}}^2)$ is an independent noise term. The MTGP, defined on the latent space, represents $f_{A^{(m)}}(\mathbf{u}_n^{(m)})$ as follows:

$$f_A(\mathbf{u}) \sim \mathcal{GP}(\mu_0(\mathbf{u}), k((\mathbf{u}, A), (\mathbf{u}', A'))), \quad (4)$$

where $\mathbf{u} \in \mathcal{U}$ is an input in the latent space, $\mu_0 : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a prior mean function, and $k((\mathbf{u}, A), (\mathbf{u}', A'))$ is a kernel function for a pair $\mathcal{U} \times \mathcal{A}$. Figure 2 shows an illustration of this MTGP. In the literature of MTGPs, a variety of approaches to building $k((\mathbf{u}, A), (\mathbf{u}', A'))$ have been discussed, by which relations among tasks can be controlled. We employ the well-known linear model of coregionalization (LMC) [Álvarez et al.(2012)] kernel, which captures task dependencies using a low-rank plus diagonal covariance matrix across tasks.

The posterior distribution can be calculated by the same procedure as the standard GP. Consider a predictive distribution for an HP $\lambda^{(m)}$ of an ML algorithm $A^{(m)}$, for which the latent variable is $\mathbf{u}^{(m)} = \phi^{(m)}(\lambda^{(m)})$. Let $U = \bigcup_{m \in [M]} \{(\mathbf{u}_n^{(m)}, A^{(m)})\}_{n \in [N_m]}$ be a set of pairs of an embedded latent variable and an ML algorithm in the observed set \mathcal{O} , and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{k} &= k(U, (\mathbf{u}^{(m)}, A^{(m)})) \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{O}|}, \\ \mathbf{K} &= k(U, U) \in \mathbb{R}^{|\mathcal{O}| \times |\mathcal{O}|}, \end{aligned}$$




Figure 2: Schematic illustration of MTGP on latent space. (a) Independent GPs are fitted to each ML algorithm separately. (b) The MTGP is fitted in the latent space, by which information from different ML algorithms are shared.

be a vector and a matrix created by substituting each element of U into the kernel function k . Then, the posterior given observations (2) is

$$f_{A^{(m)}}(\mathbf{u}^{(m)}) | \mathcal{O} \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu(\mathbf{u}^{(m)}), \sigma^2(\mathbf{u}^{(m)})),$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\mathbf{u}^{(m)}) &= \mathbf{k}^\top (\mathbf{K} + \sigma_{\text{noise}}^2 \mathbf{I})^{-1} (\mathbf{y} - \mu_0) + \mu_0(\mathbf{u}^{(m)}), \\ \sigma^2(\mathbf{u}^{(m)}) &= k((\mathbf{u}^{(m)}, A^{(m)}), (\mathbf{u}^{(m)}, A^{(m)})) - \mathbf{k}^\top (\mathbf{K} + \sigma_{\text{noise}}^2 \mathbf{I})^{-1} \mathbf{k}, \end{aligned}$$

and μ_0 and \mathbf{y} are vectors concatenating $\mu_0(\mathbf{u}_n^{(m)})$ and $y_n^{(m)}$, respectively. We will discuss how to construct the prior μ_0 in Section 3.2.1.

Figure 2 compares independent GPs for each ML algorithm (left) and the MTGP through the latent space embedding (right). In the left three plots, each GP can only use their own observations $\mathcal{O}^{(m)}$. On the other hand, the MTGP can use all observations \mathcal{O} to give a prediction for any $\lambda_n^{(m)}$ of any $A^{(m)}$.

3.1.2 Parameter Optimization

Let Θ be all the parameters including the parameters of the MTGP (such as the kernel length scale) and the weight parameters of the MLP $\phi^{(m)}$. We optimize Θ by minimizing

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}(\Theta) &= - \left(-\frac{1}{2} (\mathbf{y} - \mu_0)^\top \mathbf{C}^{-1} (\mathbf{y} - \mu_0) - \frac{1}{2} \log |\mathbf{C}| \right) \\ &\quad + \alpha \sum_{m \in [M]} R(\theta^{(m)}), \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{K} + \sigma_{\text{noise}}^2 \mathbf{I}$, $\theta^{(m)}$ is the weight parameters of $\phi^{(m)}$, $R(\theta^{(m)})$ is a regularization term for $\theta^{(m)}$, and α is a regularization parameter. The first term in (5) is the (negative) marginal likelihood of the MTGP. By minimizing (5), we can estimate the MTGP hyper-parameters and latent space embedding, simultaneously. In this formulation, the kernel function including MLPs can be seen as a deep kernel [Wilson et al.(2016)].

Due to limited observations in the early iterations of BO, training the MLPs may be unstable. To mitigate this issue, we will introduce a pre-training of the MLPs in Section 3.2. The regularization term $R(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(m)})$ in (5) penalizes the deviation from the pre-trained parameters, by which the over-fitting under small observations is inhibited:

$$R(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(m)}) = \frac{1}{K_m} \left\| \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(m)} - \boldsymbol{\theta}_{\text{pre-trained}}^{(m)} \right\|_2^2, \quad (6)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(m)}$ is the weight parameter vector of the MLP $\phi^{(m)}$ whose dimension is K_m , and $\boldsymbol{\theta}_{\text{pre-trained}}^{(m)}$ is the corresponding pre-trained vector. Therefore, the regularization (6) tries to maintain the pre-trained $\phi^{(m)}$ [Kirkpatrick et al.(2017)].

3.1.3 Selecting Next Observation

Based on the estimated MTGP, we determine a pair $(A_{\text{next}}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\text{next}}) \in \Xi$ that we evaluate Acc next. In BO, a next observation is determined by the acquisition function maximization:

$$(A_{\text{next}}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_{\text{next}}) = \underset{(A^{(m)}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(m)}) \in \Xi}{\operatorname{argmax}} a(A^{(m)}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(m)}). \quad (7)$$

where a is an acquisition function. We here employ the standard Expected Improvement (EI) [Brochu et al.(2010)], though any acquisition function studied in BO is applicable:

$$a(A^{(m)}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(m)}) = \mathbb{E} \left[\max \left\{ f_{A^{(m)}}(\phi^{(m)}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(m)})) - y_{\text{best}}, 0 \right\} \right], \quad (8)$$

where y_{best} is the maximum observed value until the current iteration.

To solve the acquisition function maximization (7), we simply maximize $\boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(m)}$ for each $A^{(m)}$, and select $(A^{(m)}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}^{(m)})$ that maximizes a . For each maximization, any optimization algorithm (such as DIRECT [Jones et al.(1993)] that is often used in BO) is applicable. We employ a heuristic local optimization algorithm [Hutter et al.(2011)] based approach that is applicable to an HP space containing both continuous and discrete variables (see Appendix A for detail).

3.2 Pre-training for Shared Latent Space

As shown in Section 3.1, our proposed method considers the CASH problem through the latent space shared by all candidate ML algorithms. In this approach, constructing an appropriate latent space is obviously important. We introduce a pre-training approach so that effective latent space can be used even with small amount of observations \mathcal{O} .

3.2.1 Loss Function for Pre-training

Suppose that there is an additional ‘source’ dataset \mathcal{D}' that the user would like to use for the knowledge transfer to the target dataset \mathcal{D} . Further, for \mathcal{D}' , the validation evaluation Acc for many HPs of each candidate ML algorithm is assumed to be already observed. It should be noted that these observations for \mathcal{D}' and the entire process of pre-training are performed beforehand




Figure 3: Schematic illustrations of quadratic surface prior obtained by pre-training (latent dimension is two). Each color corresponds to $\Lambda^{(m)}$ embedded in \mathcal{U} .

(before we obtain \mathcal{D}). A set of the observations for \mathcal{D}' is written as

$$\mathcal{O}' = \bigcup_{m \in [M]} \mathcal{O}'^{(m)}, \quad (9)$$

where $\mathcal{O}'^{(m)} = \{(A^{(m)}, \boldsymbol{\lambda}_n'^{(m)}, y_n'^{(m)})\}_{n \in [N'_m]}$ and N'_m are observations for the m -th ML algorithm and its size, respectively.

To construct the latent space in which the objective function becomes simple, we try to approximate $y_n'^{(m)}$ by a quadratic function:

$$y_n'^{(m)} \approx -\|\mathbf{u}_n'^{(m)}\|_2^2 + y_{\text{best}}', \quad (10)$$

where y_{best}' is the maximum of $y_n'^{(m)}$ in \mathcal{O}' . This approximation means that the latent space is estimated in such a way that the objective function can be represented as a simple quadratic surface, which attains the maximum (y_{best}') at the origin. Although other more complicated functions (with trainable parameters) can also be used, we employ the quadratic function for simplicity. By defining $\tilde{y}_n^{(m)} = y_{\text{best}}' - y_n'^{(m)}$, the objective function of the pre-training of the m -th MLP $\phi^{(m)}$ is written as

$$\mathcal{L}_m^{(\text{Pre-train})}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(m)}) = \sum_{n \in [N'_m]} \frac{1}{N'_m} \left(\tilde{y}_n^{(m)} - \|\phi^{(m)}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n'^{(m)})\|_2^2 \right)^2. \quad (11)$$

This objective function is a quadratic error of the approximation (10). Because of this pre-training, a similar quadratic surface in the latent space is (approximately) expected for the target dataset \mathcal{D} . Therefore, we set the prior mean of the MTGP (4) based on

$$\mu_0(\mathbf{u}) = -\|\mathbf{u}\|_2^2 + y_{\text{best}}'.$$

Note that appropriate standardization can be applied to $\mu_0(\mathbf{u})$ if the scale adjustment is required in the MTGP on the target dataset.

