

LLM4FS: Leveraging Large Language Models for Feature Selection and How to Improve It

Jianhao Li and Xianchao Xiu

Abstract—Recent advances in large language models (LLMs) have provided new opportunities for decision-making, particularly in the task of automated feature selection. In this paper, we first comprehensively evaluate LLM-based feature selection methods, covering the state-of-the-art DeepSeek-R1, GPT-o3-mini, and GPT-4.5. Then, we propose a novel hybrid strategy called LLM4FS that integrates LLMs with traditional data-driven methods. Specifically, input data samples into LLMs, and directly call traditional data-driven techniques such as random forest and forward sequential selection. Notably, our analysis reveals that the hybrid strategy leverages the contextual understanding of LLMs and the high statistical reliability of traditional data-driven methods to achieve excellent feature selection performance, even surpassing LLMs and traditional data-driven methods. Finally, we point out the limitations of its application in decision-making.

I. INTRODUCTION

Feature selection is a key step in optimization and artificial intelligence, with the objective of selecting the most useful features to improve performance and computational efficiency in high-dimensional scenarios [1], [2]. In general, it can be divided into three categories: filtering, wrapper, and embedded. Specifically, filtering methods that rank and select features according to their correlation [3], wrapper methods that apply heuristic search strategies to find the best feature subset [4], and embedded methods that integrate feature selection into model training processes through regularization techniques [5]. Although the above traditional data-driven methods have demonstrated considerable success in various applications, they usually require a large number of training data and extensive computation.

Different from traditional data-driven methods, large language models (LLMs) bring more possibilities to feature selection through their semantic reasoning capabilities and in-context learning potential. Choi et al. [6] pioneered to instruct GPT-3 [7] to answer “yes” or “no” to determine whether a given feature is important or not, thus achieving automated feature selection. Jeong et al. [8] subsequently proposed three different pipelines that directly exploited the generated text outputs, and evaluated various model sizes and incentive strategies through extensive experiments. Yang et al. [9] introduced in-context evolutionary search (ICE-SEARCH) in medical predictive analysis, which iteratively optimizes selected features by prompting LLMs to perform feature filtering based on test scores. Han et al. [10] used

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant 12371306. (Corresponding author: Xianchao Xiu.)

Jianhao Li and Xianchao Xiu are with the School of Mechatronic Engineering and Automation, Shanghai University, Shanghai 200444, China {lijianhao; xcxiu}@shu.edu.cn




Fig. 1: Average performance on all selected datasets, where blue, orange, and green indicate the LLMs-based methods, traditional data-driven methods, and our proposed hybrid strategy (LLM4FS), respectively.

LLMs as feature engineers to generate meta-features in addition to the original features and integrated them with a simple machine learning model to improve the downstream task predictions. Very recently, Li et al. [11] paired features of samples with the corresponding target variable values and then treated these sample pairs as few-shot examples along with additional context for LLMs to perform feature selection. Lee et al. [12] integrated Chain-of-Thought (CoT) with ensembling principles and developed the FREEFORM framework that enhances feature output stability via free-flow reasoning and diversified model aggregation.

Although existing LLMs-based methods have illustrated promising automated capabilities in feature selection, their performance is still difficult to match that of traditional data-driven methods. It is well known that LLMs have powerful reasoning ability, while traditional data-driven methods have better reliability. Therefore, a natural question is whether it is possible to develop a strategy that allows LLM to directly leverage traditional data-driven methods for feature selection.

In this paper, we will give an affirmative response. The contributions of this work are given as follows.

- We evaluate several cutting-edge LLMs the task of feature selection, revealing that DeepSeek-R1 [13] performs comparable to GPT-4.5, which is generally better than GPT-o3-mini.
- We propose a hybrid strategy called LLM4FS that combines the semantic reasoning of LLMs with the robustness of traditional data-driven methods, thus achieving promising performance, as shown in Fig. 1.
- We analyze the remaining shortcomings and challenges of leveraging LLMs for feature selection, along with potential future directions in decision-making.




Fig. 2: Illustration of the hybrid strategy (LLM4FS). A task description and dataset samples are provided to the LLMs, which are then instructed to analyze the data using traditional data-driven methods.

II. METHODOLOGY

This section first reviews an efficient LLMs-based method, followed by our novel hybrid strategy (LLM4FS).

