
A Closer Look at Deep Learning on Tabular Data

Han-Jia Ye¹ Si-Yang Liu^{1*} Hao-Run Cai^{1*} Qi-Le Zhou¹ De-Chuan Zhan¹

¹ School of Artificial Intelligence, Nanjing University, China
National Key Laboratory for Novel Software Technology, Nanjing University
{yehj,zhouql,zhandc}@lamda.nju.edu.cn, {liusiyang, caihr}@smail.nju.edu.cn

Abstract

Tabular data is prevalent across various domains in machine learning. Although Deep Neural Network (DNN)-based methods have shown promising performance comparable to tree-based ones, in-depth evaluation of these methods is challenging due to varying performance ranks across diverse datasets. In this paper, we propose a comprehensive benchmark comprising 300 tabular datasets, covering a wide range of task types, size distributions, and domains. We perform an extensive comparison between state-of-the-art deep tabular methods and tree-based methods, revealing the average rank of all methods and highlighting the key factors that influence the success of deep tabular methods. Next, we analyze deep tabular methods based on their *training dynamics*, including changes in validation metrics and other statistics. For each dataset-method pair, we learn a mapping from both the meta-features of datasets and the first part of the validation curve to the final validation set performance and even the evolution of validation curves. This mapping extracts essential meta-features that influence prediction accuracy, helping the analysis of tabular methods from novel aspects. Based on the performance of all methods on this large benchmark, we identify two subsets of 45 datasets each. The first subset contains datasets that favor either tree-based methods or DNN-based methods, serving as effective analysis tools to evaluate strategies (*e.g.*, attribute encoding strategies) for improving deep tabular models. The second subset contains datasets where the ranks of methods are consistent with the overall benchmark, acting as a probe for tabular analysis. These “tiny tabular benchmarks” will facilitate further studies on tabular data.

1 Introduction

Machine learning has achieved success in a wide range of domains. Tabular data, where datasets are organized in table format, are among the most commonly used data types in machine learning, *e.g.*, CTR prediction [30, 55], healthcare [24], medical analysis [44, 48], and e-commerce [39]. In a tabular dataset, each row represents an instance, and each column corresponds to an attribute (aka. a feature). In supervised learning, a training instance is associated with a label (discrete for classification tasks and continuous for regression tasks). A machine learning model learns a mapping from an instance to its label on the training set and generalizes this ability to unseen test instances sampled from the same distribution.

Machine learning methods for tabular datasets are constantly evolving. Classical methods like Logistic Regression (LR), Support Vector Machine (SVM), Multi-Layer Perceptron (MLP), and decision tree have been proposed long ago and serve as the basis for a wide range of algorithms [7, 37]. For practical usage, tree-based ensemble methods have demonstrated their advantages in many applications [13,

*These authors contribute equally to this work.




Figure 1: Performance-Efficiency-Size comparison of representative tabular methods on our benchmark for (a) binary classification, (b) multi-class classification, (c) regression tasks, and (d) all task types. The performance is measured by the average rank of all methods (lower is better). The efficiency is measured by the average training time in seconds (lower is better). The model size is measured based on the average size of all models (the larger the radius, the larger the model).

33, 41]. In recent years, Deep Neural Networks (DNN) have been successfully applied in vision and language domains [46, 50, 17]. Inspired by this success, attribute embeddings [47, 19], data augmentation [56], and deep models for tabular data have been designed [8, 57, 58, 60, 61]. Early deep tabular methods struggled to achieve good performance due to their high complexity, leading to efforts to capture complicated feature correlation and mimic the workflow of tree-based models [14, 22, 40, 10]. However, further studies have shown that modern deep learning techniques [4, 18] enable classical methods such as MLPs to excel [31].

Considering several advantages of deep tabular models beyond performance, such as their ability to capture complex feature interactions via nonlinear mappings and their flexibility to adapt to special requirements, evaluating these models is essential for their development. Unlike the visual and textual domains, which have widely accepted benchmarks, datasets for evaluating tabular methods are collected from various sources such as UCI [23], OpenML [49], and Kaggle. Although there have constructed some tabular benchmarks [8, 21, 36], they are limited in terms of the coverage of evaluated methods, dataset sizes, and types of tabular tasks. Furthermore, the dilemma between the need for many tabular datasets to thoroughly reveal the ability of a given method and the high computational burden makes a large benchmark challenging for practical usage.

In this paper, we first construct a comprehensive benchmark comprising 300 tabular datasets, covering binary classification, multi-class classification, and regression tasks from diverse domains. Datasets in our benchmark are distributed from small to large sizes in a more uniform manner. We perform an extensive comparison between deep tabular methods and tree-based methods, revealing the average rank of all methods fairly. Our results provide insights into applying tabular methods based on the intrinsic properties of both methods and datasets.

We also record the training dynamics, including changes in losses and other statistics for the training, validation, and test stages, along with the training progress for each dataset-method pair. Instead of merely analyzing the final tabular results, we propose a new tabular prediction task: predicting the evolution of a performance curve based on its initial points. Specifically, the model learns a mapping from the meta-features of datasets and the initial part of the dynamics, to the validation set statistics over epochs. This model helps extract essential meta-features that influence prediction accuracy and emphasizes the key factors influencing task preference for different types of methods.

Based on the full evaluations of our large benchmark, we identify two subsets of 45 datasets. The first subset contains datasets that favor either tree-based methods or DNN-based methods, serving as an effective analysis tool to check whether a strategy benefits deep tabular models. We validate this subset by investigating when an attribute encoding strategy is beneficial. The second subset contains datasets where the method ranks are consistent with the overall benchmark, acting as a probe for tabular analysis. These “tiny tabular benchmarks” will facilitate further studies on tabular data. The contributions of our paper are:

- We propose a large tabular classification and regression benchmark and evaluate up-to-date tabular methods comprehensively.
- We propose a novel task predicting the training dynamics (the validation performance curves) from the initial points and the meta-features of a dataset. The learned model helps tabular data analysis.
- Two tiny benchmarks with 15% of the whole size are also extracted to facilitate further tabular research in a lightweight manner.

2 Preliminary

2.1 Learning with Tabular Data

A supervised tabular dataset is formatted as N examples and d features/attributes, corresponding to N rows and d columns in the table. An instance $\mathbf{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is depicted by its d feature values. Assume $x_{i,j}$ as the j -th feature of instance \mathbf{x}_i , it could be a numerical (continuous) one $x_{i,j}^{\text{num}} \in \mathbb{R}$, or a categorical (discrete) value $x_{i,j}^{\text{cat}}$. The categorical features are usually transformed in an index (integer). Each instance is associated with a label y_i , where $y_i \in \{1, -1\}$ in a binary classification task, $y_i \in [C] = \{1, \dots, C\}$ in a multi-class classification task, and $y_i \in \mathbb{R}$ in a regression task. Given a tabular dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$, we aim to learn a model f on \mathcal{D} via empirical risk minimization that maps \mathbf{x}_i to its label y_i :

$$\min_f \sum_{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) \in \mathcal{D}} \ell(y, \hat{y}_i = f(\mathbf{x}_i)) + \Omega(f). \quad (1)$$

$\ell(\cdot, \cdot)$ measures the discrepancy between the predicted label \hat{y}_i and the true label y_i , *e.g.*, cross-entropy in classification. $\Omega(\cdot)$ is the regularization on the model. We expect the learned f is able to extend its ability to unseen instances sampled from the same distribution as \mathcal{D} .

2.2 Representative Tabular Models

We consider several types of tabular models to implement f , the classical methods, the tree-based methods, and deep tabular methods. Classical methods contain LR, KNN, and SVM. We also consider the dummy baseline, which outputs the label of the major class and the average labels for classification and regression tasks, respectively. For tree-based methods, we consider Random Forest, XGBoost[13], CatBoost [41], and LightGBM [33]. Based on the workflow of deep tabular methods, we categorize them into three main groups: those that focus on handling input features, those that design the learning objectives, and those that apply specific learning algorithms.

Raw-feature-based Methods. Similar to the vanilla MLP working on raw features, many deep tabular methods adopt the same strategy, but with different model architectures for the mapping f . In addition to the newly designed MLP [18], architectures such as Residual Network (ResNet)[18], Self-Normalizing Neural Networks (SNN)[34], DANets [11], TabCaps [12], and DCNv2 [53] are also applied. **Tree-mimic Methods** design their architectures to mimic the decision strategy of trees, including NODE [40], GrowNet [5], and TabNet [4]. Unlike parametric methods, some **Neighborhood-based Methods** use non-parametric strategies to predict the label of a target instance based on the entire training set. Examples include DNNR [38] and TabR [20].

Instead of applying the model directly to raw features, **Token-based Methods** transform feature vectors into a set of tokens. Each feature value is mapped to a high-dimensional vector using a lookup table or linear mapping. These learnable tokens facilitate the final predictions. Representative methods include AutoInt [47], TabTransformer [28], and FT-Transformer (FT-T) [18].

Regularization-based Methods regularize the predictions of deep tabular models, *e.g.*, TAN-GOS [29] and SwitchTab [54]. PTaRL is a prototype-based method based on space calibration [59].




Figure 2: Advantages of the proposed benchmark. (a) shows the number of datasets for three tabular prediction tasks. (b) shows the number of datasets along the change of their sizes ($N \times d$). (c) shows the histogram of datasets across various domains.

General Deep Methods pre-train a deep neural network can be applied to any downstream tabular task, typically without requiring additional hyper-parameter tuning [27, 45, 62]. Specifically, we use TabPFN [27], where pre-trained transformers handle small-size tabular classification tasks. Following [36], we randomly sample 3000 examples when the training data size is large.

3 A Comprehensive Tabular Data Benchmark

We propose a large tabular benchmark for comprehensive evaluation. First, we describe the steps of constructing this benchmark as well as the advantages, followed by the comparison results.

3.1 Benchmark Construction Details

Datasets. The datasets in our benchmark are collected from UCI [23], OpenML [49], and Kaggle. We mainly filter and pre-process datasets as follows:

- Size selection. A dataset is considered if $N > 1000$ and $d > 5$, since too small datasets are difficult to evaluate due to their limited test sets.
- Missing value ratio. We exclude datasets with more than 20% missing values.
- Outlier dataset. Classification datasets are excluded if they are too imbalanced (where an MLP predicts all instances as the major class) or too easy (where an MLP achieves over 99% accuracy).
- Attribute pre-processing. Given a dataset, we delete “id/index/timestamp” attributes. We use ordinal encoding for categorical features [8, 36]. Then we follow [18] to pre-process the dataset.

Since there exist duplicate datasets in UCI and OpenML, we neglect *copies* of a dataset as well as those smaller *subsets* sampled from a larger one. Ultimately, we have 101 binary classification datasets, 80 multi-class classification datasets, and 119 regression datasets. Details are in Appendix A.

Implementation Details. Given that the performance of tabular methods depends on tuned hyper-parameters, we follow setups in [18, 20] to evaluate all methods. Each dataset is randomly split into training/validation/test partitions with proportions of 64%/16%/20%, respectively. Hyper-parameters are tuned and early stopping is performed on the validation set. All hyper-parameters are searched using Optuna [2] over 100 trials. The best-performing hyper-parameters are then used to train the model with 15 random seeds, and the average performance is reported. For all deep methods, we set the batch size to 1024 and use AdamW [35] as the optimizer.

Evaluation. We use accuracy for classification (higher is better) and Root Mean Square Error (RMSE) for regression (lower is better) to select the best-performing model during training on the validation set. Additionally, we consider F1/AUC for classification and MAE/R² for regression to evaluate test set performance. Following [16, 36], we report the average performance rank among all methods and datasets (lower is better).

Comparison Methods. We compare all methods mentioned in subsection 2.2, with full results included in Appendix D. Representative methods selected for analysis in the main paper, *i.e.*, LR, KNN, SVM, XGBoost, CatBoost, RandomForest, MLP, ResNet, FT-T, DCNv2, TabR, and TabPFN.

Table 1: The comparison results of all methods on our benchmark. We list the detailed results on binary classification, multi-class classification, and regression tasks with the default hyper-parameters and the tuned ones. The “min”, “max”, and “avg.” denote the minimum, maximum, and average rank among all methods over datasets belonging to a certain tabular task. “Dummy” means the naive baseline. “LR”, “XGB”, and “CatB” denote “Logistic regression/Linear Regression”, “XGBoost”, and “CatBoost”, respectively. TabPFN cannot be applied to regression tasks.

	Binary Classification						Multi-Class Classification						Regression					
	Default			Tuned			Default			Tuned			Default			Tuned		
	min	max	avg.	min	max	avg.	min	max	avg.	min	max	avg.	min	max	avg.	min	max	avg.
Dummy	1	13	11.97	1	13	11.93	1	13	12.31	2	13	12.30	1	12	11.24	1	12	11.26
LR	1	13	8.90	1	13	8.03	1	12	9.00	1	12	8.54	2	12	9.18	1	12	8.59
KNN	2	13	10.32	1	13	8.91	1	13	9.36	1	13	7.83	1	12	8.73	1	11	7.13
SVM	1	13	7.94	1	13	8.54	1	12	8.06	1	13	9.78	1	12	8.07	1	12	9.63
XGB	1	13	5.65	1	13	4.77	1	12	5.45	1	12	5.26	1	11	5.44	1	12	4.13
CatB	1	11	3.67	1	12	4.24	1	11	3.91	1	12	4.44	1	8	2.41	1	11	3.15
RForest	1	13	5.59	1	13	6.10	1	12	5.74	1	12	6.42	1	11	5.08	1	12	5.24
MLP	1	11	6.33	1	13	6.61	1	12	6.88	1	12	5.90	1	11	5.86	1	12	6.25
ResNet	1	13	6.42	1	13	6.85	1	12	5.20	1	12	5.37	1	10	5.50	1	12	6.23
FT-T	1	12	5.62	1	13	5.58	1	12	5.28	1	12	5.50	1	12	4.89	1	12	5.02
DCNv2	1	13	6.09	1	13	6.98	1	13	6.44	1	13	6.15	1	12	6.52	1	12	6.28
TabR	1	13	<u>5.03</u>	1	13	<u>4.70</u>	1	11	<u>3.99</u>	1	13	3.79	1	12	<u>4.60</u>	1	12	4.97
TabPFN	1	12	6.26	1	12	6.36	1	11	6.73	1	12	6.92	-	-	-	-	-	-




Figure 3: Comparison results on our benchmark. The score in (a) is calculated as the performance difference between the best tree-based method and the best DNN-based method. Average performance rank is used as a criterion in (b) and (c).

3.2 Advantages of Our Benchmark

Our proposed benchmark has several advantages on evaluating and analyzing tabular methods compared with the previous one, TabZilla [36].

Coverage of Tasks. Unlike [36], which only considers classification tasks, our benchmark also includes 119 regression tasks. Evaluations on regression datasets are crucial since most deep tabular methods can handle both classification and regression simultaneously. The numbers of datasets for binary classification, multi-class classification, and regression tasks are illustrated in Figure 2 (a).

Coverage of Data Sizes. Our benchmark covers a wide range of datasets with diverse sizes, particularly in terms of N and d . Although TabZilla includes datasets with a wide range of N , most datasets are either too small or extremely large. As shown in Figure 2 (b), our benchmark offers a more uniform distribution of dataset sizes w.r.t. $N \times d$.

Coverage of Domains. We collect datasets from 13 domains, including healthcare, biology, finance, education, and physics. This diverse collection allows us to better assess whether a tabular method can generalize across different applications. Details are shown in Figure 2 (c).

3.3 Results on Our Benchmark

The comparison results of 13 representative methods, including those tuned models and models with default hyper-parameters, on the proposed benchmark are listed in Table 1. In addition, Figure 1 demonstrates the performance-efficiency-size comparison of these tabular methods on our benchmark,

with classification tasks shown in (a) and (b), regression tasks in (c), and all task types in (d). Based on the results, we have several observations:

- CatBoost achieves the best average rank in most classification and regression tasks, which is consistent with [36]. Among all deep tabular methods, TabR works the best in most cases. However, it has a high training cost, as demonstrated in Figure 1.
- Most methods benefit significantly from hyper-parameter tuning. Since the average rank reveals the relative comparison between methods, a lower rank after hyper-parameter tuning indicates substantial improvements for certain methods (*e.g.*, classical methods like LR and deep methods like TabR). Although the average ranks of some tuned models, such as CatBoost, may increase, this suggests that while their performance improves, they are still surpassed by other methods on certain datasets. In other words, their relative improvements are smaller compared to other methods.
- For deep tabular methods, the variance in their ranks between classification and regression tasks is usually stable. Moreover, the ranks of deep tabular methods improve (*i.e.*, become lower) when extending the same method from regression to binary classification and then to multi-class classification tasks. Since some classical linear methods perform well on binary classification tasks, the ranks of deep methods may be slightly higher in this case.
- We calculate the difference in performance between the best tree-based methods and the best DNN-based methods. We sort the differences and present the results in Figure 3 (a), where higher scores indicate that the dataset is more tree-friendly. The varied results between tree-based and DNN-based methods suggest that datasets have a preference for specific types of methods.
- Nonlinear models archive better results in most cases than linear ones. However, there indeed exist several datasets where the naive baseline and linear model (such as LR) achieves the best results.
- Figure 3 (b) shows the results on different sizes ($N \times d$) ranging from 1e4 to 1e8. We find that TabR works better than other methods on smaller-sized datasets, while CatBoost maintains its superiority on larger datasets.
- We also demonstrate the results of different methods across diverse domains in Figure 3 (c). For example, CatBoost outperforms the second-best method by a large margin on industrial, societal, and educational datasets.

