

AutoGeTS: Automated Generation of Text Synthetics for Improving Text Classification

Anonymous Author(s)

Abstract

When developing text classification models for real world applications, one major challenge is the difficulty to collect sufficient data for all text classes. In this work, we address this challenge by utilizing large language models (LLMs) to generate synthetic data and using such data to improve the performance of the models without waiting for more real data to be collected and labelled. As an LLM generates different synthetic data in response to different input examples, we formulate an automated workflow, which searches for input examples that lead to more “effective” synthetic data for improving the model concerned. We study three search strategies with an extensive set of experiments, and use experiment results to inform an ensemble algorithm that selects a search strategy according to the characteristics of a class. Our further experiments demonstrate that this ensemble approach is more effective than each individual strategy in our automated workflow for improving classification models using LLMs.

CCS Concepts

- Computing methodologies → Natural language generation; Supervised learning by classification.

Keywords

Text Classification, Ensemble Algorithm, Synthetic Data, Data Augmentation, Large Language Model, Knowledge Map, Optimization

ACM Reference Format:

Anonymous Author(s). 2025. AutoGeTS: Automated Generation of Text Synthetics for Improving Text Classification. In . ACM, New York, NY, USA, 16 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

1 Introduction

In industrial applications of text classification the classes are typically defined according to semantic grouping as well as organizational function. Critical impediments to developing robust text classification models for such applications include (i) noticeably imbalanced class sizes, data scarcity in some classes, and (ii) changes of the categorization scheme due to organizational changes. One group of examples are automated ticketing systems in different companies and organizations for processing users’ messages and distributing them to different services, e.g., IT issues, building problems, operational incidents, and service requests [2].

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

Conference'17, Washington, DC, USA

© 2025 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.

ACM ISBN 978-x-xxxx-xxxx-x/YY/MM

<https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>

As illustrated in Figure 1, a model is initially trained on a set of labeled tickets. Classification errors necessitate manual classification and redistribution, incurring delays and costs [19]. With the gradual changes within each organization, messages of certain semantics may become less frequent, while those with other semantics (including new semantics) become more frequent. Over time, the model performance degrades [14]. On the one hand, such a model needs to be improved regularly. On the other hand, identifying worsened performance of a model is usually not accompanied by adequate training data for improving the model.

Synthetic data has been used to overcome the limitations of real-world data, addressing data scarcity, sensitivity, or collection cost [22, 25] in many fields, such as computer vision and NLP [24], medical imaging [13], autonomous driving systems [29], finance [7] and cybersecurity [26]. In this work, we focus on providing a novel and cost-effective solution to improve models for classifying short messages in ticketing systems.

In particular, we conducted a large number of experiments to study the approaches for finding message examples for LLMs to generate synthetic data for improving models. Building on our analysis of the experimental results, we outlined a novel algorithm for controlling the model improvement workflow by distributing the computational resources (e.g., for searching examples, generating synthetic data, retraining models, and testing models) according the knowledge gained from systematic exploration of the algorithmic space for identifying effective message examples. We also validated our findings using other datasets and data synthesis method.

2 Related Work

Synthetic data has increasingly been used to assist in various data science tasks across many domains [4, 23]. Bootstrapping [5, 11] is one of the early *data synthesis* methods. It resamples original data to simulate desired distributions and improve model performance [30]. To overcome the shortcomings of imbalanced datasets, synthetic data was used in conjunction with the common method to over-sample the minority classes and under-sample the majority classes [8]. Today, *data augmentation* encompasses a family of techniques that transform existing data in a dataset to generate synthetic data with desired properties, such as increasing diversity, changing distributions, filling in missing data, and so on [18].

Machine learned models, such as Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) [15], were used to generate synthetic data with a high level of realism and complexity. Studies have shown that models trained on GAN-generated data often can perform comparably to those trained on real data [9, 39]. For example, Frid-Adar et al. [12] enhanced liver lesion diagnosis using GAN-generated images. Yale et al. [37] demonstrated comparable performance using GAN-generated electronic health records for ICU patient predictions. Croce et al. [10] demonstrated their effectiveness in generating realistic text for NLP tasks. He et al. [16] explored task-specific text




Figure 1: The workflow for developing and deploying a classification model in an industrial ticketing system, and the main obstacles impacting on the performance of the model.

generation. However, GAN-generated data for text classification often lacks semantic coherence and relevance to specific tasks [31].

