An Expanded Benchmark that Rediscovers and Affirms the Edge of Uncertainty Sampling for Active Learning in Tabular Datasets

Anonymous authors
Paper under double-blind review

Abstract

Active Learning (AL) addresses the crucial challenge of enabling machines to efficiently gather labeled examples through strategic queries. Among the many AL strategies, Uncertainty Sampling (US) stands out as one of the most widely adopted. US queries the example(s) that the current model finds uncertain, proving to be both straightforward and effective. Despite claims in the literature suggesting superior alternatives to US, community-wide acceptance remains elusive. In fact, existing benchmarks for tabular datasets present conflicting conclusions on the continued competitiveness of US. In this study, we review the literature on AL strategies in the last decade and build the most comprehensive open-source AL benchmark to date to understand the relative merits of different AL strategies. The benchmark surpasses existing ones by encompassing a broader coverage of strategies, models, and data. Through our investigation of the conflicting conclusions in existing tabular AL benchmarks by evaluation under broad AL experimental settings, we uncover fresh insights into the often-overlooked issue of using machine learning models–**model compatibility** in the context of US. Specifically, we notice that adopting the different models for the querying unlabeled examples and learning tasks would degrade US's effectiveness. Notably, our findings affirm that US maintains a competitive edge over other strategies when paired with compatible models. These findings have practical implications and provide a concrete recipe for AL practitioners, empowering them to make informed decisions when working with tabular classifications with limited labeled data.

1 Introduction

Supervised learning models can achieve competitive results with sufficient high-quality labeled data. However, acquiring such data can be costly in specific domains. This situation calls for Active Learning (AL), a learning paradigm that strategically selects the most valuable unlabeled examples for labeling. AL has the capability of achieving better performance with lower labeling costs, which has been widely studied and applied in various domains, such as computer vision (Li & Guo, 2013; Demir et al., 2015; Beluch et al., 2018), natural language processing (Liu et al., 2021; Schröder et al., 2021; Kishaan et al., 2020), and biology and medical fields (Hao et al., 2020; Nath et al., 2020; Logan et al., 2022).

Among the many AL strategies, Uncertainty Sampling (US) stands out as a straightforward and efficient query strategy by selecting the most uncertain examples for labeling based on the model's prediction confidence. US has demonstrated success across multiple applications (Kishaan et al., 2020; Narayanan et al., 2020; Nath et al., 2020); while US is widely used, several AL studies have developed more sophisticated query strategies to address specific limitations in particular scenarios (Donmez et al., 2007; Huang et al., 2010; Li et al., 2015).

Two large-scale benchmarks for pool-based AL have been developed to evaluate existing strategies for classification on tabular datasets (Yang & Loog, 2018; Zhan et al., 2021). However, they present conflicting conclusions regarding the preferred query strategies. While Yang & Loog (2018) suggested that the straight-

Table 1: Comparison between Yang & Loog (2018); Zhan et al. (2021) and our benchmark. (D) means aspects of datasets; (M) means aspects of base models; (Q) means aspects of query strategies; (A) means aspects of analysis; (O) means aspects of an open source tool. Our benchmark fetches up lacking query strategies in Yang & Loog (2018) and lacking analysis in Zhan et al. (2021) to provide a comprehensive comparison.

		Yang & Loog (2018)	Zhan et al. (2021)	Ours
(D)	More than 100K examples	✓		✓
(D)	More than 400 features	✓		✓
(M)	LR	✓		✓
(M)	RBFSVM		✓	✓
(M)	RF			✓
(Q)	Model uncertainty	✓	✓	✓
(Q)	Bayesian uncertainty			✓
(Q)	Data diversity		✓	✓
(Q)	Hybrid criteria	✓	✓	✓
(Q)	Redesigned learning framework		✓	✓
(A)	AUBC	✓	✓	✓
(A)	Average ranking	✓		✓
(A)	Comparison with Uniform	✓		✓
(O)	Released datasets		✓	✓
(O)	Unified AL protocol			✓
(O)	Analysis tools			✓

forward US strategy excels across the majority of datasets, Zhan et al. (2021) argued that Learning Active Learning (LAL) (Konyushkova et al., 2017) outperforms US.

Given the lack of consistent comparisons across diverse contexts and the contradictory conclusions drawn from the previous two extensive benchmarks, there is a critical need for a benchmark that accurately represents the current state of AL techniques in this field. Therefore, this work aims to build the most comprehensive AL benchmark compared to previous benchmarks, focusing on datasets, base models, query strategies, and analysis aspects, as highlighted in Table 1. Our benchmark is the most comprehensive open-source framework to date, crafted by integrating a transparent and unified interface. This unified interface cooperates with existing GitHub repositories, such as libact (Yang et al., 2017), Google AL playground (Yilei "Dolee" Yang, 2017), ALiPy (Tang et al., 2019), ModAL (Danka & Horvath), scikit-activeml (Kottke et al., 2021), and sets a new standard for future research.

Subsequently, we assess the performance of query strategies specifically for classifications on tabular data, which is widely used in various real-world applications due to its structured nature and the availability of diverse datasets. Our benchmarking results show that US is SOTA on 18 of the 29 binary-class datasets and 5 of the 7 multi-class datasets.

Furthermore, through our investigation under different AL experimental settings, we uncover the reason for the substandard performance of US in Zhan et al. (2021) is **model compatibility**. The incompatibility between a model used within US querying the unlabeled examples (query-oriented model) and a model being evaluated for the tasks (task-oriented model) degrades the performance because the queired examples might not be the most uncertain to the current task-oriented model. Through careful study, we affirm that US maintains a competitive edge over other strategies when used with compatible settings on Logistic Regression (LR), Radial Basis Function kernel Support Vector Machine (RBFSVM), Random Forest (RF), and Gradient Boosting Decision Tree (GBDT). In summary, we recommend adopting US with compatible settings as the first choice for practitioners, providing a clear baseline for AL in real-world usage from the community.

In this work, we make the following contributions:

- To our knowledge, our benchmark is the most comprehensive, surpassing existing benchmarks in terms of datasets, models, query strategies, and analyses.
- We re-benchmark existing strategies for tabular datasets, demonstrating the US's competitiveness on most datasets, and, importantly, uncover profound insights into the often-overlooked issue of **model compatibility** in the context of US.
- We offer a reproducible and open-source benchmarking framework, which includes preparing datasets, an active learning process, and analysis tools to facilitate future research in the community.

2 Preliminary

In this section, we extend the Settles (2012)'s literature to the current state of pool-based AL research, addressing the gap created by the lack of an open-source benchmark and highlighting significant developments in query strategies over the last decade. We also introduce the experimental protocol of our benchmark, which facilitates a deeper understanding of the critical components involved in pool-based AL, helping readers to comprehensively evaluate the efficacy of different query strategies in this domain.

2.1 Literature survey of pool-based active learning

Settles (2012) formalized the pool-based active learning protocol as follows:

Initial setup The process begins with a small labeled pool $D_{\mathrm{l}} = \{(x_1, y_1), \ldots, (x_N, y_N)\}$, where $x_n \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is d-dimension features, $y_n \in \mathcal{Y}$ is label, and $|D_{\mathrm{l}}| = N$ is the number of labeled examples, and a large unlabeled pool $D_{\mathrm{u}} = \{x_{N+1}, \ldots, x_{N+M}\}$, where $|D_{\mathrm{u}}| = M$ is the number of unlabeled examples; and an oracle O that provides ground truth labels.

Execution setup The active learning algorithm operates over T rounds within a total query budget, where each round involves querying the label of one unlabeled example from D_{u} until the budget is exhausted.

Query steps in each round

1. **Query**: Employ the query strategy $\mathcal{Q}$ to select an example x_j from D_{u}.
2. **Label**: Acquire the label y_j for x_j from an oracle $O(x_j) = y_j$.
3. **Update pools**: Move the new labeled example from D_{u} to D_{l}, i.e., $D_{\mathrm{l}} \leftarrow D_{\mathrm{l}} \cup \{(x_j, y_j)\}$, $D_{\mathrm{u}} \leftarrow D_{\mathrm{u}} \setminus \{(x_j)\}$.
4. **Update the model**: Retrain the model using the updated labeled pool D_{l}.

Prediction on the test set Finally, we train the model $\mathcal{G}$ on the latest labeled pool D_{l} and make predictions on new examples from the unseen testing set D_{te}.

The critical element in pool-based active learning is the query strategy $\mathcal{Q}$. A naïve uniform sampling (Uniform) method randomly selects unlabeled examples for labeling. Uniform does not utilize active learning strategies and serves primarily as a baseline. The overarching goal of active learning is to develop a query strategy that outperforms the Uniform baseline, and there are already numerous query strategies available today. Based on Settles (2012), we classify existing query strategies into six categories: **model uncertainty**, **expected model changing**, **representation exploiting**, **hybrid criteria**, **Bayesian methods**, and **redesigned Learning Framework**. In the next section, we first introduce different query strategies with an illustrative example, and then we further introduce each type of query strategy and their variants in detail.

2.1.1 An illustrative example of types of different methods

In this section, we illustrate the characteristics of six distinct types of query strategies. We denote negative examples with red points, positive examples with blue points, and unlabeled examples with gray points. Figure 1 demonstrates the properties of these methods, highlighting the queried example with a black square box. Given the model's decision boundary, marked with a green dashed line,

- **Model uncertainty** strategy selects the example closest to the decision boundary, reflecting high marginal uncertainty.
- **Expected model changing** chooses an example that, if labeled negative as displayed in Figure 1, would significantly change the current model to the new model displayed in sketched green line.
- **Representative Exploiting** selects the centre of the densest cluster, which does not rely on the current model.
- **Hybrid criteria** balance uncertainty with density by querying uncertain examples in denser regions compared to pure Uncertainty Sampling.
- **Bayesian methods** identify examples within uncertain regions with high posterior variance, as illustrated by the colored areas in Figure 1.
- **Redesigned Learning Framework** selects the most rewarding query strategy and then queries a new example by it.



Figure 1: Illustration examples of **model uncertainty**, **expected model changing**, **representation exploiting**, **hybrid criteria**, **Bayesian method**, and **redesigned learning framework**.

Given the high-level idea of different types of query strategies, we begin with **model uncertainty** to guide readers through the relationships and historical development of these query strategies.

Model uncertainty Uncertainty Sampling (US) is a prevalent query strategy in pool-based active learning, where it selects examples for labeling based on the degree of uncertainty regarding the model's prediction. US assumes that examples about which the model is most uncertain are likely to yield the highest information gain upon being labeled. Various measures can be employed to quantify uncertainty, including the margin score and entropy of the predictions of an examples in the unlabeled pool returned by the current model. In binary classification scenarios, using margin and entropy scores are equivalent in terms of defining model uncertainty (see Appendix B.5). Previous works have found that US is a strong baseline for most pool-based active learning problems (Cawley, 2011; Yang & Loog, 2018; Karamcheti et al., 2021; Schröder et al., 2021; Bahri et al., 2022).

In contrast to US, which relies on a single model to quantify uncertainty, Query By Committee (QBC) (Seung et al., 1992) quantifies uncertainty through multiple models to address the sampling bias in US (Settles, 2012). QBC operates on the principle of disagreement among a committee of models, each representing a different model derived from the training set. Specifically, QBC selects the unlabeled example where there is the maximal disagreement among the committee members. Disagreement is measured by voting entropy, defined as the entropy of the distribution of the committee's votes. A higher voting entropy of an example indicates more significant disagreement and, consequently, a higher value for querying.

Expected model changing Previous query strategies aim to query the most informative example for the current model. In this category, we strive to query the most informative example to reduce the model's error in the future. For instance, Expected Error Reduction (EER) queries the highest expected error of the future output over an unlabeled pool, where the error would be estimated by the Monte-Carlo approach (Roy & McCallum, 2001). Similarly, Variance Reduction (VR) estimates the variance of the model's output based on its Fisher information, which estimates the inverse of the lower bound on the variance of the model's parameters (Cover, 1999; Schein & Ungar, 2007). Another method proposed the difference between the error reduction and the cost of obtaining the label to query the most informative example over an unlabeled pool effectively (Kapoor et al., 2007).

Representation exploiting US and QBC might perform poorly due to outliers or sampling bias that results in querying a non-representative example during the query process (Dasgupta & Hsu, 2008; Yang et al., 2015; Shui et al., 2020). Although EER and VR take the input distribution into account via estimating expected future error over all unlabeled examples, these methods are computationally expensive, making them unsuitable for large datasets (Settles, 2012). In this category, we depart from strategies that rely on model predictions and instead focus on the structure/representation of data, an approach we refer to as *model-free*. Hierarchical Sampling (Hier) is a model-free representation sampling method that exploits hierarchical clustering to explore the data structure of the unlabeled pool (Dasgupta & Hsu, 2008). Hier randomly selects an example from the subtree of the hierarchical clustering tree to obtain its label. Then, the tree structure is iteratively updated by making the labels in the cluster more pure and focusing on the remaining impure clusters.

The query strategies mentioned in Settles (2012) are long-standing. However, the survey should be updated with the latest approaches. Graph Density (Graph) is also a model-free representation sampling method that exploits cluster structure by applying graph-based clustering techniques to the unlabeled pool without depending on any model. Similar to Graph, Core-Set uses K-Means clustering on the embedding space extracted from the data transformation (such as deep convolutional neural networks) and then queries unlabeled examples closest to the centers of clusters. Sener & Savarese (2018) show that Core-Set works well on image classification tasks. Besides Graph and Core-Set, we could categorize recent query strategies into three categories: **hybrid criteria**, **Bayesian method**, and **redesigned learning framework**.

Hybrid criteria Several works study the combination of uncertainty and diversity information to improve previous query strategies. For example, Density-Weight Uncertainty Sampling (DWUS) assumes that informative examples should have both high uncertainty and be representative of the data distribution (Nguyen & Smeulders, 2004), so DWUS designs a weighted uncertainty score by averaging an example's similarity to the remaining examples in the training set. Hinted Support Vector Machine (HintSVM) focused on selecting an example of an updated decision boundary that passes through unqueried regions instead of reducing its margin only (Li et al., 2015). QUerying Informative and Representative Examples (QUIRE) formulated the informativeness and representativeness with kernel matrices (Huang et al., 2010), which characterizes the similarity between labeled examples and unlabeled examples, to select an example with large self-similarity and large similarity to most remaining examples in the unlabeled pool. Representative Marginal Cluster Mean Sampling (MCM) queries examples within the model's margin closest to the K-Means centers in the embedding space (Xu et al., 2003), which inherits the benefits from Core-Set and US. Recently, Batch Mode Discriminative and Representative (BMDR) and Self-Paced Active Learning (SPAL) have been designed to query a batch of examples with elaborated empirical risk minimization (Wang & Ye, 2015; Tang & Huang, 2019). BMDR queries the example that expects to minimize the empirical risk on the labeled and unlabeled pools using a self-learning approach and distribution difference between the labeled pool and training set. Following the objective function of BMDR, SPAL modifies the constraint of the objective function (1) to improve BMDR's performance. Please refer to Appendix B.5 for the detailed information.

Bayesian method Although QBC aims to query the most disagreeable example, the voter entropy might ignore each model's confidence regarding its predictions, potentially reducing efficiency. To address this issue, Bayesian Active Learning by Disagreement (BALD) queries the most uncertain example across the ensemble models but confident in the single model (Houlsby et al., 2011). This approach can be interpreted

as the conditional mutual information between the model's prediction and its parameters. BALD aims to query the example with high conditional mutual information, where the model's prediction is uncertain, but the model's parameters are certain.

Redesigned learning framework As the number of query strategies increases, some are designed to automatically select the optimal strategy from multiple heuristic query strategies. For example, Active Learning By Learning (ALBL) treats the learning problem as a multi-armed bandit problem (Hsu & Lin, 2015). It thus selects the optimal strategy from a set of query strategies and queries the example based on this strategy that maximizes the estimated reward at each round. Learning Active Learning (LAL) formulates the query process as a regression problem to learn the strategy from various types of toy data (Konyushkova et al., 2017). LAL queries the example from the learned regression function, which predicts the potential error reduction.

2.1.2 Deep active learning

Besides previous query strategies for conventional machine learning models, such as Logistic Regression (LR), and Radial Basis Function kernel Support Vector Machine (RBFSVM), Beck et al. (2021) and Zhan et al. (2022) compared additional query strategies designed for deep learning models used in computer vision classification tasks. Their results show that US outperforms data diversity-based sampling strategies (CoreSet, Variational Adversarial Active Learning) (Sinha et al., 2019). Moreover, hybrid criteria query strategies, such as Batch Active learning by Diverse Gradient Embeddings (BADGE) (Ash et al., 2019), Learning Loss for Active Learning (LPL) (Yoo & Kweon, 2019), and Wasserstein Adversarial Active Learning (WAAL) (Shui et al., 2020), achieve competitive results better than US. Given that many recent works have taken the burden to study deep active learning on computer vision tasks (Zhan et al., 2022), transformer models (Rauch et al., 2023), and cross-domain scenarios (Werner et al., 2024), we consider "the use of deep active learning in tabular data" still requires a lot of effort to study deeply. Therefore, we focus on providing the practical guide and benchmark of active learning methods for *tabular datasets* in this work.

2.2 Experimental protocol for the benchmark

Section 2.1 depicts an abstract process of pool-based active learning. To concretize the experimental protocol for the benchmark, we illustrate the framework in Figure 2. In this framework, we define the training set as the union of the labeled pool and unlabeled pool, denoted as $D_{\text{tr}} = D_{\text{l}} \cup D_{\text{u}}$. First, we split the dataset into disjoint training and testing sets, i.e., $D_{\text{tr}} \cap D_{\text{te}} = \emptyset$, to simulate a real-world learning scenario. After splitting the dataset, we sample from the labeled pool D_{l} within D_{tr} and leave the remaining examples as the unlabeled pool D_{u} to set up the initial environment. Furthermore, we isolate a query-oriented model $\mathcal{H}$ from the task-oriented model $\mathcal{G}$ in Section 2.1. The query-oriented model is used for selecting the most informative example during the query step while the task-oriented model is used for prediction on the test set, as depicted in Figure 2.

To distinguish the relationship between the query-oriented model and the task-oriented model, we define **model compatibility** as the setting where the examples obtained by the query-oriented model might be different from using the task-oriented model. After introducing the **model compatibility**, we can further discuss the query strategies that depend on the query-oriented models to query new examples. For example, the query-oriented model in HintSVM and QUIRE are restricted to the SVM model due to their theoretical design contrasting *model-free* strategies, which do not rely on the query-oriented model (See Section 2.1).

We notice that the setting of the **model compatibility** is an often-overlooked issue in previous benchmarks when they compared query strategies under the same task-oriented model (Yang & Loog, 2018; Zhan et al., 2021). Although some works discuss the influence of using different models for query informative examples in deep active learning (Yoo & Kweon, 2019; Sinha et al., 2019), it remains unclear in the context of Uncertainty Sampling. In this work, we denote the compatible query-oriented and task-oriented models for Uncertainty Sampling as US-Compatible (US-C) and non-compatible models as US-Non-Compatible (US-NC). Section 5.1 studies the impact of model compatibility on US to clarify the conflicting conclusion in previous benchmarks.



Figure 2: The Framework of Active Learning Experiments. Rectangles represent datasets including labeled pool, unlabeled pool, and test set. Rounded rectangles represent processes including an active learning algorithm, labeling, and evaluation. Circles represent models. In this work, we differentiate the relationship between two models: task-oriented and query-oriented.

The benchmark aims to provide a standardized framework for evaluating and comparing different query strategies in a fair manner. Following (Guyon et al., 2010; 2011; Desreumaux & Lemaire, 2020; Zhan et al., 2021), we utilize the Area Under the Budget Curve (AUBC) as a summary metric to quantify the results of learning curves. A learning curve tracks the performance of model $\mathcal{G}$ at each round of the active learning process, typically using evaluation metrics such as accuracy. AUBC provides a concise way to compare the overall performance of different learning curves of query strategies. Figure 3 demonstrates that US, BALD, and LAL achieve higher accuracy more quickly than Uniform, corresponding to the mean AUBC of US (85.78%) and BALD (85.72%), which are better than LAL (85.52%), Uniform (84.77%), and Core-Set (84.47%) in detail. Furthermore, we report the accuracy of the task-oriented model under different labeled data sizes and data utilization rates of the query strategy for more detail.

3 Experimental settings

We employ most of the settings outlined in the prior benchmark (Zhan et al., 2021). For each dataset D, we reserve 40% as the unseen test set D_te for performance evaluation. Then, for the remaining 60%, our default protocol is uniformly sampling few examples as the initial labeled pool D_l and leave the others as the unlabeled pool D_u.

$$D = D_\mathrm{tr} \cup D_\mathrm{te}, \quad |D_\mathrm{te}| = 0.4|D|,$$
$$D_\mathrm{tr} = D_\mathrm{l} \cup D_\mathrm{u}, \quad |D_\mathrm{l}| = k \times |\mathcal{Y}|,$$

where k is the positive number to control the size of the initial labeled pool. In the following, we clarify the differences and expansions in our benchmark compared to the previous benchmarks (Yang & Loog, 2018; Zhan et al., 2021).

Remove improper use of query strategies The previous benchmark simultaneously evaluated query strategies that either support or do not support multi-class or batch size greater than one, may have affected the validity of claims when comparing results across different aspects (Zhan et al., 2021). Therefore, we restrict our evaluation only on valid use of query strategies to ensure consistency and fairness.

Include comprehensive datasets with a unified format. We select 26 binary datasets from (Zhan et al., 2021) and (Yang & Loog, 2018). Besides, we ensure consistency in the source datasets and the composition of the initial labeled and unlabeled pools. For instance, we scaled raw data features to $[-1, 1]$ for all datasets.[1] We added 4 datasets from the other tabular data benchmark (Grinsztajn et al., 2022) to expand the coverage

[1]We retained the original scaling for some of the LIBSVM datasets, such as *Heart*, *Ionosphere*, and *Sonar*, which were already scaled to the range of $[-1, 1]$.