4 Tabular Model Analysis via Training Dynamics Prediction

In this section, we propose a new tabular task, *i.e.*, making predictions on the training dynamics of deep tabular models. This task helps estimate the ability of a tabular method efficiently and allows us to analyze the key factors that influence the performance of deep tabular methods.

4.1 Predicting the Training Dynamics

In addition to performance measures of different methods, our benchmark also records detailed statistics during the training process. Specifically, given a training set \mathcal{D} of a dataset, we optimize a deep tabular model f by stochastic gradient descent over Equation 1. In each epoch, we randomly permute the order of all examples in \mathcal{D} , and sample mini-batches of examples sequentially. An epoch is defined as one complete pass through all examples in \mathcal{D} . We can record the change in the validation set statistics (*e.g.*, accuracy for a classification task) in the form $\mathbf{a} = [a_1, a_2, \dots, a_T] \in \mathbb{R}_+^T$ over T epochs before early stopping.

Training deep tabular models usually incurs high time and computational costs. Therefore, an *efficient* way to estimate the model’s ability is to predict subsequent values in \mathbf{a} given the initial values. In other words, we aim to predict the dynamics of validation set statistics curves based on their initial parts. If the accuracy curve for a classification task does not increase rapidly but oscillates, it is reasonable to stop the training and try another configuration of the model [15]. To this end, we propose a new tabular prediction task: predicting the dynamics of a model during its training progress based on both the properties of \mathcal{D} as well as the initial values of the curve \mathbf{a} .

In particular, we collect meta-features $\mathbf{m}_{\mathcal{D}}$ for \mathcal{D} , which include basic statistics of a dataset (N , d , and C), and other criteria such as the joint entropy between each attribute and class [36]. Additionally, we define a support set $\mathcal{S} \in \mathbb{R}_+^K$ containing the first K values in \mathbf{a} , and a query set $\mathcal{Q} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{T-K}$ consisting of the remaining values. We aim to learn a mapping g from $\{\mathbf{m}_{\mathcal{D}}, \mathcal{S}\}$ to \mathcal{Q} , based on the statistics of all datasets and methods in our benchmark. We set \mathbf{a} as the list of accuracies for classification and as the list of normalized RMSE for regression tasks. The support set \mathcal{S} depicts the




Figure 4: The visualization results of fitting the training dynamics (the validation curves of an MLP trained with default hyper-parameters) on eight datasets are shown. The datasets in the first and second rows are DNN-friendly and Tree-friendly, respectively. The first two columns represent classification tasks, while the second two columns represent regression tasks.

initial changes in the validation curve, while the meta-features $m_{\mathcal{D}}$ encode the intrinsic properties of a dataset. By learning g , we can analyze which meta-features influence changes in validation set accuracy, thereby identifying the key factors essential for the performance of deep tabular methods.

4.2 Learning to Predict the Curve

Given the support set \mathcal{S} , one direct strategy to fit and extrapolate the curve is to apply the neural scaling law [25, 42, 6, 26, 3, 1, 9]. The scaling law defines a curve family with several parameters, which can be estimated based on \mathcal{S} . Due to the limited values in \mathcal{S} , we propose a baseline for this task via meta-learning a mapping from \mathcal{S} to the parameters across various datasets.

We use the following function family to depict the curve:

$$a_{\theta}(t) = A \log t + B\sqrt{t} + C + D/t. \quad (2)$$

Here t is an integer representing the epoch number, and $a(t)$ outputs the validation set statistics for a given epoch index. $\theta = \{A, B, C, D\}$ are the parameters of the curve. The variability of the curve is determined by θ , so we aim to learn a meta-mapping h from $\{m_{\mathcal{D}}, \mathcal{S}\}$ to θ [51].

Although the curve may be predicted based only on the support set \mathcal{S} , we include the meta-features $m_{\mathcal{D}}$ as an additional input source. $m_{\mathcal{D}}$ not only provides auxiliary information about the dataset but also makes the predictions depend on the properties of the dataset. The learning objective of h is

$$\min_h \sum_{\{m_{\mathcal{D}}, \mathcal{S}\}} \sum_{a_t \in \{\mathcal{Q}\}} \ell(a_{\theta=h(m_{\mathcal{D}}, \mathcal{S})}(t), a_t). \quad (3)$$

We randomly sample a (batch of) dataset from the benchmark, and for each dataset, we collect $m_{\mathcal{D}}$, \mathcal{S} , and \mathcal{Q} . The model predicts the parameter θ of the curve family, and the quality of the prediction is based on the discrepancy (measured by ℓ) between the predicted values via θ and the true values in \mathcal{Q} . We evaluate the ability of h given an unseen dataset.

4.3 Main Results and Analysis

We analyze tabular methods by fitting the mapping h in four scenarios: classification vs. regression and tree-friendly vs. DNN-friendly datasets. Details on splitting datasets are in the next section.

The visualization results of fitting the training dynamics (the validation curves of an MLP trained with default hyper-parameters) on eight datasets are shown in Figure 4. For more details, see Appendix B. The datasets in the first and second rows are DNN-friendly and tree-friendly, respectively. The first and second columns represent classification and regression tasks. Our proposed method fits the curve more accurately than using the scaling law directly. Besides, the inclusion of meta-features improves the fit in most cases. The results indicate that our method effectively estimates the training dynamics




Figure 5: The importance of meta-features when we train a predictor for training dynamics over all the datasets.

	Greedy		Random		Clustering	
	Seen	Unseen	Seen	Unseen	Seen	Unseen
Split 1	0.85	1.17	0.16	0.11	0.47	0.62
Split 2	1.07	1.92	0.16	0.58	0.49	0.66
Split 3	1.48	1.63	0.18	0.26	0.49	0.78
Split 4	0.90	1.85	0.19	0.40	0.47	0.70
Split 5	1.03	1.43	0.13	0.47	0.55	0.52
Avg.	1.07	1.60	0.16	0.36	0.50	0.66

Table 2: MAE of the ranks of methods on the proposed tiny benchmark and the ranks on the whole benchmark.

of a deep tabular model. Based on these estimates, we can intelligently choose the best configurations of models by early stopping those unlikely to achieve good performance.

Combining the curve fitting results in Figure 4 with the feature importance results in Figure 5, we find that meta-features with large weights are meaningful, revealing that the complexity of the dataset matters in predicting the training dynamics. For classification tasks, the distance to the center (gravity) is important for fitting the curve for both tree-based and DNN-based methods. For regression tasks, the range of attributes (range.mean) and the mean of attributes (mean.mean) are essential. For tree-based methods, the sparsity (sparsity.mean) of attributes is crucial, while DNN-based methods pay more attention to the statistics of attributes (such as max.sd).

5 Tiny Benchmarks for Tabular Data

Although the proposed large benchmark facilitates the analysis of deep tabular models, running a single method on all the datasets incurs a high computational burden. In this section, we extract a subset of the benchmark containing 15% of the full benchmark, *i.e.*, 45 datasets, to enable more efficient tabular analysis.

5.1 Tiny Benchmark for Tree/DNN Comparison

The different behaviors of tree-based tabular methods and DNN-based methods have been observed and analyzed in previous studies [21, 36] and in section 3. In other words, tree-based and DNN-based methods have different preferences for datasets. We construct a tiny benchmark where the difference between the two types of methods is pronounced, which will be useful for tree-vs.-DNN analysis.

Selection Strategy. We select a subset of datasets where tree-based and DNN-based methods exhibit diverse behaviors based on their performance ranks in the full benchmark. Specifically, for a given dataset and the performance criteria of different methods, we define a dataset as “tree-friendly (TF)” if tree-based approaches (*i.e.*, RandomForest, XGBoost, CatBoost) achieve higher performance than the best DNN-based methods (*i.e.*, MLP, ResNet, FT-T, TabR). Conversely, a dataset is “DNN-friendly (DF)” if DNN-based methods outperform tree-based ones. If the performance of the two types of methods is similar (*i.e.*, the difference between their results is smaller than a threshold), we classify the dataset as a “tie”. We partition all datasets into several groups based on their sizes. Specifically, there are 5, 4, and 6 groups for binary classification, multi-class classification, and regression, respectively. For each subset, we choose one dataset from each of the three cases: “TF”, “DF”, and “Tie”.

Applications of the benchmark. The success of deep tabular models relies on some key modules, but the proportion of their helpfulness also depends on the property of a dataset. Since the datasets in this tiny benchmark have diverse preferences, we demonstrate the benchmark becomes a useful tool for analyzing some special modules in deep tabular methods, *e.g.*, attribute encoding strategies. In addition to the vanilla strategy which keeps the original numerical value, several feature encoding strategies have been proposed in previous studies for numerical feature x_{ij}^{num} , *i.e.*, Piece-wise Linear Encoding strategies (quantile version PLE-Q and tree-based version PLE-T) [19, 20]. We equip representative tabular methods with these encoding strategies and report their results on this tiny benchmark in Table 3. Although the PLE encoding generally benefits deep tabular methods, we find that it is particularly helpful on tree-friendly datasets. However, on DNN-friendly datasets, it sometimes leads to negative effects.

Table 3: Comparison results over the first proposed tiny benchmark. We use ‘‘TF’’, ‘‘DF’’, and ‘‘Tie’’ to denote the subsets of datasets that are tree-friendly, DNN-friendly, and those without any preference, respectively. Various encoding strategies are applied to the numerical features. In addition to the vanilla one, we also investigate PLE-Q and PLE-T, denoted by ‘‘E-Q’’ and ‘‘E-T’’, respectively.

	MLP			ResNet			FT-T			TabR		
	Vanilla	w/ E-Q	w/ E-T	Vanilla	w/ E-Q	w/ E-T	Vanilla	w/ E-Q	w/ E-T	Vanilla	w/ E-Q	w/ E-T
TF	2.25	1.92	1.83	1.92	2.08	2.00	2.33	1.75	1.83	2.08	1.83	2.08
Tie	1.83	2.00	2.17	1.50	2.33	2.17	1.67	2.08	2.17	1.75	2.33	1.92
DF	1.25	2.38	2.38	1.75	2.19	2.06	1.50	2.00	2.50	1.69	2.00	2.31

	XGBoost			RandomForest			SVM			Catboost		
	Vanilla	w/ E-Q	w/ E-T	Vanilla	w/ E-Q	w/ E-T	Vanilla	w/ E-Q	w/ E-T	Vanilla	w/ E-Q	w/ E-T
TF	2.67	1.83	1.50	1.67	2.00	2.33	2.17	2.17	1.67	2.25	1.83	1.83
Tie	2.08	1.83	1.83	1.58	2.25	2.08	2.33	1.92	1.67	1.92	2.00	1.83
DF	2.18	1.94	1.88	2.19	1.88	1.94	2.25	1.94	1.75	2.25	1.81	1.88

5.2 Tiny Benchmark for Rank Consistent Evaluation

The large size of the full benchmark increases the burden of evaluating a new tabular method. Therefore, we propose to extract a subset of the datasets and expect the average ranks of these tabular methods on this tiny benchmark to be consistent with the ranks on the full benchmark.

Selection Strategy. Given a dataset \mathcal{D} in the benchmark \mathcal{B} , we can evaluate L methods \mathcal{A} via $\text{ranking}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{A}) \in \mathbb{R}_+^L$. Based on the performance record over \mathcal{B} , we formulate the selection process as an optimization problem:

$$\min_{\mathcal{B}' \subseteq \mathcal{B}} \ell \left(\sum_{\mathcal{D} \in \mathcal{B}} \text{ranking}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{A}), \sum_{\mathcal{D}' \in \mathcal{B}'} \text{ranking}(\mathcal{D}', \mathcal{A}) \right) \quad \text{s.t. } |\mathcal{B}'| \leq \eta D. \quad (4)$$

η is the ratio that controls the number of datasets selected from the benchmark, and ℓ measures the difference between the average rank based on the selected benchmark \mathcal{B}' and the whole benchmark \mathcal{B} . To solve the combinatorial optimization, we try three strategies: a greedy strategy, a random selection over 10,000 trials, and a clustering method (KMeans) based on all rank results.

Applications of the benchmark. We validate whether this proposed tiny benchmark can produce consistent ranks for a new method. Since the benchmark is selected based on 13 representative tabular methods, we split these methods into five groups. We select subsets using four groups and test the quality of the selection strategy on the remaining group. Specifically, we measure the MAE of a given strategy between the ranks of the seen/unseen methods on the selected benchmark compared to the ranks on the whole benchmark. We find that the random strategy obtains lower MAE on both seen and unseen groups of methods in Table 2. Finally, we use the same strategy to select the tiny benchmark based on the results of all 13 methods.

6 Conclusion

We provide a comprehensive evaluation of machine learning methods for tabular data. Our benchmark includes a large number of datasets covering a wide range of domains, data sizes, and task types. Beyond evaluating multiple performance criteria for different methods, we also record the training dynamics, introducing a novel task: predicting the validation curve based on its initial part and the dataset’s meta-features. Finally, we extract two subsets of tiny benchmarks. One subset reveals the diverse properties of DNN and tree-based models, while the other maintains consistent ranks of different methods with the full benchmark, facilitating further studies on tabular data.

References

- [1] Samira Abnar, Mostafa Dehghani, Behnam Neyshabur, and Hanie Sedghi. Exploring the limits of large scale pre-training. In *ICLR*, 2022.
- [2] Takuya Akiba, Shotaro Sano, Toshihiko Yanase, Takeru Ohta, and Masanori Koyama. Optuna: A next-generation hyperparameter optimization framework. In *KDD*, pages 2623–2631, 2019.

- [3] Ibrahim M. Alabdulmohsin, Behnam Neyshabur, and Xiaohua Zhai. Revisiting neural scaling laws in language and vision. In *NeurIPS*, pages 22300–22312, 2022.
- [4] Sercan Ö. Arik and Tomas Pfister. Tabnet: Attentive interpretable tabular learning. In *AAAI*, pages 6679–6687, 2021.
- [5] Sarkhan Badirli, Xuanqing Liu, Zhengming Xing, Avradeep Bhowmik, and Sathiya S. Keerthi. Gradient boosting neural networks: Grownet. *CoRR*, abs/2002.07971, 2020.
- [6] Yasaman Bahri, Ethan Dyer, Jared Kaplan, Jaehoon Lee, and Utkarsh Sharma. Explaining neural scaling laws. *CoRR*, abs/2102.06701, 2021.
- [7] Christopher Bishop. *Pattern recognition and machine learning*. Springer, 2006.
- [8] Vadim Borisov, Tobias Leemann, Kathrin Seßler, Johannes Haug, Martin Pawelczyk, and Gjergji Kasneci. Deep neural networks and tabular data: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, abs/2110.01889:1–21, 2022.
- [9] Ethan Caballero, Kshitij Gupta, Irina Rish, and David Krueger. Broken neural scaling laws. In *ICLR*, 2023.
- [10] Chun-Hao Chang, Rich Caruana, and Anna Goldenberg. NODE-GAM: neural generalized additive model for interpretable deep learning. In *ICLR*, 2022.
- [11] Jintai Chen, Kuanlun Liao, Yao Wan, Danny Z. Chen, and Jian Wu. Danets: Deep abstract networks for tabular data classification and regression. In *AAAI*, pages 3930–3938, 2022.
- [12] Jintai Chen, KuanLun Liao, Yanwen Fang, Danny Chen, and Jian Wu. Tabcaps: A capsule neural network for tabular data classification with bow routing. In *ICLR*, 2023.
- [13] Tianqi Chen and Carlos Guestrin. Xgboost: A scalable tree boosting system. In *KDD*, pages 785–794, 2016.
- [14] Heng-Tze Cheng, Levent Koc, Jeremiah Harmsen, Tal Shaked, Tushar Chandra, Hrishi Aradhye, Glen Anderson, Greg Corrado, Wei Chai, Mustafa Ispir, Rohan Anil, Zakaria Haque, Lichan Hong, Vihan Jain, Xiaobing Liu, and Hemal Shah. Wide & deep learning for recommender systems. In *DLRS*, pages 7–10, 2016.
- [15] Corinna Cortes, Lawrence D. Jackel, Sara A. Solla, Vladimir Vapnik, and John S. Denker. Learning curves: Asymptotic values and rate of convergence. In *NIPS*, pages 327–334, 1993.
- [16] Manuel Fernández Delgado, Eva Cernadas, Senén Barro, and Dinani Gomes Amorim. Do we need hundreds of classifiers to solve real world classification problems? *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 15(1):3133–3181, 2014.
- [17] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. BERT: pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *NAACL-HLT*, pages 4171–4186, 2019.
- [18] Yury Gorishniy, Ivan Rubachev, Valentin Khruikov, and Artem Babenko. Revisiting deep learning models for tabular data. In *NeurIPS*, pages 18932–18943, 2021.
- [19] Yury Gorishniy, Ivan Rubachev, and Artem Babenko. On embeddings for numerical features in tabular deep learning. In *NeurIPS*, pages 24991–25004, 2022.
- [20] Yury Gorishniy, Ivan Rubachev, Nikolay Kartashev, Daniil Shlenskii, Akim Kotelnikov, and Artem Babenko. Tabr: Tabular deep learning meets nearest neighbors in 2023. In *ICLR*, 2024.
- [21] Léo Grinsztajn, Edouard Oyallon, and Gaël Varoquaux. Why do tree-based models still outperform deep learning on typical tabular data? In *NeurIPS*, pages 507–520, 2022.
- [22] Huifeng Guo, Ruiming Tang, Yunming Ye, Zhenguo Li, and Xiuqiang He. Deepfm: A factorization-machine based neural network for CTR prediction. In *IJCAI*, pages 1725–1731, 2017.

