

A Benchmarking Study of Kolmogorov-Arnold Networks on Tabular Data

Eleonora Poeta
Dip. di Automatica e Informatica
Politecnico di Torino
Turin, Italy
eleonora.poeta@polito.it

Flavio Giobergia
Dip. di Automatica e Informatica
Politecnico di Torino
Turin, Italy
flavio.giobergia@polito.it

Eliana Pastor
Dip. di Automatica e Informatica
Politecnico di Torino
Turin, Italy
eliana.pastor@polito.it

Tania Cerquitelli
Dip. di Automatica e Informatica
Politecnico di Torino
Turin, Italy
tania.cerquitelli@polito.it

Elena Baralis
Dip. di Automatica e Informatica
Politecnico di Torino
Turin, Italy
elena.baralis@polito.it

Abstract—Kolmogorov-Arnold Networks (KANs) have very recently been introduced into the world of machine learning, quickly capturing the attention of the entire community. However, KANs have mostly been tested for approximating complex functions or processing synthetic data, while a test on real-world tabular datasets is currently lacking. In this paper, we present a benchmarking study comparing KANs and Multi-Layer Perceptrons (MLPs) on tabular datasets. The study evaluates task performance and training times. From the results obtained on the various datasets, KANs demonstrate superior or comparable accuracy and F_1 scores, excelling particularly in datasets with numerous instances, suggesting robust handling of complex data. We also highlight that this performance improvement of KANs comes with a higher computational cost when compared to MLPs of comparable sizes.

Index Terms—KAN, MLP, Benchmarking

I. INTRODUCTION

The introduction of Kolmogorov-Arnold Networks (KANs) [1] has received significant attention from the machine learning and deep learning community, quickly capturing the interest of researchers and practitioners. Inspired by the work of Andrey Kolmogorov and Vladimir Arnold [2], [3], KANs represent a new class of neural network architectures. KANs represent a significant advancement in addressing some limitations of Multi-Layer Perceptrons (MLPs). They try to mitigate the “black box” nature inherent in MLPs by offering an *interpretable* framework. In KANs, users can inspect the network internally, understand activation functions, and interact with the network structure through pruning. Another distinguishing feature of KANs is their fully connected structure. While this resembles MLPs, where nodes (neurons) have fixed activation functions, KANs innovate by incorporating learnable activation functions on edges (weights). This approach eliminates traditional linear weight matrices, replacing each weight parameter with a learnable 1D function that is typically parameterized as a spline. By representing functions as a sum of

these simple, learnable functions, KANs significantly enhance accuracy and interpretability in function approximation tasks.

This capability makes KANs useful for scientific discovery and various complex applications, as they can accurately represent continuous functions while maintaining the interpretability of the underlying model. Until now, KANs have mainly been evaluated on simple cases and synthetic datasets, leaving their performance unexplored on more complex, real-world data. To address this gap, we propose benchmarking KAN networks using some of the most widely utilized datasets from the UCI Machine Learning Repository [4].

This benchmarking study tests KANs on diverse datasets encompassing various domains and dimensionalities to assess their robustness, scalability, and practical applicability. We test KANs against their MLP counterparts. By systematically evaluating KANs, we aim to gain a comprehensive understanding of their capabilities and limitations, ultimately contributing to their development and potential adoption in a wider range of applications. The results indicate that KAN is a viable substitute for MLP, demonstrating competitive performance across various scenarios and excelling in more complex datasets with numerous instances, although at a higher computational cost.

II. RELATED WORK AND BACKGROUND

Multi-layer Perceptrons (MLP) [5]–[8] have long been a fundamental building block for constructing neural networks. Their fully connected architecture and ability to approximate complex functions, as well as their expressive power, have made them widely popular in various applications, from image recognition to natural language processing. Even if really popular, MLP architectures suffer from different drawbacks. For example, activation functions are fixed and applied to nodes (neurons). To some extent, this network rigidity may limit the model’s flexibility in capturing complex relationships within the data, as it relies on predefined nonlinearities. Moreover, MLPs are often considered black boxes [9] because their inner

TABLE I

DATASET CHARACTERISTICS. FOR EACH DATASET, WE REPORT THE CLASSIFICATION TYPE (BINARY OR MULTICLASS), THE NUMBER OF FEATURES, NUMBER OF ROWS, MISSING VALUES, AND DATA TYPES.

