

eTOP: Early Termination of Pipelines for Faster Training of AutoML System

Anonymous

Abstract. Recent advancements in software and hardware technologies have enabled the use of AI/ML models in everyday applications has significantly improved the quality of service rendered. However, for a given application, finding the right AI/ML model is a complex and costly process, that involves the generation, training, and evaluation of multiple interlinked steps (called pipelines), such as data pre-processing, feature engineering, selection, and model tuning. These pipelines are complex (in structure) and costly (both in compute resource and time) to execute end-to-end, with a hyper-parameter associated with each step. AutoML systems automate the search of these hyper-parameters but are slow, as they rely on optimizing the pipelines' end output. We propose "*the eTOP Framework*" which works on top of any AutoML system and decides whether or not to execute the pipeline to the end or terminate at an intermediate step. Experimental evaluation on 26 benchmark datasets¹ and integration of eTOP with MLBox² reduces the training time of the AutoML system upto 40x than baseline MLBox.

Keywords: AutoML · Meta-Learning · Hyper-Parameter Search

1 Introduction

Training classical machine learning models, such as Support Vector Machines (SVM) and decision tree-based models (DT), involves the optimization of multiple hyper-parameters, let alone deep models. Such optimization involves hand-crafted search space that results in 100s and 1000s of possible hyper-parameter configurations that must be considered and evaluated empirically. This process takes a considerable amount of computing time and resources. Many works have been proposed to address the hyper-parameter search, such as grid search [9], random search [2], and Bayesian optimization [11]. More recently, [7] focused on zero-shot hyper-parameter search for deep networks by performing pre-training analysis of the data.

Contemporary hyper-parameter search techniques (as shown in Figure 1a) have advanced to include not only model hyper-parameters but also hyper-parameters involved in machine learning pipelines (sequence in individual steps) outside the model training, such as data cleaning, imputation, and wrangling [4, 12, 13]. Such techniques are now referred to as AutoML Systems (\mathcal{A}) that

¹ OpenML - <https://www.openml.org/search?type=data>

² MLBOX - <https://github.com/AxeldeRomblay/MLBox>




Fig. 1: Architectural overview highlighting the critical difference in how pipelines are searched and executed in eTOP vs standard AutoML systems

automate, or minimize the need for human intervention during the search process. Furthermore, AutoML systems aim to automate the search of a large space of the Machine Learning (ML) pipeline. These AutoML systems typically work following an iterative heuristic, i.e. given a dataset (\mathcal{D}) of interest, they first define a search space (\mathcal{S}) and generate a set of corresponding pipelines ($\mathbb{P} \in P_1, P_2, \dots, P_P$). Each pipeline is further composed of interlinked sequential steps (s) that reflect different parameterized operations in the machine learning pipeline. In order to find the best hyper-parameter setting or pipeline, these pipelines are individually trained (end-to-end) and tested after the completion of the last step.

1.1 Key Limitations

While the iterative search (such as grid search or random search) has shown success, however, the search space explodes when pipelines contain many steps with an even greater number of choices. This explosion in the number of candidate pipelines is prohibitive of compute time and cost of resources needed to support searching through large hyper-parameter search space.

The significant time cost of AutoML systems comes from evaluating the *end-to-end* pipeline. As the quality of the pipeline is only measured after the completion of the last step. Time Constrained approaches have been proposed that limited the amount of time available for AutoML system to search through the space, however, this came with a trade-off - balancing between time and pipeline accuracy [10]. Thus the resulting pipeline was mostly sub-optimal.

1.2 Key Contributions of eTOP

To this end, we observe that one can achieve results that are “*near optimal* – *if not optimal*” – by intelligent determining the quality of a pipeline at an intermediary step in the search process and terminating the pipeline early as opposed to the after pipeline at the end of last step (as shown in Figure 1b). We propose the **eTOP** Framework, an add-on to any existing AutoML systems that allow them to self-determine at an intermediate step with the pipeline to continue executing the pipeline or terminate early, instead of exploring the pipelines end-to-end (as shown in Figure 2). As a result, eTOP can accelerate the AutoML




Fig. 2: An Abstract overview of the proposed eTOP framework, which is organized into 3 steps: first, generating history of experiments, second, Hyper-Parameter Search with Early Terminate of Pipeline, and third, selection of winner pipeline. Details in Section 3.

pipeline search process and thus makes the training of AutoML systems faster. Described in detail in Section 3.