Figure 3: The learning curves (test accuracy vs. number of labeled examples) of query strategies on *Australian* dataset (Chang & Lin, 2011).

of the binary classifications. These datasets were selected based on their large-scale, class-imbalanced, and high-dimensional properties to better reflect real-world scenarios. We also extend our benchmark by adding 8 multi-class classification across diverse fields from UCI datasets (Dua & Graff, 2017). Moreover, we extend 2 domain-specific datasets, including utilization of Vision Transformer (ViT) (Dosovitskiy et al., 2021) as a feature extractor for CIFAR10 (Krizhevsky et al., 2009), and BERT (Devlin et al., 2019) for IMDB (Maas et al., 2011), to connect our findings with modern machine learning research. Please refer to Table 17 for the properties of 40 datasets.

Include broad types of query strategies. Zhan et al. (2021) extended the query strategies from Yang & Loog (2018) to 17 query strategies. However, the redundancy of query strategies, such as US and Informative Cluster Diverse (InfoDiv) (See Appendix B.5 for more detail.), may lead to repetitive and limited insights into the benchmark. Therefore, we only keep the most representative 12 query strategies: US, QBC, Hier, Graph, Core-Set, HintSVM, QUIRE, DWUS, MCM, BMDR, ALBL, and LAL. We further expand the benchmark to explore a broader range of query strategies by including BALD, a popular query strategy in deep learning (Gal et al., 2017).

Adopt a tree-based model. Previous benchmarks studied Logistic Regression and RBFSVM.[2] In this work, we further studied tree-based models such as XGBoost (Chen & Guestrin, 2016) and Random Forest (Breiman, 2001) (See Appendix D), as recommended by the earlier benchmark for tabular datasets (Grinsztajn et al., 2022). To clarify the relationship between query-oriented and task-oriented models, we report some query strategies that do not use tree-based model as the query-oriented model in Table 2.

We disclose the construction of the initial labeled pool, data preprocessing steps, and the choice of models, which can significantly impact the experimental results (Ji et al., 2023), that saves participants time examining the settings and critical considerations for designing active learning experiments. Notably, Ji et al. (2023) recommended using consistent "initial sets" across multiple runs to minimize the impact of randomness and ensure fair comparisons. In our study, randomness arises from two main sources: the train-test split used to

[2]We also reproduce the previous benchmarks with different base models in Appendix C

Table 2: Settings of query-oriented models $\mathcal{H}$ for specific query strategies $\mathcal{Q}$.

$\mathcal{Q}$	$\mathcal{H}$	Reason of choice
HintSVM	RBFSVM	the implementation in libact
QUIRE	RBFSVM	the implementation in libact
QBC	LR(C = 0.1), RBFSVM, RF, Linear Discriminant Analysis	the inheritance of Zhan et al. (2021)
ALBL	Combination of multiple $\mathcal{Q}$ with same $\mathcal{H}$: US, HintSVM	the default settings in libact
LAL	RF	the implementation in ALiPy

derive datasets $D_{\text{tr}}, D_{\text{te}}$ and the construction of initial sets for $D_{\text{l}}, D_{\text{u}}$ (See Section 3.). While randomness from the train-test split is unavoidable without predefined training and test sets, we adhere Ji et al. (2023)'s suggestions by keeping the initial labeled sets fixed to mitigate randomness. A detailed investigation into the effects of randomness due to the train-test split is presented in Appendix C.3. In summary, our findings indicate that Uncertainty Sampling exhibits consistent performance across most datasets, confirming its stability within our benchmark.

Handle errors and exceptions of experiments. We report the issues encountered and solutions when we conduct experiments. Because current modules cannot support *cold-start* problems[3], we run the experiments repeatedly and skip any seed that lacks labels in the training or test set at the initial setup. For execution, we set a maximum running time of 72 hours for executing a query strategy on a dataset to ensure completion within a reasonable time (Denote 'TLE' in Table 6).

This section outlines the necessary information to conduct experiments for the benchmark. In our implementation and report, we strive to ensure the reproducibility of all results under these specific settings and processes corresponding to Figure 2. Furthermore, we compare our settings and results with the existing benchmark (Zhan et al., 2021) in Appendix B and Appendix C, covering any additional modifications or improvements needed.

4 Benchmarking results

This section presents the benchmarking results for XGBoost in Table 3. We repeated experiments 100 times for small datasets with a size less than 2000 ($K_{\text{S}} = 100$) and 10 times for large datasets ($K_{\text{L}} = 10$). We set a total query budget of 3000 to reduce running time for large datasets. Next, we verify the superiority of Uncertainty Sampling over other query strategies. Furthermore, we investigate whether existing query strategies bring more benefits than Uniform for each dataset. After comparing the performance of query strategies in binary classification datasets, we further initiate the experiments for multi-class classification and domain-specific problems to enrich the scope of this work. In addition, we reproduced the benchmarking results from (Zhan et al., 2021) with RBFSVM in Appendix C and constructed the new benchmark for RF in Appendix D.

4.1 Verify superiority

Referring to Table 3, we observe that US attains the highest mean AUBC among all query strategies on 18 datasets, indicating its superior performance compared to other query strategies on average. The remaining dominant query strategies are LAL and BALD, which achieve the highest AUBC on 6 and 4 datasets, respectively.

Besides AUBC, we also observe learning curves from different perspectives. Specifically, we check the model's accuracy with varying ratios of labeled examples on each dataset. Table 4 shows the model's accuracy with

[3]The *cold-start* problem is that some classes are under-represented in the initial labeled pool (Yuan et al., 2020; Brangbour et al., 2020).

Table 3: Benchmarking results of XGBoost. The numbers are mean AUBC (↑ is better). We report the baseline method (Uniform), the best query strategy with its mean AUBC (BEST_QS, BEST), and the worst query strategy with its mean AUBC (WORST_QS, WORST).

	Uniform	BEST_QS	BEST	WORST_QS	WORST
Appendicitis	81.51%	US	82.85%	DWUS	80.74%
Sonar	75.10%	US	76.06%	Core-Set	74.11%
Parkinsons	84.24%	US	86.63%	HintSVM	83.12%
Ex8b	84.21%	LAL	85.16%	DWUS	83.05%
Heart	78.37%	BALD	79.35%	HintSVM	77.83%
Haberman	67.69%	US	69.17%	HintSVM	66.82%
Ionosphere	87.96%	US	89.95%	DWUS	81.85%
Clean1	76.54%	US	78.99%	Graph	76.30%
Breast	95.57%	LAL	96.31%	DWUS	91.85%
Wdbc	94.07%	LAL	95.24%	HintSVM	93.96%
Australian	84.77%	US	85.78%	HintSVM	83.89%
Diabetes	72.62%	US	73.62%	HintSVM	71.49%
Mammographic	79.46%	BALD	80.78%	DWUS	78.80%
Ex8a	92.06%	Core-Set	94.07%	HintSVM	84.75%
Tic	90.11%	US	90.65%	DWUS	89.11%
German	72.68%	US	74.03%	DWUS	71.78%
Splice	91.89%	US	93.76%	DWUS	89.51%
Gcloudb	87.85%	LAL	88.68%	QUIRE	85.99%
Gcloudub	92.98%	US	94.30%	DWUS	86.12%
Checkerboard	98.72%	LAL	99.49%	DWUS	86.83%
Spambase	93.16%	US	94.51%	HintSVM	91.09%
Banana	87.70%	LAL	88.45%	HintSVM	79.70%
Phoneme	85.78%	US	87.77%	DWUS	82.42%
Ringnorm	93.76%	US	95.46%	Core-Set	64.58%
Twonorm	95.43%	US	96.39%	HintSVM	83.38%
Phishing	94.20%	US	96.24%	DWUS	91.68%
Covertype	74.11%	US	76.64%	DWUS	61.34%
Bioresponse	72.92%	BALD	74.50%	Core-Set	72.04%
Pol	96.03%	BALD	97.62%	HintSVM	90.52%

20% labeled examples on each dataset, and US outperforms other query strategies on more than half (15) datasets. Please refer to Appendix A for more comparisons under other ratios. Beyond using a fixed query budget in Table 4, we also check the metric of the number of queried examples required to reach 99% of the model's performance trained on the full budget. Table 5 demonstrates that Uncertainty Sampling stably achieves first place or second place on 21 datasets, which shows a consistent conclusion with Table 3 and Table 4. More results are revealed in Appendix A.

Finally, we verify the ranking performance of query strategies across multiple datasets. Specifically, we assess the average and standard deviation of the rankings by seeds of the query strategy on each dataset. Then, we apply the Friedman test with a 5% significance level to test for statistical significance. The p-values of the Friedman test are less than 5% for all datasets, indicating that the performance differences between query strategies are statistically significant. Table 6 demonstrates that US ranks first on 18 datasets, and LAL, BALD, and MCM often achieve second and third ranks.

These results show that the straightforward and efficient US outperforms others on most datasets. These outcomes also correspond to previous work claiming US is the strong baseline with LR (Yang & Loog, 2018) and RBFSVM, which we re-benchmarked in Appendix C. We recommend that practitioners initiate their pool-based active learning projects with US.

Table 4: Accuracy (↑ is better) of the model with 20% labeled examples: We report the model's accuracy with 20% labeled examples on each dataset. The scores with **bold** indicate the best performance, and with *italics* indicate the second-place performance on a dataset. 'TLE' means a query strategy exceeds the time limit.

	Uniform	US	QBC	BALD	Hier	Graph	Core-Set	HintSVM	QUIRE	DWUS	MCM	BMDR	ALBL	LAL
Sonar	67.82%	67.29%	66.95%	66.73%	66.45%	67.83%	66.25%	65.88%	67.99%	*68.15%*	66.82%	**68.56%**	67.25%	67.32%
Parkinsons	79.26%	**80.71%**	79.36%	*80.51%*	79.40%	78.90%	78.68%	78.41%	78.60%	79.69%	80.10%	78.81%	79.91%	80.27%
Ex8b	80.55%	80.69%	79.98%	79.37%	80.24%	79.13%	81.11%	80.32%	**81.26%**	78.76%	80.45%	*81.26%*	80.74%	80.60%
Heart	75.73%	*77.19%*	75.06%	**77.36%**	75.59%	76.31%	76.69%	74.82%	76.36%	75.09%	75.41%	75.91%	76.36%	76.39%
Haberman	69.24%	*70.61%*	69.20%	70.15%	68.54%	68.96%	67.68%	68.43%	67.69%	68.51%	**71.04%**	69.15%	68.67%	70.50%
Ionosphere	83.59%	*86.96%*	83.84%	86.78%	84.18%	82.28%	83.24%	81.84%	80.82%	74.91%	84.02%	80.28%	86.73%	**87.21%**
Clean1	68.34%	**69.86%**	68.03%	69.10%	68.57%	68.21%	66.74%	67.59%	68.42%	68.34%	67.36%	66.42%	*69.35%*	69.31%
Breast	95.17%	**96.73%**	95.17%	*96.72%*	95.54%	95.29%	94.54%	94.77%	94.93%	90.07%	96.57%	94.77%	96.16%	96.66%
Wdbc	92.91%	95.34%	92.50%	*95.36%*	92.91%	92.99%	93.04%	91.94%	92.66%	92.54%	95.26%	92.68%	94.75%	**95.55%**
Australian	83.63%	**85.55%**	83.77%	*85.33%*	83.87%	83.90%	82.97%	81.95%	82.75%	82.51%	84.86%	83.58%	83.28%	85.13%
Diabetes	71.84%	**73.96%**	72.34%	*73.35%*	72.07%	72.38%	71.73%	70.14%	71.81%	70.54%	72.85%	72.16%	71.78%	72.80%
Mammographic	79.66%	**82.51%**	79.66%	*82.30%*	79.48%	79.17%	79.52%	78.70%	80.41%	79.39%	82.09%	80.03%	80.33%	81.67%
Ex8a	88.22%	88.55%	87.81%	88.75%	87.94%	89.41%	*91.69%*	78.04%	78.12%	78.06%	88.41%	89.22%	85.21%	**91.88%**
Tic	89.25%	**90.43%**	89.23%	*90.38%*	89.30%	89.72%	89.33%	88.12%	89.83%	85.76%	89.58%	TLE%	89.32%	89.15%
German	71.23%	**72.90%**	71.37%	*72.73%*	71.08%	71.48%	70.46%	71.61%	71.06%	68.76%	71.97%	TLE%	71.55%	72.11%
Splice	89.07%	**92.95%**	88.88%	*92.65%*	89.00%	89.25%	84.99%	85.74%	88.99%	84.69%	91.33%	89.04%	88.65%	90.25%
Gcloudb	87.82%	**89.55%**	87.98%	89.24%	87.95%	88.19%	88.27%	84.62%	84.61%	85.48%	*89.49%*	87.96%	88.35%	89.36%
Gcloudub	91.25%	**94.11%**	91.45%	92.40%	91.92%	92.28%	88.58%	83.11%	85.69%	80.24%	91.69%	89.76%	88.91%	*93.61%*
Checkerboard	98.76%	96.89%	98.80%	*99.46%*	99.35%	98.95%	98.59%	91.40%	88.72%	79.82%	99.46%	99.09%	98.26%	**99.80%**
Spambase	92.47%	*94.84%*	92.69%	**94.91%**	92.54%	92.64%	92.06%	88.95%	TLE%	92.54%	94.61%	TLE%	92.66%	94.68%
BaTLEa	87.46%	87.93%	87.46%	87.65%	87.53%	87.50%	88.02%	71.37%	76.11%	74.94%	*88.49%*	TLE%	86.99%	**88.94%**
Phoneme	83.97%	*87.13%*	83.73%	**87.24%**	84.66%	84.13%	84.70%	80.83%	TLE%	78.60%	86.36%	TLE%	83.73%	86.52%
Ringnorm	92.79%	*95.75%*	93.33%	**95.77%**	92.35%	92.40%	51.86%	57.27%	TLE%	55.71%	95.33%	TLE%	92.45%	92.55%
Twonorm	94.99%	**96.61%**	95.04%	96.53%	95.07%	95.24%	95.73%	79.31%	TLE%	94.26%	*96.60%*	TLE%	95.52%	95.90%
Phishing	93.41%	**96.19%**	93.01%	*96.04%*	92.83%	93.35%	93.18%	91.75%	TLE%	88.11%	95.70%	TLE%	94.37%	95.94%
Covertype	72.30%	**75.26%**	72.05%	*75.26%*	TLE%	64.54%	TLE%	62.90%	TLE%	59.97%	71.54%	TLE%	69.30%	73.92%
Bioresponse	69.96%	**73.14%**	71.05%	*72.87%*	70.48%	71.11%	66.59%	66.70%	TLE%	69.96%	71.34%	TLE%	70.33%	72.07%
Pol	95.29%	**98.19%**	95.52%	*98.10%*	95.40%	86.38%	93.68%	86.75%	TLE%	95.29%	97.58%	TLE%	95.18%	97.75%

Table 5: The minimum number of queried examples required to reach 99% accuracy (↓ is better) of the model: The **bold** indicates the first place and *italics* indicates the second place. 'TLE' means a query strategy exceeds the time limit.

	Uniform	US	QBC	BALD	Hier	Graph	Core-Set	HintSVM	QUIRE	DWUS	MCM	BMDR	ALBL	LAL
Appendicitis	28.44	25.58	29.52	25.06	28.59	27.50	26.03	25.63	26.92	31.49	**24.71**	28.68	25.43	*24.74*
Sonar	73.45	65.70	68.14	*65.21*	72.94	75.91	77.40	73.36	75.83	75.70	70.33	71.05	67.15	**63.78**
Parkinsons	66.44	**44.56**	66.81	47.26	58.10	75.95	65.68	81.31	70.40	67.83	49.78	60.99	59.36	*45.41*
Ex8b	51.02	**42.87**	54.42	46.34	45.86	55.63	*43.27*	58.98	52.16	66.05	43.28	49.59	43.56	45.09
Heart	47.75	*41.11*	48.64	**40.14**	51.24	45.84	48.88	52.44	46.48	51.28	44.87	45.48	45.19	43.35
Haberman	25.53	**24.59**	28.73	25.35	27.02	27.17	29.75	30.51	29.40	28.74	26.36	26.81	28.67	*25.12*
Ionosphere	97.04	**53.38**	98.79	*55.72*	91.89	95.68	88.46	104.41	96.79	179.88	66.03	120.41	70.33	57.49
Clean1	207.79	**152.39**	207.93	*155.50*	201.93	211.52	191.98	198.64	196.44	207.79	166.59	199.24	180.07	166.30
Breast	70.81	38.78	65.98	*38.02*	56.25	90.22	61.85	64.05	60.09	288.68	40.14	81.19	39.19	**30.39**
Wdbc	102.53	48.87	111.69	*48.00*	89.32	106.51	88.53	110.64	92.47	110.06	51.92	100.71	49.67	**44.84**
Australian	88.71	**55.39**	79.43	*59.18*	86.36	92.02	101.76	119.76	96.14	104.74	66.84	96.08	77.46	64.00
Diabetes	56.67	*49.28*	57.50	54.89	53.78	58.07	59.12	104.25	62.42	88.29	57.51	56.83	56.63	**44.80**
Mammographic	30.29	28.73	39.66	**27.09**	42.09	39.69	37.89	35.29	31.48	50.08	30.52	31.67	28.13	*27.10*
Ex8a	263.54	191.79	250.31	193.59	241.43	261.52	**154.35**	379.03	363.91	312.23	188.39	204.05	367.55	*168.98*
Tic	144.75	*90.08*	148.10	**89.12**	137.06	151.89	194.89	172.11	132.64	185.20	119.46	TLE	166.50	132.92
German	178.81	**124.03**	163.55	138.11	184.64	177.15	177.90	164.53	169.58	256.71	144.83	TLE	146.80	*129.60*
Splice	310.57	**134.00**	305.19	*140.50*	307.94	285.83	264.18	321.10	290.00	444.19	158.67	302.19	274.96	214.72
Gcloudb	56.49	*36.83*	63.12	38.09	48.29	71.45	42.10	116.48	158.24	73.58	37.54	45.44	45.08	**34.30**
Gcloudub	239.57	*124.60*	228.82	140.76	194.34	252.24	309.11	510.70	355.73	512.64	150.74	270.05	206.95	**119.19**
Checkerboard	140.40	233.72	146.03	91.92	100.84	121.44	159.23	528.25	529.48	619.52	*72.11*	107.50	151.65	**37.22**
Spambase	941.80	**221.00**	865.50	*247.30*	780.30	1090.40	991.00	1670.10	TLE	965.40	322.60	TLE	734.70	324.20
BaTLEa	540.70	496.30	450.10	537.10	509.10	579.50	*319.20*	2081.00	1593.80	2618.60	489.60	TLE	729.50	**221.90**
Phoneme	1742.80	**611.30**	1665.60	*622.70*	1248.10	1750.50	1332.40	1792.80	TLE	2690.90	750.70	TLE	1501.40	738.90
Ringnorm	1317.10	**386.90**	1150.40	*410.00*	1400.60	1332.20	2564.60	1959.10	TLE	2066.90	546.80	TLE	1189.30	922.80
Twonorm	525.50	**179.40**	622.30	*189.10*	574.90	531.10	398.20	2638.30	TLE	921.80	222.00	TLE	382.50	375.20
Phishing	1080.50	282.60	1366.60	*273.50*	1244.70	1396.00	1151.10	**20.00**	TLE	2500.00	374.50	TLE	578.00	322.90
Covertype	1981.60	796.50	2115.80	842.30	TLE	**20.00**	TLE	TLE	TLE	*20.00*	TLE	TLE	TLE	1008.00
Bioresponse	1182.30	**771.00**	1262.50	793.50	1112.20	1160.80	1068.80	TLE	TLE	1182.30	908.50	TLE	TLE	*777.40*
Pol	1001.00	*288.90*	938.70	**272.40**	930.90	955.60	1501.00	300.00	TLE	1001.00	404.30	TLE	1236.60	312.20

Table 6: Average Ranking of Query Strategies (↓ is better): We report query strategies with the best average ranking. The scores with ^{1}, ^{2}, or ^{3} mean the 1st, 2nd and 3rd performance on a dataset. 'TLE' means a query strategy exceeds the time limit.