3.2.2 Adversarial Regularization

To construct the latent space in which the information of observations from different ML algorithms $A^{(m)}$ are fully shared, each

$\Lambda^{(m)}$ should be ‘overlapped’ in \mathcal{U} . In the illustration of Fig. 3(a), the embedded $\Lambda^{(m)}$ is largely overlapped. On the other hand, in Fig. 3(b), there are almost no shared region by which information sharing cannot be expected. Therefore, we introduce an idea of adversarial regularization [Ganin et al.(2016), Zhao et al.(2018)], which encourages each $\Lambda^{(m)}$ to be projected onto an overlapped space.

We embed M domains of the HP space $\Lambda^{(m)}$ into \mathcal{U} . When those M domains cannot be separated in \mathcal{U} , the surrogate model on \mathcal{U} should give higher similarity across different ML algorithms (i.e., sharing knowledge of different tasks more strongly). Thus, we consider an adversarial classifier that predicts “Which ML algorithm is the given \mathbf{u}_n created from?”, for which the true label is “ m ” (the m -th ML algorithm $A^{(m)}$). For example, in Fig. 3(a), ML algorithms are largely overlapped by which the classification is difficult. Our adversarial regularizer encourages a large classification error during pre-training of the latent space embedding.

To enforce overlaps for any $M C_2$ pairs of ML algorithms, we employ the one-versus-one formulation. For a given pair $A^{(m)}$ and $A^{(m')}$, the probability that \mathbf{u} is an embedding from $A^{(m)}$ is represented by

$$p(A = A^{(m)} \mid A \in \{A^{(m)}, A^{(m')}\}) = g_{m,m'}(\mathbf{u}; \boldsymbol{\psi}_{m,m'}),$$

where $g_{m,m'} : \mathcal{U} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a binary classifier network having a parameter vector $\boldsymbol{\psi}_{m,m'}$. This classifier can be learned by using $\mathcal{D}_{m,m'}^{(\text{Adv})} = \{(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n^{(m)}, A^{(m)})\}_{n \in [N_m]} \cup \{(\boldsymbol{\lambda}_n^{(m')}, A^{(m')})\}_{n \in [N_{m'}]}$, which is created from \mathcal{O}' . For an instance of the classification $(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, A) \in \mathcal{D}_{m,m'}^{(\text{Adv})}$, the cross-entropy loss can be defined, by which we have an objective function for the classifier:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{m,m'}^{(\text{CE})}(\boldsymbol{\psi}_{m,m'}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(m)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(m')}) = \\ \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}_{m,m'}^{(\text{Adv})}|} \sum_{(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, A) \in \mathcal{D}_{m,m'}^{(\text{Adv})}} \{ -\mathbb{I}(A = A^{(m)}) \log g_{m,m'}(\phi^{(m)}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}); \boldsymbol{\psi}_{m,m'}) \\ - \mathbb{I}(A = A^{(m')}) \log(1 - g_{m,m'}(\phi^{(m')}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}); \boldsymbol{\psi}_{m,m'})) \}, \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where \mathbb{I} is the indicator function. For given $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(m)}$ and $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(m')}$, the optimization problem for the classifier:

$$\min_{\boldsymbol{\psi}_{m,m'}} \mathcal{L}_{m,m'}^{(\text{CE})}(\boldsymbol{\psi}_{m,m'}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(m)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(m')}).$$

For the pre-training (11), we add the negative value of the cross entropy loss as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\Theta_{\text{MLP}}} \sum_{m \in [M]} \mathcal{L}_m^{(\text{Pre-train})}(\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(m)}) \\ - \beta \sum_{m=1}^M \sum_{m'=m+1}^M \min_{\boldsymbol{\psi}_{m,m'}} \mathcal{L}_{m,m'}^{(\text{CE})}(\boldsymbol{\psi}_{m,m'}; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(m)}, \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(m')}). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where β is a regularization coefficient and $\Theta_{\text{MLP}} = \{\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(m)}\}_{m \in [M]}$ is the set of parameters of $\phi^{(m)}$. In this optimization, the outer $\min_{\Theta_{\text{MLP}}}$ is the minimization of $\mathcal{L}_m^{(\text{Pre-train})}$ regularized by the maximization of $\mathcal{L}_{m,m'}^{(\text{CE})}$, and the inner $\min_{\boldsymbol{\psi}_{m,m'}}$ optimizes the adversarial classifier. Figure 4 shows an illustration of (13).




Figure 4: Illustration of objective function in pre-training. Acc is fitted by the quadratic function through $\mathcal{L}^{(\text{Pre-train})}$, while $\mathcal{L}^{(\text{CE})}$ encourages sharing the latent space among different ML algorithms.

3.3 Selection of Pre-trained Embedding Model by Learning to Rank

The pre-training can be performed in advance. Therefore, we can even perform the pre-training for multiple different source datasets, without increasing the cost of the target dataset optimization. Suppose that the pre-training is already finished for each one of S source datasets $\mathcal{D}'_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}'_S$. This means that we have S different pre-trained embedding models, which we call PTEMs (a PTEM is a set of MLPs $\{\phi^{(m)}\}_{m \in [M]}$ trained by one of source datasets \mathcal{D}'_s). By selecting an appropriate PTEM for a given target dataset \mathcal{D} , a greater performance improvement of BO can be expected. To this end, we consider building a ranking model that recommends an effective PTEM.

The supervision for training of the ranking model is created by partitioning source datasets $\{\mathcal{D}'_s\}_{s \in [S]}$, similarly to cross-validation. We first select \mathcal{D}'_τ as a pseudo target dataset from $\{\mathcal{D}'_s\}_{s \in [S]}$, and use the remaining $S - 1$ datasets as source datasets. Then, we can create the ground-truth ranking of $\{\mathcal{D}'_s\}_{s \neq \tau}$ for the target dataset \mathcal{D}'_τ , so that it can be used for training of the ranking model. Note that this ranking model optimization can also be performed before we obtain \mathcal{D} .

The ranking for a pseudo target dataset \mathcal{D}'_τ is determined by the actual performance of BO with a PTEM trained by \mathcal{D}'_s ($s \neq \tau$). Suppose that $y_t^{\text{best}}(\mathcal{D}'_\tau; \mathcal{D}'_s)$ is the maximum Acc identified by t -iterations of BO on the pseudo target \mathcal{D}'_τ with the pre-training dataset \mathcal{D}'_s . After T iterations of BO, $y_t^{\text{best}}(\mathcal{D}'_\tau; \mathcal{D}'_s)$ for $\forall t \in [T]$ are obtained, and we use the average of them as a performance measure to define the ranking:

$$\text{Score}_\tau(s) = \text{Average}(y_t^{\text{best}}(\mathcal{D}'_\tau; \mathcal{D}'_s)),$$

where Average is the average over the different initializations and T iterations of BO (in our experiments, the average over 10 different initializations and every 20 iterations out of total $T = 200$ iterations were taken). For the target dataset \mathcal{D}'_τ , the score $\text{Score}_\tau(s)$ can be seen as a performance measure of a PTEM obtained by a source dataset \mathcal{D}'_s . As a result, the descending sort of $\text{Score}_\tau(s)$ with respect to s is the ground-truth ranking for the target dataset \mathcal{D}'_τ .

Our ranking model uses so-called meta-features [Feurer et al.(2015a), Feurer et al.(2015b)], such as various

statistics of the dataset, for defining the input features. Let $\mathbf{x}_\tau^{\text{meta}}$ and $\mathbf{x}_s^{\text{meta}}$ be the meta-feature vectors of the pseudo target \mathcal{D}'_τ and a source dataset \mathcal{D}'_s , respectively. To predict the ranking of \mathcal{D}'_s for the target \mathcal{D}'_τ , the ranking model uses $\mathbf{x}_\tau^{\text{meta}}$ and $\mathbf{x}_s^{\text{meta}}$ as the input features. The ranking model, denoted as f_{rank} , outputs the score value of \mathcal{D}'_s for the target \mathcal{D}'_τ as $f_{\text{rank}}(\mathbf{x}_\tau^{\text{meta}}, \mathbf{x}_s^{\text{meta}})$. The prediction of the ranking for the target \mathcal{D}'_τ is defined by the descending sort of $f_{\text{rank}}(\mathbf{x}_\tau^{\text{meta}}, \mathbf{x}_s^{\text{meta}})$ with respect to s for the fixed τ .

To optimize the ranking model f_{rank} , we employ **LGBMRanker** in the LightGBM library¹. **LGBMRanker** is based on a ranking model called LabmdaMART [Burges(2010)], in which the base boosting tree model is replaced from the original MART with LightGBM [Ke et al.(2017)]. LabmdaMART does not directly approximate $\text{Score}_\tau(s)$. Instead, only relative order of the score is used to define the loss function, by which different target datasets can be incorporated into the model optimization. The objective function is defined through Normalized Documented Cumulative Gain (NDCG) [Liu(2011)], in which errors occurred in better positions of the ranking have larger penalties. Suppose that $\pi(r)$ indicates the true ranking of a source dataset \mathcal{D}'_s for which the ranking is predicted as r . Top k NDCG, which evaluates the accuracy of the top k items in the ranking list, is defined as

$$\text{NDCG}@k = \frac{\text{DCG}@k}{\max \text{DCG}@k},$$

where $\text{DCG}@k = \sum_{r \in [k]} \frac{\text{rel}_\pi(r)}{\log_2(r+1)}$, $\text{rel}_r = (k - r + 1)^2$ is the relevance score of the r -th position, and $\max \text{DCG}@k$ is the maximum value of $\text{DCG}@k$ that makes $\text{NDCG}@k \in [0, 1]$. To optimize f_{rank} , LabmdaMART defines a pairwise loss function weighted by NDCG, to which a booting based algorithm is applied (See [Burges(2010)] for detail).