Recent advancements in large language models (LLMs), such as GPT-2 [27], provide new approaches to overcome these limitations. LLMs excel in few-shot and zero-shot learning [6, 33], adapting to unseen tasks and generating contextually relevant data that improves model robustness. Yoo et al.'s GPT-3Mix [38] demonstrated LLMs' capability to generate diverse, effective synthetic data for text classification through careful *prompt engineering*. Prompt optimization strategies have shown that carefully crafting input prompts can significantly impact the quality of generated data [32]. Automated search techniques for identifying optimal prompts, such as those used in AutoPrompt [28, 35], offer a potential solution to improve synthetic data generation.

One aspect in prompt engineering is to select existing data objects as input prompts (examples). The effectiveness of such example data objects becomes crucial factor in synthetic data generation. Several methods have been proposed to enable the selection of effective input examples, ranging from uniform distribution to human selection with the aid of visualization [3, 21]. Motivated by an industrial application, this work aims to provide an automated technique that can perform example selection much faster than the human selection approach [3], while simulating some behaviors in human selection processes.

Beyond data synthesis and prompt engineering, ensemble methods has emerged as another promising approach for improving synthetic data generation. Xu et al. [36] proposed AdaDEM, which ensembles multiple convolutional networks at different granularity levels to optimize synthetic data selection for text classification. Similarly, Zhou et al. [40] introduced MetaAugment, an ensemble framework based on reinforcement learning that dynamically selects augmentation strategies per class, ensuring adaptive augmentation. Agbesi et al. [1] developed MuTCELM, integrating multiple sub-classifiers to capture distinct linguistic features in an ensemble framework. In this work, we extract useful knowledge in the testing data in our model improvement workflow AutoGeTS and use the knowledge to select an ensemble of effective methods for identifying example data.

3 Methods

As the prior work [3] has already confirmed that synthetic data generated using LLMs can improve classification models used in automated ticketing systems, this work focuses on three research questions as shown in the upper part of Figure 2. Firstly, we conducted a large number of structured experiments to understand the effect of different variants of the algorithm for finding suitable message examples on the performance of model improvement. Ideally, we could discover a superior algorithm. We will describe our experimental method in this section and report the results and analysis in Section 4. Our analysis showed the absence of such a superior algorithm. This led to the second and third research questions, which will be discussed in Section 5.

Objectives for Model Optimization. Ticketing systems deployed in specific organizational environments often face different, sometimes conflicting, requirements. Typical business requirements and related performance metrics include:

- R1. The accuracy of every class should be as high as possible and above a certain threshold. One may optimize a model with a performance metric such as class-based *balanced accuracy* or *F1-score* as the objective function, with each threshold value as a constraint.
- R2. The overall classification accuracy of a model should be as high as possible and above a certain threshold because misclassified messages lead to undesirable consequences. One may optimize a model with a global performance metric, such as overall *balanced accuracy* and overall *F1-score*.
- R3. The recall for some specific classes (e.g., important) should be as high as possible and above a certain threshold in order to minimize the delay due to the messages in such a class being sent to other services. Class-based *recall* is the obvious metric for this requirement.

These requirements inform the definition of objective functions and constraints for model optimization. However, as the use of LLMs to generate synthetic data to aid ML is a recent approach [3], it is necessary to understand how different example selection algorithms for LLMs may impact the performance of optimization with different metrics. This led to **research question 1** in Figure 2.




Figure 2: AutoGeTS architecture: (left) the research questions (RQs) instigated its design. (middle) its experimental workflow used for answering research questions, creating a knowledge map, and enabling a model-improvement operation. (right) its operational pipeline for improving a model. It can support the development and maintenance of multiple ticketing systems.




Figure 3: The three strategies experimented in this work for selecting example messages to be used by LLMs for generating synthetic data. The examples are only selected from training data of a particular class (light green dots), while blue, red, and gray dots illustrate contextual information, including correct and incorrect testing results and the data of other classes.

AutoGeTS Architecture and Workflow. The AutoGeTS architecture includes an experimental environment and an operational pipeline, which are illustrated in the middle and right parts of Figure 2. The experimental environment was initially used to answer **research question 1**, and later to support the operational pipeline, which will be detailed in Section 5.

Given a model M_0 to be improved and a set of improvement requirements (overall or class-specific), the improvement process is an optimization workflow as shown in the middle of Figure 2. To answer **research question 1**, we systematically sample different variants of selection algorithm, run the workflow for each algorithmic sample, collect a large volume of results, and analyze the performance of these variants in obtaining the best model.

As reported in [3], using class-based visualization plots similar to those shown in Figure 3, humans can select example messages from the training data and provide LLMs with these examples to generate synthetic data. To conduct experiments at a large scale, we replaced humans in the process. For a selected class C , visualization plots are automatically generated for every class. All training and testing data are mapped onto data points in an n -D feature space (in our work, $n = 20$). Each plot depicts data points in two feature dimensions, with blue for correct testing data points in C , red for

incorrect ones in C , light green for training data points in C , and gray for all data points in other classes. Note that an algorithm selects example messages only from the green data points.