- [23] Kam Hamidieh. Superconductivity Data. UCI Machine Learning Repository, 2018. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.24432/C53P47>.
- [24] Md. Rafiul Hassan, Sadiq Al-Insaf, Muhammad Imtiaz Hossain, and Joarder Kamruzzaman. A machine learning approach for prediction of pregnancy outcome following IVF treatment. *Neural Computing and Applications*, 32(7):2283–2297, 2020.
- [25] Joel Hestness, Sharan Narang, Newsha Ardalani, Gregory F. Diamos, Heewoo Jun, Hassan Kianinejad, Md. Mostofa Ali Patwary, Yang Yang, and Yanqi Zhou. Deep learning scaling is predictable, empirically. *CoRR*, abs/1712.00409, 2017.
- [26] Derek Hoiem, Tanmay Gupta, Zhizhong Li, and Michal Shlapentokh-Rothman. Learning curves for analysis of deep networks. In *ICML*, pages 4287–4296, 2021.
- [27] Noah Hollmann, Samuel Müller, Katharina Eggenberger, and Frank Hutter. TabPFN: A transformer that solves small tabular classification problems in a second. In *ICLR*, 2023.
- [28] Xin Huang, Ashish Khetan, Milan Cvitkovic, and Zohar S. Karnin. Tabtransformer: Tabular data modeling using contextual embeddings. *CoRR*, abs/2012.06678, 2020.
- [29] Alan Jeffares, Tension Liu, Jonathan Crabbé, Fergus Imrie, and Mihaela van der Schaar. Tangos: Regularizing tabular neural networks through gradient orthogonalization and specialization. In *ICLR*, 2023.
- [30] Yu-Chin Juan, Yong Zhuang, Wei-Sheng Chin, and Chih-Jen Lin. Field-aware factorization machines for CTR prediction. In *RecSys*, pages 43–50, 2016.
- [31] Arind Kadra, Marius Lindauer, Frank Hutter, and Josif Grabocka. Well-tuned simple nets excel on tabular datasets. In *NeurIPS*, pages 23928–23941, 2021.
- [32] Jared Kaplan, Sam McCandlish, Tom Henighan, Tom B. Brown, Benjamin Chess, Rewon Child, Scott Gray, Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, and Dario Amodei. Scaling laws for neural language models. *CoRR*, abs/2001.08361, 2020.
- [33] Guolin Ke, Qi Meng, Thomas Finley, Taifeng Wang, Wei Chen, Weidong Ma, Qiwei Ye, and Tie-Yan Liu. Lightgbm: A highly efficient gradient boosting decision tree. In *NIPS*, pages 3146–3154, 2017.
- [34] Günter Klambauer, Thomas Unterthiner, Andreas Mayr, and Sepp Hochreiter. Self-normalizing neural networks. In *NIPS*, pages 971–980, 2017.
- [35] Ilya Loshchilov and Frank Hutter. Decoupled weight decay regularization. In *ICLR*, 2019.
- [36] Duncan C. McElfresh, Sujay Khandagale, Jonathan Valverde, Vishak Prasad C., Ganesh Ramakrishnan, Micah Goldblum, and Colin White. When do neural nets outperform boosted trees on tabular data? In *NeurIPS*, pages 76336–76369, 2023.
- [37] Mehryar Mohri, Afshin Rostamizadeh, and Ameet Talwalkar. *Foundations of Machine Learning*. MIT Press, 2012.
- [38] Youssef Nader, Leon Sixt, and Tim Landgraf. DNNR: differential nearest neighbors regression. In *ICML*, pages 16296–16317, 2022.
- [39] Lennart J Nesterstigt, Steven S Aanen, Damir Vandic, and Flavius Frasincar. Floppies: a framework for large-scale ontology population of product information from tabular data in e-commerce stores. *Decision Support Systems*, 59:296–311, 2014.
- [40] Sergei Popov, Stanislav Morozov, and Artem Babenko. Neural oblivious decision ensembles for deep learning on tabular data. In *ICLR*, 2020.
- [41] Liudmila Ostroumova Prokhorenkova, Gleb Gusev, Aleksandr Vorobev, Anna Veronika Dorogush, and Andrey Gulin. Catboost: unbiased boosting with categorical features. In *NeurIPS*, pages 6639–6649, 2018.

- [42] Jonathan S. Rosenfeld, Amir Rosenfeld, Yonatan Belinkov, and Nir Shavit. A constructive prediction of the generalization error across scales. In *ICLR*, 2020.
- [43] John Schulman, Filip Wolski, Prafulla Dhariwal, Alec Radford, and Oleg Klimov. Proximal policy optimization algorithms. *CoRR*, abs/1707.06347, 2017.
- [44] Lisa M Schwartz, Steven Woloshin, and H Gilbert Welch. The drug facts box: providing consumers with simple tabular data on drug benefit and harm. *Medical Decision Making*, 27(5): 655–662, 2007.
- [45] Junhong Shen, Liam Li, Lucio M Dery, Corey Staten, Mikhail Khodak, Graham Neubig, and Ameet Talwalkar. Cross-modal fine-tuning: Align then refine. In *ICML*, pages 31030–31056, 2023.
- [46] Karen Simonyan and Andrew Zisserman. Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition. In *ICLR*, 2015.
- [47] Weiping Song, Chence Shi, Zhiping Xiao, Zhijian Duan, Yewen Xu, Ming Zhang, and Jian Tang. AutoInt: Automatic feature interaction learning via self-attentive neural networks. In *CIKM*, pages 1161–1170, 2019.
- [48] Abdulhamit Subasi. Medical decision support system for diagnosis of neuromuscular disorders using dwt and fuzzy support vector machines. *Computers in Biology and Medicine*, 42(8): 806–815, 2012.
- [49] Joaquin Vanschoren, Jan N Van Rijn, Bernd Bischl, and Luis Torgo. Openml: networked science in machine learning. *ACM SIGKDD Explorations Newsletter*, 15(2):49–60, 2014.
- [50] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In *NIPS*, 2017.
- [51] Oriol Vinyals, Charles Blundell, Tim Lillicrap, Koray Kavukcuoglu, and Daan Wierstra. Matching networks for one shot learning. In *NIPS*, pages 3630–3638, 2016.
- [52] Pauli Virtanen, Ralf Gommers, Travis E. Oliphant, Matt Haberland, Tyler Reddy, David Cournapeau, Evgeni Burovski, Pearu Peterson, Warren Weckesser, Jonathan Bright, Stéfan J. van der Walt, Matthew Brett, Joshua Wilson, K. Jarrod Millman, Nikolay Mayorov, Andrew R. J. Nelson, Eric Jones, Robert Kern, Eric Larson, C J Carey, İlhan Polat, Yu Feng, Eric W. Moore, Jake VanderPlas, Denis Laxalde, Josef Perktold, Robert Cimrman, Ian Henriksen, E. A. Quintero, Charles R. Harris, Anne M. Archibald, Antônio H. Ribeiro, Fabian Pedregosa, Paul van Mulbregt, and SciPy 1.0 Contributors. SciPy 1.0: Fundamental Algorithms for Scientific Computing in Python. *Nature Methods*, 17:261–272, 2020.
- [53] Ruoxi Wang, Rakesh Shivanna, Derek Zhiyuan Cheng, Sagar Jain, Dong Lin, Lichan Hong, and Ed H. Chi. DCN V2: improved deep & cross network and practical lessons for web-scale learning to rank systems. In *WWW*, pages 1785–1797, 2021.
- [54] Jing Wu, Suiyao Chen, Qi Zhao, Renat Sergazinov, Chen Li, Shengjie Liu, Chongchao Zhao, Tianpei Xie, Hanqing Guo, Cheng Ji, Daniel Cociorva, and Hakan Brunzell. Switchtab: Switched autoencoders are effective tabular learners. In *AAAI*, pages 15924–15933, 2024.
- [55] Ling Yan, Wu-Jun Li, Gui-Rong Xue, and Dingyi Han. Coupled group lasso for web-scale CTR prediction in display advertising. In *ICML*, pages 802–810, 2014.
- [56] Han-Jia Ye, De-Chuan Zhan, Xue-Min Si, and Yuan Jiang. Learning mahalanobis distance metric: Considering instance disturbance helps. In *IJCAI*, pages 3315–3321, 2017.
- [57] Han-Jia Ye, De-Chuan Zhan, Nan Li, and Yuan Jiang. Learning multiple local metrics: Global consideration helps. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, 42(7):1698–1712, 2020.
- [58] Han-Jia Ye, Qi-Le Zhou, and De-Chuan Zhan. Training-free generalization on heterogeneous tabular data via meta-representation. *CoRR*, abs/2311.00055, 2023.
- [59] Hangting Ye, Wei Fan, Xiaozhuang Song, Shun Zheng, He Zhao, Dan dan Guo, and Yi Chang. Ptarl: Prototype-based tabular representation learning via space calibration. In *ICLR*, 2024.

- [60] Weinan Zhang, Tianming Du, and Jun Wang. Deep learning over multi-field categorical data - - A case study on user response prediction. In *ECIR*, pages 45–57, 2016.
- [61] Qi-Le Zhou, Han-Jia Ye, Leye Wang, and De-Chuan Zhan. Unlocking the transferability of tokens in deep models for tabular data. *CoRR*, abs/2310.15149, 2023.
- [62] Bingzhao Zhu, Xingjian Shi, Nick Erickson, Mu Li, George Karypis, and Mahsa Shoaran. Xtab: Cross-table pretraining for tabular transformers. In *ICML*, pages 43181–43204, 2023.

Appendix A Benchmark Details

As mentioned in section 3 in the main paper, we propose a large benchmark for the comprehensive evaluation of tabular methods, which contains 101 binary classification datasets, 80 multi-class classification datasets, and 119 regression datasets. In this section, we present detailed descriptions of the 300 datasets, as well as their statistics.

A.1 Dataset Name List

In Table 4, we list the names as well as the source URLs of all datasets in our benchmark. We select these datasets based on the rules mentioned in section 3. Each dataset is associated with an ID number. In the following tables, we use the ID to index a dataset and avoid listing long dataset names.

Table 4: The list of datasets (names as well as source URLs) in our proposed benchmark.

ID	Name (Source)	ID	Name (Source)
1	1000-Cameras-Dataset	151	compass
2	2dplanes	152	compass_reg
3	3D_Estimation_using_RSSI_of_WLAN_dataset	153	concrete_compressive_strength
4	3D_Estimation_using_RSSI_of_WLAN_dataset_complete_1_target	154	contraceptive_method_choice
5	ASP-POTASSCO-classification	155	cpu_act
6	Abalone_reg	156	cpu_small
7	Ailerons	157	credit
8	Amazon_employee_access	158	credit_reg
9	Another-Dataset-on-used-Fiat-500-(1538-rows)	159	customer_satisfaction_in_airline
10	BLE_RSSI_dataset_for_Indoor_localization	160	dabetes_130-us_hospitals
11	BNG(breast-w)	161	dataset_sales
12	BNG(cmc)	162	debutanizer
13	BNG(echoMonths)	163	default_of_credit_card_clients
14	BNG(lowbwt)	164	delta_aileron
15	BNG(mv)	165	delta_elevators
16	BNG(stock)	166	dis
17	BNG(tic-tac-toe)	167	dna
18	Bank_Customer_Churn_Dataset	168	drug_consumption
19	Basketball_c	169	dry_bean_dataset
20	Bias_correction_r	170	eeg-eye-state
21	Bias_correction_r_2	171	electricity
22	Brazilian_houses_reproduced	172	elevators
23	CDC_Diabetes_Health_Indicators	173	estimation_of_obesity_levels
24	CPMP-2015-regression	174	eye_movements
25	CPMP-2015-runtime-regression	175	eye_movements_bin
26	CPS1988	176	fifa
27	California-Housing-Classification	177	first-order-theorem-proving
28	Cardiovascular-Disease-dataset	178	fried
29	Click_prediction_small	179	garments_worker_productivity
30	Contaminant-detection-in-packaged-cocoa-hazelnut-...-10.0GHz(Urbinati)	180	gas-drift
31	Contaminant-detection-in-packaged-cocoa-hazelnut-...-10.5GHz(Urbinati)	181	gas_turbine_CO_and_NOx_emission
32	Contaminant-detection-in-packaged-cocoa-hazelnut-...-11.0GHz(Urbinati)	182	gina_agnostic
33	Contaminant-detection-in-packaged-cocoa-hazelnut-...-9.0GHz(Urbinati)	183	golf_play_dataset_extended
34	Contaminant-detection-in-packaged-cocoa-hazelnut-...-9.5GHz(Urbinati)	184	healthcare_insurance_expenses
35	CookbookReviews	185	heloc
36	Credit_c	186	hill-valley
37	Customer_Personality_Analysis	187	house_16H
38	Data_Science_Salaries	188	house_16H_reg
39	Data_Science_for_Good_Kiva_Crowdfunding	189	house_8L
40	Diabetic_Retinopathy_Debrecen	190	house_sales_reduced
41	Diamonds	191	houses
42	E-CommereShippingData	192	housing_price_prediction
43	Employee	193	htru
44	FICO-HELOC-cleaned	194	ibm-employee-performance
45	FOREX_audcad-day-High	195	in_vehicle_coupon_recommendation
46	FOREX_audcad-hour-High	196	internet_firewall
47	FOREX_audchf-day-High	197	internet_usage
48	FOREX_audjpy-day-High	198	jm1
49	FOREX_audjpy-hour-High	199	jungle_chess_2pcs_raw_endgame_complete
50	FOREX_audsgd-hour-High	200	kc1
51	FOREX_audusd-hour-High	201	kdd_ipums_la_97-small
52	FOREX_cadjpy-day-High	202	kin8nm
53	FOREX_cadjpy-hour-High	203	kr-vs-k
54	Facebook_Comment_Volume	204	kropt
55	Firm-Teacher_Clave-Direction_Classification	205	law-school-admission-bianry
56	Fitness_Club_c	206	led24
57	Food_Delivery_Time	207	led7
58	GAMETES_Epistasis_2-Way_20atts_0.1H_EDM-1_1	208	letter
59	GAMETES_Heterogeneity_20atts_1600_Het_0.4_0.2_50_EDM-2_001	209	madeline
60	Gender_Gap_in_Spanish_WP	210	mammography
61	GesturePhaseSegmentationProcessed	211	maternal_health_risk
62	Goodreads-Computer-Books	212	mauna-loa-atmospheric-co2
63	HR_Analytics_Job_Change_of_Data_Scientists	213	mfeat-factors
64	Heart-Disease-Dataset-(Comprehensive)	214	mfeat-fourier
65	IBM_HR_Analytics_Employee_Attrition_and_Performance	215	mfeat-karhunen
66	IEEE80211aa-GATS	216	mfeat-morphological

