
STREAMLINE: AN AUTOMATED MACHINE LEARNING PIPELINE FOR BIOMEDICINE APPLIED TO EXAMINE THE UTILITY OF PHOTOGRAPHY-BASED PHENOTYPES FOR OSA PREDICTION ACROSS INTERNATIONAL SLEEP CENTERS

Ryan J. Urbanowicz^{1,4*}, Harsh Bandhey¹, Brendan T. Keenan², Greg Maislin², Sy Hwang³, Danielle L. Mowery⁴, Shannon M. Lynch⁵, Diego R. Mazzotti^{6,7}, Fang Han⁸, Qing Yun Li⁹, Thomas Penzel¹⁰, Sergio Tufik¹¹, Lia Bittencourt¹¹, Thorarinn Gislason^{12,13}, Philip de Chazal¹⁴, Bhajan Singh^{15,16}, Nigel McArdle^{15,16}, Ning-Hung Chen¹⁷, Allan Pack², Richard J. Schwab², Peter A. Cistulli¹⁸, Ulysses J. Magalang¹⁹

¹Department of Computational Biomedicine, Cedars Sinai Medical Center, Los Angeles, CA

²Division of Sleep Medicine, Department of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA

³Institute for Biomedical Informatics, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA

⁴Department of Biostatistics Epidemiology and Informatics, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA

⁵Cancer Prevention and Control Program, Fox Chase Cancer Center, Philadelphia, PA

⁶Division of Medical Informatics, Department of Internal Medicine, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS

⁷Division of Pulmonary, Critical Care, and Sleep Medicine, Department of Internal Medicine, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS

⁸Division of Sleep Medicine, Peking University People's Hospital, Beijing, China

⁹Department of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine, Ruijin Hospital, Shanghai Jiao Tong University School of Medicine, Shanghai, China

¹⁰Interdisciplinary Center of Sleep Medicine, Charite University Hospital, Berlin, Germany

¹¹Department of Psychobiology, Federal University of Sao Paulo, Sao Paulo, Brazil

¹²Department of Sleep Medicine, Landspítali University Hospital, Reykjavik, Iceland

¹³University of Iceland, Faculty of Medicine, Reykjavik, Iceland

¹⁴Charles Perkins Center, Faculty of Engineering, University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia

¹⁵Department of Pulmonary Physiology and Sleep Medicine, Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital, Nedlands, Australia

¹⁶University of Western Australia, Crawley, Australia

¹⁷Department of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine, Sleep Center, Linkou Chang Gung Memorial Hospital, Taoyuan, Taiwan

¹⁸Charles Perkins Centre, Faculty of Medicine and Health, University of Sydney and Royal North Shore Hospital, Sydney, Australia

¹⁹Division of Pulmonary, Critical Care, and Sleep Medicine, Department of Medicine, Ohio State University Wexner Medical Center, Columbus, OH

*Corresponding author: R.J.U. (ryan.urbanowicz@cshs.org)

700 N. San Vicente Blvd., Pacific Design Center Suite G541E, Los Angeles, CA 90069

ABSTRACT

Objective: While machine learning (ML) includes a valuable array of tools for analyzing biomedical data with multivariate and complex underlying associations, significant time and expertise is required to assemble effective, rigorous, comparable, reproducible, and unbiased pipelines. Automated ML (AutoML) tools seek to facilitate ML application by automating a subset of analysis pipeline elements. In this study we develop and validate a Simple, Transparent, End-to-end Automated Machine Learning Pipeline (STREAMLINE) and apply it to investigate the added utility of photography-based phenotypes for predicting obstructive sleep apnea (OSA); a common and underdiagnosed condition associated with a variety of health, economic, and safety consequences.

Methods: STREAMLINE is designed to tackle biomedical binary classification tasks while (1) avoiding common mistakes, (2) accommodating complex associations and common data challenges, and (3) allowing scalability, reproducibility, and model interpretation. It automates the majority of established, generalizable, and reliably automatable aspects of an ML analysis pipeline while incorporating cutting edge algorithms and providing opportunities for human-in-the-loop customization. We present a broadly refactored and extended release of STREAMLINE, validating and benchmarking performance across simulated and real-world datasets. Then we applied STREAMLINE to evaluate the utility of demographics (DEM), self-reported comorbidities (DX), symptoms (SYM), and photography-based craniofacial (CF) and intraoral (IO) anatomy measures in predicting ‘any OSA’ or ‘moderate/severe OSA’ using 3,111 participants from Sleep Apnea Global Interdisciplinary Consortium (SAGIC).

Results: Benchmarking analyses validated the efficacy of STREAMLINE across data simulations with increasingly complex patterns of association including epistatic interactions and genetic heterogeneity. OSA analyses identified a significant increase in ROC-AUC when adding CF to DEM+DX+SYM to predict ‘moderate/severe’ OSA. Additionally, a consistent but non-significant increase in PRC-AUC was observed with the addition of each subsequent feature set to predict ‘any OSA’, with CF and IO yielding minimal improvements.

Conclusion: STREAMLINE is an effective, rigorous, transparent, and easy-to-use AutoML approach to a comparative ML analysis that adheres to best practices in data science. Application of STREAMLINE to OSA data suggests that CF features provide additional value in predicting moderate/severe OSA, but neither CF nor IO features meaningfully improved the prediction of ‘any OSA’ beyond established demographics, comorbidity and symptom characteristics.

Keywords automated machine learning · obstructive sleep apnea · data science · predictive modeling · craniofacial traits · intraoral anatomy

1 Introduction

Machine learning (ML) encompasses a variety of computational methodologies for tackling optimization tasks, including predictive modeling (1, 2). Interest in, and application of, ML has continued to expand across many domains including biomedical research; a field synonymous with complex, noisy, heterogeneous, and often large-scale data, as well as the need for interpretable/explainable solutions, statistical rigor, and reproducibility (3, 4). However, assembly of an ML analysis pipeline can be time-intensive, require significant programming and data science expertise, and hold countless opportunities for mistakes (5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14). Packages such as *pandas*, *scikit-learn*, and *scipy* make it easier to implement elements of a pipeline, but the challenge of how to correctly and effectively put these elements together into a complete analysis pipeline remains. As implied by the “no free lunch” theorem (15), no single ML algorithm can be expected to perform optimally for all problems. This expectation could similarly be extended to the entire ML analysis pipeline, such that for any new problem, users will not know which combination of ML algorithms, algorithm hyperparameter settings, or possible data preparation steps (e.g. cleaning and feature selection, engineering, or transformation) will yield an optimized model.

Automated machine learning (AutoML) represents a newer subfield of artificial intelligence and ML research focused on the development of tools or code libraries that facilitate and/or optimize the design, implementation, or execution of ML analyses in a manner that “relaxes the need for a user in the loop” (16, 17). A comparative survey of the scope and automation capabilities of 24 open-source AutoML implementations highlights many of their differences (see S.1, and Tables S1, S2). High-level differences include: (1) *applicable data types*; they all handle structured (e.g. tabular) data, but a minority can use images, text, time-series, or multi-modal data (e.g. Auto-Keras (18), FEDOT (19), and Auto-Gluon (20) can handle all these types); (2) *applicable targets*; they all handle binary classification, most also handle multi-class and regression, and a small minority handle multi-task (e.g. Ludwig (21)), multi-label

(Auto-Sklearn (22)), clustering and anomaly detection (e.g. PYCARET (23)); (3) *advanced utilization of a meta-learner* to either recommend analysis configurations (ALIRO (24) and AutoPyTorch (25)) or automatically discover ML pipeline configurations through search (i.e. TPOT (26, 27, 28), FEDOT (19), Auto-Sklearn (22), GAMA (29), RECIPE (30), and ML-Plan (31)); (4) *accessibility and ease of use*; some AutoMLs are designed to be broadly accessible requiring little to no coding experience to implement and run (e.g. ALIRO (24), MLme (32), MLIJAR-supervised (33), H2O-3 (34), STREAMLINE (35), and Auto-WEKA (36)), while others are designed primarily as a code library to facilitate building a customizable pipeline with automated elements (e.g. LAMA (37), FLAML (38), Hyperopt-sklearn (39), TransmogrifAI (40), MLBox (41), Xcessiv (42)); (5) *output focus*; the aims of AutoML vary, with focus on either a single best optimized model/pipeline (e.g. Auto-Sklearn (22)), a leaderboard of top models/pipelines (e.g. TPOT (28)), or a direct comparison of model performance across algorithms (e.g. STREAMLINE (35), MLme (32), and PYCARET (23)); (6) *inclusion and automation of different possible elements of a complete end-to-end ML pipeline*; with algorithm selection and hyperparameter optimization being most common; and (7) *transparency in the documentation*, i.e. to what degree are the available elements, options, and automations defined and validated.

Previously, we implemented and benchmarked a prototype version of a “Simple, Transparent, End-to-end AutoML analysis pipeline” (STREAMLINE) (35) specifically designed for the needs and challenges of structured biomedical data analysis with binary outcomes. This implementation was also applied to investigate a variety of biomedical problems/datasets, including Alzheimer’s disease (43, 44), oncology patient readmission (45), acute respiratory failure (46), and pancreatic cancer (47) with feedback from these collaborations informing the present implementation. STREAMLINE differs from other surveyed AutoML in that it (1) fully automates all generalizable ML pipeline elements that can be reliably automated without specific problem domain knowledge, (2) follows a carefully designed, transparent, and standardized pipeline workflow, rather than conducting a meta-algorithm search of pipeline configurations (often computationally expensive) or focusing on extensive user-driven pipeline customization (for ease of use and to avoid pitfalls, mistakes, and bias), (3) rigorously applies and directly compares a variety of established and cutting-edge ML modeling algorithms, (4) captures and facilitates interpretation of complex associations (e.g. feature interactions and heterogeneous associations), and (5) automatically generates and organizes figures, visualizations, results, and analysis summaries for each phase of the pipeline. STREAMLINE is among the minority of AutoMLs that include exploratory data analysis (EDA), basic data cleaning, or outputting separately trained models for each cross-validation (CV) partition to directly assess the potential impact of sample bias in data partitioning.

To the best of our knowledge, STREAMLINE is unique in its ability to automatically (1) analyze and compare multiple datasets (e.g. to examine the value of specific feature subsets, as in the present study), (2) engineer binary ‘missingness features’ to determine the predictive value of data entries that are ‘missing not at random’ (MNAR) (48), (3) utilize cutting-edge bioinformatics feature selection methodologies (i.e. MultiSURF (49) and collective feature selection (50)), and modeling (i.e. ExSTraCS (51), a rule-based algorithm designed specifically to address the challenges of detecting and characterizing epistasis (52) and heterogeneous associations (53) in biomedical data), (4) conduct statistical significance comparisons (between algorithms and datasets), (5) collectively compare and contrast feature importance (FI) estimates across modelling algorithms, and (6) generate a comprehensive sharable summary report. With respect to overall AutoML design and goals, STREAMLINE currently is most closely related to MLIJAR-supervised (33) and MLme (32) AutoML tools.

Herein, we introduce a broadly refactored and extended release of STREAMLINE (v.0.3.4) as a comprehensive automated machine learning analysis methodology, including new capabilities targeting ease-of-use, parallelizability, automated data preparation, and customizability. We validated and benchmarked its performance on a diverse set of real and simulated datasets; some previously analyzed in v.0.2.5 (35). We then applied STREAMLINE to train, evaluate, and compare ML models for the prediction of Obstructive Sleep Apnea (OSA) using 3,111 participants from the Sleep Apnea Global Interdisciplinary Consortium (SAGIC) (54, 55, 56, 57, 58). OSA is a common condition characterized by repetitive episodes of complete or partial collapse of the upper airway with a respective decrease in blood oxygen saturation or cortical arousal from sleep (59, 60). OSA is estimated to affect one billion people worldwide and is associated with a variety of adverse health (61, 62), economic (63, 64), and safety consequences (65). However, OSA remains underdiagnosed and untreated even within primary care settings (66, 67, 68), leading to an estimated additional \$3.4 billion/year in medical costs (69). Hence, there is a need to identify reliable risk factors and biomarkers predictive of OSA that are ideally low cost and low burden to collect. Leveraging STREAMLINE, this study evaluates the utility of progressively adding distinct feature categories (i.e. demographics, self-reported comorbidities, symptoms (70), and photography-based measures of craniofacial and intraoral anatomy (57, 58, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75)) in the prediction of OSA, defined by an apnea-hypopnea index (AHI) ≥ 15 events/hour (moderate/severe OSA) or AHI ≥ 5 events/hour (any OSA).

STREAMLINE Automated Machine Learning Pipeline




Figure 1: STREAMLINE Automated Machine Learning Pipeline Schematic. Includes 9 parallelizable phases, run consecutively, with phase 7 only run in the presence of multiple input datasets and phase 8 only run when external hold-out data (replication data) is available. Results across all phases are visualized, summarized, and organized as output.

2 Materials & Methods

2.1 STREAMLINE Automated Machine Learning Pipeline

The ML analyses presented in this paper were conducted with STREAMLINE (v0.3.4), a significantly refactored and extended release based on v0.2.5 (35). Currently, STREAMLINE is limited to structured, binary classification data analyses. As summarized in Figure 1, STREAMLINE runs a carefully designed ML analysis pipeline across 9 consecutive phases following best practices in ML and data science and addressing common challenges in biomedical data (i.e. missing, imbalanced, large-scale, noisy, complex, and mixed type data, with a need for interpretability, reproducibility, and analytical rigor).

In summary, STREAMLINE fully automates the following pipeline elements: (1) initial and post-processed EDAs, (2) basic data cleaning (i.e. numerical encoding, removal of instances with no outcome or high missingness, and removal of features with invariant values, high missingness, and high correlation with another feature), (3) basic feature engineering (i.e. adding binary 'missingness features', and one-hot-encoding of categorical features), (4) k-fold cross-validation partitioning with models trained and output for each partition, (5) missing value imputation, (6) feature scaling, (7) filter-based FI estimation using mutual information (MI) (76) for univariate associations and MultiSURF (49) for multivariate interactions, (8) collective feature selection (50) utilizing MI and MultiSURF FI estimates, (9) ML modeling across 16 scikit-learn compatible algorithms, including two prototype rule-based ML algorithm implementations (i.e. eLCS (77) and XCS (78); not used in this study) incorporating Optuna-driven hyperparameter optimization (79), final model training, permutation-based model feature importance estimation (80), and performance evaluation using 16 standard classification metrics (see S.2.1.5), (10) generating and organizing all models, publication-ready plots, evaluation results, statistical significance comparisons across ML algorithms and analyzed datasets, and a formatted PDF summary report documenting run parameters and key results, and (11) application and re-evaluation of all trained models on further hold-out replication data, including separate EDA, cleaning, feature engineering, imputation, scaling, and feature selection to prepare the replication data in a manner consistent with the respective training partitions. A detailed explanation of STREAMLINE elements and key run parameters across all phases is given in S.2.1.

In addition to refactoring, and in contrast with (v0.2.5), STREAMLINE (v0.3.4) introduced the following automated capabilities: (1) numerical encoding of text-valued features, (2) enforced handling of categorical features including

user-specification of feature types (which cannot always be reliably automated) and one-hot-encoding of categorical features for modeling, (3) engineering of ‘missingness features’ to consider missingness as a potentially informative feature, (4) cleaning (i.e. removal) of invariant features, (5) cleaning of instances and features with high missingness, (6) cleaning of features with high correlation (e.g., one of each pair of any perfectly correlated features is removed), (7) a secondary round of EDA documenting step-wise data modifications to ensure data processing quality, and (8) ML modeling with elastic net (81). This new release can also now: (1) be parallelized on 7 different types of high-performance computing (HPC) clusters, (2) run all phases from a single command using a configuration file, (3) be run by those with no coding experience using an improved Google Colab run mode, and (4) easily add additional scikit-learn compatible ML modeling algorithms.

While STREAMLINE is configured to run using default parameters, users can optionally customize these parameters to improve performance, reduce runtime, or better scale the pipeline to large datasets. In this study, we largely adopted default STREAMLINE parameters (see S.2.4) with some problem-specific exceptions. Run parameters for each analysis are documented in the respective PDF reports (supplementary materials).

STREAMLINE offers run modes suitable for non-programmers and data science experts alike, including: (1) Google Colab notebook, (2) Jupyter notebook, and (3) command line interface; either locally or with a dask-compatible HPC Cluster. Analyses in this study were performed on the Cedars Sinai HPC (1,012 CPU cores, 11.4 TB of RAM, using Slurm). STREAMLINE is open-source and available at: <https://github.com/UrbsLab/STREAMLINE>.

2.2 Data and Analyses

We first validated and benchmarked STREAMLINE’s performance on real and simulated datasets. We then applied STREAMLINE to train, evaluate, and compare ML models for the prediction of Obstructive Sleep Apnea (OSA) encoded as a binary outcome (54, 55, 56, 57) using two clinically-relevant thresholds: AHI *geq* 15 events/hour (moderate/severe OSA) and AHI *geq* 5 events/hour (any OSA).

2.2.1 Benchmark Datasets

STREAMLINE benchmarking was conducted over four separate STREAMLINE ‘experiments’ (i.e. individual runs of the AutoML pipeline). The first analyzed the hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) survival dataset from the UCI repository (82) in comparison to a modified ‘custom’ HCC dataset that removed covariate features and added simulated features and instances to explicitly verify all data processing elements of STREAMLINE (see S.2.2.1). The second analyzed and compared 6 different simulated genomic datasets each with a unique underlying pattern of association (i.e. univariate, additive, heterogeneous, 2-way epistasis, 2-way epistasis with heterogeneity, and 3-way epistasis). Each dataset was simulated by GAMETES (83) to include 100 features, 1600 instances and a noisy signal (see S.2.2.2). The third analyzed and compared 6 different x-bit multiplexer datasets (i.e. 6, 11, 20, 37, 70, and 135-bit) often used as complex simulated ML benchmarks (49, 51, 77, 78). Multiplexer datasets represent clean problems (i.e. no noise) that involve underlying feature interactions and heterogeneous associations that increase in complexity with increasing ‘x’ (see S.2.2.3). The fourth analyzed and compared 4 different ‘XOR’ datasets (i.e. 2, 3, 4, and 5-way) applied in previous benchmarking of the MultiSURF feature selection algorithm (49). XOR datasets represent clean problems with increasing orders of pure/strict-epistatic interactions predicting a binary outcome (see S.2.2.4). The HCC, GAMETES, and multiplexer datasets were previously applied to benchmark STREAMLINE v.0.2.5 (35), while the XOR datasets are newly examined here.

2.2.2 Obstructive Sleep Apnea Dataset

These data include a total of 3,111 participants from the Sleep Apnea Global Interdisciplinary Consortium (SAGIC) with available data on severity of obstructive sleep apnea (OSA) based on the AHI (see Table 1) (54, 55, 56, 57, 58). SAGIC is an international study of participants recruited from sleep centers across the world, including sites in the United States (The Ohio State University and University of Pennsylvania), China (Peking University People’s Hospital and Peking University International Hospital, Beijing), Germany (Charité University Hospital, Berlin), Brazil (Medicado Instituto do Sono, São Paulo), Iceland (Landspítali – The National University Hospital of Iceland, Reykjavik), Australia (Royal North Shore Hospital, Sydney and Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital, Perth), and Taiwan (Chang Gung Memorial Hospital, Taipei). The main goal of SAGIC is to establish a large international cohort with in-depth OSA-related phenotyping in which to understand overall and racial/ethnic differences in OSA causes, presentations, and consequences.

This SAGIC data includes the following feature sets: (1) demographics (DEM), including age, sex, race/ethnicity, and body mass index (BMI); (2) self-reported comorbidities (DX), including hypertension, coronary artery disease, heart failure, stroke, atrial fibrillation, high cholesterol, and diabetes; (3) symptoms (SYM) from the Multivariable Apnea Prediction Index (MAP), including frequency of loud snoring, snorting or gasping, and breathing stops or

Site	AHI \geq 15 (Moderate/Severe OSA)		AHI \geq 5 (Any OSA)		Total Samples
	< 15	\geq 15	< 5	\geq 5	
Germany (Berlin)	134 (78.36%)	37 (21.64%)	92 (53.80%)	79 (46.20%)	171
Brazil	572 (69.59%)	250 (30.41%)	375 (45.62%)	447 (54.38%)	822
Iceland	75 (33.19%)	151 (66.81%)	4 (1.77%)	222 (98.23%)	226
USA (Ohio State)	76 (42.94%)	101 (57.06%)	35 (19.77%)	142 (80.23%)	177
USA (UPenn)	102 (51.00%)	98 (49.00%)	36 (18.00%)	164 (82.00%)	200
Australia (Perth)	72 (62.61%)	43 (37.39%)	46 (40.00%)	69 (60.00%)	115
Australia (Sydney)	162 (60.22%)	107 (39.78%)	93 (34.57%)	176 (65.43%)	269
Taiwan	19 (12.03%)	139 (87.97%)	5 (3.16%)	153 (96.84%)	158
China (Beijing)	489 (50.26%)	484 (49.74%)	283 (29.09%)	690 (70.91%)	973
Totals	1701	1410	969	2142	3111

Table 1: Summary of SAGIC OSA data across participating sites. Includes sample counts and percent ‘no OSA’ vs. ‘OSA’ for AHI \geq 15 (moderate/severe OSA) and AHI \geq 5 (any OSA) outcome encodings.

witnessed apneas, and MAP index [68]; (4) craniofacial measures from photographs (CF) (58, 72, 73, 74, 75) (i.e. 46 quantitative measures capturing craniofacial widths, heights, and angles); and (5) intraoral measures from photographs (IO) (57, 58, 71) (i.e. 12 quantitative measures of mouth and tongue size and two Mallampati score classifications I-IV (84)). Section S.2.3 and Tables S3 and S4 provide data summary statistics and details of these features. Further details on study methods, including sleep study scoring, photography-based phenotyping, and patient questionnaires have been previously published (54, 55, 56, 57, 85, 86, 87, 88).

Prior to applying STREAMLINE, the complete SAGIC dataset had been pre-processed by numerically encoding SYM features as ordinal and one-hot-encoding race/ethnicity and Mallampati classifications. Next, 20 dataset variations were created, each with a unique combination of feature set(s) and binary OSA outcome encoding. Considered feature sets included each set on its own, as well as the sequential addition of features sets regarded as more challenging/time-consuming/expensive to collect (DEM<DX<SYM<CF<IO), as well as specifically examining DEM+DX+SYM+IO in contrast with DEM+DX+SYM+CF to understand the relative importance of different anatomical measures. Two binary OSA outcomes were evaluated: “moderate/severe OSA” (AHI \geq 15 events/hour) and “any OSA” (AHI \geq 5 events/hour). Table S5 summarizes these 20 datasets (identified as A-T).

Each of the 20 datasets were split into respective ‘development’ (70%) and ‘replication’ (30%) sets using stratified partitioning (see S.2.3.1). Each development set was used by STREAMLINE to train and test CV models in phases 1-7, and the replication set was used in phase 8 to evaluate all models on the same hold-out evaluation data to further evaluate model generalizability and select a best performer.

3 Results

3.1 Benchmark Analyses Yielded Consistent Findings

Detailed model evaluation and feature importance results of STREAMLINE benchmarking analyses across HCC, GAMETES, multiplexer, and XOR datasets are given in S.3.1, S.3.2, S.3.3, and S.3.4, respectively. In summary, the custom HCC dataset validated the efficacy of STREAMLINE’s automated data processing, and ML modeling performance across all datasets was consistent with previous findings including ‘ground-truth’ expectations for model feature importance in simulated GAMETES, multiplexer, and XOR datasets.

For XOR datasets, we noted that STREAMLINE’s default settings for phase 4 collective feature selection (i.e. removing features that score ≤ 0 by both FI algorithms) incorrectly removed predictive features involved in pure 4 or 5-way epistatic interactions prior to modeling. This was in line with previous MultiSURF benchmarking observations noting that predictive features involved in high-order interactions (i.e. >3-way) yielded highly negative rather than highly positive feature importance scores with respect to non-predictive features [47]. However, performance was restored on the 4-way XOR by turning off feature selection; allowing all features to be present for modeling. In line with previous findings, the biomedically-tuned rule-based algorithm (ExSTraCS) dramatically outperformed all other algorithms on the 4-way XOR, as well as other benchmarks with a high degree of underlying complexity, i.e. the GAMETES dataset ‘E’ (simulating both epistasis and heterogeneity) and the 70-bit multiplexer dataset.

3.2 Obstructive Sleep Apnea

A detailed examination of STREAMLINE results across all 20 OSA datasets including EDA, data processing, feature importance, model testing performance, and model replication performance is given in S.3.5. Key results are presented below.

3.2.1 Exploratory Data Analysis, Processing, and Feature Importance Estimation

The next two subsections focus exclusively on development partitions of the 20 OSA datasets (70% of data used for training and testing within STREAMLINE phases 1-7). Prior to data processing, $AHI \geq 15$ datasets had similarly balanced class counts (no OSA = 1098, OSA = 1080), while $AHI \geq 5$ datasets did not (no OSA = 606, OSA = 1573); see Figure S14. Across all 20 datasets, processing (via automated data cleaning and feature engineering steps) removed instances with > 50% missing values in certain datasets. The largest removal occurred datasets with DX features alone (384 and 381 instances removed for datasets B and L, respectively). None of the datasets had features removed due to > 50% missingness, feature value invariance, or perfect feature correlation (see Figure S16), nor instances removed due to missing outcome. Following processing, all $AHI \geq 15$ datasets remained largely balanced, and all $AHI \geq 5$ datasets remained imbalanced (see Tables S11 and S12). Consequently, we primarily focus on receiver operating characteristic area under the curve (ROC-AUC) to evaluate balanced $AHI \geq 15$ datasets and precision-recall curve area under the curve (PRC-AUC) to evaluate imbalanced $AHI \geq 5$ datasets.

Prior to 10-fold CV partitioning, univariate analyses were conducted across all 85 features included in datasets J and T (examining OSA as $AHI \geq 15$ and $AHI \geq 5$, respectively). The 10 most significant features for $AHI \geq 15$ include BMI (from DEM feature set) and 9 CF features; with face width as most significant ($p=1.046 \times 10^{-51}$) (see Table S13). The 10 most significant features for $AHI \geq 5$ include BMI, 8 CF features, and loud snoring (from SYM feature set); with BMI as most significant ($p=1.060 \times 10^{-42}$) (see Table S14).

Following CV partitioning, STREAMLINE estimated FI independently within each training set using Mutual Information and MultiSURF with respective median FI scores across CV partitions being examined (see Figures S19 and S20). The 10 top scoring features for $AHI \geq 15$ with Mutual Information included; BMI, 7 CF features (mandibular width scoring highest), MAP index and loud snoring (from SYM feature set). With MultiSURF, the top 10 included BMI and male sex (from DEM), 6 CF features (mandibular width scoring highest), and loud snoring and breathing stops or choking/struggling for breath (from SYM).

The 10 top scoring features for $AHI \geq 5$ with Mutual Information included; BMI, 6 CF features (mandibular width scoring highest), and MAP index, loud snoring, and breathing stops or choking/struggling for breath (from SYM). With MultiSURF, the top 10 included BMI, age, male (from DEM), 6 CF features (cervicomental angle scoring highest), and loud snoring (from SYM).

3.2.2 ML Modeling Testing Evaluations Across 20 OSA Datasets

Figure 2 gives a global summary of model testing performance (with 14 ML algorithms) across the 20 OSA datasets. Pairwise performance metric comparisons (using Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test) between datasets having the same underlying features (e.g. A vs. K), indicate that balanced accuracy and ROC-AUC were consistently (but not always significantly) higher for models predicting $AHI \geq 5$ (see Table S15). The $AHI \geq 5$ datasets consistently yielded significantly higher PRC-AUC ($p < 0.05$) than $AHI \geq 15$ datasets (see S.3.5.5 for details).

Pairwise performance metric comparisons between datasets having only a single feature set (i.e. A-E and K-O) identified DEM and CF features as being significantly more informative of either OSA outcome than DX, SYM, or IO based on balanced accuracy and ROC-AUC. For PRC-AUC in $AHI \geq 15$, DEM was significantly more informative than DX or IO and non-significantly better than SYM or CF. CF was significantly more informative than IO, and non-significantly better than SYM or DX. For PRC-AUC in $AHI \geq 5$, DEM and CF were both significantly more informative than DX or IO, and non-significantly better than SYM. SYM was consistently (but not always significantly) higher than DX or IO for $AHI \geq 15$ and $AHI \geq 5$ and all three metrics. DEM and CF yielded similar performance for the three metrics and both outcome encodings. IO performed significantly better than DX for $AHI \geq 15$ and $AHI \geq 5$, with balanced accuracy and ROC-AUC, but yielded a significantly lower PRC-AUC for $AHI \geq 15$ and a similar PRC-AUC for $AHI \geq 5$. To generalize, DEM and CF were similarly most informative on their own, followed by SYM, IO, and lastly DX. Details of these comparisons are given in Tables S16 and S17.

Next, we examined pairwise performance metric comparisons between datasets progressively adding feature sets (i.e. DEM, +DX, +SYM, +CF, +IO). Figure 3 focuses on these specific comparisons (narrowing the results from Figure 2), using ROC-AUC for $AHI \geq 15$ and PRC-AUC for $AHI \geq 5$. For $AHI \geq 15$ datasets, the only step-wise feature set addition that led to a significant increase in ROC-AUC was CF added to DEM+DX+SYM (dataset G vs. H; $p=0.0137$).




Figure 2: **STREAMLINE OSA Model Testing Evaluation Summary.** These 6 subplots report key evaluation metrics in datasets where OSA outcome is defined by either $AHI \geq 15$ or $AHI \geq 5$. Algorithm hyperparameters were selected to optimize balanced accuracy, and we focus on ROC-AUC or PRC-AUC to compare overall algorithm and dataset performance based on whether the data was balanced or not (see the two darkly outlined subplots). In each subplot the y-axis is the metric value (to improve visibility; the y-axis range is not fixed) and the x-axis is the target dataset (with dataset names specifying included feature sets, i.e. DEM, DX, SYM, CF, and IO). Each of the 60 individual boxplots give the spread of target metric performance (averaged over 10-fold CV models) across the 14 ML algorithms. Mean CV testing performance of a given algorithm is identified by the colored lines in the key.

Significant ROC-AUC increases were also observed between (1) A vs. either H or J, (2) F vs. either H or J, and (3) G vs. J (see Table S18). The highest overall median ROC-AUC was obtained on dataset H (DEM+DX+SYM+CF) using the artificial neural network (ANN) algorithm. Figure 3B reveals a similar pattern of ROC-AUC performance across $AHI \geq 15$ datasets when exclusively focusing on the 10 ANN models trained for each CV partition.

Focusing further on dataset H (which includes DEM+DX+SYM+CF), Figure 4 presents model FI estimates across all algorithms and a more detailed look at FI estimates for the ANN algorithm. Across all algorithms, the top 10 mean FI scores included DEM features (BMI, age, and male), SYM features (loud snoring and choking/struggling for breath), and CF features (cervicomental angle, mandibular width, face width, mandibular triangular area, and mandibular width to length angle). For the top performing ANN algorithm, the top 10 mean FI scores included DEM features (BMI, age, Asian race, and male), SYM feature (loud snoring) and CF features (mandibular triangular area, cervicomental angle, mandibular width to length angle, mandibular-nasion angle, and face width to lower face depth angle).

Shifting to $AHI \geq 5$ (Figure 3C), no step-wise feature set additions led to a significant increase in PRC-AUC. However, we observe consistently increasing median best-algorithm performance with the addition of each subsequent feature set, with CF and IO yielding minimal improvements. The only significant PRC-AUC increases were observed between datasets K and R (i.e. DEM vs. DEM+DX+SYM+CF) and K and T (i.e. DEM vs. DEM+DX+SYM+CF+IO) (see Table S19). The highest overall median PRC-AUC across both $AHI \geq 5$ and $AHI \geq 15$ datasets was obtained on dataset T (DEM+DX+SYM+CF+IO) using elastic net. Figure 3D reveals a similar pattern of PRC-AUC performance across $AHI \geq 5$ datasets when exclusively focusing on the 10 elastic net models trained for each CV partition. In comparing all algorithm PRC-AUCs on dataset T, elastic net performed significantly better than decision tree, genetic programming,




Figure 3: **Testing Evaluations for the Progressive Addition of OSA Feature Sets.** Sub-plots A and C represent a subset of the comparisons found in Figure 2, with individual boxplots capturing the distribution of mean (10-fold CV) model metric performance across 14 algorithms. Differently, sub-plots B and D focus on the algorithm with the highest overall median metric performance for either $AHI \geq 15$ or $AHI \geq 5$ (as identified in Tables S18 and S19, respectively). For these, individual boxplots capture the distributions of metric performance across 10-fold CV models trained by that algorithm. (A) Algorithm comparisons on datasets A, F, G, H, and J ($AHI \geq 15$) with ROC-AUC. (B) 10-fold CV comparisons for artificial neural network on datasets A, F, G, H, and J ($AHI \geq 15$) with ROC-AUC. (C) Algorithm comparisons for artificial neural network on datasets K, P, Q, R, and T ($AHI \geq 5$) with PRC-AUC. (D) 10-fold CV comparisons for elastic net on datasets K, P, Q, R, and T ($AHI \geq 5$) with PRC-AUC.




Figure 4: **Dataset H (AHI ≥ 15 and DEM+DX+SYM+CF) Model FI Estimates.** This composite feature importance plot illustrates features normalized and (balanced accuracy)-weighted mean FI scores summed across all algorithms. Only the top 40 features are displayed. Embedded in the main plot is a boxplot of ANN FI estimates for the same dataset, showing the distribution of model FI estimates across all 10-fold CV partition models.

K-nearest neighbors, and Naïve Bayes algorithms, and similarly to the rest (see Table S20). A detailed evaluation of dataset T across 14 ML algorithms using 16 classification metrics is given in Figures S22-S24 and Tables S21-S22.

