

# Evolutionary Large Language Model for Automated Feature Transformation

Nanxu Gong

School of Computing and AI  
Arizona State University  
Tempe, USA  
nanxugong@outlook.com

Wangyang Ying

School of Computing and AI  
Arizona State University  
Tempe, USA  
wangyang.ying@asu.edu

Chandan K. Reddy

Department of Computer Science  
Virginia Tech  
Arlington, USA  
reddy@cs.vt.edu

Yanjie Fu

School of Computing and AI  
Arizona State University  
Tempe, USA  
yanjie.fu@asu.edu

## ABSTRACT

Feature transformation aims to reconstruct the feature space of raw features to enhance the performance of downstream models. However, the exponential growth in the combinations of features and operations poses a challenge, making it difficult for existing methods to efficiently explore a wide space. Additionally, their optimization is solely driven by the accuracy of downstream models in specific domains, neglecting the acquisition of general feature knowledge. To fill this research gap, we propose an evolutionary LLM framework for automated feature transformation. This framework consists of two parts: 1) constructing a multi-population database through an RL data collector while utilizing evolutionary algorithm strategies for database maintenance, and 2) utilizing the ability of Large Language Model (LLM) in sequence understanding, we employ few-shot prompts to guide LLM in generating superior samples based on feature transformation sequence distinction. Leveraging the multi-population database initially provides a wide search scope to discover excellent populations. Through culling and evolution, the high-quality populations are afforded greater opportunities, thereby furthering the pursuit of optimal individuals. Through the integration of LLMs with evolutionary algorithms, we achieve efficient exploration within a vast space, while harnessing feature knowledge to propel optimization, thus realizing a more adaptable search paradigm. Finally, we empirically demonstrate the effectiveness and generality of our proposed method. The code is available at <https://github.com/NanxuGong/ELLM-FT>

## 1 INTRODUCTION

In many real world applications, ML models struggle to fight complex and imperfect data (e.g., bias, outliers, noises). The quality of data, as a fundamental element in machine learning (ML), plays a significant role in the predictive performance of ML. To alleviate this issue, feature transformation is proposed to reconstruct an optimized feature space based on original features and mathematical operations (e.g., +, -, \*, /, sqrt). In industrial practices, traditional feature transformation typically are labor intensive, time costly, and lack generalization. Therefore, we focus on the task of Automated Feature Transformation (AFT) [8, 20, 21] that aims to reconstruct a discriminative feature space through an automatic model.

There are two main challenges in solving AFT: 1) efficient search in massive discrete space; 2) teaming between general feature knowledge and task-specific feature knowledge. Firstly, a feature space comprises exponentially growing possibilities of combinations of features and operations as candidate feature transformations, resulting in an immensely large search space. Efficient search in massive discrete space aims to answer: *How can we improve the efficiency of identifying the optimal search path given a large feature combination space?* Secondly, we need knowledge to steer the optimal search path. A widely used idea is to exploit task-specific feature knowledge, defined as the predictive accuracy feedback of a transformed feature set on a downstream ML model. This strategy ignores general feature knowledge from Artificial General Intelligence (AGI) like ChatGPT and other LLMs. Teaming between general feature knowledge and task-specific knowledge aims to answer: *How can we steer the optimal search path by leveraging both task-specific feature knowledge and LLM-like AGI?*

Prior literature can partially address the challenges. These methods can be divided into three categories: (1) *expansion-reduction methods* [8, 10]. These methods employ operators and randomly combine features to generate new feature samples, expanding the feature space. Subsequently, useful features are further filtered through feature selection. However, such methods rely on stochasticity, lacking optimization trajectories. (2) *evolution-evaluation methods* [9, 20]. These methods, rooted in reinforcement learning or evolutionary algorithms, amalgamate features and operator sets within a unified learning framework. They iteratively generate improved individuals until the model reaches the maximum iteration threshold. Such methods generally harbors explicit objectives. However, achieving maximal rewards over the long term is challenging. In the open environments, they tend to fall into local optima. (3) *Neural Architecture Search (NAS)-based methods* [3, 25]. These methods are constructed upon NAS, which was proposed to search optimal network architectures. Given that the objectives of AFT align closely with those of NAS, related methods have also been applied in this domain. However, such methods struggles to model the expansive feature transformation space, while exhibiting diminished efficiency. Existing studies show limitations on jointly

addressing efficiency and task-specific and general feature knowledge teaming in feature transformation. As a result, we need a novel perspective to derive the new formulation for AFT.