Dataset name	Task	Number of Features	Number Rows	Missing values	Data Type
Breast Cancer	Binary	30	569	✗	Numerical
Spam	Binary	47	4,601	✗	Numerical
Musk	Binary	166	6,598	✗	Numerical
Dry Bean	Multiclass	16	13,611	✗	Numerical
Gamma Telescope	Binary	10	19,020	✗	Numerical
Adult	Binary	14	48,842	✓	Numerical + Categorical
Shuttle	Multiclass	7	58,000	✗	Numerical
Diabetes	Binary	21	253,680	✓	Numerical
Poker	Multiclass	10	1,025,010	✗	Numerical

workings are not easily interpreted. This opacity can hinder the adoption of MLPs in fields where interpretability is critical.

A. Kolmogorov-Arnold Theorem (KAT)

The Kolmogorov-Arnold theorem (KAT) originated with the foundational work of Andrey Kolmogorov [2], who demonstrated that any multivariate continuous function can be represented as a finite composition of several univariate continuous functions and a binary operation of addition. This result laid the theoretical foundation for the theorem. Vladimir Arnold [3] further refined Kolmogorov’s theory, solidifying KAT as a robust framework for representing functions.

Specifically, a smooth multivariate continuous function on a bounded domain, $f : [0, 1]^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, can be written as follows:

$$f(x) = f(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sum_{q=1}^{2n+1} \Phi_q \left(\sum_{p=1}^n \phi_{q,p}(x_p) \right) \quad (1)$$

with $\phi_{q,p} : [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and $\Phi_q : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ being the univariate functions.

Despite its theoretical significance, KAT was not initially seen as directly applicable to neural networks. In [10], the authors address the challenge of representing nonlinear mappings with simpler functions of fewer variables in neural networks, reviewing the Kolmogorov-Arnold theorem. They conclude that KAT is irrelevant for neural networks because these networks can approximate multivariable functions using one-input, one-output units without relying on the specific representation properties outlined by Kolmogorov’s theorem.

Additionally, the theorem is based on using only two hidden layers and a limited set of activation functions, which is impractical for modern neural networks. Contemporary neural network architectures can involve hundreds of hidden layers and thousands of neurons within those layers. As a result, deeper networks with nonlinear activation functions tend to perform significantly better for function approximation tasks.

B. Kolmogorov-Arnold Networks (KAN)

Liu et al. [1] are the first to propose Kolmogorov-Arnold Networks (KANs) as promising alternatives to MLPs, addressing the previously mentioned limitations. Their work differentiates from previous research by identifying the similarity

between MLPs and networks using the Kolmogorov-Arnold Theorem, which they term Kolmogorov-Arnold Networks (KANs). Typically, an MLP is characterized by its multiple stacked layers. Therefore, the focus is on identifying what constitutes a “layer” within KAN architectures. From equation 1, the network is structured as a two-layer neural network with activation functions on the edges rather than the nodes (where a simple summation is performed) and with a width of $2n + 1$ in the middle layer. This clarifies the concept of deeper Kolmogorov-Arnold representations by simply stacking more KAN layers. One distinctive feature of KAN networks is the absence of traditional weights of neural networks. In KANs, every “weight” is effectively represented as a small function. Unlike traditional neural networks where nodes apply fixed non-linear activation functions, each edge in a KAN is characterized by a learnable activation function. This architectural paradigm allows KANs to operate more flexibly and adaptively than conventional approaches, potentially allowing the modeling of complex relationships in data.