The salient contributions of eTOP are

- **Pipeline Structure Agnostic:** eTOP does not assume any fixed pipeline structure or sequential order. Thus able to accommodate pipelines of varying lengths and interlinks. This is possible due to the inherent design of eTOP, i.e. as it can be plugged after any individual step in the pipeline.
- **Low-Cost Pipeline Quality Measure:** eTOP employs low-cost surrogate models that estimate the quality of pipelines at different steps, this allows for minimal overhead in comparison to the cost of training all pipelines end-to-end.
- **Intra-Pipeline Knowledge Sharing:** Furthermore, eTOP self-determines pipeline termination by comparing its intermediate with the intermediate results from other pipelines.

1.3 Organization

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: Section 2 provides an overview of the existing state-of-the-art, followed by Section 3 which describes – in detail – the proposed **eTOP Framework**, Section 4 presents the extensive evaluation of the proposed work, and Section 5 concludes.

2 Related Work

The increase in the application of AI/ML models in everyday applications and critical applications such as predictive maintenance [16, 6], medical [3], and emergency response [1] has increased the need for curating the models for specific applications. Classical machine learning models to state-of-the-art deep learning models are complex models that involve multiple hyper-parameters that require tuning, i.e. finding the right setting to train an accurate model for a given data/task. The process of finding these settings is called “*hyper-parameter search*” and the set of all possible settings is referred to as “*search space*”.

2.1 Hyper-Parameter Search Space

Classical hyper-parameter search has been around for many decades, starting from grid search [9], and Bayesian Optimization [11]. The former relies on principled greedy heuristics that search through each and every hyper-parameter choice in the hand-crafted search space defined by the expert. However, this grid-based search is a slow and costly process. To this end, the latter proposed to select starter hyper-parameter choices randomly and then iteratively search around the few set-performing ones. This helped reduce the need for exploring all hyper-parameter settings.

2.2 AutoML System

As noted in Section 1, the present-day need for hyper-parameter search is no longer centered around models only but also around steps such as data pre-processing and engineering - to name a few. Thus, many AutoML systems were designed, such as MLBox [13], AutoSkLearn[5], and TPOT [12], to address the increasing complexities of hyper-parameter search. The first step these AutoML took was to automate the process of searching and configuring the best machine learning pipeline (combination of hyper-parameter choices). This automation liberated the data scientists from the tedious and time-consuming process of hyper-parameter search. Despite the wider benefits of this automation, the large and complex search space still exists, which makes the AutoML system computationally expensive. Many AutoML systems have been focusing on optimizing the pipeline searching time.

2.3 Pipeline Optimization

[15] performs the optimization at two stages: first (offline) to identify a collection of proxy models for different types of models, and second (online) to evaluate these proxy models with a reduced dataset and selecting the most accurate proxy model. [4] proposed two-step optimization: first (offline) to acquire a set of accurate pipelines across multiple datasets; and second (online), given a new dataset, all pipelines in the portfolio are evaluated iteratively using Bayesian Optimization (BO). However, all these AutoML systems require a large amount of time for meta-learning to generate a reference of history experiments. Furthermore, the optimization is focused on inter-pipeline performance, i.e. the winner pipeline is selected based on their performance after it is executed end-2-end irrespective of the optimization strategy.

Table 1: Notations used in the paper

General		Step		Pipeline	
Notation	Definition	Notation	Definition	Notation	Definition
\mathcal{A}	AutoML Systems	\mathcal{S}	Step Instance	\mathcal{P}	Pipeline Instance
\mathcal{M}	AI/ML Model	s	Step Iterator	p	Pipeline Iterator
\mathcal{M}^s	Surrogate Model	\mathbb{S}	Set of Steps	\mathbb{P}	Set of pipelines
		\mathcal{S}	Step Search Space	\mathcal{P}	Pipeline Search Space

3 The eTOP Framework

In this section, we present (in detail) the proposed “*eTOP Framework*” that helps significantly reduce the AutoML training time while preserving (of at minimal trade-off) the end model accuracy. eTOP operates with a simple assumption that not every pipeline ($\mathcal{P} \in \mathbb{P}$, here, \mathbb{P} is a set of pipelines) needs to be executed end-2-end (i.e. from start to end). To be specific, eTOP performs a step-wise conditional execution of AutoML s.t. the mediocre pipelines will be terminated at an earlier step without running the pipeline until the last step. To do so, eTOP leverages early markers to decide if and when to the pipeline.

3.1 Prerequisites

Let’s first begin by formally defining the key concepts used in this work:

Definition 1. Step (\mathcal{S}) is an isolated computational operation in an AutoML Pipeline. Furthermore, a step can be further classified into two groups,

- data step (\mathcal{S}^d) is a type of step that focuses on data operations, i.e. if take data in a specific format as input and output data in a new format or representation., s.t., $X^{new} \leftarrow \mathcal{S}^d(X^{old})$.
- model step (\mathcal{S}^m) is a type of step that focuses on learning a model for a specific task, such as classification or regression. This step takes data (in any form) and target variable as input (X) and output (Y) a trained model (\mathcal{M}) and associated performance metric (acc), s.t. $\langle acc, \mathcal{M} \rangle \leftarrow \mathcal{S}^m(X, Y)$.