**Our insights: an evolutionary LLM generation perspective.**


We formulate feature transformation as a sequential generation task. We regard a transformed feature set as a token sequence comprising feature ID symbols and operators. The emerging LLM (e.g. ChatGPT) has shown its few shot and in-context learning ability to optimize and generate through seeing demonstrations. Our first insight to leverage LLMs as a feature transformation generator by demonstrating sample feature transformation operation sequence and corresponding priority to LLMs, so that LLMs can progressively learn complex feature knowledge, capture feature-feature interactions, and discern optimization directions. Inspired by the Google Deepmind Funsearch related studies [12, 13, 22, 24], our second insight is to team LLM with Evolutionary Algorithms (EA) can obtain an evolutionary LLM. Under the feature transformation contexts, EA can serve as a decision science model to decide the order, quality, diversity of few shot demonstrations, to strengthen few-shot learning and alleviate hallucination of LLMs

**Summary of Proposed Approach.** In this paper, we propose a novel Evolutionary Large Language Model framework for automated Feature Transformation (ELLM-FT). The framework has two goals: 1) LLM as a feature transformation operation sequence generator; 2) teaming LLMs with EA for better few-shot demonstrations to identify the optimal search direction. To achieve the goals, we firstly leverage a reinforcement learning data collector to construct a multi-population dataset. Within the database, each population evolves independently. We progressively eliminate subpar individuals while adding generated high-quality ones, and likewise eliminate inferior populations, granting superior populations more opportunities for evolution. We keep the diversity of the database from a multi-population perspective, while continuously enhancing the quality of samples within the population. We craft meticulously designed prompts for the pre-trained LLM. By leveraging the feature knowledge of few-shot samples, we guide the LLM to uncover optimization directions. Throughout the iterative process, we continuously update the database to enhance the performance of the LLM with diverse and high-quality samples. By employing *Llama-2-13B-chat-hf* as the backbone of LLM, ELLM-FT demonstrate competitive performance across diverse datasets.

**The contributions:** 1) We formulate feature transformation as LLM generative few shot learning to show that LLM can learn complex feature interaction knowledge and generate improved feature spaces by observing demonstrations of feature transformation operation sequences; 2) We develop an evolutionary LLM framework to show that teaming LLM with EA can enable collaboration between task-specific knowledge and general knowledge, improve demonstration quality, and identify a better optimization direction.

## 2 DEFINITION AND PROBLEM STATEMENT

**Operation Set.** In order to reconstruct the feature space, we conduct mathematical operations on the original features to generate new features. These mathematical operations encompass unary operations (e.g., "log," "sqrt," "sin") and binary operations (e.g., "minus," "plus," "multiply"), collectively forming a operation set  $O$ .



**Figure 1: An example of feature transformation sequence.**  $s_i$  denotes the sequence of  $\tilde{f}_i$ .

**Problem Statement.** Assuming a raw dataset  $D = \{X, y\}$ , where  $X$  is original feature set consisting of  $N$  features i.e.,  $X = [f_1, f_2, \dots, f_N]$  and  $y$  is the target. We aim to reconstruct the feature space by performing mathematical operations on the original features, thereby generating  $K$  new features. A better feature space can be defined by  $\tilde{X} = [\tilde{f}_1, \tilde{f}_2, \dots, \tilde{f}_K]$ . In this process, we can explicitly represent each new feature using a sequence, as shown in Figure 1. Thereafter,  $\tilde{X}$  can be further represented by  $\tilde{S} = [\tilde{s}_1, \tilde{s}_2, \dots, \tilde{s}_K]$ . We formulate the feature transformation problem as a sequential generation task. The goal is to identify an optimal feature transformation sequence  $S^*$  to enhance downstream ML task.