An algorithm for selecting example messages can have many variations and their effectiveness depends on (1) the training datasets, (2) the structures and training parameters of models, (3) optimization metrics, and (4) the LLMs used and their control parameters. While it is not feasible to sample all algorithmic variations and their related conditions finely, our experiments covered a broad scope:

0. We compared three search strategies for example selection, namely *Sliding Window* (SW), *Hierarchical Sliding Window* (HSW), and *Generic Algorithm* (GA). We conducted a pilot study to ensure that the parameters (e.g., window size, crossover method, etc.) of each strategy is fairly optimized.
1. In addition to a real world dataset collected in an industrial ticketing system, we also experimented with two other datasets, TREC-6 [20] and Amazon Reviews 2023 [17].
2. We optimized the structure and training parameters for our baseline model M_0 , and use the same structure and training parameters consistently throughout experiments for a training dataset.

- 349 3. We compared optimization performance using a number
 350 of metrics, including *balanced accuracy*, *F1-score*, and *recall*
 351 for each of the 15 classes as well as for the overall dataset.
 352 4. We used the GPT-3.5's API with a zero-shot prompt tem-
 353 plate. We conducted a pilot study to ensure that its control
 354 parameters were fairly optimized for examples selected
 355 using all three algorithms (i.e., SW, HSW, and GA). We com-
 356 pared the data generated using the GPT-3.5's API and the
 357 Easy Data Augmentation (EDA) tool [34].

359 **Strategies for Example Selection.** Given m text messages in a
 360 training dataset, there are a total of 2^m different combinations for
 361 selecting $1 \leq k \leq m$ messages as input examples for LLMs to
 362 generate synthetic data. Probabilistically, synthetic data generated
 363 using any of these 2^m combinations might help improve a model.
 364 However, testing all 2^n combinations falls into the NP category.

365 The previous non-automatic work [3] has found uses visual
 366 clusters of negative testing results (red dots) in different 2D feature
 367 spaces to guide the selection of examples from training data (light
 368 green dots) in an individual class. They found that the approach
 369 was relatively effective, though some attempts would fail to result
 370 in an improved model. Based on this finding, we consider three
 371 strategies for example selection:

372 ► *Sliding Window* (SW) – As illustrated in Figure 3(a), this simple
 373 automated strategy scans a 2D feature space square by square, and
 374 in each attempt, selects k training data points randomly as examples.
 375 The total number of *attempts* is more than the number of windows.

376 ► *Hierarchical Sliding Window* (HSW) – In the non-automatic
 377 work [3], ML developers make intuitive decisions about the sizes
 378 of regions for selecting examples according to the visual patterns
 379 they are observing. In order to provide more flexibility than the SW
 380 approach, this automated strategy has a larger sliding window at
 381 level 1, and when encountering a promising or interesting window,
 382 it hierarchically makes more attempts with reduced window sizes
 383 as illustrated in Figure 3(b). The specification of k is the same as
 384 SW. The total number of *attempts* is the sum of the attempts in
 385 every window examined at every level.

386 ► *Genetic Algorithm* (GA) – In the non-automatic work [3], ML
 387 developers do not just rely on simple visual clusters of erroneous
 388 testing data points, and they sometimes select examples from a
 389 few separated regions. To enable more flexibility than the SW and
 390 HSW approaches, this automated strategy allows examples to be
 391 selected from any training data in a 2D feature space. Given m_i
 392 training data points in a particular class C_i , the GA maintains a
 393 population of r chromosomes, each of which has $1 \leq s \leq m_i$ genes
 394 that are switched on representing s training data points selected
 395 as examples. In every iteration, GA evolves the population, while
 396 making attempts to improve the model with chromosomes that
 397 have not been previously tested. The total number of *attempts* is
 398 the sum of the attempts in every iteration.

399 **Objective Functions for Optimization.** As illustrated in Figure
 400 2, the above three strategies provide alternative algorithms to the
 401 **example selection** process, with which the workflow in the mid-
 402 dle of the figure makes numerous *attempts* to find different subsets
 403 of training data points of a particular class as examples for LLMs to
 404 generate synthetic data. The synthetic data is then added into the
 405

406 training data, and the classification is retrained and tested. There-
 407 fore, the workflow is essentially an optimization process to find a
 408 set of examples E^* that results in a model M^* that is considered to
 409 be the best model, i.e., given \mathbb{E} consisting of all sets of examples
 410 attempted in a multi-iteration workflow, the best model M^* is:
 411

$$\text{Objective: } \arg \max(f(M_0), \max_{E_j \in \mathbb{E}} f(M_j)) \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, t$$

$$\text{Subject to: } M_j \leftarrow \text{TRAIN}(M^\square, D_{\text{tn}}, \text{LLM}(E_j)) \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, t$$

$$f(M_j) \leftarrow \phi(\text{TEST}(M_j, D_{\text{tt}})) \quad j = 1, 2, \dots, t$$