	US	QBC	BALD	Hier	Graph	Core-Set	HintSVM	QUIRE	DWUS	MCM	BMDR	ALBL	LAL
Appendicitis	**4.83**^{1}	7.50	5.51^3	7.63	8.30	7.15	7.34	7.82	9.12	*5.20*^{2}	7.85	6.92	5.83
Sonar	**4.79**^{1}	6.38	*4.97*^{2}	6.83	7.52	8.35	8.04	7.79	6.71	6.19	TLE	5.39	5.04^3
Parkinsons	**3.39**^{1}	8.41	*3.79*^{2}	7.03	9.45	8.37	10.92	8.47	8.74	4.59	7.26	6.34	4.24^3
Ex8b	*5.31*^{2}	7.95	6.34	7.60	8.28	5.83	9.09	7.42	10.07	**5.08**^{1}	7.13	5.50	5.40^3
Heart	*4.89*^{2}	7.72	**4.76**^{1}	7.66	8.17	7.18	9.65	8.34	6.43	6.33	7.10	7.04	5.73^3
Haberman	**4.38**^{1}	7.69	*4.56*^{2}	7.04	8.10	8.97	9.76	9.55	6.07	4.74^3	7.07	7.95	5.12
Ionosphere	**2.67**^{1}	7.19	*2.89*^{2}	7.12	8.22	8.28	9.38	10.10	12.74	4.51	10.08	4.30	3.52^3
Clean1	**2.61**^{1}	8.13	*2.96*^{2}	8.33	8.76	7.87	8.47	7.39	8.59	5.30	TLE	5.53	4.06^3
Breast	3.98^3	8.72	*3.72*^{2}	7.14	10.02	7.43	8.88	7.50	12.97	4.24	8.64	4.88	**2.88**^{1}
Wdbc	3.67^3	9.47	*3.44*^{2}	8.15	9.35	8.41	9.57	9.02	9.54	3.95	9.59	3.71	**3.13**^{1}
Australian	**2.80**^{1}	7.75	*3.20*^{2}	7.70	7.47	8.97	10.38	8.36	8.65	4.66	8.30	8.32	4.44^3
Diabetes	**3.64**^{1}	7.15	*4.35*^{2}	6.88	7.09	7.17	10.44	8.44	10.01	4.98^3	7.20	8.14	5.51
Mammographic	3.46^3	8.69	**3.30**^{1}	7.67	8.07	9.09	8.24	9.06	9.54	*3.41*^{2}	7.51	9.07	3.89
Ex8a	4.37^3	6.10	4.42	5.90	6.16	**1.70**^{1}	11.68	10.75	10.24	4.43	TLE	8.94	*3.31*^{2}
Tic	**2.65**^{1}	5.66	*2.99*^{2}	6.47	6.84	8.49	9.32	8.31	9.24	4.59^3	TLE	7.28	6.16
German	**3.10**^{1}	7.29	*3.52*^{2}	7.81	7.23	7.41	6.87	8.24	10.92	4.14^3	TLE	6.02	5.45
Splice	**1.52**^{1}	7.30	*1.86*^{2}	7.18	8.61	9.29	9.82	6.40	11.62	3.37^3	TLE	6.62	4.41
Gcloudb	4.24^3	7.25	4.69	7.51	8.19	5.93	10.71	11.04	11.67	*4.02*^{2}	7.07	5.56	3.12^1
Gcloudub	**2.52**^{1}	6.41	3.68^3	4.91	7.13	8.75	12.44	10.70	12.45	4.51	7.60	7.05	*2.85*^{2}
Checkerboard	6.37	7.15	4.94	5.03	7.44	6.54	11.36	11.48	12.81	*3.72*^{2}	4.58^3	8.34	**1.24**^{1}
Spambase	**1.50**^{1}	7.80	*1.70*^{2}	6.80	8.10	8.30	11.00	TLE	7.80	3.30^3	TLE	6.20	3.50
Banana	5.20	5.70	5.70	3.60^3	8.20	*3.00*^{2}	10.60	TLE	10.40	5.00	TLE	7.20	**1.40**^{1}
Phoneme	**1.60**^{1}	8.10	*2.00*^{2}	5.20	8.40	6.40	10.00	TLE	10.90	3.30	TLE	7.00	3.10^3
Ringnorm	**1.40**^{1}	5.10	*1.60*^{2}	6.30	8.00	10.50	9.00	TLE	10.50	3.00^3	TLE	6.30	4.30
Twonorm	**1.30**^{1}	7.90	*1.70*^{2}	8.50	7.40	6.00	11.00	TLE	10.00	3.00^3	TLE	5.20	4.00
Phishing	**1.40**^{1}	7.90	*1.60*^{2}	7.20	8.70	6.20	10.10	TLE	10.90	3.60	TLE	5.00	3.40^3
Covertype	**1.40**^{1}	3.80	*1.90*^{2}	TLE	5.00	TLE	TLE	TLE	6.00	TLE	TLE	TLE	2.90^3
Bioresponse	*1.90*^{2}	6.40	**1.60**^{1}	6.40	6.20	8.60	TLE	TLE	6.60	3.70	TLE	TLE	3.60^3
Pol	**1.80**^{2}	5.80	**1.50**^{1}	6.20	9.80	9.20	11.00	TLE	6.70	4.00	TLE	7.30	2.70^3

4.2 Verify usefulness

We investigate the *usefulness* of query strategies in Section 4.2. The analysis of *usefulness* can uncover which query strategy brings more benefits than Uniform, offering practitioners a reality check on the effectiveness of a query strategy. Specifically, we investigate the improvement of the optimal stopping point of query strategies over Uniform. The optimal stopping point is the point where the model achieves the target accuracy with the least number of labeled examples. We refer to the *data utilization rate* (Culver et al., 2006), which is the number of labeled examples to achieve the target accuracy divided by the number of labeled examples required by Uniform. In this benchmark, we set the target accuracy as the accuracy with the total query budget minus 0.01. Table 7 shows the data utilization rate of the optimal stopping point of query strategies over Uniform. We observe that US, BALD, MCM, and LAL achieve a higher data utilization rate than Uniform on most datasets.

To further investigate the usefulness of US, we check the improved accuracy (τ) of US, BALD, Core-Set, and LAL over Uniform on effective dataset (*Covertype*) and ineffective dataset (*Checkerboard*) on average with different scales of the total budget. Figure 4 shows that the performance of US and BALD gains significant benefits on large scale dataset. However, US suffers from the sampling bias on *Checkerboard* with a small budget, while BALD is more stable. We notice that a query strategy with good performance brings more benefits at the early stage of the learning process.

Tables 4–7 demonstrate that the *Checkerboard* and *Banana* datasets pose challenges for Uncertainty Sampling. Both are synthetic two-dimensional datasets introduced in previous works (Alcala-Fdez et al., 2010; Konyushkova et al., 2017). To study the cause of the Uncertainty Sampling's failure, we visualize scatter plots at selected rounds throughout the active learning process. Specifically, we examine the size of labeled pool at 20, 200, and 800 for *Checkerboard*, while 20, 400, and 800 for *Banana*. These rounds correspond

Table 7: Data utilization rate (↓ is better): We report the data utilization rate of query strategies. The **bold** indicates the first place and *italics* indicates the second place. The scores with pink color indicate that the query strategy does not provide more benefits than Uniform. 'TLE' means a query strategy exceeds the time limit.

	US	QBC	BALD	Hier	Graph	Core-Set	HintSVM	QUIRE	DWUS	MCM	BMDR	ALBL	LAL
Appendicitis	77.96%	93.97%	**71.10%**	88.47%	84.87%	77.22%	73.31%	81.74%	101.34%	73.73%	88.66%	72.73%	*71.81%*
Sonar	94.66%	98.91%	**92.74%**	103.50%	109.41%	115.15%	107.62%	110.06%	106.54%	103.24%	103.20%	94.73%	*93.96%*
Parkinsons	**65.14%**	100.21%	70.28%	86.74%	116.07%	99.84%	123.64%	103.34%	101.74%	74.59%	92.52%	90.79%	*67.29%*
Ex8b	**90.08%**	109.88%	93.86%	95.59%	107.28%	91.14%	126.40%	104.15%	129.39%	*90.31%*	103.05%	90.49%	93.70%
Heart	*86.90%*	107.95%	**84.11%**	107.17%	97.55%	103.64%	113.07%	103.62%	109.48%	97.06%	95.77%	91.87%	89.85%
Haberman	**82.19%**	95.22%	*82.67%*	111.45%	105.52%	129.80%	161.28%	141.81%	107.57%	92.66%	104.88%	118.27%	100.55%
Ionosphere	**61.01%**	111.80%	*63.87%*	105.88%	108.81%	96.76%	119.75%	111.23%	209.02%	76.15%	139.82%	78.44%	65.46%
Clean1	**75.75%**	103.42%	*76.96%*	99.94%	104.20%	94.65%	97.48%	95.94%	100.00%	82.71%	99.69%	88.50%	82.04%
Breast	69.35%	109.64%	*66.14%*	89.34%	147.47%	95.73%	100.94%	95.69%	494.88%	71.37%	133.41%	66.72%	**49.26%**
Wdbc	64.80%	133.42%	*62.73%*	108.66%	131.75%	109.41%	138.49%	116.93%	117.16%	68.42%	119.39%	64.54%	**59.28%**
Australian	**77.16%**	115.07%	*79.27%*	107.96%	128.48%	144.82%	159.60%	127.39%	130.52%	92.17%	128.82%	111.12%	85.45%
Diabetes	93.03%	102.01%	107.05%	*89.91%*	114.95%	108.80%	181.30%	112.29%	171.75%	94.00%	105.48%	101.62%	**76.47%**
Mammographic	92.07%	120.26%	**78.18%**	124.13%	128.84%	112.22%	237.91%	103.86%	202.17%	88.01%	119.19%	82.66%	*79.15%*
Ex8a	80.82%	101.76%	82.20%	97.18%	110.12%	**62.62%**	164.20%	158.36%	134.14%	79.50%	84.62%	153.98%	*69.71%*
Tic	*80.79%*	128.22%	**79.62%**	118.52%	137.88%	151.43%	147.20%	111.52%	164.54%	105.34%	TLE	137.67%	118.43%
German	*99.67%*	119.68%	103.79%	125.82%	122.31%	139.69%	114.99%	124.65%	190.73%	113.27%	TLE	113.41%	**95.44%**
Splice	**50.12%**	109.42%	*52.06%*	110.84%	101.56%	96.64%	116.59%	97.02%	165.10%	58.39%	105.95%	99.16%	77.40%
Gcloudb	73.44%	124.36%	*71.91%*	103.12%	145.65%	78.12%	222.56%	289.43%	152.25%	72.98%	85.25%	72.23%	**64.86%**
Gcloudub	*67.80%*	118.36%	79.22%	102.15%	131.47%	168.09%	310.10%	198.38%	303.37%	87.16%	156.37%	117.76%	**66.35%**
Checkerboard	231.82%	140.07%	93.83%	110.34%	115.64%	154.47%	529.48%	543.18%	660.77%	*72.37%*	105.94%	153.28%	**39.50%**
Spambase	**25.23%**	97.59%	*28.02%*	87.65%	121.97%	106.69%	196.13%	TLE	101.91%	37.69%	TLE	82.08%	37.18%
Banana	111.31%	95.73%	121.28%	106.59%	117.47%	*65.76%*	448.34%	393.05%	574.50%	103.93%	TLE	132.50%	**43.66%**
Phoneme	**35.59%**	97.05%	*36.87%*	73.34%	103.54%	80.84%	107.40%	TLE	165.20%	43.68%	TLE	90.82%	44.67%
Ringnorm	**31.06%**	91.33%	*32.57%*	111.24%	102.61%	208.70%	158.46%	TLE	195.48%	44.30%	TLE	94.07%	73.23%
Twonorm	**34.59%**	115.91%	*36.78%*	112.05%	103.37%	75.10%	529.37%	TLE	173.40%	43.62%	TLE	73.05%	74.54%
Phishing	**27.08%**	131.84%	*28.23%*	117.78%	137.85%	109.86%	57.30%	TLE	244.87%	37.25%	TLE	55.39%	31.95%
Covertype	*41.33%*	109.86%	**40.35%**	TLE	116.98%	TLE	TLE	TLE	117.86%	TLE	TLE	TLE	46.23%
Bioresponse	*64.95%*	105.42%	**64.58%**	89.29%	96.76%	91.78%	TLE	TLE	100.00%	73.95%	TLE	TLE	66.72%
Pol	*29.38%*	96.56%	**27.82%**	96.41%	98.11%	152.58%	34.08%	TLE	100.00%	41.06%	TLE	126.70%	31.84%



Figure 4: Mean difference of accuracy (improvement) of a query strategy from Uniform on *Covertype* (left) and *Checkerboard* (right). Note that there are no results of Core-Set on *Covertype* due to the time limit (TLE).

to the initial labeled pool, the round at which Uncertainty Sampling performs worse than Uniform, and the round at which Uncertainty Sampling achieves comparable performance to Uniform, as observed in the learning curves for each dataset presented in Figure 5.

Figures 6 (*Checkerboard*) and 7 (*Banana*) illustrate existing **unexplored regions** either at the initial or during intermediate rounds. Our analysis reveals that when datasets have multiple overlapping positive and

negative regions, Uncertainty Sampling tends to query examples from these overlapping regions rather than exploring less-covered regions, particularly due to the uneven distribution of the initial labeled pool. In this paragraph, we analyze the possible reasons for the failure of US. Other related works investigating the causes of US failure is discussed in Section 5.4.



Figure 5: The learning curves (test accuracy vs. number of labeled examples) of query strategies on *Checkerboard* (left) and *Banana* (right).



Figure 6: The scatter plots of *Checkerboard* at 20 (left), 200 (middle), and 800 (right) labeled examples. We denote red points as negative examples, blue points as positive examples, and gray points as unlabeled examples. We mark an example with a **cross** in labeled pool D_{l} and others with **dot**s.



Figure 7: The scatter plots of *Banana* at 20 (left), 200 (middle), and 800 (right) labeled examples. The format is the same as the Figure 6.

Table 8: 'Mean ± standard deviation' AUBC of XGBoost for multi-class classifications (↑ is better). The scores with [1], [2], or [3] denote the 1st, 2nd and 3rd performance on a dataset. 'TLE' denotes a query strategy that exceeds the time limit. The scores with underline denote its mean AUBC is greater than Uniform's 'mean + standard deviation' AUBC.

	Uniform	US-SM	US-LC	US-ME	BALD	Core-Set	MCM
Iris	92.95%±1.88%	94.05%±0.85%	94.06%±0.84%[3]	94.01%±0.91%	*94.07%±0.85%*[2]	**94.45%±0.51%**[1]	92.87%±0.54%
Wine	92.40%±1.25%	92.95%±0.50%[3]	*92.98%±0.47%*[2]	92.94%±0.52%	**93.14%±0.52%**[1]	92.85%±0.96%	91.94%±0.64%
Abalone	88.06%±0.27%	**90.14%±0.10%**[1]	90.04%±0.10%[3]	89.92%±0.13%	*90.06%±0.11%*[2]	88.51%±0.26%	89.57%±0.17%
Academic Success	91.17%±0.21%	**92.30%±0.08%**[1]	92.28%±0.09%[3]	92.24%±0.09%	*92.29%±0.08%*[2]	91.20%±0.25%	91.73%±0.19%
Satellite	74.02%±0.32%	**74.80%±0.17%**[1]	74.44%±0.26%[3]	74.33%±0.31%	*74.49%±0.23%*[2]	74.00%±0.28%	74.38%±0.23%
Dry Bean	22.39%±0.47%	**23.08%±0.00%**[1]	*22.95%±0.09%*[2]	22.45%±0.05%	22.50%±0.44%	22.34%±0.05%	22.73%±0.08%[3]
Diabetes 130	53.92%±0.43%	**55.26%±0.44%**[1]	*54.39%±0.87%*[2]	53.77%±0.74%	TLE	54.13%±0.15%[3]	54.04%±0.58%

4.3 Expanded benchmarks: multi-class classifications and domain-specific data

4.3.1 Multi-class classification datasets

We extend the evaluation to include 7[4] multi-class classification problems to demonstrate the broad scope of the benchmark and improve the validity of the US competitive edge. The multi-class datasets cover several fields of applications such as biology, physics, climate, business, healthcare, and social science, which reveals the value of this benchmark for real-world applications (See Table 17 for details). As an initiating demo, we only adopt the query strategies that are valid for the multi-class classifications and representative of each category of query strategy described in Section 2.1. Therefore, we choose US, BALD, MCM, and Core-Set. In particular, the different uncertainty measures in US behave differently for multi-class classifications (Settles, 2012), so we compare the least confidence (US-LC), the smallest margin (US-SM), and the maximum entropy (US-ME) to verify their performance.

Table 8 demonstrates the superiority of uncertainty sampling with margins (US-SM) performing well in multi-class classifications. Although US-SM does not achieve first place in *Iris* and *Wine*, the difference between all query strategies, including Uniform, is insignificant in these datasets. In this experiment, we verify that US-SM with compatible XGBoost models would significantly improve the model's performance for the multi-class classifications.

4.3.2 Domain-specific datasets

Our benchmark also includes domain-specific datasets. One is *CIFAR-10* (Krizhevsky et al., 2009), which belongs to the computer vision (CV) domain; the other is *IMDB* (Maas et al., 2011), belonging to the natural language process (NLP) domain. We incorporate deep learning models, such as the ViT feature extractor for *CIFAR-10* and BERT tokenizer for *IMDB*, to transform the images and texts to embedding spaces[5]. Then, we treat them as tabular datasets and follow the same active learning process described in Section 3.

Table 9 shows that Uncertainty Sampling with different measures is still competitive to Uniform. In particular, US-ME stands out from other uncertainty measures, and all query strategies achieve similar performance in this experiment. The results indicate that by utilizing the feature extractor to convert image or text data to a tabular format, domain-specific tabular data essentially differs from the regular tabular structure.

In this section, we initialize the preliminary investigation on active learning for domain-specific scenarios. Specifically, we utilize feature extractors for *CIFAR-10* and *IMDB* to convert domain-specific data sets to tabular data sets and verify the feasibility of US for this protocol. However, there is still a lack of comparisons for other approaches. For example, the feature extractors for *CIFAR-10* and *IMDB* we chose are pre-trained on large-scale datasets and might be considered the 'external knowledge' for the benchmark. Such 'external knowledge' would be obtained by semi-supervised learning or self-supervised learning on both

[4]We exclude *RT-IoT2022* for this experiment because the highly imbalanced ratio of the dataset results in lacking classes for the training set when initializing the labeled pool by the default protocol (See Section 3).

[5]We used the pre-trained ViT (`https://huggingface.co/google/vit-base-patch16-224`) and BERT tokenizer (`https://huggingface.co/google-bert/bert-base-uncased`) from Hugging Face repository

Table 9: 'Mean ± standard deviation' AUBC of XGBoost for multi-class classifications (↑ is better). The scores with [1], [2], or [3] denote the 1st, 2nd and 3rd performance on a dataset. 'TLE' denotes a query strategy that exceeds the time limit. The scores with underline denote its mean AUBC is greater than Uniform's 'mean + standard deviation' AUBC.

	Uniform	US-SM	US-LC	US-ME	BALD	Core-Set	MCM
CIFAR-10	97.59%±0.11%	98.49%±0.02%[3]	98.48%±0.04%	*98.50%±0.02%*[2]	98.47%±0.03%	**98.51%±0.03%**[1]	97.02%±0.68%
IMDB	93.75%±0.09%	93.88%±0.06%	93.88%±0.06%	*93.91%±0.06%*[2]	93.90%±0.07%[3]	**93.98%±0.01%**[1]	93.89%±0.06%

labeled and unlabeled pools (Zhang et al., 2023) or from foundation models (Gupte et al., 2024). We leave the investigation on the protocol choice for domain-specific datasets and its impact on active learning methods in future work.

5 Analysis of uncertainty sampling

In this section, we first study the impact of **model compatibility** on Uncertainty Sampling, which clarifies the conflicting conclusions between our benchmark and the previous work of Zhan et al. (2021) (Section 5.1). Then, we extend the benchmark by evaluating the usefulness of Uncertainty Sampling on three real-world datasets, which are large-scale or high-dimension used in the recent tabular benchmark (Grinsztajn et al., 2022) (Section 5.2). Lastly, we study the sensitivity of active learning protocols for Uncertainty Sampling, including imbalanced datasets with the one-shot protocol, hyper-parameters/ model complexity, and query batch sizes (Section 5.3). We also present the limitations of Uncertainty Sampling to remind AL practitioners of the ineffectiveness of some tabular classification scenarios (Section 5.4).

5.1 Impact of non-compatible models for uncertainty sampling

In contrast to the broader performance comparisons in earlier sections, Section 5.1 focuses on the **model compatibility** with US. Our investigation demonstrates that the incompatibility between query-oriented and task-oriented models significantly influences the performance of US. An example of model incompatibility is that the previous benchmark adopted US with LR($C = 1$) as the query-oriented model and RBFSVM as the task-oriented model (Zhan et al., 2021).[6] Through careful analysis, we found that when non-compatible models are used (denoted as US-NC), the performance of US (denoted as US-C) notably drops, as shown in Table 19. This drop is primarily due to the misalignment of the decision boundaries between the query-oriented and task-oriented models, which can lead the query-oriented model to select samples that are not the most uncertain for the task-oriented model, as illustrated in Figure 8. In summary, our benchmarking highlights that by utilizing compatible models, US-C consistently performs better than US-NC on average.

We compare different combinations of query-oriented and task-oriented models based on LR, RBFSVM, and RF. Figure 9 and Appendix C.4 emphasize that compatible model pairs perform better than non-compatible model pairs for US, evident across 22 datasets, where the optimal AUBC score occurs with compatible models, i.e., the highest AUBC score is found along the diagonal. Although some results demonstrate that non-compatible models are slightly better than compatible models, such as *Splice* and *Banana* in Figure 18, these instances were exceptions rather than the norm in our benchmark.

In summary, we advocate for the default use of compatible model parings in US for practical applications. This setting simplifies the model selection process and can potentially yield better performance across various datasets.

5.2 Extending the usefulness of uncertainty sampling

We extend the existing benchmark to real-world datasets used in another tabular data benchmark (Grinsztajn et al., 2022) to demonstrate the usefulness of US within our current benchmark and its potential applicability

[6]See Zhan et al. (2021)'s implementation for more details `https://github.com/SineZHAN/ComparativeSurveyIJCAI2021PoolBasedAL/blob/master/Algorithm/baseline-google-binary.py#L242`.



Figure 8: Given RBFSVM as the task-oriented model, we study the non-compatible query-oriented model with LR($C = 0.1$). The red and blue points represent labeled examples. The gray points represent unlabeled examples. The cyan and magenta lines indicate the decision boundaries of query models LR($C = 0.1$) and RBFSVM trained on current labeled examples. If we adopt US, the non-compatible setting queries a sample (orange circle) that is most uncertain to LR($C = 0.1$) rather than the most uncertain sample to RBFSVM (red circle).



Figure 9: Mean AUBC of a query-oriented model (rows) and a task-oriented model (columns) on *Australian* (left) and *Phishing* (right)

and benefits across a more comprehensive array of real-world datasets. Real-world datasets include a larger number of examples, such as *Pol* and *Covertype*, and higher dimensions, such as *Bioresponse*. By extending our evaluation to these datasets, we aim to illustrate that the consistent usefulness of US is not limited to the existing benchmark.

In Figure 10, similar to Section 4.2, US could bring more benefits than Uniform at the early stage. These results affirm that US has potential as an applicable approach across large-scale and high-dimension scenarios, which encourages the exploration of US in broader applications.



Figure 10: Mean difference of AUBC (improvement) of a query strategy from Uniform on *Bioresponse* (left) and *Pol* (right).

Table 10: 'Mean ± standard deviation' weighted F1 score of XGBoost for imbalanced classifications with the one-shot protocol at 20% total budget (↑ is better). The scores with **bold** denote the best performance on a dataset. The scores with underline denote its mean AUBC is greater than Uniform's 'mean + standard deviation' AUBC.