Focusing further on dataset T (which includes all feature sets), Figure 5 presents model FI estimates across all algorithms and a more detailed look at FI estimates for the elastic net algorithm. Across all algorithms, the top 10 mean FI scores included DEM features (BMI and age), SYM features (loud snoring and MAP index), CF features (cervicomental angle, mandibular triangular area, mandibular width, intercanthal width, and face width) and one IO feature (tongue thickness). For the top performing elastic net algorithm, the top 10 mean FI scores included DEM features (BMI, age, Asian race, and male), SYM features (loud snoring and MAP index), CF features (cervicomental angle, and intercanthal width) and IO features (tongue thickness and tongue length).

3.2.3 ML Modeling Replication Evaluations

Thus far, all OSA model evaluations have been conducted on respective hold-out testing datasets (different for each CV partition). Next, STREAMLINE was applied to re-evaluate all ML models (i.e. 10 individual CV models trained by each of 14 ML algorithms) on the same replication dataset (processed differently/appropriately for each respective CV training partition; see S.2.1.8).

For each of the 20 OSA datasets we compare the models that previously yielded the best median testing performance metric (either ROC-AUC for AHI ≥ 15 or PRC-AUC for AHI ≥ 5) to the performance of the same models on the replication data (see Table S23). For AHI ≥ 15, the best replication performance was again observed for dataset H with ANN models, having a significantly increased ROC-AUC of 0.807 (p=0.0002) compared to testing evaluation. Figure 6 gives average ROC plots comparing all algorithms on testing vs. replication data for dataset H. For all other AHI ≥ 15 datasets, we observed a mix of significant and non-significant increases and decreases in ROC-AUC replication performance. For AHI ≥ 5, the best replication performance was again observed for dataset T with elastic net models, although there was a significantly decreased PRC-AUC of 0.830 (p=0.0002) compared to the testing evaluation. Figure 7 gives average PRC plots comparing all algorithms on testing vs. replication data for dataset T. For all other AHI ≥ 5 datasets we similarly observed significant decreases in PRC-AUC replication performance compared to the testing evaluation.




Figure 5: **Dataset T (AHI \geq 5 and DEM+DX+SYM+CF+IO) Model FI Estimates.** This composite feature importance plot illustrates normalized and (balanced accuracy)-weighted mean FI scores summed across all algorithms. Only the top 40 features are displayed. Embedded in the main plot is a boxplot of logistic regression FI estimates for the same dataset, showing the distribution of model FI estimates across all 10-fold CV partition models.

Additionally, for each of the 20 OSA datasets we compare the models that previously yielded the best median testing performance metric (either ROC-AUC for AHI \geq 15 or PRC-AUC for AHI \geq 5) to the same (or different) models that yielded the best median performance on the replication data (see Table S24). For AHI \geq 15, the best replication ROC-AUC was again observed for dataset H with ANN models and all other AHI \geq 15 datasets yielded a consistently (but not always significantly) higher median ROC-AUC on replication data compared with testing evaluations. For AHI \geq 5, the best median replication performance was again observed for dataset T with elastic net models, and all other AHI \geq 5 datasets yielded significantly lower median PRC-AUC on replication data compared to testing evaluations.

Table S24 also identifies the best performing individual model on the replication data across all 20 OSA datasets. For AHI \geq 15, a top ROC-AUC of 0.813 was obtained by CV model ‘1’ using the ANN algorithm on dataset H (DEM+DX+SYM+CF). For AHI \geq 5, a top PRC-AUC of 0.847 was obtained by CV model ‘8’ using the category gradient boosting algorithm on dataset R (DEM+DX+SYM+CF). Optuna-optimized hyperparameter settings for the two models are specified in S.3.5.6.1

4 Discussion

In the subsections below we discuss (1) benchmarking of STREAMLINE, (2) applying STREAMLINE to OSA prediction including clinical relevance and potential limitations, (3) potential uses of STREAMLINE, and (4) future directions for STREAMLINE development.

4.1 Benchmarking

Our primary goal in benchmarking analyses was to transparently present the design, capabilities, and efficacy of STREAMLINE as an automated ML analysis pipeline. The benchmarking analyses conducted in this study (sections S.3.1-S.3.4) successfully validated STREAMLINE efficacy, contrasted performance of v.0.3.4 with the v0.2.5, and compared the performance of individual ML modeling algorithms across simple to extremely complex dataset scenarios. These analyses also identified future directions for expanding and improving the STREAMLINE framework as discussed in section 4.4.




Figure 6: **ROC Plots for Dataset H Contrasting Testing vs Replication Algorithm Performance.** Dataset H encodes OSA as $AHI \geq 15$ and includes feature sets DEM+DX+SYM+CF. Each algorithm line represents an average ROC across 10-fold CV models. (Top) Testing data evaluation; each CV model is evaluated on a unique hold-out testing partition. (Bottom) Replication data evaluation; each CV model is evaluated on the same hold-out replication dataset processed consistent with the model's corresponding training data.




Figure 7: **PRC Plots for Dataset T Contrasting Testing vs Replication Algorithm Performance.** Dataset T encodes OSA as $AHI \geq 5$ and includes feature sets DEM+DX+SYM+CF+IO. Each algorithm line represents an average PRC across 10-fold CV models. (Top) Testing data evaluation; each CV model is evaluated on a unique hold-out testing partition. (Bottom) Replication data evaluation; each CV model is evaluated on the same hold-out replication dataset processed consistent with the model's corresponding training data.

We acknowledge that there are countless ways to assemble a valid ML analysis pipeline and therefore do not claim that STREAMLINE offers an ‘ideal’ analytical configuration for every problem/dataset. STREAMLINE uniquely brings together reliable, well-established, but often overlooked or misused approaches to data preparation and modeling as a wholistic methodology for machine learning analyses in biomedicine while uniquely incorporating cutting-edge machine learning methods well-suited to the challenges and complexities of biomedical data (e.g. MultiSURF (49), collective feature selection (50), and ExSTraCS (51)). While we have highlighted the rigor and novelty of STREAMLINE in contrast with other AutoML tools (see sections 1 and S.1), this study has not made direct performance comparisons to other AutoML tools. Benchmarking between different AutoML tools will be a focus of future work as it presents a variety of major challenges regarding AutoML comparability, computational expense, and the choice of benchmarking datasets and benchmarking study design (as detailed in S.4.1).

In brief, ‘how’ to benchmark effectively remains an open topic of debate even in the comparison of individual modeling algorithms (89). These challenges are only exaggerated in seeking to compare the performance of different AutoML tools which becomes a meta-optimization problem. Ultimately, we expect convincing AutoML comparison to necessarily examine predictive performance across multiple metrics using a wide variety of simulated and real-world datasets with different underlying association complexities, data dimensions, signal/noise ratio, feature types, class balance/imbalance, feature value frequencies and distributions, and ratio of informative to non-informative features. AutoML stochasticity should also be taken into account in performance comparisons by conducting multiple runs of each tool on each benchmark dataset. Sufficiently rigorous AutoML benchmarking is thus expected to be extremely computationally expensive. Beyond metric performance, AutoML comparisons should also examine computational complexity/run time, model/pipeline interpretability and transparency, what pipeline elements are automated, and ease of use.

Furthermore, convincing AutoML benchmarking will have to establish how to fairly compare AutoML tools that adopt different approaches to data partitioning (impacting the quantity and consistency of which instances are used for training vs. hold-out evaluation) as well as how to fairly choose different AutoML run parameters and computational constraints in such comparisons. While some attempts have been made to compare the performance of a subset of AutoML tools (19, 29, 34, 90, 91, 92, 93), no study has yet addressed all of the above issues.

In lieu of reliable cross-AutoML benchmarking, we recommend users select an AutoML tool that can handle the demands of the given task (e.g. data type, intended model use), and which is transparent enough to understand exactly how the data is being processed, how the model is trained vs. evaluated, and whether best practices are being properly adopted.

4.2 OSA Feature Set Utility and ML Model Performance

STREAMLINE phases 1-7 focus on the development data, which was further partitioned into training and testing sets for evaluation. This analysis was used to compare model performance between algorithms and datasets having different OSA feature subsets and outcomes. As highlighted in section 3.2.1, $AHI \geq 5$ datasets had a relatively large degree of class imbalance (majority of instances labeled as positive for ‘any OSA’), leading us to primarily evaluate these datasets with PRC-AUC. In contrast, $AHI \geq 15$ datasets (moderate/severe OSA), were balanced and focused on ROC-AUC. Across all feature sets, $AHI \geq 5$ datasets yielded higher model performance than $AHI \geq 15$ datasets (see Table S15). While a higher PRC-AUC would be expected by default in $AHI \geq 5$ datasets given the imbalanced classes, this performance difference was similarly observed for both balanced accuracy and ROC-AUC, indicating that the ML algorithms were more effective at predicting ‘any OSA’. Comparisons between datasets having only a single feature set (i.e. A-E and K-O) provided insight to their standalone utility. This highlighted the similarly high predictive value of DEM and CF feature sets, and the lower predictive value of available DX features.

Comparisons between datasets with stepwise addition of feature sets, ordered by general availability/accessibility (i.e. DEM, +DX, +SYM, +CF, +IO), indicated that CF added significant value for predicting ‘moderate/severe’ OSA, but both CF and IO added minimal value for predicting ‘any OSA’. Thus, facial photographic measurements appear to not significantly improve the prediction of OSA status when subjects with mild OSA (defined as AHI of 5-15/hour) are included. However, craniofacial features from digital photographs did improve the prediction of moderate-to-severe OSA. As a key purpose of predicting OSA risk is to prioritize diagnosis and treatment of those individuals with more significant disease (e.g., those with moderate/severe OSA), these results suggest CF features may have clinical value. Of note, it is also possible that the predictive value of CF and IO digital photographs may be underestimated by the specific set of quantitative measures that were extracted for analysis, and that ML algorithms able to directly train on the images (e.g. convolutional neural networks) could potentially derive greater predictive value, albeit with limited interpretability.

Interestingly, the addition of DX features to DEM led to a non-significant reduction in ROC-AUC but a non-significant improvement in PRC-AUC, indicating that DX features improved OSA prediction at the expense of more false positives

(highlighted in Figures 2 and 3). The same trend was observed when adding IO features to DEM+DX+SYM+CF. Ultimately, in this testing evaluation, the highest median ROC-AUC for moderate/severe OSA was obtained on dataset H (DEM+DX+SYM+CF) using the ANN algorithm and the highest median PRC-AUC for predicting any OSA was obtained on dataset T (DEM+DX+SYM+CF+IO) using the elastic net algorithm. Future work should more closely examine OSA prediction in the top performing feature sets alone (i.e. DEM+SYM+CF), as well as evaluate how the predictive value of the CF and IO features may differ based on certain DEM traits such as race/ethnicity (as suggested by a recent SAGIC publication (58)). A potential clinical limitation of this study is that subjects in the SAGIC dataset had already been referred for a sleep test on suspicion of OSA (explaining the imbalance in $AHI \geq 5$). Thus, future work should ideally re-evaluate model performance for screening for OSA in general population samples.

Figures S25-S27 compare feature ranking consistency among the top 10 features within univariate analyses, pre-modeling FI estimates, model FI estimates across all algorithms, and model FI estimates for the top median performing algorithm. BMI was the only feature consistently identified for both $AHI \geq 15$ and $AHI \geq 5$, in-line with the well-established relationship between OSA and obesity (94, 95). For $AHI \geq 15$, cervicomentral angle was also consistently top-ranked, followed by loud snoring, face width, mandibular width, and mandibular triangular area, each in the top 10 in 4/5 rankings. For $AHI \geq 5$, loud snoring was also consistently top-ranked, followed by mandibular width, cervicomentral angle, and face width, each in the top 10 in 4/5 rankings. For model FI estimates, only DEM, SYM, CF and IO features ranked in the top 10 scorings.

STREAMLINE phase 8 focused on the replication data, which is used to further assess model generalizability and globally compare model performance to pick a “best” model. For $AHI \geq 15$ and $AHI \geq 5$, the best median performance was obtained on datasets H and T, respectively, consistent with testing evaluations. Notably, as summarized by Table S24, $AHI \geq 15$ datasets yielded larger ROC-AUCs on replication data compared to testing data, while $AHI \geq 5$ replication datasets yielded smaller PRC-AUCs, reflecting a general increase in true negative rate and reduction in true positive rate. Ideally, when using STREAMLINE to select a best performing model, investigators would conduct additional replication analyses across multiple sites or subpopulations and select either (1) the model that performs best across these sites or (2) the best performing model for a given site/sub-population. However, this is beyond the scope of the current OSA study.

Lastly, across all benchmarking and OSA datasets, we observed that the ‘best’ performing algorithm often varies depending on the dataset, metric, and whether the evaluation is on testing or replication data. This variability is due to many factors including algorithm and pipeline stochasticity, class balance, feature types, and underlying sample bias in data partitioning. This highlights the importance of considering a variety of ML modeling algorithms and metrics which can be facilitated by AutoML tools in tackling each new data analysis.

4.3 STREAMLINE Uses

STREAMLINE was primarily designed for biomedical researchers to easily run a carefully designed and rigorous ML analysis across one or more target datasets, comparing performance and assess feature importance across multiple algorithms with testing data evaluations, as well as pick a top performing model with the replication evaluations. This is in-line with the objectives of the OSA analyses above. However, STREAMLINE is also designed to be used as a rigorous framework for benchmarking and comparing newly developed (scikit-learn compatible) ML modeling algorithms to the other established algorithms (currently included). This can be achieved with minimal coding to add other algorithms to its repertoire. Furthermore, we expect STREAMLINE will be useful as a standard of comparison (i.e. a positive control) with which to evaluate and benchmark other emerging AutoML tools, in particular those that seek to automatically discover and optimize pipeline assembly as a whole (e.g. TPOT (28), FEDOT (19), Auto-Sklearn (22), GAMA (29), RECIPE (30), and ML-Plan (31)).

4.4 STREAMLINE Future Development

While STREAMLINE (v.0.3.4) was successfully validated, and performed well on the analyses conducted herein, it is actively being improved/extended (see also S.4.3). Currently, the biggest limitation being addressed is extension to data with multi-class or quantitative (i.e. regression) outcomes. Other limitations highlighted by this study that we aim to address include: (1) improve the collective feature selection strategy (phase 4) to account for the possibility of pure, higher-order feature interactions as identified in the XOR benchmarking analysis (see S.3.4); (2) consider alternative approaches to comparing PRC-AUC between datasets with differences in class balance; (3) directly incorporate model fairness evaluations and fairness-inclusive optimization into the framework to help address underlying biases in the data (96); and (4) add a new phase to STREAMLINE following modeling (phase 5) that automatically trains voting and stacking ensemble models using phase 5 baseline models and comparing ensembles to other baseline models in post

analysis (phase 6). We welcome feedback on how to improve/extend STREAMLINE to address a broader range of analytical needs and challenges.

5 Conclusion

This work introduced a broadly refactored and extended release of STREAMLINE (v.0.3.4), an end-to-end AutoML analysis pipeline designed to address the needs of biomedical structured data analysis. While currently limited to data analysis tasks with binary outcome, STREAMLINE automation makes it easy for users with and without programming experience to understand, process, partition, and prepare their dataset(s), as well as train, evaluate, and replicate models using a diversity of established and cutting-edge ML algorithms in a carefully structured, rigorous, and transparent manner. Simulated and real-world benchmarking analyses validated STREAMLINE efficacy and highlighted the value of using a diversity of ML algorithms and evaluation metrics, including ExSTraCS, a rule-based ML algorithm, that outperformed other algorithms on problems with a high degree of underlying complexity (e.g. epistatic interactions and heterogeneous associations).

Application of STREAMLINE AutoML to evaluate the utility of available feature sets in predicting moderate/severe OSA ($AHI \geq 15$) or any OSA ($AHI \geq 5$) supported the following: (1) ML models performed significantly and substantially better in predicting any OSA vs. moderate/severe OSA, (2) the predictive value of individual features sets can be ranked as $DEM > CF > SYM > IO > DX$, (3) CF features provide significant added value in predicting moderate/severe OSA, and (4) neither CF or IO features significantly improved the prediction of any OSA. Overall, these findings suggest that in combination with DEM, DX, and SYM features, photography-based anatomy measures provided conditional added value in the prediction of OSA outcomes, with the strongest benefit coming from adding CF features in the prediction of moderate/severe OSA.

Acknowledgments

The authors acknowledge the helpful comments and suggestions by Dr. Jason H. Moore, Dr. Li Shen, and Pedro Ribeiro in the development and testing of STREAMLINE and Dr. Kate Sutherland for her involvement in SAGIC data collection. The study was supported in part by the following NIH grants: R01s AI173095, AG066833, and P01 HL160471.

Funding

The study was supported in part by the following NIH grants: R01s AI173095, AG066833, and P01 HL160471.

Data Availability Statement

Benchmarking datasets used in this study are all available publicly or upon request. The OSA data analyzed here have been supplied by the Sleep Apnea Global Interdisciplinary Consortium (SAGIC) and are not publicly available but may be made available upon request and approval by the SAGIC investigators. Queries or clarifications regarding the results can be made to the corresponding author. The authors are open to communicating and/or collaborating with other researchers interested in this topic.

CrediT Authorship Contribution Statement

Ryan J. Urbanowicz: Conceptualization; Data curation; Formal Analysis; Methodology; Project administration; Software; Supervision; Visualization; Validation; Writing – Original Draft; Writing – Review & Editing **Harsh Bandhey:** Formal Analysis; Methodology; Software; Visualization; Writing – Review & Editing **Brendan T. Keenan:** Data curation; Writing – Original Draft; Writing – Review & Editing **Greg Maislin:** Data curation; Writing – Review & Editing **Sy Hwang:** Visualization; Writing – Review & Editing **Danielle L. Mowery:** Methodology; Writing – Review & Editing **Shannon M. Lynch:** Methodology; Writing – Review & Editing **Diego R. Mazzotti:** Methodology; Writing – Review & Editing **Fang Han:** Resources; Writing – Review & Editing **Qing Yun Li:** Resources; Writing – Review & Editing **Thomas Penzel:** Resources; Writing – Review & Editing **Sergio Tufik:** Resources; Writing – Review & Editing **Lia Bittencourt:** Resources; Writing – Review & Editing **Thorarinn Gislason:** Resources; Writing – Review & Editing **Philip de Chazal:** Resources; Writing – Review & Editing **Bhajan Sing:** Resources; Writing – Review & Editing **Nigel McArdle:** Resources; Writing – Review & Editing **Ning-Hung Chen:** Resources; Writing –

Review & Editing **Allan Pack**: Conceptualization; Project administration; Resources; Supervision; Writing – Review & Editing **Richard J. Schwab**: Resources; Writing – Review & Editing **Peter A. Cistulli**: Resources; Writing – Review & Editing **Ulysses J. Magalang**: Conceptualization; Resources; Supervision; Writing – Review & Editing

Declaration of Competing Interest

The authors declare the following financial interests/personal relationships not directly related to this present study but which may be considered as potential competing interests from the past 3 years: Thomas Penzel reports consultation and speaker fees from Bayer, Bioprojet, Cerebra, Idorsia, Jazz Pharma, Sleepimage, Löwenstein Medical, Philips, and the National Sleep Foundation, and grant funding from Cidelec, Löwenstein Medical, and Novarti. Bhajan Singh reports honoraria from SomnoMed Australia. Richard J. Schwab reports grant funding from ResMed, Inspire, and CryOSA, royalties from UpToDate and Merck Manual, research consulting for Eli Lilly, and is on the Medical Advisory Board for eXciteOSA. Peter A. Cistulli has an appointment to an endowed academic Chair at the University of Sydney that was established from ResMed funding, has received research support from ResMed and SomnoMed, and is a consultant to ResMed, SomnoMed, Signifier Medical Technologies, Bayer, and Sunrise Medical.

Appendix A. Supplementary Materials

The following are the supplementary materials to this article:

- Supporting Information Document
- hcc_exp_STREAMLINE_Report.pdf
- hcc_exp_STREAMLINE_Replication_Report.pdf
- gametes_exp_STREAMLINE_Report.pdf
- multiplexer_exp_STREAMLINE_Report.pdf
- xor_exp_STREAMLINE_Report.pdf
- xor_nofs_exp_STREAMLINE_Report.pdf
- sagic_exp_STREAMLINE_Report.pdf

References

- [1] Juan Jovel and Russell Greiner. An Introduction to Machine Learning Approaches for Biomedical Research. *Frontiers in Medicine*, 8, 2021. ISSN 2296-858X. URL <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fmed.2021.771607>.
- [2] Solveig Badillo, Balazs Banfai, Fabian Birzele, Iakov I. Davydov, Lucy Hutchinson, Tony Kam-Thong, Juliane Siebourg-Polster, Bernhard Steiert, and Jitao David Zhang. An Introduction to Machine Learning. *Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics*, 107(4):871–885, 2020. ISSN 1532-6535. doi: 10.1002/cpt.1796. URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/cpt.1796>. _eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/cpt.1796>.
- [3] Bilal Mirza, Wei Wang, Jie Wang, Howard Choi, Neo Christopher Chung, and Peipei Ping. Machine Learning and Integrative Analysis of Biomedical Big Data. *Genes*, 10(2):87, February 2019. ISSN 2073-4425. doi: 10.3390/genes10020087. URL <https://www.mdpi.com/2073-4425/10/2/87>. Number: 2 Publisher: Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute.
- [4] N. Peek, J. H. Holmes, and J. Sun. Technical Challenges for Big Data in Biomedicine and Health: Data Sources, Infrastructure, and Analytics. *Yearbook of Medical Informatics*, 23(1):42–47, 2014. ISSN 0943-4747, 2364-0502. doi: 10.15265/IY-2014-0018. URL <http://www.thieme-connect.de/DOI/DOI?10.15265/IY-2014-0018>. Publisher: Georg Thieme Verlag KG.
- [5] Sean Whalen, Jacob Schreiber, William S. Noble, and Katherine S. Pollard. Navigating the pitfalls of applying machine learning in genomics. *Nature Reviews Genetics*, 23(3):169–181, March 2022. ISSN 1471-0064. doi: 10.1038/s41576-021-00434-9. URL <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41576-021-00434-9>. Number: 3 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- [6] Raul Garreta, Guillermo Moncecchi, Trent Hauck, and Gavin Hackeling. *scikit-learn : Machine Learning Simplified: Implement scikit-learn into every step of the data science pipeline*. Packt Publishing Ltd, November 2017. ISBN 978-1-78883-152-9. Google-Books-ID: sEFPDwAAQBAJ.

- [7] Joe G. Greener, Shaun M. Kandathil, Lewis Moffat, and David T. Jones. A guide to machine learning for biologists. *Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology*, 23(1):40–55, January 2022. ISSN 1471-0080. doi: 10.1038/s41580-021-00407-0. URL <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41580-021-00407-0>. Number: 1 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- [8] Davide Chicco. Ten quick tips for machine learning in computational biology. *BioData Mining*, 10(1):35, December 2017. ISSN 1756-0381. doi: 10.1186/s13040-017-0155-3. URL <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13040-017-0155-3>.
- [9] Mohamed L. Seghier. Ten simple rules for reporting machine learning methods implementation and evaluation on biomedical data. *International Journal of Imaging Systems and Technology*, 32(1):5–11, 2022. ISSN 1098-1098. doi: 10.1002/ima.22674. URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/ima.22674>. eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/ima.22674>.
- [10] Wei Luo, Dinh Phung, Truyen Tran, Sunil Gupta, Santu Rana, Chandan Karmakar, Alistair Shilton, John Yearwood, Nevenka Dimitrova, Tu Bao Ho, Svetha Venkatesh, and Michael Berk. Guidelines for Developing and Reporting Machine Learning Predictive Models in Biomedical Research: A Multidisciplinary View. *Journal of Medical Internet Research*, 18(12):e5870, December 2016. doi: 10.2196/jmir.5870. URL <https://www.jmir.org/2016/12/e323>. Company: Journal of Medical Internet Research Distributor: Journal of Medical Internet Research Institution: Journal of Medical Internet Research Label: Journal of Medical Internet Research Publisher: JMIR Publications Inc., Toronto, Canada.
- [11] Benjamin J. Heil, Michael M. Hoffman, Florian Markowetz, Su-In Lee, Casey S. Greene, and Stephanie C. Hicks. Reproducibility standards for machine learning in the life sciences. *Nature Methods*, 18(10):1132–1135, October 2021. ISSN 1548-7105. doi: 10.1038/s41592-021-01256-7. URL <https://www.nature.com/articles/s41592-021-01256-7>. Number: 10 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- [12] Patrick Riley. Three pitfalls to avoid in machine learning. *Nature*, 572(7767):27–29, August 2019. doi: 10.1038/d41586-019-02307-y. URL <https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-019-02307-y>. Bandiera_abtest: a Cg_type: Comment Number: 7767 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group Subject_term: Mathematics and computing, Software, Research data.
- [13] Pawel Smialowski, Dmitrij Frishman, and Stefan Kramer. Pitfalls of supervised feature selection. *Bioinformatics*, 26(3):440–443, February 2010. ISSN 1367-4803. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btp621. URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btp621>.
- [14] Muhammed Kürşad Uçar, Majid Nour, Hatem Sindi, and Kemal Polat. The Effect of Training and Testing Process on Machine Learning in Biomedical Datasets. *Mathematical Problems in Engineering*, 2020:e2836236, May 2020. ISSN 1024-123X. doi: 10.1155/2020/2836236. URL <https://www.hindawi.com/journals/mpe/2020/2836236/>. Publisher: Hindawi.
- [15] D.H. Wolpert and W.G. Macready. No free lunch theorems for optimization. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, 1(1):67–82, April 1997. ISSN 1941-0026. doi: 10.1109/4235.585893. Conference Name: IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation.
- [16] Hugo Jair Escalante. Automated Machine Learning—A Brief Review at the End of the Early Years. In Nelishia Pillay and Rong Qu, editors, *Automated Design of Machine Learning and Search Algorithms*, Natural Computing Series, pages 11–28. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2021. ISBN 978-3-030-72069-8. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-72069-8_2. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-72069-8_2.
- [17] Jonathan Waring, Charlotta Lindvall, and Renato Umeton. Automated machine learning: Review of the state-of-the-art and opportunities for healthcare. *Artificial Intelligence in Medicine*, 104:101822, April 2020. ISSN 0933-3657. doi: 10.1016/j.artmed.2020.101822. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0933365719310437>.
- [18] Haifeng Jin, François Chollet, Qingquan Song, and Xia Hu. AutoKeras: An AutoML Library for Deep Learning. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 24(6):1–6, 2023. ISSN 1533-7928. URL <http://jmlr.org/papers/v24/20-1355.html>.
- [19] Nikolay O. Nikitin, Pavel Vychuzhanin, Mikhail Sarafanov, Iana S. Polonskaia, Ilia Revin, Irina V. Barabanova, Gleb Maximov, Anna V. Kalyuzhnaya, and Alexander Boukhanovsky. Automated evolutionary approach for the design of composite machine learning pipelines. *Future Generation Computer Systems*, 127:109–125, February 2022. ISSN 0167-739X. doi: 10.1016/j.future.2021.08.022. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167739X21003307>.
- [20] Nick Erickson, Jonas Mueller, Alexander Shirkov, Hang Zhang, Pedro Larroy, Mu Li, and Alexander Smola. AutoGluon-Tabular: Robust and Accurate AutoML for Structured Data, March 2020. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2003.06505>. arXiv:2003.06505 [cs, stat].

- [21] Piero Molino, Yaroslav Dudin, and Sai Sumanth Miryala. Ludwig: a type-based declarative deep learning toolbox, September 2019. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1909.07930>. arXiv:1909.07930 [cs, stat].
- [22] Matthias Feurer, Aaron Klein, Katharina Eggensperger, Jost Springenberg, Manuel Blum, and Frank Hutter. Efficient and Robust Automated Machine Learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 28. Curran Associates, Inc., 2015. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2015/hash/11d0e6287202fced83f79975ec59a3a6-Abstract.html.
- [23] Welcome to PyCaret, September 2023. URL <https://github.com/pycaret/pycaret>. original-date: 2019-11-23T18:40:48Z.
- [24] William La Cava, Heather Williams, Weixuan Fu, Steve Vitale, Durga Srivatsan, and Jason H Moore. Evaluating recommender systems for AI-driven biomedical informatics. *Bioinformatics*, 37(2):250–256, April 2021. ISSN 1367-4803. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btaa698. URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btaa698>.
- [25] Lucas Zimmer, Marius Lindauer, and Frank Hutter. Auto-PyTorch Tabular: Multi-Fidelity MetaLearning for Efficient and Robust AutoDL, April 2021. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2006.13799>. arXiv:2006.13799 [cs, stat].
- [26] Randal S. Olson, Nathan Bartley, Ryan J. Urbanowicz, and Jason H. Moore. Evaluation of a Tree-based Pipeline Optimization Tool for Automating Data Science. In *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference 2016*, GECCO '16, pages 485–492, New York, NY, USA, July 2016. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 978-1-4503-4206-3. doi: 10.1145/2908812.2908918. URL <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/2908812.2908918>.
- [27] Randal S. Olson and Jason H. Moore. TPOT: A Tree-based Pipeline Optimization Tool for Automating Machine Learning. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Automatic Machine Learning*, pages 66–74. PMLR, December 2016. URL https://proceedings.mlr.press/v64/olson_tpot_2016.html. ISSN: 1938-7228.
- [28] Trang T Le, Weixuan Fu, and Jason H Moore. Scaling tree-based automated machine learning to biomedical big data with a feature set selector. *Bioinformatics*, 36(1):250–256, January 2020. ISSN 1367-4803. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btz470. URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btz470>.
- [29] Pieter Gijsbers and Joaquin Vanschoren. GAMA: A General Automated Machine Learning Assistant. In Yuxiao Dong, Georgiana Ifrim, Dunja Mladenić, Craig Saunders, and Sofie Van Hoecke, editors, *Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases. Applied Data Science and Demo Track*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 560–564, Cham, 2021. Springer International Publishing. ISBN 978-3-030-67670-4. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-67670-4_39.
- [30] Alex G. C. de Sá, Walter José G. S. Pinto, Luiz Otavio V. B. Oliveira, and Gisele L. Pappa. RECIPE: A Grammar-Based Framework for Automatically Evolving Classification Pipelines. In James McDermott, Mauro Castelli, Lukas Sekanina, Evert Haasdijk, and Pablo García-Sánchez, editors, *Genetic Programming*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 246–261, Cham, 2017. Springer International Publishing. ISBN 978-3-319-55696-3. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-55696-3_16.
- [31] Felix Mohr, Marcel Wever, and Eyke Hüllermeier. ML-Plan: Automated machine learning via hierarchical planning. *Machine Learning*, 107(8):1495–1515, September 2018. ISSN 1573-0565. doi: 10.1007/s10994-018-5735-z. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10994-018-5735-z>.
- [32] Akshay Akshay, Mitali Katoch, Navid Shekarchizadeh, Masoud Abedi, Ankush Sharma, Fiona C. Burkhard, Rosalyn M. Adam, Katia Monastyrskaya, and Ali Hashemi Gheinani. Machine Learning Made Easy (MLme): A Comprehensive Toolkit for Machine Learning-Driven Data Analysis, July 2023. URL <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2023.07.04.546825v1>. Pages: 2023.07.04.546825 Section: New Results.
- [33] MLJAR Automated Machine Learning for Humans, September 2023. URL <https://github.com/mljar/mljar-supervised>. original-date: 2018-11-05T12:58:04Z.
- [34] Erin LeDell and Sebastien Poirier. H2O AutoML: Scalable automatic machine learning. *7th ICML Workshop on Automated Machine Learning (AutoML)*, July 2020. URL https://www.automl.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/AutoML_2020_paper_61.pdf.
- [35] Ryan Urbanowicz, Robert Zhang, Yuhan Cui, and Pranshu Suri. STREAMLINE: A Simple, Transparent, End-To-End Automated Machine Learning Pipeline Facilitating Data Analysis and Algorithm Comparison. In Leonardo Trujillo, Stephan M. Winkler, Sara Silva, and Wolfgang Banzhaf, editors, *Genetic Programming Theory and Practice XIX*, Genetic and Evolutionary Computation, pages 201–231. Springer Nature, Singapore, 2023. ISBN 978-981-19846-0-0. doi: 10.1007/978-981-19-8460-0_9. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-8460-0_9.