412 where D_{tn} and D_{tt} are the original training and testing data respect-
 413 ively, M_0 is the baseline model to be improved, $t = \|\mathbb{E}\|$ is the total
 414 number of attempts (i.e., sets of example data points selected from
 415 D_{tn}), $M_j (j \in [1, t])$ are sampled models in the optimization process,
 416 $\text{TRAIN}()$ and $\text{TEST}()$ are the processes for training and testing a
 417 classification model M_j , f is the measurement of the testing results
 418 with a statistical measure ϕ , M^\square is the structure of a classification
 419 model, and $\text{LLM}()$ is the process for LLMs to generate synthetic
 420 data using a set of examples E_j .

421 In ticketing systems, *recall* for an individual class ϕ_c^{cr} is a measure
 422 that client organizations pay attention to because improving ϕ_c^{cr}
 423 reduces the amount of manual classification in Figure 1. On the
 424 other hand, for a specific class, when we consider both TP and FP
 425 (true and false positive) messages, for a small class, the FP total
 426 (#FP) can easily overwhelm the TP total (#TP). Measures, such as
 427 *accuracy* and *precision*, can be overly biased by #FP. For this reason,
 428 we focus on *recall* ϕ_c^{cr} and *balanced accuracy* ϕ_c^{cba} to measure the
 429 improvement made in the context of a specific class C_i . Meanwhile,
 430 to measure the overall performance of a model, we use overall
 431 *balanced accuracy* ϕ^{oba} and overall F1-score ϕ^{of1} . In summary:
 432

$$\phi_c^{\text{cr}} = \frac{\#TP_c}{\#TP_c + \#FN_c} \quad \phi_c^{\text{cba}} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\#TP_c}{\#TP_c + \#FP_c} + \frac{\#TN_c}{\#TN_c + \#FN_c} \right)$$

$$\phi^{\text{of1}} = \frac{2\#TP}{2\#TP + \#FP + \#FN} \quad \phi^{\text{oba}} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\#TP}{\#TP + \#FP} + \frac{\#TN}{\#TN + \#FN} \right)$$

433 where the subscript c indicated the total values in a class C .
 434

4 Single-Phase Experiments and Results

444 In this work, we first conducted single-phase experiments to answer
 445 **research question 1** as discussed in Section 3. Here “single-phase”
 446 means that a baseline model M_0 is improved by running the work-
 447 flow using \mathbb{E}_a , i.e., examples selected from the training data of a
 448 single class C_a . As indicated by (a) and (b) in Figure 2, we systemati-
 449 cally sampled three algorithmic variants and four metric variants,
 450 together with the variations of classes where example messages
 451 were selected. In Section 5, we will report that the systematic test-
 452 ing can provide an answer to **research questions 2 & 3**, while
 453 supporting multi-phase optimization, with which M_0 is improved
 454 by running the workflows in multiple phrases, using examples from
 455 different classes, i.e., $\mathbb{E}_a, \mathbb{E}_b$, etc.

456 For **research question 1**, we sought answers in several aspects:
 457

- How does each of the three strategies (SW, HSW, GA) per-
 458 form under different testing conditions (e.g., performance
 459 metric, time allowed for finding M^* , etc.).
 460
- Is there a superior strategy for each metric ϕ as an objective
 461 function?
 462

- How does optimization using one metric ϕ affect the model performance measured with other metrics?
- How does improvement made using examples from one class affect the overall performance of the model and its performance in other classes?
- Is synthetic data generated by LLMs comparable with traditional data augmentation method? For this, we also conducted experiments with data generated using the Easy Data Augmentation (EDA) tool [34].
- Are the findings obtained in our experiments data-dependent? For this, we also conducted experiments on two public datasets, TREC-6 [20] and Amazon Reviews 2023 [17].

Experiment Setup. Our main experiments were conducted using a real-world dataset collected in an industrial ticketing system. It has 39,100 pieces of messages as training and testing data objects. Their labels fall into 15 classes for different services (Figure 1). As shown in Table 1, the dataset is highly imbalanced, with some classes have less than 1% of the total data objects. Because of the imbalance, we split the dataset into 60% for training, 20% for optimization testing, and 20% for performance testing outside the optimization process. Developing models with imbalanced data is a common phenomenon among almost all ticketing systems in different organizations.