Data	Uniform	US-SM	Core-Set	BALD	MCM
Appendicitis	80.07%±8.439%	80.15%±8.804%	**84.20%±7.734%**	*80.87%±10.225%*	80.38%±8.579%
Tic	88.99%±1.303%	**91.08%±1.147%**	88.18%±1.691%	*91.02%±1.170%*	90.13%±1.480%
Myocardial	95.14%±0.423%	95.50%±0.144%	95.21%±0.199%	*95.53%±0.133%*	**95.56%±0.096%**
Abalone	*20.98%±1.001%*	20.97%±1.039%	19.57%±1.017%	**20.99%±1.293%**	20.69%±1.073%
Dry Bean	90.83%±0.443%	*92.27%±0.203%*	90.70%±0.652%	**92.29%±0.205%**	91.33%±0.520%
Diabetes 130	*49.85%±0.853%*	**50.52%±0.872%**	49.41%±0.199%	TLE	49.31%±1.339%
RT-IoT2022	98.52%±0.250%	*99.71%±0.028%*	83.80%±10.681%	**99.72%±0.053%**	98.93%±1.054%

5.3 Sensitive of active learning protocols for uncertainty sampling

5.3.1 Outcomes of the imbalanced datasets with the one-shot protocol

We collect imbalanced datasets in our benchmark (See Table 17 for details). To evaluate the results under imbalanced data, we report the weighted F1 score[7] of datasets. We especially check the datasets with an imbalance ratio $r \geq 4$ with the one-shot protocol, where at least one label is used for each class. This scenario is practical, that the new project is initialized with only a few data for each class with an unknown label distribution of the test set.

Table 10 demonstrates that no query strategy is significantly superior on most datasets. In particular, all query strategies cannot have significant improvement over Uniform in *Appendicitis*, *Myocardial*, *Abalone*, and *Diabetes 130*. We argue that existing active learning algorithms lack consideration of imbalanced data and expect practitioners to investigate Uncertainty Sampling on imbalanced tabular datasets in future work[8].

5.3.2 Outcomes of different hyper-parameters for the query-oriented model

Previous sections illustrate that Uncertainty Sampling with compatible XGBoost task-oriented and query-oriented models is a strong baseline for our benchmark. In this section, we verify whether the change in

[7] The weighted F1 score is usually used for imbalanced datasets to handle unequal class distribution issues.

[8] Recent work investigates active learning for imbalanced datasets in the CV domain and suggests incorporating a balancing step into the labeling process to mitigate imbalance within the labeled pool (Aggarwal et al., 2020).

the model complexity of the query-oriented model would influence the Uncertainty Sampling. The model complexity of the XGBoost model is controlled by the hyper-parameters, e.g., we could reduce the proportional number of leaves in the trees by adjusting `min_child_weight` in XGBoost. Therefore, we further launched thought experiments that compare the default and best hyper-parameters of the query-oriented model on small datasets over the same structure with different hyper-parameters. Concretely, we follow the hyper-parameters tuning process in previous work (Grinsztajn et al., 2022) to get the best hyper-parameters of the XGBoost models for each dataset. Then, we create the XGBoost models with these hyper-parameters and repeat the same active learning process described in Section 3.

Figure 11 demonstrates that the query-oriented model with the best hyper-parameters obtains slightly better mean AUBC than the default hyper-parameters on most datasets. We conjecture that XGBoost, which has high model complexity, performs stably on our benchmark; hence, the tuning hyper-parameters do not affect these results too much. In summary, the compatible models with the default hyper-parameters of XGBoost would achieve good performance for most tabular datasets.



Figure 11: Mean and standard deviation AUBC of US with the default and the best hyper-parameters for XGBoost as the query-oriented model for each dataset. *Note.* We use the best hyper-parameters for XGBoost as the task-oriented model.

5.3.3 Outcomes of different query batch sizes

Early studies design the active learning algorithms based on a serial query, i.e., query an example at each round in the early stage. However, a serial query would be inefficient when the size of the query-oriented model increases or the training process becomes slower. Increasing the query batch size B at each round becomes the choice to overcome these issues. Nevertheless, directly selecting the most B-highest uncertain examples for Uncertainty Sampling might query redundant examples, resulting in inefficiency. In this section, we study the impact of increasing the batch size on US without designing complicated techniques.

Table 11 shows the degrading of Uncertainty Sampling when increasing batch size from 1 to 10, and 100, indicating the existing ineffective examples queried by batch-mode Uncertainty Sampling. While previous works made an effort to design **hybrid criteria** such as BMDR and SPAL to improve batch-mode Uncertainty Sampling, most methods suffer from the computational cost (in Appendix E) and only bring small benefits compared to Uniform (in Table 7). For future work, we suggest that the researcher consider the trade-off between the improvement over Uniform and the computational cost of their design.

5.4 Limitations of uncertainty sampling

Previous benchmarks show that query strategies may not outperform Uniform in specific settings or tasks (Yang & Loog, 2018; Desreumaux & Lemaire, 2020; Karamcheti et al., 2021; Munjal et al., 2022).

Table 11: Accuracy (↑ is better) of the model with 3000 labeled examples for the batch size $B = 1$, $B = 10$, and $B = 100$ on large-scale datasets.

Data	1 (Original)	10	100
Covertype	**79.34%**	*79.29%*	79.08%
Pol	98.29%	**98.40%**	*98.39%*
Phishing	**96.80%**	*96.75%*	96.74%
Dry Bean	**92.63%**	*92.60%*	*92.60%*
Diabetes 130	**56.48%**	*56.37%*	56.35%

Our findings demonstrated in Table 7 also indicate that uncertainty sampling does not excel on datasets like *Checkerboard* and *Banana*. Several works study possible reasons for the failure of Uncertainty Sampling (Mussmann & Liang, 2018; Karamcheti et al., 2021; Tifrea et al., 2022) to realize the applicability of active learning algorithms. It underscores the need to explore robust baselines for pool-based active learning, particularly in real-world scenarios (Lu et al., 2023).

In this work, we give the preliminary results of exploration Uncertainty Sampling for tabular datasets, covering binary classification and multi-class classification. Although Uncertainty Sampling provides promising for some of these scenarios, the usefulness and effectiveness of Uncertainty Sampling still have a gap and are unclear in domain-specific classification and imbalance learning (Johnson & Khoshgoftaar, 2019). We believe there are still potential research directions, and our protocol could help researchers explore more scenarios in future works.

6 Conclusion

This work presents the most comprehensive survey and open-source benchmark for active learning to date. Our benchmark, with its transparent and unified interface, incorporates existing GitHub repositories, providing a thorough and up-to-date comparison of active learning query strategies. We equip Uncertainty Sampling with compatible models and affirm that it remains superior to other active learning strategies as well as Uniform Sampling on most of the datasets. Furthermore, we discover that Uncertainty Sampling can be affected by the incompatibility between query-oriented and task-oriented models, resulting in discrepancies between previous benchmarks. Our affirmation suggests Uncertainty Sampling with compatible query-oriented and task-oriented models as a first-hand choice for practitioners. These insights not only enhance the community's comprehension of current active learning strategies but also establish a foundation for future research with this practical guide. We anticipate extending our framework to encompass diverse domains like vision and languages and incorporating various models such as deep neural networks, as outlined in Appendix F for future exploration.

Broader Impact Statement

Active learning is a long-term research topic in machine learning, yet achieving a consensus on the best strategies within the community is challenging. This work starts from the tabular data to build the most comprehensive open-source active learning benchmark to date. We affirm that Uncertainty Sampling (US) remains superior to other active learning strategies and Uniform on most datasets. We also clarify conflicting conclusions in previous benchmarks by carefully verifying previous settings. Our work will benefit the active learning community by providing a transparent and unified framework for evaluating active learning strategies compared to a strong baseline–US with compatible settings. We hope our work will help practitioners check the reality of existing active learning strategies and settings for different domains. Moreover, re-examine the potential issues in existing benchmarks, such as neglected settings and unpublished analysis steps.

Studying active learning beyond pursuing high accuracy is also important. For example, some AL works studied ML fairness (Anahideh et al., 2022) and privacy issues (Feyisetan et al., 2019) for ethical considerations, which are essential for using new ML/AL techniques for other fields. To study AL for different

real-world scenarios, we trust our benchmark and experimental protocol is the solid foundation for future works.

References

Umang Aggarwal, Adrian Popescu, and Céline Hudelot. Active learning for imbalanced datasets. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF winter conference on applications of computer vision*, pp. 1428–1437, 2020.

Jesus Alcala-Fdez, Alberto Fernández, Julián Luengo, J. Derrac, S Garc'ia, Luciano Sanchez, and Francisco Herrera. Keel data-mining software tool: Data set repository, integration of algorithms and experimental analysis framework. *Journal of Multiple-Valued Logic and Soft Computing*, 17:255–287, 01 2010.

Hadis Anahideh, Abolfazl Asudeh, and Saravanan Thirumuruganathan. Fair active learning. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 199:116981, 2022.

Jordan T Ash, Chicheng Zhang, Akshay Krishnamurthy, John Langford, and Alekh Agarwal. Deep batch active learning by diverse, uncertain gradient lower bounds. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1906.03671*, 2019.

Dara Bahri, Heinrich Jiang, Tal Schuster, and Afshin Rostamizadeh. Is margin all you need? an extensive empirical study of active learning on tabular data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.03822*, 2022.

Nathan Beck, Durga Sivasubramanian, Apurva Dani, Ganesh Ramakrishnan, and Rishabh Iyer. Effective evaluation of deep active learning on image classification tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.15324*, 2021.

William H Beluch, Tim Genewein, Andreas Nürnberger, and Jan M Köhler. The power of ensembles for active learning in image classification. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 9368–9377, 2018.

Etienne Brangbour, Pierrick Bruneau, Thomas Tamisier, and Stéphane Marchand-Maillet. Active learning with crowdsourcing for the cold start of imbalanced classifiers. In *CDVE*, pp. 192–201, 2020. URL `https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-60816-3_22`.

Leo Breiman. Random forests. *Machine learning*, 45:5–32, 2001.

Clemens-Alexander Brust, Christoph Käding, and Joachim Denzler. Active learning for deep object detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.09875*, 2018.

Wenbin Cai, Muhan Zhang, and Ya Zhang. Batch mode active learning for regression with expected model change. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, 28(7):1668–1681, 2016.

Gavin C Cawley. Baseline methods for active learning. In *Active Learning and Experimental Design workshop In conjunction with AISTATS 2010*, pp. 47–57. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings, 2011.

Chih-Chung Chang and Chih-Jen Lin. LIBSVM: A library for support vector machines. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology*, 2:27:1–27:27, 2011. Software available at `http://www.csie.ntu.edu.tw/~cjlin/libsvm`.

Rita Chattopadhyay, Zheng Wang, Wei Fan, Ian Davidson, Sethuraman Panchanathan, and Jieping Ye. Batch mode active sampling based on marginal probability distribution matching. *KDD : proceedings. International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, 2012:741–749, 2012.

Tianqi Chen and Carlos Guestrin. XGBoost: A scalable tree boosting system. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, KDD '16, pp. 785–794, New York, NY, USA, 2016. ACM. ISBN 978-1-4503-4232-2. doi: 10.1145/2939672.2939785. URL `http://doi.acm.org/10.1145/2939672.2939785`.

Thomas M Cover. *Elements of information theory*. John Wiley & Sons, 1999.

Matt Culver, Deng Kun, and Stephen Scott. Active learning to maximize area under the roc curve. In *Sixth International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM'06)*, pp. 149–158, 2006. doi: 10.1109/ICDM.2006.12.

Tivadar Danka and Peter Horvath. modAL: A modular active learning framework for Python. URL https://github.com/modAL-python/modAL. available on arXiv at https://arxiv.org/abs/1805.00979.

Sanjoy Dasgupta and Daniel Hsu. Hierarchical sampling for active learning. In *Proceedings of the 25th international conference on Machine learning*, pp. 208–215, 2008.

Emre Demir, Zehra Cataltepe, Umit Ekmekci, Mateusz Budnik, and Laurent Besacier. Unsupervised Active Learning For Video Annotation. In *ICML Active Learning Workshop 2015*, Lille, France, July 2015. URL https://hal.science/hal-01350092.

Louis Desreumaux and Vincent Lemaire. Learning active learning at the crossroads? evaluation and discussion. *arXiv e-prints*, art. arXiv:2012.09631, December 2020.

Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2019 conference of the North American chapter of the association for computational linguistics: human language technologies, volume 1 (long and short papers)*, pp. 4171–4186, 2019.

Pinar Donmez, Jaime G. Carbonell, and Paul N. Bennett. Dual strategy active learning. In Joost N. Kok, Jacek Koronacki, Raomon Lopez de Mantaras, Stan Matwin, Dunja Mladenič, and Andrzej Skowron (eds.), *Machine Learning: ECML 2007*, pp. 116–127, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2007. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. ISBN 978-3-540-74958-5.

Alexey Dosovitskiy, Lucas Beyer, Alexander Kolesnikov, Dirk Weissenborn, Xiaohua Zhai, Thomas Unterthiner, Mostafa Dehghani, Matthias Minderer, Georg Heigold, Sylvain Gelly, Jakob Uszkoreit, and Neil Houlsby. An image is worth 16x16 words: Transformers for image recognition at scale. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021. URL https://openreview.net/forum?id=YicbFdNTTy.

Dheeru Dua and Casey Graff. UCI machine learning repository, 2017. URL http://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml.

Sandra Ebert, Mario Fritz, and Bernt Schiele. Ralf: A reinforced active learning formulation for object class recognition. In *2012 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 3626–3633, 2012. doi: 10.1109/CVPR.2012.6248108.

Oluwaseyi Feyisetan, Thomas Drake, Borja Balle, and Tom Diethe. Privacy-preserving active learning on sensitive data for user intent classification. 2019. URL https://www.amazon.science/publications/privacy-preserving-active-learning-on-sensitive-data-for-user-intent-classification.

Yarin Gal, Riashat Islam, and Zoubin Ghahramani. Deep bayesian active learning with image data. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 1183–1192. PMLR, 2017.

Léo Grinsztajn, Edouard Oyallon, and Gaël Varoquaux. Why do tree-based models still outperform deep learning on typical tabular data? *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:507–520, 2022.

Sanket Rajan Gupte, Josiah Aklilu, Jeffrey J Nirschl, and Serena Yeung-Levy. Revisiting active learning in the era of vision foundation models. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2024. ISSN 2835-8856. URL https://openreview.net/forum?id=u8K83M9mbG.

Isabelle Guyon, Gavin Cawley, Gideon Dror, and Vincent Lemaire. Design and analysis of the wcci 2010 active learning challenge. In *The 2010 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*, pp. 1–8, 2010. doi: 10.1109/IJCNN.2010.5596506.

Isabelle Guyon, Gavin C. Cawley, Gideon Dror, and Vincent Lemaire. Results of the active learning challenge. In Isabelle Guyon, Gavin Cawley, Gideon Dror, Vincent Lemaire, and Alexander Statnikov (eds.), *Active Learning and Experimental Design workshop In conjunction with AISTATS 2010*, volume 16 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pp. 19–45, Sardinia, Italy, 16 May 2011. PMLR. URL https://proceedings.mlr.press/v16/guyon11a.html.

Zhongkai Hao, Chengqiang Lu, Zhenya Huang, Hao Wang, Zheyuan Hu, Qi Liu, Enhong Chen, and Cheekong Lee. Asgn: An active semi-supervised graph neural network for molecular property prediction. In *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, pp. 731–752, 2020.

Neil Houlsby, Ferenc Huszár, Zoubin Ghahramani, and Máté Lengyel. Bayesian active learning for classification and preference learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1112.5745*, 2011.

Wei-Ning Hsu and Hsuan-Tien Lin. Active learning by learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI)*, pp. 2659–2665, January 2015.

Sheng-jun Huang, Rong Jin, and Zhi-Hua Zhou. Active learning by querying informative and representative examples. In J. Lafferty, C. Williams, J. Shawe-Taylor, R. Zemel, and A. Culotta (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 23. Curran Associates, Inc., 2010. URL `https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2010/file/5487315b1286f907165907aa8fc96619-Paper.pdf`.

Yilin Ji, Daniel Kaestner, Oliver Wirth, and Christian Wressnegger. Randomness is the root of all evil: More reliable evaluation of deep active learning. In *2023 IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision (WACV)*, pp. 3932–3941, 2023. doi: 10.1109/WACV56688.2023.00393.

Justin M Johnson and Taghi M Khoshgoftaar. Survey on deep learning with class imbalance. *Journal of big data*, 6(1):1–54, 2019.

Ashish Kapoor, Eric Horvitz, and Sumit Basu. Selective supervision: guiding supervised learning with decision-theoretic active learning. In *Proceedings of the 20th International Joint Conference on Artifical Intelligence*, IJCAI'07, pp. 877–882, San Francisco, CA, USA, 2007. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc.

Siddharth Karamcheti, Ranjay Krishna, Li Fei-Fei, and Christopher Manning. Mind your outliers! investigating the negative impact of outliers on active learning for visual question answering. In *Proceedings of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pp. 7265–7281, Online, August 2021. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2021.acl-long.564. URL `https://aclanthology.org/2021.acl-long.564`.

Jeeveswaran Kishaan, Mohandass Muthuraja, Deebul Nair, and Paul-Gerhard Plöger. Using active learning for assisted short answer grading. 2020.

Ksenia Konyushkova, Raphael Sznitman, and Pascal Fua. Learning active learning from data. In I. Guyon, U. Von Luxburg, S. Bengio, H. Wallach, R. Fergus, S. Vishwanathan, and R. Garnett (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 30. Curran Associates, Inc., 2017. URL `https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2017/file/8ca8da41fe1ebc8d3ca31dc14f5fc56c-Paper.pdf`.

Daniel Kottke, Adrian Calma, Denis Huseljic, GM Krempl, Bernhard Sick, et al. Challenges of reliable, realistic and comparable active learning evaluation. In *Proceedings of the Workshop and Tutorial on Interactive Adaptive Learning*, pp. 2–14, 2017.

Daniel Kottke, Marek Herde, Tuan Pham Minh, Alexander Benz, Pascal Mergard, Atal Roghman, Christoph Sandrock, and Bernhard Sick. scikit-activeml: A Library and Toolbox for Active Learning Algorithms. *Preprints*, 2021. doi: 10.20944/preprints202103.0194.v1. URL `https://github.com/scikit-activeml/scikit-activeml`.

Jan Kremer, Kim Steenstrup Pedersen, and Christian Igel. Active learning with support vector machines. *Wiley Int. Rev. Data Min. and Knowl. Disc.*, 4(4):313–326, jul 2014. ISSN 1942-4787. doi: 10.1002/widm.1132. URL `https://doi.org/10.1002/widm.1132`.

Alex Krizhevsky, Geoffrey Hinton, et al. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. 2009.

Chun-Liang Li, Chun-Sung Ferng, and Hsuan-Tien Lin. Active learning using hint information. *Neural computation*, 27(8):1738–1765, 2015.

Xin Li and Yuhong Guo. Adaptive active learning for image classification. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 859–866, 2013.

Qiang Liu, Yanqiao Zhu, Zhaocheng Liu, Yufeng Zhang, and Shu Wu. Deep active learning for text classification with diverse interpretations. In *Proceedings of the 30th ACM International Conference on Information & Knowledge Management*, pp. 3263–3267, 2021.

Yash-yee Logan, Mohit Prabhushankar, and Ghassan AlRegib. Decal: Deployable clinical active learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.10120*, 2022.

Po-Yi Lu, Chun-Liang Li, and Hsuan-Tien Lin. A more robust baseline for active learning by injecting randomness to uncertainty sampling. In *Proceedings of the AI and HCI Workshop @ ICML*, July 2023.

Carsten T Lüth, Till J Bungert, Lukas Klein, and Paul F Jaeger. Toward realistic evaluation of deep active learning algorithms in image classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.10625*, 2023.

Andrew L. Maas, Raymond E. Daly, Peter T. Pham, Dan Huang, Andrew Y. Ng, and Christopher Potts. Learning word vectors for sentiment analysis. In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies*, pp. 142–150, Portland, Oregon, USA, June 2011. Association for Computational Linguistics. URL `http://www.aclweb.org/anthology/P11-1015`.

Prateek Munjal, Nasir Hayat, Munawar Hayat, Jamshid Sourati, and Shadab Khan. Towards robust and reproducible active learning using neural networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 223–232, 2022.

Stephen Mussmann and Percy Liang. On the relationship between data efficiency and error for uncertainty sampling. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 3674–3682. PMLR, 2018.

S Deepak Narayanan, Apoorv Agnihotri, and Nipun Batra. Active learning for air quality station deployment. 2020.

V. Nath, Dong Yang, Bennett A. Landman, Daguang Xu, and Holger R. Roth. Diminishing uncertainty within the training pool: Active learning for medical image segmentation. *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging*, 40:2534–2547, 2020.

Hieu T Nguyen and Arnold Smeulders. Active learning using pre-clustering. In *Proceedings of the twenty-first international conference on Machine learning*, pp. 79, 2004.

Lukas Rauch, Matthias Aßenmacher, Denis Huseljic, Moritz Wirth, Bernd Bischl, and Bernhard Sick. Activeglae: A benchmark for deep active learning with transformers. In *Joint European Conference on Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*, pp. 55–74. Springer, 2023.

Nicholas Roy and Andrew McCallum. Toward optimal active learning through sampling estimation of error reduction. In *Proceedings of the Eighteenth International Conference on Machine Learning*, ICML '01, pp. 441–448, San Francisco, CA, USA, 2001. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc. ISBN 1558607781.

Andrew I. Schein and Lyle H. Ungar. Active learning for logistic regression: an evaluation. *Machine Learning*, 68(3):235–265, 2007. doi: 10.1007/s10994-007-5019-5. URL `https://doi.org/10.1007/s10994-007-5019-5`.

Christopher Schröder, Andreas Niekler, and Martin Potthast. Revisiting uncertainty-based query strategies for active learning with transformers. In *Findings*, 2021. URL `https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:235828923`.

Ozan Sener and Silvio Savarese. Active learning for convolutional neural networks: A core-set approach. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018. URL `https://openreview.net/forum?id=H1aIuk-RW`.

Burr Settles. *Active Learning*, volume 6. Springer, 7 2012. doi: 10.2200/S00429ED1V01Y201207AIM018. URL https://www.morganclaypool.com/doi/abs/10.2200/S00429ED1V01Y201207AIM018?ai=1ge&mi=6e3g68&af=R.

H Sebastian Seung, Manfred Opper, and Haim Sompolinsky. Query by committee. In *Proceedings of the fifth annual workshop on Computational learning theory*, pp. 287–294, 1992.

Changjian Shui, Fan Zhou, Christian Gagné, and Boyu Wang. Deep active learning: Unified and principled method for query and training. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pp. 1308–1318. PMLR, 2020.