- [36] Lars Kotthoff, Chris Thornton, Holger H. Hoos, Frank Hutter, and Kevin Leyton-Brown. Auto-WEKA 2.0: Automatic model selection and hyperparameter optimization in WEKA. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18(25):1–5, 2017. ISSN 1533-7928. URL <http://jmlr.org/papers/v18/16-261.html>.
- [37] Anton Vakhrushev, Alexander Ryzhkov, Maxim Savchenko, Dmitry Simakov, Rinchin Damdinov, and Alexander Tuzhilin. LightAutoML: AutoML Solution for a Large Financial Services Ecosystem, September 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2109.01528v2>.
- [38] Chi Wang, Qingyun Wu, Markus Weimer, and Eric Zhu. FLAML: A Fast and Lightweight AutoML Library, 2021. URL <https://github.com/microsoft/FLAML>. original-date: 2020-08-20T20:46:11Z.
- [39] Frank Hutter, Lars Kotthoff, and Joaquin Vanschoren, editors. *Automated Machine Learning: Methods, Systems, Challenges*. The Springer Series on Challenges in Machine Learning. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2019. ISBN 978-3-030-05317-8 978-3-030-05318-5. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-05318-5. URL <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-030-05318-5>.
- [40] TransmogriAI, September 2023. URL <https://github.com/salesforce/TransmogriAI>. original-date: 2017-11-02T16:15:15Z.
- [41] Mihaela-Andreea Vasile, Florin Pop, Mihaela-Cătălina Niță, and Valentin Cristea. MLBox: Machine learning box for asymptotic scheduling. *Information Sciences*, 433-434:401–416, April 2018. ISSN 0020-0255. doi: 10.1016/j.ins.2017.01.005. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0020025517300099>.
- [42] Reiichiro Nakano. Xcessiv, August 2023. URL <https://github.com/reiinakano/xcessiv>. original-date: 2017-03-07T18:18:25Z.
- [43] Xinkai Wang, Yanbo Feng, Boning Tong, Jingxuan Bao, Marylyn D. Ritchie, Andrew J. Saykin, Jason H. Moore, Ryan Urbanowicz, and Li Shen. Exploring Automated Machine Learning for Cognitive Outcome Prediction from Multimodal Brain Imaging using STREAMLINE. *AMIA Summits on Translational Science Proceedings*, 2023:544–553, June 2023. ISSN 2153-4063. URL <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC10283099/>.
- [44] Boning Tong, Shannon L. Risacher, Jingxuan Bao, Yanbo Feng, Xinkai Wang, Marylyn D. Ritchie, Jason H. Moore, Ryan Urbanowicz, Andrew J. Saykin, and Li Shen. Comparing Amyloid Imaging Normalization Strategies for Alzheimer’s Disease Classification using an Automated Machine Learning Pipeline. *AMIA Summits on Translational Science Proceedings*, 2023:525–533, June 2023. ISSN 2153-4063. URL <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC10283108/>.
- [45] Sy Hwang, Ryan Urbanowicz, Selah Lynch, Tawnya Vernon, Kellie Bresz, Carolina Giraldo, Erin Kennedy, Max Leabhart, Troy Bleacher, Michael R. Ripchinski, Danielle L. Mowery, and Randall A. Oyer. Toward Predicting 30-Day Readmission Among Oncology Patients: Identifying Timely and Actionable Risk Factors. *JCO Clinical Cancer Informatics*, (7):e2200097, September 2023. doi: 10.1200/CCI.22.00097. URL <https://ascopubs.org/doi/abs/10.1200/CCI.22.00097>. Publisher: Wolters Kluwer.
- [46] Rachel Kohn, Michael O. Harhay, Gary E. Weissman, Ryan Urbanowicz, Wei Wang, George L. Anesi, Stefania Scott, Brian Bayes, S. Ryan Greysen, Scott D. Halpern, and Meeta Prasad Kerlin. A Data-Driven Analysis of Ward Capacity Strain Metrics That Predict Clinical Outcomes Among Survivors of Acute Respiratory Failure. *Journal of Medical Systems*, 47(1):83, August 2023. ISSN 1573-689X. doi: 10.1007/s10916-023-01978-5. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10916-023-01978-5>.
- [47] Ryan J. Urbanowicz, Pranshu Suri, Yuhan Cui, Jason H. Moore, Karen Ruth, Rachael Stolzenberg-Solomon, and Shannon M. Lynch. A Rigorous Machine Learning Analysis Pipeline for Biomedical Binary Classification: Application in Pancreatic Cancer Nested Case-control Studies with Implications for Bias Assessments, September 2020. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2008.12829>. arXiv:2008.12829 [cs, stat].
- [48] Tlanelo Emmanuel, Thabiso Maupong, Dimane Mpoeleng, Thabo Semong, Banyatsang Mphago, and Oteng Tabona. A survey on missing data in machine learning. *Journal of Big Data*, 8(1):140, October 2021. ISSN 2196-1115. doi: 10.1186/s40537-021-00516-9. URL <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40537-021-00516-9>.
- [49] Ryan J. Urbanowicz, Randal S. Olson, Peter Schmitt, Melissa Meeker, and Jason H. Moore. Benchmarking relief-based feature selection methods for bioinformatics data mining. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, 85:168–188, September 2018. ISSN 1532-0464. doi: 10.1016/j.jbi.2018.07.015. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1532046418301412>.
- [50] Shefali S. Verma, Anastasia Lucas, Xinyuan Zhang, Yogasudha Veturi, Scott Dudek, Binglan Li, Ruowang Li, Ryan Urbanowicz, Jason H. Moore, Dokyoon Kim, and Marylyn D. Ritchie. Collective feature selection to identify crucial epistatic variants. *BioData Mining*, 11(1):5, April 2018. ISSN 1756-0381. doi: 10.1186/s13040-018-0168-6. URL <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13040-018-0168-6>.

- [51] Ryan J. Urbanowicz and Jason H. Moore. ExSTraCS 2.0: description and evaluation of a scalable learning classifier system. *Evolutionary Intelligence*, 8(2):89–116, September 2015. ISSN 1864-5917. doi: 10.1007/s12065-015-0128-8. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12065-015-0128-8>.
- [52] Brett A. McKinney, David M. Reif, Marylyn D. Ritchie, and Jason H. Moore. Machine Learning for Detecting Gene-Gene Interactions. *Applied Bioinformatics*, 5(2):77–88, June 2006. ISSN 1175-5636. doi: 10.2165/00822942-200605020-00002. URL <https://doi.org/10.2165/00822942-200605020-00002>.
- [53] Alexa A. Woodward, Ryan J. Urbanowicz, Adam C. Naj, and Jason H. Moore. Genetic heterogeneity: Challenges, impacts, and methods through an associative lens. *Genetic Epidemiology*, 46(8):555–571, 2022. ISSN 1098-2272. doi: 10.1002/gepi.22497. URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/gepi.22497>. _eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/gepi.22497>.
- [54] Ulysses J. Magalang, Ning-Hung Chen, Peter A. Cistulli, Annette C. Fedson, Thorarinn Gíslason, David Hillman, Thomas Penzel, Renaud Tamisier, Sergio Tufik, Gary Phillips, Allan I. Pack, and SAGIC Investigators. Agreement in the scoring of respiratory events and sleep among international sleep centers. *Sleep*, 36(4):591–596, April 2013. ISSN 1550-9109. doi: 10.5665/sleep.2552.
- [55] Ulysses J. Magalang, Erna S. Arnardottir, Ning-Hung Chen, Peter A. Cistulli, Thorarinn Gíslason, Diane Lim, Thomas Penzel, Richard Schwab, Sergio Tufik, Allan I. Pack, and SAGIC Investigators. Agreement in the Scoring of Respiratory Events Among International Sleep Centers for Home Sleep Testing. *Journal of clinical sleep medicine: JCSM: official publication of the American Academy of Sleep Medicine*, 12(1):71–77, January 2016. ISSN 1550-9397. doi: 10.5664/jcsm.5398.
- [56] Brendan T. Keenan, Jinyoung Kim, Bhajan Singh, Lia Bittencourt, Ning-Hung Chen, Peter A. Cistulli, Ulysses J. Magalang, Nigel McArdle, Jesse W. Mindel, Bryndis Benediktsdottir, Erna Sif Arnardottir, Lisa Kristin Prochnow, Thomas Penzel, Bernd Sanner, Richard J. Schwab, Chol Shin, Kate Sutherland, Sergio Tufik, Greg Maislin, Thorarinn Gíslason, and Allan I. Pack. Recognizable clinical subtypes of obstructive sleep apnea across international sleep centers: a cluster analysis. *Sleep*, 41(3):zsx214, March 2018. ISSN 1550-9109. doi: 10.1093/sleep/zsx214.
- [57] Fabiola G. Rizzatti, Diego R. Mazzotti, Jesse Mindel, Greg Maislin, Brendan T. Keenan, Lia Bittencourt, Ning-Hung Chen, Peter A. Cistulli, Nigel McArdle, Frances M. Pack, Bhajan Singh, Kate Sutherland, Bryndis Benediktsdottir, Ingo Fietze, Thorarinn Gíslason, Diane C. Lim, Thomas Penzel, Bernd Sanner, Fang Han, Qing Yun Li, Richard Schwab, Sergio Tufik, Allan I. Pack, and Ulysses J. Magalang. Defining Extreme Phenotypes of OSA Across International Sleep Centers. *Chest*, 158(3):1187–1197, September 2020. ISSN 1931-3543. doi: 10.1016/j.chest.2020.03.055.
- [58] Kate Sutherland, Soriul Kim, Olivia J. Veatch, Brendan T. Keenan, Lia Bittencourt, Ning-Hung Chen, Thorarinn Gíslason, Fang Han, Niusha Jafari, Qing Yun Li, Diane C. Lim, Greg Maislin, Ulysses Magalang, Diego R. Mazzotti, Nigel McArdle, Jesse Mindel, Allan I. Pack, Thomas Penzel, Bhajan Singh, Andrew Wiemken, Liyue Xu, Yun Sun, Sergio Tufik, Richard J. Schwab, and Peter A. Cistulli. Facial and Intraoral Photographic Traits Related to Sleep Apnea in a Clinical Sample with Genetic Ancestry Analysis. *Annals of the American Thoracic Society*, 20(6):880–890, June 2023. ISSN 2325-6621. doi: 10.1513/AnnalsATS.202207-577OC.
- [59] M. Melanie Lyons, Nitin Y. Bhatt, Allan I. Pack, and Ulysses J. Magalang. Global burden of sleep-disordered breathing and its implications. *Respirology*, 25(7):690–702, 2020. ISSN 1440-1843. doi: 10.1111/resp.13838. URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/resp.13838>. _eprint: <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/resp.13838>.
- [60] Daniel J. Gottlieb and Naresh M. Punjabi. Diagnosis and Management of Obstructive Sleep Apnea: A Review. *JAMA*, 323(14):1389–1400, April 2020. ISSN 0098-7484. doi: 10.1001/jama.2020.3514. URL <https://doi.org/10.1001/jama.2020.3514>.
- [61] Apoor S. Gami, Daniel E. Howard, Eric J. Olson, and Virend K. Somers. Day-night pattern of sudden death in obstructive sleep apnea. *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 352(12):1206–1214, March 2005. ISSN 1533-4406. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa041832.
- [62] H. Klar Yaggi, John Concato, Walter N. Kernan, Judith H. Lichtman, Lawrence M. Brass, and Vahid Mohsenin. Obstructive sleep apnea as a risk factor for stroke and death. *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 353(19):2034–2041, November 2005. ISSN 1533-4406. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa043104.
- [63] Nayef AlGhanim, Vikram R. Comondore, John Fleetham, Carlo A. Marra, and Najib T. Ayas. The economic impact of obstructive sleep apnea. *Lung*, 186(1):7–12, 2008. ISSN 0341-2040. doi: 10.1007/s00408-007-9055-5.
- [64] A. T. Mulgrew, C. F. Ryan, J. A. Fleetham, R. Cheema, N. Fox, M. Koehoorn, J. M. Fitzgerald, C. Marra, and N. T. Ayas. The impact of obstructive sleep apnea and daytime sleepiness on work limitation. *Sleep Medicine*, 9(1):42–53, December 2007. ISSN 1389-9457. doi: 10.1016/j.sleep.2007.01.009.

- [65] C. F. George. Reduction in motor vehicle collisions following treatment of sleep apnoea with nasal CPAP. *Thorax*, 56(7):508–512, July 2001. ISSN 0040-6376. doi: 10.1136/thorax.56.7.508.
- [66] Erna S. Arnardottir, Erla Bjornsdottir, Kristin A. Olafsdottir, Bryndis Benediktsdottir, and Thorarinn Gislason. Obstructive sleep apnoea in the general population: highly prevalent but minimal symptoms. *The European Respiratory Journal*, 47(1):194–202, January 2016. ISSN 1399-3003. doi: 10.1183/13993003.01148-2015.
- [67] Benjamin Arsic, Kristina Zebic, Aamna Sajid, Neha Bhave, Karla D. Passalacqua, Denise White-Perkins, Lois Lamerato, Della Rees, and Katarzyna Budzynska. Assessing the Adequacy of Obstructive Sleep Apnea Diagnosis for High-Risk Patients in Primary Care. *Journal of the American Board of Family Medicine: JABFM*, 35(2): 320–328, 2022. ISSN 1558-7118. doi: 10.3122/jabfm.2022.02.210296.
- [68] Nikolaus C. Netzer, Josef J. Hoegel, Daniel Loube, Cordula M. Netzer, Birgit Hay, Rudolfo Alvarez-Sala, Kingman P. Strohl, and Sleep in Primary Care International Study Group. Prevalence of symptoms and risk of sleep apnea in primary care. *Chest*, 124(4):1406–1414, October 2003. ISSN 0012-3692. doi: 10.1378/chest.124.4.1406.
- [69] V. Kapur, D. K. Blough, R. E. Sandblom, R. Hert, J. B. de Maine, S. D. Sullivan, and B. M. Psaty. The medical cost of undiagnosed sleep apnea. *Sleep*, 22(6):749–755, September 1999. ISSN 0161-8105. doi: 10.1093/sleep/22.6.749.
- [70] G. Maislin, A. I. Pack, N. B. Kribbs, P. L. Smith, A. R. Schwartz, L. R. Kline, R. J. Schwab, and D. F. Dinges. A survey screen for prediction of apnea. *Sleep*, 18(3):158–166, April 1995. ISSN 0161-8105. doi: 10.1093/sleep/18.3.158.
- [71] Richard J. Schwab, Sarah E. Leinwand, Cary B. Bearn, Greg Maislin, Ramya Bhat Rao, Adithya Nagaraja, Stephen Wang, and Brendan T. Keenan. Digital Morphometrics: A New Upper Airway Phenotyping Paradigm in OSA. *Chest*, 152(2):330–342, August 2017. ISSN 1931-3543. doi: 10.1016/j.chest.2017.05.005.
- [72] Kate Sutherland, Richard J. Schwab, Greg Maislin, Richard W. W. Lee, Bryndis Benediktsdottir, Allan I. Pack, Thorarinn Gislason, Sigurdur Juliusson, and Peter A. Cistulli. Facial phenotyping by quantitative photography reflects craniofacial morphology measured on magnetic resonance imaging in Icelandic sleep apnea patients. *Sleep*, 37(5):959–968, May 2014. ISSN 1550-9109. doi: 10.5665/sleep.3670.
- [73] Kate Sutherland, Richard W. W. Lee, Peter Petocz, Tat On Chan, Susanna Ng, David S. Hui, and Peter A. Cistulli. Craniofacial phenotyping for prediction of obstructive sleep apnoea in a Chinese population. *Respirology (Carlton, Vic.)*, 21(6):1118–1125, August 2016. ISSN 1440-1843. doi: 10.1111/resp.12792.
- [74] Richard W. W. Lee, Andrew S. L. Chan, Ronald R. Grunstein, and Peter A. Cistulli. Craniofacial phenotyping in obstructive sleep apnea—a novel quantitative photographic approach. *Sleep*, 32(1):37–45, January 2009. ISSN 0161-8105.
- [75] Richard W. W. Lee, Peter Petocz, Tania Prvan, Andrew S. L. Chan, Ronald R. Grunstein, and Peter A. Cistulli. Prediction of obstructive sleep apnea with craniofacial photographic analysis. *Sleep*, 32(1):46–52, January 2009. ISSN 0161-8105.
- [76] Brian C. Ross. Mutual Information between Discrete and Continuous Data Sets. *PLOS ONE*, 9(2):e87357, February 2014. ISSN 1932-6203. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0087357. URL <https://journals.plos.org/plosone/article?id=10.1371/journal.pone.0087357>. Publisher: Public Library of Science.
- [77] Ryan J Urbanowicz and Will N Browne. *Introduction to learning classifier systems*. Springer, 2017.
- [78] Martin V. Butz. The XCS Classifier System. In Martin V. Butz, editor, *Rule-Based Evolutionary Online Learning Systems: A Principled Approach to LCS Analysis and Design*, Studies in Fuzziness and Soft Computing, pages 51–64. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2006. ISBN 978-3-540-31231-4. doi: 10.1007/3-540-31231-5_4. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-31231-5_4.
- [79] Takuya Akiba, Shotaro Sano, Toshihiko Yanase, Takeru Ohta, and Masanori Koyama. Optuna: A Next-generation Hyperparameter Optimization Framework. In *Proceedings of the 25th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining, KDD '19*, pages 2623–2631, New York, NY, USA, July 2019. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 978-1-4503-6201-6. doi: 10.1145/3292500.3330701. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3292500.3330701>.
- [80] Leo Breiman. Random Forests. *Machine Learning*, 45(1):5–32, October 2001. ISSN 1573-0565. doi: 10.1023/A:1010933404324. URL <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010933404324>.
- [81] sklearn.linear_model.ElasticNet. URL https://scikit-learn/stable/modules/generated/sklearn.linear_model.ElasticNet.html.
- [82] Pedro Abreu Miriam Santos. HCC Survival, 2015. URL <https://archive.ics.uci.edu/dataset/423>.

- [83] Ryan J. Urbanowicz, Jeff Kiralis, Nicholas A. Sinnott-Armstrong, Tamra Heberling, Jonathan M. Fisher, and Jason H. Moore. GAMETES: a fast, direct algorithm for generating pure, strict, epistatic models with random architectures. *BioData Mining*, 5(1):16, October 2012. ISSN 1756-0381. doi: 10.1186/1756-0381-5-16. URL <https://doi.org/10.1186/1756-0381-5-16>.
- [84] S. Rao Mallampati. Clinical sign to predict difficult tracheal intubation (hypothesis). *Canadian Anaesthetists' Society Journal*, 30(3):316–317, May 1983. ISSN 1496-8975. doi: 10.1007/BF03013818. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF03013818>.
- [85] Naima Laharnar, Sebastian Herberger, Lisa-Kristin Prochnow, Ning-Hung Chen, Peter A. Cistulli, Allan I. Pack, Richard Schwab, Brendan T. Keenan, Diego R. Mazzotti, Ingo Fietze, and Thomas Penzel. Simple and Unbiased OSA Prescreening: Introduction of a New Morphologic OSA Prediction Score. *Nature and Science of Sleep*, 13:2039–2049, 2021. ISSN 1179-1608. doi: 10.2147/NSS.S333471.
- [86] Hua Qin, Brendan T. Keenan, Diego R. Mazzotti, Fernando Vaquerizo-Villar, Jan F. Kraemer, Niels Wessel, Sergio Tufik, Lia Bittencourt, Peter A. Cistulli, Philip de Chazal, Kate Sutherland, Bhajan Singh, Allan I. Pack, Ning-Hung Chen, Ingo Fietze, Thorarinn Gislason, Steven Holfinger, Ulysses J. Magalang, and Thomas Penzel. Heart rate variability during wakefulness as a marker of obstructive sleep apnea severity. *Sleep*, 44(5):zsab018, May 2021. ISSN 1550-9109. doi: 10.1093/sleep/zsab018.
- [87] Steven J. Holfinger, M. Melanie Lyons, Brendan T. Keenan, Diego R. Mazzotti, Jesse Mindel, Greg Maislin, Peter A. Cistulli, Kate Sutherland, Nigel McArdle, Bhajan Singh, Ning-Hung Chen, Thorarinn Gislason, Thomas Penzel, Fang Han, Qing Yun Li, Richard Schwab, Allan I. Pack, and Ulysses J. Magalang. Diagnostic Performance of Machine Learning-Derived OSA Prediction Tools in Large Clinical and Community-Based Samples. *Chest*, 161(3):807–817, March 2022. ISSN 1931-3543. doi: 10.1016/j.chest.2021.10.023.
- [88] Kate Sutherland, Brendan T. Keenan, Lia Bittencourt, Ning-Hung Chen, Thorarinn Gislason, Sarah Leinwand, Ulysses J. Magalang, Greg Maislin, Diego R. Mazzotti, Nigel McArdle, Jesse Mindel, Allan I. Pack, Thomas Penzel, Bhajan Singh, Sergio Tufik, Richard J. Schwab, Peter A. Cistulli, and SAGIC Investigators. A Global Comparison of Anatomic Risk Factors and Their Relationship to Obstructive Sleep Apnea Severity in Clinical Samples. *Journal of clinical sleep medicine: JCSM: official publication of the American Academy of Sleep Medicine*, 15(4):629–639, April 2019. ISSN 1550-9397. doi: 10.5664/jcsm.7730.
- [89] Thomas Liao, Rohan Taori, Inioluwa Deborah Raji, and Ludwig Schmidt. Are We Learning Yet? A Meta Review of Evaluation Failures Across Machine Learning. August 2021. URL <https://openreview.net/forum?id=mPducS1MsEK>.
- [90] Marc-André Zöllner and Marco F. Huber. Benchmark and Survey of Automated Machine Learning Frameworks. *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research*, 70:409–472, January 2021. ISSN 1076-9757. doi: 10.1613/jair.1.11854. URL <https://www.jair.org/index.php/jair/article/view/11854>.
- [91] Adithya Balaji and Alexander Allen. Benchmarking Automatic Machine Learning Frameworks, August 2018. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1808.06492>. arXiv:1808.06492 [cs, stat].
- [92] Luís Ferreira, André Pilastrri, Carlos Manuel Martins, Pedro Miguel Pires, and Paulo Cortez. A Comparison of AutoML Tools for Machine Learning, Deep Learning and XGBoost. In *2021 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*, pages 1–8, July 2021. doi: 10.1109/IJCNN52387.2021.9534091. URL <https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/abstract/document/9534091>. ISSN: 2161-4407.
- [93] Pieter Gijsbers, Marcos L. P. Bueno, Stefan Coors, Erin LeDell, Sébastien Poirier, Janek Thomas, Bernd Bischl, and Joaquin Vanschoren. AMLB: an AutoML Benchmark, July 2022. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2207.12560>. arXiv:2207.12560 [cs, stat].
- [94] T. Young, M. Palta, J. Dempsey, J. Skatrud, S. Weber, and S. Badr. The occurrence of sleep-disordered breathing among middle-aged adults. *The New England Journal of Medicine*, 328(17):1230–1235, April 1993. ISSN 0028-4793. doi: 10.1056/NEJM199304293281704.
- [95] Paul E. Peppard, Terry Young, Jodi H. Barnet, Mari Palta, Erika W. Hagen, and Khin Mae Hla. Increased prevalence of sleep-disordered breathing in adults. *American Journal of Epidemiology*, 177(9):1006–1014, May 2013. ISSN 1476-6256. doi: 10.1093/aje/kws342.
- [96] Simon Caton and Christian Haas. Fairness in machine learning: A survey. *ACM Computing Surveys*, 2020.

STREAMLINE: An Automated Machine Learning Pipeline for Biomedicine Applied to Examine the Utility of Photography-Based Phenotypes for OSA Prediction Across International Sleep Centers

Supporting Information

Ryan J. Urbanowicz^{1,4*}, Harsh Bandhey¹, Brendan T. Keenan², Greg Maislin², Sy Hwang³, Danielle L. Mowery⁴, Shannon M. Lynch⁵, Diego R. Mazzotti^{6,7}, Fang Han⁸, Qing Yun Li⁹, Thomas Penzel¹⁰, Sergio Tufik¹¹, Lia Bittencourt¹¹, Thorarinn Gislason^{12,13}, Philip de Chazal¹⁴, Bhajan Singh^{15,16}, Nigel McArdle^{15,16}, Ning-Hung Chen¹⁷, Allan Pack², Richard J. Schwab², Peter A. Cistulli¹⁸, Ulysses J. Magalang¹⁹

¹Department of Computational Biomedicine, Cedars Sinai Medical Center, Los Angeles, CA

²Division of Sleep Medicine, Department of Medicine, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA

³Institute for Biomedical Informatics, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA

⁴Department of Biostatistics Epidemiology and Informatics, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA

⁵Cancer Prevention and Control Program, Fox Chase Cancer Center, Philadelphia, PA

⁶Division of Medical Informatics, Department of Internal Medicine, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS

⁷Division of Pulmonary, Critical Care, and Sleep Medicine, Department of Internal Medicine, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS

⁸Division of Sleep Medicine, Peking University People's Hospital, Beijing, China

⁹Department of Respiratory and Critical Care Medicine, Ruijin Hospital, Shanghai Jiao Tong University School of Medicine, Shanghai, China

¹⁰Interdisciplinary Center of Sleep Medicine, Charite University Hospital, Berlin, Germany

¹¹Department of Psychobiology, Federal University of Sao Paulo, Sao Paulo, Brazil

¹²Department of Sleep Medicine, Landspítali University Hospital, Reykjavik, Iceland

¹³University of Iceland, Faculty of Medicine, Reykjavik, Iceland

¹⁴Charles Perkins Center, Faculty of Engineering, University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia

¹⁵Department of Pulmonary Physiology and Sleep Medicine, Sir Charles Gairdner Hospital, Nedlands, Australia

¹⁶University of Western Australia, Crawley, Australia

¹⁷Department of Pulmonary and Critical Care Medicine, Sleep Center, Linkou Chang Gung Memorial Hospital, Taoyuan, Taiwan

¹⁸Charles Perkins Centre, Faculty of Medicine and Health, University of Sydney and Royal North Shore Hospital, Sydney, Australia

¹⁹Division of Pulmonary, Critical Care, and Sleep Medicine, Department of Medicine, Ohio State University Wexner Medical Center, Columbus, OH

*Corresponding author: R.J.U. (ryan.urbanowicz@cshs.org)

700 N. San Vicente Blvd., Pacific Design Center Suite G541E, Los Angeles, CA 90069

arXiv:2312.05461v1 [cs.LG] 9 Dec 2023

Contents

S.1: AutoML Survey/Comparison

Table S1: Summary of AutoML Tools and Libraries Surveyed.

Table S2: A High-Level Comparison of AutoML Tools and Libraries.

S.2 Materials & Methods

S.2 STREAMLINE Detailed Pipeline Walkthrough

S.2.1.1: Phase 1 - Data Exploration & Processing

S.2.1.2: Phase 2 - Imputation and Scaling

S.2.1.3: Phase 3 - Feature Importance Estimation

S.2.1.4: Phase 4 - Feature Selection

S.2.1.5: Phase 5 - Machine Learning (ML) Modeling

S.2.1.6: Phase 6 - Post-Analysis

S.2.1.7: Phase 7 - Compare Datasets

S.2.1.8: Phase 8 - Replication

S.2.1.9: Phase 9 – Summary Report

S.2.2: Benchmark Datasets

S.2.2.1: HCC Benchmark Data

S.2.2.2: GAMETES Benchmark Data

S.2.2.3: Multiplexer Benchmark Data

S.2.2.4: XOR Benchmark Data

S.2.3: Obstructive Sleep Apnea Data

Table S3: Summary Statistics for SAGIC Obstructive Sleep Apnea Data.

Table S4: Variable Key - SAGIC Obstructive Sleep Apnea Data

Table S5: Constructed Datasets for Analysis

S.2.3.1: Development and Replication Datasets

S.2.3.2: OSA Data Analyses with STREAMLINE

S.2.4: Study-Wide STREAMLINE Run Parameters

S.3: Results

S.3.1: HCC Benchmark Results

S.3.1.1: Simulated ‘Custom’ HCC Validates Automated Data Processing

S.3.1.2: Original HCC Benchmark Results

Figure S1: Original HCC Data - Comparing Mean Algorithm Performance.

Figure S2: Original HCC Data - PRC Plot of SVM performance across individual CV Models.

Figure S3: Original HCC Data – Mean Model Feature Importance Estimates Across all Algorithms.

Table S6: Best Mean Algorithm Performance Between STEAMLINe versions on HCC.

S.3.2: GAMETES Benchmark Results

Table S7: Best Mean Algorithm ROC-AUC Between STEAMLINe versions on GAMETES Datasets.

Figure S4: GAMETES Dataset Performance Comparison.

Figure S5: GAMETES Dataset D (2-Way Epistasis) Model Feature Importance.

Figure S6: GAMETES Dataset E (2-Way Epi+2 Het) Model Feature Importance.

S.3.3: Multiplexer Benchmark Results

Table S8: Best Mean Algorithm ROC-AUC Between STEAMLINe versions on Multiplexer Datasets.

Figure S7: Multiplexer Dataset Performance Comparison.

Figure S8: 70-bit Multiplexer ROC Plot Comparing Mean Algorithm Performance.

Figure S9: 70-bit Multiplexer – Mean Model Feature Importance Estimates Across all Algorithms.

S.3.4: XOR Benchmark Results

Table S9: Best Mean Algorithm ROC-AUC in STEAMLINe v0.3.4 on XOR Datasets.

Figure S10: XOR Dataset Performance Comparison.

Figure S11: 4-way XOR Pre-Modeling Median Feature Importance Scores.

Table S10: Best Mean Algorithm ROC-AUC in STEAMLINe v0.3.4 on XOR Datasets (no feature selection).

Figure S12: XOR Dataset Performance Comparison (no feature selection).

Figure S13: XOR 4-way Dataset Mean Model Feature Importance Estimates Across all Algorithms.

S.3.5: Obstructive Sleep Apnea Results

S.3.5.1: Initial Exploratory Data Analysis

Figure S14: Bar Plot of Class Balance in OSA Development Datasets (Before Processing).

Figure S15: Histogram of Missing Value Counts Across Features in J_GE15_DEMDXSYMCFO Development Dataset.

Figure S16: Pearson Feature Correlations in J_GE15_DEMDXSYMCFO Development Dataset.

S.3.5.2: Automated Data Processing

Table S11: $AHI \geq 15$ Development Dataset Characteristics Pre vs. Post STEAMLINe Processing.

Table S12: $AHI \geq 5$ Development Dataset Characteristics Pre vs. Post STEAMLINe Processing.

S.3.5.3: EDA Univariate Analyses on Processed Development Data

Table S13: Top Univariate Analyses for J_GE15_DEMDXSYMCFO.

Table S14: Top Univariate Analyses for T_GE5_DEMDXSYMCFO.

Figure S17: Most Significant Univariate Association for J_GE15_DEMDXSYMCFO Development Dataset (face_width).

Figure S18: Most Significant Univariate Association for T_GE5_DEMDXSYMCFO Development Dataset (bmi).

S.3.5.4: Pre-Modeling Feature Importance Estimation

Figure S19: J_GE15_DEMDXSYMCFO Pre-Modeling Median FI Scores.

Figure S20: T_GE5_DEMDXSYMCFO Pre-Modeling Median FI Scores.

S.3.5.5: Development Data Testing Evaluations of Modeling

Table S15: Pairwise Performance Comparisons of $AHI \geq 15$ vs. $AHI \geq 5$ Datasets with Same Feature Set(s).

Figure S21: PRC-AUC Model Testing Evaluation Summary Across All OSA Datasets.

Table S16: Pairwise Performance Comparisons of $AHI \geq 15$ Datasets with One Feature Set.

Table S17: Pairwise Performance Comparisons of $AHI \geq 5$ Datasets with One Feature Set.

Table S18: Pairwise Performance Comparisons of $AHI \geq 15$ Datasets Progressively Adding Feature Sets.

Table S19: Pairwise Performance Comparisons of $AHI \geq 5$ Datasets Progressively Adding Feature Sets.

Table S20: T_GE5_DEMDXSYMCFIO Algorithm Performance Comparison.

Figure S22: T_GE5_DEMDXSYMCFIO ROC Performance Across Algorithms.

Figure S23: T_GE5_DEMDXSYMCFIO PRC Plot Across Algorithms.

Table S21: T_GE5_DEMDXSYMCFIO Median Performance Metrics Across all Algorithms.

Table S22: T_GE5_DEMDXSYMCFIO Mean Performance Metrics Across all Algorithms.

Figure S24: T_GE5_DEMDXSYMCFIO ROC and PRC Plots EN Performance Across CV Test Sets.

S.3.5.6: Replication Data Evaluations of Modeling

Table S23: Testing vs Replication Data Evaluation Comparisons Using the Same Models.

Table S24: Testing vs Replication Data Evaluation Comparisons Using Top Performing Algorithms.

S.4 Discussion

S.4.1 Benchmarking Challenges

S.4.2 Feature Importance Consistency

Figure S25: Consistency of the Top 10 Features ($AHI \geq 15$ and $AHI \geq 5$).

Figure S26: Consistency of the Top 10 Features ($AHI \geq 15$).

Figure S27: Consistency of the Top 10 Features ($AHI \geq 5$).

S.4.3 STREAMLINE Future Development

S.1: AutoML Survey/Comparison

We surveyed a total of 19 automated machine learning (AutoML) tools and libraries (including STREAMLINE). “Tools” represent a more self-contained (i.e. ready-to-run) AutoML approach with little to no pipeline implementation required, while “libraries” generally are designed to simplify the coding required to design and run a machine learning analysis pipeline (but can include automation of some aspects of the pipeline (e.g. algorithm selection and hyperparameter optimization being most common)).

We limited our survey to include popular and relevant open-source (i.e non-enterprise) AutoML since they are free to access/use and their documentation and capabilities are largely transparent. We also limited our survey to AutoML designed (at minimum) to analyze structured data (i.e. tabular data) for binary classification tasks (but most could also do multi-class and regression tasks).

This survey focused on documentation provided within the respective GitHub repositories of each AutoML approach, including README’s, User’s Guides, and other documentation links within each repository. In each case we focused on the current release (as of September 2023) in the ‘main’ branch of each repository. **Table S1** summarized basic information on each of the 24 AutoML tools surveyed.

Table S2 provides a high-level comparison of the scope and capabilities of each AutoML approach including (1) the data types they can work with, (2) the AutoML objective(s), e.g. classification, regression, etc., (3) aspects impacting ease-of-use, convenience, and parallizability for those with and without programming experience, and (4) what aspects of the ML analysis pipeline have some degree of automation. Some of these characterizations rely on our best subjective interpretation of the respective AutoML documentation, as to whether the AutoML approach automates (to at least some degree) the specified element (i.e. row in the table). This table does not capture many nuances of the different AutoML approaches, including; (1) the quality and efficiency of their implementation (2) the quality and degree of detail provided in the documentation, (3) other uncommon or more specific capabilities and (4) the degree to which each capability is satisfied, e.g. how many options are available?, how much user input is required for setup?, what assumptions are being made? To date, we have only directly used STREAMLINE, TPOT, and ALIRO, thus characterizations of other approaches exclusively rely on their documentation, therefore we apologize to developers if we have inadvertently mischaracterized any of these capabilities, and would be happy to receive feedback. Note that the characterization of STREAMLINE’s capabilities reflects those most recent release used in this current publication (0.3.4), rather than the original published version (0.2.5).