Definition 2. Pipeline (\mathcal{P}) is an interlinked set of steps, \mathbb{S} , where steps execute in a cascade fashion, s.t. $\langle acc, \mathcal{M} \rangle \leftarrow \mathcal{P}(X, Y|\theta)$, here, θ represents the set of choices selected for different steps in the pipeline.

Definition 3. Surrogate Model (\mathcal{M}^s) is a classic machine learning tree-based model used to approximate the intermediate quality of data, s.t. $acc \leftarrow \mathcal{M}^s(X, Y)$. As noted in [14], tree-based models are known to outperform AI-based models on tabular datasets. Thus, we employ tree-based surrogates as our experimental evaluation is on classification tasks for tabular dataset³.

³ eTOP does not tune the hyper-parameters of the surrogate models as the main goal is to limit the overhead of eTOP and to maintain deterministic and invariable evaluation criteria

Next, in this section, we present the key components (as shown in Figure 2) of the eTOP framework that enable early termination of pipelines and consequently provide a significant boost in reducing of training time of AutoML Systems.

Given an AutoML system (\mathcal{A}) and its pipeline search space (\mathcal{P}), and a dataset ($D \leftarrow \langle X, Y \rangle$) for each \mathcal{A} has to search for a high performing pipeline (\mathcal{P}^o). Our proposed strategy, first, generates a history of experiments (HoE) to establish a baseline of pipeline performance, followed by an iterative, but conditional, pipeline search while maximizing the intra-pipeline-step performance.

3.2 History of Experiments

Motivated by the well-established concept of meta-learning, eTOP aims to establish a baseline performance for the pipelines and the individual steps associated with the pipelines. Generating the history of experiments (HoE) involves the following steps - execute in a cascade fashion:

1. **Data Sampling:** This step generates a subset of data instances and pipelines
 - **Representative Stochastic Data Sampling:** This step performs a class-distribution-aware random sampling, i.e. this sampling maintains the class distribution in the sampled population that is identical to the original population. This heuristic serves two purposes: first, real-world data has class imbalance thus the sampled population will reflect the same., and second, random sampling doesn't assume or hold subconscious bias towards any prior distribution. This work selects a sample population (D') with 5k data points.
 - **Random Pipeline Sampling:** This step random selects a subset of pipelines (\mathbb{P}') from \mathbb{P} to be used for generating HoE. This work samples 10% of pipelines as sampled pipeline population.
2. **Generating HoE:** To generate the HoE (\mathcal{H} , a hashmap), one must iterate over each pipeline in the sub-sampled pipelines (\mathbb{P}') and evaluate their performance against the representative data population (D'). Along with pipeline performance, HoE records individual steps performance as well. Each pipeline $\mathcal{P} \in \mathbb{P}'$, consists of several steps (\mathcal{S}) which can be denoted as $\mathcal{P} \leftarrow \langle \mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2, \dots, \mathcal{S}_S \rangle$ where \mathcal{S}_i is the step i and S is the number of steps in the pipeline. For example, when $S = 3$, the pipeline \mathcal{P} can be expressed as $\langle \mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2, \mathcal{S}_3 \rangle$. To record the pipeline and its individual step performance in the \mathcal{H} , the output of each data step (\mathcal{S}^d) is passed through a surrogate model (as described in definition 3) to extract the step accuracy, for model step (\mathcal{S}^m), the trained model (of interest) accuracy on the sub-sampled data is recorded (i.e. D'). Step-accuracy pair is interested in the hashmap, s.t.

$$\mathcal{H}[\mathcal{S}] = \begin{cases} \mathcal{M}^s(\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{X}'), \mathcal{Y}') & \mathcal{S} \text{ is data step} \\ \mathcal{M}(\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{Y}' | \mathcal{S}) & \mathcal{S} \text{ is model step} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

For example, of a 3-step pipeline, $p = \{s_1, s_2, s_3\}$, eTOP records the performance of each step of this pipeline in \mathcal{H} : $\langle \mathcal{S}_1 - acc_1 \rangle$, $\langle \mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2 - acc_2 \rangle$ and $\langle \mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2, \mathcal{S}_3 - acc_3 \rangle$, where acc is the performance score (accuracy in the scope of classification task) evaluated after a step \mathcal{S} or multiple interlinked steps.

```

evaluateStep( $\mathcal{S}$ ,  $X$ ,  $Y$ ):
  Data: Data and Pipeline Step
  Result: Same for output data
  if  $\mathcal{S}$  is  $\mathcal{S}^d$  then
    |  $X \leftarrow \mathcal{S}(X)$  // Data Step
    |  $acc \leftarrow \mathcal{M}^s(X, Y)$ 
  else
    |  $acc \leftarrow \mathcal{M}(X, Y|\mathcal{S})$  // Model Step
  end
  return  $acc$ ,  $X$ 