4 Related Work

For the CASH problem, BO based approaches [Thornton et al.(2013), Snoek et al.(2012)] and genetic algorithm based approaches [Whitley(1994), Olson et al.(2016)] have been studied. A well-known approach to dealing with different HP spaces is to create the concatenated space [Thornton et al.(2013), Lévesque et al.(2017), Feurer et al.(2015b), Feurer et al.(2015a)]:

$$\mathbf{\Lambda} = \mathbf{\Lambda}^{(1)} \cup \mathbf{\Lambda}^{(2)} \dots \cup \mathbf{\Lambda}^{(M)} \cup \{\lambda_r\},$$

where λ_r is a parameter indicating which candidate ML algorithm $A^{(1)}, \dots, A^{(M)}$ is now selected (active). To search this concatenated space, SMAC [Hutter et al.(2011)] based approaches have been often used, which can handle conditional HPs [Thornton et al.(2013), Lévesque et al.(2017)]. The surrogate model in SMAC needs some default value for an HP that an ML algorithm $A^{(m)}$ does not have [Lévesque et al.(2017)]. For example, in the case of support vector machine (SVM) and random forest (RF), RF does not have the SVM HP ‘ C ’ (regularization coefficient). Then, RF has some default value for the dimension corresponding to the SVM C in the concatenated vector. However, this approach makes the dimension of the search space

(i.e., dimension of the concatenated vector) large, and the theoretical justification of the default value is unclear. On the other hand, [Swersky et al.(2013)] proposes a kernel that partially uses a shared space for ‘relevant’ parameters, but the relevance should be defined manually and most of hyper-parameters are typically seen as irrelevant each other (e.g., SVM and RF does not have relevant parameters).

Another approach to the CASH problem is to separate the ML algorithm selection and the HP selection [Nguyen et al.(2020), Liu et al.(2020), Li et al.(2020), Li et al.(2023)]. [Nguyen et al.(2020)] applied independent BO to each ML algorithm, by which each one of the HP spaces can be small. However, sufficient observations should be required for all candidate ML algorithms because of the independence. [Li et al.(2020), Li et al.(2023)] also use independent BO, and select only a promising ML algorithm as the final search candidate. This approach can reduce the search space, but to select an ML algorithm appropriately, sufficient observations are again required for all ML algorithms. Further, in practice, there is a risk of discarding the true best ML algorithm.

While we introduce a pre-training for the latent space learning, meta-learning [Lemke et al.(2015)] approaches to the CASH problem have also been studied. [Mu et al.(2022), Wang et al.(2020)] learn the ML algorithm selection through meta-learning and the HP optimization is performed only for the selected ML algorithm. Since these approaches select a single ML algorithm before the optimization starts, the risk of the miss-selection of the ML algorithm can be high. [Dagan et al.(2024), Cohen-Shapira et al.(2019), Laadan et al.(2019)] considers meta-learning for the simultaneous selection of an ML algorithm and an HP. The meta-learner predicts a pair consisting of an ML algorithm and an HP that achieves high accuracy, and generates a fixed-size ranking list used to evaluate performance sequentially. However, this strategy is not adaptive to the observations of the given target dataset unlike our approach, by which the error in the meta-learner cannot be corrected.

BO algorithms using the latent space surrogate have been studied (e.g., [Gómez-Bombarelli et al.(2018)]). Typically, to avoid the acquisition function maximization in the structured input (such as sequences and graphs) or high dimensional space, the acquisition function is maximized in the latent space from which the next search point is ‘decoded’. On the other hand, we do not employ this decoding approach and the acquisition function maximization is performed in the original space as described in (7). This is to avoid the cycle consistency problem [Jha et al.(2018)], i.e., the selected latent variable \mathbf{u} may not be consistent with the encoded value of the decoded \mathbf{u} , by which the GPs cannot obtain the observation at the selected point. Combining recent techniques mitigating this problem [Boyar and Takeuchi(2024)] with our proposed method is a possible future direction. Recently, transformer based latent space approaches have been studied [Lyu et al.(2023), Li et al.(2024)]. They regard an HP as a ‘token’ by which a variable size of HPs can be handled, while we employ the simple MLP because the size of HPs is fixed beforehand in our setting. Further, [Li et al.(2024)] does not discuss pre-training and [Lyu et al.(2023)] does not consider the CASH problem.

¹<https://lightgbm.readthedocs.io/en/stable/>

5 Experiments

We compare the performance of the proposed method with seven existing AutoML methods applicable to the CASH problem.

5.1 Settings

We used the following methods as baselines:

- Random Search[Bergstra and Bengio(2012)]: Both the ML algorithm and its HPs are randomly determined.
- SMAC [Hutter et al.(2011)]: SMAC is a well-known HP optimization method with a random forest surrogate, and has been often employed as a baseline of the CASH problem.
- Bandit BO [Nguyen et al.(2020)]: This approach is based on BO with independent surrogate models for candidate ML algorithms. GPs are estimated for all ML algorithms and their acquisition functions are maximized, respectively. A pair of an ML algorithm and HPs with the highest acquisition function is selected as a next candidate.
- Rising Bandit by SMAC (RB-SMAC) [Li et al.(2020)]: This approach also based on independent surrogate models for candidate ML algorithms. During the optimization, RB-SMAC gradually discards candidate ML algorithms that are estimated unlikely to be the optimal selection. SMAC is used for the based optimizer.
- Pre-train BO [Wang et al.(2024)]: BO with pre-trained GPs. The optimization procedure is same as Bandit BO.
- Algorithm Selection by Meta-Learning (AS-ML): An ML algorithm is selected by a ranking model using meta-features. An HP optimization is performed for the selected ML algorithm by BO. This strategy can be seen as a simplified version of [Mu et al.(2022)] (see Appendix C.2.1 for detail).
- Algorithm and Hyper-parameter Selection by Meta-Learning (AHS-ML): As an additional meta-learning based baseline, we extended AS-ML so that hyper-parameters can be simultaneously selected. A similar meta-feature based ranking model to AS-ML is constructed, by which the ranking list for a pair of ML algorithm and its HPs is generated (see Appendix C.2.2 for detail). An observation is obtained from the top of the ranking list.

We used $M = 12$ ML algorithms available at scikit-learn [Pedregosa et al.(2011)], and each ML algorithm has 1 to 5 dimensional HPs (see Appendix C.3 for the complete list). The datasets is from OpenML [Vanschoren et al.(2013)]. We used classification problem datasets. For the proposed method and pre-train BO, 161 source datasets were used for pre-training, and 40 datasets were used for target datasets (see Appendix C.5 for the complete list).

In the proposed method, the latent space embedding $\phi^{(m)}$ was implemented by an MLP with two hidden layers, and the Gaussian kernel was used for the covariance of \mathbf{u} in LMC (the LMC rank parameter is set as 1 which is default of `gpytorch`). In the




Figure 5: Ranking-based performance comparison (10 runs average ranking over 40 target datasets).

parameter optimization (5) during the target dataset optimization, for the pre-trained MLPs, we only optimize the last layer (fine tuning). The regularization coefficients α in (5) and β in (13) were set as 10^{-3} and 10^{-4} , respectively. The dimension of the latent space was 3. The regularization coefficients and the latent dimension were determined by optimizing for pre-training datasets (described in Appendix C.1).

5.2 Main Result


The results are shown in Fig. 5, in which the performance of each method is compared by the ranking among eight compared methods (lower is better). For each one of 40 target datasets, each method run 10 times by changing initial points (randomly selected two HP settings for each ML algorithm $A^{(m)}$). The search was performed 200 iterations. At each iteration, the average of the objective function (1) over 10 runs are used to create the ranking at that iteration. Figure 5 shows the average ranking and its standard error over 40 target datasets.

Throughout the iterations, the proposed method achieved better rankings compared with all the other methods. RB-SMAC showed high performance particularly in later iterations, but the proposed method outperformed it. Although pre-train BO improved BanditBO in early iterations, BanditBO outperformed pre-train BO at the end of iterations. This suggests that the benefit of pre-training can be seen in the beginning, but after observations in the target dataset were accumulated, BanditBO without pre-training showed better performance. AHS-ML showed high performance in early iterations, but the ranking became worse gradually. AHS-ML creates a recommended list of combinations of an ML algorithm and an HP setting through an meta-learning model, and sequentially observes from the top of that list. Therefore, possibility of discovering better solutions during the iterations becomes lower unlike other optimization-based methods. Comparison based on the objective function value (validation accuracy) is also shown in Appendix C.4.


5.3 Ablation Study

We performed ablation study to evaluate the effect of 1) pre-training, and 2) selection of a pre-training dataset.

When we remove pre-training, denoted as ‘Proposed w/o pre-



(a) Proposed method vs Proposed w/o pre-train.



(b) Proposed w/o pre-train compared with other methods.


Figure 6: Ablation study for pre-training.

train’, the latent space embedding $\phi^{(m)}$ is learned only from the target datasets using (5) without the pre-training described in 3.2. In ‘Proposed w/o pre-train’, all the parameters in MLP is learned unlike the original proposed method in which only the last layer is optimized for the target datasets. Note that since the regularization term in (5) is the penalty for deviating from the pre-trained models, this term is vanished when we remove the pre-training. The results are shown in Fig. 6. Fig. 6(a) shows direct comparison between the proposed methods with and without pre-training. The vertical axis is the ranking same as Section 5.2 (i.e., here, the rank is 1 or 2). The results clearly show that the proposed method with pre-training outperforms the proposed method without pre-training. Fig. 6(b) is performance evaluation of Proposed w/o pre-train compared with other existing methods. In this figure, Proposed w/o pre-train still shows mostly comparable performance with the best methods. We can also see the effect of the pre-training by comparing Fig. 6(b) with Fig. 5, in which clearer differences from existing methods can be seen.