## 3 METHODOLOGY


### 3.1 Framework Overview

Figure 2 illustrates the framework of ELLM-FT including two steps: 1) reinforcement learning-based data dataset construction; 2) LLM-based feature transformation operation sequence search. In step 1, we construct a RL data collector consisting of two feature agents and an operation agent. The agents decide a feature in each iteration, and expand the feature space by adding the feature. Through evaluation by downstream ML models, the data collector autonomously adjusts its selection strategy, ensuring the acquisition of high-quality database. To reduce the required token count, we represent all data using postfix expression. Thereafter, we regard all sets of feature transformation generated within a single Markov process as a unified population. They share the same genotype overall but exist at different evolutionary stages. The variances at the feature level potentially reflect the optimization direction. In step 2, We iteratively guide the LLM through few-shot prompts to discover optimization directions from the differences between samples, thereby generating improved samples. These new samples are evaluated by downstream ML models and stored in the database. Thereafter, we periodically eliminate inferior individuals and populations, enhancing the quality of the database while maintaining diversity.

### 3.2 RL-based Multi-Population Database Construction

**Why constructing a multi-population database.** The search space for feature transformation is extremely vast, thus, we aim to efficiently cover as much ground as possible. To achieve this objective, we construct a multi-population database. The diversity of populations enables us to encompass a broader range of feature sets, thereby uncovering promising populations. Furthermore, we gradually filter out high-quality populations and individuals for a refined search, thus maximizing possibilities while maintaining efficiency.

**Reinforcement Learning-based Data Collection.** Generally, manual data collection is time-consuming, and challenging to obtain diverse and high-quality data. Inspired by [20, 23], we develop



**Figure 2: Framework overview.** Firstly, we utilize the RL data collector to construct the database, Then, we leverage pre-trained LLM to iteratively generate new feature transformation sequences while simultaneously updating the database.

a reinforcement learning data collector to perform automated data collection. Specifically, the RL data collector consists of three agents: a head feature agent, an operation agent, and a tail feature agent. It iteratively generates new features based on feedback from downstream ML models. For example, during the  $i$ -th iteration, with the previous feature space denoted as  $X_i = [f_1, f_2, \dots, f_i]$ , three agents collaborate to select two features and one operator to generate a new feature  $f_{i+1}$ . Therefore, we can get a new sample  $\{X_{i+1}, y_{i+1}\}$  where  $X_{i+1}$  denotes the new feature set and  $y_{i+1}$  is the downstream ML model accuracy. The dataset constructed through such a Markov decision processes (MDPs) aligns closely with the requirements of our database. The optimization direction of LLM is implicitly guided by the priority of accuracy from downstream ML models.

**Feature Transformation Sequence as Postfix Expressions.** In order to enable the comprehension of feature transformation knowledge by the LLM, we serialize the feature transformation. However, three challenges arise in this process: 1) *Semantic sparsity*: The feature transformation sequences often encompass not only feature IDs and operators but also numerous brackets indicating computation priority. This tends to dilute the semantic information within the sequence, making it challenging for LLM to capture the essence effectively. 2) *Illegal feature transformation sequences*: Incorrect usage of brackets can lead to errors in the entire feature transformation sequence, thereby diminishing the validity of generation. 3) *Token constraints*: LLMs typically operate within maximum token limits, necessitating the encapsulation of extensive feature knowledge within a limited token space.


To address these challenges, we convert the feature transformation sequences into postfix expressions. For example, the sequence  $\{f_0, (f_1 + f_2), ((f_0 + f_2) * f_3)\}$  can be represented by  $\{f_0, f_1 f_2 +, f_0 f_2 + f_3 *\}$ . Through such transformations, we can reduce the required token count while enhancing the informativeness of the sequences.

### 3.3 LLM-based Feature Transformation Operation Sequence Search

**Why generating feature transformation Operation sequence via LLM.** Instead of solely optimizing the search process based on feedback from downstream tasks, we believe that acquiring general feature knowledge is also the key to a universal feature transformation approach. These feature knowledge encompass interactions between features, relationships between features and operators, and can aid in optimizing search. Based on the ability of comprehending sequential knowledge, LLM can capture discrepancies within given feature transformation operation sequences and optimize them based on feature knowledge.

**Step 1: Prompt Design.** To facilitate the learning of feature knowledge by the LLM, a meticulously designed prompt is necessary. Existing works have proposed two kinds of prompt 1) Sampling  $M$  examples randomly from a population [13]. 2) Sampling  $M$  top-performing examples from a population and arranging them in order of priority (priority\_v0, priority\_v1, ..., priority\_vM), with higher indices indicating better performance [14]. However, both approaches have their limitations. The former relies too heavily on randomness, lacking the optimization information that LLM can leverage. Meanwhile, the latter’s input is relatively fixed, leading the LLM to tend towards regenerating existing samples after a certain number of iterations.