Samarth Sinha, Sayna Ebrahimi, and Trevor Darrell. Variational adversarial active learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pp. 5972–5981, 2019.

Ying-Peng Tang and Sheng-Jun Huang. Self-paced active learning: Query the right thing at the right time. *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 33(01):5117–5124, Jul. 2019. doi: 10.1609/aaai.v33i01.33015117. URL https://ojs.aaai.org/index.php/AAAI/article/view/4445.

Ying-Peng Tang, Guo-Xiang Li, and Sheng-Jun Huang. ALiPy: Active learning in python. Technical report, Nanjing University of Aeronautics and Astronautics, 1 2019. URL https://github.com/NUAA-AL/ALiPy. available as arXiv preprint https://arxiv.org/abs/1901.03802.

Alexandru Tifrea, Jacob Clarysse, and Fanny Yang. Uniform versus uncertainty sampling: When being active is less efficient than staying passive. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.00772*, 2022.

Holger Trittenbach, Adrian Englhardt, and Klemens Böhm. An overview and a benchmark of active learning for outlier detection with one-class classifiers. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 168:114372, 2021. ISSN 0957-4174. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2020.114372. URL https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0957417420310496.

Zheng Wang and Jieping Ye. Querying discriminative and representative samples for batch mode active learning. *ACM Trans. Knowl. Discov. Data*, 9(3), feb 2015. ISSN 1556-4681. doi: 10.1145/2700408. URL https://doi.org/10.1145/2700408.

Thorben Werner, Johannes Burchert, Maximilian Stubbemann, and Lars Schmidt-Thieme. A cross-domain benchmark for active learning. In *The Thirty-eight Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems Datasets and Benchmarks Track*, 2024. URL https://openreview.net/forum?id=OOItbUUQcd.

Dongrui Wu, Chin-Teng Lin, and Jian Huang. Active learning for regression using greedy sampling. *Information Sciences*, 474:90–105, 2019.

Zhao Xu, Kai Yu, Volker Tresp, Xiaowei Xu, and Jizhi Wang. Representative sampling for text classification using support vector machines. In Fabrizio Sebastiani (ed.), *Advances in Information Retrieval*, pp. 393–407, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2003. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. ISBN 978-3-540-36618-8.

Yao-Yuan Yang, Shao-Chuan Lee, Yu-An Chung, Tung-En Wu, Si-An Chen, and Hsuan-Tien Lin. libact: Pool-based active learning in python. Technical report, National Taiwan University, 10 2017. URL https://github.com/ntucllab/libact. available as arXiv preprint https://arxiv.org/abs/1710.00379.

Yazhou Yang and Marco Loog. A benchmark and comparison of active learning for logistic regression. *Pattern Recognition*, 83:401–415, 2018. ISSN 0031-3203. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.patcog.2018.06.004. URL https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0031320318302140.

Yi Yang, Zhigang Ma, Feiping Nie, Xiaojun Chang, and Alexander G Hauptmann. Multi-class active learning by uncertainty sampling with diversity maximization. *International Journal of Computer Vision*, 113:113–127, 2015.

rostamiz Yilei "Dolee" Yang. Active learning playground. https://github.com/google/active-learning, 2017. URL https://github.com/google/active-learning.

Donggeun Yoo and In So Kweon. Learning loss for active learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 93–102, 2019.

Michelle Yuan, Hsuan-Tien Lin, and Jordan Boyd-Graber. Cold-start active learning through self-supervised language modeling. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, November 2020.

Tianning Yuan, Fang Wan, Mengying Fu, Jianzhuang Liu, Songcen Xu, Xiangyang Ji, and Qixiang Ye. Multiple instance active learning for object detection. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 5330–5339, 2021.

Xueying Zhan, Huan Liu, Qing Li, and Antoni B. Chan. A comparative survey: Benchmarking for pool-based active learning. In Zhi-Hua Zhou (ed.), *Proceedings of the Thirtieth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-21*, pp. 4679–4686. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization, 8 2021. doi: 10.24963/ijcai.2021/634. URL `https://doi.org/10.24963/ijcai.2021/634`. Survey Track.

Xueying Zhan, Qingzhong Wang, Kuan-hao Huang, Haoyi Xiong, Dejing Dou, and Antoni B Chan. A comparative survey of deep active learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.13450*, 2022.

Hongjing Zhang, SS Ravi, and Ian Davidson. A graph-based approach for active learning in regression. In *Proceedings of the 2020 SIAM International Conference on Data Mining*, pp. 280–288. SIAM, 2020.

Jifan Zhang, Yifang Chen, Gregory Canal, Stephen Mussmann, Arnav M Das, Gantavya Bhatt, Yinglun Zhu, Jeffrey Bilmes, Simon Shaolei Du, Kevin Jamieson, et al. Labelbench: A comprehensive framework for benchmarking adaptive label-efficient learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.09910*, 2023.

Zhisong Zhang, Emma Strubell, and Eduard Hovy. A survey of active learning for natural language processing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.10109*, 2022.

Table 12: Accuracy of the model with 10% labeled examples: We report the accuracy of the model with 10% labeled examples on each dataset. The **bold** indicates the first place. 'TLE' means a query strategy exceeds the time limit.

	Uniform	US	QBC	BALD	Hier	Graph	Core-Set	HintSVM	QUIRE	DWUS	MCM	BMDR	ALBL	LAL
Ionosphere	74.99%	75.43%	74.94%	74.91%	74.57%	74.86%	75.82%	74.91%	75.30%	74.31%	74.83%	75.06%	75.25%	**75.96%**
Clean1	62.60%	62.65%	62.32%	62.39%	**63.36%**	61.67%	62.52%	61.93%	62.60%	62.60%	61.44%	61.71%	62.82%	62.88%
Breast	93.33%	94.95%	93.13%	94.68%	94.26%	90.32%	93.61%	93.74%	93.56%	90.49%	94.65%	93.18%	94.73%	**95.88%**
Wdbc	90.54%	90.28%	90.58%	91.38%	90.09%	87.78%	91.33%	90.49%	90.96%	90.07%	89.88%	89.29%	91.92%	**92.32%**
Australian	81.00%	**83.13%**	81.17%	82.96%	81.37%	80.44%	76.49%	78.11%	77.38%	79.75%	80.85%	80.20%	80.11%	82.36%
Diabetes	70.22%	**72.07%**	70.52%	71.40%	70.85%	69.98%	69.25%	69.34%	68.88%	69.30%	70.90%	70.29%	70.43%	71.68%
Mammographic	79.92%	81.45%	79.38%	**81.76%**	79.46%	79.40%	79.61%	78.65%	79.07%	78.72%	81.32%	79.29%	80.26%	81.56%
Ex8a	79.53%	79.62%	79.70%	78.66%	79.49%	78.32%	**83.99%**	76.19%	76.52%	71.73%	78.38%	82.90%	79.19%	82.25%
Tic	86.54%	**88.12%**	86.63%	87.95%	86.46%	84.66%	87.33%	85.39%	85.46%	81.19%	87.07%	TLE	87.58%	87.09%
German	69.23%	**70.75%**	69.46%	70.37%	69.11%	69.35%	68.96%	69.18%	69.28%	68.47%	69.64%	TLE	69.29%	70.45%
Splice	83.16%	**84.98%**	82.06%	84.91%	82.45%	75.17%	76.06%	78.42%	83.03%	79.81%	81.08%	80.61%	81.79%	82.71%
Gcloudb	86.36%	89.11%	86.39%	88.86%	87.14%	83.93%	87.18%	84.21%	84.60%	84.17%	88.84%	87.09%	87.57%	**89.15%**
Gcloudub	88.19%	88.91%	88.41%	87.93%	88.47%	86.93%	86.82%	82.97%	84.66%	79.88%	86.87%	87.70%	86.01%	**90.77%**
Checkerboard	97.32%	95.81%	97.08%	97.67%	97.93%	96.57%	96.78%	90.18%	87.09%	75.27%	98.66%	98.23%	94.78%	**99.80%**
Spambase	90.77%	**93.85%**	89.93%	93.62%	90.63%	90.97%	88.96%	85.38%	TLE	90.85%	93.11%	TLE	91.09%	93.04%
Banana	85.76%	83.20%	86.17%	82.74%	86.53%	83.44%	87.51%	69.76%	62.64%	70.87%	84.51%	TLE	85.29%	**88.43%**
Phoneme	81.66%	**85.13%**	80.97%	84.77%	82.30%	80.62%	81.45%	78.38%	TLE	76.87%	83.62%	TLE	81.47%	83.64%
Ringnorm	89.55%	93.89%	89.92%	**94.02%**	87.82%	57.35%	54.17%	55.70%	TLE	57.73%	92.03%	TLE	88.21%	89.32%
Twonorm	93.97%	95.92%	93.56%	**95.95%**	93.31%	93.73%	94.45%	80.79%	TLE	92.31%	95.70%	TLE	94.50%	94.42%
Phishing	92.17%	94.62%	92.06%	**94.84%**	91.76%	91.18%	92.22%	90.97%	TLE	87.74%	93.80%	TLE	93.20%	94.28%
Covertype	70.98%	**73.70%**	70.22%	73.43%	TLE	64.46%	TLE	61.73%	TLE	58.76%	67.50%	TLE	66.92%	71.90%
Bioresponse	66.64%	68.38%	66.74%	**68.99%**	65.45%	65.64%	63.52%	60.64%	TLE	66.64%	67.77%	TLE	66.55%	67.88%
Pol	93.24%	96.67%	93.27%	**96.84%**	92.96%	84.26%	85.70%	75.77%	TLE	93.24%	95.24%	TLE	93.67%	96.15%

A Detailed benchmarking results of XGBoost

We present more settings of the benchmarking results for XGBoost for verifying the superiority of query strategies in Section 4.1. We check the accuracy of the model with different ratios, e.g., 10% and 30% of labeled examples on each dataset. Tables 12 and 13 also confirm that US outperforms other query strategies on most datasets. It is worth mentioning that LAL achieves good performance on *Gcloudb*, *Gcloudub*, and *Checkerboard* when the ratio of labeled examples is 10%. However, these datasets are synthetic, and their features may be more similar to the pre-trained datasets used by LAL, resulting in LAL's exceptional performance on these datasets.

We also extend the Table 5 to the number of queried examples required to reach 90% and 95% of the model's performance trained on the full budget. Table 14 demonstrates that Uncertainty Sampling stably achieves first place or second place on 14 datasets. Similarly, Table 15 demonstrates that Uncertainty Sampling achieves first place or second place on 15 datasets. These results verify that Uncertainty Sampling is competitive in our benchmark.

B Revision of Zhan et al. (2021)

In this section, we reveal and revise descriptions in Zhan et al. (2021) to study the conflicting conclusions in previous benchmarks and provide clear information to the active learning community. We appreciate that Zhan et al. (2021) published their source code on GitHub.[9] Thus we could examine the difference from our settings.

B.1 Experimental Settings

Inputs and base models. At the initial setup, Zhan et al. (2021) employed a random split of 60% of the dataset for the training set and the remaining 40% for the testing set. No pre-processing was applied to the dataset, and fixed random seeds were used to ensure consistency in the training and testing sets across repeated experiments. They used an RBFSVM as the task-oriented model for evaluating the query strategies.

[9] `https://github.com/SineZHAN/ComparativeSurveyIJCAI2021PoolBasedAL`

Table 13: Accuracy of the model with 30% labeled examples: We report the accuracy of the model with 30% labeled examples on each dataset. The **bold** indicates the first place. 'TLE' means a query strategy exceeds the time limit.

	Uniform	US	QBC	BALD	Hier	Graph	Core-Set	HintSVM	QUIRE	DWUS	MCM	BMDR	ALBL	LAL
Sonar	71.18%	71.71%	70.73%	71.90%	70.89%	71.02%	67.89%	69.06%	70.20%	71.43%	70.10%	**72.37%**	71.75%	71.99%
Parkinsons	81.44%	**84.95%**	81.88%	84.38%	81.87%	81.95%	81.58%	80.50%	81.74%	81.74%	83.74%	82.67%	83.21%	84.08%
Ex8b	82.76%	84.21%	82.99%	83.14%	83.11%	82.54%	84.42%	81.99%	83.48%	81.54%	83.88%	83.51%	84.40%	**84.87%**
Heart	77.78%	**79.78%**	77.90%	79.50%	77.85%	77.84%	78.07%	76.76%	77.99%	77.84%	78.29%	78.49%	78.37%	79.27%
Haberman	68.87%	**71.21%**	68.41%	70.92%	69.58%	68.96%	68.54%	67.49%	67.65%	69.13%	70.33%	69.24%	68.85%	70.33%
Ionosphere	85.97%	**90.30%**	86.70%	90.27%	87.21%	87.41%	84.42%	84.07%	79.92%	78.34%	88.85%	81.04%	88.76%	89.99%
Clean1	72.59%	**74.79%**	72.52%	74.26%	72.36%	72.40%	71.87%	72.59%	72.87%	72.59%	72.54%	72.03%	73.59%	74.59%
Breast	95.68%	96.69%	95.77%	96.76%	96.26%	95.52%	96.08%	95.74%	95.99%	90.15%	96.64%	95.62%	96.36%	**96.81%**
Wdbc	93.73%	95.95%	93.77%	95.95%	94.28%	93.86%	94.07%	92.98%	93.94%	93.58%	95.94%	93.71%	95.75%	**95.99%**
Australian	84.59%	**86.25%**	84.62%	86.12%	84.56%	85.00%	84.50%	82.80%	84.79%	83.76%	86.00%	84.76%	84.91%	85.77%
Diabetes	72.60%	**74.27%**	72.84%	73.84%	72.72%	73.12%	73.19%	70.34%	72.86%	71.05%	73.59%	72.59%	72.54%	72.78%
Mammographic	79.53%	82.05%	79.27%	82.07%	79.42%	78.87%	79.10%	79.10%	79.60%	78.65%	**82.08%**	79.89%	79.17%	81.69%
Ex8a	91.08%	92.63%	91.30%	92.75%	91.20%	91.01%	**94.96%**	77.68%	80.40%	82.04%	93.09%	92.75%	88.08%	93.89%
Tic	90.12%	91.07%	90.12%	**91.29%**	90.11%	90.15%	89.58%	89.37%	90.21%	88.67%	90.78%	TLE	89.79%	90.11%
German	72.16%	**73.73%**	72.50%	73.56%	72.35%	72.71%	72.11%	72.40%	71.84%	70.83%	73.47%	TLE	72.96%	73.24%
Splice	91.53%	**95.47%**	91.53%	95.17%	91.36%	91.75%	90.43%	89.53%	91.76%	87.21%	94.79%	91.80%	91.82%	92.98%
Gcloudb	88.09%	89.06%	88.20%	89.03%	88.23%	88.33%	88.56%	84.96%	84.50%	85.99%	89.15%	88.26%	88.62%	**89.27%**
Gcloudub	92.67%	**95.38%**	92.52%	94.84%	93.37%	92.76%	90.66%	84.03%	87.36%	81.48%	94.49%	91.84%	91.76%	94.42%
Checkerboard	99.29%	97.22%	99.19%	99.76%	99.61%	99.16%	99.47%	91.51%	91.71%	79.49%	99.65%	99.56%	99.29%	**99.81%**
Spambase	93.10%	**95.14%**	93.22%	95.11%	93.45%	93.07%	92.99%	90.03%	TLE	93.16%	94.88%	TLE	93.49%	95.04%
Banana	88.02%	89.08%	87.83%	88.98%	87.86%	87.75%	87.96%	74.16%	79.78%	76.83%	**89.16%**	TLE	87.43%	88.98%
Phoneme	85.14%	**88.47%**	85.14%	88.20%	86.02%	84.93%	85.59%	83.45%	TLE	80.68%	88.15%	TLE	85.15%	88.00%
Ringnorm	94.22%	96.15%	94.59%	**96.32%**	93.38%	94.01%	51.04%	64.64%	TLE	55.09%	96.12%	TLE	94.06%	94.94%
Twonorm	95.67%	96.76%	95.67%	**96.77%**	95.76%	95.73%	96.03%	77.35%	TLE	95.08%	96.75%	TLE	96.02%	96.57%
Phishing	94.09%	96.56%	93.67%	96.55%	93.79%	93.98%	93.83%	91.96%	TLE	91.03%	96.38%	TLE	94.81%	**96.60%**
Covertype	73.54%	**76.30%**	73.16%	76.25%	TLE	65.82%	TLE	63.94%	TLE	60.21%	73.13%	TLE	69.72%	74.64%
Bioresponse	72.11%	74.10%	72.51%	**74.72%**	71.91%	73.20%	69.89%	69.11%	TLE	72.11%	73.33%	TLE	71.76%	73.78%
Pol	96.34%	**98.28%**	96.22%	98.25%	96.41%	96.70%	94.84%	91.99%	TLE	96.34%	98.14%	TLE	95.93%	98.25%

Table 14: The minimum number of queried examples required to reach 90% accuracy (↓ is better) of the model: The **bold** indicates the first place and *italics* indicates the second place. 'TLE' means a query strategy exceeds the time limit.

	Uniform	US	QBC	BALD	Hier	Graph	Core-Set	HintSVM	QUIRE	DWUS	MCM	BMDR	ALBL	LAL
Appendicitis	20.88	**20.62**	21.16	20.71	20.89	21.32	20.85	20.98	21.09	21.82	*20.64*	21.04	20.87	20.82
Sonar	34.95	33.94	34.65	34.23	33.62	35.54	39.05	38.70	33.47	35.75	34.23	**31.54**	33.84	*32.67*
Parkinsons	26.22	*23.29*	26.81	23.68	25.02	27.32	26.84	32.36	27.29	26.10	24.09	24.74	24.61	**23.28**
Ex8b	25.01	23.57	24.60	23.24	24.67	23.34	*23.02*	27.20	24.15	26.79	23.36	23.03	23.13	**22.07**
Heart	23.35	23.20	23.34	*22.76*	23.28	23.93	22.76	24.40	22.98	24.64	23.74	23.85	**22.69**	23.13
Haberman	20.45	*20.32*	20.51	20.51	20.60	20.62	22.09	20.95	21.21	20.54	**20.26**	20.53	20.40	20.47
Ionosphere	35.05	30.38	32.74	30.02	32.79	38.32	32.26	35.42	39.80	93.23	32.94	50.42	**27.56**	*28.05*
Clean1	97.02	85.99	99.13	*85.04*	102.03	101.63	102.60	101.68	96.60	97.02	97.67	104.31	87.96	**84.58**
Breast	21.04	20.88	20.95	22.25	20.89	24.60	20.98	21.03	20.85	44.26	20.88	21.50	*20.53*	**20.35**
Wdbc	23.33	23.00	23.38	22.37	22.63	25.25	22.04	23.56	22.42	23.41	23.00	24.37	*21.53*	**20.92**
Australian	25.02	24.35	24.61	**23.85**	25.30	26.25	30.30	33.27	28.87	26.19	27.65	26.27	26.89	*24.32*
Diabetes	22.42	*22.02*	22.99	22.30	22.02	22.87	22.53	23.22	22.80	25.03	23.36	23.37	**21.86**	22.16
Mammographic	21.07	**20.28**	20.40	20.70	20.39	20.44	20.49	*20.29*	20.33	20.99	20.83	20.39	20.33	20.38
Ex8a	74.56	76.86	76.89	75.54	79.67	71.65	**55.77**	248.32	214.78	154.69	82.22	63.65	99.55	*58.75*
Tic	22.80	*21.60*	23.68	22.06	22.40	24.23	22.12	24.19	25.99	27.35	21.70	TLE	**21.55**	22.04
German	29.63	**27.72**	30.15	*28.29*	29.54	29.94	30.92	33.47	32.72	35.41	28.32	TLE	30.26	29.29
Splice	71.31	**57.28**	77.10	*57.87*	75.11	91.75	107.48	107.19	70.71	120.35	73.65	80.92	77.76	69.37
Gcloudb	22.37	22.99	22.41	22.18	22.18	24.08	**20.92**	21.53	22.42	24.02	22.84	*21.15*	21.19	21.28
Gcloudub	38.13	38.29	36.94	45.03	36.18	41.46	35.65	84.29	60.09	206.32	44.59	**35.10**	38.94	*35.51*
Checkerboard	39.15	95.46	41.08	41.61	37.36	41.37	33.60	126.14	93.89	420.74	45.56	*30.83*	53.35	**28.22**
Spambase	63.70	**37.10**	53.10	40.70	59.60	91.80	83.60	184.30	TLE	61.60	46.90	TLE	56.10	*38.10*
BaTLEa	73.10	222.50	85.20	201.90	*72.10*	195.10	**67.00**	1040.10	617.60	777.70	173.90	TLE	127.90	79.20
Phoneme	120.50	102.20	193.70	101.70	*99.60*	227.00	165.20	325.10	TLE	573.90	112.50	TLE	138.80	**91.40**
Ringnorm	165.90	**101.20**	162.70	*104.70*	209.60	478.60	2255.00	1333.50	TLE	2484.30	172.20	TLE	228.20	138.50
Twonorm	52.50	**38.40**	65.70	39.10	78.70	68.60	55.60	1359.60	TLE	80.60	54.10	TLE	50.70	*39.00*
Phishing	22.30	22.40	23.20	*21.90*	25.50	30.80	24.00	25.60	TLE	52.40	22.00	TLE	**21.30**	22.80
Covertype	164.00	*110.80*	130.10	146.60	TLE	1689.20	TLE	TLE	TLE	**20.00**	TLE	TLE	TLE	129.70
Bioresponse	291.00	*201.70*	225.10	**174.60**	267.10	249.40	450.10	TLE	TLE	291.00	222.50	TLE	TLE	213.20
Pol	86.00	*62.80*	79.60	69.20	105.80	649.20	286.70	531.60	TLE	86.00	96.40	TLE	78.30	**58.60**

Query strategies. To compare the performance of 17 query strategies, they implemented random sampling and all query strategies using different libraries. The libact library provided implementations for Uncertainty Sampling (US), Query by Committee (QBC), Hinted Support Vector Machine (HintSVM),

Table 15: The minimum number of queried examples required to reach 99% accuracy (↓ is better) of the model: The **bold** indicates the first place and *italics* indicates the second place. 'TLE' means a query strategy exceeds the time limit.