To verify the effect of the ranking model for the selection of a PTEM, we compared the ranking model with the random selection. The results are shown in Fig. 7. In Fig. 7(a), we can clearly see that the ranking based selection achieved better performance compared with the random selection throughout iterations. Fig. 7(b) indicates that the proposed method still shows comparable performance to the best methods among the compared methods.

5.4 Wall-Clock-Time Evaluation

We here consider a wall-clock time based evaluation. To make comparison fair, we assume that all ML algorithms and HPs have the same computational cost t for obtaining its Acc value. In



(a) Proposed method with ranking-based and random selection of a PTEM.



(b) The proposed method with random selection of a PTEM compared with other methods.

Figure 7: Ablation study for the selection of a PTEM.




Figure 8: Comparison based on wall-clock time. The horizontal axis is computational time (min) and the vertical axis is the average ranking. The observation time is set as 1 min.

practice, t can change depending on ML algorithms and HPs. However, in this study, all the compared methods do not explicitly consider time difference of candidates. Therefore, if the actual time is used for the evaluation, the optimization method that happens to select low cost ML algorithms can be unfairly advantageous. This hinders fair comparison (One possible approach is to estimate the cost itself from observations, and incorporate it into the acquisition function. However, since this introduces factors beyond the performance of the acquisition function into the experimental results, we do not consider it in this paper). Instead, we set $t = 60(\text{sec})$ for all ML algorithms and HPs, which is the average time obtained by the random sampling of HPs for all ML algorithms (it was about 61 sec for randomly selected 5 HPs of 12 ML algorithms on the 40 target datasets).

The results are shown in Fig. 8. The horizontal axis is the elapsed time (hours) that contains both the acquisition function computations and the ML algorithm computations (i.e., t). Note

that the proposed method, AL-ML and AHS-ML contain computations of meta-features and the ranking model prediction. Except for AL-ML and AHS-ML, the elapsed time for initial 24 points (2 points for each of 12 ML algorithms) are included (AL-ML and AHS-ML observes from the ranking list without initial points). Computational times of pre-training is not included because it is performed beforehand. We see that the proposed method still shows the superior performance except for the beginning of iterations, in which AHS-ML shows good performance because of the same reason described in Section 5.2. The proposed method was not high performance at the beginning. This is because, among the methods who require the observation cost for initial 24 points (proposed method, pre-train BO, SMAC and RB-SMAC), only the proposed method requires cost of the meta-feature and the ranking model calculations. However, we can see at the around 30 min (i.e., after finishing the initial points observation), the proposed method start outperforming the other methods.

6 Conclusions

We proposed a BO for the CASH problem, in which the surrogate model is constructed on the latent space shared by HP spaces of different ML algorithms. Since the quality of the latent space embedding is an important factor for the performance, we further proposed a pre-training of the embedding models. Finally, we developed a ranking model that recommend an effective pre-trained embedding for a given target dataset. In the experiments, we demonstrated that the proposed method shows efficient performance compared with existing studies for actual CASH problems.

Acknowledgement

This work was supported by MEXT KAKENHI (20H00601, 23K21696, 22H00300), JST CREST (JPMJCR21D3), JST Moonshot R&D (JPMJMS2033-05), JST AIP Acceleration Research (JPMJCR21U2), NEDO (JPNP18002, JPNP20006), and RIKEN Center for Advanced Intelligence Project.

References

- [Álvarez et al.(2012)] Mauricio A. Álvarez, Lorenzo Rosasco, and Neil D. Lawrence. 2012. Kernels for Vector-Valued Functions: A Review. *Found. Trends Mach. Learn.* 4, 3 (2012), 195–266.
- [Bergstra et al.(2011)] James Bergstra, Rémi Bardenet, Yoshua Bengio, and Balázs Kégl. 2011. Algorithms for Hyper-Parameter Optimization. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, J. Shawe-Taylor, R. Zemel, P. Bartlett, F. Pereira, and K.Q. Weinberger (Eds.), Vol. 24. Curran Associates, Inc.
- [Bergstra and Bengio(2012)] James Bergstra and Yoshua Bengio. 2012. Random search for hyper-parameter optimization. *Journal of machine learning research* 13, 2 (2012).
- [Bonilla et al.(2007)] Edwin V Bonilla, Kian Chai, and Christopher Williams. 2007. Multi-task Gaussian Process Prediction. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, J. Platt, D. Koller, Y. Singer, and S. Roweis (Eds.), Vol. 20. Curran Associates, Inc.
- [Boyar and Takeuchi(2024)] Onur Boyar and Ichiro Takeuchi. 2024. Latent Space Bayesian Optimization With Latent Data Augmentation for Enhanced Exploration. *Neural Computation* 36, 11 (2024), 2446–2478.
- [Brochu et al.(2010)] Eric Brochu, Vlad M Cora, and Nando De Freitas. 2010. A tutorial on Bayesian optimization of expensive cost functions, with application to active user modeling and hierarchical reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1012.2599* (2010).
- [Burges(2010)] Chris J.C. Burges. 2010. *From RankNet to LambdaRank to LambdaMART: An Overview*. Technical Report MSR-TR-2010-82.
- [Cohen-Shapira et al.(2019)] Noy Cohen-Shapira, Lior Rokach, Bracha Shapira, Gilad Katz, and Roman Vainshtein. 2019. Autogr: Model recommendation through graphical dataset representation. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*. 821–830.
- [Dagan et al.(2024)] Itai Dagan, Roman Vainshtein, Gilad Katz, and Lior Rokach. 2024. Automated algorithm selection using meta-learning and pre-trained deep convolution neural networks. *Information Fusion* 105 (2024), 102210.
- [Feurer et al.(2015a)] Matthias Feurer, Aaron Klein, Katharina Eggensperger, Jost Springenberg, Manuel Blum, and Frank Hutter. 2015a. Efficient and Robust Automated Machine Learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, C. Cortes, N. Lawrence, D. Lee, M. Sugiyama, and R. Garnett (Eds.), Vol. 28. Curran Associates, Inc.
- [Feurer et al.(2015b)] Matthias Feurer, Jost Springenberg, and Frank Hutter. 2015b. Initializing bayesian hyperparameter optimization via meta-learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 29.
- [Ganin et al.(2016)] Yaroslav Ganin, Evgeniya Ustinova, Hana Ajakan, Pascal Germain, Hugo Larochelle, François Laviolette, Mario March, and Victor Lempitsky. 2016. Domain-adversarial training of neural networks. *Journal of machine learning research* 17, 59 (2016), 1–35.
- [Gómez-Bombarelli et al.(2018)] Rafael Gómez-Bombarelli, Jennifer N Wei, David Duvenaud, José Miguel Hernández-Lobato, Benjamín Sánchez-Lengeling, Dennis Sheberla, Jorge Aguilera-Iparraguirre, Timothy D Hirzel, Ryan P Adams, and Alán Aspuru-Guzik. 2018. Automatic chemical design using a data-driven continuous representation of molecules. *ACS central science* 4, 2 (2018), 268–276.
- [Harris et al.(2020)] Charles R Harris, K Jarrod Millman, Stéfan J Van Der Walt, Ralf Gommers, Pauli Virtanen, David Cournapeau, Eric Wieser, Julian Taylor, Sebastian Berg, Nathaniel J Smith, et al. 2020. Array programming with NumPy. *Nature* 585, 7825 (2020), 357–362.