A. LLMs-based Method

A study [8] explores the use of the vast semantic knowledge in LLMs for feature selection. Specifically, it involves providing detailed dataset descriptions in the prompt, guiding LLMs to semantically assess the significance of each feature based on their inherent knowledge and experience.

Specifically, for a pre-trained LLM denoted by \mathcal{M} , the prompt provided to \mathcal{M} in this method includes dataset-specific description (Des), few-shot examples (Ex), and CoT explanation (CoT). These, together with the task description instruction context C , derive the following prompt

$$P^{\text{LLM}} = \text{prompt}(Des, Ex, CoT, C), \quad (1)$$

where P^{LLM} represents the prompt for \mathcal{M} . Then, \mathcal{M} will generate an importance score S_i for each feature f_i based on the following formula

$$S_i = \mathcal{M}(P_{f_i}^{\text{LLM}}), \quad i \in \{1, \dots, l\}. \quad (2)$$

B. Hybrid Strategy (LLM4FS)

The hybrid strategy refers to an approach that integrates LLMs with traditional data-driven methods for feature selection. As shown in Fig. 2, we first send approximately 200 data samples (typically accounting for 20% or less of the total data) to the LLMs, and allow them to directly analyze the data using traditional data-driven methods such as random forest [14], forward sequential selection, and backward sequential selection. Then, the LLMs will use these traditional data-driven methods for feature selection and assign an importance score to each feature.

More precisely, for a given \mathcal{M} , the prompt P^{LLM4FS} consists of a task description instruction context C and a CSV file containing 200 dataset samples SP , which is given by the form of

$$P^{\text{LLM4FS}} = \text{prompt}(C, SP). \quad (3)$$

LLM4FS

Main System Prompt

Please apply *random forest*, *forward sequential selection*, *backward sequential selection*, *recursive feature elimination (RFE)*, *minimum redundancy maximum relevance (MRMR)*, and *mutual information (MI)* separately to analyze the dataset samples. This is a classification task, where ‘‘Class’’ represents the classification. Please analyze the importance scores of all features. The score range is [0.0, 1.0], and the score of each feature should be different. The output format is as follows, in JSON file format.

Format for Response

```
[
  {
    "concept-1" : "Glucose",
    "reasoning" : "The feature importance score is calculated using a random forest classifier. A higher score indicates greater importance in predicting the target variable.",
    "score" : 0.95
  }
]
```

Dataset Samples

(csv file with 200 samples)

Then, the \mathcal{M} is required to directly call traditional data-driven methods for feature selection based on the prompt and provide the importance score S_i for each feature f_i , that is,

$$S_i = \mathcal{M}(P_{f_i}^{\text{LLM4FS}}), \quad i \in \{1, \dots, l\}. \quad (4)$$

The detailed prompts of hybrid strategy (LLM4FS) are provided in the box above.





(a) *Bank*(b) *Credit-G*(c) *Pima Indians Diabetes*(d) *Give Me Some Credit*

Fig. 3: AUROC results for each dataset when the top 30% of features are selected, where blue and orange indicate the LLMs-based methods and traditional data-driven methods, respectively.

TABLE I: Statistics of the selected datasets.

| Dataset | # of samples | # of features |
|------------------------------|--------------|---------------|
| <i>Bank</i> | 45,211 | 16 |
| <i>Credit-G</i> | 1,000 | 20 |
| <i>Pima Indians Diabetes</i> | 768 | 8 |
| <i>Give Me Some Credit</i> | 120,269 | 10 |

III. EXPERIMENTS

This section validates the effectiveness of our proposed hybrid strategy through comparative experiments for the classification task on the following four datasets: *Bank* [15], *Credit-G* [16], *Pima Indians Diabetes* [17], *Give Me Some Credit*¹. The detailed statistics are presented in Table I.

A. Setups

1) *LLMs*: To explore the performance of LLMs for feature selection, several latest models are chosen including

- DeepSeek-R1 (DS-R1, 2025-01-20)
- GPT-o3-mini (GPT-o3m, 2025-01-31)
- GPT-4.5 (2025-02-27)

In practice, these LLMs are called via API and set $T = 0.1$ to obtain more stable outputs. For our proposed LLM4FS,

¹<https://www.kaggle.com/c/GiveMeSomeCredit>


due to the usage restrictions of GPT-4.5, only GPT-o3-mini and DeepSeek-R1 are selected for comparison.