III. BENCHMARKING EVALUATION

This section outlines the methodology employed in this study for benchmarking. We provide an overview of the benchmarking process, including a description of the datasets used, the testing procedures, the metrics examined, and the configurations of the KAN and MLP architectures evaluated.

A. Benchmarking methodology

The study benchmarks KANs by comparing their performance and effectiveness with those of traditional MLPs. We aim to evaluate whether KANs could be a viable alternative and motivate their adoption. For the analysis, we use real-world datasets to explore the practical applications and effectiveness of KANs in scenarios commonly encountered in everyday data analysis tasks.

The benchmarking process evaluates the two models across ten architectural configurations, ensuring each configuration has a comparable number of parameters for both models. This balanced configuration allows us to determine which model demonstrates superior performance under equivalent conditions. We progressively increase the number of parameters and evaluate how performance varies.

TABLE II

PERFORMANCE RESULTS OF KAN AND MLP ACROSS THE DATASETS. EACH METRIC IS EXPRESSED AS AVERAGE±STANDARD DEVIATION. THE SELECTED ACCURACY, F1-SCORE, PRECISION, AND RECALL ARE THE HIGHEST AMONG THE AVERAGE METRICS FROM FIVE RUNS ACROSS ALL PARAMETER CONFIGURATIONS. THE FPR AND FNR ARE CALCULATED FOR BINARY CLASSIFICATION DATASETS ONLY. THE TRAINING TIME IN SECONDS REFERS TO THE AVERAGE EXPIRED TIME IN TRAINING FOR EACH CONFIGURATION.

Dataset	Model	Accuracy	F1 score	Precision	Recall	FPR	FNR	Training time (s)
Breast Cancer	KAN	94.56±1.569	78.69±1.692	95.03±1.791	93.43±1.685	1.97±1.606	11.163±2.548	0.09
	MLP	96.84±0.480	80.44±0.423	96.64±0.540	96.64±0.536	2.53±0.630	4.18±1.040	0.06
Spam	KAN	94.09±0.238	78.31±0.245	94.10±0.249	93.78±0.247	4.18±0.309	8.26±0.421	0.69
	MLP	93.96±0.182	79.19±0.188	93.93±0.180	93.69±0.195	4.52±0.133	8.11±0.292	0.38
Musk	KAN	92.45±0.358	83.62±0.992	93.71±1.492	89.86±1.943	1.53±0.397	18.76±3.571	0.97
	MLP	90.44±1.125	76.47±4.119	97.05±0.577	91.07±1.223	0.45±0.134	17.42±2.383	0.43
Dry Bean	KAN	92.80±0.158	92.82±0.162	92.87±0.169	92.80±0.158	-	-	1.92
	MLP	92.75±0.088	92.77±0.085	92.81±0.076	92.75±0.088	-	-	0.86
Gamma Telescope	KAN	86.94±0.313	71.01±0.331	87.03±0.470	83.97±0.287	5.91±0.487	26.15±0.463	2.74
	MLP	85.94 ±0.042	69.56±0.049	85.83±0.083	82.12±0.061	6.05±0.127	29.71±0.213	1.45
Adult	KAN	85.93 ±0.061	80.24±0.231	82.71±0.249	78.52±0.443	6.41±0.254	37.39±1.180	6.66
	MLP	85.72±0.119	79.87±0.313	82.47±0.070	78.89±1.995	6.40±0.419	36.57±1.295	3.47
Shuttle	KAN	99.76±0.013	99.70±0.021	99.72±0.056	99.76±0.013	-	-	8.39
	MLP	99.62±0.011	99.47±0.016	99.49±0.023	99.62±0.011	-	-	4.22
Diabetes	KAN	86.80 ±0.028	58.38±0.728	73.00±0.228	56.69±0.503	1.74±0.166	84.86±1.170	38.74
	MLP	86.73±0.194	55.92±3.860	74.06±1.070	55.19±2.198	1.26±0.579	88.35±4.972	20.34
Poker	KAN	99.91±0.038	99.91±0.039	99.91±0.039	99.91±0.038	-	-	34.76
	MLP	92.44±0.209	89.07±0.610	86.24±1.186	92.44±0.209	-	-	13.98

Regarding data handling, each dataset undergoes uniform preprocessing tailored to its specific data type, ensuring consistency and reliability in the evaluation process.