67	INNHOTelsGroup	217	mfeat-pixel
68	Indian_pines	218	mfeat-zernike
69	Insurance	219	mice_protein_expression
70	Intersectional-Bias-Assessment	220	microaggregation2
71	Is-this-a-good-customer	221	mobile_c36_oversampling
72	JapaneseVowels	222	mozilla4
73	Job_Profitability	223	mv
74	KDD	224	naticusdroid+android+permissions+dataset
75	KDDCup09_upselling	225	national-longitudinal-survey-binary
76	Kaggle_bike_sharing_demand_challenge	226	okcupid_stem
77	Laptop_Prices_Dataset	227	one-hundred-plants-margin
78	Large-scale_Wave_Energy_Farm_Perth_100	228	one-hundred-plants-shape
79	Large-scale_Wave_Energy_Farm_Perth_49	229	one-hundred-plants-texture
80	Large-scale_Wave_Energy_Farm_Sydney_100	230	online_shoppers
81	Large-scale_Wave_Energy_Farm_Sydney_49	231	optdigits
82	Long	232	ozone-level-8hr
83	MIC	233	ozone_level
84	MagicTelescope	234	page-blocks
85	Marketing_Campaign	235	pc1
86	MiamiHousing2016	236	pc3
87	Mobile_Phone_Market_in_Ghana	237	pc4
88	Mobile_Price_Classification	238	pendigits
89	NASA_PHM2008	239	phoneme
90	NHANES_age_prediction	240	pol
91	National_Health_and_Nutrition_Health_Survey	241	pol_reg
92	Parkinson_Multiple_Sound_Recording	242	pole
93	Parkinsons_Telemonitoring	243	predict_students_dropout_and_academic_success
94	Performance-Prediction	244	puma32H
95	PhishingWebsites	245	puma8NH
96	Physicochemical_r	246	qsar
97	PieChart3	247	qsar_aquatic_toxicity
98	Pima_Indians_Diabetes_Database	248	qsar_fish_toxicity
99	PizzaCutter3	249	rice_cammeo_and_osmancik
100	Pumpkin_Seeds	250	ringnorm
101	QSAR_biodegradation	251	rl
102	Rain_in_Australia	252	satellite_image
103	SDSS17	253	satimage
104	Satellite	254	segment
105	Shipping	255	seismic+bumps
106	Shop_Customer_Data	256	semeion
107	Smoking_and_Drinking_Dataset_with_body_signal	257	sensory
108	Student_Alcohol_Consumption	258	shill-bidding
109	Student_Performance_Portuguese	259	shruntime
110	Superconductivty	260	shuttle
111	Telecom_Churn_Dataset	261	socmob
112	UI_Pen_Characters	262	space_ga
113	UJIndoorLoc	263	spambase
114	VulNoneVul	264	splice
115	Water_Quality_and_Potability	265	sports_articles_for_objectivity_analysis
116	Waterstress	266	statlog
117	Wilt	267	steel_industry_energy_consumption
118	Wine_Quality_red	268	steel_plates_faults
119	Wine_Quality_white	269	stock
120	abalone	270	stock_fardamento02
121	accelerometer	271	sulfur
122	ada	272	svmguid3
123	ada_agnostic	273	sylvine
124	ada_prior	274	taiwanese_bankruptcy_prediction
125	airfoil_self_noise	275	telco-customer-churn
126	airlines_seed_0_nrows_2000_nclasses_10_ncols_100_stratify_True	276	texture
127	allbp	277	thyroid
128	allrep	278	thyroid-ann
129	anacatdata_authorship	279	thyroid-dis
130	anacatdata_supreme	280	topo_2_1
131	archive2	281	treasury
132	archive_r56_Maths	282	turiye_student_evaluation
133	archive_r56_Portuguese	283	twonorm
134	artificial-characters	284	vehicle
135	auction_verification	285	volkert
136	autoUniv-au4-2500	286	volume
137	autoUniv-au7-1100	287	walking-activity
138	avocado_sales	288	wall-robot-navigation
139	bank	289	water_quality
140	bank32nh	290	waveform-5000
141	bank8FM	291	waveform_database_generator
142	banknote_authentication	292	waveform_database_generator_versio_n_1
143	baseball	293	weather_izmir
144	blogfeedback	294	website_phishing
145	car-evaluation	295	wind
146	churn	296	wine
147	cmc	297	wine+quality
148	combined_cycle_power_plant	298	wine-quality-red
149	communities_and_crime	299	wine-quality-white
150	company_bankruptcy_prediction	300	yeast

A.2 Dataset Statistics

We list the statistics of all 300 datasets in Table 5. The datasets are indexed based on their IDs. For each dataset, we list the type of the task (*i.e.*, classification “CLS” or regression “REG”), the number

of classes (only for classification tasks), the number of samples, the number of numerical features, the number of category features, and the domain of the dataset based on its source information (there are 13 domains, *i.e.*, financial, physical, biological, healthcare, natural, industrial, societal, vision, computer, educational, leisure, handcrafted, and others). We show the statistics of datasets in Figure 2 in the main paper, which indicates the advantages of the proposed benchmark w.r.t. its coverage of tasks, sizes, and domains.

Moreover, we also display the score of each dataset to indicate the preference of a dataset on tree-based or DNN-based models (a higher score means the dataset is Tree-friendly and DNN-friendly otherwise). More detailed rules for calculating Tree-DNN scores can be found in subsection B.2.

The last two columns in the table for each dataset mean whether the dataset is selected in our proposed two tiny benchmarks.

Table 5: Statistics of all datasets. ID continues the ID in Table 4, TB1 and TB2 indicate whether this dataset belongs to Tiny Benchmark 1 or Tiny Benchmark 2.

ID	Task	Classes	Samples	Num.	Cat.	Domain	Score	TB1	TB2	ID	Task	Classes	Samples	Num.	Cat.	Domain	Score	TB1	TB2
1	Reg	-	1038	10	0	Industrial	1.129			151	Cls	2	16644	8	9	Industrial	0.070	✓	
2	Reg	-	40768	10	0	Physical	0.673			152	Reg	-	16644	17	0	Industrial	1.755		✓
3	Reg	-	5760	6	0	Vision	0.379			153	Reg	-	1030	8	0	Industrial	2.067		
4	Reg	-	14400	12	0	Vision	0.995			154	Cls	3	1473	5	4	Societal	0.792		
5	Cls	11	1294	140	1	Biological	1.953	✓		155	Reg	-	8192	21	0	Industrial	-0.481		
6	Reg	-	4177	7	1	Biological	-1.790			156	Reg	-	8192	12	0	Industrial	1.434		
7	Reg	-	13750	40	0	Industrial	2.448	✓	✓	157	Cls	2	16714	10	0	Financial	1.946		✓
8	Cls	2	32769	0	7	Financial	2.014	✓		158	Reg	-	16714	10	0	Financial	1.571		
9	Reg	-	1538	6	0	Financial	1.071			159	Cls	2	129880	4	17	Industrial	0.031		
10	Cls	3	9984	3	0	Computer	2.059			160	Cls	2	101766	8	12	Healthcare	1.138		
11	Cls	2	39366	9	0	Handcrafted	1.320		✓	161	Reg	-	10738	10	0	Financial	0.244		
12	Cls	3	55296	2	7	Handcrafted	1.035		✓	162	Reg	-	2394	7	0	Industrial	0.237		
13	Reg	-	17496	5	3	Handcrafted	0.973			163	Cls	2	30000	14	9	Financial	0.603		
14	Reg	-	31104	2	7	Handcrafted	-0.309			164	Cls	2	7129	5	0	Physical	1.759		
15	Reg	-	78732	7	3	Handcrafted	0.695			165	Reg	-	9517	6	0	Physical	-0.704		
16	Reg	-	59049	9	0	Handcrafted	0.523			166	Cls	2	3772	6	23	Others	-0.880		✓
17	Cls	2	39366	0	9	Handcrafted	0.028	✓	✓	167	Cls	3	3186	0	180	Biological	0.437		
18	Cls	2	10000	6	4	Financial	1.188			168	Cls	7	1884	12	0	Healthcare	-0.609		
19	Cls	2	1340	11	0	Leisure	-1.506			169	Cls	7	13611	16	0	Biological	-0.824		
20	Reg	-	7725	21	0	Physical	-0.482			170	Cls	2	14980	14	0	Vision	-0.001		
21	Reg	-	7725	21	0	Physical	-0.059	✓		171	Cls	2	45312	7	1	Industrial	1.671	✓	
22	Reg	-	10692	8	0	Financial	-0.912			172	Reg	-	16599	18	0	Industrial	-0.578		
23	Cls	2	253680	7	14	Healthcare	-0.432			173	Cls	7	2111	8	8	Healthcare	-2.195	✓	
24	Reg	-	2108	23	2	Computer	1.680			174	Cls	3	10936	24	3	Biological	0.132		
25	Reg	-	2108	22	1	Computer	2.149	✓		175	Cls	2	7608	20	0	Biological	1.757		✓
26	Reg	-	28155	2	4	Societal	0.551			176	Reg	-	18063	5	0	Leisure	1.481		
27	Cls	2	20640	8	0	Financial	1.513			177	Cls	6	6118	51	0	Educational	1.830		
28	Cls	2	70000	5	6	Healthcare	0.057	✓	✓	178	Reg	-	40768	10	0	Computer	-0.013	✓	
29	Cls	2	39948	3	0	Leisure	-2.146	✓		179	Reg	-	1197	8	5	Industrial	1.976		
30	Reg	-	2400	30	0	Healthcare	-1.587			180	Cls	6	13910	128	0	Natural	-0.123		
31	Reg	-	2400	30	0	Healthcare	-1.677			181	Reg	-	36733	10	0	Industrial	1.877		
32	Reg	-	2400	30	0	Healthcare	-1.690	✓		182	Cls	2	3468	970	0	Physical	0.963		
33	Reg	-	2400	30	0	Healthcare	-1.040			183	Cls	2	1095	3	6	Leisure	-0.597		
34	Reg	-	2400	30	0	Healthcare	-1.633			184	Reg	-	1338	3	3	Healthcare	0.740		✓
35	Reg	-	18182	7	0	Healthcare	1.384	✓		185	Cls	2	10000	22	0	Financial	0.720		
36	Cls	3	100000	17	5	Financial	0.770			186	Cls	2	1212	100	0	Vision	-2.123		
37	Cls	2	2240	22	2	Financial	-0.324			187	Cls	2	13488	16	0	Societal	1.820		
38	Reg	-	3755	1	4	Financial	2.005			188	Reg	-	22784	16	0	Societal	0.835		✓
39	Cls	4	671205	7	4	Financial	0.711			189	Reg	-	22784	8	0	Societal	1.516		
40	Cls	2	1151	16	3	Healthcare	-1.875			190	Reg	-	21613	18	0	Societal	0.142		
41	Reg	-	53940	6	3	Natural	0.031	✓		191	Reg	-	20640	8	0	Societal	1.010		
42	Cls	2	10999	6	4	Financial	-0.178	✓		192	Reg	-	545	5	7	Financial	1.560		
43	Cls	2	4653	3	5	Societal	1.707			193	Cls	2	17898	8	0	Natural	2.149		✓
44	Cls	2	9871	21	2	Financial	1.178			194	Cls	2	1470	23	7	Societal	0.000		✓
45	Cls	2	1834	10	0	Financial	-2.042			195	Cls	2	12684	0	21	Industrial	0.239		
46	Cls	2	43825	10	0	Financial	-1.090			196	Cls	4	65532	7	0	Computer	1.814		✓
47	Cls	2	1833	10	0	Financial	-1.212		✓	197	Cls	46	10108	0	70	Leisure	1.157		
48	Cls	2	1832	10	0	Financial	-2.336	✓		198	Cls	2	10885	21	0	Computer	0.109		
49	Cls	2	43825	10	0	Financial	-1.418			199	Cls	3	44819	6	0	Vision	-2.094		✓
50	Cls	2	43825	10	0	Financial	-1.803	✓	✓	200	Cls	2	2109	21	0	Computer	2.076		✓
51	Cls	2	43825	10	0	Financial	-1.662			201	Cls	2	5188	20	0	Societal	2.032		
52	Cls	2	1834	10	0	Financial	-2.066			202	Reg	-	8192	8	0	Physical	-0.701		✓
53	Cls	2	43825	10	0	Financial	-1.609	✓		203	Cls	18	28056	3	3	Physical	-1.119		
54	Reg	-	40949	53	0	Societal	0.273			204	Cls	18	28056	0	6	Physical	-0.790		
55	Cls	4	10800	0	16	Physical	-0.524			205	Reg	-	20800	7	4	Educational	0.046		✓
56	Cls	2	1500	3	3	Healthcare	-0.104	✓		206	Cls	10	3200	0	24	Computer	0.343		✓
57	Reg	-	45593	6	2	Societal	2.238			207	Cls	10	3200	0	7	Computer	0.104		
58	Cls	2	1600	0	20	Biological	1.710			208	Cls	26	20000	15	0	Physical	-0.394		
59	Cls	2	1600	0	20	Biological	0.653			209	Cls	2	3140	259	0	Physical	1.793		
60	Cls	3	4746	13	0	Societal	-0.853	✓		210	Cls	2	11183	6	0	Healthcare	1.298		
61	Cls	5	9873	32	0	Vision	1.194			211	Cls	3	1014	6	0	Healthcare	1.291		
62	Reg	-	1234	5	0	Leisure	1.959			212	Reg	-	2225	5	1	Natural	1.016		
63	Cls	2	19158	3	10	Financial	-0.080			213	Cls	10	2000	216	0	Physical	-1.321		
64	Reg	-	1190	11	0	Healthcare	1.330			214	Cls	10	2000	76	0	Physical	1.466		✓
65	Cls	2	1470	25	6	Financial	-2.137	✓		215	Cls	10	2000	64	0	Physical	-0.672		