2) *Baselines*: The above LLMs-based feature selection methods are compared with the following traditional data-driven baselines


- LASSO [18]
- Forward sequential selection
- Backward sequential selection
- Recursive feature elimination (RFE) [19]
- Minimum redundancy maximum relevance selection (MRMR) [20]
- Mutual information (MI) [21]
- Random feature selection

Note that in our hybrid strategy (LLM4FS), we also select another well-known baseline, i.e., random forest (RF).


3) *Implementations*: In the experiments, each feature selection method is evaluated by measuring how the test performance of a downstream classification prediction model varies as the proportion of selected features increases from 10% to 100% (in increments of approximately 10%). Specifically, apart from LASSO, for each dataset and at each feature proportion, we evaluate the test performance using a downstream ℓ_2 -regularized logistic regression model chosen via grid search with 5-fold cross-validation; whereas for feature selection with LASSO, an ℓ_1 -regularized logistic regression model is trained for the classification task on each dataset. In addition, the area under the receiver operating




(a) Bank



(b) Credit-G



(c) Pima Indians Diabetes



(d) Give Me Some Credit

Fig. 4: AUROC results for each dataset when the top 30% of features are selected, where blue, orange, and green indicate the LLMs-based methods, traditional data-driven methods, and our proposed hybrid strategy (LLM4FS), respectively.




Fig. 5: Prices of the selected LLMs.




Fig. 6: Comparison of model performance and runtime.

characteristic (AUROC) curve is used to measure the classification performance.

B. Results

We present our main experimental results in Figs. 3-7, and highlight the following findings.

- **(Finding 1) The latest LLMs exhibit a performance comparable to traditional data-driven methods.**

Specifically, as shown in Fig. 3, although the performance of LLMs-based methods is slightly lower than that of some traditional data-driven methods in some cases, its overall performance is still comparable. In particular, on the *Credit-G* and *Give Me Some Credit* datasets, DeepSeek-R1 shows competitive potential, indicating that LLMs hold certain advantages and promise in feature selection tasks.

- **(Finding 2) The hybrid strategy (LLM4FS) can further improve the performance for feature selection.**

From Fig. 4, it is concluded that the hybrid strategy enhances the performance of LLMs-based feature selection, even when LLMs only employ about 200 data points. Furthermore, LLMs indeed utilize traditional data-driven feature selection methods, as we execute the code returned by LLMs and obtain the same results (importance scores) provided by LLMs. Another interesting thing is that when LLMs apply traditional data-driven methods, they use a different model from our




Fig. 7: Feature selection paths for LASSO, LLMs-based methods (GPT-o3-mini, DeepSeek-R1), and our hybrid strategy (GPT-o3-mini+RF, DeepSeek-R1+RF).

downstream validation model (ℓ_2 -regularized logistic regression model with grid search and cross-validation), which may contribute to performance improvement.

- **(Finding 3) DeepSeek-R1 exhibits consistently strong and cost-efficient performance.**

The cost comparisons among DeepSeek-R1, GPT-o3-mini, and GPT-4.5 are presented in Fig. 5. Clearly, the output cost of DeepSeek-R1 is about 50% of GPT-o3-mini and only 1.5% of GPT-4.5, yet it achieves the best overall performance across all aspects. As illustrated in Fig. 3, DeepSeek-R1 performs similarly to GPT-4.5, and also demonstrates superiority in our hybrid strategy (LLM4FS), as presented in Fig. 4. Additionally, due to the smaller model size of GPT-o3-mini, it may occasionally yield lower or invalid values, a situation rarely encountered with DeepSeek-R1.

- **(Finding 4) Both LLMs-based methods and hybrid strategies can help us quickly select features.**

Fig. 6 shows the relationship between AUROC and time for some selected methods. It is observed that the LLMs-based methods and our proposed hybrid strategy (LLM4FS) can quickly select relevant features, although this comes at the cost of a marginal reduction in performance. In contrast, DeepSeek-R1 and DeepSeek-R1+RF not only maintain this computational efficiency but also improve the overall performance, achieving a

good trade-off between speed and accuracy.