To address these limitations, We propose a novel prompt that balances randomness and quality. Figure 3 shows an example of our prompt. Firstly, the prompt entail descriptions of the problem, set of operators and original feature IDs, all of which provide domain knowledge to the LLM. With each input, we feed the LLM with few-shot examples of feature transformation operation sequence, enabling it to adaptively refine existing samples. Notably, each input sample is randomly drawn from the same population and ranked according to priority (priority\_v0, priority\_v1, ...), with higher indices indicating better performance. In this setting, the LLM can



**Figure 3: An example of our prompt consisting of the instruction and few-shot feature transformation operation sequence samples**

receive progressive examples at a iteration. By examining the differences between them, the LLM can uncover implicit directions for optimization and perform evolutionary operations to produce more superior individuals. Since we maintain a high-quality database, the input examples are well-performing. While preserving input quality, we retain a degree of randomness, infusing additional dynamism into the generation process of the LLM.

**Step 2: Feature Transformation Operation Sequence Generation by LLM.** To generate superior samples, we employ LLM to execute adaptive evolutionary operations based on existing samples. Specifically, we utilize *Llama-2-13B-chat-hf* as the pre-trained LLM. In each iteration, we select a population to obtain a corresponding set of few samples. The description of the problem and these samples are input into LLM to guide the model in refining upon existing samples, thus producing new samples. The success of this approach primarily relies on LLM’s extensive prior scientific knowledge and understanding of textual data. It is capable of comprehending the problem and executing evolutionary operations based on the domain-specific information we provide.

**Step 3: Verification and Evaluation.** After obtaining feature transformation operation sequences from the output of the LLM, we further verify their validity from three perspectives: 1) adherence to specified operators and feature IDs; 2) legal postfix expressions; and 3) absence from the database. Upon filtering out valid samples, we transform them into corresponding datasets, leveraging downstream ML models to evaluate performance and thereby augment the database with new samples.

**Step 4: Database Update.** As the quality of samples in the database affects the performance of generating samples by LLM, it is necessary to ensure the database undergoes update. Therefore, we propose a database update strategy, which can be summarized as two steps: individual elimination and population elimination. For individual elimination, we establish a threshold number  $T$  for individuals. At regular intervals during iteration, assuming the current individual number within a population is  $P$ , we prioritize based on performance and eliminate the least  $T - P$  qualified individuals, ensuring the preservation of overall high-quality within the population. For population elimination, we regularly clean out lower-performing half of the population, where the performance of the populations are determined by the best individuals. Upon the elimination of the inferior populations, we replicate the superior ones, affording high-quality populations greater opportunities for

proliferation. This strategy enables us to extensively explore potentially viable populations in the early stages, subsequently granting superior populations additional opportunities, thereby mitigating the risk of getting trapped in local optimum within a narrower search space.

## 4 EXPERIMENTS

### 4.1 Experimental Setup

**Data Description.** We collected 12 datasets from UCIrvine, LibSVM, Kaggle, and OpenML. We evaluated our method and baseline methods on two widely-used predictive tasks in machine learning: 1) classification (C); 2) regression (R). Table 1 shows the detail information of the datasets.

**Evaluation Design.** We adopt Random Forest (RF) as the downstream ML model. For classification tasks, we use F-1 score to evaluate the accuracy. For regression tasks, we use 1-relative absolute error (RAE). To reduce the randomness of predictor, we perform 5-fold stratified cross-validation in all experiments.

**Baseline Algorithms.** We compare our method with 7 widely used feature generation algorithms: (1) **RDG** randomly generates feature-operation-feature transformation records to get new features. (2) **ERG** applies operation on each feature to expand the feature space, then selects the valuable features. (3) **LDA** [1] obtains new features through matrix factorization. (4) **AFAT** [6] iteratively generate new features and leverage multi-step feature selection to filter useful features. (5) **NFS** [3] models the transformation trajectory of each feature and optimize the feature generation process via reinforcement learning (6) **TTG** [9] formulates the transformation process as a graph and search the best feature set through reinforcement learning. (7) **GRFG** [20] leverage a cascading agent structure to generate new features and proposes a feature grouping strategy to accelerate agent learning.