- [Hutter et al.(2011)] Frank Hutter, Holger H Hoos, and Kevin Leyton-Brown. 2011. Sequential model-based optimization for general algorithm configuration. In *Learning and Intelligent Optimization: 5th International Conference, LION 5, Rome, Italy, January 17-21, 2011. Selected Papers 5*. Springer, 507–523.
- [Jha et al.(2018)] Ananya Harsh Jha, Saket Anand, Maneesh Singh, and VSR Veeravasaru. 2018. Disentangling Factors of Variation with Cycle-Consistent Variational Autoencoders. In *Computer Vision – ECCV 2018: 15th European Conference, Munich, Germany, September 8–14, 2018, Proceedings, Part III*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, 829–845.
- [Jones et al.(1993)] D. R. Jones, C. D. Perttunen, and B. E. Stuckman. 1993. Lipschitzian optimization without the Lipschitz constant. *Journal of Optimization Theory and Applications* 79, 1 (1993), 157–181.
- [Ke et al.(2017)] Guolin Ke, Qi Meng, Thomas Finley, Taifeng Wang, Wei Chen, Weidong Ma, Qiwei Ye, and Tie-Yan Liu. 2017. LightGBM: A highly efficient gradient boosting decision tree. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- [Kirkpatrick et al.(2017)] James Kirkpatrick, Razvan Pascanu, Neil Rabinowitz, Joel Veness, Guillaume Desjardins, Andrei A Rusu, Kieran Milan, John Quan, Tiago Ramalho, Agnieszka Grabska-Barwinska, et al. 2017. Overcoming catastrophic forgetting in neural networks. *Proceedings of the national academy of sciences* 114, 13 (2017), 3521–3526.
- [Laadan et al.(2019)] Doron Laadan, Roman Vainshtein, Yarden Curiel, Gilad Katz, and Lior Rokach. 2019. Rankml: a meta learning-based approach for pre-ranking machine learning pipelines. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.00108* (2019).
- [Lemke et al.(2015)] Christiane Lemke, Marcin Budka, and Bogdan Gabrys. 2015. Metalearning: a survey of trends and technologies. *Artificial intelligence review* 44 (2015), 117–130.
- [Lévesque et al.(2017)] Julien-Charles Lévesque, Audrey Durand, Christian Gagné, and Robert Sabourin. 2017. Bayesian optimization for conditional hyperparameter spaces. In *2017 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*. IEEE, 286–293.
- [Li et al.(2024)] Jiaying Li, Wei Liu, Chao Xue, Xiaoxing Wang, Weifeng Liu, and Dacheng Tao. 2024. An Attention-based Approach for Bayesian Optimization with Dependencies. <https://openreview.net/forum?id=sv65gA2cLA>
- [Li et al.(2020)] Yang Li, Jiawei Jiang, Jinyang Gao, Yingxia Shao, Ce Zhang, and Bin Cui. 2020. Efficient automatic CASH via rising bandits. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 34. 4763–4771.
- [Li et al.(2023)] Yang Li, Yu Shen, Wentao Zhang, Ce Zhang, and Bin Cui. 2023. VolcanoML: speeding up end-to-end AutoML via scalable search space decomposition. *The VLDB Journal* 32, 2 (2023), 389–413.
- [Liu et al.(2020)] Sijia Liu, Parikshit Ram, Deepak Vijaykeerthy, Djallel Bouneffouf, Gregory Bramble, Horst Samulowitz, Dakuo Wang, Andrew Conn, and Alexander Gray. 2020. An ADMM based framework for automl pipeline configuration. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 34. 4892–4899.
- [Liu(2011)] Tie-Yan Liu. 2011. *Learning to Rank for Information Retrieval*. Springer Berlin, Heidelberg.
- [Lyu et al.(2023)] W. Lyu, S. Hu, J. Chuai, and Z. Chen. 2023. Efficient Bayesian Optimization with Deep Kernel Learning and Transformer Pre-trained on Multiple Heterogeneous Datasets.
- [Mu et al.(2022)] Tianyu Mu, Hongzhi Wang, Chunnan Wang, Zheng Liang, and Xinyue Shao. 2022. Auto-CASH: A meta-learning embedding approach for autonomous classification algorithm selection. *Information Sciences* 591 (2022), 344–364.
- [Nguyen et al.(2020)] Dang Nguyen, Sunil Gupta, Santu Rana, Alistair Shilton, and Svetha Venkatesh. 2020. Bayesian optimization for categorical and category-specific continuous inputs. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 34. 5256–5263.
- [Olson et al.(2016)] Randal S. Olson, Nathan Bartley, Ryan J. Urbanowicz, and Jason H. Moore. 2016. Evaluation of a Tree-based Pipeline Optimization Tool for Automating Data Science. In *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference 2016 (Denver, Colorado, USA) (GECCO '16)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 485–492. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2908812.2908918>
- [Pedregosa et al.(2011)] F. Pedregosa, G. Varoquaux, A. Gramfort, V. Michel, B. Thirion, O. Grisel, M. Blondel, P. Prettenhofer, R. Weiss, V. Dubourg, J. Vanderplas, A. Passos, D. Cournapeau, M. Brucher, M. Perrot, and E. Duchesnay. 2011. Scikit-learn: Machine Learning in Python. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 12 (2011), 2825–2830.
- [Rasmussen and Williams(2006)] C. E. Rasmussen and C. K. I. Williams. 2006. *Gaussian Processes for Machine Learning*. MIT Press.
- [Snoek et al.(2012)] Jasper Snoek, Hugo Larochelle, and Ryan P Adams. 2012. Practical bayesian optimization of machine learning algorithms. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 25 (2012).
- [Swersky et al.(2013)] Kevin Swersky, David Duvenaud, Jasper Snoek, Frank Hutter, and Michael Osborne. 2013. Raiders of the Lost Architecture: Kernels for Bayesian Optimization in Conditional Parameter Spaces. In *NIPS workshop on Bayesian Optimization in Theory and Practice*.
- [Thornton et al.(2013)] Chris Thornton, Frank Hutter, Holger H Hoos, and Kevin Leyton-Brown. 2013. Auto-WEKA: Combined selection and hyperparameter optimization of classification algorithms. In *Proceedings of the 19th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*. 847–855.

[Vanschoren et al.(2013)] Joaquin Vanschoren, Jan N. van Rijn, Bernd Bischl, and Luis Torgo. 2013. OpenML: networked science in machine learning. *SIGKDD Explorations* 15, 2 (2013), 49–60. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2641190.2641198>

[Wang et al.(2020)] Chunnan Wang, Hongzhi Wang, Tianyu Mu, Jianzhong Li, and Hong Gao. 2020. Auto-model: utilizing research papers and HPO techniques to deal with the CASH problem. In *2020 IEEE 36th International Conference on Data Engineering (ICDE)*. IEEE, 1906–1909.

[Wang et al.(2024)] Zi Wang, George E Dahl, Kevin Swersky, Chansoo Lee, Zachary Nado, Justin Gilmer, Jasper Snoek, and Zoubin Ghahramani. 2024. Pre-trained Gaussian processes for Bayesian optimization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 25, 212 (2024), 1–83.

[Whitley(1994)] Darrell Whitley. 1994. A genetic algorithm tutorial. *Statistics and computing* 4 (1994), 65–85.

[Wilson et al.(2016)] Andrew Gordon Wilson, Zhiting Hu, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Eric P. Xing. 2016. Deep Kernel Learning. In *Proceedings of the 19th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, Vol. 51)*. PMLR, 370–378.

[Zhao et al.(2018)] Han Zhao, Shanghang Zhang, Guanhong Wu, José MF Moura, Joao P Costeira, and Geoffrey J Gordon. 2018. Adversarial multiple source domain adaptation. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 31 (2018).

A Acquisition Function Maximization

We need to maximize $a(A^{(m)}, \lambda^{(m)})$ defined in (8) to determine the next point. We maximize with respect to $\lambda^{(m)}$ for each m in which both discrete and continuous variables can be involved. We employ a heuristic optimization algorithm similar to those used in SMAC [Hutter et al.(2011)].

We first randomly sample an initial HP $\lambda^{(m)}$. Let $\lambda_i^{(m)}$ be the i -th dimension of $\lambda^{(m)}$. For each candidate $A^{(m)}$, the acquisition function is maximized by the following procedure:

1. If $\lambda_i^{(m)}$ is a continuous variable, 10 points are sampled from $\mathcal{N}(\lambda_i^{(m)}, 0.1)$. Note that each continuous variable is assumed to be scaled in $[0, 1]$. If the sample value is the out of the domain, we reject that value and re-sample from the same distribution. On the other hand, as shown in Table 1, all our discrete variables are count variables (note that KNeighborsClassifier has a categorical variable. However, since we employ the exhaustive search only for KNeighborsClassifier, we do not consider it here). For a count variable $\lambda_i^{(m)}$, 10 points are sampled from the uniform distribution on

$$\{c \in \mathbb{N} \mid \lambda_i^{(m)} - Z \leq c \leq \lambda_i^{(m)} + Z\},$$

where \mathbb{N} is the natural number, and $Z = \lfloor (\lambda_i^{(m)\max} - \lambda_i^{(m)\min} + 1)/10 \rfloor$ in which $\lambda_i^{(m)\max}$ and $\lambda_i^{(m)\min}$ are the maximum and minimum values of $\lambda_i^{(m)}$, respectively. Note that since all our count variables in Table 1 are $\lambda_i^{(m)\max} - \lambda_i^{(m)\min} + 1 \geq 10$, we have $Z \geq 1$.

Algorithm 2: Ranking Model Estimation

Require: S PTEMs trained by $\mathcal{D}'_1, \dots, \mathcal{D}'_S$, meta-feature $\mathbf{x}_1^{\text{meta}}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_S^{\text{meta}}$

- 1 $\mathcal{D}_{\text{rank}} \leftarrow \emptyset$
- 2 **for** $\tau \in [S]$ **do** ▶ Create training data for ranking model
- 3 **for** $s \in [S] \setminus \tau$ **do**
- 4 Set $\{\phi^{(m)}\}_{m \in [M]}$ as the PTEMs trained by \mathcal{D}'_s
- 5 Apply BO to the pseudo target \mathcal{D}'_s
- 6 Calculate $\text{Score}_\tau(s)$
- 7 $\mathcal{D}_{\text{rank}} \leftarrow \mathcal{D}_{\text{rank}} \cup \{(\mathbf{x}_\tau^{\text{meta}}, \mathbf{x}_s^{\text{meta}}, \text{Score}_\tau(s), \tau)\}$
- 8 Optimize f_{rank} by $\mathcal{D}_{\text{rank}}$ through LGBMRanker
- 9 **return** f_{rank}

2. The acquisition function values are calculated for the all 10 points, and employ the maximum among them as the next $\lambda^{(m)}$
3. We repeat the procedure 1 and 2 until the selected $\lambda^{(m)}$ does not have a larger acquisition function value than the previous iteration.

We generate 10 initial HP vectors and apply the same procedure 1-3 to all of them.

B Ranking Model Estimation

The procedure of our ranking model estimation is shown in Algorithm 2. For each pseudo target \mathcal{D}'_τ , the score $\text{Score}_\tau(s)$ is calculated for all other source datasets $s \neq \tau$. The dataset for LGBMRanker is defined by the meta feature vectors $\mathbf{x}_\tau^{\text{meta}}$ and $\mathbf{x}_s^{\text{meta}}$, the score $\text{Score}_\tau(s)$, and the index of the pseudo target τ . f_{rank} can use any feature created from $\mathbf{x}_\tau^{\text{meta}}$ and $\mathbf{x}_s^{\text{meta}}$. In this study, we use $|\mathbf{x}_\tau^{\text{meta}} - \mathbf{x}_s^{\text{meta}}|$.