66	Reg	-	4046	27	0	Computer	-1.247	✓	✓	216	Cls	10	2000	6	0	Physical	-1.902	
67	Cls	2	36275	11	6	Societal	1.337			217	Cls	10	2000	0	240	Physical	-0.777	
68	Cls	8	9144	220	0	Physical	-1.348			218	Cls	10	2000	47	0	Physical	-1.884	
69	Reg	-	23548	3	7	Financial	0.846			219	Cls	8	1080	75	0	Biological	-0.736	
70	Reg	-	11000	14	5	Computer	0.020	✓		220	Cls	5	20000	20	0	Biological	-1.440	
71	Reg	-	1723	9	4	Financial	0.960			221	Cls	2	51760	6	0	Others	-0.638	
72	Cls	9	9961	14	0	Vision	-0.978			222	Cls	2	15545	4	0	Others	1.401	
73	Reg	-	14480	27	1	Educational	2.659	✓		223	Reg	-	40768	7	3	Others	-0.982	✓
74	Reg	-	5032	34	11	Physical	0.138		✓	224	Cls	2	29332	0	86	Leisure	-0.249	
75	Cls	2	5128	34	15	Financial	0.563			225	Cls	2	4908	9	7	Societal	0.398	
76	Reg	-	10886	3	6	Industrial	2.034	✓		226	Cls	3	26677	2	11	Societal	0.181	✓
77	Reg	-	4441	8	0	Financial	1.347			227	Cls	100	1600	64	0	Vision	1.068	
78	Reg	-	7277	201	0	Natural	1.146			228	Cls	100	1600	64	0	Vision	-1.259	
79	Reg	-	36043	99	0	Natural	1.226			229	Cls	100	1599	64	0	Vision	0.162	
80	Reg	-	2318	201	0	Natural	0.437			230	Cls	2	12330	5	9	Financial	1.005	✓
81	Reg	-	17964	99	0	Natural	-0.166	✓		231	Cls	10	5620	64	0	Physical	-1.554	✓
82	Reg	-	4477	19	0	Others	-0.159			232	Cls	2	2534	72	0	Natural	0.334	
83	Cls	2	1649	9	95	Physical	1.144			233	Reg	-	2536	0	36	Natural	-0.235	
84	Cls	2	19020	9	0	Physical	0.816			234	Cls	5	5473	10	0	Others	2.573	✓
85	Cls	2	2240	19	8	Financial	0.879			235	Cls	2	1109	21	0	Physical	1.240	✓
86	Reg	-	13932	16	0	Financial	1.471			236	Cls	2	1563	37	0	Physical	-0.680	✓
87	Reg	-	3600	4	10	Financial	0.634			237	Cls	2	1458	37	0	Physical	1.743	
88	Cls	4	2000	14	6	Financial	-0.037	✓		238	Cls	10	10992	16	0	Vision	-0.193	✓
89	Reg	-	45918	21	0	Industrial	-0.360			239	Cls	2	5404	5	0	Others	0.758	
90	Reg	-	2277	4	3	Healthcare	-1.840	✓		240	Cls	2	10082	26	0	Others	-0.933	✓
91	Cls	2	2278	7	0	Healthcare	1.732			241	Reg	-	15000	48	0	Others	-1.686	✓
92	Reg	-	1040	26	0	Healthcare	1.067			242	Reg	-	14998	26	0	Others	-1.495	✓
93	Reg	-	5875	18	1	Healthcare	2.019			243	Cls	3	4424	5	29	Educational	1.438	
94	Reg	-	1340	19	0	Others	0.556			244	Reg	-	8192	32	0	Industrial	-0.084	
95	Cls	2	11055	0	30	Leisure	0.454			245	Reg	-	8192	8	0	Industrial	0.362	
96	Reg	-	45730	9	0	Physical	-0.192			246	Cls	2	1055	30	10	Biological	-2.103	✓
97	Cls	2	1077	37	0	Others	-0.351			247	Reg	-	546	8	0	Biological	1.840	
98	Cls	2	768	8	0	Healthcare	1.765			248	Reg	-	908	4	2	Biological	1.355	
99	Cls	2	1043	37	0	Financial	-0.840			249	Cls	2	3810	7	0	Vision	0.851	
100	Cls	2	2500	12	0	Biological	1.959			250	Cls	2	7400	20	0	Handcrafted	-0.359	
101	Cls	2	1054	41	0	Biological	0.608			251	Cls	2	4970	5	7	Others	1.299	✓
102	Cls	3	145460	12	6	Natural	1.289			252	Reg	-	6435	36	0	Vision	0.854	
103	Cls	3	100000	8	4	Natural	1.632			253	Cls	6	6430	36	0	Vision	1.432	✓
104	Cls	2	5100	36	0	Vision	0.197			254	Cls	7	2310	17	0	Vision	0.112	✓
105	Reg	-	10999	5	4	Industrial	0.273			255	Cls	2	2584	14	4	Natural	1.593	
106	Reg	-	2000	4	2	Financial	0.149	✓		256	Cls	10	1593	256	0	Physical	-1.288	
107	Cls	2	991346	22	1	Healthcare	0.180			257	Reg	-	576	0	11	Vision	0.456	
108	Reg	-	395	13	17	Educational	2.047	✓	✓	258	Reg	-	6321	3	0	Leisure	-0.134	
109	Reg	-	397	15	17	Educational	0.793			259	Reg	-	10000	4	6	Others	0.715	
110	Reg	-	21197	81	0	Industrial	1.815		✓	260	Cls	7	58000	9	0	Physical	0.751	
111	Cls	2	3333	14	3	Financial	0.250			261	Reg	-	1156	1	4	Others	-2.069	✓
112	Cls	35	1364	80	0	Physical	-2.218			262	Reg	-	3107	6	0	Others	-1.406	
113	Reg	-	21048	520	0	Physical	0.172			263	Cls	2	4601	57	0	Physical	2.083	
114	Reg	-	5692	16	0	Industrial	0.032	✓	✓	264	Cls	3	3190	0	60	Physical	0.173	✓
115	Cls	2	3276	8	0	Natural	-0.306			265	Cls	2	1000	57	2	Leisure	1.452	
116	Reg	-	1188	22	0	Natural	-0.045	✓		266	Cls	2	1000	7	13	Others	1.435	
117	Cls	2	4821	5	0	Natural	-0.100			267	Reg	-	35040	7	3	Industrial	-0.920	
118	Reg	-	1599	11	0	Vision	1.820			268	Cls	7	1941	25	2	Industrial	1.904	
119	Reg	-	4898	11	0	Vision	1.577			269	Reg	-	950	9	0	Financial	-0.789	
120	Cls	3	4177	7	1	Biological	-1.728			270	Reg	-	6277	5	1	Financial	0.596	
121	Cls	4	153004	3	1	Physical	-1.214			271	Reg	-	10081	6	0	Natural	-1.680	
122	Cls	2	4147	48	0	Physical	1.718			272	Reg	-	1243	22	0	Others	1.799	
123	Cls	2	4562	48	0	Physical	1.477			273	Cls	2	5124	20	0	Physical	0.618	✓
124	Cls	2	4562	6	8	Physical	0.301			274	Cls	2	6819	95	0	Societal	1.686	✓
125	Reg	-	1503	5	0	Industrial	-0.474			275	Cls	2	7043	3	15	Financial	1.002	
126	Cls	2	2000	3	4	Industrial	1.151			276	Cls	11	5500	40	0	Vision	-0.679	
127	Cls	3	3772	6	23	Biological	1.683			277	Cls	3	7200	21	0	Healthcare	1.582	
128	Cls	4	3772	6	23	Biological	1.555			278	Cls	3	3772	21	0	Healthcare	1.829	
129	Cls	4	841	69	0	Educational	0.135			279	Cls	5	2800	6	20	Healthcare	-2.415	✓
130	Reg	-	4052	7	0	Educational	1.949			280	Reg	-	8885	266	0	Natural	1.299	
131	Reg	-	1143	11	1	Educational	1.194		✓	281	Reg	-	1049	15	0	Financial	-1.689	
132	Reg	-	397	1	29	Educational	-0.332			282	Cls	5	5820	30	2	Educational	0.250	
133	Reg	-	651	1	29	Educational	2.352	✓		283	Cls	2	7400	20	0	Handcrafted	-0.542	
134	Cls	10	10218	7	0	Physical	1.633			284	Cls	4	846	18	0	Industrial	-2.127	
135	Reg	-	2043	6	1	Financial	1.957			285	Cls	10	58310	180	0	Others	-1.075	
136	Cls	3	2500	58	42	Handcrafted	0.662			286	Reg	-	50993	53	0	Others	0.632	
137	Cls	5	1100	8	4	Handcrafted	0.234			287	Cls	22	149332	4	0	Industrial	0.559	
138	Reg	-	18249	11	2	Financial	0.237			288	Cls	4	5456	24	0	Industrial	0.635	
139	Cls	2	45211	7	9	Financial	-0.496			289	Cls	2	7996	20	0	Natural	-1.962	
140	Reg	-	8192	32	0	Financial	-0.187			290	Cls	3	5000	40	0	Physical	-0.666	✓
141	Reg	-	8192	8	0	Financial	-0.131		✓	291	Cls	3	4999	21	0	Physical	1.676	
142	Cls	2	1372	4	0	Financial	-1.064			292	Cls	3	5000	21	0	Physical	-1.498	
143	Cls	3	1340	15	1	Leisure	0.737		✓	293	Reg	-	1461	9	0	Natural	-0.043	
144	Reg	-	60021	62	214	Physical	1.687			294	Cls	3	1353	0	9	Computer	0.322	✓
145	Cls	4	1728	0	21	Physical	0.331			295	Reg	-	6574	14	0	Natural	-0.577	
146	Cls	2	5000	16	4	Financial	-0.567			296	Cls	2	2554	4	0	Vision	2.235	✓
147	Cls	3	1473	2	7	Physical	1.697			297	Reg	-	6497	11	0	Vision	1.747	
148	Reg	-	9568	4	0	Industrial	1.922			298	Cls	6	1599	4	0	Vision	2.143	
149	Reg	-	1994	102	0	Societal	0.401		✓	299	Cls	7	4898	11	0	Vision	1.756	✓
150	Cls	2	6819	93	2	Financial	1.086			300	Cls	10	1484	8	0	Biological	2.365	✓

Appendix B Discussions

We discuss additional details and setups to construct our proposed (tiny) benchmarks.

B.1 Additional Details to Construct the Whole Benchmark

The search space of hyper-parameters. As mentioned in subsection 3.1 in the main paper, all hyper-parameters are searched using Optuna [2] over 100 trials. We list the range of hyper-parameters for each comparison method below for reproduction. For most methods, we follow the hyper-parameter space provided in [18]. For more details, see our source code.

- **MLP**
 - layers: UniformInt[1, 8]
 - d_layers: UniformInt[64, 512]
 - dropout: {0, Uniform[0, 0.5]}
 - lr: LogUniform[1e-5, 1e-2]
 - weight_decay: {0, LogUniform[1e-6, 1e-3]}
- **ResNet**
 - layers: UniformInt[1, 8]
 - d_layers: UniformInt[64, 512]
 - dropout: {0, Uniform[0, 0.5]}
 - lr: LogUniform[1e-5, 1e-2]
 - weight_decay: {0, LogUniform[1e-6, 1e-3]}
- **FT-T**
 - n_layers: UniformInt[1, 4]
 - d_token: Categorical{8, 16, 32, 64, 128}
 - residual_dropout: {0, Uniform[0, 0.2]}
 - attention_dropout: Uniform[0, 0.5]
 - ffn_dropout: Uniform[0, 0.5]
 - d_ffn_factor: Uniform[0.667, 2.667]
 - lr: LogUniform[1e-5, 1e-3]
 - weight_decay: LogUniform[1e-6, 1e-3]
- **NODE**
 - num_layers: UniformInt[1, 4]
 - depth: UniformInt[4, 6]
 - tree_dim: UniformInt[2, 3]
 - layer_dim: Categorical{512, 1024}
 - lr: LogUniform[1e-5, 0.1]
 - weight_decay: LogUniform[1e-6, 1e-3]
- **TabR**
 - d_main: UniformInt[96, 384]
 - context_dropout: Uniform[0, 0.6]
 - encoder_n_blocks: UniformInt[0, 1]
 - predictor_n_blocks: UniformInt[1, 2]
 - dropout0: Uniform[0, 0.6]
 - num_embeddings:
 - * n_frequencies: UniformInt[16, 96]
 - * frequency_scale: LogUniform[0.01, 100.0]
 - * d_embedding: UniformInt[16, 64]
 - lr: LogUniform[3e-5, 1e-3]
 - weight_decay: {0, LogUniform[1e-6, 1e-3]}
- **TANGOS**
 - layers: UniformInt[1, 8]
 - d_layers: UniformInt[64, 512]
 - dropout: {0, Uniform[0, 0.5]}
 - lambda1: LogUniform[0.001, 10]
 - lambda2: LogUniform[0.0001, 1]
 - subsample: UniformInt[30, 100]
 - lr: LogUniform[1e-4, 1e-3]
 - weight_decay: {0, LogUniform[1e-6, 1e-3]}
- **TabCaps**
 - lr: LogUniform[1e-5, 0.1]
 - weight_decay: LogUniform[1e-6, 1e-3]
 - sub_class: UniformInt[1, 5]

- init_dim: UniformInt[32, 128]
- primary_capsule_size: UniformInt[4, 32]
- digit_capsule_size: UniformInt[4, 32]
- leaves: UniformInt[16, 64]
- **TabNet**
 - lr: Uniform[0.001, 0.01]
 - gamma: Uniform[1, 2]
 - n_steps: UniformInt[3, 10]
 - n_independent: UniformInt[1, 5]
 - n_shared: UniformInt[1, 5]
 - momentum: Uniform[0.01, 0.4]
- **SNN**
 - layers: UniformInt[2, 16]
 - d_layers: UniformInt[1, 512]
 - dropout: {0, Uniform[0, 0.1]}
 - d_embedding: UniformInt[64, 512]
 - lr: LogUniform[1e-5, 1e-2]
 - weight_decay: {0, LogUniform[1e-6, 1e-3]}
- **PTaRL**
 - layers: UniformInt[1, 3]
 - d_layers: UniformInt[64, 512]
 - dropout: {0, Uniform[0, 0.5]}
 - d_embedding: UniformInt[64, 128]
 - lr: LogUniform[1e-5, 0.1]
 - weight_decay: {0, LogUniform[1e-6, 1e-3]}
- **DANets**
 - n_layers: UniformInt[6, 32]
 - dropout: {0, Uniform[0, 0.5]}
 - base_outdim: UniformInt[64, 128]
 - lr: LogUniform[1e-5, 0.1]
 - weight_decay: {0, LogUniform[1e-6, 1e-3]}
- **DCNv2**
 - d: UniformInt[64, 512]
 - d_embedding: UniformInt[64, 512]
 - hidden_dropout: Uniform[0, 0.5]
 - cross_dropout: Uniform[0, 0.5]
 - n_cross_layers: UniformInt[1, 8]
 - n_hidden_layers: UniformInt[1, 8]
 - lr: LogUniform[1e-5, 0.1]
 - weight_decay: {0, LogUniform[1e-6, 1e-3]}
- **TabTransformer**
 - dim: Categorical{32, 64, 128, 256}
 - depth: Categorical{1, 2, 3, 6, 12}
 - heads: Categorical{2, 4, 8}
 - attn_dropout: Uniform[0, 0.5]
 - ff_dropout: Uniform[0, 0.5]
 - lr: LogUniform[1e-5, 0.1]
 - weight_decay: {0, LogUniform[1e-6, 1e-3]}
- **GrowNet**
 - d_embedding: UniformInt[32, 512]
 - hidden_d: UniformInt[32, 512]
 - lr: LogUniform[1e-5, 0.1]
 - weight_decay: {0, LogUniform[1e-6, 1e-3]}
 - epochs_per_stage: UniformInt[1, 2]
 - correct_epoch: UniformInt[1, 2]
- **AutoInt**
 - n_layers: UniformInt[1, 6]
 - d_token: Categorical{8, 16, 32, 64, 128}
 - residual_dropout: {0, Uniform[0, 0.2]}

- attention_dropout: Uniform[0, 0.5]
- lr: LogUniform[1e-5, 1e-3]
- weight_decay: LogUniform[1e-6, 1e-3]
- **DNNR**
 - n_neighbors: Fixed[3]
 - n_derivative_neighbors: UniformInt[32, 1024]
 - order: Categorical{"1", "2diag"}
 - solver: Categorical{"linear_regression", "scipy_lsqr", "numpy", "ridge", "lasso"}
 - index: Fixed{"annoy"}
- **SwitchTab**
 - alpha: LogUniform[0.01, 100]
 - lr: LogUniform[1e-6, 1e-3]
 - weight_decay: LogUniform[1e-6, 1e-3]
- **XGBoost**
 - alpha: {0, LogUniform[1e-8, 100]}
 - colsample_bylevel: Uniform[0.5, 1.0]
 - colsample_bytree: Uniform[0.5, 1.0]
 - gamma: {0, LogUniform[1e-8, 100]}
 - lambda: {0, LogUniform[1e-8, 100]}
 - learning_rate: LogUniform[1e-5, 1]
 - max_depth: UniformInt[3, 10]
 - min_child_weight: LogUniform[1e-8, 100000]
 - subsample: Uniform[0.5, 1.0]
- **CatBoost**
 - bagging_temperature: Uniform[0, 1.0]
 - depth: UniformInt[3, 10]
 - l2_leaf_reg: LogUniform[1.0, 10.0]
 - leaf_estimation_iterations: UniformInt[1, 10]
 - learning_rate: LogUniform[1e-5, 1]
- **LightGBM**
 - num_leaves: UniformInt[10, 100]
 - max_depth: UniformInt[3, 10]
 - learning_rate: LogUniform[1e-3, 1]
 - min_child_weight: LogUniform[1e-5, 1e-1]
 - min_child_samples: UniformInt[2, 100]
 - subsample: Uniform[0.5, 1.0]
 - colsample_bytree: Uniform[0.5, 1.0]
 - reg_lambda: {0, LogUniform[1e-5, 1.0]}
- **LogReg**
 - C: LogUniform[1e-5, 5]
 - penalty: Categorical{"l2", null}
 - max_iter: UniformInt[50, 500]
- **Random Forest**
 - min_samples_split: UniformInt[2, 10]
 - min_samples_leaf: UniformInt[1, 10]
- **SVM**
 - C: LogUniform[1e-5, 1e5]
- **KNN**
 - n_neighbors: UniformInt[1, 128]
 - weights: Categorical{"uniform", "distance"}
 - p: Categorical{1, 1.5, 2, 2.5, 3}

The content given a dataset and method pair. Our benchmark provides a comprehensive evaluation of various tabular methods across numerous datasets. For each dataset-method pair, we record extensive statistics, which are valuable in tabular machine learning research. The recorded statistics include:

- **Training logs.** Detailed logs are kept for all methods, capturing changes in statistics such as learning rate, batch-wise losses, and other criteria throughout the training process.

- **Performance metrics.** For each method, hyper-parameters are tuned over 100 trials using the training and validation sets. The best-performing hyper-parameters are then used to train the model with 15 random seeds, and the average performance is reported. We apply early stopping based on accuracy for classification tasks and RMSE for regression tasks. In addition to tracking validation and test set statistics (loss values, accuracy, and RMSE) throughout the training epochs, we also record test set criteria. Additional metrics such as F1/AUC for classification and MAE/R2 for regression are used to evaluate test set performance.
- **Running time.** The running time for each method is recorded over the 15 random seeds. Since models may stop early at different epochs, running times can vary across epochs.
- **Model sizes.** The sizes of models with default hyper-parameters and those with tuned hyper-parameters are recorded.

B.2 Additional Details to Construct Tiny Benchmarks

We construct two tiny benchmarks with 15% of the whole size to facilitate further tabular research in a lightweight manner. In particular, Tiny Benchmark 1 is for Tree/DNN comparison, and Tiny Benchmark 2 is for rank-consistent evaluation. We will illustrate the selection method respectively.

Tiny Benchmark 1 for Tree/DNN comparison. We expect this tiny benchmark to cover datasets in the whole benchmark with different sizes ($N \times d$) and have diverse preferences for tree-based and DNN-based methods.

