Transfer Learning with Deep Tabular Models

Roman Levin, Valeriia Cherepanova, Avi Schwarzschild, Arpit Bansal, Bayan Bruss, Tom Goldstein, Andrew Gordon Wilson, Micah Goldblum

November 4, 2022

- Gradient boosted decision trees (GBDT) are the traditionally dominant approach for tabular data
- However, recent tabular deep learning models demonstrate competitive performance and almost bridge the gap between DL and GBDT¹
- Accuracy aside, a major advantage of neural networks is that they are easily fine-tuned and learn reusable feature representations giving rise to **transfer learning**
- Transfer learning plays a central role in computer vision and NLP, but is underexplored in the tabular domain². One might wonder if representation learning is even useful for tabular data.

¹Gorishniy, Yury, et al. "Revisiting deep learning models for tabular data." Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 34 (2021) ²Borisov, Vadim, et al. "Deep neural networks and tabular data: A survey." *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.01889* (2021).

Introduction: Our Work

- We systematically study transfer learning with recent deep tabular models
- We conduct experiments in a realistic medical diagnosis test bed with limited amounts of downstream data
- We find that deep tabular models with transfer learning provide a definitive advantage over strong GBDT baselines, even those that also leverage upstream data
- We compare supervised and self-supervised pre-training strategies and provide practical advice on transfer learning with tabular models
- We propose a pseudo-feature method for cases where the upstream and downstream feature sets differ, addressing a common tabular-specific problem

- Medical data is often limited, especially for rare conditions. However, large related datasets *upstream data* with similar features (lab tests) could be available, e.g. for more common diseases
- MetaMIMIC¹ repository
 - Based on MIMIC-IV² clinical database of ICU admissions
 - 12 binary prediction tasks for different diagnoses related tasks of varied similarity
 - o 34925 patients, 172 features

Experimental Setup: TL Pipeline, Upstream and Downstream Tasks



Upstream and downstream tasks – simulate a scenario of diagnosing a rare disease

- Reserve 11 targets for pretraining and 1 target for the downstream task
- Limit the amount of downstream data to 4, 10, 20, 100, 200 samples
- Obtain 12 upstream-downstream splits in total (60 transfer learning tasks)

- Neural networks:
 - FT-Transformer¹
 - Tabular ResNet¹
 - \circ MLP¹
- GBDT:
 - CatBoost²
 - XGBoost³

• Neural networks:

- FT-Transformer¹
- Tabular ResNet¹
- MLP¹
- GBDT:
 - CatBoost²
 - XGBoost³

• Transfer learning setups:

- Linear head atop a frozen feature extractor
- MLP head atop a frozen feature extractor
- End-to-end fine-tuning with a linear head
- End-to-end fine-tuning with an MLP head

• Baselines:

- Neural model trained from scratch
- GBDT

• Neural networks:

- FT-Transformer¹
- Tabular ResNet¹
- MLP¹
- GBDT:
 - CatBoost²
 - XGBoost³

• Transfer learning setups:

- Linear head atop a frozen feature extractor
- MLP head atop a frozen feature extractor
- End-to-end fine-tuning with a linear head
- End-to-end fine-tuning with an MLP head

Baselines:

- Neural model trained from scratch
- GBDT
 - Only on downstream data

• Neural networks:

- FT-Transformer¹
- Tabular ResNet¹
- MLP¹
- GBDT:
 - CatBoost²
 - XGBoost³

• Transfer learning setups:

- Linear head atop a frozen feature extractor
- MLP head atop a frozen feature extractor
- End-to-end fine-tuning with a linear head
- End-to-end fine-tuning with an MLP head
- Baselines:
 - Neural model trained from scratch
 - GBDT
 - Only on downstream data
 - Leveraging upstream data through stacking

Results: Transfer Learning with Deep Tabular Models vs GBDT

The results of 30000 experiments, aggregated as average rank across all 12 downstream tasks at each data level:



Takeaways:

- Deep tabular models with transfer learning outperform strong GBDT baselines at all data levels (note the color pattern)
- Representation learning with deep tabular models is more powerful than leveraging knowledge transfer through stacking
- Simpler models such as MLP with transfer learning are very competitive in extremely low data regimes. However, more complex architectures like FT-Transformer offer consistent performance gains over GBDT across all data levels
- On specific tasks, transfer learning with deep tabular models offers up to 5-7% accuracy improvement