```

Algorithm 1: Algorithmic overview of Step execution and evaluation

3.3 Pipeline Search

Upon creation of the HoE using the approach described in the previous section, this section describes the pipeline search process that leverages an early termination criterion to automate the decision process of whether to train a pipeline from start to end or terminate at an intermediate step. During the pipeline search eTOP frequently refers to \mathcal{H} in the decision making. Search involves:

1. Pipeline search is an iterative process, where eTOP iterates through every pipeline ($\mathcal{P} \in \mathbb{P}$) in the search space (\mathcal{P}) and further iterates through each step ($\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{P}$ and $\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{S}$) in a pipeline.
2. For any step, \mathcal{S}_s , the search process first checks if the step exists in \mathcal{H} or not. This check is essential, as many AutoML systems execute steps that are redundant. If the step or the sequence of steps is not previously seen is not present then the step(s) is evaluated else pass accuracy is leveraged.
3. In the case, \mathcal{S}_s does not exist in the \mathcal{H} , we leverage Algorithm 1 that executes the individual step operation and also evaluates the step output using surrogate model (as described in Definition 3).
4. The resultant of the **pipeline evaluation** based on the surrogate model is an accurate estimate. This estimate is an approximation of how accurate the pipeline. eTOP operates under the assumption that “*intermediate step performance is reflective of the end pipeline performance*”. Therefore, the aim of eTOP is to maximize the surrogate accuracy: i.e.

$$\underset{\forall \mathcal{S}}{\operatorname{argmax}} \mathcal{M}^s(\mathcal{S}_{S-1}(\dots \mathcal{S}_1(X)), Y) \quad (2)$$

5. Once the accuracy is determined, we use the “**Pipeline Terminate Criteria**”. This criterion determines where the current step is sufficiently accurate enough to warrant further execution of the next steps or the pipelines, and is defined as follows:

$$earlyStop(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{S}) = \begin{cases} continue, & \text{if } acc > median(\mathcal{H}) \\ terminate, & otherwise \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

6. Winner pipeline is selected from pipeline that finished until the last step and achieved maximum end accuracy.

This concludes the proposed eTOP framework. It is formally outlined the implementation details in Algorithm 2. Next, we present experimental evaluation.

```

Data: Data ( $D \leftarrow \langle X, Y \rangle$ ), and Pipelines ( $\mathbb{P}$ )
Result: Winner Pipeline
// Generating History of Experiments
initialize:  $D' \leftarrow \text{representativeSampling}(D)$ 
initialize:  $\mathbb{P}' \leftarrow \text{randomSampling}(\mathbb{P})$ 
initialize:  $P \leftarrow |\mathbb{P}'|$ ;
 $\text{tempX} \leftarrow X'$ ;
for  $p \leftarrow 1$  to  $P$  by 1 do
     $\mathcal{P} \leftarrow \mathbb{P}'[p]$ 
     $\text{stepPrefix} \leftarrow ""$ 
    for  $S \in \mathcal{P}$  do
         $\text{stepPrefix} += S$ ;
        if  $\text{stepPrefix}$  not in  $\mathcal{H}$  then
             $\text{acc}, \text{tempX} \leftarrow \text{evaluateStep}(S, \langle \text{tempX}, Y \rangle)$ 
             $\mathcal{H}[\text{stepPrefix}] \leftarrow \text{acc}$ 
        end
    end
end
// Pipeline Search
 $\text{tempX} \leftarrow X'$ 
for  $\mathcal{P} \in \{\mathcal{P}_1, \dots, \mathcal{P}_P\}$  do
     $\text{stepPrefix} \leftarrow ""$ 
    for  $S \in \mathcal{P}$  do
        // Pipeline Evaluation Criterion
         $\text{stepPrefix} += S.\text{prefix}$ 
        if  $\mathcal{H}[\text{stepPrefix}]$  then
             $\text{acc} \leftarrow \mathcal{H}[\text{stepPrefix}]$  // Identical Steps exists in  $\mathcal{H}$ 
        else
             $\text{acc}, \text{tempX} \leftarrow \text{evaluateStep}(S, \langle \text{tempX}, Y \rangle)$ 
             $\mathcal{H}[\text{stepPrefix}] \leftarrow \text{acc}$ 
        end
        // Pipeline Termination Criterion
        if  $\text{acc} > \text{median}(\mathcal{H})$  then
            continue // CONTINUE to next step in current pipeline
        else
            break // TERMINATE current pipeline execution
        end
    end
end
 $\text{winnerPipeLinePrefix}, \text{acc} \leftarrow \max(\mathcal{H})$ ;
return  $\text{winnerPipeLinePrefix}, \text{acc}$ ;