To validate the efficacy of the each technical component, we also develop variants of ELLM-FT: (i) **ELLM-FT<sup>f</sup>** follows the prompt of [14], i.e., selecting the top- $M$  samples from a population, arranging them in ascending order in each iteration. (ii) **ELLM-FT<sup>c</sup>** follows the prompt of [13], i.e., randomly selecting  $M$  samples in each iteration. (iii) **ELLM-FT<sup>r</sup>** removes the RL data collector and collect the data at random.

### 4.2 Overall Comparison

This experiment aims to answer: *Can our method effectively improve the downstream task?* We compare the proposed method with 7

**Table 1: The comparison of the proposed method with baselines over 12 datasets, where the best results have been bolded**

Dataset	C/R	Samples	Features	RDG	ERG	LDA	AFT	NFS	TTG	GRFG	ELLM-FT
Amazon Employee	C	32769	9	0.744	0.740	0.920	0.943	0.935	0.806	<b>0.946</b>	<b>0.946</b>
SVMGuide3	C	1243	21	0.703	0.747	0.683	0.829	0.831	0.766	0.850	<b>0.856</b>
German Credit	C	1001	24	0.695	0.661	0.627	0.751	0.765	0.731	0.772	<b>0.775</b>
Messidor Features	C	1150	19	0.673	0.635	0.580	0.678	0.746	0.726	0.757	<b>0.760</b>
SpamBase	C	4601	57	0.951	0.931	0.908	0.951	0.955	<b>0.961</b>	0.958	0.957
Ionosphere	C	351	34	0.919	0.926	0.730	0.827	0.949	0.938	0.960	<b>0.963</b>
Openml_586	R	1000	25	0.595	0.546	0.472	0.687	0.748	0.704	0.783	<b>0.801</b>
Openml_589	R	1000	25	0.638	0.560	0.331	0.672	0.711	0.682	0.753	<b>0.781</b>
Openml_607	R	1000	50	0.579	0.406	0.376	0.658	0.675	0.639	0.680	<b>0.793</b>
Openml_616	R	500	50	0.448	0.372	0.385	0.585	0.593	0.559	0.603	<b>0.739</b>
Openml_618	R	1000	50	0.415	0.427	0.372	0.665	0.640	0.587	0.672	<b>0.778</b>
Openml_620	R	1000	25	0.575	0.584	0.425	0.663	0.698	0.656	0.714	<b>0.725</b>


baselines on 12 datasets, the results of which are shown in Table 1. Across most datasets, ELLM-FT has exhibited superior performance, surpassing the best baseline by an average margin of 2.4%. Only on "SpamBase" does our model fall below the baseline by 0.4%. This confirms our model's ability to effectively identify optimization directions based on feature differentials, yielding superior samples. An interesting finding emerges on noisy datasets, such as Openml\_616, where ELLM-FT notably surpasses the baselines. This implies that optimization driven by feature knowledge is more robust compared to accuracy-driven optimization, capable of resisting disturbances caused by noise.

### 4.3 Study of the Performance Trajectory

This experiment aims to answer: *Can the proposed method efficiently search feature transformation operation sequence?* To investigate the search efficiency of the proposed model, we compare the performance trajectories of ELLM-FT and GRFG, as shown in Figure 4. In the short term, ELLM-FT achieves excellent performance within 50 iterations. The underlying driver is the high-quality database constructed through the RL data collector, providing a solid starting point for the search. In the long term, ELLM-FT consistently evolves superior individuals, exhibiting more ascending points compared to GRFG's trajectory and reaching higher zenith. This indicates the efficacy of ELLM in learning general feature knowledge and uncovering optimization directions across few-shot samples. In general, ELLM-FT achieves promising results more rapidly compared to reinforcement learning methods represented by GRFG. Furthermore, ELLM-FT continuously optimizes feature transformation operation sequences in the long-term iteration, thus harboring the potential to explore even superior results.