B. Datasets

The benchmarking conducted in this study utilizes datasets from the UCI Machine Learning Repository [4]. This selection was made to evaluate the performance of KANs on real-world datasets, which are widely used within the data science community. We select the datasets considering different aspects and scenarios, such as testing KAN in the *many instances* scenario or the *few features* scenario. The considered datasets are as follows:

- **Breast Cancer Wisconsin Diagnostic (Breast Cancer):** [11] This dataset comprises features computed from digitized images of fine needle aspirates (FNA) of breast masses. It is generally used to predict whether a breast mass is malignant or benign.
- **Spambase (Spam):** [12] This dataset is utilized for email spam detection, containing a collection of email messages categorized as spam or non-spam. It aids in the development of models for automatic spam filtering systems.
- **Musk** [13]: This dataset contains descriptions of molecules to distinguish between musks (active) and non-musks (inactive). It is used primarily for classification tasks in chemoinformatics and bioinformatics. We use the 2^{nd} version of this dataset as it contains more instances.
- **Dry Bean** [14]: It includes morphological features of seven types of dry beans. The dataset is used to classify the types of dry beans.

- **MAGIC Gamma Telescope (Gamma Telescope):** [15] This dataset consists of measurements from a gamma-ray telescope. It is utilized to classify gamma-ray sources based on their spectral characteristics, aiding in astrophysical research.
- **Adult:** [16] Also known as the “Census Income” dataset, it contains information extracted from the 1994 U.S. Census database. It is used for predicting whether a person makes over \$50,000 a year.
- **Statlog (Shuttle):** [17] This dataset is used for space shuttle component identification and status prediction. It includes various sensor measurements for classifying the status of the shuttle’s components.
- **CDC Diabetes Health Indicators (Diabetes):** This dataset contains behavioral risk factors for diabetes derived from the Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) 2015 survey data by the CDC. It is used for predicting diabetes status.
- **Poker Hand (Poker):** [18] This dataset is used to determine the poker hand held by a player based on five cards drawn from a standard deck. It is used to classify the type of poker hand (e.g., one pair, two pairs, three of a kind, etc.).

These datasets present various challenges, such as varying numbers of instances and features, the presence of missing values, and a range of classification tasks. This diversity allows for the thorough evaluation of KANs’ performance across multiple real-world scenarios. We summarize the main characteristics of the datasets in Table I.




Fig. 1. Accuracy scores of KANs and MLPs as the number of parameters increases. For each dataset, we report the average accuracy across five runs for each parameter count.

C. Architectures configuration

For the experiments, we employed an efficient implementation of the KAN architecture detailed in [19]. This version addresses some performance issues of the implementation proposed by [1]. In our experiments, we use a basic KAN model with a single input layer, an intermediate layer configured with ten distinct dimensions of k nodes where $k \in [1, 10]$, and an output layer for classification.

Similarly, the MLP model used in our study includes an intermediate layer of k nodes, with $k \in [10, 100]$, ensuring comparability in the number of parameters with the KAN model. As an activation function, we use the Sigmoid Linear Unit (SiLU) [20], [21].

It should be noted that we expanded the range of nodes k for the Poker dataset due to the unsatisfactory results we encountered with the MLP. The new number of k nodes for both architectures is increased by a factor of 10 compared to the previously stated values.

In each case, we ensure a fair and meaningful comparison by evaluating architectures with the same number of parameters under equivalent experimental conditions.

D. Metrics

Our assessment employs several key task performance metrics: accuracy score, F_1 score, precision, recall, False Positive Rate (FPR), and False Negative Rate (FNR). For datasets with a multiclass target, the F_1 score, precision and recall are

computed using a weighted average¹. Instead, for datasets with binary targets, we report the macro (i.e., unweighted) average.