To differentiate the tree-friendly and DNN-friendly datasets, we introduce a Tree-DNN score as displayed in Table 5, which indicates the gap between tree-based methods and DNN-based methods. We first choose 6 representative tabular methods: XGBoost, CatBoost, Random Forest, MLP, ResNet, and FT-T. The first three are tree-based methods, and the remaining ones represent DNN-based methods. For each dataset, the results of the selected methods are first normalized to remove the differences in the difficulty level of each dataset. We then use the difference between the best-performed tree-based methods and the best-performing DNN-based method as a score reflecting the gap between them. Formally, the Tree-DNN score is given by:

$$s = \max(\hat{s}_{\text{XGBoost}}, \hat{s}_{\text{CatBoost}}, \hat{s}_{\text{RForest}}) - \max(\hat{s}_{\text{MLP}}, \hat{s}_{\text{ResNet}}, \hat{s}_{\text{FT-T}}), \quad (5)$$

where \hat{s} is the normalized metric, *i.e.*, the accuracy for the classification task, or negative RMSE for the regression task.

We then extract 15% of the dataset by task type, *i.e.*, 15 binary classification tasks, 12 multi-class classification tasks, and 18 regression tasks are selected from the 300 datasets. More specifically, we sort the datasets for each task type by their size ($N \times d$) and divide the 101 binary classification tasks, 80 multi-class classification tasks, and 119 regression tasks into 5, 4, and 6 groups, respectively. For each group, we choose one dataset from each of the three cases: “TF”, “DF”, and “Tie”, which means choosing the dataset with the highest score, the lowest score, and the score with an absolute value close to zero. We also adjust the selection by choosing a second candidate dataset, in order to ensure that the number of datasets containing categorical features and datasets containing numerical features in the tiny benchmark are balanced. Such a selection method helps us to select datasets with different performances while taking into account the range of dataset size and the distribution of features.

Tiny Benchmark 2 for rank consistent evaluation. We also extract 15% of the datasets by task type to form Tiny Benchmark 2, aiming to maintain the rank consistency with the full benchmark, rather than its diversity. To minimize Equation 4 in the main paper, we consider three approximated approaches: greedy selection, random selection, and clustering-based selection. The criterion is the mean absolute error (MAE) between the ranks of methods on the selected subsets and the ranks of methods on the whole dataset. The details of the three strategies are:

- **Greedy Selection.** For each task type, we specify the number of datasets to choose, as mentioned above. Then, in each loop, we select the dataset that minimizes the MAE until the desired number is reached.
- **Random Selection.** For each task type, we randomly select a specified number of datasets for 10,000 trials. Then, we choose the subsets with the minimum MAE.
- **Clustering.** The goal of selecting a subset of datasets such that the ranks of methods on it approximate their ranks on the full benchmark can be viewed as a clustering problem. We perform KMeans clustering with Euclidean distance and select the dataset closest to each cluster center as the representative.

We first test the performance of the above three approaches by performing multiple splits on these 13 methods: Dummy, LR, KNN, SVM, XGBoost, CatBoost, Random Forest, MLP, ResNet, FT-T, DCNv2, TabR, and TabPFN. In each split, we choose 10 methods as seen methods and others as unseen methods (*i.e.*, 3 for classification tasks and 2 for regression tasks since TabPFN cannot be applied to regression tasks). The results are shown in Table 2 in the main paper.

We find that the greedy selection does not work well, while random selection achieves the best performance on both seen and unseen methods. The possible reason is that since we specify the number of datasets to choose, the greedy selection might not achieve the optimum within that number. The best performance was observed in the randomly selected set, which, to some extent, also indicates that our dataset is distributed quite uniformly, rather than conforming to the assumptions of clustering.

Therefore, we release Tiny Benchmark 2 by performing random selection on all 13 methods as mentioned above, as shown in Table 5.

B.3 Meta-Features Used in Training Dynamics Prediction

In section 4 of the main paper, we introduce a novel tabular prediction setting where we focus on predicting the training dynamics of a model. Specifically, using the meta-features of a dataset, we aim to predict the validation curves of a model as well as its overall training progress. The meta-features offer valuable information about the dataset, enhancing the accuracy of our model predictions. All the meta-features utilized in this prediction task are detailed in Table 6, accompanied by their respective explanations. These meta-features play a crucial role in understanding the dataset characteristics and are instrumental in accurately forecasting the model’s training behavior.

B.4 Training Dynamic Prediction

In this section, we describe the details of training a neural network for curve prediction and compare it with conventional scaling law based methods, such as M1, M2 [15, 25, 42, 1], M3 [43], and M4 [3]. We also provide specific evaluation metrics on the task.

B.4.1 Training Details for Curve Prediction

It is important to note that all the data used for training and testing come from the validation set curves, which are obtained during the training progress of a method, specifically MLPs with default hyper-parameters, on our benchmark. We use 80% of the curves as the training set for the task and the remaining 20% as the test set, ensuring no overlap between the datasets corresponding to the training and test curves.

We propose to fit the curve with the following scaling law:

$$y = A \log x + B\sqrt{x} + C + D/x . \tag{6}$$

To obtain the parameters $\theta = \{A, B, C, D\}$ in the function, our method has two steps, which approximates the optimization of Equation 3 in the main paper. First, we select important meta-features with the help of a decision tree. Then, we learn a nonlinear model MLP for curve prediction based on the selected features.

In particular, we sample pairs of \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{Q} from the training set of the task, which contains the first five points and the remaining points in the validation performance curve, respectively. Instead of fitting the curve with a nonlinear mapping directly, we take advantage of the feature selection ability of a decision tree to select important features from the meta-feature set. Given \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{Q} , we combine them together and utilize SciPy [52] to fit parameters θ in our scaling law. After combining the validation set performance on the first five training epochs along with all meta-features in Table 6, we train a decision tree whose output is the values in θ we obtained before. The predictive performance of the decision tree on the test set has been demonstrated in Figure 4 in the main paper. Additionally, we use the learned decision tree to select appropriate meta-features. Ultimately, we selected all meta-features with a feature importance greater than 0.005, as shown in the main paper and Table 6.

Based on the selected features, we learn a mapping h to predict the curve directly, which is implemented based on a four-layer MLP. The input dimension of the MLP is 24 (including 5 dimensions for the validation performance of the first 5 epochs of each curve, and 19 dimensions for the meta-

Table 6: Meta-features used in the training dynamics prediction task. The first column indicates the selected meta-feature by the model in the training dynamics prediction task.

Selected	Meta-Feature	Explanation
	attr_conc	The concentration coef. of each pair of distinct attributes.
✓	class_conc	The concentration coefficient between each attribute and class.
	class_ent	The target attribute Shannon’s entropy.
✓	inst_to_attr	The ratio between the number of instances and attributes.
✓	mean	The mean value of each attribute.
	sd	The standard deviation of each attribute.
	var	The variance of each attribute.
✓	range	The range (max - min) of each attribute.
✓	iq_range	The interquartile range (IQR) of each attribute.
✓	nr_attr	The total number of attributes.
✓	sparsity	The (possibly normalized) sparsity metric for each attribute.
	t_mean	The trimmed mean of each attribute.
	nr_bin	The number of binary attributes.
	nr_cat	The number of categorical attributes.
	nr_num	The number of numeric features.
	nr_norm	The number of attributes normally distributed based in a given method.
	nr_cor_attr	The number of distinct highly correlated pair of attributes.
✓	gravity	The distance between minority and majority classes’ center of mass.
	nr_class	The number of distinct classes.
✓	joint_ent	The joint entropy between each attribute and class.
✓	attr_ent	Shannon’s entropy for each predictive attribute.
✓	cov	The absolute value of the covariance of distinct dataset attribute pairs.
	eigenvalues	The eigenvalues of covariance matrix from dataset.
	eq_num_attr	The number of attributes equivalent for a predictive task.
✓	max	The maximum value from each attribute.
	min	The minimum value from each attribute.
	median	The median value from each attribute.
	freq_class	The relative frequency of each distinct class.
	mad	The Median Absolute Deviation (MAD) adjusted by a factor.
	mad	The Median Absolute Deviation (MAD) adjusted by a factor.
✓	mut_inf	The mutual information between each attribute and target.
✓	nr_inst	The number of instances (rows) in the dataset.
✓	nr_outliers	The number of attributes with at least one outlier value.
✓	ns_ratio	The noisiness of attributes.
✓	imbalance_ratio	The ratio of the number of instances in the minority to the majority class.
	attr_to_inst	The ratio between the number of attributes.

features and their derived metrics, such as range.mean, and range.std, listed in Table 6), and its output dimension is 4, corresponding to the parameters in θ .

To learn the mapping h , we minimize the MAE between the predicted curves and the actual curves on the training set of the task. In detail, we input the first 5 epochs’ validation performance and the meta-features of the corresponding dataset into the MLP to obtain the predicted scaling law parameters. These parameters are then substituted into Equation 6 to generate the predicted curves. We calculate the MAE between the predicted and actual curves and back-propagate the loss to adjust the MLP’s weights. After several iterations of training, we obtain a curve predictor that can accurately forecast the validation curves.

B.4.2 Comparison Methods

We compare our method with five different scaling laws, whose parameters could be estimated based on the first five points of the validation curve.

- **M1** describes the basic form of the scaling law: $y = ax^b$. This has been used, for example, to estimate the required sample size in language models [32].
- **M2** [15, 25, 42, 1] models the performance of multi-layer neural networks as a power law of the form $y = ax^b + c$.

- **M3** [43] introduces the functional form $y = a(x + d)^b + c$, where d represents the scale at which the performance starts to improve beyond the random guess loss and transitions to a power law scaling regime.
- **M4** [3] proposes the functional form $(y - \epsilon_\infty)/((\epsilon_0 - y)^a) = bx^c$, where ϵ_∞ is the irreducible entropy of the data distribution and ϵ_0 is the random guess performance.
- **Our Scaling Law** represents the form $y = A \log x + B\sqrt{x} + C + D/x$, without training an MLP.

It should be noted that we used the official code to fit the scaling law parameters mentioned above, available at [revisiting_neural_scaling_laws](#).

B.4.3 Metrics for The Curve Prediction Task

We consider two key metrics to evaluate the performance of the curve prediction task: the MAE between the predicted and true curves, and the optimal value difference (OVD) between the predicted and true curves. These metrics provide a comprehensive assessment of the prediction precision and the alignment of critical points on the curves.

MAE between predicted and true curves: The Mean Absolute Error (MAE) measures the average magnitude of the absolute differences between the predicted values and the actual values. It is a common metric used to evaluate the regression models. A lower MAE indicates a closer match between the predicted and actual values, implying better prediction performance.

Given a predicted curve \hat{y}_i and the corresponding true curve y_i , the MAE is defined as:

$$\text{MAE}(\hat{y}, y) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n |\hat{y}_i - y_i|, \quad (7)$$

where n is the number of points in the curves.

OVD between predicted and true curves: The Optimal Value Difference (OVD) assesses the absolute difference between the optimal values of the predicted curve and the true curve over a specified range of epochs. Specifically, it measures the maximum value difference for classification tasks and the minimum value difference for regression tasks, within the epoch range from 0 to 200.

- For classification tasks (maximum value difference):

$$\text{OVD}(\hat{y}, y) = |\max(\hat{y}) - \max(y)|. \quad (8)$$

- For regression tasks (minimum value difference):

$$\text{OVD}(\hat{y}, y) = |\min(\hat{y}) - \min(y)|. \quad (9)$$

OVD provides insight into how well the model predicts the critical points of the curve. A lower OVD signifies a better alignment of the predicted curve’s optimal value with the true curve’s optimal value, indicating that the model is effectively capturing the key characteristics of the training process.

Table 7 displays the average MAE and OVD for curves in the test sets. Additionally, Figure 6 provides more visual comparisons, revealing that the existing scaling laws struggle with curve prediction tasks when only a small portion of data is available, while our method performs excellently. The results validate that our method effectively estimates the training dynamics of deep tabular models.

Given the learned model h which effectively predicts the remaining validation performance curves, we can intelligently select the optimal model configuration and early stop models that are unlikely to achieve good performance. By introducing this new task, we can achieve accurate and efficient curve predictions, which helps us better study and understand meta-features and aids in the analysis of tabular data.

Appendix C Further Explanations

In this section, we present expanded explanations of the figures and tables introduced in the main paper.

C.1 Performance-Efficiency-Size comparison of representative tabular methods

We list the detailed results of the Performance-Efficiency-Size comparison in Figure 1 in the main paper in Table 8, which contains the average rank, running time, and checkpoint size of each method.

Table 7: Average MAE and OVD for various curves of test datasets.

Comparison Methods	MAE	OVD
M1	0.1858	0.4575
M2	0.8383	8.7971
M3	0.1351	0.1577
M4	0.1851	0.1849
Our Scaling law	1.1949	1.9854
Ours with MLP	0.0928	0.1164




Figure 6: The visualization results of fitting the training dynamics (the validation curves of an MLP trained with default hyper-parameters) on 16 datasets. The datasets in the first two and last two rows are DNN-friendly and Tree-friendly, respectively. The first and the third rows represent classification tasks, while the second and the fourth rows represent regression tasks.

C.2 Detailed Results for Encoding Strategies on Tiny Benchmark

We equip representative tabular methods with various encoding strategies and report their average ranks on the tiny benchmark 1 in Table 3 in the main paper. In this section, we show more detailed results in Table 9, Table 10, Table 11, and Table 12, which contain the results when we equip encoding strategies with deep tabular methods and classical methods on classification and regression tasks, respectively.

Table 8: The **detailed results of Performance-Efficiency-Size comparison** in Figure 1 in the main paper. We list the average rank, running time, and checkpoint size of each method. “Dummy” means the naive baseline. “LR”, “XGB”, “CatB”, and “RForest” denote “Logistic regression/Linear Regression”, “XGBoost”, “CatBoost”, and “Random Forest”, respectively. TabPFN cannot be applied to regression tasks.

	avg. size	Binary		Multi-Class		Regression		All tasks	
		avg. rank	avg. time	avg. rank	avg. time	avg. rank	avg. time	avg. rank	avg. time
Dummy	0 KB	11.96	1.26×10^{-4}	12.44	1.08×10^{-4}	11.27	7.25×10^{-5}	11.81	1.00×10^{-4}
LR	1.146 KB	8.06	1.21×10^{-1}	8.66	2.26×10^{-1}	8.60	1.22×10^{-2}	8.43	1.06×10^{-1}
KNN	2775 KB	8.94	2.96×10^{-1}	7.95	3.24×10^{-1}	7.14	4.91×10^{-1}	7.96	3.81×10^{-1}
SVM	1730 KB	8.57	1.09×10^0	9.91	2.45×10^0	9.64	3.23×10^0	9.35	2.30×10^0
XGB	12535 KB	4.79	4.39×10^0	5.33	1.67×10^1	4.13	9.79×10^{-1}	4.67	2.31×10^0
CatB	18290 KB	4.24	1.47×10^1	4.44	3.11×10^1	3.15	9.05×10^0	3.86	1.68×10^1
RForest	182266 KB	6.12	1.22×10^0	6.56	1.15×10^0	5.25	8.61×10^0	5.89	4.13×10^0
MLP	2180 KB	6.63	1.58×10^1	5.99	1.51×10^1	6.26	1.42×10^1	6.31	1.50×10^1
ResNet	4383 KB	6.86	2.64×10^1	5.45	2.84×10^1	6.24	2.40×10^1	6.24	2.60×10^1
FT-T	7330 KB	5.53	5.89×10^1	5.49	4.85×10^1	5.03	9.34×10^1	5.32	6.98×10^1
DCNv2	10250 KB	6.95	2.55×10^1	6.21	2.61×10^1	6.29	2.02×10^1	6.49	2.36×10^1
TabR	14410 KB	4.73	1.81×10^2	3.71	2.53×10^2	4.95	1.69×10^2	4.55	1.95×10^2
TabPFN	100928 KB	6.39	7.33×10^{-4}	6.98	6.59×10^{-4}	-	-	-	-

Table 9: Results of **deep methods** using different encoding strategies on **classification** tasks in Tiny Benchmark 1. We report the average accuracies over 15 seeds, with each method tuned for 100 iterations. ID continues the ID in Table 4. We use “TF”, “DF”, and “Tie” to denote the subsets of datasets that are tree-friendly, DNN-friendly, and those without any preference, respectively.