AutoML Tool/Library	Release Version	Initial Release	Latest Release	ML Package Reliance	Code Language	Code Link	Paper Citation
STREAMLINE	0.3.4	2022	2023	sklearn	python	https://github.com/UrbsLab/STREAMLINE	(1)
Auto-Keras	1.1.0	2023	2023	keras	python	https://github.com/keras-team/autokeras	(2)
H2O-3	NA	2023	2023		java	https://github.com/h2oai/h2o-3	NA
MLme	NA	2023	2023	sklearn	python	https://github.com/FunctionalUrology/MLme	(3)
LAMA	0.3.7.3	2021	2023	sklearn	python	https://github.com/sb-ai-lab/LightAutoML	(4)
FEDOT	0.7.2	2021	2023	sklearn	python	https://github.com/aimclub/FEDOT	(5)
FLAML	2.1.0	2020	2023	Apache-Spark	python	https://github.com/microsoft/FLAML	NA
ALIRO	0.19	2020	2023	sklearn	javascript, python	https://github.com/EpistasisLab/Aliro	(6)
PYCARET	3.1.0	2020	2023	sklearn	python	https://github.com/pycaret/pycaret	NA
Auto-Gluon	0.8.2	2020	2023	sklearn	python	https://github.com/autogluon/autogluon	(7)
MLJAR-supervised	1.0.2	2019	2023	sklearn	python	https://github.com/mljar/mljar-supervised	NA
Ludwig	0.8.3	2019	2023		python	https://github.com/ludwig-ai/ludwig/	(8)
TPOT	0.12.1	2016	2023	sklearn	python	https://github.com/EpistasisLab/tpot	(9, 10, 11)
Auto-Sklearn	0.15.0	2015	2023	sklearn	python	https://github.com/automl/auto-sklearn	(12)
Auto-PyTorch	0.2.1	2021	2022	Py-Torch	python	https://github.com/automl/Auto-PyTorch	(13)
GAMA	23.0.0	2020	2022		python	https://github.com/openml-labs/gama	(14)
Hyperopt-sklearn	NA	2014	2022	sklearn	python	https://github.com/hyperopt/hyperopt-sklearn	(15)
Auto-WEKA	2.6.4	2013	2022	WEKA	java	https://github.com/automl/autoweka	(16)
RECIPE	NA	2017	2021	sklearn	python, C, JavaScript	https://github.com/laic-ufmg/Recipe	(17)
ML-Plan	0.2.3	2018	2020	sklearn, WEKA	java	https://github.com/starlibs/AILibs	(18)
TransmogriAI	0.7.0	2018	2020	Apache-Spark	Scala	https://github.com/salesforce/TransmogriAI	NA
MLBox	0.8.1	2017	2019	sklearn	python	https://github.com/AxeldeRomblay/MLBox	(19)
Xcessiv	0.5.1	2017	2017	sklearn	javascript, python	https://github.com/reiinakano/xcessiv	NA
Auto_ML	2.7.0	2016	2017	sklearn	python	https://github.com/ClimbsRocks/auto_ml	NA

Table S1: Summary of AutoML Tools and Libraries Surveyed. Key logistical information for popular and relevant AutoML tools and/or libraries. Not all methods included a publication or pre-print by the developers (but were still included). Methods are sorted in descending year based on latest release and initial release (with STREAMLINE at the top for convenience). Empty cells indicate that we were unsure or unable to confirm the respective value.

Below we explain our definitions of each capability category (note that the documentation for different AutoML's sometimes use different terms and term definitions):

- **'Data Types'**: Indicates whether respective data types can be utilized.
- **'Target'**: Indicates what ML tasks can be automated. Note that anomaly detection (as an objective) is different than outlier detection (as a data cleaning element). Also note that Auto-sklearn appeared to be unique in its capability to handle multi-label tasks and PYCARET appeared to be unique in its capability to handle anomaly detection.
- **'Ease of Use'**:
 - **'Codeless implementation'**: Identifies whether the user is required to utilize any level of coding to implement the pipeline itself, i.e. to set up the analysis pipeline, specify algorithms or hyperparameters, utilize (or not) different elements of an ML pipeline, and in what order.
 - **'Codeless running'**: Identifies whether has the capability to run the AutoML from a GUI, Web-interface, or a preconfigured notebook, at most having to adjust pipeline run parameters and file paths, and not requiring command line usage. I.e. is the AutoML able to be used by someone with no coding experience.
 - **'GUI'**: Is there a downloadable or web-based graphical user interface? Note this does not necessarily mean that the AutoML can be used without coding (which is the case for Xcessiv).
 - **'Generates Figures/Viz'**: Does the tool provide automation for the generation of results figures, model visualizations, and or other comparisons? This can either be run automatically as part of the pipeline, or automated secondarily when asked for by the user.
 - **'Outputs/organizes results'**: The approach automates or facilitates generating /downloading/ saving/ accessible-archiving of individual models, performance results, and visualizations. The focus here is allowing the user to easily examine and take a deeper dive into their results.
 - **'Summary report'**: The approach automates or facilitates the generation and presentation of some type of global analysis summary, e.g. documenting run parameters, key results, key visualizations, etc.
 - **'Recommender system'**: The approach includes some higher-level AI or decision making to suggest or decide what analysis configurations to try.
 - **'Parallelizable'**: Is there a clear and documented approach in place to parallelize the analysis, either on a compute cluster, multi-core CPU, or GPU.
- **'Automated Pipeline Elements'**:
 - **'Pipeline config. discovery'**: The approach provides some automation for determining/discovering what pipeline elements to include and in what order – beyond some pre-specified pipeline of elements.
 - **'Feature Extraction'**: Automates the extraction of structured features from unstructured data (e.g. text, images, time-series, etc) so that the structured features can be analyzed by algorithms designed to run on structured data only.
 - **'Exploratory Data Analysis'**: Automates multiple aspects of an exploratory data analysis (without requiring manual implementation) including but not limited to the data dimensions, data missingness, feature types, outcome balance or distribution, univariate analysis, feature correlations, clustering, etc.

- **‘Categorical Encoding’**: Based on automatic detection or user specification of feature types (e.g. categorical vs. quantitative), any categorical features are automatically appropriately encoded for the user (e.g. one-hot-encoding), so that they are treated appropriately in ML modeling.
- **‘Numerical Encoding’**: Can the pipeline automatically work with data features that include text-values (e.g. Hair color – ‘brown’, ‘black’, ‘blond’, ‘red’), and ideally encode and treat ordinal vs. categorical features appropriately. Users may still need to specify a given feature’s type as this often requires domain knowledge.
- **‘Basic Data Cleaning’**: Is there automation of some basic data cleaning elements (excluding missing value imputation), e.g. removing rows with missing outcome, removing redundant instances or features (i.e. perfect/high correlation), outlier detection/removal, etc.
- **‘Feature Engineering’**: This term is often confusingly used synonymously with feature extraction, feature learning, and even feature transformation. In modern days its most accurately defined as utilizing domain knowledge to manually ‘engineer’ new features from the dataset (without using knowledge of the target outcome), e.g. taking drug start/stop dates and engineering a drug duration variable. Here we consider feature engineering in a slightly more flexible manner – that does not necessarily require specific problem domain knowledge (but is still distinct from feature extraction, feature learning, and feature transformation). We define it here as the generation of new features from existing structured features (which may or may not then be removed from the dataset). Here we consider this to include elements of data encoding (including one-hot-encoding, where multiple new features replace an original feature), adding new features generated by dimensionality reduction (e.g. PCA), multivariate interaction encoding, or missing value encoding to explore feature missingness as a predictive variable. The key here is that new features are added to the dataset, and these features were generated without knowledge of the target outcome.
- **‘Missing Val. Imputation’**: Automatically imputes or is capable of ignoring missing values in the dataset so that modeling can be applied. Could be simple mean/median/mode imputation or more sophisticated multi-variate imputation.
- **‘Feature Transformation’**: One or more features in the dataset can be automatically transformed, e.g. normalization, scaling, or any other transformation that does not directly impact the dimensionality of the dataset (i.e. the number of features in the dataset)
- **‘Feature Learning’**: Prior to ML modeling, the approach automatically learns new features that are some combination of existing features, where knowledge of the outcome is available. I.e. generating new informative features that can help simpler algorithms identify more complex relationships in the data, e.g. Multi-Factor Dimensionality reduction, or using earlier baseline models as inputs for downstream modeling (similar but not necessarily the same as ‘stacking’, a type of ensembling)
- **‘Feature Selection’**: The AutoML automates ‘feature selection’ (the removal of non or less informative features) prior to modeling (i.e. we do not consider any feature selection internally conducted by a given ML modeling algorithm to be relevant here)
- **‘Algorithm Selection’**: The AutoML automates the utilization and comparison of multiple ML algorithms for modeling. Different AutoML approaches were found to have access to a widely varying number of potential algorithms to apply (anywhere from 2, to all algorithms available in a given ML library, e.g. scikit-learn). Additionally while some AutoML’s allowed the user to manually add other algorithms (including STREAMLINE), we do not consider this as a criteria here.

- **‘Deep Learning Included’**: The AutoML includes the availability of some form of deep learning, beyond a standard artificial neural network (ANN) that can be extended beyond a depth of three layers in a hyperparameter sweep. E.g. STREAMLINE can be adapted to look beyond 3 layers using scikit-learns ANN, however we do not consider it as including deep learning here.
- **‘Hyperparam. Optimization’**: Does the AutoML allow automatic search, seeking to optimize one or more hyperparameters of the included ML algorithms? We consider neural architecture search to be included here. This is one of the most commonly automated elements of AutoML.
- **‘Models for each CV part.’**: This aspect is focused on comparing the models generated by different ML algorithms. Specifically are individual models, each trained on a respective CV training partition, saved/output/evaluated. Most AutoML tools use internal CV either for the hyperparameter optimization, or to internally estimate model generalizability before either being evaluated on a hold out dataset (i.e. which could be termed evaluation, testing, or replication data). However this aspect asks if individual models are output by the autoML as part of a more global CV analysis, rather than a single model.
- **‘Model Evaluation’**: Does the AutoML automate model evaluation (either on a testing partition, or globally held out data, e.g. replication data) across a variety of metrics, and easily present or summarize these results for the user? This differs from the ‘summary report’ in that it is specifically focused on summarizing and presenting model performance metrics either upon command request, within a GUI, or saved as output.
- **‘Ensembling’**: Does the AutoML automate some form of ensembling (e.g. voting, bagging, stacking), apart from what could be considered ‘feature learning’. More specifically is the AutoML capable of generating an ensemble model using some or all other models trained by the different ML modeling algorithms. This could be across CV partitions or one model for each algorithm. Ideally this capability would also include comparing ensemble model performance to models generated by individual ML algorithms (but this was not always the case).
- **‘Significance Comparisons’**: Does the AutoML automatically conduct statistical significance analysis comparing model and or dataset performance? STREAMLINE appears to be unique in this regard.
- **‘Directly Compare Datasets’**: Does the AutoML support running multiple datasets through the pipeline at once and facilitate ML performance comparisons between those multiple datasets?
- **‘Replication Analysis’**: Does the AutoML tool make it easy to re-evaluate a model on some additional holdout or new data (including target outcome information), beyond the primary hold out data. This often includes saving/archiving the trained model(s), and ideally should include applying the same data processing that was applied to the training data (e.g. imputation, feature transformations, feature engineering, feature selection, etc.) to ensure the model is applicable to that new data. This was difficult to clearly determine from the documentation of most other AutoMLs.
- **‘Model Deploy (Predictions)’**: Does the AutoML make it easy to apply the model to making predictions on data that does not include target outcome information, e.g. making predictions for a competition, or in deploying the model to make real-world predictions (e.g. clinical decision making, or risk prediction). Ideally this would also include some form of explanation indicating the factors or reasoning from the model that led to a given prediction.

		STREAMLINE	Auto-Keras	H2O-3 AutoML	MLme	LAMA	FEDOT	FLAML	AIRO	PYCARET	Auto-Gluon	MLJAR-supervised	Ludwig	TPOT	Auto-Sklearn	Auto-PyTorch	GAMA	Hyperopt-sklearn	Auto-WEKA	RECIPE	ML-Plan	TransmogriFAI	MLBox	Xcessiv	Auto_ML	
Data Types	Structured (Tabular)	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	
	Images	NO	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	
	Text	NO	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	
	Time-Series	NO	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	
	Multi-Modal	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	
Target	Binary Classification	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	
	MultiClass Classification	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES		YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	
	Regression	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	
	Multi-Task	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	
	Multi-Label	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	
	Clustering	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	
	Anomaly Detection	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	
Ease of Use	Codeless Implementation	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	
	Codeless Running	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	
	GUI	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	
	Generates Figures/Viz	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	
	Outputs/Oranizes Results	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	
	Summary Report	YES	NO	SOME	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	SOME	NO	SOME	NO	
	Recommender System	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	
	Parallizable	YES	YES	SOME	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	SOME	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	SOME	NO		NO	SOME	YES	NO	YES	NO	
Automated Pipeline Elements	Pipeline Config. Discovery	NO		NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES		YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	
	Feature Extraction	NO	N/A	NO	NO	YES			NO	NO		YES	NO	NO	NO	N/A	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	
	Exploratory Data Analysis	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	
	Categorical Encoding	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO		
	Numerical Encoding	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO		NO	NO	NO		NO	YES	
	Basic Data Cleaning	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	
	Missing Val. Imputation	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO		
	Feature Engineering	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	
	Feature Transformation	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES
	Feature Learning	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES
	Feature Selection	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	
	Algorithm Selection	YES	NO	YES	YES	SOME	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES
	Hyperparam. Optimization	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES		YES		YES	NO
	Deep Learning Included	NO	ONLY	YES	NO	NO	NO		NO	NO	NO	NO	SOME	SOME	NO	ONLY	NO	NO	NO	NO		NO	YES	NO	YES	YES
	Models for each CV Part.	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO		YES	NO	NO
	Model Evaluation	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	NO
	Ensembling	NO	NO	YES	NO	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	NO
	Significance Comparisons	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Directly Compare Datasets	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
	Replication Analysis	YES	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO				NO	NO			NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO
Model Deploy (Predictions)	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	NO	NO	

Table S2: A High-Level Comparison of AutoML Tools and Libraries. 24 AutoML methods are compared with respect to various aspects of capabilities and scope of automation. ‘YES’ entries are highlighted in green, and ‘NO’ entries are highlighted in red. Ambiguous entries and those that we could not confidently determine from the documentation are left white and/or blank. Note, that it should not be concluded from this table that AutoMLs with more capabilities are necessarily better with respect to overall performance, ease of use, or adoption of data science best practices (in general or for specific applications).

S.2 Materials & Methods

S.2.1 STREAMLINE Detailed Pipeline Walkthrough

In this section we explain: (1) what STREAMLINE does, (2) what happens in during each phase, (3) why it’s designed the way it has been, (4) what user options are available to customize a run, and (5) what to expect when

running a given phase. Phases 1-6 make up the core automated pipeline, with Phase 7 and beyond being run optionally based on user needs. Phases are organized to both encapsulate related pipeline elements, as well as to address practical computational needs. STREAMLINE includes reliable default run parameters so that it can easily be used 'as-is', but these parameters can be adjusted for further customization. We refer to a single run of the entire STREAMLINE pipeline as an 'experiment', with all outputs saved to a single 'experiment folder' for later examination and re-use.

To avoid confusion on 'dataset' terminology we briefly review our definitions here:

1. **Target dataset** - A whole dataset (minus any instances the user may wish to hold out for replication) that has not yet undergone any other data partitioning and is intended to be used in the training and testing of models within STREAMLINE. Could also be referred to as the 'development dataset'.

2. **Training dataset** - A generally larger partition of the target dataset used in training a model

3. **Testing dataset** - A generally smaller partition of the target dataset used to evaluate the trained model

4. **Validation dataset** - The temporary, secondary hold-out partition of a given training dataset used for hyperparameter optimization. This is the product of using nested (aka double) cross-validation in STREAMLINE as a whole.

5. **Replication dataset** - Further data that is withheld from STREAMLINE phases 1-7 to (1) compare model evaluations on the same hold-out data and (2) verify the replicability and generalizability of model performance on data collected from other sites or sample populations. A replication dataset should have at least all of the features present in the target dataset which it seeks to replicate.

In the sections below, specific STREAMLINE run parameters are indicated by italics. Further details on STREAMLINE installation, run modes, run instructions, run parameters, output files, and additional code to do more with the output is given in the STREAMLINE documentation (<https://urbslab.github.io/STREAMLINE/index.html>).

S.2.1.1: Phase 1 - Data Exploration & Processing

This phase; (1) provides the user with key information about the target dataset(s) they wish to analyze, via an initial exploratory data analysis (EDA) (2) numerically encodes any text-based feature values in the data, (3) applies basic data cleaning and feature engineering to process the data, (4) informs the user how the data has been changed by the data processing, via a secondary, more in-depth EDA, and then (5) partitions the data using k-fold cross validation.

- Parallelizability: Runs once for each target dataset to be analyzed
- Run Time: Typically fast, except when evaluating and visualizing feature correlation in datasets with a large number of features

Initial EDA Characterizes the original dataset as loaded by the user, including: data dimensions, feature type counts, missing value counts, class balance, other standard pandas data summaries (i.e. `describe()`, `dtypes()`, `nunique()`) and feature correlations (pearson).

For precision, we strongly suggest users identify which features in their data should be treated as categorical vs. quantitative using the *categorical_feature_path* and/or *quantitative_feature_path* run parameters. However, if not specified by the user, STREAMLINE will attempt to automatically determine feature types relying on the *categorical_cutoff* parameter. Any features with fewer unique values than *categorical_cutoff* will be treated as categorical, and all others will be treated as quantitative.

- Output: (1) CSV files for all above data characteristics, (2) bar plot of class balance, (3) histogram of missing values in data, (4) feature correlation heatmap

Numerical Encoding of Text-based Features Detects any features in the data with non-numeric values and applies scikit-learn's 'LabelEncoder' to make them numeric as required by scikit-learn machine learning packages.

Basic Data Cleaning and Feature Engineering Applies the following steps to the target data, keeping track of changes to all data counts along the way:

1. Remove any instances that are missing an outcome label (as these cannot be used while conducting supervised learning)

2. Remove any features identified by the user with *ignore_features_path* (a convenience for users that may wish to exclude one or more features from the analysis without changing the original dataset)

3. Engineer/add 'missingness' features. Any original feature with a missing value proportion greater than *featureeng_missingness* will have a new feature added to the dataset that encodes missingness with 0 = not missing and 1 = missing. This allows the user to examine whether missingness is not at random (MNAR) and is predictive of outcome itself.

4. Remove any features that have invariant values (i.e. they are always the same), or that have only one value in addition to missing values. Then remove any features with a missingness greater than *cleaning_missingness*. Afterwards, remove any instances in the data that may have a missingness greater than *cleaning_missingness*.

5. Engineer/add one-hot-encoding for any categorical features in the data. This ensures that all categorical features are treated as such throughout all aspects of the pipeline. For example, a single categorical feature with 3 possible states will be encoded as 3 separate binary-valued features indicating whether an instance has that feature's state or not. Feature names are automatically updated by STREAMLINE to reflect this change.

6. Remove highly correlated features based on *correlation_removal_threshold*. Randomly removes one feature of a highly correlated feature pair (Pearson). While perfectly correlated features can be safely cleaned in this way, there is a chance of information loss when removing less correlated features.

- Output: CSV file summarizing changes to data counts during these cleaning and engineering steps.

Processed Data EDA Completes a more comprehensive EDA of the processed dataset including: everything examined in the initial EDA, as well as a univariate association analysis of all features using Chi-Square (for categorical features), or Mann-Whitney U-Test (for quantitative features).

- Output: (1) CSV files for all above data characteristics, (2) bar plot of class balance, (3) histogram of missing values in data, (4) feature correlation heatmap, (5) a CSV file summarizing the univariate analyses including the test applied, test statistic, and p-value for each feature, (6) for any feature with a univariate analysis p-value less than *sig_cutoff* (i.e. significant association with outcome), a bar-plot will be generated if it is categorical, and a box-plot will be generated if it is quantitative.

k-fold Cross Validation (CV) Partitioning For k-fold CV, STREAMLINE uses 'Stratified' partitioning by default, which aims to maintain the same/similar class balance within the 'k' training and testing datasets. The value of 'k' can be adjusted with *cv_partitions*. However, using *partition_method*, users can also select 'Random' or 'Group' partitioning.

Of note, 'Group' partitioning requires the dataset to include a column identified by *match_label*. This column includes a group membership identifier for each instance which indicates that any instance with the same group ID should be kept within the same partition during cross validation. This was originally intended for running

STREAMLINE on epidemiological data that had been matched for one or more covariates (e.g. age, sex, race) in order to adjust for their effects during modeling.

This strategy of performing k-fold cross validation in order to train (and ultimately evaluate k models for each algorithm) is different from most other AutoML tools, which typically only use k-fold CV internally as a way to try and optimize model generalizability during optimization prior to final hold out data evaluation. This approach has the advantage of yielding more than one model to later allow statistical comparisons between algorithms and datasets, but it has the disadvantage of having a smaller number of instances being used to optimize the model(s) during training/optimization.

- Output: CSV files for each training and testing dataset generated following partitioning. Note, by default STREAMLINE will overwrite these files as the working datasets undergo imputation, scaling and feature selection in subsequent phases. However, the user can keep copies of these intermediary CV datasets for review using the parameter *overwrite_cv*.

S.2.1.2: Phase 2 - Imputation and Scaling

This phase conducts additional data preparation elements of the pipeline that occur after CV partitioning, i.e. missing value imputation and feature scaling. Both elements are 'trained' and applied separately to each individual training dataset. The respective testing datasets are not looked at when running imputation or feature scaling learning to avoid potential data leakage. However, the learned imputation and scaling patterns are applied in the same way to the testing data as they were in the training data. Both imputation and scaling can optionally be turned off using the parameters *impute_data* and *scale_data*, respectively for some specific use cases, however imputation must be on when missing data is present in order to run most scikit-learn modeling algorithms, and scaling should be on for certain modeling algorithms learn effectively (e.g. artificial neural networks), and for if the user wishes to infer feature importances directly from certain algorithm's internal estimators (e.g. logistic regression).

- Parallelizability: Runs 'k' times for each target dataset being analyzed (where k is number of CV partitions)
- Run Time: Typically fast, with the exception of imputing larger datasets with many missing values

Imputation This phase first conducts imputation to replace any remaining missing values in the dataset with a 'value guess'. While missing value imputation could be reasonably viewed as data manufacturing, it is a common practice and viewed here as a necessary 'evil' in order to run scikit-learn modeling algorithms downstream (which mostly require complete datasets). Imputation is completed prior to scaling since it can influence the correct center and scale to be used.

Missing value imputation seeks to make a reasonable, educated guess as to the value of a given missing data entry. By default, STREAMLINE uses 'mode imputation' for all categorical values, and multivariate imputation for all quantitative features. However, for larger datasets, multivariate imputation can be slow and require a lot of memory. Therefore, the user can deactivate multiple imputation with the *multi_impute* parameter, and STREAMLINE will use median imputation for quantitative features instead.

Scaling Second, this phase conducts feature scaling with scikit-learn's 'StandardScaler' to transform features to have a mean at zero with unit variance. This is only necessary for certain modeling algorithms, but it should not hinder the performance of other algorithms. The primary drawback to scaling prior to modeling is that any future

data applied to the model will need to be scaled in the same way prior to making predictions. Furthermore, for algorithms that have directly interpretable models (e.g. decision tree), the values specified by these models need to be un-scaled in order to understand the model in the context of the original data values. STREAMLINE includes a ‘Useful Notebook’ that can generate direct model visualizations for decision tree and genetic programming models. This code automatically un-scales the values specified in these models so they retain their interpretability.

- Output: (1) Learned imputation and scaling strategies for each training dataset are saved as pickled objects allowing any replication or other future data to be identically processed prior to running it through the model. (2) If *overwrite_cv* is False, new imputed and scaled copies of the training and testing datasets are saved as CSV output files, otherwise the old dataset files are overwritten with these new ones to save space.

S.2.1.3: Phase 3 - Feature Importance Estimation

This phase applies feature importance estimation algorithms (i.e. Mutual information (MI) and MultiSURF (20), found in the ReBATE software package) used as filter-based feature selection algorithms. Both algorithms are run by default, however the user can deactivate either using *do_mutual_info* or *do_multisurf*, respectively. MI scores features based on their univariate association with outcome, while MultiSURF scores features in a manner that is sensitive to both univariate and epistatic (i.e. multivariate feature interaction) associations.

For datasets with a larger number of features (i.e. > 10,000) we recommend turning on the TuRF (21) wrapper algorithm with *use_turf*, which has been shown to improve the sensitivity of MultiSURF to interactions, particularly in larger feature spaces. Users can increase the number of TuRF iterations (and performance) by decreasing *turf_pct* from 0.5, to approaching 0. However, this will significantly increase MultiSURF run time.

Overall, this phase is important not only for subsequent feature selection, but as an opportunity to evaluate feature importance estimates prior to modeling outside of the initial univariate analyses (conducted on the entire dataset). Further, comparing feature rankings between MI, and MultiSURF can highlight features that may have little or no univariate effects, but that are involved in epistatic interactions that are predictive of outcome.

- Parallelizability: Runs ‘k’ times for each algorithm (MI and MultiSURF) and each target dataset being analyzed (where k is number of CV partitions)
- Run Time: Typically reasonably fast, but takes more time to run MultiSURF, in particular as the number of training instances approaches the default *instance_subset* parameter of 2000 instances, or if this parameter set higher in larger datasets. This is because MultiSURF scales quadratically with the number of training instances.
- Output: CSV files of feature importance scores for both algorithms and each CV partition ranked from largest to smallest scores.

S.2.1.4: Phase 4 - Feature Selection

This phase uses the feature importance estimates learned in the prior phase to conduct feature selection using a ‘collective’ feature selection approach (22). By default, STREAMLINE will remove any features from the training data that scored 0 or less by both feature importance algorithms (i.e. features deemed uninformative). Users can optionally ensure retention of all features prior to modeling by setting *filter_poor_features* to False. Users can also

specify a maximum number of features to retain in each training dataset using *max_features_to_keep* (which can help reduce overall pipeline runtime and make learning easier for modeling algorithms). If after removing 'uninformative features' there are still more features present than the user specified maximum, STREAMLINE will pick the unique top scoring features from one algorithm then the next until the maximum is reached and all other features are removed. Any features identified for removal from the training data are similarly removed from the testing data.

- Parallelizability: Runs 'k' times for each target dataset being analyzed (where k is number of CV partitions)
- Run Time: Fast
- Output: (1) CSV files summarizing feature selection for a target dataset (i.e. how many features were identified as informative or uninformative within each CV partition) and (2) a barplot of mean feature importance scores (across CV partitions). The user can specify the maximum number of top scoring features to be plotted using *top_fi_features*.

S.2.1.5: Phase 5 - Machine Learning (ML) Modeling

At the heart of STREAMLINE, this phase conducts (1) machine learning modeling using the training data, (2) model feature importance estimation (also with the training data), and (3) model evaluation on testing data. STREAMLINE uniquely includes 3 rule-based machine learning algorithms: ExSTraCS, XCS, and eLCS. These 'learning classifier systems' have been demonstrated to be able to detect complex associations while providing human interpretable models in the form of IF:THEN rule-sets. The ExSTraCS algorithm was developed by our research group to specifically handle the challenges of scalability, noise, and detection of epistasis and genetic heterogeneity in biomedical data mining.

- Parallelizability: Runs 'k' times for each algorithm and each target dataset being analyzed (where k is number of CV partitions)
- Run Time: Slowest phase, but can be sped up by reducing the set of ML methods selected to run, or deactivating ML methods that run slowly on large datasets

Model Selection The following 16 scikit-learn compatible ML modeling algorithms are currently included as options:

1. Naive Bayes (NB) (23) (*scikit-learn*)
2. Logistic Regression (LR) (24) (*scikit-learn*)
3. Elastic Net (EN) (25) (*scikit-learn*)
4. Decision Tree (DT) (26) (*scikit-learn*)
5. Random Forest (RF) (27) (*scikit-learn*)
6. Gradient Boosting (GB) (28) (*scikit-learn*)
7. XGBoost (XGB) (29) (*scikit-learn compatible*)
8. LGBost (LGB) (30) (*scikit-learn compatible*)

9. CatBoost (CGB) (31) (*scikit-learn compatible*)
10. Support Vector Machine (SVM) (32) (*scikit-learn*)
11. Artificial Neural Network (ANN) (33) (*scikit-learn*)
12. K-Nearest Neighbors (k-NN) (34) (*scikit-learn*)
13. Genetic Programming (GP) (35) (*GPLearn – scikit-learn compatible*)
14. Educational Learning Classifier System (eLCS) (36) (*scikit-learn compatible*)
15. ‘X’ Classifier System (XCS) (37) (*scikit-learn compatible*)
16. Extended Supervised Tracking and Classifying System (ExSTraCS) (38) (*scikit-learn compatible*)

NB, LR, EN, DT, RF, GB, SVM, ANN, and k-NN are all part of the standard scikit-learn package. XGB, LGB, CGB, GP, eLCS, XCS, and ExSTraCS are all separately imported scikit-learn compatible packages.

The first step is to decide which modeling algorithms to run. By default, STREAMLINE applies 14 of the 16 algorithms (excluding eLCS and XCS) it currently has built in. eLCS and XCS are currently experimental implementations of rule-based ML algorithms. Users can specify a specific subset of algorithms to run using *algorithms*, or alternatively indicate a list of algorithms to exclude from all available algorithms using *exclude*. STREAMLINE is also set up so that more advanced users can add other scikit-learn compatible modeling algorithms to run within the pipeline (as explained in ‘Adding New Modeling Algorithms’ in the documentation). This allows STREAMLINE to be used as a rigorous framework to easily benchmark new modeling algorithms in comparison to other established algorithms.

Modeling algorithms vary in the implicit or explicit assumptions they make, the manner in which they learn, how they represent a solution (as a model), how well they handle different patterns of association in the data, how long they take to run, and how complex and/or interpretable the resulting model can be. To reduce runtime in datasets with a large number of training instances, users can specify a limited random number of training instances to use in training algorithms that run slowly in such datasets using *training_subsample*.

In the STREAMLINE demo, we run only the fastest/simplest three algorithms (Naive Bayes, Logistic Regression, and Decision Tree), however these algorithms all have known limitations in their ability to detect complex associations in data. We encourage users to utilize a wider variety of the 14 established available algorithms, in their analyses, to give STREAMLINE the best opportunity to identify a best performing model for the given task (which is effectively impossible to predict for a given dataset ahead of time).

We recommend users utilize at least the following set of algorithms within STREAMLINE: Naive Bayes, Logistic Regression, Decision Tree, Random Forest, XGBoost, SVM, ANN, and ExSTraCS as we have found these to be a reliable set of algorithms with an array of complementary strengths and weaknesses on different problems. ExSTraCS is a rule-based machine learning algorithm in the sub-family of algorithms called learning classifier systems (LCS) that has been specifically adapted to the challenges of biomedical data analysis (38).

Hyperparameter Optimization Most machine learning algorithms have a variety of hyperparameter options that influence how the algorithm runs and performs on a given dataset. In designing STREAMLINE we sought to identify the full set of important hyperparameters for each algorithm, along with a comprehensive range of possible settings and hard-coded these into the pipeline. STREAMLINE adopts the ‘Optuna’ package to conduct automated Bayesian

optimization of hyperparameters for most algorithms by default. The evaluation metric 'balanced accuracy' is used to optimize hyperparameters as it takes class imbalance into account and places equal weight on the accurate prediction of both class outcomes. However, users can select an alternative metric with *primary_metric* and whether that metric needs to be maximized or minimized using the *metric_direction* parameter. To conduct the hyperparameter sweep, Optuna splits a given training dataset further, applying 3-fold cross validation to generate further internal training and validation partitions with which to evaluate different hyperparameter combinations.

Users can also configure how Optuna operates in STREAMLINE with *n_trials* and *timeout* which controls the target number of hyperparameter value combination trials to conduct, as well as how much total time to try and complete these trials before picking the best hyperparameters found. To ensure reproducibility of the pipeline, note that *timeout* should be set to 'None' (however this can take much longer to complete depending on other pipeline settings).

Notable exceptions to most algorithms; Naive Bayes has no parameters to optimize, and rule-based (i.e. LCS) ML algorithms including ExSTraCS, eLCS, and XCS can be computationally expensive thus STREAMLINE is set to use their default hyperparameter settings without a sweep unless the user updates *do_lcs_sweep* and *lcs_timeout*. While these LCS algorithms have many possible hyperparameters to manipulate they have largely stable performance when leaving most of their parameters to default values. Exceptions to this include the key LCS hyperparameters (1) number of learning iterations, (2) maximum rule-population size, and (3) accuracy pressure (nu), which can be manually controlled without a hyperparameter sweep by *lcs_iterations*, *lcs_N*, and *lcs_nu*, respectively.

- Output: CSV files specifying the optimized hyperparameter settings found by Optuna for each partition and algorithm combination.

Train 'Optimized' Model Having selected the best hyperparameter combination identified for a given training dataset and algorithm, STREAMLINE now retrains each model on the entire training dataset using those respective hyperparameter settings. This yields a total of 'k' potentially 'optimized' models for each algorithm.

- Output: All trained models are pickled as python objects that can be loaded and applied later.

Model Feature Importance Estimation Next, STREAMLINE estimates and summarizes model feature importance scores for every algorithm run. This is distinct from the initial feature importance estimation phase, in that these estimates are specific to a given model as a useful part of model interpretation/explanation. By default, STREAMLINE employs scikit-learn's 'permutation feature importance' for estimating feature importances scores in the same uniform manner across all algorithms. Some ML algorithms that have a build in strategy to gather model feature importance estimates (i.e. LR,DT,RF,XGB,LGB,GB,eLCS,XCS,ExSTraCS). The user can instead use these estimates by setting *use_uniform_fi* to 'False'. This will direct STREAMLINE to report any available internal feature importance estimate for a given algorithm, while still utilizing permutation feature importance for algorithms with no such internal estimator.

- Output: All feature importance scores are pickled as python objects for use in the next phase of the pipeline.

Evaluate Performance The last step in this phase is to evaluate all trained models using their respective testing datasets. A total of 16 standard classification metrics calculated for each model including: balanced accuracy, standard accuracy, F1 Score, sensitivity (recall), specificity, precision (positive predictive value), true positives, true negatives,

false positives, false negatives, negative predictive value, likelihood ratio positive, likelihood ratio negative, area under the ROC, area under the PRC, and average precision of PRC.