Table 1: The performance of the original CatBoost model M_0

Class	Class Size	Balanced Accuracy	Recall	F1-Score
T1	8529	0.986	0.979	0.977
T2	11350	0.950	0.941	0.921
T3	4719	0.952	0.914	0.922
T4	1387	0.899	0.801	0.859
T5	2755	0.889	0.794	0.794
T6	1888	0.821	0.665	0.623
T7	1963	0.883	0.780	0.766
T8	1028	0.828	0.665	0.672
T9	1466	0.861	0.747	0.680
T10	1699	0.761	0.540	0.554
T11	471	0.973	0.947	0.967
T12	358	0.742	0.484	0.608
T13	180	0.666	0.333	0.469
T14	764	0.772	0.548	0.607
T15	543	0.726	0.452	0.596
Overall	39100	0.923	0.856	0.856

Referring to the workflow in the middle of Figure 2, we used GPT-3.5 (version: 2023-03-15-preview) to generate synthetic text with main parameters $temperature = 0.7$, $max_tokens = 550$, $top_p = 0.5$, $frequency_penalty = 0.3$, and $presence_penalty = 0.0$. The original model (M_0) was developed in an industrial application using CatBoost. For ensuring this research relevant to the industrial application, we trained all models using CatBoost consistently with fixed hyperparameters, i.e., $number_of_iterations = 300$, $learning_rate = 0.2$, $depth = 8$, $L2\ leaf\ regularization = 1$.

Comparison of Strategies and Metrics. We systematically tested the combinations of three strategies (SW, HSW, GA) and four objective metrics (ϕ^{cr} , ϕ^{cba} , ϕ^{oba} , ϕ^{of1}). When these combinations were applied to each of the 15 classes where example messages were selected, there were a total of 180 combinations. Table 2(a) shows the results of these 180 combinations. All results were obtained from fixed-time experiments (1 GPU hour).

From the table, we can make several observations:

- Class-based objective metrics (ϕ^{cr} and ϕ^{cba}) mostly delivered improvement for the target classes with a few exceptions. For example, when ϕ^{cr} is applied to class T1, strategies SW, HSW, and GA improved the recall of T1 by 0.23, 0.35, 0.35 respectively.
- Overall objective metrics (ϕ^{oba} and ϕ^{of1}) were consistently improved for every class where example messages were selected from.
- Smaller classes, e.g., T12 ~ T15 were noticeably improved.
- Table 2(b) summarizes the strategies that were considered to be the best for each class-metric combination. While each strategy may appear in several neighboring cells that form a color block, there is no overwhelming superior strategy. This observation leads to **research question 2** in Figure 2.

Performance Beyond an Objective Metric. When a strategy-metric combination was applied to a class in an experiment, we also measure the overall performance of the model and its performance on other classes. Table 3 shows such measurements when the combination (SW, ϕ^{cr}) was applied to each of the 15 classes.

For example, in the first row T1, the model retrained with synthetic data generated using examples from the training data of T1 not only improves the recall of T1 (i.e., 0.2% in the yellow cell), but also improves the two overall measurements ϕ^{of1} and ϕ^{oba} by 0.5% and 0.2% respectively as well as the class-based measurements ϕ^{cr} and ϕ^{cba} for many other classes. Noticeably, ϕ^{cr} for class T10 was improved by 8.8%.

From the table, we can also observe that some classes, such as T10, T12, and T13 have often benefited from workflows that were intended to improve other classes. Meanwhile, there were many cells with red numbers indicating worsened performance. Note that the results are representative only for single-phase experiments.

With the 12 combinations of three strategies and four objective metrics, there are 11 other tables similar to Table 3. The results of these experiments can be found in Appendix B. Hence, if one wishes to improve ϕ^{cr} for class T1, one can search the column $\Delta CR\%-T1$ in all 12 tables for the best performance, and thereby the best combination strategy-metric-class. Any of the 180 cell may potentially offer the best setting for improving ϕ^{cr} for class T1.

The 12 tables of experimental results also inform us that we should not make simple assumption, such as “to improve ϕ^{cba} of class C, model improvement using metric ϕ^{cba} and example messages from class C training data is always the best approach.” This leads to a solution for **research question 3** (see Section 5).

Further Experiments. To ensure what observed in the aforementioned experiments described is not an isolated instance, we conducted further experiments using the same experimental environment with different datasets (TREC-6 [20] and Amazon Reviews 2023 [17]) and an alternative method for generating synthetic data (Easy Data Augmentation (EDA) tool [34]). The results of these experiments can be found in Appendix A.

In general, we can observe a common phenomenon that there is no superior strategy and we cannot assume a superior objective metric. Meanwhile, the amount of improvement through retraining with synthetic data generated using EDA normally is noticeably lower than with synthetic data generated using GPT-3.5.