ID	Type	MLP			ResNet			FT-T			TabR		
		Vanilla	w/ E-Q	w/ E-T	Vanilla	w/ E-Q	w/ E-T	Vanilla	w/ E-Q	w/ E-T	Vanilla	w/ E-Q	w/ E-T
300	TF	.6031	.5901	.5787	.6034	.5874	.5993	.5982	.5879	.5836	.5888	.5722	.5847
200	TF	.8581	.8477	.8611	.8594	.8526	.8588	.8534	.8463	.8534	.8656	.8667	.8699
193	TF	.9783	.9786	.9789	.9786	.9777	.9776	.9789	.9789	.9788	.9796	.9786	.9783
296	TF	.7268	.7369	.7273	.7259	.7581	.7144	.7234	.7295	.7249	.7590	.7606	.7486
171	TF	.8550	.8756	.8648	.8522	.8830	.8733	.8751	.8934	.8791	.9319	.9430	.9210
234	TF	.9669	.9683	.9632	.9668	.9713	.9689	.9671	.9666	.9704	.9668	.9671	.9679
196	TF	.8012	.9310	.9308	.7680	.9310	.9308	.7973	.9309	.9309	.9151	.9310	.9309
56	Tie	.7822	.7716	.7644	.7684	.7807	.7473	.7702	.7798	.7411	.7873	.7776	.7638
88	Tie	.8672	.9057	.9093	.9227	.9015	.9067	.9367	.9422	.9385	.9568	.9220	.9065
151	Tie	.7248	.7251	.7305	.7473	.7357	.7587	.7664	.7724	.7691	.8697	.8688	.8720
194	Tie	.9574	.9921	.9370	.9680	.9995	.9079	1.000	.9991	1.000	.9497	.9973	.9549
42	Tie	.6692	.6733	.6730	.6696	.6736	.6733	.6728	.6720	.6708	.6712	.6708	.6743
226	Tie	.7338	.7310	.7323	.7333	.7329	.7317	.7500	.7489	.7485	.7297	.7316	.7326
231	DF	.9825	.9799	.9803	.9864	.9819	.9840	.9779	.9757	.9778	.9852	.9875	.9856
279	DF	.6956	.6782	.6815	.6977	.6710	.6712	.6932	.6865	.6888	.6924	.6801	.6812
50	DF	.6985	.6534	.5316	.7092	.6642	.6040	.6184	.6309	.5310	.7104	.7027	.7039
199	DF	.9527	.9722	.9719	.8696	.9277	.9139	.9761	.9869	.9797	.9852	.9917	.9950
240	DF	.9854	.9830	.9825	.9885	.9833	.9847	.9914	.9870	.9861	.9886	.9791	.9802
29	DF	.8334	.8321	.8332	.8328	.8324	.8333	.8333	.8315	.8331	.8334	.8334	.8332
48	DF	.7304	.6536	.5451	.7602	.6249	.5822	.6703	.6665	.5379	.7784	.7224	.6616
173	DF	.9494	.9735	.9488	.9472	.9614	.9491	.9713	.9748	.9628	.9794	.9753	.9710
65	DF	.8626	.8544	.8601	.8626	.8483	.8463	.8723	.8721	.8703	.8415	.8501	.8472
5	DF	.3902	.3413	.3454	.3861	.3686	.8463	.3678	.4124	.4051	.3714	.3768	.3416

Based on the results in Table 9 and Table 10, we find that while the PLE encoding generally benefits deep tabular methods, it is particularly effective on tree-friendly datasets. However, it can occasionally have adverse effects on DNN-friendly datasets.

Table 10: Results of **deep methods** using different encoding strategies on **regression** tasks. We report the average RMSE over 15 seeds, with each method tuned for 100 iterations. ID continues the ID in Table 4. We use “TF”, “DF”, and “Tie” to denote the subsets of datasets that are tree-friendly, DNN-friendly, and those without any preference, respectively. The scientific notation beside the dataset name indicates the scale of the results, *e.g.*, $\times 10$ means the final value of all results should be multiple by 10.

ID	Type	MLP			ResNet			FT-T			TabR		
		Vanilla w/	E-Q w/	E-T	Vanilla w/	E-Q w/	E-T	Vanilla w/	E-Q w/	E-T	Vanilla w/	E-Q w/	E-T
73 ($\times 10^2$)	TF	.1325	.1326	.1304	.1322	.1322	.1384	.1320	.1300	.0917	.1319	.1301	.1037
7 ($\times 10^{-3}$)	TF	.1563	.1539	.1572	.1572	.1579	.1545	.1554	.1540	.1509	.1531	.1566	.1562
133 ($\times 10^1$)	TF	.2938	.2878	.2878	.2972	.2962	.2889	.2964	.2901	.2942	.3143	.3130	.3145
25 ($\times 10^4$)	TF	.1408	.1716	.1407	.1372	.1389	.1354	.1382	.1341	.1383	.1272	.1355	.1476
76 ($\times 10^2$)	TF	.7806	.8059	.7929	.7643	.7978	.7869	.7633	.7335	.7500	.7497	.7478	.7470
106 ($\times 10^2$)	Tie	.2874	.2876	.2860	.2926	.2927	.2927	.2868	.2867	.2859	.2887	.2867	.2869
114 ($\times 10^0$)	Tie	.1011	.1019	.1024	.1022	.1030	.1025	.1023	.1032	.1034	.1036	.1037	.1028
41 ($\times 10^{-4}$)	Tie	.1228	.0764	.0998	.0826	.0840	.0788	.0533	.0534	.0523	.0522	.0526	.0522
70 ($\times 10^0$)	Tie	.2369	.2519	.2536	.2194	.2517	.2382	.2137	.2251	.2219	.2371	.2461	.2457
116 ($\times 10^0$)	Tie	.4595	.5033	.5088	.4586	.5014	.4967	.4563	.4898	.5062	.4515	.5346	.5503
21 ($\times 10^0$)	Tie	.6013	.7704	.6457	.5314	.5418	.5816	.5398	.5788	.5648	.4708	.4972	.4960
66 ($\times 10^{-1}$)	DF	.2844	.7450	.8665	.2651	.3432	.5252	.2959	.2731	.2954	.2381	.2406	.2421
242 ($\times 10^1$)	DF	.2578	.2822	.2615	.3102	.2848	.2830	.2216	.2414	.2480	.2352	.3026	.3208
241 ($\times 10^1$)	DF	.2436	.2784	.2656	.3091	.3030	.2823	.2158	.2312	.2503	.2442	.2960	.3055
32 ($\times 10^0$)	DF	.2433	.3006	.3014	.2292	.2859	.2682	.2839	.2922	.3117	.2098	.2696	.2981
90 ($\times 10^2$)	DF	.1552	.1569	.1577	.1546	.1560	.1577	.1530	.1543	.1539	.1566	.1538	.1529
261 ($\times 10^2$)	DF	.2802	.2927	.2452	.2889	.2603	.2838	.1346	.1481	.1356	.2760	.2379	.2163

Table 11: Results of **classical methods** using different encoding strategies on **classification** tasks in Tiny Benchmark 1. We report the average accuracies over 15 seeds, with each method tuned for 100 iterations. ID continues the ID in Table 4. We use “TF”, “DF”, and “Tie” to denote the subsets of datasets that are tree-friendly, DNN-friendly, and those without any preference, respectively.

ID	Type	XGBoost			Random Forest			SVM			Catboost		
		Vanilla w/	E-Q w/	E-T	Vanilla w/	E-Q w/	E-T	Vanilla w/	E-Q w/	E-T	Vanilla w/	E-Q w/	E-T
300	TF	.5984	.6081	.6123	.6247	.6056	.6018	.5859	.5791	.6027	.6083	.5971	.6173
200	TF	.8627	.8673	.8660	.8698	.8654	.8641	.8507	.8555	.8649	.8624	.8621	.8624
193	TF	.9789	.9782	.9782	.9803	.9791	.9788	.9798	.9804	.9789	.9794	.9795	.9786
296	TF	.7500	.7281	.7425	.7386	.7342	.7352	.7045	.7260	.7136	.7534	.7470	.7280
171	TF	.9246	.9306	.9315	.8577	.8436	.8370	.7527	.8091	.8049	.9169	.9313	.9250
234	TF	.9745	.9746	.9762	.9703	.9719	.9738	.9565	.9616	.9689	.9667	.9669	.9712
196	TF	.9298	.9310	.9310	.9311	.9311	.9310	.7954	.9259	.9306	.9308	.9310	.9310
56	Tie	.7500	.7489	.7420	.7738	.7742	.7622	.7800	.7867	.7989	.7811	.7731	.7869
88	Tie	.9090	.9093	.9160	.8760	.9220	.8847	.8348	.7977	.8067	.9357	.9345	.9160
151	Tie	.7675	.7404	.7495	.7380	.7092	.7178	.6812	.6979	.7008	.7637	.7619	.7693
194	Tie	1.000	1.000	1.000	1.000	.9923	1.000	1.000	1.000	.9422	1.000	1.000	1.000
42	Tie	.6723	.6763	.6791	.6650	.6650	.6708	.6286	.6460	.6505	.6672	.6736	.6768
226	Tie	.7514	.7473	.7460	.7407	.7367	.7377	.7237	.7318	.7286	.7508	.7510	.7511
231	DF	.9824	.9765	.9829	.9801	.9837	.9816	.9582	.9662	.9689	.9824	.9815	.9821
279	DF	.6921	.6996	.6880	.6929	.6796	.6789	.6971	.6839	.6839	.6924	.6898	.6900
50	DF	.6023	.6241	.6121	.5653	.5541	.5447	.7041	.6998	.6256	.6158	.6305	.6164
199	DF	.8610	.8590	.8600	.8262	.8263	.8286	.6801	.7483	.7507	.8647	.8634	.8637
240	DF	.9824	.9846	.9848	.9732	.9729	.9805	.8815	.9535	.9539	.9860	.9861	.9858
29	DF	.8325	.8325	.8321	.8325	.8328	.8330	.7921	.7180	.8332	.8326	.8327	.8326
48	DF	.6487	.6489	.6271	.6416	.6245	.6056	.7664	.7252	.6452	.6558	.6365	.6638
173	DF	.9474	.9628	.9633	.9346	.9685	.9526	.7634	.8747	.8629	.9469	.9556	.9576
65	DF	.8478	.8485	.8431	.8537	.8476	.8499	.8683	.8435	.8537	.8488	.8558	.8567
5	DF	.4301	.4350	.4404	.4108	.4247	.4090	.3465	.3707	.3629	.3815	.4106	.3959

Appendix D Additional Results

In this section, we will show the results of more detailed and diverse experiments.

Table 12: Results of **classical methods** using different encoding strategies on **regression** tasks. We report the average RMSE over 15 seeds, with each method tuned for 100 iterations. ID continues the ID in Table 4. We use “TF”, “DF”, and “Tie” to denote the subsets of datasets that are tree-friendly, DNN-friendly, and those without any preference, respectively. The scientific notation beside the dataset name indicates the scale of the results, *e.g.*, $\times 10$ means the final value of all results should be multiple by 10.

ID	Type	XGBoost			Random Forest			SVM			Catboost		
		Vanilla w/	E-Q w/	E-T	Vanilla w/	E-Q w/	E-T	Vanilla w/	E-Q w/	E-T	Vanilla w/	E-Q w/	E-T
73 ($\times 10^2$)	TF	.1053	.0743	.0717	.0766	.0764	.0759	.1326	.4070	.3891	.1024	.0806	.8090
7 ($\times 10^{-3}$)	TF	.1527	.1525	.1519	.1559	.1560	.1560	.1696	.1767	.1664	.1465	.1473	.1462
133 ($\times 10^1$)	TF	.2980	.2800	.2813	.2736	.2738	.2740	.2955	.3003	.3007	.2924	.2922	.2902
25 ($\times 10^4$)	TF	.1199	.1180	.1171	.1228	.1228	.1228	.1552	.1573	.1568	.1275	.1239	.1253
76 ($\times 10^3$)	TF	.0718	.0708	.0712	.0760	.0761	.0762	.1561	.1565	.1559	.0726	.0730	.7318
106 ($\times 10^2$)	Tie	.2863	.2849	.2847	.2936	.2938	.2936	.2859	.2859	.2853	.2864	.2850	.2853
114 ($\times 10^0$)	Tie	.1010	.1009	.1023	.1023	.1023	.1022	.1059	.1026	.1013	.1044	.1017	.1018
41 ($\times 10^{-2}$)	Tie	.0533	.0529	.0532	.0555	.0556	.0556	.1507	.1423	.1340	.0525	.0530	.0531
70 ($\times 10^0$)	Tie	.2218	.2196	.2197	.2293	.2294	.2298	.2796	.2678	.2893	.2135	.2152	.2177
116 ($\times 10^0$)	Tie	.4589	.4768	.4644	.4565	.4565	.4563	.5822	.5027	.5519	.4705	.4712	.4695
21 ($\times 10^1$)	Tie	.0648	.0642	.0630	.0798	.0798	.0798	.1038	.1111	.1087	.0537	.0539	.0549
66 ($\times 10^{-1}$)	DF	.4063	.4536	.4003	.4478	.4486	.4429	.5894	.4279	.4282	.3483	.3401	.3350
242 ($\times 10^2$)	DF	.0438	.0427	.0450	.0498	.0497	.0497	.3095	.2378	.2337	.3669	.3603	.3650
241 ($\times 10^2$)	DF	.0478	.0468	.0457	.0542	.0537	.0538	.3057	.2380	.2315	.0419	.0411	.0413
32 ($\times 10^0$)	DF	.2738	.2772	.2748	.2945	.2939	.2932	.3564	.3206	.3981	.2674	.2711	.2735
90 ($\times 10^2$)	DF	.1559	.1566	.1563	.1560	.1564	.1560	.1750	.1571	.1571	.1582	.1561	.1592
261 ($\times 10^2$)	DF	.2389	.2184	.2054	.2501	.2499	.2534	.1935	.2858	.2403	.2463	.2353	.2216

D.1 Results of Full Benchmark

We release the mean and standard deviation of the performance metric results (accuracy for classification tasks and RMSE for regression tasks) for each dataset-method pair, organized into six tables by task type.

For classification tasks, we test the performance of following 27 models: Dummy, Logistic Regression, NCM, Naive Bayes, KNN, SVM, XGBoost, CatBoost, Random Forest, LightGBM, TabPFN, MLP, ResNet, NODE, SwitchTab, TabNet, TabCaps, TANGOS, DANets, FT-T, AutoInt, DCNv2, SNN, TabTransformer, PTaRL, GrowNet, and TabR. The mean and the standard deviation of accuracy on 101 binary classification tasks are shown in Table 13 and Table 16, indexed by their IDs in Table 4. Similarly, The results of 80 multi-class classification tasks are shown in Table 14 and Table 17.

For regression tasks, we test the performance of following 24 models: Dummy, Linear Regression, KNN, SVM, XGBoost, CatBoost, Random Forest, LightGBM, MLP, ResNet, NODE, SwitchTab, TabNet, TANGOS, DANets, FT-T, AutoInt, DCNv2, SNN, TabTransformer, PTaRL, GrowNet, TabR, and DNNR. The mean and the standard deviation of RMSE on 119 regression tasks are shown in Table 15 and Table 18, indexed by their IDs in Table 4. RMSE has a wide range of distributions across different datasets, for presentation purposes, we choose the scaling based on the median, and denote excessively large values as “INF”.

D.2 Statistically Significant Performance Differences

Based on Table 1 in the main paper, the differences between many methods are not readily apparent. Therefore, we use statistical tests to measure the performance differences between different methods. For any two methods A and B and a dataset \mathcal{D} , we perform a t-test on the results of 15 seeds for each method, which helps determine whether the performance differences between each algorithm are significant or not with 95% confidence interval. If the p-value is greater than 0.05, the methods are considered tied. Otherwise, if the null hypothesis is rejected, we consider the performance difference between A and B on dataset \mathcal{D} to be significant. In this case, we use the mean value of the corresponding metric to determine that one method is significantly better than the other.

In this section, we select the two best-performing tree-based methods (XGBoost and CatBoost) and the two best-performing DNN-based methods (FT-T and TabR) as the anchor methods, and compare their results against all other methods in the benchmark across all datasets. Based on the comparisons across 300 datasets, we use the win/tie/lose frequency to calculate the win rate, tie rate, and lose rate for each pair of methods. These results are recorded in Table 19, Table 21, Table 20, and Table 22, which correspond to the results of t-tests conducted on 101 binary classification datasets, 80 multi-class classification datasets, 119 regression datasets, and all 300 datasets in the full benchmark, respectively.

The results in Table 22 show that CatBoost has a tie rate of 0.3 when compared to XGBoost and 0.26 when compared to LightGBM, demonstrating the high similarity among Gradient Boosting Decision Trees (GBDTs). CatBoost also shows outstanding performance, achieving a win rate of over 0.5 in comparisons with most methods. However, its win rate against TabR is only 0.4358, highlighting the significant potential of Neighborhood-based methods for tabular prediction tasks. This indicates that while CatBoost excels broadly, Neighborhood-based methods like TabR are highly competitive and can outperform tree-based methods in certain scenarios.

Additionally, Figure 7, Figure 8, Figure 9, and Figure 10 illustrate the significance of performance differences between the selected methods and other methods across 300 datasets. The heatmaps display these differences, with darker squares indicating smaller p-values. Red squares signify that the selected method performs better, while blue ones indicate superior performance by the compared method.

Comparing Figure 9 and Figure 10, we find that FT-T and TabR perform differently against GBDTs. Specifically, TabR’s heatmap shows less blue in the corresponding sections, indicating that TabR has fewer cases where it performs worse compared to GBDTs, highlighting its relatively stronger performance in these scenarios. This suggests that Neighborhood-based approaches can be beneficial for deep learning on tabular data.

Table 19: The **win/tie/lose rates** of Method A (CatBoost, XGBoost, FT-T, and TabR) against Method B across 101 **binary classification** datasets.