- Output: All evaluation metrics are pickled as python objects for use in the next phase of the pipeline.

S.2.1.6: Phase 6 - Post-Analysis

This phase combines all modeling results to generate summary statistics files, generate results plots, and conduct non-parametric statistical significance analysis comparing ML performance across CV runs.

- Output (Evaluation Metrics):
 - Testing data evaluation metrics for each CV partition - CSV file for each modeling algorithm
 - Mean testing data evaluation metrics for each modeling algorithm - CSV file for mean, median, and standard deviation
 - ROC and PRC curves for each CV partition in contrast with the average curve - ROC and PRC plot for each modeling algorithm
 - The generation of these plots can be turned off with *exclude_plots*
 - Summary ROC and PRC plots - compares average ROC or PRC curves over all CV partitions for each modeling algorithm
 - Boxplots for each evaluation metric - comparing algorithm performance over all CV partitions
 - * The generation of these plots can be turned off with *exclude_plots*
- Output (Model Feature Importance):
 - Model feature importance estimates for each CV partition - CSV file for each modeling algorithm
 - Boxplots comparing feature importance scores for each CV partition - CSV file for each modeling algorithm
 - Composite feature importance barplots illustrating mean feature importance scores across all algorithms (2 versions)
 - * Feature importance scores are normalized prior to visualization
 - * Feature importance scores are normalized and weighted by mean model performance metric (balanced accuracy by default)
 - The metric used to weight this plot can be changed with *metric_weight*
 - Number of top scoring features illustrated in feature importance plots is controlled by *top_model_fi_features*
- Output (Statistical Significance):
 - Kruskal Wallis test results assessing whether there is a significant difference for each performance metric among all algorithms - CSV file
 - * For any metric that yields a significant difference based on *sig_cutoff*, pairwise statistical tests between algorithms will be conducted using both the Mann Whitney U and the Wilcoxon Rank Test.

- Pairwise statistical tests between algorithms using both the Mann Whitney U-test and the Wilcoxon Rank Test - CSV file for each statistic and significance test.
- Parallelizability: Runs once for each target dataset being analyzed.
- Run Time: Moderately fast - turning off some figure generation can make this phase faster

S.2.1.7: Phase 7 - Compare Datasets

This phase should be run when STREAMLINE was applied to more than one target dataset during the 'experiment'. It applies further non-parametric statistical significance testing between datasets to identify if performance differences were observed among datasets comparing (1) the best performing algorithms or (2) on an algorithm-by-algorithm basis. It also generates plots to compare performance across datasets and examine algorithm performance consistency.

- Parallelizability: Runs once - not parallelizable
- Run Time: Fast
- Output (Comparing Best Performing Algorithms for each Metric):
 - Kruskal Wallis test results assessing whether there is a significant difference between median CV performance metric among all datasets focused on the best performing algorithm for each dataset - CSV file
 - * For any metric that yields a significant difference based on *sig_cutoff* pairwise statistical tests between datasets will be conducted using both the Mann Whitney U-test and the Wilcoxon Rank Test
 - Pairwise statistical tests between datasets focused on the best performing algorithm for each dataset using both the Mann Whitney U-test and the Wilcoxon Rank Test - CSV file for each significance test.
- Output (Comparing Algorithms Independently):
 - Kruskal Wallis test results assessing whether there is a significant difference for each median CV performance metric among all datasets - CSV file for each algorithm
 - * For any metric that yields a significant difference based on *sig_cutoff*, pairwise statistical tests between datasets will be conducted using both the Mann Whitney U-test and the Wilcoxon Rank Test
 - Pairwise statistical tests between datasets using both the Mann Whitney U-test and the Wilcoxon Rank Test - CSV file for each significance test and algorithm

S.2.1.8: Phase 8 - Replication

This phase of STREAMLINE is only run when the user has further hold out data, i.e. one or more 'replication' datasets, which will be used to re-evaluate all models trained on a given target dataset. This means that this phase would need to be run once to evaluate the models of each original target dataset. Notably, this phase would be the first time that all models are evaluated on the same set of data which is useful for more confidently picking a 'best' model

and further evaluating model generalizability and its ability to replicate performance on data collected at different times, sites, or populations.

To run this phase the user needs to specify the filepath to the target dataset to be replicated with *dataset_for_rep* as well as the folderpath to the folder containing one or more replication datasets using *rep_data_path*.

This phase begins by conducting an initial exploratory data analysis (EDA) on the new replication dataset(s), followed by uniquely processing versions of the replication dataset(s) to correspond with each original CV training dataset, yielding the same number of features (but not necessarily the same number of instances). This processing includes cleaning of instances in replication data that have no outcome or with a missingness over the user-defined threshold. Then to ensure that the same features exist in the replication data that existed in the respective model's original training set, feature engineering creates the same one-hot-encoded categorical features, as well as the same 'missingness features' previously generated. If a new categorical feature values is observed (that didn't exist in the original training data for one-hot-encoding) this new value is treated as 'missing' in replication data by assigning 0's to all one hot encoded values for that feature. Similarly, with respect to feature cleaning, the same features removed in respective training data are removed from the corresponding replication dataset (i.e. features marked for exclusion or features removed due to high missingness, high feature correlation, or removed during feature selection. Then EDA is repeated to confirm processing of the replication dataset and generate a feature correlation heatmap, however univariate analyses are not repeated on the replication data.

Next all models previously trained for the target dataset are re-evaluated across all metrics using each replication dataset with results saved separately. Similarly, all model evaluation plots (with the exception of feature importance plots) are automatically generated. As before non-parametric statistical tests are applied to examine differences in algorithm performance.

- Parallelizability: Runs once for each replication dataset being analyzed for a given target dataset.
- Run Time: Moderately fast
- Output: Similar outputs to Phase 1 minus univariate analyses, and similar outputs to Phase 6 minus feature importance assessments.

S.2.1.9: Phase 9 – Summary Report

This final phase generates a pre-formatted PDF report summarizing (1) STREAMLINE run parameters, (2) key exploratory analysis for the processed target data, (3) key ML modeling results (including metrics and feature importances), (4) dataset comparisons (if relevant), (5) key statistical significance comparisons, and (6) runtime. STREAMLINE collects run-time information on each phase of the pipeline and for the training of each ML algorithm model.

Separate reports are generated representing the findings from running Phases 1-7, i.e. 'Testing Data Evaluation Report', as well as for Phase 8 if run on replication data, i.e. 'Replication Data Evaluation Report'.

- Parallelizability: Runs once - not parallelizable
- Run Time: About a minute
- Output: One or more PDF reports

S.2.2: Benchmark Datasets

Much of the text describing the GAMETES and x-bit multiplexer datasets below directly quotes our previous STREAMLINE paper [1], which we are replicating in the benchmarking analyses below. Note that since the STREAMLINE codebase has changed, even though we are using the same random seed for these analyses, the CV partitions will not be the same as previous analyses, so the results are not expected to be exactly the same (i.e. we expect to see different performance for different algorithms and different CV partitions due to differences in data partitioning as well as stochastic differences in hyperparameter optimization sweep). However, we expect similar overall performance.

S.2.2.1: HCC Benchmark Data

Real-World HCC Dataset The first benchmarking dataset (`hcc_data.csv`) is an example of a real-world biomedical classification task. This is a Hepatocellular Carcinoma (HCC) dataset taken from the UCI Machine Learning Repository. It includes 165 instances, 49 features, and a binary class label. It also includes a mix of categorical and quantitative features (however all categorical features are binary), about 10% missing values, and class imbalance, i.e. 63 deceased (class = 1), and 102 survived (class 0).

Custom Simulated HCC Dataset The second benchmarking dataset (`hcc_data_custom.csv`) is similar to the first, but we have made a number of modifications to it in order to test the data cleaning and feature engineering functionalities of STREAMLINE.

Modifications include the following:

- Removal of covariate features (i.e. ‘Gender’ and ‘Age at diagnosis’)
- Addition of two simulated instances with a missing class label (to test basic data cleaning)
- Addition of two simulated instances with a high proportion of missing values (to test instance missingness data cleaning)
- Addition of three simulated, numerically encoded categorical features with 2, 3, or 4 unique values, respectively (to test one-hot-encoding)
- Addition of three simulated, text-valued categorical features with 2, 3, or 4 unique values, respectively (to test one-hot-encoding of text-based features)
- Addition of three simulated quantitative features with high missingness (to test feature missingness data cleaning)
- Addition of three pairs of correlated quantitative features (6 features added in total), with correlations of -1.0, 0.9, and 1.0, respectively (to test high correlation data cleaning)
- Addition of three simulated features with (1) invariant feature values, (2) all missing values, and (3) a mix of invariant values and missing values.

These simulated features and instances have been clearly identified in the feature names and instances IDs of this dataset.

Custom Simulated HCC Replication Dataset The last demo dataset (`hcc_data_custom_rep.csv`) was simulated as a mock replication dataset for `hcc_data_custom.csv`. To generate this dataset we first took `hcc_data_custom.csv` and for 30% of instances randomly generated realistic looking new values for each feature and class outcome (effectively adding noise to this data). Furthermore, we simulated further instances that test the ability of STREAMLINE’s one-hot-encoding to ignore new (as-of-yet unseen) categorical features values during STREAMLINE’s replication phase. If this were to happen, the new value would be ignored (i.e. no new feature columns added).

Modifications included adding a simulated instance that includes a new (as-of-yet unseen) value for the following previously simulated features:

- The binary text-valued categorical feature
- The 3-value text-valued categorical feature
- The binary numerically encoded categorical feature
- The 3-value numerically encoded categorical feature
- We also added a new, previously unseen feature value to each of the invariant feature columns.

The code to generate the additional features and instances within the custom `hcc_data_custom.csv` and `hcc_data_custom_rep.csv` can be found in the notebook at `/data/Generate_Expanded_HCC_dataset.ipynb`.

HCC Analysis With STREAMLINE We applied STREAMLINE to analyze and compare both the HCC and custom HCC datasets. For the replication phase we evaluated the custom HCC dataset using its corresponding simulated custom replication dataset to validate the efficacy of replication data preparation and model evaluation. See the first page of ‘`hcc_exp_STREAMLINE_Report.pdf`’ in the supplementary materials for all STREAMLINE run parameters used in this analysis.

We repeated this analysis twice in parallel using a fixed number of Optuna trials and no time limit to confirm the replicability of STREAMLINE.

S.2.2.2: GAMETES Benchmark Data

We evaluated 6 genomics datasets simulated with GAMETES (39) using a newer version of the code extended to simulated additive and heterogeneous associations (<https://github.com/UrbsLab/GAMETES/tree/v2.2>). Each dataset was modeled with a different underlying pattern of association to illustrate how STREAMLINE can be utilized to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of different ML algorithms in different contexts. Each dataset simulated 100 single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) as features and included 1600 instances using a minor allele frequency of 0.2 for relevant features and the ‘easiest’ model architecture generated for each configuration using the GAMETES simulation approach. All irrelevant features were randomly simulated with a minor allele frequency between 0.05 and 0.5. We detail dataset differences here (A) Univariate association between a single feature and outcome with 1 relevant and 99 irrelevant features and a heritability of 0.4, (B) Additive combination of 4 univariate associations with 4 relevant and 96 irrelevant features and heritability of 0.4 for each relevant feature, (C) Heterogeneous combination of 4 univariate associations, i.e. each univariate association is only predictive in a respective quarter of instances (with all else the same as dataset B), (D) Pure 2-way feature interaction with 2 relevant and 98 irrelevant features and heritability of 0.4, (E) Heterogeneous combination of 2 independent pure 2-way feature interactions with 4 relevant and 96 irrelevant features and heritability of 0.4 for each 2-way interaction (used in above sections for figure

examples), and (F) Pure 3-way feature interaction with 3 relevant and 97 irrelevant features and heritability of 0.2 (i.e. the most difficult dataset).

GAMETES Analysis With STREAMLINE We applied STREAMLINE to analyze and compare all 6 GAMETES datasets, treating all features as quantitative unless it had only two possible values in the training (largely in-line with the original 0.2.5 STREAMLINE analysis which was not set up to apply one-hot-encoding). No replication data was applied in this analysis as the ground truth in these dataset simulations is known. See the first page of ‘gametes_exp_STREAMLINE_Report.pdf’ in the supplementary materials for all STREAMLINE run parameters used in this analysis.

When STREAMLINE conducts modeling in the datasets discussed so far, ExSTraCS, which was trained without a hyperparameter sweep, is set to run with hyperparameters ($nu = 1$, rule population size = 2K, and training iterations = 200K), where the nu setting represents the emphasis on discovering and keeping rules with maximum accuracy. Previous work suggests that $nu = 1$ is more effective in noisy data, while a nu of 5 or 10 is more effective in clean data (i.e. no noise) (38).

S.2.2.3: Multiplexer Benchmark Data

We applied STREAMLINE to 6 different x -bit multiplexer (MUX) binary classification benchmark datasets (i.e. 6, 11, 20, 37, 70, and 135-bit) often utilized to evaluate ML algorithms such as RBML (20, 36, 37, 38). Like GAMETES dataset ‘E’, these MUX datasets involve both feature interactions and heterogeneous associations with outcome, but differently involve binary features and a clean association with outcome. The ‘ x ’-bit value denotes the number of relevant features underlying the association, and increasing values from 6 to 135 dramatically scale up the complexity of the underlying pattern of association. Specifically, solving the 6-bit problem involves modeling 4 independent 3-way interactions, while the 135-bit problem involves modeling

128 independent 8-way interactions. In these datasets, all features are relevant to solving the problem, where a subset of features serves as ‘address bits’ which point to one of the remaining ‘register bits’. The value of that corresponding register bit indicates the correct outcome (i.e. 0 or 1). No replication data was applied in this analysis as the ground truth in these dataset simulations is known.

Previous work benchmarking MultiSURF on these datasets indicated that these address bits would yield the largest feature importance scores of all features in the dataset, as these features are important for the correct prediction of every instance in the dataset (20).

In other previous work, the ExSTraCS algorithm was the first ML demonstrated to directly model the 135-bit problem successfully, in a dataset including 40K training instances, with hyperparameters ($nu = 10$, rule population size = 10K, and training iterations = 1.5 million) (38). ExSTraCS has the advantage over other ML algorithms of using the feature importance estimates from MultiSURF. In this study, 6 to 135-bit datasets were generated with 500, 1000, 2000, 5000, 10000, and 20000 instances, respectively, with 90% of each used by STREAMLINE for training (due to 10-fold CV). In previous work, it was demonstrated that larger numbers of instances are required to solve or nearly solve increasingly complex MUX problems. In contrast with modeling on the noisy datasets, for the MUX datasets, ExSTraCS was assigned the following hyperparameter settings: $nu = 10$, rule population size = 5K, and training iterations = 500K. As such, we do not expect ExSTraCS to be able to solve the 135-bit problem in this analysis.

S.2.2.4: XOR Benchmark Data

We evaluated 4 simulated ‘XOR’ datasets with models manually generated and respective datasets simulated with GAMETES [39] using (<https://github.com/UrbsLab/GAMETES/tree/v2.2>). This benchmark was not previously applied to STREAMLINE v0.2.5. These datasets are designed to examine the capability of ML algorithms (and the STREAMLINE pipeline as a whole) to detect increasingly high dimensional pure n-way interactions (i.e. 2-way, 3-way, 4-way, and 5-way). Each dataset simulated 20 single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) as features and included 1600 instances. Unlike the other GAMETES datasets (described above), but like the multiplexer datasets, these data are simulated to have a perfectly clean signal, such that it is possible to train models with 100% testing accuracy. These are the same XOR datasets previously used to benchmark the ReBATE suite of Relief-based feature selection algorithms, including ‘MultiSURF (20)’. All features in this analysis were treated as quantitative unless it had only two possible values in the training (largely in-line with the original 0.2.5 STREAMLINE analysis which was not set up to apply one-hot-encoding). No replication data was applied in this analysis as the ground truth in these dataset simulations is known.

In that previous work, we found that MultiSURF failed to prioritize the correct predictive features in the case of 4-way and 5-way pure interactions. More specifically those features actually scored the most ‘negative’ of all feature values. Traditionally, Relief-based algorithms are applied by prioritizing the most positively scoring features, and/or removing features with a score ≤ 0 , and this is how we have implemented feature selection with MultiSURF in STREAMLINE. However, based on the results in [20] as well as in the current study (see S.3.4), we hypothesize that Relief-based algorithms should prioritize features based on the absolute value of their scores in order to detect higher order interactions (i.e. 4-way interactions and above). Preliminary work supports this hypothesis, and future work will seek to improve STREAMLINE’s current feature selection strategy to better account for the possible presence of high order interactions (which currently most research and benchmarking of algorithms does not explicitly consider), by taking the absolute value of MultiSURF scoring into account.

S.2.3: Obstructive Sleep Apnea Data

Here we provide a detailed summary of the SAGIC OSA dataset a total of 3111 instances, unique instance IDs, class/outcome (encoded by AHI threshold), and features including demographics (DEM), comorbidities (DX), symptoms (SYM), craniofacial measures from photos (CF), and intraoral measures from photos (IO). **Table S3** provides summary statistics for original SAGIC dataset. **Table S4** provides a key explaining all features, their group, type and any underlying encoding. A total of 85 features are available in datasets with all feature groups. The two Mallampati score classifications include “Frontal, Tongue Extended Maximally” (FTEM), and “Tongue in Mouth, No Phonation” (TIMNPH) (40).

Feature	Count	Missing Values	Unique Values	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min	25%	Median	75%	Max
subnum	3111	0	3111	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
class (AHI \geq 15)	3111	0	2	0.45323	0.497888	0	0	0	1	1
class (AHI \geq 5)	3111	0	2	0.688525	0.463171	0	0	1	1	1
age	3111	0	73	49.97653	13.93849	17	39	50	60	89
male	3111	0	2	0.604629	0.489009	0	0	1	1	1
bmi	3111	0	2426	29.75954	7.049058	17.03923	25.01352	28.3737	32.92469	75.30469
caucasian	3104	7	2	0.308956	0.462137	0	0	0	1	1
aframer	3104	7	2	0.037371	0.1897	0	0	0	0	1
asian	3104	7	2	0.378222	0.485021	0	0	0	1	1
csamer	3104	7	2	0.209407	0.406951	0	0	0	0	1
other	3104	7	2	0.066044	0.248399	0	0	0	0	1
medhx_hbp	2537	574	2	0.44659	0.497237	0	0	0	1	1
medhx_cad	2517	594	2	0.097735	0.297016	0	0	0	0	1
medhx_heart_fail	2520	591	2	0.04127	0.198953	0	0	0	0	1
medhx_stroke	2526	585	2	0.034046	0.181383	0	0	0	0	1
medhx_ldl	2489	622	2	0.451185	0.497711	0	0	0	1	1
medhx_dm	2525	586	2	0.127129	0.333183	0	0	0	0	1
medhx_afib	2293	818	2	0.060183	0.237878	0	0	0	0	1
loud_snore	2571	540	5	2.054842	1.729045	0	0	2	4	4
gasping	2554	557	5	1.287001	1.558197	0	0	0	3	4
choke	2554	557	5	1.100235	1.512753	0	0	0	2	4
map_index	2582	529	15	1.487284	1.3244	0	0	1.333333	2.666667	4
upper_face_depth	3108	3	86	10.0705	0.983102	6.7	9.4	10.1	10.7	14.9
mid_face_depth	3106	5	85	10.7872	0.980476	7.8	10.1	10.8	11.4	15.1
low_face_depth	3110	1	94	12.91204	1.149739	9.5	12.1	12.9	13.6	19
max_depth_angle	3104	7	355	84.44965	6.580233	8.9	80.2	84.4	88.7	107.6
mand_depth_angle	3108	3	337	77.01638	6.260158	8.9	72.8	76.95	81.3	97.6
max_mand_rel_angle	3106	5	191	7.445419	2.978375	-3.3	5.5	7.3	9.4	18.3
facial_axis_angle	3108	3	417	30.97631	7.939419	6.1	25.5	30.7	36.4	60.8
photo_upper_face_ht	3109	2	60	7.211444	0.626629	5.3	6.8	7.2	7.6	9.9
nose_ht	3105	6	52	4.995208	0.501182	3.4	4.7	5	5.3	11.4
photo_low_face_ht	3107	4	67	6.168555	0.695872	3.9	5.7	6.1	6.6	9.3
mand_length	3108	3	89	7.77684	1.028879	4.4	7.1	7.7	8.4	13
mand_length_dia	3108	3	85	9.548668	1.001957	6.6	8.9	9.5	10.1	13.8
post_mand_ht	3110	1	74	6.737971	0.947212	3.7	6.1	6.7	7.4	10.5
mand_plane_angle	3109	2	422	11.29391	7.808057	-15.9	6	11.3	16.3	46.5
photo_mand_angle	3073	38	512	114.158	10.24584	10.1	108.6	114.3	120.1	159.5
max_mand_box_area	3106	5	479	54.66754	9.55144	10.1	47.9	54.2	60.875	105.6
cranial_base_tri_area	3109	2	463	66.1554	9.033765	4.2	60.2	65.5	71.6	113.9
max_tri_area	3107	4	478	70.8823	9.490196	4.3	64.4	70.4	76.7	117.1
mand_tri_area	3111	0	419	39.48905	8.109848	7.2	33.8	38.8	43.9	82
mid_cran_fossa_vol	3105	6	889	109.475	21.77432	7.3	94.6	107.2	122.39	217.2
head_posit_angle	3109	2	386	12.65574	7.282256	-11.2	8.2	13.2	17.5	35.5
max_volume	3104	7	1344	159.8664	69.70423	5.9	130.375	152	177.6	1565.3

mand_vol	3111	0	1513	142.8338	49.46381	6.9	107.2	138.3	172.3	365.8
max_mand_vol	3104	7	1892	302.4981	94.83212	6.9	244.3	290.2	345.15	1753.6
ant_mand_ht	3111	0	58	3.918666	0.545831	2.1	3.6	3.9	4.3	7
man_nas_ang	3106	5	290	40.04895	4.977194	8.5	36.8	39.9	43.4	60.9
man_sub_ang	3104	7	364	57.18392	6.654066	7	52.7	57.1	61.4	84.4
hea_inc_ang	3108	3	377	19.68565	7.200343	-5.3	14.8	19.8	24.7	42
cer_ang	2836	275	751	154.3691	18.35592	8.3	141.985	154.345	166.2	262.3
face_width	3111	0	88	13.11694	0.954734	4.8	12.5	13.1	13.7	17.6
mand_width	3111	0	97	11.00771	1.208481	5.4	10.2	10.9	11.8	17.2
intercant_width	3099	12	44	3.341488	0.402077	2.3	3.1	3.3	3.6	5.1
biocular_width	3099	12	67	8.711707	0.728143	6.7	8.2	8.6	9.1	12
nose_width	3110	1	44	3.952251	0.425781	2.7	3.7	3.9	4.2	6.2
lat_fac_ht	3107	4	80	10.31225	0.984748	7.5	9.6	10.3	11	14.3
man_wid_len_ang	3111	0	405	74.33594	7.909022	10.6	68.8	73.9	79.5	103.9
fac_wid_fac_dep_ang	3107	4	282	62.32664	4.798661	12.3	59.2	62.2	65.4	79.2
fac_wid_low_fac_dep_ang	3111	0	258	54.6636	4.162312	12.4	51.9	54.6	57.2	71.8
eye_width	3099	12	62	2.68511	0.352662	1.65	2.45	2.65	2.85	4.15
face_eye_width	3099	12	960	4.952678	0.616253	3.2	4.529776	4.938776	5.348332	7.210526
face_height_width	3105	6	1170	0.854631	0.101542	0.584416	0.8	0.848	0.907143	4.270833
mand_width_length	3108	3	1333	0.711906	0.104744	0.398438	0.642857	0.709677	0.776596	2.407407
face_upper_lower	3105	6	611	0.816738	0.098053	0.530864	0.75	0.8125	0.877193	1.282051
face_height_depth	3104	7	1125	1.039679	0.100866	0.766667	0.971963	1.031747	1.098928	2.594937
cranial_mand_area	3109	2	2945	1.714797	0.272733	0.583333	1.527972	1.690073	1.87766	4.04
face_nose_width	3110	1	686	3.346333	0.33184	2.22807	3.121951	3.333333	3.552632	5.032258
open_wid_tim_nph	3085	26	2909	5.66042	0.854845	3.516	5.042679	5.599256	6.227113	10.02625
ver_mou_ope	3080	31	2908	4.671383	0.916921	2.141	4.012679	4.616064	5.261602	8.531904
open_area_tim_nph	3080	31	3040	19.71676	6.062227	4.523	15.3255	18.88386	23.3019	47.19128
tongue_width_tim_nph	2754	357	2606	4.744686	0.596651	2.179	4.36924	4.756935	5.141194	6.713906
open_wid_f_te_m	3000	111	2838	5.820935	0.715308	3.688	5.322976	5.79759	6.286839	9.03
tongue_length_f	2955	156	2820	5.382951	1.107808	1.28297	4.6385	5.378722	6.129566	9.477
tongue_width_f_te_m	3026	85	2831	5.035716	0.600539	3.145094	4.626886	5.02608	5.412897	7.64877
ton_are	2954	157	2922	22.84309	6.453854	5.264	18.3635	22.44592	26.68929	63.407
tongue_length_p_te_m	3042	69	2865	4.272597	0.805157	1.36538	3.763103	4.281134	4.799724	8.895
tongue_area_p_te_m	3041	70	2956	5.698665	1.979176	0.082545	4.31	5.530136	6.842665	29.382
tongue_thickness_p_te_m	3036	75	2717	1.533286	0.311344	0.48	1.324	1.511668	1.723153	2.923578
tongue_curvature_p_te_m	3042	69	2915	5.012658	1.208547	1.258	4.116	4.983812	5.860505	8.987571
mal_score_fitem_c1	2836	275	2	0.048307	0.214453	0	0	0	0	1
mal_score_fitem_c2	2836	275	2	0.068759	0.253088	0	0	0	0	1
mal_score_fitem_c3	2836	275	2	0.150917	0.358031	0	0	0	0	1
mal_score_fitem_c4	2836	275	2	0.732017	0.442987	0	0	1	1	1
mal_score_timnph_c1	2943	168	2	0.06524	0.24699	0	0	0	0	1
mal_score_timnph_c2	2943	168	2	0.067618	0.251132	0	0	0	0	1
mal_score_timnph_c3	2943	168	2	0.086646	0.281364	0	0	0	0	1
mal_score_timnph_c4	2943	168	2	0.780496	0.413981	0	1	1	1	1

Table S3: Summary Statistics for SAGIC Obstructive Sleep Apnea Data. Includes the entire original dataset prior to replication data partitioning, and internal STREAMLINE k-fold CV partitioning.

Column Name	Feature Group	Description	Feature Type/Encoding
subnum	NA	unique SAGIC instance ID including site identifier	NA
class (AHI \geq 15)	NA	OSA binary outcome encoded by AHI \geq 15 or AHI \geq 5	Binary/Categorical (0=No OSA, 1=OSA)
class (AHI \geq 5)	NA	OSA binary outcome encoded by AHI \geq 5	Binary/Categorical (0=No OSA, 1=OSA)
age	DEM	What is your age?	Quantitative
male	DEM	Are you male?	Binary/Categorical (0=Female, 1=Male)
bmi	DEM	Body Mass Index kg/m**2	Quantitative
caucasian	DEM	Caucasian Race/Ethnicity	Binary/Categorical(0=Not, 1=Caucasian)
aframer	DEM	African American Race/Ethnicity	Binary/Categorical(0=Not, 1=African Am.)
asian	DEM	Asian Race/Ethnicity	Binary/Categorical(0=Not, 1=Asian)
csamer	DEM	Central/South American Race/Ethnicity	Binary/Categorical(0=Not, 1=Cen/South Am.)
other	DEM	Other Race/Ethnicity	Binary/Categorical(0=Not, 1=Other)
medhx_hbp	DX	Have you been diagnosed with high blood pressure?	Binary/Categorical(0=No, 1=Yes)
medhx_cad	DX	Ever Diagnosed with CAD (Angina, MI, Heart Attack)?	Binary/Categorical(0=No, 1=Yes)
medhx_heart_fail	DX	Have you ever been diagnosed with heart failure?	Binary/Categorical(0=No, 1=Yes)
medhx_stroke	DX	Have you ever had a stroke?	Binary/Categorical(0=No, 1=Yes)
medhx_ldl	DX	Have you ever been told that you have high cholesterol and/or triglycerides?	Binary/Categorical(0=No, 1=Yes)
medhx_dm	DX	Have you been diagnosed with diabetes?	Binary/Categorical(0=No, 1=Yes)
medhx_afib	DX	Have you ever been diagnosed with atrial fibrillation?	Binary/Categorical(0=No, 1=Yes)
loud_snore	SYM	Frequency of loud snoring symptom from the Multivariable Apnea Prediction (MAP) Index	Ordinal/Quantitative: 0 = None/Don't Know, 1 = Rarely (less than once a week), 2 = Sometimes (1-2 times a week), 3 = Frequently (3-4 times a week), 4 = Always (5-7 times a week)
gasping	SYM	Frequency of snorting or gasping symptom from the Multivariable Apnea Prediction (MAP) Index	Ordinal/Quantitative: 0 = None/Don't Know, 1 = Rarely (less than once a week), 2 = Sometimes (1-2 times a week), 3 = Frequently (3-4 times a week), 4 = Always (5-7 times a week)
choke	SYM	Frequency of breathing stops or witnessed apneas from the Multivariable Apnea Prediction (MAP) Index	Ordinal/Quantitative: 0 = None/Don't Know, 1 = Rarely (less than once a week), 2 = Sometimes (1-2 times a week), 3 = Frequently (3-4 times a week), 4 = Always (5-7 times a week)
map_index	SYM	Multivariable Apnea Prediction (MAP) Index Score	Quantitative (0-4)
upper_face_depth	CF	Upper Face Depth	Quantitative
mid_face_depth	CF	Middle Face Depth	Quantitative
low_face_depth	CF	Lower Face Depth	Quantitative
max_depth_angle	CF	Maxillary Depth Angle	Quantitative
mand_depth_angle	CF	Mandibular Depth Angle	Quantitative
max_mand_rel_angle	CF	Maxillary-Mandibular Relationship Angle	Quantitative
facial_axis_angle	CF	Facial Axis Angle	Quantitative
photo_upper_face_ht	CF	Upper Face Height	Quantitative
nose_ht	CF	Nose Height	Quantitative
photo_low_face_ht	CF	Lower Face Height	Quantitative
mand_length	CF	Mandibular Length	Quantitative
mand_length_dia	CF	Mandibular Length Diagonal	Quantitative
post_mand_ht	CF	Posterior Mandibular Height	Quantitative
mand_plane_angle	CF	Mandibular Plane Angle	Quantitative
photo_mand_angle	CF	Mandibular Angle	Quantitative
max_mand_box_area	CF	Maxillary-Mandibular Box Area	Quantitative
cranial_base_tri_area	CF	Cranial Base Triangular Area	Quantitative
max_tri_area	CF	Maxillary Triangular Area	Quantitative
mand_tri_area	CF	Mandibular Triangular Area	Quantitative
mid_cran_fossa_vol	CF	Middle Cranial Fossa Volume	Quantitative
head_posit_angle	CF	Natural Head Position Angle	Quantitative
max_volume	CF	Maxillary Volume	Quantitative
mand_vol	CF	Mandibular Volume	Quantitative
max_mand_vol	CF	Maxillary-Mandibular Volume	Quantitative

ant_mand_ht	CF	Anterior Mandibular Height	Quantitative
man_nas_ang	CF	Mandibular-Nasion Angle	Quantitative
man_sub_ang	CF	Mandibular-Subnasion Angle	Quantitative
hea_inc_ang	CF	Head Base Inclination Angle	Quantitative
cer_ang	CF	Cervicomenal Angle	Quantitative
face_width	CF	Face Width	Quantitative
mand_width	CF	Mandibular Width	Quantitative
intercant_width	CF	Intercanthal Width	Quantitative
biocular_width	CF	Biocular Width	Quantitative
nose_width	CF	Nose Width	Quantitative
lat_fac_ht	CF	Lateral Face Height	Quantitative
man_wid_len_ang	CF	Mandibular Width to Length Angle	Quantitative
fac_wid_fac_dep_ang	CF	Face Width to Middle Face Depth Angle	Quantitative
fac_wid_low_fac_dep_ang	CF	Face Width to Lower Face Depth Angle	Quantitative
eye_width	CF	Eye Width ((biocular_width - intercant_width)/2)	Quantitative
face_eye_width	CF	Face Width :: Eye Width	Quantitative
face_height_width	CF	Face Height::Width	Quantitative
mand_width_length	CF	Mandibular Width::Length	Quantitative
face_upper_lower	CF	Upper Face Height::Lower Face Height	Quantitative
face_height_depth	CF	Face Height::Depth	Quantitative
cranial_mand_area	CF	Cranial Mandibular Area	Quantitative
face_nose_width	CF	Face Width :: Nose Width	Quantitative
open_wid_tim_nph	IO	Mouth Opening Width (Tongue in Mouth, No Phonation)	Quantitative
ver_mou_ope	IO	Vertical Mouth Opening (Tongue in Mouth, No Phonation)	Quantitative
open_area_tim_nph	IO	Mouth Opening Area (Tongue in Mouth, No Phonation)	Quantitative
tongue_width_tim_nph	IO	Tongue Width (Tongue in Mouth, No Phonation)	Quantitative
open_wid_f_te_m	IO	Mouth Opening Width (Frontal, Tongue Extended)	Quantitative
tongue_length_f	IO	Tongue Length (Frontal, Tongue Extended)	Quantitative
tongue_width_f_te_m	IO	Tongue Width (Frontal, Tongue Extended)	Quantitative
ton_are	IO	Tongue Area (Frontal, Tongue Extended)	Quantitative
tongue_length_p_te_m	IO	Tongue Length (Profile, Tongue Extended)	Quantitative
tongue_area_p_te_m	IO	Tongue Area (Profile, Tongue Extended)	Quantitative
tongue_thickness_p_te_m	IO	Tongue Thickness (Profile, Tongue Extended)	Quantitative
tongue_curvature_p_te_m	IO	Tongue Curvature (Profile, Tongue Extended)	Quantitative
mal_score_ftem_c1	IO	Mallampati Score Class I (FTEM)	Binary/Categorical (0=No, 1=Yes)
mal_score_ftem_c2	IO	Mallampati Score Class II (FTEM)	Binary/Categorical (0=No, 1=Yes)
mal_score_ftem_c3	IO	Mallampati Score Class III (FTEM)	Binary/Categorical (0=No, 1=Yes)
mal_score_ftem_c4	IO	Mallampati Score Class IV (FTEM)	Binary/Categorical (0=No, 1=Yes)
mal_score_timnph_c1	IO	Mallampati Score Class I (TIMNPH)	Binary/Categorical (0=No, 1=Yes)
mal_score_timnph_c2	IO	Mallampati Score Class II (TIMNPH)	Binary/Categorical (0=No, 1=Yes)
mal_score_timnph_c3	IO	Mallampati Score Class III (TIMNPH)	Binary/Categorical (0=No, 1=Yes)
mal_score_timnph_c4	IO	Mallampati Score Class IV (TIMNPH)	Binary/Categorical (0=No, 1=Yes)

Table S4: Variable Key - SAGIC Obstructive Sleep Apnea Data

Dataset ID	Feature Set(s) Included	AHI cutoff	Full Dataset Name
A	DEM	AHI \geq 15 events/hour	A_GE15_DEM
B	DX	AHI \geq 15 events/hour	B_GE15_DX
C	SYM	AHI \geq 15 events/hour	C_GE15_SYM
D	CF	AHI \geq 15 events/hour	D_GE15_CF
E	IO	AHI \geq 15 events/hour	E_GE15_IO
F	DEM+DX	AHI \geq 15 events/hour	F_GE15_DEMDX
G	DEM+DX+SYM	AHI \geq 15 events/hour	G_GE15_DEMDXSYM
H	DEM+DX+SYM+CF	AHI \geq 15 events/hour	H_GE15_DEMDXSYMCF
I	DEM+DX+SYM+IO	AHI \geq 15 events/hour	I_GE15_DEMDXSYMIO
J	DEM+DX+SYM+CF+IO	AHI \geq 15 events/hour	J_GE15_DEMDXSYMCFIO
K	DEM	AHI \geq 5 events/hour	K_GE5_DEM
L	DX	AHI \geq 5 events/hour	L_GE5_DX
M	SYM	AHI \geq 5 events/hour	M_GE5_SYM
N	CF	AHI \geq 5 events/hour	N_GE5_CF
O	IO	AHI \geq 5 events/hour	O_GE5_IO
P	DEM+DX	AHI \geq 5 events/hour	P_GE5_DEMDX
Q	DEM+DX+SYM	AHI \geq 5 events/hour	Q_GE5_DEMDXSYM
R	DEM+DX+SYM+CF	AHI \geq 5 events/hour	R_GE5_DEMDXSYMCF
S	DEM+DX+SYM+IO	AHI \geq 5 events/hour	S_GE5_DEMDXSYMIO
T	DEM+DX+SYM+CF+IO	AHI \geq 5 events/hour	T_GE5_DEMDXSYMCFIO

Table S5: Constructed SAGIC Datasets for Analysis

S.2.3.1: Development and Replication Datasets

Included in the SAGIC dataset instance identifiers is the site/location where the data was collected.