```

Algorithm 2: Algorithmic overview of the proposed framework that involves the generation of History of Experiments (\mathcal{H}), evaluation of pipeline steps (i.e. use of \mathcal{M}^s) and early termination of a pipeline which is driven by the recorded history of pipeline evaluations as the AutoML systems for optimal configuration of the pipeline.

Table 2: Overview of benchmark datasets

Name	Id	Instances	Number of Input Features			Classes	Missing Imbalanced	
			Numeric	Categorical	Total		Data	Data
Adult Salary Prediction	1590	48842	6	8	14	2	✓	✓
Airlines Flight Delay	1169	539383	3	4	7	2	–	✓
Amazon Employee Access	4135	32769	0	9	9	2	–	✓
Australian Credit Approval	40981	690	6	8	14	2	–	✓
Bank Marketing	1461	45211	7	9	16	2	–	✓
Blood Transfusion Service Center	1464	748	4	–	4	2	–	✓
Car	40975	1728	0	6	6	4	–	✓
CMAE-9	1468	1080	856	–	856	9	–	–
Connect-4	40668	67557	0	42	42	3	–	✓
CoverType	1596	581012	10	44	54	7	–	✓
Credit-G	31	1000	7	13	20	2	–	✓
Fabert	41164	8237	800	–	800	7	–	✓
Helena	41169	65196	27	–	27	100	–	✓
Higgs	23512	98050	28	–	28	2	✓	✓
Jungle Chess	41027	44819	6	–	6	3	–	✓
kc1	1067	2109	21	–	21	2	–	✓
KDDCup09 Appetency	1111	50000	192	38	230	2	✓	✓
kr-vs-krp	3	3196	0	36	36	2	–	✓
MiniBooNE	41150	130064	50	–	50	2	–	✓
Nomao	1486	34465	89	29	118	2	–	✓
NumerAI 28.6	23517	96320	21	–	21	2	–	✓
Phoneme	1489	5404	5	–	5	2	–	✓
Segmet	40984	2310	19	–	19	7	–	–
Shuttle	40685	58000	9	–	9	7	–	✓
Sylvine	41146	5124	20	–	20	2	–	–
Vehicle	54	846	18	–	18	4	–	✓

4 Experiments

In this section, we present in detail the experimental evaluation of the proposed *eTOP Framework* and its performance on 26 benchmark datasets [8], and is compared against state-of-the-art AutoML systems [5, 12, 13].

4.1 Configuration

The experiments were performed on a server running Ubuntu 20.04 with AMB EPYC 7302 16-core processor with 64 threads, 512 GB RAM, and 4x NVIDIA RTX A6000 (48GB Memory) with Python version 3.8.10.

4.2 Benchmark Datasets

We selected 26 datasets from AutoML Benchmark [8]. This benchmark consists of datasets that have a varying number of instances, features, and classes in the datasets with the presence of missing data and imbalance in a number of instances associated with classes, as shown in Table 2.

4.3 State-of-the-art Competitors

In this work, we considered 3 different AutoML systems:

Table 3: Comparison of different training constraints used in various competitors against eTOP

AutoML System		Sample	Search	Time
AutoSkLearn		✓	BO	✓
TPOT		✓	GP	✓
MLBox	Base	–	GS	–
	GS	✓	GS	–
	BO	✓	BO	–
	TC	✓	GS	✓
eTOP		✓	GS-ET	✓

1. **AutoSkLearn**: unlike existing AutoML system, uses meta-learning to warm start hyper-parameter search, such as Bayesian optimization, by leveraging is an AutoML system that leverages Bayesian optimization and builds an ensemble of machine learning models that were considered by search process [5].
2. **TPOT**: is a tree-based pipeline optimization tool that automates the building of ML pipelines by combining a flexible expression tree representation of pipelines searched using genetic programming [12].
3. **MLBox**: is an open-source sequential AutoML system that allows for fast and distributed data pre-processing, feature selection and bayesian optimization-based hyperparameter search [13].

A description of the settings of each AutoML system is in the following subsection.