### 4.4 Investigating the Prompt


This experiment aims to answer: *Is the proposed prompt better than other prompts?* To achieve the goal, we develop two variants of our model: 1) ELLF-FT<sup>f</sup> adopts the prompt of Funsearch [14], selecting the top- $M$  samples in each iteration, sorted by their performance.; 2) ELLF-FT<sup>c</sup> adopts the prompt of LMX [13], selecting random  $M$  samples in each iteration. Figure 5(a) shows the downstream task accuracy of the three models. On both datasets, our proposed prompt

**Figure 4: The performance trajectory of the proposed method compared to GRFG on two datasets.**


has facilitated the model in achieving best performance. Additionally, we report in Figure 5(b) the number of valid samples generated by the model at the same number of iterations. We can observe that ELLF-FT<sup>c</sup> is capable of generating the most valid samples. However, due to the prompt's reliance on random and unordered samples, LLM struggles to discern optimization directions from them, resulting in poor performance on the noisy dataset. The prompt of ELLF-FT<sup>f</sup> aids LLM in feature optimization. Nevertheless, due to its selection of only the top- $M$  samples, it results in underutilization of other data. Additionally, after a certain number of iterations, LLM struggles to generate more diverse and valid samples from repetitive inputs. Consequently, the quantity of valid samples generated by it falls significantly short compared to the other two models, and in the long term, its efficacy also proves inadequate. In terms of a comprehensive evaluation encompassing both the valid sample number and accuracy, ELLM-FT demonstrates best performance, thus confirming the efficacy of the proposed prompt.

### 4.5 Study of the RL Data Collector

This experiment aims to answer: *Is the database constructed by RL data collector effective?* We introduce the model variant ELLM-FT' to examine the impact of RL data collectors on results. Figure 6 shows the results obtained by the two models, with ELLM-FT outperforming on both datasets. This phenomenon can be elucidated by the notion that the database created by the RL data collector implicitly encapsulates the optimization direction driven by reinforcement learning, thereby aiding LLM in generating superior



**Figure 5: Results of the proposed method using three different prompts We compared (a) downstream task accuracy across two datasets, and (b) valid sample number.**



**Figure 6: Results of the proposed method using the RL data collector and random selection respectively.**

samples more effectively. Furthermore, the data acquired by the RL data collector is diverse and of high quality, which also contributes to the model’s performance.


#### 4.6 Case Study: Practical Impact Analysis

This experiment aims to answer *Can the proposed method generate a rational and interpretable feature space in practical application?* In our *Ionosphere* dataset case study, we identify the top 10 important features for predicting the free electrons in the ionosphere using random forest. Figure 7 illustrates the top 10 important features in both the original feature space and the feature space reconstructed using ELLM-FT. The depth of color represents the level of importance, with darker shades indicating greater significance. The performance of the model is showcased at the center of the annulus. We can observe that after reconstructing the feature space, the model’s performance improved by 2.78%, with the generated features covering 50% of the top 10 features. This suggests that ELLM-FT can generate informative features in practical applications to enhance the feature space, thereby improving the performance of downstream model.

## 5 RELATED WORK

### 5.1 Automated Feature Transformation

AFT aims to reconstruct the feature space by automatically transform original features through mathematical operations. Prior literature can be categorized into three classifications: 1) expansion-reduction methods. These methods expand the feature space and filter out valuable features. DFS [8] is firstly proposed to transform all the original features and select the significant features. Cognito [10] conducts feature transformation searches on a transformation tree and devises an incremental search strategy to efficiently explore valuable features. Furthermore, Autofeat [6] iteratively



**Figure 7: Top 10 important features for prediction in the (a) original feature space and (b) reconstructed feature space**

samples features based on beam search. 2) evolution-evaluation methods. These methods are primarily grounded in genetic programming and reinforcement learning, iteratively navigating the decision process.. Binh et al. [18] applies genetic programming to feature transformation. TransGraph [9] leverages Q-learning to decide feature transformation. GRFE [20] introduces three agents to collaborate in generating new feature transformations. 3) NAS-based methods. NAS [26] regards the network architecture as a variable length string. Utilizing reinforcement learning enables iterative exploration of network architecture. These methods can also be used in AFT. For example, NFS [3] employs an RNN-based controller to generate new feature transformations and trains it through reinforcement learning. In this paper, we propose an evolutionary LLM framework for feature transformation. Our method distinguishes itself from prior literature in three main aspects: 1) *diverse and high-quality search*. We maintain a multi-population database, enabling us to explore a wider range of potential populations at the search outset. Subsequently, through elimination and evolution, we conduct high-quality iterations; 2) *implicit optimization direction*. Existing methods often lack an optimization direction or possess explicit ones. We introduce an implicitly optimized approach, encouraging LLMs to perceive potential optimization directions from few-shot prompts, facilitating flexible optimization; 3) *generalization*. Our model demonstrates the ability to generalize across diverse domains, requiring only few-shot samples for generating new instances.