- **(Finding 5) DeepSeek-R1 demonstrates stability in the search path when selecting only 10%-30%.**

As shown in Fig. 7, our observations indicate that none of the methods consistently outperforms others across the 10%–30% range. Nonetheless, both DeepSeek-R1 and DeepSeek-R1+RF exhibit commendable performance while maintaining stability. Except for a slight underperformance on the *Pima Indians Diabetes* dataset at the 30% level, both approaches demonstrate robust performance across the other datasets and proportions. Moreover, although DeepSeek-R1+RF initially underperforms on the *Credit-G* dataset, it achieves a leading performance at 30%. Consequently, DeepSeek-R1 is deemed to be more stable.

C. Discussions

This section discusses the potential opportunities of LLMs in feature selection, aiming to provide some insights for intelligent decision-making.

- **Improve the stability and performance.**

Although the proposed hybrid strategy (LLM4FS) exhibits relatively good stability when applied in conjunction with RF, its performance still shows noticeable instability when paired with other traditional data-driven approaches. This highlights a crucial limitation and suggests that improving the stability and robustness of

the hybrid framework across a wider range of models remains a key direction for future research. Furthermore, a promising and exciting area lies in the effective integration of LLMs with more advanced and structured architectures, such as LASSONet [22], or even in the exploration of designing entirely new and innovative algorithms empowered by the capabilities of LLMs.

- **Ensure the privacy and security.**

In fact, the hybrid strategy (LLM4FS) requires training with a sufficient number of samples, and when dealing with non-public datasets (e.g., healthcare), protecting privacy becomes a significant issue. A key concern is whether LLMs can inadvertently record or retain sensitive information from these datasets, potentially leading to unintentional data leakage when responding to queries. Federated learning [23], a paradigm specifically designed to address data privacy concerns by enabling decentralized training without direct data sharing, presents a promising solution. Leveraging federated learning in conjunction with LLMs could serve as an effective research direction to mitigate these privacy risks while maintaining high model performance.

- **Develop foundational models for feature engineering.**

Recent works have developed various foundational models in many fields of data mining and machine learning, such as time series forecasting [24]. Large foundational models for feature engineering should be capable of understanding different types of information from datasets and performing effective operations and processing, in order to prepare appropriate data for downstream applications. Developing such a foundational model-which provides a unified, robust, and user-friendly interface for complex data processing tasks-will greatly benefit the intelligent decision-making community by enhancing both efficiency and accessibility, while also paving the way for further innovations in data analytics.

IV. CONCLUSION

In this study, we have explored the potential of state-of-the-art LLMs for feature selection and conducted a comprehensive comparison with traditional data-driven methods. More importantly, we have proposed a hybrid strategy called LLM4FS that aims to improve performance and reliability by combining LLMs with traditional data-driven selection methods. Experiments show that the performance based on the latest LLM is close to that of traditional data-driven methods, and our proposed hybrid strategy can further enhance the performance. It is worth noting that the performance of DeepSeek-R1 is comparable to GPT-4.5 and GPT-o3-mini. In the future, we are interested in developing a more stable and efficient foundational model for automated feature selection to improve scalability and robustness.

REFERENCES

[1] J. Li, K. Cheng, S. Wang, F. Morstatter, R. P. Trevino, J. Tang, and H. Liu, "Feature selection: A data perspective," *ACM Computing Surveys*, vol. 50, no. 6, pp. 1–45, 2017.

[2] G. Li, Z. Yu, K. Yang, M. Lin, and C. P. Chen, "Exploring feature selection with limited labels: A comprehensive survey of semi-supervised and unsupervised approaches," *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, vol. 36, no. 11, pp. 6124–6144, 2024.

[3] A. Bommert, X. Sun, B. Bischl, J. Rahnenführer, and M. Lang, "Benchmark for filter methods for feature selection in high-dimensional classification data," *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, vol. 143, p. 106839, 2020.

[4] J. Maldonado, M. C. Riff, and B. Neveu, "A review of recent approaches on wrapper feature selection for intrusion detection," *Expert Systems with Applications*, vol. 198, p. 116822, 2022.

[5] H. Liu, M. Zhou, and Q. Liu, "An embedded feature selection method for imbalanced data classification," *IEEE/CAA Journal of Automatica Sinica*, vol. 6, no. 3, pp. 703–715, 2019.