4.4 Training Constraints

eTOP introduces various constraints while running an AutoML system (which trains multiple machine learning pipelines). In particular, these constraints help reduce the number of computing resources needed to identify the near-optimal, if not optimal, machine learning pipeline that achieves the best model accuracy then most. Additionally, these constraints allow for a fair comparison between eTOP and other competitors (see discussed in Section 4.3). We have shown how different AutoML systems and their variants satisfy the constraints (as described below) in Table 3. In the table, (–) represents *not applicable*, and (✓) applicable.

Data Sampling eTOP observes that the contrary to convention of using entire data to train and evaluate pipelines - which is costly in time and needs compute resources one can achieve similar results by subsampling the data such that the sub-population is representative of the overall population and as a positive consequence reducing AutoML training time. In this paper, eTOP samples 5000 representative points from the data to train and evaluate AutoML pipelines.

Table 4: Model performance comparison between SOTA AutoML System various MLBox + eTOP

AutoML Systems	Accuracy (%)	eTOP Wins
AutoSkLearn	81.54	17
TPOT	82.08	14
MLBox-TC	83.30	24
eTOP	83.42	—

Table 5: Comparison of different training constraints used in various competitors against eTOP

AutoML System		Training Time (secs)	# of Pipelines Evaluated	Accuracy Percentage	eTOP	
					Dataset Wins	Time Gains
MLBox	Base	28318.92	432	83.86	7	40x
	GS	1804.65	432	83.42	23	3x
	BO	1860.46	432	83.41	23	3x
	TC	496.35	153	83.30	24	Same
eTOP		496.35	116	83.42	—	—

Hyper-Parameter Search There are different hyper-parameter search strategies, such as grid search (GS) and Bayesian optimization (BO), that have their own benefits. Both work with predefined hand-crafted hyper-parameter search space and differ in how the space is explored. The former explores each hyper-parameter configuration sequentially to identify the best (making a costly process), whereas the latter, randomly samples a few starting configurations and is followed by random sampling around the prior samples that converge the objective function. It is important that when AutoML systems are compared one does not have an unfair advantage between the intermediate choices they make, therefore, we investigate different scenarios of how different choices affect the model outcome.

Training Time As noted in [5, 12], resources are finite and there is a limit on time. Further, as results show eTOP, achieve anywhere between 3x to 250x reduction in AutoML training - thus it is important to understand the implication of same time constraints on competitors as well.

4.5 Performance: eTOP vs Competitors

While different AutoML systems have different hyper-parameter search space and searching strategies, they may require different amounts of compute time. We apply the constraints listed in Table 3 for a fair comparison. In particular, we limited the amount of time available for competitive AutoML systems to run until the wall clock time taken by eTOP.

As shown in Table 4, eTOP is able to outperform the competitors when compared using aggregate performance metrics, i.e. the table reports average classification accuracy for all 26 benchmark datasets. We further present a win




Fig. 3: Comparison of accuracy and time gains observed for eTOP against competitors (\uparrow – higher the better)

counter called “eTOP Wins”. This counter shows that for how many datasets eTOP was able to win against the competitors.

We observe that the considerable gains observed in eTOP can be credited to the early evaluation criteria that evaluated the data quality at a variety of intermediate steps in an AutoML system, contrary to the evaluation of the pipeline being performed at the last step.

4.6 Performance: eTOP vs Constraints

In Table 5, we present the comparison of eTOP against different constraints imposed on MLBox (we could not modify AutoSklearn and TPOT as they are shipped as end-to-end systems as opposed to modularized MLBox).

We observed that unconstrained MLBox(Base) outperforms eTOP which is expected as it is a greedy search that considered the entire dataset rather than a sub-sampled data (as noted in 4.4). However, one must consider the trade-off along the time - while the accuracy gain is 0.44% with MLBox(Base) the time taken to achieve that gain is 57x more than the time taken by eTOP. Furthermore, eTOP is able to prune the search space to explore only 116 pipelines end-2-end as opposed to 432 in the MLBox(Base).

When the data sampling constraint is imposed on MLBox(GS), there are no accuracy gains - both approaches achieve identical classification accuracy, however, MLBox(GS) requires 3.5x time to achieve the same level of accuracy. While both MLBox(Base) and (GS) use Grid Search which is not an intelligent searching technique, we also explore MLBox with Bayesian optimization (BO) to allow for intelligent traversal of search space to counter early termination of pipelines in eTOP MLBox(BO) fails to beat eTOP both in time and accuracy. Furthermore, when both data sampling and time constraints are introduced simultaneously, MLBox(TC) suffers a loss in classification accuracy.