	Uniform	US	QBC	BALD	Hier	Graph	Core-Set	HintSVM	QUIRE	DWUS	MCM	BMDR	ALBL	LAL
Appendicitis	24.56	*22.39*	24.72	22.69	23.65	24.23	23.93	23.05	24.41	26.31	**22.24**	24.22	23.36	22.46
Sonar	51.31	48.78	51.26	*47.09*	51.27	53.33	55.92	55.22	51.48	53.32	50.29	49.14	49.01	**46.11**
Parkinsons	41.89	**29.74**	41.95	*31.35*	36.36	44.87	42.01	52.58	40.87	41.77	32.14	36.16	34.49	31.69
Ex8b	34.15	30.30	34.30	31.70	32.04	34.86	*29.73*	39.04	33.11	42.11	30.27	32.50	30.51	**28.12**
Heart	28.16	28.83	30.43	*27.84*	29.53	30.43	27.85	31.22	28.53	31.49	30.53	30.13	**27.62**	28.60
Haberman	22.17	21.35	21.32	*21.27*	21.70	21.59	22.86	23.73	22.91	21.95	**21.06**	21.49	21.53	21.36
Ionosphere	57.59	*38.77*	51.75	38.94	54.52	56.78	53.82	58.17	63.56	145.18	45.75	84.66	39.71	**37.18**
Clean1	154.98	**116.87**	149.53	*117.15*	152.53	156.88	145.54	145.98	143.03	154.98	129.95	149.07	129.58	121.23
Breast	27.80	26.48	27.98	26.80	24.51	38.88	26.27	28.45	24.37	110.20	26.50	29.27	*23.51*	**21.66**
Wdbc	33.43	33.02	35.83	29.50	35.15	38.93	30.16	36.22	30.91	37.32	33.26	37.70	*26.67*	**25.62**
Australian	36.67	*29.97*	34.00	**29.72**	35.67	37.48	43.39	53.25	43.54	43.85	35.10	39.84	38.07	30.29
Diabetes	30.10	28.37	32.14	31.09	*28.33*	31.92	31.15	45.45	33.72	41.25	32.06	33.58	29.50	**26.06**
Mammographic	22.50	21.49	22.24	21.42	23.53	23.99	21.87	22.20	*21.11*	25.54	23.82	21.67	21.16	**21.01**
Ex8a	137.20	131.24	136.96	127.49	133.07	131.67	**87.53**	303.87	292.35	236.73	125.00	107.80	213.37	*92.54*
Tic	38.18	**31.05**	39.40	*31.64*	36.90	43.42	36.85	48.37	42.04	66.66	33.24	TLE	34.47	35.07
German	77.75	**53.58**	61.17	58.86	73.46	72.13	75.27	66.40	70.93	99.70	57.47	TLE	58.21	*54.55*
Splice	136.05	**85.07**	136.84	*85.34*	134.67	139.17	165.62	172.66	133.49	263.52	106.11	138.55	137.54	112.67
Gcloudb	28.93	28.11	32.15	26.43	28.58	39.38	*25.40*	32.25	38.50	37.28	27.56	26.09	27.03	**24.57**
Gcloudub	89.46	70.17	78.74	80.73	*63.78*	76.47	89.61	325.75	178.15	364.91	93.69	88.56	99.21	**59.37**
Checkerboard	55.70	195.19	59.63	61.28	47.50	58.96	54.86	276.80	239.73	584.71	56.07	*43.10*	85.12	**32.18**
Spambase	223.00	*81.20*	256.90	**78.70**	180.20	205.40	252.20	620.00	TLE	220.00	114.10	TLE	167.80	96.80
BaTLEa	141.90	337.30	153.70	349.30	144.40	313.00	**105.80**	1474.50	888.20	1761.10	286.30	TLE	182.30	*112.00*
Phoneme	509.70	**226.40**	527.30	*233.70*	427.00	442.00	445.00	880.60	TLE	1455.90	303.60	TLE	556.80	296.00
Ringnorm	390.40	*175.10*	354.40	**169.20**	481.80	546.80	2337.70	1503.90	TLE	2621.40	253.00	TLE	442.80	361.00
Twonorm	127.50	*62.10*	123.50	**61.30**	176.20	140.80	121.30	2320.40	TLE	218.30	93.20	TLE	89.70	73.30
Phishing	99.00	*47.20*	101.40	**46.80**	75.00	215.70	83.30	138.90	TLE	695.40	70.70	TLE	80.50	53.50
Covertype	642.20	*231.90*	759.80	248.40	TLE	561.70	TLE	TLE	TLE	**20.00**	TLE	TLE	TLE	421.80
Bioresponse	602.40	*374.70*	540.10	**354.60**	560.40	529.00	713.60	TLE	TLE	602.40	496.50	TLE	TLE	447.30
Pol	224.10	131.40	227.20	**122.00**	290.30	772.60	429.40	1009.80	TLE	224.10	175.20	TLE	205.30	*124.50*

QUerying Informative and REpresentative Examples (QUIRE), Active Learning by Learning (ALBL), Density Weighted Uncertainty Sampling (DWUS), and Variation Reduction (VR). The Google library included Random Sampling (Uniform), k-Center-Greedy (KCenter or Core-Set), Margin-based Uncertainty Sampling (Margin), Graph Density (Graph), Hierarchical Sampling (Hier), Informative Cluster Diverse (InfoDiv), and Representative Sampling (MCM). The ALiPy library contributed Estimation of Error Reduction (EER), BMDR, SPAL, and LAL. Besides, they proposed the Beam-Search Oracle (BSO) as a reference to approximate the optimal sequence of queried samples that maximizes performance on the testing set, aiming to assess the potential improvement space for query strategies on specific datasets. Through reviewing their released source code, we identified differences between the task-oriented and query-oriented models for specific query strategies. Table 16 highlights the discrepancies between the two models for each query strategy.[10] In particular, Margin and US (US-C and US-NC in our notation) are variant settings for Uncertainty Sampling. We further discuss such differences in Section 5.1. In re-benchmarking (Appendix C), we adopt RBFSVM for a query strategy and evaluation by default.

Experimental design. The active learning algorithm was stopped when the total budget was equal to the size of the unlabeled pool, $T = |D_{\mathrm{u}}^{(0)}|$. They collected the testing accuracy at each round to construct a learning curve, and the AUBC was calculated to summarize the performance of a query strategy on a dataset. To ensure reliable results, they conducted $K_{\mathrm{S}} = 100$ repeated experiments for small datasets ($n < 2000$) and $K_{\mathrm{L}} = 10$ repeated experiments for large datasets ($n \geq 2000$), where n represents the size of the dataset. Finally, they compute the average AUBCs across repeated experiments for each query strategy on each dataset.

Analysis methods. Zhan et al. (2021) benchmarked the pool-based active learning for classifications on 35 datasets, including 26 binary-class and 9 multi-class datasets collected from LIBSVM and UCI (Chang & Lin, 2011; Dua & Graff, 2017). They provided the data properties, such as the number of samples n, dimension d, and imbalance ratio IR, where the imbalance ratio is the proportion of negative labels to the

[10]The settings are different from their source code for Google and ALiPy[9].

Table 16: Settings of query-oriented models $\mathcal{H}$ for specific query strategies $\mathcal{Q}$ in Zhan et al. (2021).

$\mathcal{Q}$	$\mathcal{H}$
US (Zhan et al., 2021) , US-NC (Ours)	LR($C = 0.1$)
QBC	LR($C = 1$), SVM(Linear, `probability = True`), SVM(RBF, `probability = True`), Linear Discriminant Analysis
ALBL	Combination of QSs with same $\mathcal{H}$: US-C, US-NC, HintSVM
VR	LR($C = 1$)
EER	SVM(RBF, `probability = True`)

number of positive labels

$$\text{IR} = \frac{|\{(x_i, y_i) : y_i = +1\}|}{|\{(x_j, y_j) : y_j = -1\}|}.$$

They employed these metrics to analyze the results from different aspects to explain the results of the query strategy's performance on a dataset. We agree with their core idea of the analysis methods and believe their benchmark benefits the research community. However, we observe that the conclusion of their work differs from several previous works. For example, Zhan et al. (2021) claimed that LAL performs better on binary datasets than Uncertainty Sampling while not in the other benchmark (Yang & Loog, 2018). The evidence urges us to re-implement the active learning benchmark to clarify the conflicting claims.

B.2 Benchmarking datasets

Section 3 records the datasets used in the previous benchmark (Zhan et al., 2021). However, we discover that the attributes of datasets are different. We report the revision in Table 17 via 'Zhan et al. (2021) → Our new version'.

B.3 Failure of the Reproducing Uniform

Table 20 (Table 21) shows the significant difference between ours and Zhan et al. (2021). We noticed an implementation error in the previous benchmark. In Google, Uniform assumes that the data has already been shuffled.[11] However, the implementation in Zhan et al. (2021) does not shuffle the unlabeled pool at first.[12]

```
[Code=Python]
dict_data,labeled_data,test_data,unlabeled_data = \
    split_data(dataset_filepath, test_size, n_labeled)

print(unlabeled_data)
# results of indices of unlabeled pool
#[3, 4, 5, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 20, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 33, 36, 37, 41, 43, 44, 45 \
# 49, 50, 51, 53, 54, 55, 57, 63, 64, 65, 70, 73, 75, 77, 78, 79, 83, 84, 86, 87, 88, 89, \
# 91, 92, 95, 97, 102, 105, 110, 112, 114, 115, 121, 122, 127, 128, 131, 132, 136, 137, \
# 139, 140, 144, 148, 150, 151, 155, 157, 159, 160, 161, 162, 164, 165, 167, 168, 172, 175, \
# 176, 177, 178, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 190, 191, 193, 194, 197, 198, 199, \
```

[11] https://github.com/google/active-learning/blob/master/sampling_methods/uniform_sampling.py#L40

[12] https://github.com/SineZHAN/ComparativeSurveyIJCAI2021PoolBasedAL/blob/master/Algorithm/baseline-google-binary.py#L331

Table 17: Benchmarking datasets in this work and revision of Table 2 in Zhan et al. (2021).

	Domain	k	r	d	n
Appendicitis	Health and Medicine	2	4.05	7	106
Iris	Biology	3	1	4	150
Wine	Physics and Chemistry	3	1.48	13	178
Sonar	Physics and Chemistry	2	1	60	108→208
Parkinsons	Health and Medicine	2	3.06	22	195
Ex8b	Synthetic	2	1	2	206→210
Heart	Health and Medicine	2	1	13	270
Haberman	Health and Medicine	2	2	3	306
Ionosphere	Physics and Chemistry	2	1	34	351
Clean1	Physics and Chemistry	2	1	168→166	475→476
Breast	Health and Medicine	2	1	10	478
Wdbc	Health and Medicine	2	1	30	569
Australian	Business	2	1	14	690
Diabetes	Health and Medicine	2	1	8	768
Mammographic	Health and Medicine	2	1	5	830
Ex8a	Synthetic	2	1	2	863→766
Tic	Games	2	6	9	958
German	Social Science	2	2	20→24	1000
Splice	Biology	2	1	61→60	1000
Gcloudb	Synthetic	2	1	2	1000
Gcloudub	Synthetic	2	2→2.03	2	1000
Checkerboard	Synthetic	2	1→1.82	2	1600
Myocardial	Health and Medicine	2	20.52	111	1700
Bioresponse	Biology	2	1	419	3434
Abalone	Biology	21	114.83	8	4168
Academic Success	Social Science	3	2.78	36	4424
Spambase	Computer Science	2	1→1.54	57	4601
Banana	Synthetic	2	1	2	5300
Phoneme	Speech	2	2	5	5404
Satellite	Climate and Environment	6	2.45	36	6435
Ringnorm	Synthetic	2	1	21→20	7400
Twonorm	Synthetic	2	1	50→20	7400
Pol	Synthetic	2	1	26	10082
Phishing	Computer Science	2	1	30	2456→11055
Dry Bean	Biology	7	6.79	16	13611
IMDB	Text	2	1	768	50000
CIFAR-10	Image	10	1	768	60000
Diabetes 130-US Hospitals	Health and Medicine	3	4.83	2463	101766
RT-IoT2022	Engineering	12	3380.68	94	123117
Covertype	Biology	2	1	10	566602

```
# 202, 203, 204, 205, 207, 208]
```

We also modify their Uniform implementation by `shuffle` the `unlabeled_data`. Then, we can obtain similar results based on their source code, see Table 18.

```
[Code=Python]
dict_data,labeled_data,test_data,unlabeled_data = \
    split_data(dataset_filepath, test_size, n_labeled)
```

Table 18: Comparing different train/test/labeled splits on *Sonar*: first column is reprot and reproducing results in Zhan et al. (2021), second column in our implementation, and the third column is reproducing results after we revise Zhan et al. (2021)'s code.

Uniform	Report and code in Zhan et al. (2021)	Our code	Modified code in Zhan et al. (2021)
Google	**0.6274***	0.7513	0.7577
libact	-	0.7520	0.7543
ALiPy	-	0.7556	0.7579

```
random.shuffle(unlabeled_data)
```

The unshuffled implementation in Google significantly impacts binary classification datasets, such as *Sonar*, *Clean1*, and *Spambase*. Also, it affects *Ex8a* and *German*, which enlarges the difference AUBCs between Uniform and other query strategies. Due to this experience, we suggest practitioners ensure the correctness of the baseline method by comparing different implementations before conducting the benchmarking experiments.

B.4 Query Strategy and Implementation

We revise some descriptions of the query strategies in Zhan et al. (2021):

(1) 'Graph Density (Graph) is a typical parallel-form combined strategy that balances the uncertainty and representative based measure simultaneously via a time-varying parameter (Ebert et al., 2012).'

(2) 'Marginal Probability based Batch Mode AL (Margin) Chattopadhyay et al. (2012) selects a batch that makes the marginal probability of the new labeled set similar to the one of the unlabeled set via optimization by Maximum Mean Discrepancy (MMD).'

(3) 'Kremer et al. (2014) proposed an SVM-based AL strategy by minimizing the distances between data points and classification hyperplane (HintSVM).'

Issue (1): Although Ebert et al. (2012) proposed the reinforcement learning method to select uncertainty and diversity sample(s) during the procedure, Google (Yilei "Dolee" Yang, 2017) does not implement the whole procedure but only the diversity sampling method.[13] Thus, we should categorize it as **diversity-based** method.
Issue (2): Google (Yilei "Dolee" Yang, 2017) does not use MMD to measure the distance. The implementation is uncertainty sampling with a margin score is mentioned in the survey paper (Settles, 2012). Therefore, we should categorize it to **uncertainty-based** method.
Issue (3): libact (Yang et al., 2017) implemented HintSVM based on the work of Li et al. (2015) rather than Kremer et al. (2014).

B.5 Relationship between query strategies

We provide additional evidence to explain the relationship between query strategies, which supports our experimental results.

(1) US-C and InfoDiv should be the same when the query batch size is one.

(2) Different uncertainty measurements should be the same in the binary classification, indicating that different uncertainty measurements do not cause differences between US-C and US-NC.

[13] `https://github.com/google/active-learning/blob/master/sampling_methods/graph_density.py`

(3) SPAL changes the condition of variables used for discriminative and representative objective functions in BMDR.

Issue (1): InfoDiv clusters unlabeled samples into several clusters, then selects uncertain samples and keeps the same cluster distribution simultaneously.[14] Therefore, it is the same when we set the $B = 1$ to query the most uncertain sample. Zhan et al. (2021) provided the different numbers of US-C and InfoDiv in Table 4, which might have resulted from using the different batch sizes of these query strategies.
Issue (2): The least confidence, margin, and entropy are monotonic functions with a peak equal to $\mathbb{P}(y = +1 \mid x) = 0.5$ in binary classification, such that all of these uncertainty measurements would query the same point (Settles, 2012).
Issue (3) The optimization problem in BMDR is

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\alpha^\top 1_{|D_u|}=b, w} & \sum_{i=1}^{|D_l|} (y_i - w^\top \phi(x_i))^2 + \lambda \|w\|^2 \\ & + \sum_{i=1}^{|D_u|} \alpha_i \left[\|w^\top \phi(x_j)\|_2^2 + 2|w^\top \phi(x_j)| \right] \\ & + \beta(\alpha^\top K_1 \alpha + k\alpha), \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where $\phi(x)$ is the feature mapping, λ is the hyper-parameter for the regularization term, β is the hyper-parameter for the diversity term, $1_{|D_u|}$ means ones vector with length of the unlabelled pool $|D_u|$. K_1 is defined as $K_1 = \frac{1}{2} K_{UU}$, where K_{UU} means the kernel matrix with sub-index U of unlabelled pool D_u. SPAL only changes $\alpha^\top 1_{|D_u|} = b$ to $\alpha^\top e_{|D_u|} = b$.[15]

B.6 Comparison between Zhan et al. (2021) and Yang & Loog (2018)

Yang & Loog (2018) propose the first benchmark for pool-based active learning for the conventional Logistic Regression model. The work compares 10 query strategies that could be categorized into **model uncertainty** and **hybrid criteria**. In datasets, they adopt 44 binary datasets and follow data pre-processing in Chang & Lin (2011). To compare performance across different query strategies, they also use an Area Under the Learning Curve with accuracy to show the average performance of a query strategy, named AUBC in Zhan et al. (2021). Furthermore, they compare the performance of each query strategy by average rank and improvement (win/tie/loss) from random sampling, which has the same purpose as our work (See Section 4.1 and Section 4.2).

C Re-benchmarking results of Zhan et al. (2021)

After we accomplish experiments under the settings in Appendix B.1, we obtain the benchmarking results for RBFSVM with the form (query strategy, dataset, seed, $|D_l|$, accuracy) for each round. A (random) seed corresponds to the different training sets, test sets, and initial label pool splits for a dataset. We collect the accuracy at each round ($|D_l|$, accuracy) to plot a learning curve for query strategy on a dataset with a seed and summarize it as the mean AUBC in Table 19. Our re-benchmarking results show that Uncertainty Sampling with compatible models (US-C) outperforms the other query strategies on most datasets.

C.1 Statistical comparison of re-benchmarking results

We show our re-benchmarking results for RBFSVM side-by-side with Zhan et al. (2021)'s Table 3 in Table 20. To determine if there is a statistical difference between the two benchmarking results, we construct the confidence interval with the t-distribution of mean AUBCs. If a result in Zhan et al. (2021) falls outside the interval, their mean significantly differs from ours. We notice significant differences in Uniform on several datasets in Table 20. Therefore, we focus on comparing Uniform in Table 21, demonstrating our mean and

[14] https://github.com/google/active-learning/blob/master/sampling_methods/informative_diverse.py
[15] https://github.com/NUAA-AL/ALiPy/blob/master/alipy/query_strategy/query_labels.py#L1469

Table 19: Mean AUBC of Query Strategies: We report query strategies with mean of repeated experiments.

	Uniform	US-C	US-NC	InfoDiv	QBC	EER	VR	Hier	Graph	Core-Set	HintSVM	QUIRE	DWUS	MCM	BMDR	SPAL	ALBL	LAL
Appendicitis	83.95%	84.54%	84.49%	84.54%	84.41%	84.26%	83.95%	84.14%	84.19%	83.98%	83.90%	83.99%	84.21%	84.57%	84.18%	84.15%	84.49%	84.33%
Sonar	75.00%	77.88%	76.54%	77.88%	76.75%	75.73%	75.00%	75.54%	75.58%	74.54%	74.06%	75.11%	74.35%	77.51%	75.98%	TLE	76.28%	76.76%
Parkinsons	83.05%	85.31%	85.11%	85.31%	84.49%	84.51%	83.05%	83.57%	82.91%	83.56%	81.78%	83.05%	82.74%	85.27%	83.69%	83.85%	84.61%	84.63%
Ex8b	88.53%	89.81%	89.39%	89.81%	89.38%	89.36%	88.53%	88.81%	88.50%	89.15%	86.95%	87.86%	88.42%	89.77%	88.84%	TLE	88.74%	89.42%
Heart	80.51%	81.57%	81.20%	81.57%	81.30%	80.85%	80.51%	80.75%	80.54%	81.05%	80.39%	81.03%	80.57%	81.54%	80.65%	80.97%	81.18%	81.24%
Haberman	73.09%	72.99%	73.02%	72.99%	73.05%	73.14%	73.08%	73.01%	73.04%	72.67%	72.62%	72.46%	73.16%	72.92%	73.23%	TLE	72.97%	73.11%
Ionosphere	91.80%	93.00%	91.97%	93.00%	92.78%	92.49%	91.80%	92.04%	91.62%	91.34%	89.64%	90.15%	87.93%	92.96%	89.34%	92.32%	92.06%	92.65%
Clean1	81.79%	84.32%	83.41%	84.32%	83.42%	82.15%	TLE	81.86%	81.00%	79.02%	76.97%	81.81%	81.79%	84.16%	TLE	TLE	82.64%	83.34%
Breast	96.14%	96.34%	96.26%	96.34%	96.33%	96.31%	95.82%	96.17%	96.15%	96.28%	96.24%	96.24%	96.06%	96.34%	96.18%	TLE	96.26%	95.86%
Wdbc	95.39%	96.52%	95.97%	96.52%	96.26%	96.22%	95.39%	95.65%	95.40%	95.86%	95.58%	95.83%	95.04%	96.50%	95.12%	95.72%	96.12%	96.13%
Australian	84.83%	85.04%	84.59%	85.04%	84.94%	84.72%	84.83%	84.87%	84.69%	84.78%	84.44%	84.76%	84.73%	85.04%	84.73%	85.04%	84.86%	84.83%
Diabetes	74.24%	74.79%	74.32%	74.79%	74.72%	74.57%	74.24%	74.34%	74.24%	74.91%	74.56%	74.70%	72.27%	74.71%	74.23%	74.65%	74.43%	74.62%
Mammographic	81.25%	81.64%	81.65%	81.64%	81.61%	81.58%	81.23%	81.40%	81.22%	81.48%	80.94%	81.42%	79.95%	81.68%	81.32%	TLE	81.59%	81.39%
Ex8a	85.52%	88.01%	82.83%	88.01%	86.16%	85.22%	85.52%	86.10%	85.13%	85.55%	81.34%	80.95%	79.24%	87.80%	85.39%	TLE	84.19%	83.54%
Tic	87.18%	87.20%	87.18%	87.20%	87.19%	87.19%	87.18%	87.19%	87.20%	87.16%	87.19%	86.99%	87.10%	87.20%	87.19%	87.12%	87.18%	87.20%
German	73.40%	74.17%	73.87%	74.17%	73.96%	73.80%	73.40%	73.48%	73.54%	73.62%	73.06%	73.55%	72.69%	74.09%	TLE	73.62%	73.66%	74.00%
Splice	80.68%	82.28%	81.47%	82.28%	81.50%	80.73%	80.68%	80.62%	78.21%	74.76%	77.57%	80.35%	76.08%	82.39%	TLE	TLE	81.00%	80.45%
Gcloudb	89.50%	89.85%	88.58%	89.85%	89.73%	89.47%	89.50%	89.49%	89.40%	89.25%	87.55%	87.85%	88.62%	89.82%	89.54%	TLE	89.72%	89.46%
Gcloudub	94.40%	95.67%	94.89%	95.67%	95.36%	93.87%	94.40%	94.75%	94.40%	89.12%	89.35%	93.17%	93.62%	95.57%	93.77%	TLE	93.83%	94.76%
Checkerboard	97.81%	98.47%	91.34%	98.47%	97.02%	98.40%	97.81%	97.85%	97.37%	98.74%	92.42%	94.37%	90.45%	98.47%	98.32%	TLE	96.79%	96.41%
Spambase	91.03%	92.05%	90.10%	92.05%	91.90%	TLE	TLE	91.22%	90.73%	90.52%	89.85%	TLE	91.03%	92.00%	TLE	TLE	91.62%	90.62%
Banana	89.26%	87.87%	80.50%	87.87%	89.08%	TLE	89.25%	89.29%	88.48%	89.30%	85.10%	82.99%	81.64%	87.54%	TLE	TLE	88.51%	89.23%
Phoneme	82.54%	83.55%	82.11%	83.55%	83.18%	TLE	TLE	83.00%	82.09%	82.40%	80.83%	81.83%	81.37%	83.59%	TLE	TLE	82.47%	82.42%
Ringnorm	97.76%	97.86%	97.67%	97.86%	97.71%	TLE	TLE	97.66%	97.11%	94.77%	97.15%	TLE	93.46%	97.82%	TLE	TLE	97.69%	97.80%
Twonorm	97.53%	97.64%	97.55%	97.64%	97.60%	TLE	TLE	97.52%	97.54%	97.55%	97.36%	TLE	97.31%	97.63%	TLE	TLE	97.52%	97.61%
Phishing	93.82%	94.60%	93.91%	94.60%	94.41%	TLE	TLE	93.80%	93.27%	94.06%	92.96%	TLE	89.23%	94.49%	TLE	TLE	94.20%	94.29%

Table 20: We report our AUBCs (%) with Table 3 in Zhan et al. (2021) side-by-side. A score denoted with format: `Zhan et al. (2021)` → `ours`. The symbol '*' indicates a significant difference with the significance level $\alpha = 5\%$.