To evaluate the time efficiency of each model, we measure the training duration for every configuration used in our experiments. At test time, to measure the number of FLOPS, we use the Python implementation [22] of the PAPI [23] library.

IV. EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we present the experiments conducted on KAN and MLP to empirically evaluate their effectiveness across diverse tabular datasets. It is well-known in the literature that tree-based methods such as Random Forests [24] or gradient-boosted trees [25] typically achieve better performance on tabular data [26]. However, because the KAN model was introduced specifically as an alternative to MLP, we have chosen to focus our analysis on comparing KAN with MLP and, therefore, have not included tree-based methods in our evaluation.

We assessed task performance (as detailed in Subsection III-D), training time per epoch and number of floating-point operations (FLOPS) required for task completion. We ran each experiment 5 times with different seeds. In each run, every model is trained for 10 epochs using AdamW [27]

¹We note that the definition of the weighted recall coincides with that of the accuracy




Fig. 2. Number of FLOPS. The number of FLOPS performed by each model as the number of parameters increases is reported in megaflops (MFLOPS).

optimizer with a learning rate of 10^{-2} . Additionally, we apply an exponential decay to the learning rate, with a decay factor 0.8. The code to reproduce our experiments is available at <https://github.com/eleonorapoeta/benchmarking-KAN>

A. Results

This section presents the evaluation results of the KAN and MLP models using the datasets listed in Table I. We report the performance results and training time in Table II-A.

The values in the table for F_1 score, precision, recall, FPR, and FNR correspond to the model with the highest overall accuracy for each dataset.

Across the range of datasets examined in this study, the KAN consistently achieves better performance w.r.t. MLP. When evaluating metrics such as accuracy and F_1 score, KAN’s results consistently outperform those achieved by MLPs, showing an improvement by several percentage points. Indeed, KAN’s performances are particularly good in datasets with larger volumes of instances, such as the Poker dataset. This trend underscores KAN’s effectiveness in handling various data complexities and task demands.

Regarding precision and recall, the KAN model generally performs better, although no consistent trend is evident.

Figure 1 shows the accuracy of KAN and MLP models as the number of parameters increases. Across most datasets, both models generally improve in accuracy as the number of parameters increases. The degree of improvement and the performance gap between models can vary significantly

depending on the dataset. For example, the KAN model shows substantial advantages in datasets like Poker and Musk, while differences are minimal in datasets like Dry Bean and Shuttle.

Another metric we use to evaluate the effectiveness of KANs is the number of FLOPS, expressed in megaflops (MFLOPS). Figure 2 shows, for each dataset, the performance of the models, as the number of operations used increases. The results show that in most cases KANs perform a larger number of operations w.r.t. MLPs, despite using comparable numbers of parameters. This indicates that KANs achieve higher performance at the cost of a higher number of operations, for a fixed budget of parameters. This fact can be explained thanks to the richer activation functions used in KANs, which allow for a better, although more computationally expensive modeling of the problem.

V. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we present a benchmarking study of the recently introduced Kolmogorov-Arnold Networks (KANs). Specifically, we measure the task performance and time efficiency of KANs compared to MLPs using tabular datasets, extending the analysis beyond the synthetic data used in the original paper.

From the results, we can conclude that KANs are a promising alternative to MLPs, demonstrating comparable performance across various tasks. Notably, KANs excel in datasets with many instances, indicating their potential to handle complex datasets effectively. We highlighted how the

improvements in the performance of KANs come at a higher computational cost, as expected, given the adoption of more complex activation functions. Future research could focus on extending the currently proposed investigation to encompass regression tasks and diverse data types to improve the understanding of how KANs can be effectively applied in real-world contexts.