[6] K. Choi, C. Cundy, S. Srivastava, and S. Ermon, "LMPriors: Pre-trained language models as task-specific priors," in *NeurIPS 2022 Foundation Models for Decision Making Workshop*.

[7] T. Brown, B. Mann, N. Ryder, M. Subbiah, J. D. Kaplan, P. Dhariwal, A. Neelakantan, P. Shyam, G. Sastry, A. Askell, *et al.*, "Language models are few-shot learners," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 33, pp. 1877–1901, 2020.

[8] D. P. Jeong, Z. C. Lipton, and P. Ravikumar, "LLM-select: Feature selection with large language models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.02694*, 2024.

[9] T. Yang, T. Yang, F. Lyu, S. Liu, *et al.*, "ICE-SEARCH: A language model-driven feature selection approach," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.18609*, 2024.

[10] S. Han, J. Yoon, S. O. Arik, and T. Pfister, "Large language models can automatically engineer features for few-shot tabular learning," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 17454–17479, PMLR, 2024.

[11] D. Li, Z. Tan, and H. Liu, "Exploring large language models for feature selection: A data-centric perspective," *ACM SIGKDD Explorations Newsletter*, vol. 26, no. 2, pp. 44–53, 2025.

[12] J. Lee, S. Yang, J. Y. Baik, X. Liu, Z. Tan, D. Li, Z. Wen, B. Hou, D. Duong-Tran, T. Chen, *et al.*, "Knowledge-driven feature selection and engineering for genotype data with large language models," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.01795*, 2024.

[13] D. Guo, D. Yang, H. Zhang, J. Song, R. Zhang, R. Xu, Q. Zhu, S. Ma, P. Wang, X. Bi, *et al.*, "DeepSeek-R1: Incentivizing reasoning capability in llms via reinforcement learning," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.12948*, 2025.

[14] L. Breiman, "Random forests," *Machine Learning*, vol. 45, no. 1, pp. 5–32, 2001.

[15] S. Moro, P. Cortez, and P. Rita, "A data-driven approach to predict the success of bank telemarketing," *Decision Support Systems*, vol. 62, pp. 22–31, 2014.

[16] A. Kadra, M. Lindauer, F. Hutter, and J. Grabocka, "Well-tuned simple nets excel on tabular datasets," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 34, pp. 23928–23941, 2021.

[17] J. W. Smith, J. E. Everhart, W. C. Dickson, W. C. Knowler, and R. S. Johannes, "Using the ADAP learning algorithm to forecast the onset of diabetes mellitus," in *Proceedings of the Annual Symposium on Computer Application in Medical Care*, p. 261, 1988.

[18] R. Tibshirani, "Regression shrinkage and selection via the lasso," *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B: Statistical Methodology*, vol. 58, no. 1, pp. 267–288, 1996.

[19] I. Guyon, J. Weston, S. Barnhill, and V. Vapnik, "Gene selection for cancer classification using support vector machines," *Machine Learning*, vol. 46, pp. 389–422, 2002.

[20] C. Ding and H. Peng, "Minimum redundancy feature selection from microarray gene expression data," *Journal of Bioinformatics and Computational Biology*, vol. 3, no. 02, pp. 185–205, 2005.

[21] D. D. Lewis, "Feature selection and feature extraction for text categorization," in *Speech and Natural Language: Proceedings of a Workshop Held at Harriman, New York, February 23-26, 1992*, 1992.

[22] I. Lemhadri, F. Ruan, L. Abraham, and R. Tibshirani, "LassoNet: A neural network with feature sparsity," *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 22, no. 127, pp. 1–29, 2021.

[23] P. Kairouz, H. B. McMahan, B. Avent, A. Bellet, M. Bennis, A. N. Bhagoji, K. Bonawitz, Z. Charles, G. Cormode, R. Cummings, *et al.*, "Advances and open problems in federated learning," *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, vol. 14, no. 1–2, pp. 1–210, 2021.

- [24] M. Jin, S. Wang, L. Ma, Z. Chu, J. Y. Zhang, X. Shi, P.-Y. Chen, Y. Liang, Y.-F. Li, S. Pan, *et al.*, “Time-LLM: Time series forecasting by reprogramming large language models,” in *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2024.