	Uniform	BSO	Avg	BEST	BEST_QS	WORST	WORST_QS
Appendicitis	84% → 83.95%	88% → 88.37%	84% → 84.25%	86% → 84.57%*	EER → MCM	83% → 83.90%*	DWUS → HintSVM
Sonar	62% → 74.63%*	83% → 88.40%*	76% → 75.60%	78% → 77.62%*	LAL → US-C	73% → 73.57%	HintSVM →HintSVM
Parkinsons	84% → 83.05%*	87% → 88.28%*	85% → 83.97%	86% → 85.31%*	QBC → US-C	83% → 81.78%	HintSVM →HintSVM
Ex8b	87% → 88.53%*	92% → 93.76%*	89% → 88.88%	91% → 89.81%*	SPAL → US-C	86% → 86.99%	HintSVM →HintSVM
Heart	81% → 80.51%	85% → 89.30%*	79% → 80.99%	83% → 81.57%*	InfoDiv → US-C	72% → 80.39%*	DWUS → HintSVM
Haberman	73% → 73.08%	75% → 78.96%*	73% → 72.95%	74% → 73.19%	BMDR → BMDR	72% → 72.44%	QUIRE → QUIRE
Ionosphere	90% → 91.80%*	93% → 95.45%*	91% → 91.59%	93% → 93.00%*	LAL → US-C	88% → 87.93%*	HintSVM → DWUS
Clean1	65% → 81.83%*	87% → 92.19%*	81% → 81.97%	84% → 84.25%*	LAL → US-C	75% → 76.95%	HintSVM →HintSVM
Breast	95% → 96.16%*	96% → 97.60%*	96% → 96.19%	96% → 96.32%*	SPAL → US-C	95% → 95.82%*	DWUS → VR
Wdbc	95% → 95.39%	97% → 98.41%*	96% → 95.87%	97% → 96.52%*	LAL → US-C	94% → 95.04%*	EER → DWUS
Australian	85% → 84.83%	88% → 90.46%*	85% → 84.82%	85% → 85.04%*	Core-Set → US-C	82% → 84.44%*	DWUS → HintSVM
Diabetes	74% → 74.24%*	78% → 82.57%*	74% → 74.42%	75% → 74.91%	Core-Set →Core-Set	69% → 72.27%*	EER → DWUS
Mammographic	82% → 81.30%*	84% → 85.03%*	82% → 81.44%	83% → 81.78%	MCM → MCM	80% → 79.99%*	EER → DWUS
Ex8a	84% → 85.39%*	87% → 88.28%*	84% → 84.62%	86% → 87.88%*	Hier → US-C	80% → 79.11%*	QUIRE → DWUS
Tic	87% → 87.18%	87% → 90.77%*	87% → 87.17%	87% → 87.20%*	EER → US-C	87% → 86.99%	QUIRE → QUIRE
German	73% → 73.40%*	78% → 82.08%*	74% → 73.65%	74% → 74.17%*	QBC → US-C	72% → 72.68%	DWUS → DWUS
Splice	81% → 80.75%	87% → 91.02%*	79% → 80.08%	82% → 82.34%*	QBC → MCM	68% → 75.18%*	EER → Core-Set
Gcloudb	89% → 89.52%	90% → 90.91%*	89% → 89.20%	90% → 89.81%*	Graph → US-C	87% → 87.48%	HintSVM →HintSVM
Gcloudub	94% → 94.37%	96% → 96.83%*	93% → 93.72%	95% → 95.60%*	QBC → US-C	86% → 89.29%*	EER → Core-Set
Checkerboard	98% → 97.81%	99% → 99.72%*	94% → 96.42%	99% → 98.74%	Core-Set →Core-Set	90% → 90.45%*	VR → DWUS
Spambase	69% → 91.03%*	TLE	88% → 91.14%	92% → 92.05%*	QBC → US-C	69% → 89.85%*	DWUS → HintSVM
Banana	90% → 89.26%	TLE	85% → 86.90%	89% → 89.30%*	Hier → Core-Set	78% → 80.50%*	QUIRE → US-NC
Phoneme	82% → 82.54%	TLE	82% → 82.49%	83% → 83.59%*	QBC → MCM	80% → 80.83%	HintSVM →HintSVM
Ringnorm	98% → 97.76%*	TLE	95% → 97.05%	98% → 97.86%*	LAL → US-C	80% → 93.46%	DWUS → DWUS
Twonorm	98% → 97.53%	TLE	98% → 97.54%	98% → 97.64%*	Core-Set → US-C	97% → 97.31%	DWUS → DWUS
Phishing	93% → 93.82%*	TLE	94% → 93.65%	95% → 94.60%*	LAL → US-C	92% → 89.23%*	Graph → DWUS

standard deviation (SD) AUBC of Uniform and the mean AUBC of Uniform reported by Zhan et al. (2021). There are 13, nearly half of the datasets, significantly different from the existing benchmark with significance level $\alpha = 5\%$. Furthermore, we perform better on most datasets except for *Parkinsons* and *Mammographic*. 1% of mean AUBC is larger than previous work on 8 datasets, especially for *Sonar*, *Clean1*, and *Spambase*. Following the same procedure of statistical testing, Table 22 demonstrates **BSO** of ours and Zhan et al. (2021). This phenomenon is more evident in BSO than in Uniform. We still get significantly different and better performances on most datasets except for *Appendicitis*.

C.2 Verify usefulness

Zhan et al. (2021) verified the applicability of a query strategy by several aspects:

Table 21: Reporducing Failure of **Uniform**

	Mean	SD	Zhan et al. (2021)	$\alpha = 5\%$	$\alpha = 1\%$
Appendicitis	83.95%	3.63%	83.6%	In	In
Sonar	74.63%	3.79%	61.7%	Out	Out
Parkinsons	83.05%	3.68%	84.0%	Out	In
Ex8b	88.53%	2.80%	86.6%	Out	Out
Heart	80.51%	2.79%	80.8%	In	In
Haberman	73.08%	2.70%	72.7%	In	In
Ionosphere	91.80%	1.78%	90.1%	Out	Out
Clean1	81.83%	1.94%	64.9%	Out	Out
Breast	96.16%	0.90%	95.4%	Out	Out
Wdbc	95.39%	1.30%	95.2%	In	In
Australian	84.83%	1.58%	84.6%	In	In
Diabetes	74.24%	1.52%	73.6%	Out	Out
Mammographic	81.30%	1.98%	81.9%	Out	Out
Ex8a	85.39%	2.17%	83.8%	Out	Out
Tic	87.18%	1.53%	87.0%	In	In
German	73.40%	1.73%	72.6%	Out	Out
Splice	80.75%	1.61%	80.6%	In	In
Gcloudb	89.52%	1.17%	89.3%	In	In
Gcloudub	94.37%	0.96%	94.2%	In	In
Checkerboard	97.81%	0.59%	97.8%	In	In
Spambase	91.03%	0.57%	68.5%	Out	Out
Banana	89.26%	0.38%	89.5%	In	In
Phoneme	82.54%	1.01%	82.2%	In	In
Ringnorm	97.76%	0.21%	97.6%	Out	In
Twonorm	97.53%	0.19%	97.6%	In	In
Phishing	93.82%	0.48%	92.6%	Out	Out

- *Low/high dimension view* (*LD* for $d < 50$, *HD* for $d \geq 50$),
- *Data scale view* (*SS* for $n < 1000$, *LS* for $n \geq 1000$),
- *Data balance/imbalance view* (*BAL* for $\gamma < 1.5$, *IMB* for $\gamma \geq 1.5$).

They compare these aspects with a score

$$\delta_{q,s} = \max\{\overline{\text{AUBC}_{\text{BSO},s}}, \overline{\text{AUBC}_{\text{US},s}}, \ldots, \overline{\text{AUBC}_{\text{LAL},s}}\} - \overline{\text{AUBC}_{q,s}},$$

Specifically, they grouped $\delta_{q,s}$ by different aspects to generate the metric for the report

$$\bar{\delta}_{q,v} = \frac{\sum_{s \in v} \delta_{q,s}}{|\{s \in v\}|},$$

where v is one of a dataset's dimension, scale, or class-balance views. We re-benchmark results and denote the rank of the query strategy with a superscript in Table 23. Table 23 shows that the US-C (InfoDiv) and MCM occupy the first and second ranks in different aspects, and the QBC keeps the third rank. The results are unlike those of Zhan et al. (2021) except for the QBC performance well on both of us. We explain the reason for the same performance of US-C and InfoDiv in Appendix B.5.

Using score $\bar{\delta}_{q,v}$ to ascertain the applicability of several query strategies is straightforward. However, it could bring an issue: BSO outperforms query strategies significantly on most datasets in our benchmarking results. We cannot exclude those remaining large-scale datasets without BSO, i.e., $n > 1000$, having the same pattern, such that their results could impact different aspects. Therefore, we replace $\bar{\delta}_{q,v}$ with the improvement of query strategy q over Uniform, i.e., $\tau_{q,s,k}$ in Section 4.2, because Uniform is the baseline and most efficient across all experiments, which is essential to complete.

Table 22: Reporducing Failure of **BSO**

	Mean	SD	Zhan et al. (2021)	$\alpha = 5\%$	$\alpha = 1\%$
Appendicitis	88.37%	2.95%	88.1%	In	In
Sonar	88.40%	2.84%	83.0%	Out	Out
Parkinsons	88.28%	3.19%	86.5%	Out	Out
Ex8b	93.76%	1.82%	92.4%	Out	Out
Heart	89.30%	2.47%	84.8%	Out	Out
Haberman	78.96%	3.05%	75.1%	Out	Out
Ionosphere	95.45%	1.42%	93.3%	Out	Out
Clean1	92.19%	1.69%	87.1%	Out	Out
Breast	97.60%	0.67%	96.1%	Out	Out
Wdbc	98.41%	0.65%	97.3%	Out	Out
Australian	90.46%	1.48%	87.8%	Out	Out
Diabetes	82.57%	1.70%	78.4%	Out	Out
Mammographic	85.03%	1.97%	84.4%	Out	Out
Ex8a	88.28%	2.03%	87.3%	Out	Out
Tic	90.77%	2.27%	87.3%	Out	Out
German	82.08%	2.01%	78.3%	Out	Out
Splice	91.02%	1.18%	87.1%	Out	Out
Gcloudb	90.91%	1.09%	90.1%	Out	Out
Gcloudub	96.83%	0.78%	96.3%	Out	Out
Checkerboard	99.72%	0.36%	99.2%	Out	Out

Table 23: Verifying Applicability with δ_i

	B	LD	HD	SS	LS	BAL	IMB
US-NC	4.77	4.16	8.12	5.36	3.96	5.09	4.39
QBC	3.83^3	3.15^3	7.57^3	5.02^3	2.20^3	4.05^3	3.57^3
HintSVM	5.91	4.92	11.37	6.77	4.73	6.25	5.51
QUIRE	5.96	5.08	11.54	6.13	5.60	6.94	4.98
ALBL	4.20	3.49	8.06	5.37	2.59	4.45	3.90
DWUS	6.20	5.46	10.24	6.71	5.50	6.83	5.46
VR	5.04	4.26	12.02	5.43	4.13	5.36	4.72
Core-Set	4.92	3.78	11.20	5.79	3.72	5.35	4.42
US-C	3.50^1	2.89^1	6.86^1	4.62^1	1.97^1	3.72^1	3.24^1
Graph	4.62	3.72	9.58	5.77	3.05	4.98	4.20
Hier	4.22	3.41	8.69	5.53	2.43	4.49	3.90
InfoDiv	3.50^1	2.89^1	6.86^1	4.62^1	1.97^1	3.72^1	3.24^1
MCM	3.56^2	2.94^2	6.98^2	4.68^2	2.03^2	3.80^2	3.27^2
EER	5.21	4.18	11.09	5.33	4.86	6.13	4.30
BMDR	5.61	4.57	11.50	5.77	5.11	6.33	4.89
SPAL	5.90	4.69	12.32	5.67	6.77	6.56	5.17
LAL	4.14	3.41	8.14	5.27	2.59	4.37	3.86

The other issue is heuristically grouping the views into a binary category and averaging the performance with the same views $\bar{\delta}_{q,v}$ without reporting SDs. These analysis methods may be biased when the properties of datasets are not balanced. To address this issue, we plot a matrix of scatter plots that directly demonstrates the improvement of US-C for each property on all datasets with different colors. Figure 12 shows a low correlation ($|r| < 0.4$) and no apparent patterns between properties and the improvement of US-C, indicating that Our analysis results do not support the claims of 'Method aspects' in the existing benchmark (Zhan et al., 2021), either. In conclusion, we want to emphasize that **revealing the analysis methods is**

Table 24: Mean and standard deviation of AUBCs of query strategies under *no-fixed* and *fixed* initial sets.

	Uniform		US	
	Table 3	FixInit	Table 3	FixInit
Heart	78.37%±2.59%	77.88%±2.58%	79.32%±2.43%	78.82%±2.43%
Mammographic	79.46%±1.50%	79.14%±1.59%	80.75%±1.39%	80.53%±1.38%
Phoneme	85.78%±0.56%	85.66%±0.55%	87.77%±0.38%	87.67%±0.37%

as important as the experimental settings because the analysis method employed will influence the conclusion.



Figure 12: A matrix of scatter plots of the improvement of US-C

C.3 The impact of initial sets

The current results are based on the train-test split described in Section 3, followed by random sampling to select the initial labeled and unlabeled pools. In this section, we follow Ji et al. (2023)'s recommendation to check the influence of the consistent initial set (labeled pool and unlabeled pool) on Uniform and Uncertainty Sampling. Specifically, we investigate two settings on *Heart*, *Mammographic*, and *Phoneme* datasets:

- No fixed train-test split and no fixed initial sets (Table 3/current results),
- Fixed initial sets and no fixed train-test split (FixInit).

The similar standard deviations between no-fixed (Table 3) and fixed initial sets in Table 24 indicate that fixing the seed of the initial sets across different train-test splits does not lead to significant differences. This is mainly because the primary source of randomness comes from the train-test split itself. Because the datasets in our benchmark do not have predefined train-test splits, we would not eliminate the randomness by fixing the train-test split in our experiments. Although the randomness of the train-test split exists, our benchmarking results show that Uncertainty Sampling performs consistently on most datasets.

C.4 More on analysis of non-compatible models for uncertainty sampling

Section 5.1 demonstrates results involving different combinations of query-oriented and task-oriented models on *Checkerboard* and *Gcloudb* datasets. We reveal more datasets from Figure 13 to Figure 17. These results still hold for the compatible models for uncertainty sampling outperform non-compatible ones on most datasets, i.e., the diagonal entries of the heatmap are larger than non-diagonal entries. Figure 18 demonstrates that non-compatible models achieve slightly better performance than compatible models. When

query-oriented and task-oriented models are heterogeneous, we conjecture that it could improve uncertainty sampling by exploring more diverse examples like the hybrid criteria approach (Settles, 2012; Sinha et al., 2019).

D Benchmarking results of Random Forest

This section follows the analysis procedure in Section 4 to benchmark Random Forest (RF) on the same datasets. The analysis results are listed as follows:

1. Verify the superiority by comparing the mean AUBC of query strategies in Table 25.
2. Verify the superiority by comparing the average accuracy of the model with 20% of the total budget in Table 26.
3. Verify the superiority by comparing the average ranking of query strategies in Table 27.
4. Verify the usefulness by comparing the data utilization rate of query strategies in Table 28.

These results are consistent with the previous benchmarking results in Section 4 and Appendix C. We conclude that the uncertainty sampling with compatible RF models gains superiority and usefulness for tabular datasets.

E Computational resource

We test the time of an experiment for query strategy running on a dataset. Our resource is: *DELL PowerEdge R730* with CPU *Intel Xeon E5-2640 v3 @2.6GHz * 2* and memory *192 GB*. We report the computational time for a query strategy for each dataset per round in Table 29 following the setting in Section 3.

Note that this work does not optimize libact, Google, and ALiPy performance. If practitioners discover inefficient implementation, please contact us by mail or leave issues on GitHub.

F Limitations, related benchmarks, and future works

While we intentionally constrain our benchmark's scope to maintain fairness and reproducibility, this focus might give the impression of limitations. We encourage practitioners to explore active learning techniques in broader tasks and domains. For example, ample room exists to investigate active learning's applicability in areas like regression problems, object detection, and natural language processing (Cai et al., 2016; Wu et al., 2019; Zhang et al., 2020; Yuan et al., 2021; Brust et al., 2018; Zhang et al., 2022).

Evaluating the performance of query strategy is a challenge in benchmarking. Kottke et al. (2017) and Trittenbach et al. (2021) propose metrics such as *Deficiency score*, *Data Utilization Rate*, *Start Quality*, and *Average End Quality* to summarize the performance of a query strategy from learning curves. Our implementation saves querying results at each round, enabling thorough analysis without costly re-runs, which empowers researchers to develop novel metrics and methods.

The stability of experimental results is another challenge to a fair comparison. Ji et al. (2023); Lüth et al. (2023); Munjal et al. (2022) have revealed variations in performance metrics stemming from different query strategies, causing inconsistent results and claims in previous research. They suggest standardizing experimental settings like data augmentation, neural network structures, and optimizers. These findings emphasize the sensitivity of active learning algorithms to experimental settings, a critical consideration for future work.

Table 25: Benchmarking results of Random Forest. The numbers are mean AUBC (↑, %). We report the baseline method (Uniform), the best query strategy with its mean AUBC (BEST_QS, BEST), and the worst query strategy with its mean AUBC (WORST_QS, WORST) across datasets in Table 25.

	Uniform	BEST_QS	BEST	WORST_QS	WORST
Appendicitis	83.70%	US	84.48%	DWUS	83.12%
Sonar	75.66%	US	77.31%	HintSVM	74.75%
Parkinsons	84.31%	US	86.61%	HintSVM	82.79%
Ex8b	85.97%	US	87.07%	HintSVM	84.67%
Heart	80.19%	DWUS	80.93%	HintSVM	79.64%
Haberman	69.56%	US	70.61%	QUIRE	68.91%
Ionosphere	90.98%	BALD	92.08%	HintSVM	87.22%
Clean1	79.15%	BALD	82.09%	HintSVM	75.18%
Breast	96.42%	US	96.82%	DWUS	95.44%
Wdbc	94.29%	LAL	95.32%	HintSVM	93.92%
Australian	85.77%	US	86.20%	DWUS	85.55%
Diabetes	74.60%	LAL	74.97%	DWUS	73.59%
Mammographic	79.36%	LAL	80.82%	DWUS	78.82%
Ex8a	93.09%	BALD	95.50%	HintSVM	87.65%
Tic	86.36%	Core-Set	86.43%	DWUS	85.48%
German	74.02%	US	74.74%	DWUS	72.86%
Splice	90.49%	MCM	91.52%	Core-Set	84.17%
Gcloudb	88.33%	LAL	88.96%	QUIRE	86.50%
Gcloudub	93.83%	BALD	95.34%	HintSVM	87.38%
Checkerboard	99.24%	LAL	99.67%	DWUS	95.00%
Spambase	93.54%	BALD	94.74%	HintSVM	92.11%
Banana	88.25%	LAL	88.82%	DWUS	81.54%
Phoneme	86.63%	BALD	88.81%	HintSVM	84.75%
Ringnorm	94.15%	US	95.66%	Core-Set	70.55%
Twonorm	96.60%	BALD	96.88%	HintSVM	94.78%
Phishing	95.61%	US	96.68%	HintSVM	94.24%
Covertype	76.47%	US	79.20%	Uniform	76.47%
Bioresponse	73.57%	US	74.83%	Uniform	73.57%
Pol	96.58%	US	97.85%	Uniform	96.58%

Table 26: Accuracy of the model with 20% labeled examples: We report the accuracy of the model with 20% labeled examples on each dataset. The scores with **bold** mean the best performance on a dataset. 'TLE' means a query strategy exceeds the time limit.