Below we provide the unique study/data collection site IDs:

- BER = Germany (Berlin)
- BRA = Brazil
- ICE = Iceland
- OSU = USA (Ohio State)
- PEN = USA (UPenn)
- WES = Australia (Perth)
- SYD = Australia (Sydney)
- TAI = Taiwan
- BEI = China (Beijing)

Once the 20 datasets listed in Table S4 were constructed we applied a Jupyter Notebook ‘OSA_Replication_Data_Splitter.ipynb’ (available upon request), which split each of these datasets into respective development and replication sets. All data partitioning in this study (both here and during internal STREAMLINE CV partitioning) randomly assigned instances to partitions, i.e. instances from a given site are not kept together as a hold out evaluation set, in order to avoid possible underlying site-specific collection differences/biases. For datasets with the same binary OSA class definition (i.e. AHI \geq 15 or AHI \geq 5), the exact same set of instances comprise the development and replication sets to ensure within-group comparability. However, between these two dataset groups, different instances are included in development and replication sets because different instances are labeled as having either a 0 (no OSA) or 1 (OSA) outcome with a subsequently different degree of ‘class balance’.

Specifically, $AHI \geq 15$ datasets all have $\sim 45.3\%$ OSA (i.e. class 1), and $AHI \geq 5$ datasets all have $\sim 68.9\%$ OSA (i.e. class 1). Thus while $AHI \geq 15$ datasets are relatively ‘balanced’, $AHI \geq 5$ datasets have a more significant degree of imbalance which is taken into account during model evaluation. After this initial partitioning, $AHI \geq 15$ development datasets have 2178 instances and replication datasets have 933 instances, while $AHI \geq 5$ development datasets have 2179 instances and replication datasets have 932 instances.

S.2.3.2: OSA Data Analyses with STREAMLINE

Refer to ‘sagic_exp_STREAMLINE_Report.pdf’ (Page 1) for all STREAMLINE run parameter settings used in this analysis. We ran this complete analysis across all 20 development datasets using STREAMLINE phases 1-7, and then ran separate phase 8 replication analyses for each of the 20 respective replication datasets.

Subsequently, we re-ran phase 7 ‘dataset comparison’ (on it’s own, without retraining models) on different subsets of the 20 datasets to generate simpler and more targeted comparisons between (1) $AHI \geq 15$ vs. $AHI \geq 5$ datasets, (2) all datasets with just one feature group included, and (3) datasets with just one feature group included for $AHI \geq 15$ vs. $AHI \geq 5$ datasets, separately.

S.2.4: Study-Wide STREAMLINE Run Parameters

While STREAMLINE run parameters for each ‘experiment’ are documented on the first page of their respective PDF reports (in supplemental materials), here we document the relevant STREAMLINE run parameters that were consistent across all experiments and analyses.

- CV Partitions: 10
- Partition Method: Stratified
- Statistical Significance Cutoff: 0.05
- Random Seed: 42
- Use Mutual Information: True
- Use MultiSURF: True
- Use TURF: False
- Max Features to Keep: 2000
- Top Features to Display: 40
- Export Feature Importance Plot: True
- Engineering Missingness Cutoff: 0.5
- Cleaning Missingness Cutoff: 0.5
- Correlation Removal Threshold: 1.0
- List of Exploratory Analysis Ran: ['Describe', 'Univariate Analysis', 'Feature Correlation']
- List of Exploratory Plots Saved: ['Describe', 'Univariate Analysis', 'Feature Correlation']
- Use Data Scaling: True
- Use Data Imputation: True

- Use Multivariate Imputation: True
- Overwrite CV Datasets: True
- Artificial Neural Network: True
- Category Gradient Boosting: True
- Decision Tree: True
- Elastic Net: True
- ExSTraCS: True
- Extreme Gradient Boosting: True
- Genetic Programming: True
- Gradient Boosting: True
- K-Nearest Neighbors: True
- Light Gradient Boosting: True
- Logistic Regression: True
- Naive Bayes: True
- Random Forest: True
- Support Vector Machine: True
- XCS: False
- eLCS: False
- Primary Metric: balanced_accuracy
- Uniform Feature Importance Estimation (Models): True
- Hyperparameter Sweep Number of Trials: 200
- Hyperparameter Timeout: 900
- Stats and Figure Settings:
- Export ROC Plot: True
- Export PRC Plot: True
- Export Metric Boxplots: True
- Export Feature Importance Boxplots: True
- Metric Weighting Composite FI Plots: balanced_accuracy
- Top Model Features To Display: 40

S.3 Results

Note, that all results figures below and in main text were automatically generated by STREAMLINE (some were minorly edited in Adobe Illustrator to move legends or create multi-panel figures. STREAMLINE is also set up with supporting code in the form of ‘Useful Notebooks’ allowing users to re-generate plots to their own formatting specifications. Included in these supplementary materials are PDF reports for each STREAMLINE ‘experiment’. However, detailed results files, models, and other automatically saved STREAMLINE output files can also be made available upon request (ryan.urbanowiz@cshs.org).

S.3.1: HCC Benchmark Results

S.3.1.1: Simulated ‘Custom’ HCC Validates Automated Data Processing

First, examination of the `hcc_data_custom` data processing results validated the efficacy of the STREAMLINE phase 1 data processing (i.e. cleaning and feature engineering. Specifically, all simulated features and instances designed to be cleaned or engineered were done so correctly. Referring to ‘`hcc_exp_STREAMLINE_Report.pdf`’ (Page 3) note that `hcc_data` does not have any changes to feature or instance count as the result of cleaning or engineering. However, on (Page 4) we observe the following correct data processing of the simulated `hcc_data_custom` dataset:

- **C1:** 2 instances missing an outcome label are removed (note that class counts don’t change because those class labels were missing to begin with)
- **E1:** 3 categorical features are added to the dataset representing newly engineered missingness features for the 3 features in this dataset with a missingness > 0.5 .
- **C2:** 6 features are removed (4 categorical and 2 quantitative) including the original 3 features with high missingness and 3 features with invariant values.
- **C3:** 2 instances are removed with missingness > 0.5
- **E2:** One-hot-encoding replaces 4 non-binary categorical features with binary features for each feature’s possible categories. Specifically 14 features are added and 4 are removed yielding a net gain of 10 binary categorical features.
- **C4:** 2 pairs of features in this data are perfectly correlated. One of each pair is removed for a net reduction of two quantitative features

Now referring to ‘`hcc_exp_STREAMLINE_Replication_Report.pdf`’ (Page 2) which summarizes the replication evaluation of `hcc_data_custom` using `hcc_data_custom_rep`, we correctly observed that C1 removes 3 instances missing the class label, and R1 processes the rest of this data in the same way as for `hcc_data_custom`, yielding the same number of features as well as confirming Phase 8’s ability to handle as-of-yet unobserved categorical values occurring in the replication data (i.e. replacing them with NA for binary categorical features, and adding 0 values for all one-hot-encoded features for that original feature.

S.3.1.2: Original HCC Benchmark Results

Refer to ‘`hcc_exp_STREAMLINE_Report.pdf`’ (Pages 2,3,5,6,&7) for EDA and modeling results for the `hcc_data` dataset. We review major results below.

Figure S1 includes ROC and PRC plots comparing mean algorithm performance. XGB yielded the best ROC-AUC of 0.800 (0.127). In this dataset there is a reasonable degree of class imbalance (63 deceased, and 102 survived in the original dataset) so it is best here to focus instead balanced accuracy and on PRC-AUC results. EN yielded the best balanced accuracy of 0.728 (0.067) and SVM yielded the best PRC-AUC of 0.718 (0.107). **Figure S2** gives the PRC plot for SVM comparing each of 10-fold CV models trained, and illustrating reasonably high variance in performance across partitions. This is reasonably expected given the small sample size of this dataset and highlights the importance of evaluating models across CV partitions in order to evaluate the impact of partitioning-based sample bias. **Figure S3** gives permutation-based model feature importance estimates for each algorithm (averaged across all 10-CV models for each algorithm).




Figure S1: Original HCC Data - Comparing Mean Algorithm Performance. (A) ROC plot comparing algorithm performance. (B) PRC plot comparing algorithm performance. For both, each line represents mean algorithm performance across 10 CV models. Area under the curve (AUC) is provided for both, and average precision (APS) is included for PRC.




Figure S2: Original HCC Data - PRC Plot of SVM performance across individual CV Models.




Figure S3: Original HCC Data – Mean Model Feature Importance Estimates Across all Algorithms. This composite feature importance plot illustrates normalized and (balanced accuracy)-weighted mean FI scores summed across all algorithms. Only the top 40 features are displayed.

Table S6 compares the performance of our previous STREAMLINE HCC benchmarking (v0.2.5) [1] with the current (v0.3.4). Mean model performances were similar, if not slightly higher, however the performance metric standard deviation was also significantly larger, suggesting a larger degree of random partitioning sample bias than in the earlier benchmarking run. Replication data was not available for the HCC benchmarking, and the dataset was too small to reasonably hold out further data for replication, however these results suggest that this new release of STREAMLINE is performing as expected, yielding similar top performance metrics, and similar top model feature importance estimates.

Metric	v0.2.5		v0.3.4	
	Best Algorithm	Benchmark Testing Evaluation	Best Algorithm	Benchmark Testing Evaluation
ROC AUC	SVM	0.777 (0.049)	XGB	0.800 (0.127)
PRC AUC	CGB	0.635 (0.076)	SVM	0.718 (0.107)
Balanced Accuracy	RF	0.724 (0.013)	EN	0.728 (0.067)
F1 Score	RF	0.662 (0.008)	EN	0.667 (0.094)

Table S6: Best Mean Algorithm Performance Between STEAMLINe versions on HCC. Each value represents the mean metric value (with standard deviation) across 10-fold CV trained models for that algorithm. Here the ‘best’ model is selected for each individual metric for comparison.

Notably the results highlight the fact that there is no clear ‘winning’ algorithm that performs best across all evaluation metrics or CV partitions, and on this particular dataset most algorithms perform similarly well with respect to PRC-AUC, with the exception of DT and GP.

GAMETES Dataset	v0.2.5		v0.3.4	
	Best Algorithm	Benchmark Testing Evaluation	Best Algorithm	Benchmark Testing Evaluation
A - univariate	RF	0.842 (0.022)	XGB	0.847 (0.035)
B - uni-4add	XGB	0.983 (0.009)	XGB	0.983 (0.007)
C - uni-4het	CGB	0.672 (0.040)	CGB	0.671 (0.042)
D - 2way-epistasis	ExSTraCS	0.854 (0.028)	ExSTraCS	0.852 (0.025)
E - 2way epi+2het	ExSTraCS	0.740 (0.040)	ExSTraCS	0.746 (0.026)
F - 3way epistasis	ExSTraCS	0.564 (0.114)	SVM	0.511 (0.042)

Table S7: Best Mean Algorithm ROC-AUC Between STREAMLINE versions on GAMETES Datasets. Each value represents the mean metric value (with standard deviation) across 10-fold CV trained models for that algorithm. Here the ‘best’ model is selected for each individual metric for comparison.

S.3.2: GAMETES Benchmark Results

Refer to ‘gametes_exp_STREAMLINE_Report.pdf’ for EDA and modeling results for all 6 of the simulated GAMETES datasets. We review major results below. These datasets are balanced, so we can confidently focus on ROC-AUC as the key performance metric. **Table S7** compares the performance of our previous STREAMLINE GAMETES benchmarking (v0.2.5) [1] with the current (v0.3.4). As expected, mean model ROC-AUCs were very similar between the two analyses.

Figure S4 similarly compares mean model performance across all algorithms and datasets using STREAMLINE v0.2.5 vs v0.3.4. Similar to what was observed for v0.2.5 [1], dataset (A), i.e. univariate, all algorithms performed similarly well, with NB (instead of KNN) performing the least well. For dataset (B), i.e. additive univariate, all algorithms performed similarly well, with SVM (instead of NB) performing the least well. For dataset (C), i.e. heterogeneous univariate, CGB, XGB, EN, LGB, RF, GB, and ExSTraCS performed best, while NB, KNN, and GP performed the least well. For dataset (D), i.e. pure 2-way epistasis, we observed the first dramatic performance differences with ExSTraCS, CGB, LGB, XGB, and GB performing similarly at the top, while NB, LR, and DT entirely failed to detect the 2-feature interaction. For dataset (E), i.e. heterogeneous pure 2-way epistasis, ExSTraCS and CGB stood out as top performers, while again NB, LR, and DT entirely failed. Lastly, for dataset (F), i.e. pure 3-way epistasis, all algorithms struggled with this noisy complex association. Notably in this run even ExSTraCS failed to detect the correct noisy complex association. As would be expected, no algorithm stands out as being ideal across all data scenarios.

Also, as before, model feature importance estimates correctly prioritized the ground-truth important features in these simulations. For example, **Figure S5** illustrates the correct identification of features M0P0 and M0P1 (involved in a pure, epistatic interaction) out of a total 100 features in the original dataset. Additionally, **Figure S6** illustrates the correct identification of features M0P0, M0P1, M1P0, and M1P1 (which represent two independently simulated 2-way epistatic interactions, i.e. M0P0xM0P1, M1P0xM1P1, that are each predictive in half of the simulated instances of the original dataset). We can observe here how different algorithms succeed or fail in their ability to handle both interactions and heterogeneous associations.

In summary, these results suggest that this new release of STREAMLINE is performing as expected, yielding similar top performance metrics, and similar top model feature importance estimates.




Figure S4: GAMETES Dataset Performance Comparison. (A). STREAMLINE v0.2.5 analysis (B) STREAMLINE v0.3.4 analysis. Each algorithm line represents mean ROC-AUC across 10-fold CV models. Each plot's formatting is different given that it was automatically generated with different versions of the AutoML, and the newest version has added the EN algorithm.




Figure S5: GAMETES Dataset D (2-Way Epistasis) Model Feature Importance. This composite feature importance plot illustrates normalized and (balanced accuracy)-weighted mean FI scores summed across all algorithms. Only the top 40 features are displayed.




Figure S6: GAMETES Dataset E (2-Way Epi+2 Het) Model Feature Importance. This composite feature importance plot illustrates normalized and (balanced accuracy)-weighted mean FI scores summed across all algorithms. Only the top 40 features are displayed. In this dataset only MOP0, MOP1, M1P0, and M1P1 are predictive.

S.3.3: Multiplexer Benchmark Results

Refer to ‘multiplexer_exp_STREAMLINE_Report.pdf’ for EDA and modeling results for all 6 of the benchmark multiplexer datasets. We review major results below. These datasets are also balanced, so we can confidently focus on ROC-AUC as the key performance metric. **Table S8** compares the performance of our previous STREAMLINE multiplexer benchmarking (v0.2.5) [1] with the current (v0.3.4). As expected, mean model ROC-AUCs were very similar between the two analyses. We attribute minor performance differences to any pipeline variations based on the use of ‘random’, i.e. stochasticity, including the partitioning of training/testing CV sets, which will not be exactly the same in running v0.2.5 and v0.3.4.

Multiplexer Dataset	v0.2.5		v0.3.4	
	Best Algorithm	Benchmark Testing Evaluation	Best Algorithm	Benchmark Testing Evaluation
A – 6-bit	10-way tie	1.000 (0.000)	11-way tie	1.000 (0.000)
B – 11-bit	8-way tie	1.000 (0.000)	RF	0.982 (0.013)
C – 20-bit	5-way tie	1.000 (0.000)	ExSTraCS	0.968 (0.026)
D – 37-bit	ExSTraCS	1.000 (0.000)	ExSTraCS	0.938 (0.021)
E – 70-bit	ExSTraCS	0.992 (0.016)	ExSTraCS	0.908 (0.051)
F – 135-bit	LGB	0.559 (0.016)	SVM	0.556 (0.009)

Table S8: Best Mean Algorithm ROC-AUC Between STEAMLINe versions on Multiplexer Datasets. Each value represents the mean metric value (with standard deviation) across 10-fold CV trained models for that algorithm. Here the ‘best’ model is selected for each individual metric for comparison.

Figure S7 similarly compares mean model performance across all algorithms and datasets using STREAMLINE v0.2.5 vs v0.3.4. Similar to what was observed in v0.2.5 (1), for the 6-bit dataset, most algorithms solved the problem similarly well with the exception of EN, LR, and NB which are not expected to handle complex interactions in data. These algorithms performed similarly poorly on all other (more complicated) multiplexer datasets. For the 11-bit dataset, GP joined the list of poor performing algorithms, and unlike in v0.2.5, no algorithm solved this dataset with 100% testing accuracy (likely due to variations in CV partitioning), with RF performing slightly best. For the 20-bit dataset, CGB, ExSTraCS, XGB, GB, LGB, and RF performed best, with DT and K-NN significantly dropping in performance. For the 37-bit dataset, ExSTraCS and LGB performed best with XGB and GB seeing some more significant drop in performance. For the 70-bit dataset, ExSTraCS performed far better than any other algorithm (see **Figure S8**).

Figure S9 illustrates how ExSTraCS correctly prioritizes ‘address’ bit features in model testing. And lastly, for the 135-bit dataset, no algorithm performed well, but SVM performed slightly better than others. While ExSTraCS had previously been demonstrated to be able to perform well even on the 135-bit multiplexer problem, in this analysis only 18K instances were available for model training, when previous work required 40K instances for ExSTraCS to closely solve the 135-bit MUX where a staggering $4.36e40$ unique binary instances make up the problem space (38). In this particular benchmark analysis, ExSTraCS stands out clearly as the best-performing algorithm. Overall this analysis highlights the capability of RBML algorithms such as ExSTraCS to perform competitively and sometimes better than other well-established ML modeling approaches.





Figure S7: Multiplexer Dataset Performance Comparison. (A). STREAMLINE 0.2.5 analysis (B) STREAMLINE 0.3.4 analysis. Each algorithm line represents mean ROC-AUC across 10-fold CV models. Each plot's formatting is different given that it was automatically generated with different versions of the AutoML, and the newest version has added the EN algorithm.




Figure S8: 70-bit Multiplexer ROC Plot Comparing Mean Algorithm Performance. A composite feature importance plot illustrating the mean, normalized and balanced-accuracy weighted permutation feature importance estimates for each algorithm. Each line represents mean algorithm performance across 10 CV models. Area under the curve (AUC) is provided.




Figure S9: 70-bit Multiplexer – Mean Model Feature Importance Estimates Across all Algorithms. This composite feature importance plot illustrates normalized and (balanced accuracy)-weighted mean FI scores summed across all algorithms. Only the top 40 features are displayed. In this dataset all features are predictive, but A_0, A_1, A_2, A_3, A_4, and A_5 are expected to be most predictive.

S.3.4: XOR Benchmark Results

Refer to ‘xor_exp_STREAMLINE_Report.pdf’ for EDA and modeling results for all 4 of the benchmark xor datasets. We review major results below. These datasets are also balanced, so we can confidently focus on ROC-AUC as the key performance metric. **Table S9** and **Figure S10** highlight the performance of STREAMLINE v0.3.4 on these datasets that had not been previously evaluated using STREAMLINE v0.2.5. For the 2-way dataset, 8 algorithms solve it perfectly, and DT, KNN, and SVM do reasonably well, with EN, LR, and NB failing. For the 3-way dataset, 5 algorithms (including CGB, ExSTraCS, XGB, GB, and LGB) solve it perfectly, and RF performing reasonably well, with all other algorithms failing. For the 4 and 5-way datasets, no algorithm performed well. This result was not initially expected, as previous work applying ExSTraCS suggested it should be well suited to detecting even higher-order interactions.

	v0.3.4	
Multiplexer Dataset	Best Algorithm	Benchmark Testing Evaluation
A – 2-way	8-way tie	1.000 (0.000)
B – 3-way	5-way tie	1.000 (0.000)
C – 4-way	DT	0.519
D – 5-way	LR	0.542

Table S9: Best Mean Algorithm ROC-AUC in STEAMLINE v0.3.4 on XOR Datasets. Each value represents the mean metric value (with standard deviation) across 10-fold CV trained models for that algorithm. Here the ‘best’ model is selected for each individual metric for comparison.




Figure S10: XOR Dataset Performance Comparison. STREAMLINE v0.3.4 analysis. Each algorithm line represents mean ROC-AUC across 10-fold CV models.

However, this failure can be explained (not as an issue with all modeling algorithms) but due to the default strategy implemented by STREAMLINE to remove features during feature selection. Specifically, in the current implementation of STREAMLINE, phase 4 automatically removes any features from the respective training and testing datasets that yielded a score of 0 or lower for both the mutual information and MultiSURF algorithms (when filter-feat is set to True, i.e. the current default setting). This is based on the current working assumption that only a positive score for these algorithms is indicative of a potentially important feature. As mentioned above, we previously observed that MultiSURF would yield highly negative scores for predictive features involved in a high order interaction (i.e. 4-way and above) (20). We thus noticed that predictive features were being removed prior to ML modeling in the 3-way and 4-way dataset analyses (see **Figure S11**).




Figure S11: 4-way XOR Pre-Modeling Median Feature Importance Scores. (A) Mutual Information, (B) MultiSURF. In this dataset, simulated predictive features include M0P1, M0P2, M0P3, and M0P4.

Thus, we re-ran this experiment setting STREAMLINE’s filter-feat parameter to False, to keep all features in the dataset regardless of initial feature importance scoring by mutual information or MultiSURF. **Table S10** and **Figure S12** presents the results of this follow-up analysis. In this secondary analysis, performance results for algorithms were very similar for 2-way and 3-way, but as expected for the 4-way XOR, ExSTraCS now stood out as performing close to 100%, with CGB and GB doing fairly well, at around 82%. Further behind was XGB and LGB achieving closer to 60% and all algorithms failing. **Figure S13** illustrates model feature importance estimates for this 4-way XOR dataset, showing how the models that performed best focused on the correct interacting predictive features. On the 5-way XOR dataset, no algorithms performed well, but out of these, ExSTraCS performed best. This is most likely a result of the ‘curse of dimensionality’ and having a relatively small sample size available to detect such a high order interaction (41). It is likely that with a larger number of instances, ExSTraCS (and possibly other ML algorithms evaluated) would be able to perform better on this benchmark problem.

	v0.3.4 – no feature selection	
Multiplexer Dataset	Best Algorithm	Benchmark Testing Evaluation
A – 2-way	7-way tie	1.000 (0.000)
B – 3-way	5-way tie	1.000 (0.000)
C – 4-way	ExSTraCS	0.98 ()
D – 5-way	ExSTraCS	0.522 ()

Table S10: Best Mean Algorithm ROC-AUC in STEAMLINe v0.3.4 on XOR Datasets (no feature selection). Each value represents the mean metric value (with standard deviation) across 10-fold CV trained models for that algorithm. Here the ‘best’ model is selected for each individual metric for comparison.




Figure S12: XOR Dataset Performance Comparison (no feature selection). STEAMLINe v0.3.4 analysis. Each algorithm line represents mean ROC-AUC across 10-fold CV models.




Figure S13: XOR 4-way Dataset Mean Model Feature Importance Estimates Across all Algorithms. This composite feature importance plot illustrates normalized and (balanced accuracy)-weighted mean FI scores summed across all algorithms. In this dataset, simulated predictive features include MOP1, MOP2, MOP3, and MOP4.

These results highlight the need to further improve the feature selection strategy utilized in Phase 4 of STREAMLINE in future releases, in particular to address the (likely) rare, but possible, presence of features involved in high order interactions with no univariate effects. Future work will specifically examine the reliability of employing absolute value feature ranking with MultiSURF and its impact on the detection of simple univariate effects, as well as increasingly complex interactions, and then adopt the most effective strategy within STREAMLINE.

S.3.5: Obstructive Sleep Apnea Results

Refer to ‘sagic_exp_STREAMLINE_Report.pdf’ for EDA and modeling results for all 20 variations of the SAGIC datasets. EDA and model performance results for respective replication datasets (A-T) are available upon request to the corresponding author (as their inclusion exceeded arxiv file size limits). Select plots and results are presented below to (1) demonstrate the diverse set of automated figures generated by STREAMLINE over subsequent phases, and (2) highlight major findings.

S.3.5.1: Initial Exploratory Data Analysis

Figure S14 first illustrates the difference in class balance in SAGIC development datasets (before data processing) where OSA is defined as either $AHI \geq 15$ or $AHI \geq 5$ events/hour. While $AHI \geq 15$ datasets are close to balanced, i.e. Class 0 = 1098 and Class 1 = 1080 (and can be primarily evaluated with ROC-AUC as the primary metric), $AHI \geq 5$ have reasonably imbalanced classes, i.e. Class 0 = 606 and Class 1 = 1573 (and should be primarily evaluated with PRC-AUC as the primary metric). Note, these respective class balances have been maintained in the corresponding replication datasets for each (stratified partitioning used).




Figure S14: Bar Plot of Class Balance in OSA Development Datasets (Before Processing). (A) Class counts for all 10 development datasets where OSA is defined as having $AHI \geq 15$ events/hour. These are closely balanced datasets. (B) Class counts for all 10 development datasets where OSA is defined as having $AHI \geq 5$ events/hour. These datasets have a reasonably large degree of class imbalance with more OSA than non-OSA.

Figure S15 give an example of missing value counts in one of the 20 OSA datasets analyzed (i.e. J) prior to processing. This plot is the same for all 20 datasets (prior to processing). The majority of the 85 total features had no missing values, however some other features had a fairly high degree of missingness, with 'medhx_afib' having the largest missing value count of 548.




Figure S15: Histogram of Missing Value Counts Across Features in J_GE15_DEMDXSYMCFIO Development Dataset. This dataset includes all features (across all feature groups) and a total of 2178 instances prior to data processing.

Figure S16 gives the Pearson correlation heatmap for one of the 20 OSA datasets analyzed (i.e. J) across all 85 features in the OSA data prior to processing. These correlations are the same for all $AHI \geq 15$ datasets, and very similar for all $AHI \geq 5$ datasets. There were no perfect correlations in any of the datasets, so no features were automatically removed by STREAMLINE using the default correlation cutoff of 1.0. However, we note that there are a number of reasonably high positive and negative correlations among features in this dataset with the strongest correlation observed between *mand_tri_area* and *mand_length_dia* (0.959), in all datasets.




Figure S16: Pearson Feature Correlations in J_GE15_DEMDXSYMCFIO Development Dataset. This dataset includes all features (across all feature groups) and a total of 2178 instances prior to processing.

S.3.5.2: Automated Data Processing

Table S11 and **Table S12** summarize the development datasets characteristics before and after automated STREAMLINE data processing (i.e. cleaning and feature engineering). Since in these datasets we had already one-hot-encoded categorical features, and no features had a missingness $> 50\%$, the only processing to take place on any of these

datasets was removing instances with high missingness (i.e. > 50%). STREAMLINE automatically removes instances with more than 50% missing values (by default), intended to avoid potential data quality issues when imputing missing values with multiple imputation when many other feature values for an instance are also missing. Note that even after processing, $AHI \geq 15$ datasets remained relatively balanced, and $AHI \geq 5$ datasets remained largely imbalanced (i.e. class ratio).

Dataset	Pre/Post Proc.	Instances	Total Features	Categorical Features	Quant. Features	Missing Values	Missing Percent	Class 0	Class 1	Class Ratio
A	Pre	2178	8	6	2	20	0.0011	1098	1080	1.02
A	Post	2174	8	6	2	0	0	1097	1077	1.02
B	Pre	2178	7	7	0	2877	0.1887	1098	1080	1.02
B	Post	1794	7	7	0	229	0.0182	840	954	0.88
C	Pre	2178	4	0	4	1442	0.1655	1098	1080	1.02
C	Post	1810	4	0	4	10	0.0014	855	955	0.90
D	Pre	2178	46	0	46	360	0.0036	1098	1080	1.02
D	Post	2178	46	0	46	360	0.0036	1098	1080	1.02
E	Pre	2178	20	8	12	2183	0.0501	1098	1080	1.02
E	Post	2139	20	8	12	1719	0.0402	1090	1049	1.04
F	Pre	2178	15	13	2	2897	0.0887	1098	1080	1.02
F	Post	1810	15	13	2	306	0.0113	852	958	0.89
G	Pre	2178	19	13	6	4339	0.1048	1098	1080	1.02
G	Post	1834	19	13	6	546	0.0157	867	967	0.90
H	Pre	2178	65	13	52	4699	0.0332	1098	1080	1.02
H	Post	2178	65	13	52	4699	0.0332	1098	1080	1.02
I	Pre	2178	39	21	18	6522	0.0768	1098	1080	1.02
I	Post	2166	39	21	18	6281	0.0743	1092	1074	1.02
J	Pre	2178	85	21	64	6882	0.0372	1098	1080	1.02
J	Post	2178	85	21	64	6882	0.0372	1098	1080	1.02

Table S11: $AHI \geq 15$ Development Dataset Characteristics Pre vs. Post STREAMLINE Processing.

Dataset	Pre/Post Proc.	Instances	Total Features	Categorical Features	Quant. Features	Missing Values	Missing Percent	Class 0	Class 1	Class Ratio
K	Pre	2179	8	6	2	25	0.0014	606	1573	0.39
K	Post	2174	8	6	2	0	0	605	1569	0.39
L	Pre	2179	7	7	0	2866	0.1879	606	1573	0.39
L	Post	1798	7	7	0	233	0.0185	447	1351	0.33
M	Pre	2179	4	0	4	1408	0.1615	606	1573	0.39
M	Post	1820	4	0	4	10	0.0014	449	1371	0.33
N	Pre	2179	46	0	46	336	0.0034	606	1573	0.39
N	Post	2179	46	0	46	336	0.0034	606	1573	0.39
O	Pre	2179	20	8	12	2170	0.0498	606	1573	0.39
O	Post	1961	20	8	12	1673	0.0391	603	1534	0.41
P	Pre	2179	15	13	2	2891	0.0885	606	1573	0.39
P	Post	1812	15	13	2	302	0.0111	450	1362	0.39
Q	Pre	2179	19	13	6	4299	0.1028	606	1573	0.39
Q	Post	1840	19	13	6	566	0.0162	457	1383	0.33
R	Pre	2179	65	13	52	4635	0.0327	606	1573	0.39
R	Post	2179	65	13	52	4635	0.0327	606	1573	0.39
S	Pre	2179	39	21	18	6469	0.0761	606	1573	0.39
S	Post	2168	39	21	18	6244	0.0738	600	1668	0.36
J	Pre	2179	85	21	64	6805	0.0367	606	1573	0.39
J	Post	2179	85	21	64	6805	0.0367	606	1573	0.39

Table S12: $AHI \geq 5$ Development Dataset Characteristics Pre vs. Post STREAMLINE Processing.

S.3.5.3: EDA Univariate Analyses on Processed Development Data

Here, we focus on the univariate analyses conducted in the two development datasets (after processing) with all feature subgroups (i.e. J and T). **Table S13** and **Table S14** give the top features univariately associated with outcome for $AHI \geq 15$ and $AHI \geq 5$ datasets, respectively. In these datasets, top features were all quantitative (i.e. evaluated with the Mann-Whitney U Test), however all categorical features were automatically evaluated with Chi-Square Test.