C Detail of Experiments

C.1 Regularization Coefficients and Dimension of Latent Space

We optimize α , β and the latent space dimension by using the source datasets. The candidates were $\alpha = 10^{-1}, 10^{-2}, 10^{-3}, 10^{-4}$, $\beta = 10^{-1}, 10^{-2}, 10^{-3}, 10^{-4}$, and the latent space dimension 2, 3, 4. We applied the proposed method to 150 source datasets and observed $\alpha = 10^{-3}, \beta = 10^{-4}$ and the latent dimension 3 was the best average performance, which was employed in our experiments (Note that 150 source datasets are from the original 161 source datasets. We omitted datasets that require long computational time and that achieve max Acc, i.e., 1, only by initial points for more than 6 times out of 10 trials).

C.2 Meta-learning based Baselines

In our experiments, we used two meta-learning based baselines, called AS-ML and AHS-ML. We build these methods by ourselves based on existing meta-learning studies to make comparison fair

Source datasets	ML algorithms	Meta-feature	One-hot vector of machine algorithm	Acc	Ranking
\mathcal{D}'_1	SVM	$\mathbf{x}_1^{\text{meta}}$	1 0 0	0.78	1
	RF	$\mathbf{x}_1^{\text{meta}}$	0 1 0	0.776	2
	LR	$\mathbf{x}_1^{\text{meta}}$	0 0 1	0.768	3
⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮
\mathcal{D}'_s	SVM	$\mathbf{x}_N^{\text{meta}}$	1 0 0	0.84	3
	RF	$\mathbf{x}_N^{\text{meta}}$	0 1 0	0.851	1
	LR	$\mathbf{x}_N^{\text{meta}}$	0 0 1	0.845	2

Input of meta model
Prediction target

Figure 9: Training dataset of AS-ML.

(e.g., candidate ML algorithms and HPs). Both AS-ML and AHS-ML employ LightGBM as a base ranking model.

C.2.1 Algorithm Selection by Meta-Learning (AS-ML)

AS-ML selects the ML algorithm by the ranking model, and then, BO is applied to the selected top ML algorithm. Figure 9 is an illustration of the training data of AS-ML. Let \mathcal{D}'_τ be a pseudo target dataset from our source datasets $\{\mathcal{D}'_s\}_{s \in [S]}$. For the ranking model optimization, the input feature in the training dataset consists of the meta-feature $\mathbf{x}_\tau^{\text{meta}}$ of the pseudo target \mathcal{D}'_τ and the one-hot representation of the ML algorithm $A^{(m)}$. The ranking model is optimized so that the ranking (defined by the validation accuracy) of ML algorithms for each pseudo target \mathcal{D}'_τ can be accurately predicted.

C.2.2 Algorithm and Hyperparameter Selection by Meta-Learning (AHS-ML)

AHS-ML creates a ranking list of a pair of an ML algorithm and its HPs. The training dataset for AHS-ML is shown in Fig. 10. For the ranking model optimization, the input feature in the training dataset consists of the meta-feature $\mathbf{x}_\tau^{\text{meta}}$ of the pseudo target \mathcal{D}'_τ , the one-hot representation of the ML algorithm $A^{(m)}$, and the HP vector. As shown in Fig. 10, an element of the HP vector is set 0.5 if $A^{(i)}$ does not have that HP (Note that HPs are scaled in $[0, 1]$). This is inspired by the default value imputation strategy in the conditional HP optimization [Lévesque et al.(2017)]. In the `LGBMRanker` function of the LightGBM library, the size of the ranking list in the training dataset should be less than 10,000. We heuristically reduced the size of candidates to satisfy this condition. We first collected the top 150 pairs of an ML algorithm and an HP vector for each source dataset. From $150 \times S$ pairs, we removed duplicated settings, and remaining 9,389 settings were used as candidates from which training ranking list was created. For the final target dataset \mathcal{D} , we created the ranking by the learned ranking model (in this phase, `LGBMRanker` can incorporate all candidates without the 10,000 constraint), and then, we observe the performance of each pair of the ML algorithm and the HP vector sequentially from the top of the ranking list.

C.3 List of ML algorithms and hyper-parameters

Table 1 shows ML algorithms and hyper-parameters used in Section 5. The table is described by function and variable names in

Source datasets	ML algorithm + hyperparameter	Meta-feature	One-hot vector of ML algorithms	λ_1	λ_2	λ_3	λ_4	λ_5	Acc	Ranking
\mathcal{D}'_1	SVM $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = (0.52, 0.01)$	$\mathbf{x}_1^{\text{meta}}$	1 0 0	0.52	0.01	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.78	1
	SVM $(\lambda_1, \lambda_2) = (0.03, 0.85)$	$\mathbf{x}_1^{\text{meta}}$	1 0 0	0.03	0.85	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.72	126
	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮
	RF $(\lambda_3, \lambda_4, \lambda_5) = (0.1, 0.75, 0.88)$	$\mathbf{x}_1^{\text{meta}}$	0 1 0	0.5	0.5	0.1	0.75	0.88	0.776	11
	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮
\mathcal{D}'_s	LR $(\lambda_i) = (1)$	$\mathbf{x}_1^{\text{meta}}$	0 0 1	1	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.768	36
	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮	⋮

Input of meta model
Prediction target

Figure 10: Training dataset of AHS-ML.

scikit-learn [Pedregosa et al.(2011)].

C.4 Comparison based on Validation Accuracy

In Section 5, the ranking based evaluation was shown. Here, we show the final $\text{Acc}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{valid}})$ for each dataset in Table 2.

C.5 Datasets

The source and target datasets are shown in Table 3 and 4, respectively. Missing values were imputed using the mode of each feature. The categorical variable in `KNeighborsClassifier` is simply encoded as 1 (uniform) and 2 (distance). The source datasets were used in pre-training of the proposed method and pre-train BO and meta-learning of AS-ML and AHS-ML, for which we observed many $\text{Acc}(\boldsymbol{\lambda}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{valid}})$ beforehand as shown in Table 5.

Table 1: List of ML algorithms and HPs. All discrete variables are count variables.

ML algorithm	Hyper-parameters	Range	Type
AdaBoostClassifier	learning_rate	$10^{-3} \sim 1$	Continuous
	n_estimators	1 ~ 50	Discrete
BaggingClassifier	max_features	$10^{-3} \sim 1$	Continuous
	n_estimators	1 ~ 50	Discrete
	max_samples	$10^{-3} \sim 1$	Continuous
DecisionTreeClassifier	max_features	$10^{-3} \sim 1$	Continuous
	max_depth	1 ~ 50	Discrete
	min_samples_leaf	2 ~ 512	Discrete
	min_samples_split	2 ~ 512	Discrete
ExtraTreeClassifier	max_features	$10^{-3} \sim 1$	Continuous
	n_estimators	1 ~ 50	Discrete
	max_depth	1 ~ 50	Discrete
	min_samples_leaf	2 ~ 512	Discrete
	min_samples_split	2 ~ 512	Discrete
GaussianNB	var_smoothing	$10^{-15} \sim 1$	Continuous
GradientBoostingClassifier	learning_rate	$10^{-3} \sim 1$	Continuous
	n_estimators	1 ~ 50	Discrete
	max_features	$10^{-3} \sim 1$	Continuous
	max_depth	1 ~ 50	Discrete
	min_samples_split	2 ~ 512	Discrete
KNeighborsClassifier	n_neighbors	1 ~ 50	Discrete
	p	1 ~ 2	Discrete
	weights	uniform, distance	Categorical
LogisticRegression	C	$10^{-3} \sim 10^3$	Continuous
MLPClassifier	learning_rate_init	$10^{-5} \sim 10^{-1}$	Continuous
	alpha	$10^{-2} \sim 10^2$	Continuous
	first hidden layer's unit size	16 ~ 128	Discrete
	second hidden layer's unit size	32 ~ 256	Discrete
	third hidden layer's unit size	8 ~ 64	Discrete
QuadraticDiscriminantAnalysis	reg_param	$10^{-5} \sim 1$	Continuous
RandomForestClassifier	max_features	$10^{-3} \sim 1$	Continuous
	n_estimators	1 ~ 50	Discrete
	max_depth	1 ~ 50	Discrete
	min_samples_leaf	2 ~ 512	Discrete
	min_samples_split	2 ~ 512	Discrete
SVC	gamma	$10^{-8} \sim 10^4$	Continuous
	C	$10^{-3} \sim 10^3$	Discrete

Table 2: Maximum $\text{Acc}(\lambda, \mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{valid}})$ obtained by each method (average of 10 runs with different initialization). The left most column ‘data id’ is the dataset id of OpenML. The red, blue and green fonts are the best, the second best and the third best methods, respectively.