	Uniform	US	QBC	BALD	Hier	Graph	Core-Set	HintSVM	QUIRE	DWUS	MCM	BMDR	ALBL	LAL
Sonar	68.98%	69.99%	69.96%	70.45%	69.11%	70.77%	68.57%	69.40%	70.11%	70.15%	69.81%	**70.92%**	70.33%	70.17%
Parkinsons	81.04%	81.94%	80.87%	**82.21%**	81.56%	81.04%	80.47%	80.54%	80.53%	81.05%	81.97%	81.41%	81.24%	81.94%
Ex8b	82.44%	83.40%	82.45%	83.62%	82.56%	82.04%	**83.83%**	81.85%	83.04%	82.61%	83.20%	83.43%	83.18%	83.33%
Heart	78.37%	**79.42%**	77.80%	78.97%	78.89%	79.08%	78.81%	77.40%	78.78%	79.05%	79.29%	79.40%	78.54%	78.83%
Haberman	70.11%	**71.63%**	70.24%	71.58%	70.67%	70.79%	69.34%	69.57%	68.76%	71.47%	71.41%	70.49%	70.39%	71.28%
Ionosphere	88.65%	91.34%	88.42%	**91.91%**	89.13%	88.50%	83.14%	82.30%	80.99%	84.30%	91.54%	TLE	88.73%	90.87%
Clean1	71.01%	72.94%	70.82%	**73.42%**	71.25%	71.27%	66.95%	66.69%	71.31%	70.98%	73.32%	68.87%	72.34%	72.54%
Breast	96.35%	97.18%	96.51%	97.14%	96.66%	96.36%	95.70%	96.36%	95.93%	95.20%	97.22%	96.31%	96.89%	**97.23%**
Wdbc	93.56%	96.18%	93.35%	**96.27%**	93.55%	93.62%	93.12%	92.69%	93.28%	93.46%	96.07%	93.85%	94.98%	96.18%
Australian	84.97%	**86.17%**	85.25%	86.09%	85.42%	85.34%	85.01%	84.69%	85.39%	84.45%	85.72%	85.00%	85.47%	85.98%
Diabetes	73.84%	74.13%	74.07%	**74.39%**	73.96%	73.86%	73.85%	73.07%	73.71%	72.36%	74.24%	73.50%	73.68%	74.33%
Mammographic	79.74%	**82.46%**	79.75%	82.23%	80.46%	79.61%	81.19%	80.97%	82.44%	80.13%	82.39%	79.95%	80.67%	82.22%
Ex8a	89.91%	**95.05%**	89.58%	95.02%	89.86%	91.50%	93.15%	77.99%	82.09%	80.45%	94.51%	91.23%	87.17%	94.46%
Tic	86.92%	86.92%	86.84%	86.96%	86.58%	**87.02%**	86.93%	86.55%	86.86%	84.93%	86.94%	86.63%	86.98%	TLE
German	72.86%	73.62%	72.64%	73.46%	72.66%	72.89%	72.75%	72.53%	72.67%	70.20%	73.41%	72.57%	73.22%	**73.72%**
Splice	87.65%	**88.77%**	87.41%	88.57%	87.76%	87.17%	70.04%	78.95%	87.15%	78.31%	88.76%	87.25%	87.53%	86.36%
Gcloudb	88.27%	89.25%	88.52%	89.14%	88.45%	88.69%	88.52%	84.99%	85.68%	86.68%	89.29%	88.48%	89.25%	**89.58%**
Gcloudub	92.02%	95.31%	92.24%	**95.68%**	93.05%	93.95%	90.16%	84.09%	86.48%	83.41%	95.47%	91.53%	89.65%	93.90%
Checkerboard	99.28%	99.14%	99.32%	99.13%	99.60%	99.58%	99.41%	93.15%	93.09%	93.32%	99.69%	99.48%	99.10%	**99.88%**
Spambase	93.09%	95.32%	92.93%	95.31%	92.98%	92.92%	92.17%	90.28%	91.81%	93.20%	**95.39%**	92.21%	92.80%	95.08%
Banana	87.97%	89.28%	88.00%	**89.30%**	87.92%	88.04%	88.43%	75.08%	74.97%	77.28%	89.25%	88.23%	87.27%	89.16%
Phoneme	84.44%	88.01%	84.41%	**88.30%**	85.67%	84.77%	85.51%	81.39%	83.14%	82.61%	87.89%	85.12%	84.46%	87.55%
Ringnorm	93.73%	**96.91%**	93.90%	96.80%	94.33%	92.80%	50.68%	56.12%	50.68%	60.49%	96.86%	74.30%	92.83%	90.30%
Twonorm	96.47%	96.83%	96.52%	**96.89%**	95.30%	96.60%	96.46%	93.07%	91.79%	96.15%	96.77%	TLE	96.07%	96.85%
Phishing	94.83%	**96.85%**	94.50%	96.72%	94.66%	94.61%	94.56%	92.91%	91.25%	92.79%	96.80%	TLE	95.57%	96.83%
Covertype	74.78%	76.91%	TLE	**76.97%**	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE
Bioresponse	70.63%	**73.03%**	TLE	72.64%	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE
Pol	95.94%	**98.23%**	TLE	98.22%	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE

Table 27: Average Ranking of Query Strategies: We report query strategies with the best average ranking. The scores with ^{1}, ^{2}, or ^{3} mean the 1st, 2nd and 3rd performance on a dataset. 'TLE' means a query strategy exceeds the time limit.

	US	QBC	BALD	Hier	Graph	Core-Set	HintSVM	QUIRE	DWUS	MCM	BMDR	ALBL	LAL
Appendicitis	4.81^1	7.76	5.44^2	7.30	7.74	7.31	8.43	7.89	8.85	5.63	7.81	6.47	5.56^3
Sonar	3.69^1	6.95	3.97^3	7.86	7.77	8.15	8.87	7.71	7.83	3.96^2	TLE	6.52	4.72
Parkinsons	2.97^1	8.55	3.08^2	6.81	10.06	9.53	11.61	9.34	7.17	3.72^3	7.77	6.66	3.73
Ex8b	4.50^2	8.08	4.37^1	7.56	8.60	6.04	10.10	8.26	8.90	5.13^3	7.28	6.82	5.36
Heart	6.06^3	7.49	6.26	7.46	8.40	7.86	9.42	8.24	4.90^1	5.74^2	6.34	6.63	6.20
Haberman	5.07^1	7.22	5.33	7.42	7.26	8.38	9.35	9.71	5.25^2	5.29^3	7.10	7.90	5.72
Ionosphere	2.43^2	6.53	2.40^1	6.29	7.27	9.96	11.50	11.55	11.25	2.90^3	8.03	7.17	3.72
Clean1	2.69^2	7.76	2.44^1	7.40	9.25	9.49	11.60	7.15	7.86	2.96^3	TLE	5.58	3.82
Breast	3.44^1	8.35	3.64^3	6.75	9.60	8.36	7.66	9.05	12.24	3.60^2	8.54	5.94	3.83
Wdbc	3.05^3	9.30	2.80^1	8.41	9.53	9.58	10.67	9.42	9.31	3.32	8.19	4.49	2.93^2
Australian	4.77^2	7.48	4.58^1	6.78	8.50	8.11	8.21	7.25	8.89	5.69	8.26	6.82	5.66^3
Diabetes	5.53^2	6.75	5.77^3	7.22	6.83	6.30	8.27	7.78	10.86	6.03	6.86	7.75	5.05^1
Mammographic	3.92^3	9.62	3.73^2	7.66	8.23	9.06	6.96	6.74	10.10	3.92	9.11	8.54	3.41^1
Ex8a	2.37^1	7.93	2.39^2	7.27	7.95	4.10	12.14	11.78	11.86	3.14^3	6.43	9.83	3.81
Tic	7.49	4.53^2	7.66	6.58	5.02	3.89^1	6.15	7.01	9.01	7.80	TLE	4.82^3	8.04
German	3.80^1	7.89	4.19^2	8.44	7.55	7.07	8.71	7.55	12.52	4.34^3	8.21	5.67	5.06
Splice	2.72^1	6.46	2.81^3	6.15	9.43	11.59	9.86	6.20	10.77	2.72^2	TLE	5.23	4.06
Gcloudb	4.81	7.34	4.76^3	7.65	8.25	6.73	11.28	10.51	10.25	4.90	6.76	4.53^2	3.23^1
Gcloudub	2.47^2	7.34	2.46^1	5.49	6.63	8.48	12.90	11.21	11.56	2.87^3	7.48	7.80	4.31
Checkerboard	3.00^2	7.67	3.25	6.47	7.49	7.20	12.18	11.67	11.81	3.15^3	5.83	8.38	2.90^1
Spambase	2.40^2	7.50	1.60^1	5.50	9.10	9.30	11.00	TLE	7.60	2.60^3	TLE	6.00	3.40
BaTLEa	3.10^3	6.90	2.90^2	7.00	9.60	5.60	11.60	12.00	12.40	3.30	6.10	8.30	2.20^1
Phoneme	2.40^3	8.60	1.90^1	5.00	8.60	6.50	11.60	9.60	11.30	2.20^2	TLE	6.80	3.50
Ringnorm	1.40^1	6.00	1.80^2	4.60	8.00	11.70	9.30	11.30	9.70	3.10^3	TLE	5.90	5.20
Twonorm	1.90^2	6.20	1.80^1	9.50	5.50	4.80	10.90	TLE	8.00	2.30^3	TLE	8.80	6.30
Phishing	1.50^1	7.00	2.30^3	5.70	7.50	5.80	9.80	TLE	9.20	2.20^2	TLE	4.00	TLE
Covertype	1.40^1	TLE	1.60^2	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE
Bioresponse	1.40^1	TLE	1.60^2	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE
Pol	1.30^1	TLE	1.70^2	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE

Table 28: Data utilization rate of query strategies. The scores with [1], [2], or [3] mean the 1st, 2nd and 3rd performance on a dataset. 'TLE' means a query strategy exceeds the time limit.

	US	QBC	BALD	Hier	Graph	Core-Set	HintSVM	QUIRE	DWUS	MCM	BMDR	ALBL	LAL
Appendicitis	72.68%	88.27%	72.37%	83.77%	84.57%	78.46%	94.03%	79.59%	96.47%	73.37%	77.20%	75.18%	68.32%
Sonar	83.21%	96.93%	79.75%	*103.93%*	*105.19%*	*109.28%*	*113.21%*	*100.60%*	98.23%	82.09%	93.32%	94.02%	84.00%
Parkinsons	66.78%	*104.47%*	65.65%	89.01%	*115.53%*	*113.00%*	*125.06%*	*109.28%*	90.19%	71.19%	83.42%	90.02%	71.19%
Ex8b	72.10%	*100.51%*	75.02%	*108.36%*	*105.54%*	82.26%	*134.12%*	*107.66%*	*104.83%*	78.49%	97.42%	92.07%	78.03%
Heart	83.52%	93.96%	80.04%	87.83%	98.14%	*105.58%*	*126.91%*	*105.54%*	96.75%	85.71%	88.20%	94.19%	84.66%
Haberman	*108.22%*	*166.25%*	86.22%	*127.40%*	*117.93%*	*155.72%*	*194.88%*	*160.76%*	*110.28%*	84.09%	*108.16%*	*131.40%*	94.10%
Ionosphere	71.03%	*109.47%*	70.06%	*112.15%*	*118.36%*	*184.42%*	*204.09%*	*190.78%*	*266.93%*	75.05%	TLE	*117.39%*	78.14%
Clean1	66.38%	*101.51%*	68.54%	98.33%	*113.03%*	*105.73%*	*125.79%*	98.96%	99.31%	67.75%	*104.35%*	86.16%	75.82%
Breast	56.07%	91.36%	58.33%	83.40%	*161.72%*	92.76%	94.25%	90.92%	*342.11%*	58.36%	*124.45%*	78.14%	59.50%
Wdbc	48.49%	*118.85%*	49.57%	*104.03%*	*119.32%*	*113.68%*	*147.97%*	*112.58%*	*119.54%*	52.55%	94.83%	65.46%	52.33%
Australian	71.43%	95.51%	73.10%	98.52%	*121.25%*	*114.84%*	*106.65%*	*108.79%*	*125.02%*	73.67%	*101.76%*	92.53%	74.20%
Diabetes	95.33%	*104.14%*	92.27%	*104.10%*	*122.35%*	*109.48%*	*119.51%*	*116.73%*	*178.03%*	96.93%	*110.47%*	*117.40%*	92.93%
Mammographic	72.07%	*153.42%*	71.66%	89.03%	91.95%	81.27%	*103.54%*	87.55%	*128.24%*	64.89%	*101.07%*	93.26%	59.36%
Ex8a	43.75%	*111.29%*	42.78%	97.60%	*109.29%*	57.61%	*165.84%*	*176.49%*	*166.71%*	46.08%	88.94%	*142.32%*	54.80%
Tic	75.39%	96.17%	80.45%	92.89%	*124.21%*	82.87%	*140.92%*	*129.96%*	*209.75%*	89.96%	*111.72%*	61.44%	TLE
German	92.08%	*119.64%*	96.81%	*129.11%*	*122.34%*	*114.60%*	*144.97%*	*120.44%*	*237.03%*	*104.75%*	*136.86%*	*106.77%*	92.01%
Splice	77.98%	*108.12%*	79.25%	*101.68%*	*108.61%*	*164.32%*	*144.63%*	97.44%	*181.65%*	77.97%	*104.14%*	96.84%	84.31%
Gcloudb	61.60%	*147.10%*	60.36%	94.06%	*147.55%*	*104.00%*	*488.17%*	*423.89%*	*142.77%*	66.29%	98.02%	81.17%	64.59%
Gcloudub	46.41%	*105.08%*	48.27%	84.01%	85.21%	*119.68%*	*273.89%*	*186.53%*	*168.58%*	47.57%	*123.12%*	*103.64%*	59.03%
Checkerboard	80.42%	*125.73%*	70.49%	99.35%	79.21%	*124.08%*	*916.17%*	*801.92%*	*553.50%*	58.66%	*106.13%*	*141.07%*	50.63%
Spambase	22.96%	*109.32%*	19.14%	94.56%	*122.51%*	*132.64%*	*282.80%*	*207.05%*	96.33%	21.76%	TLE	*104.81%*	25.40%
Banana	65.49%	*116.15%*	47.70%	*131.01%*	*132.31%*	83.74%	*455.27%*	*396.93%*	*691.08%*	56.57%	*122.59%*	*194.17%*	52.98%
Phoneme	33.78%	*102.37%*	33.95%	68.43%	*100.16%*	72.78%	*116.82%*	92.83%	*107.17%*	34.62%	87.11%	83.28%	39.12%
Ringnorm	27.95%	*114.87%*	31.49%	*142.95%*	*250.54%*	*866.58%*	*817.08%*	*844.31%*	*731.19%*	36.33%	TLE	*208.99%*	*124.45%*
Twonorm	54.11%	90.13%	42.61%	*285.71%*	*114.89%*	97.52%	*902.62%*	TLE	*114.72%*	58.90%	TLE	*134.42%*	68.25%
Phishing	18.38%	*118.07%*	20.24%	*102.20%*	*142.07%*	98.98%	*215.34%*	TLE	*151.26%*	20.96%	TLE	59.51%	22.77%
Covertype	45.70%	TLE	46.78%	TLE	*116.98%*	TLE	TLE	TLE	*117.86%*	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE
Bioresponse	70.86%	TLE	72.53%	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE
Pol	17.78%	TLE	17.21%	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE	TLE

Table 29: The computational time of a query strategy (column) on a dataset (row) with format 'minutes:seconds'. 'TLE' denotes a query strategy that exceeds the time limit.

	Uniform	US	QBC	Hier	Graph	Core-Set	HintSVM	QUIRE	DWUS	MCM	BMDR	ALBL	LAL
Appendicitis	0m3.838s	0m38.605s	0m39.556s	0m6.453s	0m6.473s	0m4.556s	0m5.390s	0m12.681s	0m9.665s	0m4.322s	TLE	0m42.372s	9m12.175s
Sonar	0m2.278s	0m42.757s	0m59.219s	0m15.093s	0m3.278s	0m5.831s	0m6.422s	1m11.645s	0m9.481s	0m2.926s	10m42.063s	0m51.094s	6m6.153s
Parkinsons	0m2.102s	0m41.104s	0m42.915s	0m10.972s	0m2.960s	0m5.147s	0m5.414s	0m47.767s	0m38.258s	0m2.556s	22m19.975s	0m46.091s	11m40.118s
Ex8b	0m2.099s	0m41.264s	0m40.830s	0m13.134s	0m4.657s	0m4.807s	0m4.982s	1m17.010s	0m9.605s	0m2.648s	12m48.409s	0m44.175s	3m37.467s
Heart	0m2.496s	0m44.071s	0m46.790s	0m24.228s	0m5.449s	0m6.257s	0m6.740s	3m27.610s	0m23.185s	0m3.434s	59m9.378s	0m49.261s	12m23.746s
Haberman	0m2.612s	0m44.858s	0m47.148s	0m29.947s	0m5.583s	0m6.364s	0m6.531s	5m14.789s	0m14.081s	0m3.412s	15m49.559s	0m49.798s	7m17.263s
Ionosphere	0m3.012s	0m45.163s	0m57.073s	0m55.119s	0m4.748s	0m8.249s	0m9.165s	7m51.793s	1m7.518s	0m4.479s	30m20.452s	1m3.266s	12m52.246s
Clean1	0m8.529s	1m39.377s	3m7.041s	1m16.212s	0m10.947s	0m31.609s	0m39.084s	19m34.331s	0m43.750s	0m15.876s	TLE	2m59.617s	20m54.571s
Breast	0m4.879s	0m52.967s	1m15.016s	2m52.406s	0m11.266s	0m15.623s	0m17.907s	40m7.140s	0m56.034s	0m11.091s	87m17.190s	1m30.334s	60m28.833s
Wdbc	0m4.867s	0m55.079s	1m18.105s	1m42.001s	0m8.129s	0m14.407s	0m22.674s	31m10.174s	0m19.239s	0m9.264s	160m47.424s	1m35.925s	31m4.656s
Australian	0m7.588s	1m1.552s	1m38.815s	2m42.369s	0m14.618s	0m22.574s	0m28.341s	51m13.865s	0m24.982s	0m15.664s	189m13.127s	1m41.586s	55m13.816s
Diabetes	0m9.436s	1m9.050s	1m52.802s	3m10.987s	0m16.178s	0m29.073s	0m33.750s	66m25.062s	0m54.033s	0m20.934s	112m52.681s	1m49.799s	56m45.749s
Mammographic	0m9.026s	1m6.022s	1m44.588s	4m1.753s	0m17.076s	0m26.850s	0m30.192s	81m58.434s	0m46.407s	0m21.149s	61m52.793s	1m52.393s	58m27.473s
Ex8a	0m8.391s	1m0.039s	1m30.220s	2m58.896s	0m14.736s	0m22.182s	0m24.874s	65m35.275s	0m37.734s	0m17.328s	TLE	1m35.728s	53m10.547s
Tic	0m12.182s	1m14.257s	2m5.724s	4m20.451s	0m22.801s	0m34.233s	0m47.141s	106m1.296s	1m36.144s	0m31.285s	TLE	2m16.302s	81m22.460s
German	0m21.129s	2m14.906s	4m56.843s	5m37.499s	0m32.877s	1m4.185s	1m25.568s	130m51.383s	2m40.555s	0m51.400s	TLE	4m11.411s	88m12.394s
Splice	0m30.106s	3m24.539s	11m40.330s	5m35.731s	0m41.997s	2m9.672s	6m32.557s	114m2.042s	5m35.220s	1m21.324s	TLE	8m19.553s	88m50.834s
Gcloudb	0m10.540s	1m13.866s	1m59.490s	5m6.187s	0m21.419s	0m31.987s	0m31.938s	16m13.863s	1m5.692s	0m32.361s	83m49.329s	2m21.688s	63m11.067s
Gcloudub	0m8.376s	1m8.158s	1m47.249s	5m23.843s	0m20.025s	0m26.050s	0m31.233s	16m7.883s	0m59.193s	0m26.849s	85m38.125s	2m18.006s	59m32.045s
Checkerboard	0m22.576s	1m49.740s	4m28.037s	14m5.470s	0m55.399s	1m7.784s	1m16.511s	92m10.770s	1m51.429s	1m39.574s	229m38.358s	4m22.690s	191m30.459s

Figure 13: Mean AUBC of query-oriented model and task-oriented model on group 1. (Compatible LRs achieve best results.): *Appendicitis* (top-left), *Ex8b* (top-right), *Haberman* (bottom-left), and *Wdbc* (bottom-right).

Figure 14: Mean AUBC of query-oriented model and task-oriented model on group 1. (Compatible LRs achieve best results.): *Diabetes* (top-left), *Mammographic* (top-right), *Gcloudub* (bottom-left), and *Twonorm* (bottom-right).

Figure 15: Mean AUBC of query-oriented model and task-oriented model on group 2. (Compatible SVMs achieve best results.): *Sonar* (top-left), *Ionosphere* (top-right), *Clean1* (middle-left), *Tic* (middle-left), *Gcloudb* (bottom-left), and *Ringnorm* (bottom-right).

Figure 16: Mean AUBC of query-oriented model and task-oriented model on group 3. (Compatible RFs achieve best results.): *Parkinsons* (top-left), *Breast* (top-right), *Australian* (bottom-left), and *Ex8a* (bottom-right).



Figure 17: Mean AUBC of query-oriented model and task-oriented model on group 3. (Compatible RFs achieve best results.): *German* (top-left), *Spambase* (top-right), *Phoneme* (bottom-left), and *Phishing* (bottom-right).



Figure 18: Mean AUBC of query-oriented model and task-oriented model on group 5. (Non-Compatible models achieve best results.): *Heart* (top-left), *Splice* (top-right), *Checkerboard* (bottom-left), and *Banana* (bottom-right).