Feature	p-value	Test-Statistic	Test-Name
face_width	1.046e-51	371046.5	Mann-Whitney U Test
mand_width	1.414e-50	373520.5	Mann-Whitney U Test
bmi	1.082e-38	402018.5	Mann-Whitney U Test
max_mand_vol	9.671e-36	407717.0	Mann-Whitney U Test
max_tri_area	2.541e-34	412405.0	Mann-Whitney U Test
cer_ang	8.807e-31	342422.0	Mann-Whitney U Test
cranial_base_tri_area	1.530e-28	429862.5	Mann-Whitney U Test
mand_vol	3.194e-28	431267.5	Mann-Whitney U Test
mand_tri_area	6.906e-27	435382.0	Mann-Whitney U Test
max_mand_box_area	1.250e-26	434456.5	Mann-Whitney U Test

Table S13: Top Univariate Analyses for J_GE15_DEMDXSYMCFIO. Top 10 features, ranked by p-value.

Feature	p-value	Test-Statistic	Test-Name
bmi	1.060e-42	296375.5	Mann-Whitney U Test
mand_width	1.339e-40	301119	Mann-Whitney U Test
face_width	5.267e-38	307115	Mann-Whitney U Test
cer_ang	6.350e-33	258706.5	Mann-Whitney U Test
max_mand_vol	1.464e-30	323896.5	Mann-Whitney U Test
mand_vol	1.623e-27	333591	Mann-Whitney U Test
max_tri_area	1.865e-26	336101	Mann-Whitney U Test
loud_snore	1.721e-25	214783.5	Mann-Whitney U Test
mand_tri_area	4.203e-24	343357	Mann-Whitney U Test
lat_fac_ht	4.635e-24	342626	Mann-Whitney U Test

Table S14: Top Univariate Analyses for T_GE5_DEMDXSYMCFIO. Top 10 features, ranked by p-value.

Focusing on the most significant univariate association for each table, **Figure S17** gives a boxplot summary between classes for *face_width*, and **Figure S18** gives a boxplot summary between classes for *bmi*.




Figure S17: Most Significant Univariate Association for J_GE15_DEMDXSYMCFIO Development Dataset (*face_width*). Boxplot comparing *face_width* values between class 0 and class 1 as defined by $AHI \geq 15$.




Figure S18: Most Significant Univariate Association for T_GE5_DEMDXSYMCFIO Development Dataset (*bmi*). Boxplot comparing *bmi* values between class 0 and class 1 as defined by $AHI \geq 5$.

S.3.5.4: Pre-Modeling Feature Importance Estimation

Figure S19 and **Figures S20** give pre-modeling FI estimates for the two development datasets with all feature subgroups (i.e. J and T) after processing, CV partitioning, imputation, and scaling. These scores represent the median FI calculated by either Mutual Information (sensitive to univariate effects) or MultiSURF (sensitive to both univariate and interaction effects) over 10-fold CV training datasets. For dataset J in **Figure S19**, the three top scoring features are the same for both FI estimation algorithms, i.e. *mand_width*, *face_width*, and *bmi*. For dataset T in **Figure S20**, the top scoring feature for mutual information was *bmi*, but for MultiSURF it was *cer_ang*.




Figure S19: J_GE15_DEMDXSYMCFO Pre-Modeling Median FI Scores. Median FI scores across 10-fold CV training datasets (A) Mutual Information, (B) MultiSURF.




Figure S20: T_GE5_DEMDXSYMCFFIO Pre-Modeling Median FI Scores. Median FI scores across 10-fold CV training datasets (A) Mutual Information, (B) MultiSURF.

S.3.5.5: Development Data Testing Evaluations of Modeling

Figure 2 (main text) gives a global summary of model testing performance (with 14 ML algorithms) across all 20 OSA datasets differing in their encoding of OSA outcome (as either $AHI \geq 15$ or $AHI \geq 5$), and/or their inclusion of different available features sets. **Table S15** gives pairwise performance metric comparisons (using Wilcoxon Signed-Rank Test) between datasets having the same underlying features, e.g. A vs. K, indicate that balanced accuracy and ROC-AUC were consistently (but not always significantly) higher for models trained on $AHI \geq 5$ data. Notably, when focusing on PRC-AUC, GP models perform far better than any other algorithm for datasets B, C, E, L, M, and O (see **Figure S21**). However, closer inspection of other evaluation metrics for these GP models reveal that they are predicting class 1 for all testing instances (i.e. they have the maximum number of possible false positives, and thus are not useful models). Therefore, we replaced these GP models in our assessment with the next best scoring algorithm (as indicated by GP->'AlgorithmName' in **Table S15**). Even after this substitution, $AHI \geq 5$ datasets still yielded consistently and significantly higher PRC-AUC.

Metric	Data 1	Data 2	Feature Set(s)	Statistic	p-value	Data 1 Best Algorithm	Data 1 Median (AHI \geq 15)	Data 2 Best Algorithm	Data 2 Median (AHI \geq 5)
Balanced Accuracy	A	K	DEM	15	0.232422	CGB	0.674879	XGB	0.702773
	B	L	DX	22	0.625	GP	0.55878	XGB	0.57963
	C	M	SYM	8	0.048828	LGP	0.623776	XGB	0.654582
	D	N	CF	22	0.625	LR	0.678416	XGB	0.693432
	E	O	IO	15	0.232422	LR	0.60168	EN	0.612221
	F	P	DEM+DX	24	0.769531	XGB	0.661979	SVM	0.688487
	G	Q	DEM+DX+SYM	19	0.431641	ExSTraCS	0.690846	ExSTraCS	0.695652
	H	R	DEM+DX+SYM+CF	5	0.019531	ExSTraCS	0.694347	ExSTraCS	0.718696
	I	S	DEM+DX+SYM+IO	16	0.275391	ExSTraCS	0.685458	ExSTraCS	0.709368
	J	T	DEM+DX+SYM+CF+IO	8	0.048828	CGB	0.692929	EN	0.718936
ROC-AUC	A	K	DEM	14	0.193359	ExSTraCS	0.738696	RF	0.768363
	B	L	DX	19	0.431641	LGB	0.561623	LGB	0.58465
	C	M	SYM	16	0.275391	GB	0.660045	EN	0.679587
	D	N	CF	18	0.375	RF	0.734304	XGB	0.767255
	E	O	IO	25	0.845703	SVM	0.640454	RF	0.653842
	F	P	DEM+DX	8	0.048828	LGB	0.720548	ANN	0.761928
	G	Q	DEM+DX+SYM	16	0.275391	LGB	0.742128	EN	0.761972
	H	R	DEM+DX+SYM+CF	3	0.009766	ANN	0.766822	XGB	0.79297
	I	S	DEM+DX+SYM+IO	16	0.275391	LGB	0.7554	CGB	0.778981
	J	T	DEM+DX+SYM+CF+IO	7	0.037109	ANN	0.760819	GB	0.792941
PRC-AUC	A	K	DEM	0	0.001953	CGB	0.726915	CGB	0.873214
	B	L	DX	3	0.001152	GP	0.678069	GP -> DT	0.819413
	C	M	SYM	3	0.000157	GP	0.708505	GP -> LGB	0.862589
	D	N	CF	0	0.001953	XGB	0.719624	RF	0.87526
	E	O	IO	4	0.000157	EN	0.625999	GP -> RF	0.815426
	F	P	DEM+DX	0	0.001953	RF	0.735926	CGB	0.889826
	G	Q	DEM+DX+SYM	0	0.001953	LGB	0.749936	EN	0.89404
	H	R	DEM+DX+SYM+CF	0	0.001953	CGB	0.752545	XGB	0.894904
	I	S	DEM+DX+SYM+IO	0	0.001953	XGB	0.732568	SVM	0.892398
	J	T	DEM+DX+SYM+CF+IO	0	0.001953	RF	0.756443	EN	0.896618

Table S15: Pairwise Performance Comparisons of AHI \geq 15 vs. AHI \geq 5 Datasets with Same Feature Set(s).

Pairwise tests using the Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test. The testing metrics of the 10 CV models trained by the algorithm with the best median metric is the basis for this comparison. Metrics in this table include balanced accuracy, ROC-AUC, and PRC-AUC. Cells in green denote the larger median performance of the pair. The cells in blue point out the dataset/algorithm combination where the highest median metric value was observed. Rows with p-value highlighted in yellow fall under the 0.05 significance cutoff. ‘GP->Algorithm’ indicates where GP was replaced by algorithm with next highest median performance (new algorithm metrics given).




Figure S21: PRC-AUC Model Testing Evaluation Summary Across All OSA Datasets. These 2 subplots report PRC-AUC in datasets where OSA outcome is defined by either $AHI \geq 15$ or $AHI \geq 5$. In each subplot the y-axis is not fixed (to improve algorithm performance visibility) and the x-axis is the target dataset (with dataset names specifying included feature sets, i.e. DEM, DX, SYM, CF, and IO). Each of the 20 individual boxplots give the spread of target metric performance (averaged over 10-fold CV models) across the 14 ML algorithms. Mean CV testing performance of a given algorithm is identified by the colored lines in the key.

Table S16 and **Table S17** give pairwise performance metric comparisons between datasets having only a single feature set (i.e. A-E and K-O) identified DEM and CF features as being significantly more informative of OSA outcome ($AHI \geq 15$ and $AHI \geq 5$) than DX, SYM, or IO based on balanced accuracy and ROC-AUC. For PRC-AUC in $AHI \geq 15$, DEM was significantly more informative than DX or IO and non-significantly better than SYM or CF. CF was significantly more informative than IO, and non-significantly better than SYM or DX. For PRC-AUC in $AHI \geq 5$, DEM and CF were both significantly more informative than DX or IO, and non-significantly better than SYM. SYM was consistently (but not always significantly) higher than DX or IO for $AHI \geq 15$ and $AHI \geq 5$ for all three metrics. DEM and CF yielded similar performance for the three metrics and both outcome encodings. IO performed significantly better than DX for $AHI \geq 15$ and $AHI \geq 5$ using balanced accuracy and ROC-AUC, but yielded a significantly lower PRC-AUC for $AHI \geq 15$ and a similar PRC-AUC for $AHI \geq 5$. To generalize, DEM and CF were similarly most informative on their own, followed by SYM, IO, and lastly DX.

Metric	Data 1	Data 2	Statistic	p-value	Data 1 Best Algorithm	Data 1 Median	Data 2 Best Algorithm	Data 2 Median
Balanced Accuracy	A (DEM)	B (DX)	0	0.001953	CGB	0.674879	GP	0.55878
	A (DEM)	C (SYM)	0	0.001953	CGB	0.674879	LGB	0.623776
	A (DEM)	D (CF)	27	1	CGB	0.674879	LR	0.678416
	A (DEM)	E (IO)	0	0.001953	CGB	0.674879	LR	0.60168
	B (DX)	C (SYM)	0	0.001953	GP	0.55878	LGB	0.623776
	B (DX)	D (CF)	0	0.001953	GP	0.55878	LR	0.678416
	B (DX)	E (IO)	0	0.001953	GP	0.55878	LR	0.60168
	C (SYM)	D (CF)	1	0.003906	LGB	0.623776	LR	0.678416
	C (SYM)	E (IO)	13	0.160156	LGB	0.623776	LR	0.60168
	D (CF)	E (IO)	1	0.003906	LR	0.678416	LR	0.60168
ROC-AUC	A (DEM)	B (DX)	0	0.001953	ExSTraCS	0.738696	LGB	0.561623
	A (DEM)	C (SYM)	0	0.001953	ExSTraCS	0.738696	GB	0.660045
	A (DEM)	D (CF)	21	0.556641	ExSTraCS	0.738696	RF	0.734304
	A (DEM)	E (IO)	0	0.001953	ExSTraCS	0.738696	SVM	0.640454
	B (DX)	C (SYM)	1	0.003906	LGB	0.561623	GB	0.660045
	B (DX)	D (CF)	0	0.001953	LGB	0.561623	RF	0.734304
	B (DX)	E (IO)	0	0.001953	LGB	0.561623	SVM	0.640454
	C (SYM)	D (CF)	0	0.001953	GB	0.660045	RF	0.734304
	C (SYM)	E (IO)	25	0.845703	GB	0.660045	SVM	0.640454
	D (CF)	E (IO)	0	0.001953	RF	0.734304	SVM	0.640454
PRC-AUC	A (DEM)	B (DX)	5	0.019531	CGB	0.726915	GP	0.678069
	A (DEM)	C (SYM)	11	0.105469	CGB	0.726915	GP	0.708505
	A (DEM)	D (CF)	15	0.232422	CGB	0.726915	XGB	0.719624
	A (DEM)	E (IO)	0	0.001953	CGB	0.726915	EN	0.625999
	B (DX)	C (SYM)	10	0.083984	GP	0.678069	GP	0.708505
	B (DX)	D (CF)	14	0.193359	GP	0.678069	XGB	0.719624
	B (DX)	E (IO)	0	0.001953	GP	0.678069	EN	0.625999
	C (SYM)	D (CF)	25	0.845703	GP	0.708505	XGB	0.719624
	C (SYM)	E (IO)	0	0.001953	GP	0.708505	EN	0.625999
	D (CF)	E (IO)	2	0.005859	XGB	0.719624	EN	0.625999

Table S16: Pairwise Performance Comparisons of $AHI \geq 15$ Datasets with One Feature Set. Pairwise tests using the Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test. The testing metrics of the 10 CV models trained by the algorithm with the best median metric is the basis for this comparison. Metrics in this table include balanced accuracy, ROC-AUC, and PRC-AUC. Cells in green denote the larger median performance of the pair. Rows with p-value highlighted in yellow fall under the 0.05 significance cutoff. The cells in blue point out the dataset/algorithm combination where the highest median metric value was observed. ‘GP->Algorithm’ indicates where GP was replaced by algorithm with next highest median performance (new algorithm metrics given).

Metric	Data 1	Data 2	Statistic	p-value	Data 1 Best Algorithm	Data 1 Median	Data 2 Best Algorithm	Data 2 Median
Balanced Accuracy	K (DEM)	L (DX)	0	0.001953	XGB	0.702773	XGB	0.57963
	K (DEM)	M (SYM)	6	0.027344	XGB	0.702773	XGB	0.654582
	K (DEM)	N (CF)	18	0.375	XGB	0.702773	XGB	0.693432
	K (DEM)	O (IO)	2	0.005859	XGB	0.702773	EN	0.612221
	L (DX)	M (SYM)	0	0.001953	XGB	0.57963	XGB	0.654582
	L (DX)	N (CF)	0	0.001953	XGB	0.57963	XGB	0.693432
	L (DX)	O (IO)	3	0.009766	XGB	0.57963	EN	0.612221
	M (SYM)	N (CF)	13	0.160156	XGB	0.654582	XGB	0.693432
	M (SYM)	O (IO)	6	0.027344	XGB	0.654582	EN	0.612221
	N (CF)	O (IO)	5	0.019531	XGB	0.693432	EN	0.612221
ROC-AUC	K (DEM)	L (DX)	0	0.001953	RF	0.768363	LGB	0.58465
	K (DEM)	M (SYM)	1	0.003906	RF	0.768363	EN	0.679587
	K (DEM)	N (CF)	21	0.556641	RF	0.768363	XGB	0.767255
	K (DEM)	O (IO)	0	0.001953	RF	0.768363	RF	0.653842
	L (DX)	M (SYM)	0	0.001953	LGB	0.58465	EN	0.679587
	L (DX)	N (CF)	0	0.001953	LGB	0.58465	XGB	0.767255
	L (DX)	O (IO)	3	0.009766	LGB	0.58465	RF	0.653842
	M (SYM)	N (CF)	3	0.009766	EN	0.679587	XGB	0.767255
	M (SYM)	O (IO)	12	0.130859	EN	0.679587	RF	0.653842
	N (CF)	O (IO)	0	0.001953	XGB	0.767255	RF	0.653842
PRC-AUC	K (DEM)	L (DX)	3	0.000669	CGB	0.873214	GP->DT	0.819413
	K (DEM)	M (SYM)	1	0.150926	CGB	0.873214	GP->LGB	0.862589
	K (DEM)	N (CF)	23	0.695312	CGB	0.873214	RF	0.87526
	K (DEM)	O (IO)	3	0.0008807	CGB	0.873214	GP->RF	0.815426
	L (DX)	M (SYM)	3	0.005158	GP->DT	0.819413	GP->LGB	0.862589
	L (DX)	N (CF)	3	0.001498	GP->DT	0.819413	RF	0.87526
	L (DX)	O (IO)	0	0.939742	GP->DT	0.819413	GP->RF	0.815426
	M (SYM)	N (CF)	1	0.405678	GP->LGB	0.862589	RF	0.87526
	M (SYM)	O (IO)	2	0.012611	GP->LGB	0.862589	GP->RF	0.815426
	N (CF)	O (IO)	3	0.001498	RF	0.87526	GP->RF	0.815426

Table S17: Pairwise Performance Comparisons of $AHI \geq 5$ Datasets with One Feature Set. Pairwise tests using the Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test. The testing metrics of the 10 CV models trained by the algorithm with the best median metric is the basis for this comparison. Metrics in this table include balanced accuracy, ROC-AUC, and PRC-AUC. Cells in green denote the larger median performance of the pair. Rows with p-value highlighted in yellow fall under the 0.05 significance cutoff. The cells in blue point out the dataset/algorithm combination where the highest median metric value was observed. ‘GP -> Algorithm’ indicates where GP was replaced by algorithm with next highest median performance (new algorithm metrics given).

Next, we examined pairwise performance metric comparisons between datasets progressively adding feature sets (i.e. DEM, +DX, +SYM, +CF, +IO). **Figure 3** (main text) focuses on these specific comparisons (narrowing the results from **Figure 2** – main text), using ROC-AUC for $AHI \geq 15$ and PRC-AUC for $AHI \geq 5$. For $AHI \geq 15$ datasets, the only step-wise feature set addition that led to a significant increase in ROC-AUC was CF added to DEM+DX+SYM (dataset G vs. H; $p=0.0137$). Significant ROC-AUC increases were also observed between (1) A vs.

either H or J, (2) F vs. either H or J, and (3) G vs. J (see **Table S18**). The highest overall median ROC-AUC was obtained on dataset H (DEM+DX+SYM+CF) using the artificial neural network (ANN) algorithm. **Figure 3B** (main text) reveals a similar pattern of ROC-AUC performance across $AHI \geq 15$ datasets when exclusively focusing on the 10 ANN models trained for each CV partition.

Metric	Data 1	Data 2	Statistic	p-value	Data 1 Best Algorithm	Data 1 Median	Data 2 Best Algorithm	Data 2 Median
Balanced Accuracy	A (DEM)	F (DEMDX)	19	0.431641	CGB	0.674879	XGB	0.661979
	F (DEMDX)	G (DEMDXSYM)	17	0.322266	XGB	0.661979	ExSTraCS	0.690846
	G (DEMDXSYM)	H (DEMDXSYMCF)	6	0.027344	ExSTraCS	0.690846	ExSTraCS	0.694347
	H (DEMDXSYMCF)	J (DEMDXSYMCFIO)	23	0.695312	ExSTraCS	0.694347	CGB	0.692929
	A (DEM)	G (DEMDXSYM)	17	0.322266	CGB	0.674879	ExSTraCS	0.690846
	A (DEM)	H (DEMDXSYMCF)	7	0.037109	CGB	0.674879	ExSTraCS	0.694347
	A (DEM)	J (DEMDXSYMCFIO)	2	0.005859	CGB	0.674879	CGB	0.692929
	F (DEMDX)	H (DEMDXSYMCF)	10	0.083984	XGB	0.661979	ExSTraCS	0.694347
	F (DEMDX)	J (DEMDXSYMCFIO)	9	0.064453	XGB	0.661979	CGB	0.692929
	G (DEMDXSYM)	J (DEMDXSYMCFIO)	8	0.048828	ExSTraCS	0.690846	CGB	0.692929
	H (DEMDXSYMCF)	I (DEMDXSYMIO)	20	0.492188	ExSTraCS	0.694347	ExSTraCS	0.685458
	I (DEMDXSYMIO)	J (DEMDXSYMCFIO)	14	0.193359	ExSTraCS	0.685458	CGB	0.692929
ROC-AUC	A (DEM)	F (DEMDX)	14	0.193359	ExSTraCS	0.738696	LGB	0.720548
	F (DEMDX)	G (DEMDXSYM)	11	0.105469	LGB	0.720548	LGB	0.742128
	G (DEMDXSYM)	H (DEMDXSYMCF)	4	0.013672	LGB	0.742128	ANN	0.766822
	H (DEMDXSYMCF)	J (DEMDXSYMCFIO)	15	0.232422	ANN	0.766822	ANN	0.760819
	A (DEM)	G (DEMDXSYM)	24	0.769531	ExSTraCS	0.738696	LGB	0.742128
	A (DEM)	H (DEMDXSYMCF)	0	0.001953	ExSTraCS	0.738696	ANN	0.766822
	A (DEM)	J (DEMDXSYMCFIO)	0	0.001953	ExSTraCS	0.738696	ANN	0.760819
	F (DEMDX)	H (DEMDXSYMCF)	4	0.013672	LGB	0.720548	ANN	0.766822
	F (DEMDX)	J (DEMDXSYMCFIO)	3	0.009766	LGB	0.720548	ANN	0.760819
	G (DEMDXSYM)	J (DEMDXSYMCFIO)	8	0.048828	LGB	0.742128	ANN	0.760819
	H (DEMDXSYMCF)	I (DEMDXSYMIO)	15	0.232422	ANN	0.766822	ANN	0.7554
	I (DEMDXSYMIO)	J (DEMDXSYMCFIO)	19	0.431641	LGB	0.7554	ANN	0.760819
PRC-AUC	A (DEM)	F (DEMDX)	23	0.695312	CGB	0.726915	RF	0.735926
	F (DEMDX)	G (DEMDXSYM)	19	0.431641	RF	0.735926	LGB	0.749936
	G (DEMDXSYM)	H (DEMDXSYMCF)	25	0.845703	LGB	0.749936	CGB	0.752545
	H (DEMDXSYMCF)	J (DEMDXSYMCFIO)	25	0.845703	CGB	0.752545	RF	0.756443
	A (DEM)	G (DEMDXSYM)	7	0.037109	CGB	0.726915	LGB	0.749936
	A (DEM)	H (DEMDXSYMCF)	9	0.064453	CGB	0.726915	CGB	0.752545
	A (DEM)	J (DEMDXSYMCFIO)	6	0.027344	CGB	0.726915	RF	0.756443
	F (DEMDX)	H (DEMDXSYMCF)	17	0.322266	RF	0.735926	CGB	0.752545
	F (DEMDX)	J (DEMDXSYMCFIO)	15	0.232422	RF	0.735926	RF	0.756443
	G (DEMDXSYM)	J (DEMDXSYMCFIO)	25	0.845703	LGB	0.749936	RF	0.756443
	H (DEMDXSYMCF)	I (DEMDXSYMIO)	6	0.027344	CGB	0.752545	XGB	0.732568
	I (DEMDXSYMIO)	J (DEMDXSYMCFIO)	9	0.064453	XGB	0.732568	RF	0.756443

Table S18: Pairwise Performance Comparisons of $AHI \geq 15$ Datasets Progressively Adding Feature Sets.

Pairwise tests using the Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test. The testing metrics of the 10 CV models trained by the algorithm with the best median metric is the basis for this comparison. Metrics in this table include balanced accuracy, ROC-AUC, and PRC-AUC. Cells in green denote the larger median performance of the pair. Rows with p-value highlighted in yellow fall under the 0.05 significance cutoff. The cells in blue point out the dataset/algorithm combination where the highest median metric value was observed.

Shifting to $AHI \geq 5$ datasets, no step-wise feature set additions led to a significant increase in PRC-AUC. However, we observe consistently increasing median best-algorithm performance with the addition of each subsequent feature set, with CF and IO yielding minimal increases. The only significant PRC-AUC increases were observed between datasets K and R (i.e. DEM vs. DEM+DX+SYM+CF) and K and T (i.e. DEM vs. DEM+DX+SYM+CF+IO) (see **Table S19**). The highest overall median PRC-AUC across both $AHI \geq 5$ and $AHI \geq 15$ datasets was obtained on dataset T (DEM+DX+SYM+CF+IO) using elastic net. Figure 3D reveals a similar pattern of PRC-AUC performance across $AHI \geq 5$ datasets when exclusively focusing on the 10 elastic net models trained for each CV partition. In comparing all algorithm PRC-AUCs on dataset T, elastic net performed significantly better than decision tree, genetic programming, K-nearest neighbors, and Naïve Bayes algorithms, and similarly well to the rest (see **Table S20**).

Metric	Data 1	Data 2	Statistic	p-value	Data 1 Best Algorithm	Data 1 Median	Data 2 Best Algorithm	Data 2 Median
Balanced Accuracy	K (DEM)	P (DEMDX)	18	0.375	XGB	0.702773	SVM	0.688487
	P (DEMDX)	Q (DEMDXSYM)	16	0.275391	SVM	0.688487	ExSTraCS	0.695652
	Q (DEMDXSYM)	R (DEMDXSYMCF)	14	0.193359	ExSTraCS	0.695652	ExSTraCS	0.718696
	R (DEMDXSYMCF)	T (DEMDXSYMCFIO)	21	0.556641	ExSTraCS	0.718696	EN	0.718936
	K (DEM)	Q (DEMDXSYM)	22	0.625	XGB	0.702773	ExSTraCS	0.695652
	K (DEM)	R (DEMDXSYMCF)	11	0.105469	XGB	0.702773	ExSTraCS	0.718696
	K (DEM)	T (DEMDXSYMCFIO)	14	0.193359	XGB	0.702773	EN	0.718936
	P (DEMDX)	R (DEMDXSYMCF)	11	0.105469	SVM	0.688487	ExSTraCS	0.718696
	P (DEMDX)	T (DEMDXSYMCFIO)	11	0.105469	SVM	0.688487	EN	0.718936
	Q (DEMDXSYM)	T (DEMDXSYMCFIO)	17	0.322266	ExSTraCS	0.695652	EN	0.718936
	R (DEMDXSYMCF)	S (DEMDXSYMIO)	22	0.625	ExSTraCS	0.718696	ExSTraCS	0.709368
	S (DEMDXSYMIO)	T (DEMDXSYMCFIO)	24	0.769531	ExSTraCS	0.709368	EN	0.718936
ROC-AUC	K (DEM)	P (DEMDX)	25	0.845703	RF	0.768363	ANN	0.761928
	P (DEMDX)	Q (DEMDXSYM)	21	0.556641	ANN	0.761928	EN	0.761972
	Q (DEMDXSYM)	R (DEMDXSYMCF)	14	0.193359	EN	0.761972	XGB	0.79297
	R (DEMDXSYMCF)	T (DEMDXSYMCFIO)	20	0.492188	XGB	0.79297	GB	0.792941
	K (DEM)	Q (DEMDXSYM)	22	0.625	RF	0.768363	EN	0.761972
	K (DEM)	R (DEMDXSYMCF)	13	0.160156	RF	0.768363	XGB	0.79297
	K (DEM)	T (DEMDXSYMCFIO)	15	0.232422	RF	0.768363	GB	0.792941
	P (DEMDX)	R (DEMDXSYMCF)	7	0.037109	ANN	0.761928	XGB	0.79297
	P (DEMDX)	T (DEMDXSYMCFIO)	10	0.083984	ANN	0.761928	GB	0.792941
	Q (DEMDXSYM)	T (DEMDXSYMCFIO)	14	0.193359	EN	0.761972	GB	0.792941
	R (DEMDXSYMCF)	S (DEMDXSYMIO)	20	0.492188	XGB	0.79297	CGB	0.778981
	S (DEMDXSYMIO)	T (DEMDXSYMCFIO)	22	0.625	CGB	0.778981	GB	0.792941
PRC-AUC	K (DEM)	P (DEMDX)	17	0.322266	CGB	0.873214	CGB	0.889826
	P (DEMDX)	Q (DEMDXSYM)	21	0.556641	CGB	0.889826	EN	0.89404
	Q (DEMDXSYM)	R (DEMDXSYMCF)	24	0.769531	EN	0.89404	XGB	0.894904
	R (DEMDXSYMCF)	T (DEMDXSYMCFIO)	25	0.845703	XGB	0.894904	EN	0.896618
	K (DEM)	Q (DEMDXSYM)	9	0.064453	CGB	0.873214	EN	0.89404
	K (DEM)	R (DEMDXSYMCF)	7	0.037109	CGB	0.873214	XGB	0.894904
	K (DEM)	T (DEMDXSYMCFIO)	8	0.048828	CGB	0.873214	EN	0.896618
	P (DEMDX)	R (DEMDXSYMCF)	15	0.232422	CGB	0.889826	XGB	0.894904
	P (DEMDX)	T (DEMDXSYMCFIO)	19	0.431641	CGB	0.889826	EN	0.896618
	Q (DEMDXSYM)	T (DEMDXSYMCFIO)	22	0.625	EN	0.89404	EN	0.896618
	R (DEMDXSYMCF)	S (DEMDXSYMIO)	21	0.556641	XGB	0.894904	SVM	0.892398
	S (DEMDXSYMIO)	T (DEMDXSYMCFIO)	23	0.695312	SVM	0.892398	EN	0.896618

Table S19: Pairwise Performance Comparisons of $AHI \geq 5$ Datasets Progressively Adding Feature Sets. Pairwise tests using the Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test. The testing metrics of the 10 CV models trained by the algorithm with the best median metric is the basis for this comparison. Metrics in this table include balanced accuracy, ROC-AUC, and PRC-AUC. Cells in green denote the larger median performance of the pair. Rows with p-value highlighted in yellow fall under the 0.05 significance cutoff. The cells in blue point out the dataset/algorithm combination where the highest median metric value was observed.

Algorithm 1	Algorithm 1 Median PRC-AUC	Algorithm 2	Algorithm 2 Median PRC-AUC	Statistic	p-value
EN	0.896618	ANN	0.893487	18	0.375
EN	0.896618	CGB	0.889757	16	0.275391
EN	0.896618	DT	0.871028	0	0.001953
EN	0.896618	LR	0.896397	23	0.695313
EN	0.896618	ExSTraCS	0.889757	11	0.105469
EN	0.896618	XGB	0.871028	25	0.845703
EN	0.896618	GP	0.889757	1	0.003906
EN	0.896618	GB	0.871028	25	0.845703
EN	0.896618	KNN	0.889757	2	0.005859
EN	0.896618	LGB	0.871028	17	0.322266
EN	0.896618	NB	0.861903	0	0.001953
EN	0.896618	RF	0.887067	16	0.275391
EN	0.896618	SVM	0.895224	15	0.232422

Table S20: T_GE5_DEMDXSYMCFIO Algorithm Performance Comparison. Wilcoxon Rank Sum comparisons are made in contrast with elastic net (EN) as the top median performer. Comparisons highlighted in yellow had a p-value lower than the 0.05 cutoff.

Looking more closely at dataset T (DEM+DX+SYM+CF+IO) which yielded the top study-wide median PRC-AUC, **Figure S22** examines ROC-AUC across all algorithms, and **Figure S23** examines PRC-AUC across all algorithms. Median performance of all algorithms across 16 classification metrics are given in **Table S21**. Mean performance of all algorithms across 16 classification metrics are given in **Table S22**. **Figure S24** more closely examines EN testing performance across individual 10-fold CV trained models with ROC and PRC plots.




Figure S22: T_GE5_DEMDXSYMCFIO ROC Performance Across Algorithms. (Left) ROC plot comparing 14 algorithm testing performance based on the average of 10-fold CV models trained for each algorithm. (Right) Boxplot of ROC-AUC testing performance for each algorithm across 10-fold CV models.




Figure S23: T_GE5_DEMDXSYMCFIO PRC Plot Across Algorithms. (Left) PRC plot comparing 14 algorithm testing performance based on the average of 10-fold CV models trained for each algorithm. (Right) Boxplot of PRC-AUC testing performance for each algorithm across 10-fold CV models.

Algorithm	Balanced Accuracy	Accuracy	F1 Score	Sensitivity (Recall)	Specificity	Precision (PPV)	TP	TN	FP	FN	NPV	LR+	LR-	ROC AUC	PRC AUC	PRC APS
Artificial Neural Network	0.6663	0.7683	0.8490	0.9016	0.4380	0.8052	142	26.5	34	15.5	0.6239	1.5881	0.2336	0.7789	0.8935	0.8943
Category Gradient Boosting	0.6537	0.7936	0.8714	0.9651	0.3525	0.7906	152	21.5	39.5	5.5	0.7894	1.4676	0.1025	0.7887	0.8898	0.8904
Decision Tree	0.6791	0.6874	0.7614	0.6911	0.6448	0.8360	108.5	39	21.5	48.5	0.4581	1.9576	0.4558	0.7328	0.8710	0.8620
Elastic Net	0.7189	0.7248	0.7953	0.7333	0.6967	0.8635	115.5	42.5	18.5	42	0.5022	2.4641	0.3825	0.7874	0.8966	0.8972
ExSTraCS	0.7073	0.7477	0.8183	0.8032	0.6311	0.8480	126.5	38.5	22.5	31	0.5391	2.1677	0.3322	0.7867	0.8860	0.8870
Extreme Gradient Boosting	0.7166	0.7500	0.8193	0.7898	0.6363	0.8507	124	38.5	22	33	0.5405	2.1930	0.3279	0.7898	0.8959	0.8964
Genetic Programming	0.6055	0.7454	0.8411	0.9302	0.2833	0.7711	146.5	17	43	11	0.5900	1.2934	0.2670	0.6993	0.8436	0.8427
Gradient Boosting	0.6751	0.7816	0.8584	0.9175	0.4214	0.8082	144.5	25.5	35	13	0.6667	1.6020	0.1927	0.7929	0.8934	0.8940
K-Nearest Neighbors	0.6692	0.7638	0.8461	0.8667	0.5082	0.8123	136.5	31	30	21	0.6061	1.6821	0.2496	0.7640	0.8759	0.8681
Light Gradient Boosting	0.7066	0.7333	0.8066	0.7746	0.6281	0.8452	122	38	22.5	35.5	0.5167	2.0966	0.3605	0.7869	0.8920	0.8925
Logistic Regression	0.7173	0.7248	0.7940	0.7293	0.7049	0.8645	114.5	43	18	42.5	0.5024	2.4896	0.3806	0.7893	0.8964	0.8969
Naive Bayes	0.6725	0.6628	0.7346	0.6497	0.6941	0.8474	102	42	18.5	55	0.4322	2.1574	0.5078	0.7356	0.8619	0.8617
Random Forest	0.7043	0.7615	0.8349	0.8344	0.5820	0.8370	131	35.5	25.5	26	0.5700	1.9953	0.2899	0.7875	0.8871	0.8879
Support Vector Machine	0.7083	0.7271	0.7980	0.7587	0.6611	0.8529	119.5	40	20.5	38	0.5086	2.2339	0.3756	0.7876	0.8952	0.8958

Table S21: T_GE5_DEMDXSYMCFIO Median Performance Metrics Across all Algorithms.