data id	Proposed	SMAC	BanditBO	Pre-train BO	RB-SMAC	Random	AS-ML	AHS-ML
4134	0.7948	0.7892	0.7843	0.7839	0.7915	0.7798	0.7938	0.7922
1084	0.9621	0.953	0.9606	0.9545	0.9561	0.953	0.9682	0.9697
41972	0.9427	0.9269	0.9392	0.923	0.9576	0.9437	0.925	0.9264
4153	0.9964	0.9745	0.9891	0.9745	0.9909	0.96	0.9564	0.9636
41082	0.9751	0.9729	0.9741	0.9737	0.9766	0.974	0.9594	0.9699
1557	0.6771	0.6744	0.6728	0.6649	0.6727	0.665	0.6629	0.6794
45068	0.8752	0.874	0.8713	0.8699	0.8759	0.8705	0.8755	0.8753
1457	0.718	0.7176	0.7144	0.7144	0.7178	0.7098	0.6549	0.6622
1458	0.8833	0.8483	0.865	0.84	0.8667	0.8467	0.8867	0.85
9	0.9113	0.9048	0.8984	0.8016	0.8919	0.8242	0.9	0.8871
463	0.8745	0.8727	0.8727	0.8964	0.8745	0.8727	0.8782	0.8727
1460	0.896	0.8944	0.8945	0.8963	0.8954	0.8942	0.8929	0.8938
40663	0.7075	0.7158	0.7017	0.6775	0.6883	0.6683	0.7092	0.6917
40711	0.6352	0.6165	0.622	0.6363	0.6198	0.6198	0.6341	0.6374
180	0.8792	0.8751	0.8786	0.8756	0.8813	0.873	0.8807	0.8819
846	0.901	0.8934	0.8963	0.888	0.8969	0.8844	0.9005	0.897
1044	0.7697	0.7632	0.7642	0.7279	0.745	0.6955	0.7696	0.7696
1475	0.6176	0.6107	0.6112	0.6127	0.6168	0.6042	0.6172	0.61
23512	0.722	0.7205	0.7186	0.7147	0.7187	0.7146	0.7215	0.718
1479	0.9662	0.9654	0.9684	0.9684	0.9659	0.9635	0.5409	0.5769
300	0.9722	0.9697	0.9674	0.9674	0.9719	0.9701	0.9725	0.9658
41168	0.7208	0.7219	0.7155	0.7042	0.7146	0.713	0.7211	0.72
184	0.8541	0.7647	0.8419	0.7582	0.8314	0.77	0.8725	0.8766
396	0.9211	0.9173	0.9204	0.9163	0.9186	0.9117	0.9108	0.9148
1482	0.7282	0.6777	0.732	0.6757	0.6913	0.6777	0.6291	0.699
40677	0.7367	0.7362	0.7348	0.7342	0.7377	0.736	0.7357	0.7312
6	0.9706	0.961	0.9651	0.9622	0.9744	0.9662	0.9752	0.9628
10	0.7956	0.7644	0.7867	0.7778	0.8	0.7711	0.7978	0.7778
45067	0.7491	0.7449	0.7476	0.7472	0.7514	0.7423	0.7509	0.7495
1491	0.82	0.8183	0.8121	0.8206	0.8271	0.8194	0.791	0.6937
871	0.5319	0.5281	0.5306	0.5266	0.5259	0.5186	0.5127	0.5082
44161	0.8045	0.8028	0.7987	0.7978	0.8024	0.7856	0.8019	0.8017
934	0.964	0.955	0.9556	0.9542	0.9513	0.9392	0.9651	0.9539
841	0.9723	0.9712	0.9695	0.9705	0.9681	0.9646	0.9684	0.9684
4329	0.8369	0.8348	0.8333	0.8397	0.8369	0.8362	0.8319	0.8369
1508	0.9421	0.938	0.9388	0.9322	0.9421	0.9339	0.9347	0.9339
1523	0.9323	0.9355	0.9215	0.929	0.9355	0.9333	0.8946	0.871
41166	0.6965	0.6903	0.6921	0.67	0.7144	0.6803	0.6913	0.6931
56	0.9763	0.9733	0.9718	0.9687	0.9756	0.9733	0.9771	0.9771
60	0.8657	0.8653	0.8637	0.8678	0.8679	0.864	0.861	0.86

Table 3: List of source datasets. ‘Missing Values’ indicates the existence of missing values (✓ means missing values exist). The dataset id of Open ML is shown in ‘id’.

Name	Samples	Features	Numerical	Categorical	Classes	Missing Values	id
aileron	13750	40	40	0	2	-	734
Amazon_employee_access	32769	9	0	9	2	-	4135
anacatdata_auhorship	841	70	70	0	4	-	458
anacatdata_boxing2	132	3	0	3	2	-	444
anacatdata_creditscore	100	6	3	3	2	-	461
anacatdata_dmft	797	4	0	4	6	-	469
anacatdata_lawsuit	264	4	3	1	2	-	450
anacatdata_wildcat	163	5	3	2	2	-	748
anneal	898	38	6	32	5	-	42716
AP_Breast_Colon	630	10935	10935	0	2	-	1145
AP_Breast_Kidney	604	10935	10935	0	2	-	1158
AP_Breast_Ovary	542	10935	10935	0	2	-	1165
arrhythmia	452	279	206	73	13	✓	5
artificial-characters	10218	7	7	0	10	-	1459
Australian	690	14	6	8	2	-	40981
autoUniv-au6-1000	1000	40	37	3	8	-	1555
balance-scale	625	4	4	0	3	-	11
bank-marketing	45211	16	7	9	2	-	1461
bank32nh	8192	32	32	0	2	-	833
banknote-authentication	1372	4	4	0	2	-	1462
baseball	1340	16	15	1	3	✓	185
biomed	209	8	7	1	2	✓	481
Birds	500	2	0	2	20	-	43325
blastchar	7043	19	3	16	2	✓	46280
blood-transfusion-service-center	748	4	4	0	2	-	1464
breast-tissue	106	9	9	0	6	-	1465
breast-w	699	9	9	0	2	✓	15
bridges	105	11	3	8	6	✓	327
car	1728	6	0	6	4	-	40975
cardiotocography	2126	35	35	0	10	-	1466
chatfield_4	235	12	12	0	2	-	820
christine	5418	1636	1599	37	2	-	41142
churn	5000	20	16	4	2	-	40701
cjs	2796	33	31	2	6	✓	23380
Click_prediction_small	39948	9	9	0	2	-	1220
climate-model-simulation-crashes	540	20	20	0	2	-	1467
cmc	1473	9	2	7	3	-	23
cnae-9	1080	856	856	0	9	-	1468
colic	368	22	7	15	2	✓	27
colleges_usnews	1302	33	32	1	2	✓	930
confidence	72	3	3	0	6	-	468
connect-4	67557	42	0	42	3	-	40668
CPMP-2015-runtime-classification	527	22	22	0	4	-	41919
credit-g	1000	20	7	13	2	-	31
cylinder-bands	540	37	18	19	2	✓	6332
datatrive	130	8	8	0	2	-	1075
dermatology	366	34	1	33	6	✓	35
dgf_test	3415	4	2	2	2	✓	42883
diabetes	768	8	8	0	2	-	37
dna	3186	180	0	180	3	-	40670

Continued on next page

Continued from previous page

Name	Samples	Features	Numerical	Categorical	Classes	Missing Values	id
dresses-sales	500	12	1	11	2	✓	23381
eating	945	6373	6373	0	7	-	1233
ecoli	336	7	7	0	8	-	39
eeg-eye-state	14980	14	14	0	2	-	1471
electricity	45312	8	7	1	2	-	151
eucalyptus	736	19	14	5	5	✓	188
fabert	8237	800	800	0	7	-	41164
flags	194	28	2	26	8	-	285
Flare	1066	11	0	11	6	-	46174
fri_c3_1000_25	1000	25	25	0	2	-	715
fri_c3_1000_5	1000	5	5	0	2	-	813
GCM	190	16063	16063	0	14	-	1106
GesturePhaseSegmentationProcessed	9873	32	32	0	5	-	4538
gina_prior2	3468	784	784	0	10	-	1041
glass	214	9	9	0	6	-	41
grub-damage	155	8	2	6	4	-	338
haberman	306	3	2	1	2	-	43
hayes-roth	160	4	4	0	3	-	329
heart-long-beach	200	13	13	0	5	-	1512
heart-statlog	270	13	13	0	2	-	53
hepatitis	155	19	6	13	2	✓	55
ilpd	583	10	9	1	2	-	1480
IndoorScenes	15620	2	0	2	67	-	45936
Internet-Advertisements	3279	1558	3	1555	2	-	40978
ionosphere	351	34	34	0	2	-	59
iris	150	4	4	0	3	-	61
irish	500	5	2	3	2	✓	451
JapaneseVowels	9961	14	14	0	9	-	375
jasmine	2984	144	8	136	2	-	41143
jungle_chess_2pcs_raw_endgame_complete	44819	6	6	0	3	-	41027
kr-vs-kp	3196	36	0	36	2	-	3
ldpa	164860	7	5	2	11	-	1483
LED-display-domain-7digit	500	7	7	0	10	-	40496
madelon	2600	500	500	0	2	-	1485
MagicTelescope	19020	10	10	0	2	-	1120
Mammographic-Mass-Data-Set	961	4	2	2	2	✓	45557
meta_instanceincremental.arff	74	62	62	0	4	-	278
mfeat-factors	2000	216	216	0	10	-	12
mfeat-fourier	2000	76	76	0	10	-	14
mfeat-karhunen	2000	64	64	0	10	-	16
mfeat-morphological	2000	6	6	0	10	-	18
mfeat-pixel	2000	240	0	240	10	-	20
mfeat-zernike	2000	47	47	0	10	-	22
MiceProtein	1080	77	77	0	8	✓	40966
micro-mass	571	1300	1300	0	20	-	1515
microaggregation2	20000	20	20	0	5	-	41671
Midwest_survey	2494	27	0	27	9	✓	42805
monks-problems-2	601	6	0	6	2	-	334
mushroom	8124	22	0	22	2	✓	24
musk	6598	167	166	1	2	-	1116