### 5.2 LLM and Evolutionary Algorithm

The Large Language Model (LLM) plays a significant role across various domains due to its formidable generative capabilities and understanding of natural language. However, LLM sometimes provide inaccurate responses due to either insufficient external knowledge or memory biases, which is referred to the hallucination of LLM [12, 15, 17]. Various works have been proposed to address this issue [4, 5, 7, 11, 19], among which the perspective of self-refinement through feedback and reasoning has garnered considerable attention [12, 24]. In this context, recent research has revealed that integrating LLM with evolutionary algorithms not only alleviates the hallucination of LLM but also enhances efficiency [16]. LLM harnesses prior knowledge to continually engage in adaptive

crossover and mutation, yielding significant strides in fields such as neural architecture search [2], symbolic regression [15], and mathematical discovery [14]. In this paper, we propose an evolutionary LLM framework for automated feature transformation. By leveraging LLM’s capacity for understanding sequential knowledge, the proposed method captures correlations between features and operations, thereby facilitating implicit optimization.

## 6 CONCLUSION

In this paper, we introduce an evolutionary LLM-based feature transformation model. Our approach achieves automated feature transformation through two steps: 1) automatic construction of a multi-population database via RL data collectors; 2) feature transformation operation sequence search by few-shot prompting LLM. We optimize feature transformation using LLM based on the teaming of general feature knowledge and task-specific knowledge. Within the framework of evolutionary algorithms, we continuously iterate through evolutionary processes and culling operations. By maintaining multiple population databases, we achieve diverse and high-quality searches. Through extensive experimentation, we substantiate the effectiveness and practical impact of ELLM-FT.