Table 2: (a) The results of systematic testing of 180 combinations of 3 strategies, 4 objective metrics, and 15 classes in the ticketing dataset. The bars in cells depict the improvement in the range (0%, 50%), while red texts indicate worsened performance. (b) The results can be summarized as a knowledge map showing the best strategy or strategies for each metric-class combination. For each map region, the strategies within 0.03% difference from the best strategy are also selected.

(a) the results of systematic testing

Class	ΔCR %			ΔCBA %			ΔOBA %			ΔOF1 %		
	SW	HSW	GA	SW	HSW	GA	SW	HSW	GA	SW	HSW	GA
T1	0.23	0.35	0.35	0.05	0.05	-0.12	0.30	0.31	0.20	0.61	0.63	0.40
T2	0.71	0.85	0.80	0.53	0.50	-0.11	0.33	0.36	0.10	0.66	0.73	0.19
T3	2.01	2.01	2.01	0.61	0.65	0.73	0.33	0.30	0.31	0.66	0.61	0.63
T4	8.00	9.78	8.44	3.39	4.10	3.59	0.32	0.36	0.39	0.64	0.72	0.78
T5	5.67	4.26	2.84	2.12	1.57	0.66	0.34	0.36	0.11	0.69	0.73	0.22
T6	6.85	6.45	4.84	2.32	3.23	1.22	0.38	0.33	0.16	0.76	0.66	0.33
T7	5.84	5.84	-0.32	2.58	2.56	-0.30	0.39	0.36	0.13	0.78	0.73	0.25
T8	10.19	11.46	5.10	3.87	4.33	1.71	0.33	0.32	0.22	0.66	0.64	0.43
T9	4.39	5.37	2.93	1.70	2.22	0.89	0.39	0.30	0.28	0.79	0.60	0.57
T10	12.15	11.05	12.08	3.69	3.25	3.68	0.37	0.48	0.29	0.75	0.96	0.58
T11	1.12	1.12	1.12	0.55	0.55	0.55	0.33	0.33	0.42	0.66	0.66	0.85
T12	29.03	32.26	32.26	9.43	10.41	10.45	0.40	0.35	0.39	0.81	0.70	0.79
T13	26.67	33.33	33.33	6.65	8.22	8.23	0.33	0.40	0.37	0.66	0.81	0.75
T14	13.51	16.22	16.22	4.23	5.12	5.13	0.25	0.31	0.21	0.51	0.63	0.42
T15	20.75	20.75	24.53	6.28	6.14	7.34	0.36	0.36	0.40	0.72	0.73	0.81

Table 3: When a model is improved with the SW strategy and objective metric ϕ^{cr} (class-based recall) for classes T_1, T_2, \dots, T_{15} in the ticketing dataset, the direct improvement of the target classes can be seen in the yellow cells on the left part of the table. Meanwhile, there are positive and negative impact on other classes and other performance metrics. The green bars in cells depict the improvement in the range (0%, 50%), while red texts indicate negative impact. The last row shows the baseline performance. There are 12 such tables for three strategies (SW, HSW, GA) and four objective metrics ($\phi_{cr}, \phi_{cba}, \phi_{oba}, \phi_{of1}$).