Continued on next page

Continued from previous page

Name	Samples	Features	Numerical	Categorical	Classes	Missing Values	id
nomao	34465	118	89	29	2	-	1486
nursery	12960	8	0	8	5	-	26
optdigits	5620	64	64	0	10	-	28
ozone-level-8hr	2534	72	72	0	2	-	1487
page-blocks	5473	10	10	0	5	-	30
pc1	1109	21	21	0	2	-	1068
pc2	5589	36	36	0	2	-	1069
pc3	1563	37	37	0	2	-	1050
pc4	1458	37	37	0	2	-	1049
pendigits	10992	16	16	0	10	-	32
philippine	5832	308	308	0	2	-	41145
PhishingWebsites	11055	30	0	30	2	-	4534
phoneme	5404	5	5	0	2	-	1489
PizzaCutter1	661	37	37	0	2	-	1443
PopularKids	478	10	6	4	3	-	1100
prnn_fglass	214	9	9	0	6	-	952
prnn_synth	250	2	2	0	2	-	464
profb	672	9	5	4	2	✓	470
qsar-biodeg	1055	41	41	0	2	-	1494
regime_alimentaire	202	19	3	16	2	✓	42172
rmftsa_sleepdata	1024	2	2	0	4	-	679
rsctc2010_1	105	22283	22283	0	3	-	1077
Run_or_walk_information	88588	6	6	0	2	-	40922
Satellite	5100	36	36	0	2	-	40900
satimage	6430	36	36	0	6	-	182
scene	2407	299	294	5	2	-	312
schizo	340	14	12	2	2	✓	466
seismic-bumps	210	7	7	0	3	-	1500
semeion	1593	256	256	0	10	-	1501
shuttle	58000	9	9	0	7	-	40685
solar-flare	1066	12	0	12	6	-	40687
sonar	208	60	60	0	2	-	40
soybean	683	35	0	35	19	✓	42
spambase	4601	57	57	0	2	-	44
SPECT	267	22	0	22	2	-	336
SPECTF	349	44	44	0	2	-	337
Speech	3686	400	400	0	2	-	40910
SpeedDating	8378	120	59	61	2	✓	40536
splice	3190	60	0	60	3	-	46
SRBCT	83	2308	2308	0	4	-	45101
steel-plates-fault	1941	33	33	0	2	-	1504
synthetic_control	600	60	60	0	6	-	377
tae	151	5	3	2	3	-	48
texture	5500	40	40	0	11	-	40499
thyroid-allrep	2800	26	6	20	5	-	40477
Titanic	1309	13	6	7	2	✓	40945
tokyol	959	44	42	2	2	-	40705
Traffic_violations	70340	20	1	19	3	✓	42345
vehicle	846	18	18	0	4	-	54
volcanoes-a1	3252	3	3	0	5	-	1527

Continued on next page

Continued from previous page

Name	Samples	Features	Numerical	Categorical	Classes	Missing Values	id
volcanoes-a2	1623	3	3	0	5	-	1528
volcanoes-a3	1521	3	3	0	5	-	1529
vowel	990	12	10	2	11	-	307
wall-robot-navigation	5456	24	24	0	4	-	1497
wdbc	569	30	30	0	2	-	1510
wilt	4839	5	5	0	2	-	40983
wine-quality-red	1599	11	11	0	6	-	40691
wine-quality-white	4898	11	11	0	7	-	40498
WMO-Hurricane-Survival-Dataset	5021	22	1	21	2	✓	43607
yeast	1484	8	8	0	10	-	181
zoo	101	16	1	15	7	-	62

Table 4: List of target datasets. ‘Missing Values’ indicates the existence of missing values (✓ means missing values exist). The dataset id of Open ML is shown in ‘id’.

name	Samples	Features	Numerical	Categorical	Classes	Missing Values	id
abalone	4177	8	7	1	3	-	1557
adult	48842	14	6	8	2	-	45068
amazon-commerce-reviews	1500	10000	10000	0	50	-	1457
arcene	200	10000	10000	0	2	-	1458
autos	205	25	15	10	6	✓	9
backache	180	31	5	26	2	-	463
banana	5300	2	2	0	2	-	1460
Bioresponse	3751	1776	1776	0	2	-	4134
BurkittLymphoma	220	22283	22283	0	3	-	1084
calendarDOW	399	32	12	20	5	-	40663
cleveland-nominal	303	7	0	7	5	-	40711
coverttype	110393	54	14	40	7	-	180
elevators	16599	18	18	0	2	-	846
eye_movements	10936	27	24	3	3	-	1044
first-order-theorem-proving	6118	51	51	0	6	-	1475
higgs	98050	28	28	0	2	✓	23512
hill-valley	1212	100	100	0	2	-	1479
Indian_pines	9144	220	220	0	8	-	41972
isolet	7797	617	617	0	26	-	300
jannis	83733	54	54	0	4	-	41168
kropt	28056	6	0	6	18	-	184
la1s.wc	3204	13195	13195	0	6	-	396
leaf	340	15	15	0	30	-	1482
led24	3200	24	0	24	10	-	40677
letter	20000	16	16	0	26	-	6
lymph	148	18	3	15	4	-	10
okcupid_stem	26677	13	2	11	3	-	45067
one-hundred-plants-margin	1600	64	64	0	100	-	1491
pollen	3848	5	5	0	2	-	871
road-safety	111762	32	29	3	2	-	44161
Smartphone-Based_Recognition_of_Human_Activities	180	66	66	0	6	-	4153
socmob	1156	5	1	4	2	-	934
stock	950	9	9	0	2	-	841
thoracic_surgery	470	16	3	13	2	-	4329
user-knowledge	403	5	5	0	5	-	1508
USPS	9298	256	256	0	10	-	41082
vertebra-column	310	6	6	0	3	-	1523
volkert	58310	180	180	0	10	-	41166
vote	435	16	0	16	2	✓	56
waveform-5000	5000	40	40	0	3	-	60

Table 5: List of HPs used in pre-training. $\text{np.linspace}(i, j, k)$ is from python library numpy [Harris et al.(2020)] that returns k uniform grid points in $[i, j]$.

ML algorithms	HPs	HP values	# observations N'_m
AdaBoostClassifier	learning_rate n_estimators	$\{10^i \mid i \in \text{np.linspace}(-3, 0, 10)\}$ $\{i \mid i \in \text{np.linspace}(1, 50, 10, \text{dtype} = \text{int})\}$	100
BaggingClassifier	max_features n_estimators max_samples	$\{10^i \mid i \in \text{np.linspace}(-3, 0, 5)\}$ $\{i \mid i \in \text{np.linspace}(1, 50, 10, \text{dtype} = \text{int})\}$ $\{10^i \mid i \in \text{np.linspace}(-3, 0, 7)\}$	350
DecisionTreeClassifier	max_features max_depth min_samples_leaf min_samples_split	$\{10^i \mid i \in \text{np.linspace}(-3, 0, 10)\}$ $\{i \mid i \in \text{np.linspace}(1, 50, 10, \text{dtype} = \text{int})\}$ $\{2^i \mid i \in \text{np.linspace}(1, 9, 9, \text{dtype} = \text{int})\}$ $\{2^i \mid i \in \text{np.linspace}(1, 9, 9, \text{dtype} = \text{int})\}$	8100
ExtraTreeClassifier	max_features n_estimators max_depth min_samples_leaf min_samples_split	$\{10^i \mid i \in \text{np.linspace}(-3, 0, 5)\}$ $\{i \mid i \in \text{np.linspace}(1, 50, 10, \text{dtype} = \text{int})\}$ $\{i \mid i \in \text{np.linspace}(1, 50, 5, \text{dtype} = \text{int})\}$ $\{2^i \mid i \in \text{np.linspace}(1, 9, 5, \text{dtype} = \text{int})\}$ $\{2^i \mid i \in \text{np.linspace}(1, 9, 5, \text{dtype} = \text{int})\}$	6250
GaussianNB	var_smoothing	$\{10^i \mid i \in \text{np.linspace}(-15, 0, 50)\}$	50
GradientBoostingClassifier	learning_rate n_estimators max_features max_depth min_samples_split	$\{10^i \mid i \in \text{np.linspace}(-3, 0, 7)\}$ $\{i \mid i \in \text{np.linspace}(1, 50, 10, \text{dtype} = \text{int})\}$ $\{10^i \mid i \in \text{np.linspace}(-3, 0, 5)\}$ $\{i \mid i \in \text{np.linspace}(1, 50, 5, \text{dtype} = \text{int})\}$ $\{2^i \mid i \in \text{np.linspace}(1, 9, 5, \text{dtype} = \text{int})\}$	8750
KNeighborsClassifier	n_neighbors p weights	$\{i \mid i \in \text{np.linspace}(1, 50, 50, \text{dtype} = \text{int})\}$ $\{1, 2\}$ {uniform, distance}	200
LogisticRegression	C	$\{10^i \mid i \in \text{np.linspace}(-3, 3, 50)\}$	50
MLPClassifier	learning_rate_init alpha first hidden layer's unit size second hidden layer's unit size third hidden layer's unit size	$\{10^i \mid i \in \text{np.linspace}(-5, -1, 9)\}$ $\{10^i \mid i \in \text{np.linspace}(-2, 2, 9)\}$ $\{2^i \mid i \in \text{np.linspace}(4, 7, 4, \text{dtype} = \text{int})\}$ $\{2^i \mid i \in \text{np.linspace}(5, 8, 4, \text{dtype} = \text{int})\}$ $\{2^i \mid i \in \text{np.linspace}(3, 6, 4, \text{dtype} = \text{int})\}$	5184
QuadraticDiscriminantAnalysis	reg_param	$\{10^i \mid i \in \text{np.linspace}(-5, 0, 50)\}$	50
RandomForestClassifier	max_features n_estimators max_depth min_samples_leaf min_samples_split	$\{10^i \mid i \in \text{np.linspace}(-3, 0, 5)\}$ $\{i \mid i \in \text{np.linspace}(1, 50, 10, \text{dtype} = \text{int})\}$ $\{i \mid i \in \text{np.linspace}(1, 50, 5, \text{dtype} = \text{int})\}$ $\{2^i \mid i \in \text{np.linspace}(1, 9, 5, \text{dtype} = \text{int})\}$ $\{2^i \mid i \in \text{np.linspace}(1, 9, 5, \text{dtype} = \text{int})\}$	6250
SVC	gamma C	$\{10^i \mid i \in \text{np.linspace}(-8, 4, 30)\}$ $\{10^i \mid i \in \text{np.linspace}(-3, 3, 20)\}$	600