Self-Supervised Learning (SSL) vs Supervised Pre-training

- SSL another way to use the upstream data (without labels)
- SSL learns the intrinsic structure of the data in an unsupervised way
- In NLP and vision, SSL pre-training produces more transferable features than supervised pre-training
- We use recent tabular SSL methods to investigate this in tabular domain
 - MLM pre-training masks a random feature for each sample and predicts it from the other features
 - Contrastive pre-training forms positive pairs using data augmentation, maps positive pairs close and negative pairs far in the feature space

Self-Supervised Learning (SSL) vs Supervised Pre-training

- SSL another way to use the upstream data (without labels)
- SSL learns the intrinsic structure of the data in an unsupervised way
- In NLP and vision, SSL pre-training is produces more transferable features than supervised pre-training
- We use recent tabular SSL methods to investigate this in tabular domain
 - MLM pre-training masks a random feature for each sample and predicts it from the other features
 - Contrastive pre-training forms positive pairs using data augmentation, maps positive pairs close and negative pairs far in the feature space

Rank

3





Takeaways:

- With a linear head, SSL works better than training from scratch
- However, supervised pre-training leads to more transferable features than SSL

Pseudo-Features: Aligning Upstream and Downstream Feature Sets

- What if the upstream and downstream features are similar, but misaligned? E.g. an additional lab test?
- We propose a pseudo-feature method to address this

Pseudo-Features: Aligning Upstream and Downstream Feature Sets

- What if the upstream and downstream features are similar, but misaligned? E.g. an additional lab test?
- We propose a pseudo-feature method to address this

Suppose the upstream data (X_u,Y_u) is missing a feature $x_{\rm new}$ present in (X_d,Y_d)

- 1. Pre-train $f: X_u \to Y_u$ on (X_u, Y_u) without x_{new}
- 2. Fine-tune f to predict x_{new} and get $\hat{f}: X_d \setminus \{x_{\text{new}}\} \to x_{\text{new}}$
- 3. Use \hat{f} to get $\hat{x}_{new} = \hat{f}(X_u)$ and $(X_u \cup {\hat{x}_{new}}, Y_u)$
- 4. Pre-train a feature extractor on $(X_u \cup {\hat{x}_{new}}, Y_u)$ and fine-tune on (X_d, Y_d) with x_{new}



Downstream data with a new feature

Pseudo-Features: Results



- We compare imputing the missing feature with discarding the feature from upstream or downstream data
- Pseudo-feature method offers appreciable performance boosts over discarding the missing feature

Does Tabular Transfer Learning Work Beyond Medical Data?

FT-Transformer MLP Catboost 8.7 9.4 6.8 7.2 2.5 1.8 6.0 4.1 2.4 200 4.6 Num samples 20 10 5.2 4.5 8.2 2.6 8.6 6.6 2.7 7.2 2.0 7.9 4 Rank 8.5 1.6 6.0 1.6 20-7.7 5.2 5.2 7.6 2.6 7.4 10-6.5 4.0 5.8 3.5 7.1 2.2 5.7 2.3 5.8 4.6 7.5 8 4 - 6.6 4.4 4.7 6.3 3.5 6.1 6.0 2.9 6.6 2.7 6.5 FS LHERE PRICE LHERE MREAE Stacking \$ LH MP MR JA. FT-Transformer MLP Catboost 200 - 6.5 9.3 3.0 10.5 4.8 4.3 3.7 2.0 5.8 9.3 3.2 100 · 6.7 20 · 8.2 4.8 9.3 2.8 10.7 4.2 3.7 1.8 6.3 2.8 9 Rank 4.2 5.0 6.8 1.0 7.5 10.0 2.7 9.5 6.2 3.0 Num 10-7.7 4.2 4.8 6.0 3.2 7.0 8.2 3.5 7.0 5.0 6.0 -8 4 - 6.7 4.7 6.5 4.3 6.7 4.2 4.5 6.3 3.8 8.0 5.8 -10 LH-EDE NIPEDE LHERE MREDE MIR Stacking 1H MP Th. \$5

• Yeast functional genomics data

• Emotions in music data

Summary

- We demonstrated that representation learning in tabular data is useful and that transfer learned deep tabular models definitively outperform strong GBDT baselines with stacking
- We showed that supervised pre-training produces more transferable features than SSL methods
- We presented a pseudo-feature method to enable effective transfer learning in cases where the upstream and downstream feature sets differ
- We hope that this work serves as a guide for practitioners

Thank you!