4.7 Gains observed with eTOP

In Figures 3a and 3b, we show the comparison of different AutoML systems (competitors) against eTOP, along the lines of gains observed for individual datasets. We define the accuracy gains (\mathcal{G}_A) as:

$$\mathcal{G}_A = ACC_{eTOP} - ACC_{competitor}, \quad (4)$$

and, time gains (\mathcal{G}_T) as:

$$\mathcal{G}_T = Time_{competitor} / Time_{eTOP}. \quad (5)$$

Here, *Time* is defined as the total time taken to traverse the search space to find the winning pipeline, and *ACC* is defined as the end accuracy observed for the winning timeline.

The two Figures clearly show that the accuracy and time gains go hand in hand. For key competitors such as AutoSkLearn and TPOT, one can achieve comparable accuracy gains ($gains > 0$) when the systems are run for the same amount of time. However, for MLBOX-based models - which majorly rely on greedy search, leading to better (Base) or comparable performance (Gs/BO/TC) but at the cost of time. As the figures show, accuracy gains are in the negative, and time gains are in the positive.

In Table 6 we present the dataset level performance for each competitor and eTOP. Furthermore, this table is used to derive the Tables 4 & 5, and Figures 3a & 3b.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we address the problem of prohibitive computations cost of executing AutoML systems that stems from end-to-end execution of AutoML pipelines. We propose the *eTOP Framework* that significantly reduces the execution time of the AutoML systems by at least 3x and at best 40x while maintaining comparable accuracy results. eTOP achieve the said gains by using an intelligent early termination criterion that self-determines if the pipeline in an AutoML system should be terminated at any intermediate step as opposed to being trained until the end. Experimental results on 26 benchmark datasets show wide gains observed using the proposed approach from small to large datasets.

Table 6: Detailed overview of observed accuracies and training times for all 26 datasets across different state-of-the-art competitors and variants of MLBox. (– represents AutoML system was not able to run for the dataset)

Datasets	Model Accuracy (%)					Model Training Time (in seconds)								
	MLBox				ETOP	MLBox				TPOT	AutoSk	ETOP		
	Base	GS	BO	TC		Base	GS	BO	TC					
1596	96.47	96.47	96.46	96.46	94.08	78.08	96.47	264016.79	2302.49	2369.84	1059.88	1059.88	1059.88	1059.88
1169	65.78	64.01	64.01	64.01	—	63.00	63.73	56967.57	956.86	1448.22	604.14	604.14	604.14	604.14
41150	93.52	92.30	92.30	92.30	89.23	92.16	92.25	78598.07	2450.91	2013.65	594.05	594.05	594.05	594.05
23512	71.71	71.61	71.52	71.52	72.21	69.24	71.61	27120.65	1721.97	1639.62	534.64	534.64	534.64	534.64
23517	52.16	51.86	51.86	51.86	52.55	50.51	51.86	25762.82	1341.76	1208.80	499.38	499.38	499.38	499.38
40668	82.26	81.85	81.85	81.85	82.01	76.04	81.85	23569.78	1353.41	1670.67	413.31	413.31	413.31	413.31
41169	35.10	31.46	31.46	28.46	27.98	24.78	31.46	112071.83	8716.16	6697.97	1211.98	1211.98	1211.98	1211.98
40685	99.99	99.97	99.83	99.83	99.99	99.14	99.97	8902.93	860.63	558.58	356.62	356.62	356.62	356.62
1111	98.20	98.20	98.20	98.20	—	98.30	98.20	73037.93	5350.73	5496.79	970.70	970.70	970.70	970.70
1590	86.53	86.48	86.48	86.48	—	85.21	86.48	8778.81	959.41	1156.18	385.76	385.76	385.76	385.76
1461	90.65	90.32	90.32	90.32	—	89.84	90.58	7192.07	984.42	1053.63	388.75	388.75	388.75	388.75
41027	82.16	81.59	81.59	81.59	86.42	78.21	81.59	3277.91	673.88	878.64	317.85	317.85	317.85	317.85
1486	96.25	95.94	95.94	95.94	96.27	95.20	95.94	14809.66	1846.61	1675.52	491.57	491.57	491.57	491.57
4135	94.48	94.29	94.29	94.29	94.85	94.23	94.29	7364.02	1542.23	1834.83	412.00	412.00	412.00	412.00
41164	68.05	68.05	68.05	68.05	71.17	69.54	68.05	10491.37	7376.44	9955.23	1229.80	1229.80	1229.80	1229.80
1489	86.70	86.70	86.70	86.70	91.21	89.36	86.70	1237.61	725.10	862.94	317.74	317.74	317.74	317.74
41146	93.44	93.36	93.36	93.36	94.24	94.73	93.44	2233.91	1043.63	1052.97	457.23	457.23	457.23	457.23
3	99.26	99.18	99.18	99.18	—	99.84	99.18	1880.98	934.20	915.72	333.35	333.35	333.35	333.35
40984	91.99	91.23	91.23	91.23	95.88	96.32	91.23	1437.89	854.73	780.91	315.06	315.06	315.06	315.06
1067	86.13	85.83	85.83	85.83	86.26	86.73	85.83	1248.58	690.35	890.44	315.70	315.70	315.70	315.70
40975	95.88	95.66	95.66	95.66	—	96.24	95.66	1105.41	587.15	772.37	325.14	325.14	325.14	325.14
1468	93.40	93.40	93.40	93.40	93.06	93.06	93.40	1716.88	1398.59	809.59	389.51	389.51	389.51	389.51
31	75.75	75.50	75.50	75.50	—	78.50	75.50	833.40	644.13	846.04	231.97	231.97	231.97	231.97
54	77.37	77.37	77.37	77.37	76.47	66.47	77.37	1074.69	599.87	381.38	239.80	239.80	239.80	239.80
1464	78.26	78.26	78.26	78.26	76.00	74.67	78.26	637.13	471.51	660.22	232.87	232.87	232.87	232.87
40981	88.77	88.04	87.86	88.04	79.71	79.71	88.04	923.21	533.71	741.11	274.40	274.40	274.40	274.40
Average	83.86	83.42	83.41	83.30	82.08	81.54	83.42	28318.92	1804.65	1860.46	496.35	496.35	496.35	496.35