Class	Optimization: SW-CR-Class[row]; Performance Metric: ΔOF1%, ACR %															Optimization: SW-CR-Class[row]; Performance Metric: ΔOBA%, ΔCBA %																
	%	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	T7	T8	T9	T10	T11	T12	T13	T14	%	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	T7	T8	T9	T10	T11	T12	T13	T14	T15	
T1	0.5	0.2	-0.1	0.5	-0.4	0.5	0.8	1.9	3.8	-1.5	8.8	0.0	6.5	0.0	-1.4	-5.7	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.2	-0.2	0.2	0.3	1.0	1.6	-0.5	3.1	0.0	2.1	0.0	-0.5	-1.8
T2	0.6	-0.2	0.7	-0.1	1.8	0.5	0.8	3.2	0.0	2.0	5.5	0.0	16.1	-13.3	-1.4	-7.5	0.3	-0.1	0.5	-0.1	0.8	0.2	0.3	1.5	0.1	0.9	2.0	0.0	5.2	-3.3	-0.5	-2.4
T3	-0.1	-0.2	-0.8	2.0	1.3	-1.2	2.0	-2.9	2.5	0.5	0.0	0.0	3.2	0.0	1.4	-3.8	0.0	-0.1	-0.2	0.6	-0.5	0.8	-1.3	1.2	0.3	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.5	-1.2		
T4	0.1	-0.4	-0.4	0.0	8.0	-0.9	1.2	2.9	1.3	-2.0	2.8	0.0	-3.2	6.7	-1.4	-9.4	0.1	-0.2	-0.1	0.0	3.4	-0.4	0.5	1.3	0.6	-0.8	0.9	0.0	-1.0	1.7	-0.5	-3.0
T5	0.6	-0.2	0.3	0.2	0.0	5.7	5.2	0.0	3.8	0.0	0.6	0.0	-3.2	0.0	-2.7	-7.5	0.3	-0.1	0.4	0.1	0.0	2.1	2.3	0.1	1.6	0.1	0.3	0.0	-1.1	0.0	-1.0	-2.4
T6	0.2	-0.1	-0.5	0.1	1.8	1.4	6.9	1.6	-5.1	0.5	4.4	0.0	-3.2	-6.7	-2.7	-9.4	0.1	-0.1	0.0	0.0	0.8	0.7	2.3	0.8	-1.9	0.3	1.7	0.0	-1.0	-1.7	-0.9	-3.0
T7	0.8	-0.1	0.6	0.0	1.3	0.9	0.0	5.8	3.8	0.5	3.0	0.0	16.1	0.0	-1.4	-1.9	0.4	0.0	0.5	0.6	0.5	0.1	2.5	1.6	0.3	1.2	0.0	5.3	0.0	-0.5	-0.6	
T8	-0.1	-0.1	-0.7	0.1	0.4	-1.9	-1.2	1.0	10.2	0.5	2.2	0.0	0.0	6.7	-4.1	-5.7	-0.1	0.0	-0.2	0.1	0.2	-0.8	-0.4	0.4	3.9	0.1	0.8	0.0	0.0	1.7	-1.4	-1.8
T9	0.2	-0.5	0.4	0.4	1.8	0.5	-0.4	1.6	-1.3	4.4	2.2	0.0	-3.2	-6.7	-4.1	-5.7	0.1	-0.2	0.3	0.1	0.8	0.2	0.1	0.8	-0.5	1.7	0.9	0.0	-1.0	-1.7	-1.5	-1.8
T10	-0.1	-0.4	-0.5	0.5	-0.4	-0.9	1.9	-3.2	-2.9	12.2	0.0	-6.5	6.7	1.4	-5.7	0.0	-0.2	-0.2	-0.3	-0.2	0.8	-1.2	-1.1	3.7	0.0	-2.1	1.6	0.5	-1.8			
T11	-0.1	-0.2	0.0	0.5	0.4	-0.9	-3.2	1.3	0.6	-1.0	2.2	1.1	-3.2	-6.7	1.4	-3.8	0.0	-0.1	0.1	0.2	-0.4	-1.3	0.5	0.3	-0.4	0.8	0.6	-1.1	-1.7	0.5	-1.2	
T12	0.4	-0.2	0.5	0.2	0.4	0.7	-1.2	1.6	4.5	-2.4	4.4	0.0	29.0	0.0	-4.1	-7.5	0.2	-0.1	0.4	0.1	0.2	0.3	-0.4	0.7	1.8	-1.0	1.6	0.0	9.4	0.0	-1.5	-2.4
T13	0.2	-0.5	0.0	0.0	1.8	0.2	0.8	3.9	0.0	-2.0	4.4	0.0	-6.5	26.7	-1.4	-9.4	0.1	-0.2	0.1	0.0	0.8	0.1	0.4	1.7	0.0	-0.9	1.6	0.0	-2.1	6.6	-0.5	-3.0
T14	-0.1	-0.2	-0.1	0.0	-0.4	1.2	-1.6	0.0	-1.3	-1.0	-1.1	0.0	3.2	0.0	-13.5	-5.7	0.0	-0.1	-0.2	0.0	-0.2	-0.5	-0.5	0.0	-0.4	-0.4	0.0	1.1	0.0	4.2	-1.8	
T15	0.1	0.0	0.0	-0.4	1.8	0.2	-1.2	-1.0	1.9	-2.0	3.9	0.0	-3.2	0.0	-2.7	20.8	0.1	0.0	0.1	-0.2	0.8	0.1	-0.4	-0.3	0.8	-0.8	1.3	0.0	-1.0	0.0	-1.0	6.3
M0	0.86	0.98	0.94	0.91	0.80	0.79	0.66	0.78	0.67	0.74	0.54	0.95	0.48	0.33	0.55	0.45	0.92	0.99	0.95	0.95	0.90	0.89	0.82	0.88	0.83	0.86	0.76	0.97	0.74	0.67	0.77	0.73