REFERENCES

- [1] Z. Liu, Y. Wang, S. Vaidya, F. Ruehle, J. Halverson, M. Soljačić, T. Y. Hou, and M. Tegmark, “Kan: Kolmogorov-arnold networks,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.19756*, 2024.
- [2] A. N. Kolmogorov, “On the representation of continuous functions of several variables by superpositions of continuous functions of a smaller number of variables,” in *Proceedings of the USSR Academy of Sciences*, 1956.
- [3] V. Arnold, “On functions of three variables,” in *Proceedings of the USSR Academy of Sciences*, 1957, pp. 678–681.
- [4] K. N. Markelle Kelly, Rachel Longjohn, “The UCI Machine Learning Repository,” 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://archive.ics.uci.edu>
- [5] D. E. Rumelhart, G. E. Hinton, and R. J. Williams, “Learning Internal Representations by Error Propagation, Parallel Distributed Processing, Explorations in the Microstructure of Cognition, ed. DE Rumelhart and J. McClelland. Vol. 1. 1986,” *Biometrika*, vol. 71, pp. 599–607, 1986.
- [6] I. Goodfellow, Y. Bengio, and A. Courville, *Deep learning*. MIT press, 2016.
- [7] S. Haykin, *Neural networks: a comprehensive foundation*. Prentice Hall PTR, 1998.
- [8] K. Hornik, M. Stinchcombe, and H. White, “Multilayer feedforward networks are universal approximators,” *Neural networks*, vol. 2, no. 5, pp. 359–366, 1989.
- [9] F. Radenovic, A. Dubey, and D. Mahajan, “Neural basis models for interpretability,” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 35, pp. 8414–8426, 2022.
- [10] F. Girosi and T. Poggio, “Representation properties of networks: Kolmogorov’s theorem is irrelevant,” *Neural Computation*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 465–469, 1989.
- [11] W. Wolberg, O. Mangasarian, N. Street, and W. Street, “Breast Cancer Wisconsin (Diagnostic),” UCI Machine Learning Repository, 1995, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24432/C5DW2B>.
- [12] M. Hopkins, E. Reeber, G. Forman, and J. Suermondt, “Spambase,” UCI Machine Learning Repository, 1999, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24432/C53G6X>.
- [13] D. Chapman and A. Jain, “Musk (Version 2),” UCI Machine Learning Repository, 1994, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24432/C51608>.
- [14] “Dry Bean,” UCI Machine Learning Repository, 2020, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24432/C50S4B>.
- [15] R. Bock, “MAGIC Gamma Telescope,” UCI Machine Learning Repository, 2007, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24432/C52C8B>.
- [16] B. Becker and R. Kohavi, “Adult,” UCI Machine Learning Repository, 1996, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24432/C5XW20>.
- [17] “Statlog (Shuttle),” UCI Machine Learning Repository, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24432/C5WS31>.
- [18] R. Cattral and F. Oppacher, “Poker Hand,” UCI Machine Learning Repository, 2007, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24432/C5KW38>.
- [19] A. D. Blealtan, “An efficient implementation of kolmogorov-arnold network,” <https://github.com/Blealtan/efficient-kan>, 2024.
- [20] S. Elfving, E. Uchibe, and K. Doya, “Sigmoid-weighted linear units for neural network function approximation in reinforcement learning,” 2017.
- [21] P. Ramachandran, B. Zoph, and Q. V. Le, “Searching for activation functions,” 2017.
- [22] “Python PAPI: Performance Application Programming Interface,” <https://pypi.org/project/python-papi/>.
- [23] “PAPI: Performance Application Programming Interface,” <https://icl.utk.edu/papi/>.
- [24] L. Breiman, “Random forests,” *Machine learning*, vol. 45, pp. 5–32, 2001.
- [25] T. Chen and C. Guestrin, “Xgboost: A scalable tree boosting system,” in *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, ser. KDD ’16. ACM, Aug. 2016. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/2939672.2939785>
- [26] L. Grinsztajn, E. Oyallon, and G. Varoquaux, “Why do tree-based models still outperform deep learning on typical tabular data?” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 35, pp. 507–520, 2022.
- [27] I. Loshchilov and F. Hutter, “Decoupled weight decay regularization,” 2019.