## REFERENCES

- [1] David M Blei, Andrew Y Ng, and Michael I Jordan. 2003. Latent dirichlet allocation. *Journal of machine Learning research* 3, Jan (2003), 993–1022.
- [2] Angelica Chen, David Dohan, and David So. 2024. Evoprompting: Language models for code-level neural architecture search. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [3] Xiangning Chen, Qingwei Lin, Chuan Luo, Xudong Li, Hongyu Zhang, Yong Xu, Yingnong Dang, Kaixin Sui, Xu Zhang, Bo Qiao, et al. 2019. Neural feature search: A neural architecture for automated feature engineering. In *2019 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM)*. IEEE, 71–80.
- [4] Daixuan Cheng, Shaohan Huang, Junyu Bi, Yuefeng Zhan, Jianfeng Liu, Yujing Wang, Hao Sun, Furu Wei, Denvy Deng, and Qi Zhang. 2023. Uprise: Universal prompt retrieval for improving zero-shot evaluation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08518* (2023).
- [5] Luyu Gao, Zhuyun Dai, Panupong Pasupat, Anthony Chen, Arun Tejasvi Chaganty, Yicheng Fan, Vincent Y Zhao, Ni Lao, Hongrae Lee, Da-Cheng Juan, et al. 2022. Rarr: Researching and revising what language models say, using language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.08726* (2022).
- [6] Franziska Horn, Robert Pack, and Michael Rieger. 2020. The autofeat python library for automated feature engineering and selection. In *Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases: International Workshops of ECML PKDD 2019, Würzburg, Germany, September 16–20, 2019, Proceedings, Part I*. Springer, 111–120.
- [7] Erik Jones, Hamid Palangi, Clarisse Simões, Varun Chandrasekaran, Subhabrata Mukherjee, Arindam Mitra, Ahmed Awadallah, and Ece Kamar. 2023. Teaching language models to hallucinate less with synthetic tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.06827* (2023).
- [8] James Max Kanter and Kalyan Veeramachaneni. 2015. Deep feature synthesis: Towards automating data science endeavors. In *2015 IEEE international conference on data science and advanced analytics (DSAA)*. IEEE, 1–10.
- [9] Udayan Khurana, Horst Samulowitz, and Deepak Turaga. 2018. Feature engineering for predictive modeling using reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vol. 32.
- [10] Udayan Khurana, Deepak Turaga, Horst Samulowitz, and Srinivasan Parthasarathy. 2016. Cognito: Automated feature engineering for supervised learning. In *2016 IEEE 16th international conference on data mining workshops (ICDMW)*. IEEE, 1304–1307.
- [11] Patrick Lewis, Ethan Perez, Aleksandra Piktus, Fabio Petroni, Vladimir Karpukhin, Naman Goyal, Heinrich Küttler, Mike Lewis, Wen-tau Yih, Tim Rocktäschel, et al. 2020. Retrieval-augmented generation for knowledge-intensive nlp tasks. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), 9459–9474.
- [12] Aman Madaan, Niket Tandon, Prakhar Gupta, Skyler Hallinan, Luyu Gao, Sarah Wiegrefe, Uri Alon, Nouha Dziri, Shrimai Prabhunoye, Yiming Yang, et al. 2024. Self-refine: Iterative refinement with self-feedback. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [13] Elliot Meyerson, Mark J Nelson, Herbie Bradley, Adam Gaier, Arash Moradi, Amy K Hoover, and Joel Lehman. 2023. Language model crossover: Variation through few-shot prompting. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.12170* (2023).
- [14] Bernardino Romera-Paredes, Mohammadamin Barekatian, Alexander Novikov, Matej Balog, M Pawan Kumar, Emilien Dupont, Francisco JR Ruiz, Jordan S Ellenberg, Pengming Wang, Omar Fawzi, et al. 2024. Mathematical discoveries from program search with large language models. *Nature* 625, 7995 (2024), 468–475.
- [15] Parshin Shojaee, Kazem Meidani, Shashank Gupta, Amir Barati Farimani, and Chandan K Reddy. 2024. LLM-SR: Scientific Equation Discovery via Programming with Large Language Models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.18400* (2024).
- [16] Reiji Suzuki and Takaya Arita. 2024. An evolutionary model of personality traits related to cooperative behavior using a large language model. *Scientific Reports* 14, 1 (2024), 5989.
- [17] SM Tomtoy, SM Zaman, Vinija Jain, Anku Rani, Vipula Rawte, Aman Chadha, and Amitava Das. 2024. A comprehensive survey of hallucination mitigation techniques in large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.01313* (2024).
- [18] Binh Tran, Bing Xue, and Mengjie Zhang. 2016. Genetic programming for feature construction and selection in classification on high-dimensional data. *Memetic Computing* 8 (2016), 3–15.
- [19] Neeraj Varshney, Wenlin Yao, Hongming Zhang, Jianshu Chen, and Dong Yu. 2023. A stitch in time saves nine: Detecting and mitigating hallucinations of llms by validating low-confidence generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.03987* (2023).
- [20] Dongjie Wang, Yanjie Fu, Kunpeng Liu, Xiaolin Li, and Yan Solihin. 2022. Group-wise reinforcement feature generation for optimal and explainable representation space reconstruction. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM SIGKDD Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. 1826–1834.
- [21] Dongjie Wang, Meng Xiao, Min Wu, Yuanchun Zhou, Yanjie Fu, et al. 2024. Reinforcement-enhanced autoregressive feature transformation: Gradient-steered search in continuous space for postfix expressions. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [22] Xingyu Wu, Sheng-hao Wu, Jibin Wu, Liang Feng, and Kay Chen Tan. 2024. Evolutionary Computation in the Era of Large Language Model: Survey and Roadmap. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.10034* (2024).
- [23] Meng Xiao, Dongjie Wang, Min Wu, Ziyue Qiao, Pengfei Wang, Kunpeng Liu, Yuanchun Zhou, and Yanjie Fu. 2023. Traceable automatic feature transformation via cascading actor-critic agents. In *Proceedings of the 2023 SIAM International Conference on Data Mining (SDM)*. SIAM, 775–783.
- [24] Kaiyu Yang, Aidan Swope, Alex Gu, Rahul Chalamala, Peiyang Song, Shixing Yu, Saad Godil, Ryan J Prenger, and Animashree Anandkumar. 2024. Leandojo: Theorem proving with retrieval-augmented language models. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [25] Guanghui Zhu, Zhuoer Xu, Chunfeng Yuan, and Yihua Huang. 2022. DIFER: differentiable automated feature engineering. In *International Conference on Automated Machine Learning*. PMLR, 17–1.
- [26] Barret Zoph and Quoc V Le. 2016. Neural architecture search with reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.01578* (2016).