Algorithm	Balanced Accuracy	Accuracy	F1 Score	Sensitivity (Recall)	Specificity	Precision (PPV)	TP	TN	FP	FN	NPV	LR+	LR-	ROC AUC	PRC AUC	PRC APS
Artificial Neural Network	0.6726	0.7719	0.8502	0.8964	0.4488	0.8089	141	27.2	33.4	16.3	0.6267	1.6495	0.2339	0.7845	0.8905	0.8913
Category Gradient Boosting	0.6498	0.7903	0.8694	0.9663	0.3334	0.7902	152	20.2	40.4	5.3	0.7934	1.4596	0.1055	0.7875	0.8914	0.8921
Decision Tree	0.6664	0.6847	0.7631	0.7075	0.6253	0.8318	111.3	37.9	22.7	46	0.4547	1.9414	0.4669	0.7330	0.8651	0.8571
Elastic Net	0.7158	0.7237	0.7928	0.7336	0.6980	0.8632	115.4	42.3	18.3	41.9	0.5040	2.5043	0.3845	0.7889	0.8937	0.8944
ExSTraCS	0.7164	0.7531	0.8233	0.7991	0.6337	0.8504	125.7	38.4	22.2	31.6	0.5511	2.2466	0.3188	0.7805	0.8852	0.8859
Extreme Gradient Boosting	0.7128	0.7471	0.8179	0.7902	0.6354	0.8487	124.3	38.5	22.1	33	0.5444	2.1816	0.3313	0.7902	0.8951	0.8956
Genetic Programming	0.5977	0.7421	0.8376	0.9231	0.2724	0.7677	145.2	16.5	44.1	12.1	0.5880	1.2790	0.2796	0.6968	0.8427	0.8414
Gradient Boosting	0.6717	0.7802	0.8574	0.9161	0.4273	0.8062	144.1	25.9	34.7	13.2	0.6655	1.6130	0.1990	0.7879	0.8943	0.8927
K-Nearest Neighbors	0.6719	0.7517	0.8317	0.8519	0.4919	0.8135	134	29.8	30.8	23.3	0.5674	1.7053	0.3038	0.7410	0.8698	0.8546
Light Gradient Boosting	0.7046	0.7361	0.8090	0.7756	0.6337	0.8463	122	38.4	22.2	35.3	0.5230	2.1445	0.3545	0.7842	0.8902	0.8910
Logistic Regression	0.7148	0.7201	0.7891	0.7266	0.7029	0.8642	114.3	42.6	18	43	0.4989	2.5370	0.3913	0.7890	0.8922	0.8930
Naive Bayes	0.6748	0.6696	0.7432	0.6630	0.6866	0.8463	104.3	41.6	19	53	0.4399	2.2029	0.4954	0.7338	0.8589	0.8591
Random Forest	0.7039	0.7563	0.8292	0.8220	0.5858	0.8371	129.3	35.5	25.1	28	0.5635	2.0025	0.3064	0.7863	0.8921	0.8928
Support Vector Machine	0.7051	0.7279	0.8005	0.7566	0.6536	0.8505	119	39.6	21	38.3	0.5083	2.2481	0.3762	0.7843	0.8896	0.8904

Table S22: T_GE5_DEMDXSYMCFIO Mean Performance Metrics Across all Algorithms.





Figure S24: T_GE5_DEMDXSYMCFIO ROC and PRC Plots EN Performance Across CV Test Sets. (Top) ROC plot showing individual logistic regression model performance trained on 10 separate CV partitions. (Bottom) PRC plot showing individual logistic regression model performance trained on 10 separate CV partitions.

S.3.5.6: Replication Data Evaluations of Modeling

This last assessment was completed outside of STREAMLINE utilizing the output files it generated. Note that the number of instances in the replication datasets are much larger than that of the testing partitions generated from the respective development datasets. Up until this point, all OSA model evaluations have been conducted on respective hold-out testing datasets (different for each CV partition). Next, STREAMLINE was applied to re-evaluate all ML models (i.e 10 individual CV models trained by each of 14 ML algorithms) on the same replication dataset.

For each of the 20 OSA datasets we compare the algorithm's models that previously yielded the best median testing performance metric (either ROC-AUC for $AHI \geq 15$, or PRC-AUC for $AHI \geq 5$) to the performance of that same algorithm's models on the replication data (see **Table S23**). For $AHI \geq 15$ datasets, the best replication performance was again observed for dataset H with ANN models, having a significantly increased ROC-AUC of 0.807 ($p=0.0002$) in contrast with the testing evaluation. For all other $AHI \geq 15$ datasets, we observed a mix of significant and non-significant increases and decreases in ROC-AUC replication performance. For $AHI \geq 5$ datasets, the best replication performance was again observed for dataset T with elastic net models, having a significantly decreased PRC-AUC of 0.830 ($p=0.0002$), in contrast with the testing evaluation. For all other $AHI \geq 5$ datasets we similarly observed a significant decrease in PRC-AUC replication performance in contrast with the testing evaluation.

Metric	Data	Testing Data		Replication Data		Statistic	p-value
		Best Algorithm	Median	Same Algorithm	Median		
ROC-AUC(AHI \geq 15)	A	ExSTraCS	0.738696	ExSTraCS	0.765741	3	0.003197
	B	LGB	0.561623	LGB	0.589809	2	0.049366
	C	GB	0.660045	GB	0.638504	1	0.364346
	D	RF	0.734304	RF	0.731760	0	0.820595
	E	SVM	0.640454	SVM	0.651070	1	0.173617
	F	LGB	0.720548	LGB	0.760259	3	0.001152
	G	LGB	0.742128	LGB	0.781781	3	0.008151
	H	ANN	0.766822	ANN	0.807005	4	0.000212
	I	LGB	0.7554	LGB	0.785684	4	0.000381
	J	ANN	0.760819	ANN	0.797987	3	0.000507
PRC-AUC(AHI \geq 5)	K	CGB	0.873214	CGB	0.796177	4	0.000157
	L	GP->DT	0.819413	GP->DT	0.718561	3	0.002497
	M	GP->LGB	0.862589	GP->LGB	0.652634	4	0.000157
	N	RF	0.87526	RF	0.799786	4	0.000157
	O	GP->RF	0.815426	GP->RF	0.705872	4	0.000157
	P	CGB	0.889826	CGB	0.775304	4	0.000157
	Q	EN	0.89404	EN	0.817442	4	0.000157
	R	XGB	0.894904	XGB	0.824617	4	0.000157
	S	SVM	0.892398	SVM	0.819281	4	0.000212
	T	EN	0.896618	EN	0.830697	4	0.000157

Table S23: Testing vs Replication Data Evaluation Comparisons Using the Same Models. Pairwise tests using the Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test. For each of the 20 OSA datasets we compare the algorithm that previously yielded the best median testing performance metric (either ROC-AUC for $AHI \geq 15$, or PRC-AUC for $AHI \geq 5$) to the performance of that same algorithm’s models using the replication data held out for the respective dataset (A-T). Cells in green denote the larger median performance of the pair. Rows with p-value highlighted in yellow fall under the 0.05 significance cutoff. The cells in blue point out the dataset/algorithm combination where the highest median metric value was observed.

Additionally, for each of the 20 OSA datasets we compare the algorithm’s models that previously yielded the best median testing performance metric (either ROC-AUC for $AHI \geq 15$, or PRC-AUC for $AHI \geq 5$) to the algorithm’s models that yielded the best median performance on the replication data (see **Table S24**). For $AHI \geq 15$ datasets, the best replication ROC-AUC was again observed for dataset H with ANN models and all other $AHI \geq 15$ datasets yielded a consistently (but not always significantly) higher median ROC-AUC on replication data in contrast with testing evaluations. For $AHI \geq 5$ datasets, the best median replication performance was again observed for dataset T with elastic net models, and all other $AHI \geq 5$ datasets yielded significantly lower median PRC-AUC on replication data in contrast with testing evaluations.

Table S24 also identifies the individual best performing individual model on the replication data across all 20 OSA datasets. For $AHI \geq 15$, a top ROC-AUC of 0.813 was obtained by CV model ‘1’ using the ANN algorithm on dataset H (DEM+DX+SYM+CF). For $AHI \geq 5$, a top PRC-AUC of 0.847 was obtained by CV model ‘8’ using the category gradient boosting algorithm on dataset R (DEM+DX+SYM+CF).

Metric	Data	Testing Data		Replication Data		Statistic	p-value	Replication Data	
		Best Algorithm	Median	Best Algorithm	Median			Best Model: Algorithm + (CV Partition)	Target Metric Of Single Model
ROC-AUC	A	ExSTraCS	0.738696	ExSTraCS	0.765741	3	0.003197	ANN (1)	0.771473
	B	LGB	0.561623	KNN	0.602896	2	0.023342	ExSTraCS (1)	0.619898
	C	GB	0.660045	NB	0.668883	2	0.112411	ANN (0)	0.674619
	D	RF	0.734304	ANN	0.745548	2	0.096304	LGB (9)	0.750042
	E	SVM	0.640454	EN	0.654427	1	0.290846	EN (9)	0.666300
	F	LGB	0.720548	ANN	0.759872	3	0.000670	ANN (0)	0.769845
	G	LGB	0.742128	ANN	0.791045	3	0.008274	ANN (2)	0.795970
	H	ANN	0.766822	ANN	0.807005	4	0.000212	ANN (1)	0.813081
	I	LGB	0.7554	EN	0.788949	4	0.000212	ExSTraCS (4)	0.798181
	J	ANN	0.760819	LR	0.801513	4	0.000212	LR (2)	0.804307
PRC-AUC	K	CGB	0.873214	SVM	0.804350	4	0.000157	ExSTraCS (8)	0.809892
	L	GP->DT	0.819413	GP-> RF	0.722144	3	0.002497	GP->DT (5)	0.769239
	M	GP->LGB	0.862589	GP ->LR	0.735277	4	0.000157	GP->XGB (5)	0.741470
	N	RF	0.87526	SVM	0.800717	4	0.000157	SVM (2)	0.809353
	O	GP->RF	0.815426	GP-> SVM	0.719038	4	0.000157	GP->ANN (1)	0.726045
	P	CGB	0.889826	LR	0.798189	4	0.000157	ExSTraCS (4)	0.805650
	Q	EN	0.89404	EN	0.817443	4	0.000157	EN (5)	0.824741
	R	XGB	0.894904	SVM	0.830600	4	0.000157	CGB (8)	0.846841
	S	SVM	0.892398	EN	0.824477	3	0.000881	ExSTraCS (0)	0.834440
	T	EN	0.896618	EN	0.830697	4	0.000157	ANN (9)	0.837726

Table S24: Testing vs Replication Data Evaluation Comparisons Using Top Performing Algorithms. Pairwise tests using the Wilcoxon Signed Rank Test. For each of the 20 OSA datasets we compare the algorithm that previously yielded the best median testing performance metric (either ROC-AUC for $AHI \geq 15$, or PRC-AUC for $AHI \geq 5$) to the algorithm that yields the best median performance metric models using the replication data held out for the respective dataset (A-T). Cells in green denote the larger median performance of the pair. Rows with p-value highlighted in yellow fall under the 0.05 significance cutoff. The cells in blue point out the dataset/algorithm combination where the highest median metric value was observed. The far-right side of the table identifies the single best performing model (specified by the name of the algorithm and the CV partition the model was trained on; numbered 0-9).

S.3.5.6.1: Hyperparameter Settings for Top Performing Models on Replication Data (Optuna Optimized)

Top Performing $AHI \geq 15$ model (dataset H): ANN (1)

- Activation = logistic
- Learning Rate = constant
- Momentum = 0.810133
- Solver = Adam
- Batch Size = Auto
- Alpha = 0.42784
- Max iter = 200
- Uses a default single hidden layer with a width of 100 nodes

Top Performing $AHI \geq 5$ model (dataset R): **CGB (8)**

- Learning Rate = 0.148981
- Iterations = 231
- Depth = 2
- l2_leaf_reg = 7
- loss_function = Logloss

S.4 Discussion

S.4.1 Benchmarking Challenges

First, attempting to demonstrate the superiority of a single modeling algorithm through benchmarking is challenging in itself, and often in conflict with the “no free lunch theorem (42), discussed in the main text. ML benchmark datasets often focus on a more specific collection of data types or problems (43, 44, 45), but ‘how’ to benchmark effectively remains an open topic of debate (46). These challenges are only exaggerated in seeking to compare the performance of different AutoML tools which effectively becomes a meta-optimization problem. Ultimately, we expect convincing AutoML comparison to necessarily focus on multiple objectives including (1) predictive performance across multiple metrics using a wide variety of simulated and real-world datasets with different underlying association complexities, data dimensions, signal/noise ratio, feature type mixes, class balance/imbalance, feature value frequencies and distributions, and ratio of informative to non-informative features, (2) computational complexity/run time, (3) model/pipeline interpretability and transparency, (4) what pipeline elements are automated and (5) ease of use.

Second, running a single AutoML tool can be computationally expensive, thus running a rigorous comparison across several over a ‘representative’ array of benchmark datasets may be extremely time consuming even with significant computational resources. STREAMLINE limits the overall expected run-time in comparison to some AutoML tools by adopting a fixed, pre-configured pipeline design rather than exploring many possible configurations.

Third, some AutoML tools adopt a different ‘theory’ of pipeline assembly and target output, making the design of fair comparisons problematic. For example, most other AutoML tools focus on optimizing a single best model requiring a single data partitioning of training/evaluation data. Differently, STREAMLINE’s design focuses on being able to compare the performance of models trained by different ML algorithms with statistical significance comparisons. This requires an additional level of data partitioning in order to assess a globally best-performing model, i.e. external partitioning of data into development and replication sets, and further partitioning of the development data into k-fold CV training and testing sets. Starting with a dataset of the same size, this means that some other AutoML tools would have a larger set of data to ‘learn’ from in model/pipeline optimization, at the expense of not being able to rigorously assess (1) performance differences between ML algorithms or (2) sample bias from partitioning.

Fourth, all AutoML tools likely have some degree of stochasticity, i.e. if you ran the same tool on the same dataset with the same parameter settings (excluding random seed) you would likely get somewhat different results. Therefore, AutoML benchmarking comparisons should ideally also run each tool on each dataset multiple times and ensure the same development vs. evaluation partitions were used on each. While some attempts have been made to compare the performance of a subset of AutoML tools (5, 14, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51), no study has yet addressed all of the above issues.

In lieu of reliable cross-AutoML benchmarking, we recommend users select an AutoML tool that can handle the demands of the given task (e.g. data type, intended model use), and which is transparent enough to understand exactly how the data is being processed, how the model is trained vs. evaluated, and whether best practices are being properly adopted.

S.4.2 Feature Importance Consistency




Figure S25: Consistency of the Top 10 Features ($AHI \geq 15$ and $AHI \geq 5$). The consistency with which any of the 85 total features examined in this study are ranked in the top 10 based on (1) univariate analyses, (2) mutual information, (3) MultiSURF, (4) composite model feature importance plot ranking over all algorithms, and (5) mean model feature importance ranking for the algorithm yielding the top median performance.




Figure S26: Consistency of the Top 10 Features ($AHI \geq 15$). The consistency with which any of the 85 total features examined in this study are ranked in the top 10 based on (1) univariate analyses, (2) mutual information, (3) MultiSURF, (4) composite model feature importance plot ranking over all algorithms, and (5) mean model feature importance ranking for the algorithm yielding the top median performance.




Figure S27: Consistency of the Top 10 Features ($AHI \geq 5$). The consistency with which any of the 85 total features examined in this study are ranked in the top 10 based on (1) univariate analyses, (2) mutual information, (3) MultiSURF, (4) composite model feature importance plot ranking over all algorithms, and (5) mean model feature importance ranking for the algorithm yielding the top median performance.

S.4.3 STREAMLINE Future Development

Beyond the future developments discussed in the main text, the following items are under active development to improve future STREAMLINE releases.

(1) Expand the repertoire of available feature importance estimation algorithms as well as ML modeling algorithms (e.g. deep learning and other new promising algorithms). (2) Facilitate the application of dataset comparisons (phase 7) between any subset of datasets run in a STREAMLINE analysis. (3) Automatically exclude algorithms that achieve top PRC-AUC from dataset significance comparisons if they have a true negative rate of zero. (4) Expand the replication data evaluation (phase 8) to include reassessment of model feature importance estimates, and automated statistical comparisons between replication analyses. (5) Add a multiple imputation approach suited to categorical features (currently only mode imputation is available for categorical features). (6) Add a new phase to automatically pick the overall best-performing algorithm and provide a detailed performance summary. (7) Add a new phase focused on deployment of a best performing model that facilitates making predictions on unlabeled data including explanation. (8) Provide support to easily run STREAMLINE on cloud computing platforms. (9) Add Shapley value estimators of model feature importance and corresponding visualizations in addition to existing permutation-based feature importance.

References

- [1] Ryan Urbanowicz, Robert Zhang, Yuhan Cui, and Pranshu Suri. STREAMLINE: A Simple, Transparent, End-To-End Automated Machine Learning Pipeline Facilitating Data Analysis and Algorithm Comparison. In Leonardo Trujillo, Stephan M. Winkler, Sara Silva, and Wolfgang Banzhaf, editors, *Genetic Programming Theory and Practice XIX*, Genetic and Evolutionary Computation, pages 201–231. Springer Nature, Singapore, 2023. ISBN 978-981-19846-0-0. doi: 10.1007/978-981-19-8460-0_9. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-19-8460-0_9.
- [2] Haifeng Jin, François Chollet, Qingquan Song, and Xia Hu. AutoKeras: An AutoML Library for Deep Learning. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 24(6):1–6, 2023. ISSN 1533-7928. URL <http://jmlr.org/papers/v24/20-1355.html>.
- [3] Akshay Akshay, Mitali Katoch, Navid Shekarchizadeh, Masoud Abedi, Ankush Sharma, Fiona C. Burkhard, Rosalyn M. Adam, Katia Monastyrskaya, and Ali Hashemi Gheinani. Machine Learning Made Easy (MLme): A Comprehensive Toolkit for Machine Learning-Driven Data Analysis, July 2023. URL <https://www.biorxiv.org/content/10.1101/2023.07.04.546825v1>. Pages: 2023.07.04.546825 Section: New Results.
- [4] Anton Vakhrushev, Alexander Ryzhkov, Maxim Savchenko, Dmitry Simakov, Rinchin Damdinov, and Alexander Tuzhilin. LightAutoML: AutoML Solution for a Large Financial Services Ecosystem, September 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2109.01528v2>.
- [5] Nikolay O. Nikitin, Pavel Vychuzhanin, Mikhail Sarafanov, Iana S. Polonskaia, Iliia Revin, Irina V. Barabanova, Gleb Maximov, Anna V. Kalyuzhnaya, and Alexander Boukhanovsky. Automated evolutionary approach for the design of composite machine learning pipelines. *Future Generation Computer Systems*, 127:109–125, February 2022. ISSN 0167-739X. doi: 10.1016/j.future.2021.08.022. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0167739X21003307>.
- [6] William La Cava, Heather Williams, Weixuan Fu, Steve Vitale, Durga Srivatsan, and Jason H Moore. Evaluating recommender systems for AI-driven biomedical informatics. *Bioinformatics*, 37(2):250–256, April 2021. ISSN 1367-4803. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btaa698. URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btaa698>.
- [7] Nick Erickson, Jonas Mueller, Alexander Shirkov, Hang Zhang, Pedro Larroy, Mu Li, and Alexander Smola. AutoGluon-Tabular: Robust and Accurate AutoML for Structured Data, March 2020. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2003.06505>. arXiv:2003.06505 [cs, stat].
- [8] Piero Molino, Yaroslav Dudin, and Sai Sumanth Miryala. Ludwig: a type-based declarative deep learning toolbox, September 2019. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1909.07930>. arXiv:1909.07930 [cs, stat].
- [9] Randal S. Olson, Nathan Bartley, Ryan J. Urbanowicz, and Jason H. Moore. Evaluation of a Tree-based Pipeline Optimization Tool for Automating Data Science. In *Proceedings of the Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference 2016*, GECCO '16, pages 485–492, New York, NY, USA, July 2016. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 978-1-4503-4206-3. doi: 10.1145/2908812.2908918. URL <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/2908812.2908918>.

- [10] Randal S. Olson and Jason H. Moore. TPOT: A Tree-based Pipeline Optimization Tool for Automating Machine Learning. In *Proceedings of the Workshop on Automatic Machine Learning*, pages 66–74. PMLR, December 2016. URL https://proceedings.mlr.press/v64/olson_tpot_2016.html. ISSN: 1938-7228.
- [11] Trang T Le, Weixuan Fu, and Jason H Moore. Scaling tree-based automated machine learning to biomedical big data with a feature set selector. *Bioinformatics*, 36(1):250–256, January 2020. ISSN 1367-4803. doi: 10.1093/bioinformatics/btz470. URL <https://doi.org/10.1093/bioinformatics/btz470>.
- [12] Matthias Feurer, Aaron Klein, Katharina Eggensperger, Jost Springenberg, Manuel Blum, and Frank Hutter. Efficient and Robust Automated Machine Learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 28. Curran Associates, Inc., 2015. URL https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2015/hash/11d0e6287202fced83f79975ec59a3a6-Abstract.html.
- [13] Lucas Zimmer, Marius Lindauer, and Frank Hutter. Auto-PyTorch Tabular: Multi-Fidelity MetaLearning for Efficient and Robust AutoDL, April 2021. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2006.13799>. arXiv:2006.13799 [cs, stat].
- [14] Pieter Gijsbers and Joaquin Vanschoren. GAMA: A General Automated Machine Learning Assistant. In Yuxiao Dong, Georgiana Ifrim, Dunja Mladenić, Craig Saunders, and Sofie Van Hoecke, editors, *Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases. Applied Data Science and Demo Track*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 560–564, Cham, 2021. Springer International Publishing. ISBN 978-3-030-67670-4. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-67670-4_39.
- [15] Frank Hutter, Lars Kotthoff, and Joaquin Vanschoren, editors. *Automated Machine Learning: Methods, Systems, Challenges*. The Springer Series on Challenges in Machine Learning. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2019. ISBN 978-3-030-05317-8 978-3-030-05318-5. doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-05318-5. URL <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-3-030-05318-5>.
- [16] Lars Kotthoff, Chris Thornton, Holger H. Hoos, Frank Hutter, and Kevin Leyton-Brown. Auto-WEKA 2.0: Automatic model selection and hyperparameter optimization in WEKA. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 18(25):1–5, 2017. ISSN 1533-7928. URL <http://jmlr.org/papers/v18/16-261.html>.
- [17] Alex G. C. de Sá, Walter José G. S. Pinto, Luiz Otavio V. B. Oliveira, and Gisele L. Pappa. RECIPE: A Grammar-Based Framework for Automatically Evolving Classification Pipelines. In James McDermott, Mauro Castelli, Lukas Sekanina, Evert Haasdijk, and Pablo García-Sánchez, editors, *Genetic Programming*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 246–261, Cham, 2017. Springer International Publishing. ISBN 978-3-319-55696-3. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-55696-3_16.
- [18] Felix Mohr, Marcel Wever, and Eyke Hüllermeier. ML-Plan: Automated machine learning via hierarchical planning. *Machine Learning*, 107(8):1495–1515, September 2018. ISSN 1573-0565. doi: 10.1007/s10994-018-5735-z. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10994-018-5735-z>.
- [19] Mihaela-Andreea Vasile, Florin Pop, Mihaela-Cătălina Niță, and Valentin Cristea. MLBox: Machine learning box for asymptotic scheduling. *Information Sciences*, 433-434:401–416, April 2018. ISSN 0020-0255. doi: 10.1016/j.ins.2017.01.005. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0020025517300099>.

- [20] Ryan J. Urbanowicz, Randal S. Olson, Peter Schmitt, Melissa Meeker, and Jason H. Moore. Benchmarking relief-based feature selection methods for bioinformatics data mining. *Journal of Biomedical Informatics*, 85:168–188, September 2018. ISSN 1532-0464. doi: 10.1016/j.jbi.2018.07.015. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1532046418301412>.
- [21] Jason H. Moore and Bill C. White. Tuning ReliefF for Genome-Wide Genetic Analysis. In Elena Marchiori, Jason H. Moore, and Jagath C. Rajapakse, editors, *Evolutionary Computation, Machine Learning and Data Mining in Bioinformatics*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 166–175, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2007. Springer. ISBN 978-3-540-71783-6. doi: 10.1007/978-3-540-71783-6_16.
- [22] Shefali S. Verma, Anastasia Lucas, Xinyuan Zhang, Yogasudha Veturi, Scott Dudek, Binglan Li, Ruowang Li, Ryan Urbanowicz, Jason H. Moore, Dokyoon Kim, and Marylyn D. Ritchie. Collective feature selection to identify crucial epistatic variants. *BioData Mining*, 11(1):5, April 2018. ISSN 1756-0381. doi: 10.1186/s13040-018-0168-6. URL <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13040-018-0168-6>.
- [23] `sklearn.naive_bayes.GaussianNB`, . URL https://scikit-learn/stable/modules/generated/sklearn.naive_bayes.GaussianNB.html.
- [24] `sklearn.linear_model.LogisticRegression`, . URL https://scikit-learn/stable/modules/generated/sklearn.linear_model.LogisticRegression.html.
- [25] `sklearn.linear_model.ElasticNet`, . URL https://scikit-learn/stable/modules/generated/sklearn.linear_model.ElasticNet.html.
- [26] `sklearn.tree.DecisionTreeClassifier`, . URL <https://scikit-learn/stable/modules/generated/sklearn.tree.DecisionTreeClassifier.html>.
- [27] `sklearn.ensemble.RandomForestClassifier`, . URL <https://scikit-learn/stable/modules/generated/sklearn.ensemble.RandomForestClassifier.html>.
- [28] `sklearn.ensemble.GradientBoostingClassifier`, . URL <https://scikit-learn/stable/modules/generated/sklearn.ensemble.GradientBoostingClassifier.html>.
- [29] Tianqi Chen and Carlos Guestrin. XGBoost: A Scalable Tree Boosting System. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, KDD '16, pages 785–794, New York, NY, USA, August 2016. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 978-1-4503-4232-2. doi: 10.1145/2939672.2939785. URL <https://dl.acm.org/doi/10.1145/2939672.2939785>.
- [30] Guolin Ke, Qi Meng, Thomas Finley, Taifeng Wang, Wei Chen, Weidong Ma, Qiwei Ye, and Tie-Yan Liu. LightGBM: a highly efficient gradient boosting decision tree. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, NIPS'17, pages 3149–3157, Red Hook, NY, USA, December 2017. Curran Associates Inc. ISBN 978-1-5108-6096-4.
- [31] Anna Veronika Dorogush, Vasily Ershov, and Andrey Gulin. CatBoost: gradient boosting with categorical features support, October 2018. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1810.11363>. arXiv:1810.11363 [cs, stat].
- [32] `sklearn.svm.SVC`, . URL <https://scikit-learn/stable/modules/generated/sklearn.svm.SVC.html>.

- [33] sklearn.neural_network.MLPClassifier, . URL https://scikit-learn/stable/modules/generated/sklearn.neural_network.MLPClassifier.html.
- [34] sklearn.neighbors.KNeighborsClassifier, . URL <https://scikit-learn/stable/modules/generated/sklearn.neighbors.KNeighborsClassifier.html>.
- [35] Trevor Stephens. trevorstephens/gplearn, September 2023. URL <https://github.com/trevorstephens/gplearn>. original-date: 2015-03-26T01:01:14Z.
- [36] Ryan J Urbanowicz and Will N Browne. *Introduction to learning classifier systems*. Springer, 2017.
- [37] Martin V. Butz. The XCS Classifier System. In Martin V. Butz, editor, *Rule-Based Evolutionary Online Learning Systems: A Principled Approach to LCS Analysis and Design*, Studies in Fuzziness and Soft Computing, pages 51–64. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2006. ISBN 978-3-540-31231-4. doi: 10.1007/3-540-31231-5_4. URL https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-31231-5_4.
- [38] Ryan J. Urbanowicz and Jason H. Moore. ExSTraCS 2.0: description and evaluation of a scalable learning classifier system. *Evolutionary Intelligence*, 8(2):89–116, September 2015. ISSN 1864-5917. doi: 10.1007/s12065-015-0128-8. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12065-015-0128-8>.
- [39] Ryan J. Urbanowicz, Jeff Kiralis, Nicholas A. Sinnott-Armstrong, Tamra Heberling, Jonathan M. Fisher, and Jason H. Moore. GAMETES: a fast, direct algorithm for generating pure, strict, epistatic models with random architectures. *BioData Mining*, 5(1):16, October 2012. ISSN 1756-0381. doi: 10.1186/1756-0381-5-16. URL <https://doi.org/10.1186/1756-0381-5-16>.
- [40] Richard J. Schwab, Sarah E. Leinwand, Cary B. Bearn, Greg Maislin, Ramya Bhat Rao, Adithya Nagaraja, Stephen Wang, and Brendan T. Keenan. Digital Morphometrics: A New Upper Airway Phenotyping Paradigm in OSA. *Chest*, 152(2):330–342, August 2017. ISSN 1931-3543. doi: 10.1016/j.chest.2017.05.005.
- [41] Clément Niel, Christine Sinoquet, Christian Dina, and Ghislain Rocheleau. A survey about methods dedicated to epistasis detection. *Frontiers in Genetics*, 6, 2015. ISSN 1664-8021. URL <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fgene.2015.00285>.
- [42] D.H. Wolpert and W.G. Macready. No free lunch theorems for optimization. *IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation*, 1(1):67–82, April 1997. ISSN 1941-0026. doi: 10.1109/4235.585893. Conference Name: IEEE Transactions on Evolutionary Computation.
- [43] Jeyan Thiyagalingam, Mallikarjun Shankar, Geoffrey Fox, and Tony Hey. Scientific machine learning benchmarks. *Nature Reviews Physics*, 4(6):413–420, June 2022. ISSN 2522-5820. doi: 10.1038/s42254-022-00441-7. URL <https://www.nature.com/articles/s42254-022-00441-7>. Number: 6 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- [44] Randal S. Olson, William La Cava, Patryk Orzechowski, Ryan J. Urbanowicz, and Jason H. Moore. PMLB: a large benchmark suite for machine learning evaluation and comparison. *BioData Mining*, 10(1):36, December 2017. ISSN 1756-0381. doi: 10.1186/s13040-017-0154-4. URL <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13040-017-0154-4>.

- [45] Makoto Takamoto, Timothy Praditia, Raphael Leiteritz, Daniel MacKinlay, Francesco Ale-
siani, Dirk Pflüger, and Mathias Niepert. PDEBench: An Extensive Benchmark for Scientific
Machine Learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:1596–1611, De-
cember 2022. URL [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2022/hash/
0a9747136d411fb83f0cf81820d44afb-Abstract-Datasets_and_Benchmarks.html](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2022/hash/0a9747136d411fb83f0cf81820d44afb-Abstract-Datasets_and_Benchmarks.html).
- [46] Thomas Liao, Rohan Taori, Inioluwa Deborah Raji, and Ludwig Schmidt. Are We Learning Yet? A Meta
Review of Evaluation Failures Across Machine Learning. August 2021. URL [https://openreview.net/
forum?id=mPducS1MsEK](https://openreview.net/forum?id=mPducS1MsEK).
- [47] Erin LeDell and Sebastien Poirier. H2O AutoML: Scalable automatic machine learning. *7th ICML Workshop
on Automated Machine Learning (AutoML)*, July 2020. URL [https://www.automl.org/wp-content/
uploads/2020/07/AutoML_2020_paper_61.pdf](https://www.automl.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/07/AutoML_2020_paper_61.pdf).
- [48] Marc-André Zöllner and Marco F. Huber. Benchmark and Survey of Automated Machine Learning Frameworks.
Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research, 70:409–472, January 2021. ISSN 1076-9757. doi: 10.1613/jair.1.
11854. URL <https://www.jair.org/index.php/jair/article/view/11854>.
- [49] Adithya Balaji and Alexander Allen. Benchmarking Automatic Machine Learning Frameworks, August 2018.
URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1808.06492>. arXiv:1808.06492 [cs, stat].
- [50] Luís Ferreira, André Pilastrri, Carlos Manuel Martins, Pedro Miguel Pires, and Paulo Cortez. A Comparison of
AutoML Tools for Machine Learning, Deep Learning and XGBoost. In *2021 International Joint Conference
on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*, pages 1–8, July 2021. doi: 10.1109/IJCNN52387.2021.9534091. URL [https:
//ieeexplore.ieee.org/abstract/document/9534091](https://ieeexplore.ieee.org/abstract/document/9534091). ISSN: 2161-4407.
- [51] Pieter Gijsbers, Marcos L. P. Bueno, Stefan Coors, Erin LeDell, Sébastien Poirier, Janek Thomas, Bernd Bischl,
and Joaquin Vanschoren. AMLB: an AutoML Benchmark, July 2022. URL [http://arxiv.org/abs/2207.
12560](http://arxiv.org/abs/2207.12560). arXiv:2207.12560 [cs, stat].