Method B	CatBoost			XGBoost			FT-T			TabR		
	Win	Tie	Lose	Win	Tie	Lose	Win	Tie	Lose	Win	Tie	Lose
Dummy	.9625	.0250	.0125	.9750	.0125	.0125	.9750	.0125	.0125	.9744	.0128	.0128
LR	.7750	.0500	.1750	.6875	.1000	.2125	.7125	.1500	.1375	.8077	.0897	.1026
NCM	.9750	.0125	.0125	.9750	.0000	.0250	.9375	.0375	.0250	.9744	.0128	.0128
Naive Bayes	.9750	.0125	.0125	.9500	.0375	.0125	.9250	.0500	.0250	.9359	.0385	.0256
KNN	.7625	.0500	.1875	.6625	.0750	.2625	.6750	.1250	.2000	.7821	.1154	.1026
SVM	.8125	.0750	.1125	.7875	.0500	.1625	.7750	.1500	.0750	.8590	.0769	.0641
XGBoost	.4625	.3625	.1750	.0000	1.000	.0000	.4000	.2500	.3500	.5256	.1795	.2949
CatBoost	.0000	1.000	.0000	.1750	.3625	.4625	.2875	.2375	.4750	.4231	.2692	.3077
Random Forest	.6750	.1375	.1875	.5625	.2750	.1625	.5250	.1750	.3000	.5513	.1923	.2564
LightGBM	.4125	.2625	.3250	.2875	.3125	.4000	.3875	.2125	.4000	.4615	.2692	.2692
TabPFN	.6667	.1667	.1667	.6500	.1167	.2333	.5167	.3167	.1667	.6610	.1695	.1695
MLP	.5500	.1875	.2625	.4750	.2250	.3000	.4125	.3750	.2125	.6154	.2949	.0897
ResNet	.5000	.1750	.3250	.4500	.1500	.4000	.3625	.3500	.2875	.5513	.3205	.1282
NODE	.8462	.1026	.0513	.7692	.1282	.1026	.7051	.2308	.0641	.7895	.1579	.0526
SwitchTab	.8875	.0500	.0625	.8125	.1000	.0875	.8000	.1625	.0375	.8846	.0897	.0256
TabNet	.8875	.0875	.0250	.8875	.0750	.0375	.9375	.0500	.0125	.9231	.0641	.0128
TabCaps	.6375	.1625	.2000	.5250	.2250	.2500	.5250	.4000	.0750	.7179	.1923	.0897
TANGOS	.6250	.1625	.2125	.5250	.2000	.2750	.5250	.3250	.1500	.6667	.2179	.1154
DANets	.6125	.1750	.2125	.5625	.2250	.2125	.5625	.3125	.1250	.7692	.2051	.0256
FT-T	.4750	.2375	.2875	.3500	.2500	.4000	.0000	1.000	.0000	.4872	.3462	.1667
AutoInt	.5875	.1375	.2750	.5375	.1625	.3000	.5000	.3750	.1250	.6154	.2821	.1026
DCNv2	.5375	.1875	.2750	.4375	.2000	.3625	.4000	.4500	.1500	.5641	.2949	.1410
SNN	.5625	.1625	.2750	.4750	.2250	.3000	.4125	.4250	.1625	.6538	.2436	.1026
TabTransformer	.7468	.1266	.1266	.6456	.1772	.1772	.7089	.2025	.0886	.7662	.1299	.1039
PTaRL	.6250	.1750	.2000	.5750	.1750	.2500	.5375	.4250	.0375	.7821	.1410	.0769
GrowNet	.7600	.1733	.0667	.7867	.1200	.0933	.7733	.1333	.0933	.8514	.1081	.0405
TabR	.3077	.2692	.4231	.2949	.1795	.5256	.1667	.3462	.4872	.0000	1.000	.0000

Table 20: The **win/tie/lose rates** of Method A (CatBoost, XGBoost, FT-T, and TabR) against Method B across 119 **regression** datasets.

Method B	CatBoost			XGBoost			FT-T			TabR		
	Win	Tie	Lose	Win	Tie	Lose	Win	Tie	Lose	Win	Tie	Lose
Dummy	.9580	.0084	.0336	.9664	.0084	.0252	.8908	.0672	.0420	.8814	.0339	.0847
KNN	.8655	.0504	.0840	.8403	.0336	.1261	.6471	.0756	.2773	.6441	.0508	.3051
SVM	.9244	.0336	.0420	.9328	.0336	.0336	.8235	.0504	.1261	.7712	.0508	.1780
XGBoost	.6218	.1765	.2017	.0000	1.000	.0000	.3109	.2017	.4874	.3814	.1186	.5000
CatBoost	.0000	1.000	.0000	.2017	.1765	.6218	.2353	.1681	.5966	.3305	.1017	.5678
Random Forest	.7143	.1092	.1765	.6975	.0924	.2101	.4538	.1345	.4118	.4915	.0932	.4153
LightGBM	.6050	.1765	.2185	.3529	.2269	.4202	.3277	.1345	.5378	.3729	.0593	.5678
MLP	.6891	.1345	.1765	.6050	.1261	.2689	.5546	.2521	.1933	.5763	.2458	.1780
ResNet	.6975	.1008	.2017	.6218	.0924	.2857	.5294	.2185	.2521	.5424	.2373	.2203
NODE	.7500	.0517	.1983	.6983	.0603	.2414	.4828	.2155	.3017	.4957	.1826	.3217
SwitchTab	.9832	.0000	.0168	.9832	.0000	.0168	.8908	.0420	.0672	.8475	.0678	.0847
TabNet	.9328	.0252	.0420	.8908	.0756	.0336	.7815	.1176	.1008	.7542	.1017	.1441
TANGOS	.7373	.0847	.1780	.6186	.0763	.3051	.5678	.2203	.2119	.5983	.1709	.2308
DANets	.9160	.0672	.0168	.9160	.0672	.0168	.8151	.1176	.0672	.7881	.1525	.0593
FT-T	.5966	.1681	.2353	.4874	.2017	.3109	.0000	1.000	.0000	.4153	.2712	.3136
AutoInt	.7069	.0948	.1983	.5776	.0948	.3276	.5086	.3621	.1293	.5259	.2586	.2155
DCNv2	.6891	.1429	.1681	.6134	.1008	.2857	.5546	.2437	.2017	.5085	.2373	.2542
SNN	.7647	.1008	.1345	.7143	.0756	.2101	.6303	.1933	.1765	.6017	.2542	.1441
TabTransformer	.9746	.0000	.0254	.9746	.0000	.0254	.8814	.0508	.0678	.8547	.0684	.0769
PTaRL	.6807	.0756	.2437	.5294	.1597	.3109	.4538	.1765	.3697	.4237	.1949	.3814
GrowNet	.9412	.0420	.0168	.9160	.0588	.0252	.7983	.1261	.0756	.7712	.1017	.1271
TabR	.5678	.1017	.3305	.5000	.1186	.3814	.3136	.2712	.4153	.0000	1.000	.0000
DNNR	.8824	.0588	.0588	.8403	.0588	.1008	.7899	.0924	.1176	.8220	.0593	.1186

Table 21: The **win/tie/lose rates** of Method A (CatBoost, XGBoost, FT-T, and TabR) against Method B across 80 **multi-class classification** datasets.

Method B	CatBoost			XGBoost			FT-T			TabR		
	Win	Tie	Lose	Win	Tie	Lose	Win	Tie	Lose	Win	Tie	Lose
Dummy	.9307	.0396	.0297	.9307	.0297	.0396	.8812	.0792	.0396	.8900	.0600	.0500
LR	.6733	.0990	.2277	.6931	.1089	.1980	.6139	.1584	.2277	.6200	.2000	.1800
NCM	.9802	.0000	.0198	.9703	.0099	.0198	.9703	.0099	.0198	.9600	.0200	.0200
Naive Bayes	.9505	.0000	.0495	.9406	.0099	.0495	.9109	.0495	.0396	.9200	.0300	.0500
KNN	.7921	.0792	.1287	.7921	.0792	.1287	.7426	.0693	.1881	.7600	.0800	.1600
SVM	.6733	.1485	.1782	.6931	.1089	.1980	.6238	.1782	.1980	.6300	.2600	.1100
XGBoost	.3960	.3960	.2079	.0000	1.000	.0000	.2772	.3366	.3861	.3700	.2700	.3600
CatBoost	.0000	1.000	.0000	.2079	.3960	.3960	.2178	.3564	.4257	.3000	.3200	.3800
Random Forest	.5842	.2673	.1485	.5644	.2475	.1881	.4752	.2079	.3168	.5000	.2200	.2800
LightGBM	.3762	.3564	.2673	.2673	.3960	.3366	.2970	.2871	.4158	.3300	.2600	.4100
TabPFN	.6327	.1224	.2449	.6020	.1224	.2755	.5204	.1735	.3061	.5052	.2474	.2474
MLP	.5743	.2277	.1980	.5149	.2079	.2772	.4752	.2871	.2376	.5200	.3600	.1200
ResNet	.6238	.1881	.1881	.5842	.1584	.2574	.4950	.3069	.1980	.4800	.4100	.1100
NODE	.7723	.1386	.0891	.7426	.1188	.1386	.6436	.2178	.1386	.6300	.1900	.1800
SwitchTab	.8119	.1782	.0099	.8020	.1584	.0396	.7723	.1782	.0495	.7900	.1900	.0200
TabNet	.8614	.1188	.0198	.8416	.1188	.0396	.8119	.1782	.0099	.8600	.1300	.0100
TabCaps	.5941	.2178	.1881	.5545	.2079	.2376	.4851	.3564	.1584	.5600	.3100	.1300
TANGOS	.6238	.2574	.1188	.6139	.2079	.1782	.5050	.3366	.1584	.5500	.3500	.1000
DANets	.6139	.2178	.1683	.5842	.1584	.2574	.4950	.3663	.1386	.5200	.3600	.1200
FT-T	.4257	.3564	.2178	.3861	.3366	.2772	.0000	1.000	.0000	.3800	.3900	.2300
AutoInt	.5300	.2800	.1900	.4000	.3600	.2400	.3800	.4400	.1800	.4444	.3737	.1818
DCNv2	.6040	.1782	.2178	.5347	.1782	.2871	.4455	.3267	.2277	.5100	.3300	.1600
SNN	.6040	.1980	.1980	.5050	.2178	.2772	.4554	.3663	.1782	.5500	.2700	.1800
TabTransformer	.6337	.1782	.1881	.6337	.1188	.2475	.5446	.2277	.2277	.6100	.2400	.1500
PTaRL	.5347	.3069	.1584	.5149	.2772	.2079	.4059	.4554	.1386	.5200	.3600	.1200
GrowNet	.7228	.1485	.1287	.6733	.1980	.1287	.6832	.2475	.0693	.7300	.1900	.0800
TabR	.3800	.3200	.3000	.3600	.2700	.3700	.2300	.3900	.3800	.0000	1.000	.0000

Table 22: The **win/tie/lose rates** of Method A (CatBoost, XGBoost, FT-T, and TabR) against Method B across **300 datasets**.

Method B	CatBoost			XGBoost			FT-T			TabR		
	Win	Tie	Lose	Win	Tie	Lose	Win	Tie	Lose	Win	Tie	Lose
Dummy	.9500	.0233	.0267	.9567	.0167	.0267	.9100	.0567	.0333	.9088	.0372	.0541
KNN	.8133	.0600	.1267	.7767	.0600	.1633	.6867	.0867	.2267	.7196	.0777	.2027
SVM	.8100	.0833	.1067	.8133	.0633	.1233	.7433	.1200	.1367	.7466	.1284	.1250
XGBoost	.5033	.3000	.1967	.0000	1.000	.0000	.3233	.2600	.4167	.4155	.1858	.3986
CatBoost	.0000	1.000	.0000	.1967	.3000	.5033	.2433	.2500	.5067	.3446	.2196	.4358
Random Forest	.6600	.1700	.1700	.6167	.1933	.1900	.4800	.1700	.3500	.5101	.1622	.3277
LightGBM	.4767	.2600	.2633	.3067	.3067	.3867	.3333	.2067	.4600	.3818	.1824	.4358
MLP	.6133	.1800	.2067	.5400	.1800	.2800	.4900	.2967	.2133	.5676	.2973	.1351
ResNet	.6200	.1500	.2300	.5633	.1300	.3067	.4733	.2833	.2433	.5236	.3176	.1588
NODE	.7831	.0949	.1220	.7322	.0983	.1695	.5966	.2203	.1831	.6186	.1787	.2027
SwitchTab	.9000	.0733	.0267	.8767	.0800	.0433	.8267	.1200	.0533	.8378	.1149	.0473
TabNet	.8967	.0733	.0300	.8733	.0900	.0367	.8333	.1200	.0467	.8345	.1014	.0642
TANGOS	.6689	.1639	.1672	.5920	.1538	.2542	.5351	.2876	.1773	.6000	.2441	.1559
DANets	.7333	.1467	.1200	.7100	.1400	.1500	.6400	.2533	.1067	.6926	.2365	.0709
FT-T	.5067	.2500	.2433	.4167	.2600	.3233	.0000	1.000	.0000	.4223	.3311	.2466
AutoInt	.6149	.1689	.2162	.5068	.2027	.2905	.4628	.3919	.1453	.5222	.3038	.1741
DCNv2	.6200	.1667	.2133	.5400	.1533	.3067	.4767	.3267	.1967	.5236	.2838	.1926
SNN	.6567	.1500	.1933	.5800	.1633	.2567	.5133	.3133	.1733	.5980	.2568	.1453
TabTransformer	.7987	.0940	.1074	.7718	.0872	.1409	.7215	.1510	.1275	.7483	.1429	.1088
PTaRL	.6167	.1800	.2033	.5367	.2033	.2600	.4600	.3367	.2033	.5507	.2365	.2128
GrowNet	.8203	.1119	.0678	.8000	.1220	.0780	.7525	.1695	.0780	.7774	.1336	.0890
TabR	.4358	.2196	.3446	.3986	.1858	.4155	.2466	.3311	.4223	.0000	1.000	.0000




Figure 7: Heatmap of **t-tests** between **XGBoost** and other methods on 300 datasets, which illustrates the significance of performance differences. ID continues the ID in Table 4. “DU” means Dummy as the naive baseline, “CB”, “RF”, “LG”, “RN”, “ND”, “ST”, “TN”, “TG”, “DAN”, “FT”, “AI”, “DCN”, “TT”, “PT”, “GN”, and “TR” denote “CatBoost”, “Random Forest”, “LightGBM”, “ResNet”, “NODE”, “SwitchTab”, “TabNet”, “TANGOS”, “DANets”, “FT-T”, “AutoInt”, “DCNv2”, “TabTransformer”, “PTaRL”, “GrowNet”, and “TabR”, respectively.




Figure 8: Heatmap of **t-tests** between **CatBoost** and other methods on 300 datasets, which illustrates the significance of performance differences. ID continues the ID in Table 4. “DU” means Dummy as the naive baseline, “XGB”, “RF”, “LG”, “RN”, “ND”, “ST”, “TN”, “TG”, “DAN”, “FT”, “AI”, “DCN”, “TT”, “PT”, “GN”, and “TR” denote “XGBoost”, “Random Forest”, “LightGBM”, “ResNet”, “NODE”, “SwitchTab”, “TabNet”, “TANGOS”, “DANets”, “FT-T”, “AutoInt”, “DCNv2”, “TabTransformer”, “PTaRL”, “GrowNet”, and “TabR”, respectively.




Figure 9: Heatmap of **t-tests** between **FT-T** and other methods on 300 datasets, which illustrates the significance of performance differences. ID continues the ID in Table 4. “DU” means Dummy as the naive baseline, “XGB”, “CB”, “RF”, “LG”, “RN”, “ND”, “ST”, “TN”, “TG”, “DAN”, “AI”, “DCN”, “TT”, “PT”, “GN”, and “TR” denote “XGBoost”, “CatBoost”, “Random Forest”, “LightGBM”, “ResNet”, “NODE”, “SwitchTab”, “TabNet”, “TANGOS”, “DANets”, “AutoInt”, “DCNv2”, “TabTransformer”, “PTaRL”, “GrowNet”, and “TabR”, respectively.




Figure 10: Heatmap of **t-tests** between **TabR** and other methods on 300 datasets, which illustrates the significance of performance differences. ID continues the ID in Table 4. “DU” means Dummy as the naive baseline, “XGB”, “CB”, “RF”, “LG”, “RN”, “ND”, “ST”, “TN”, “TG”, “DAN”, “FT”, “AI”, “DCN”, “TT”, “PT”, and “GN”, denote “XGBoost”, “CatBoost”, “Random Forest”, “LightGBM”, “ResNet”, “NODE”, “SwitchTab”, “TabNet”, “TANGOS”, “DANets”, “FT-T”, “AutoInt”, “DCNv2”, “TabTransformer”, “PTaRL”, and “GrowNet”, respectively.