References

1. Ai, B., Li, B., Gao, S., Xu, J., Shang, H.: An intelligent decision algorithm for the generation of maritime search and rescue emergency response plans. *IEEE Access* **7**, 155835–155850 (2019)
2. Bergstra, J., Bengio, Y.: Random search for hyper-parameter optimization. *Journal of machine learning research* **13**(2) (2012)
3. Desai, M., Shah, M.: An anatomization on breast cancer detection and diagnosis employing multi-layer perceptron neural network (mlp) and convolutional neural network (cnn). *Clinical eHealth* **4**, 1–11 (2021)
4. Feurer, M., Eggenberger, K., Falkner, S., Lindauer, M., Hutter, F.: Auto-sklearn 2.0: Hands-free automl via meta-learning. *Journal of Machine Learning & Research* **23**(261), 1–61 (2020)
5. Feurer, M., Klein, A., Eggenberger, K., Springenberg, J., Blum, M., Hutter, F.: Efficient and robust automated machine learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems* **28** (2015)
6. Garg, Y., Akyamac, A., Lehman, G.: Apparatus, method, and system for providing a sample representation for event prediction. In: *European Patent Office* (2021)
7. Garg, Y., Candan, K.S.: Racknet: Robust allocation of convolutional kernels in neural networks for image classification. In: *Proceedings of the 2019 on International Conference on Multimedia Retrieval*. pp. 315–323 (2019)
8. Gijssbers, P., LeDell, E., Thomas, J., Poirier, S., Bischl, B., Vanschoren, J.: An open source automl benchmark. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1907.00909* (2019)
9. Larochelle, H., Erhan, D., Courville, A., Bergstra, J., Bengio, Y.: An empirical evaluation of deep architectures on problems with many factors of variation. In: *Proceedings of the 24th international conference on Machine learning*. pp. 473–480 (2007)
10. Lu, Z., Chiang, C.K., Sha, F.: Hyper-parameter tuning under a budget constraint. *IJCAI* (2019)
11. Moćkus, J.: On bayesian methods for seeking the extremum. In: *Optimization Techniques IFIP Technical Conference: Novosibirsk, July 1–7, 1974*. pp. 400–404. Springer (1975)
12. Olson, R.S., Moore, J.H.: Tpot: A tree-based pipeline optimization tool for automating machine learning. In: *Workshop on automatic machine learning*. pp. 66–74. PMLR (2016)
13. Romblay, A.A.D., Cherel, N., Maskani, M., Gerard, H.: Mlbox: Machine learning box, <https://mlbox.readthedocs.io/en/latest/index.html>
14. Shwartz-Ziv, R., Armon, A.: Tabular data: Deep learning is not all you need. *Information Fusion* **81**, 84–90 (2022)
15. Yakovlev, A., Moghadam, H.F., Moharrer, A., Cai, J., Chavoshi, N., Varadarajan, V., Agrawal, S.R., Idicula, S., Karnagel, T., Jinturkar, S., et al.: Oracle automl: a fast and predictive automl pipeline. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment* **13**(12), 3166–3180 (2020)
16. Zaman, F., Hogan, G., Van Der Meer, S., Keeney, J., Robitzsch, S., Muntean, G.M.: A recommender system architecture for predictive telecom network management. *IEEE Communications Magazine* **53**(1), 286–293 (2015)