(b) a summary of the best strategy-metric combinations

Class	Measured Performance Metric			
	CR	CBA	OBA	OF1
T1	HSW/GA	SW/HSW	SW/HSW	SW/HSW
T2	HSW	SW/HSW	SW/HSW	HSW
T3	SW/HSW/GA	GA	SW/HSW/GA	SW/GA
T4	HSW	HSW	HSW/GA	GA
T5	SW	SW	SW/HSW	HSW
T6	SW	SW/HSW	SW	SW
T7	SW/HSW	HSW	SW/HSW	SW
T8	HSW	HSW	HSW/GA	SW/HSW
T9	HSW	SW	SW	SW
T10	SW	SW/HSW	HSW	HSW
T11	SW/HSW/GA	SW/HSW/GA	GA	GA
T12	SW/GA	SW/HSW/GA	SW/GA	SW/GA
T13	HSW/GA	HSW/GA	HSW/GA	HSW
T14	HSW	HSW	HSW	HSW
T15	GA	GA	GA	GA

5 Ensemble Strategy and Further Experiments

The results of our large scale experiments indicated that there was no superior search strategy or objective metric that can address the typical business requirements outlined at the beginning of Section 3. This led us to **research question 2**. We noticed that the results were highly agreeable when we repeated these single-phase experiments. Although the performance of each combination of [SW, HSW, GA] \times [$\phi^{cr}, \phi^{cba}, \phi^{oba}, \phi^{of1}$] depends many factors (e.g., training data, class size, feature specification, LLMs, and model structure M^{\square}), these factors do not change much in the process for improving a model deployed in a specific ticketing system. Therefore, single-phase experiments (such as those reported in Section 4) collect knowledge as to what search strategy and what metric may work for each class. In other words, tables (such as the one in Table 3) are essentially quantitative knowledge maps generated by ML training and testing processes. Once these tables become

available, the model improvement process can use them to identify more effective strategies, metrics, and classes for a performance metric, and the process can become more cost-effective.

Multi-Phase Model Improvement. Given a model M_0 to be improved, the systematic sampling of $[C_1, C_2, \dots, C_k] \times [\text{SW, HSW, GA}] \times [\phi^{cr}, \phi^{cba}, \phi^{oba}, \phi^{of1}]$ produces a knowledge map. At the end of this process, likely, it also delivers the most improved model M_1^* . Because in this systematic sampling phase, each attempt involves example messages from the training data of only one individual class. Naturally, we can initiate a new process for improving M_1^* obtained in the first phase. As exemplified in Table 3, we can also use examples selected from another class to achieve a requirement for improvement. With 16 such tables, we can also use a different strategy and a different objective metric. Given a single business




Figure 4: A knowledge-based ensemble algorithm for multi-phase and multi-objective model improvement.

requirement, we can invoke multiple phases of model improvement with different combinations of strategy, objective metric, and classes for providing example messages.

Multi-objective Model Improvement. Recall the three typical business requirements in Section 3, a model improvement process often has to deal with more than one requirement, e.g., improving the recall of class X and Y , while improving the overall accuracy. The experiments reported in Section 4 also indicate such requirements can conflict with each other if one makes attempts with just one approach (e.g., red numbers in Table 3), while many other combinations of strategy, objective metric, and classes can provide alternative approaches. Once tables similar to Table 3) become available, the model improvement process can use the knowledge stored in these tables to explore different cost-effective approaches to meet multi-objective requirements.

The performance measurements obtained in an early phase can therefore facilitate a knowledge-based algorithm, which provides an answer to **research question 3**.

Knowledge-based Ensemble Algorithm. Figure 4 shows the flowchart of an ensemble algorithm for multi-phase and multi-objective model improvement. Given a set of objectives O_1, O_2, \dots, O_l and a set of constraints S_1, S_2, \dots, S_l , the algorithm begins with the creation of a pool of objectives P_0 . The algorithm randomly selects one objective O_i from P_0 each time, aiming to improve the currently-best candidate model with O_i as the focus. The randomness also provides the outer loop of the algorithm with further opportunities to improve the currently-best candidate model.

If the algorithm detects the absence of a knowledge map, it activates the process for creating such a map, while optimizing O_i (i.e., the yellow block). As described in Sections 3 and 4, the

process is the middle part of Figure 2 with systematic sampling all combinations of classes, search strategies, and objective metrics. For example, for the ticketing example, the process may run 180 workflows for 15 classes \times 3 strategies \times 4 metrics.

If the knowledge map is already there, the algorithm moves directly to the knowledge-based approach (i.e., the three blue blocks). The algorithm selects top $k > 0$ experimental settings that will likely benefit O_i most according to the knowledge map. Note that the selected settings do not have to use the objective metric ϕ defined for O_i . For example, if O_i is to improve ϕ_{C11}^{cr} (the recall of class C_{11}), as long as the knowledge map shows that ϕ_{C13}^{cr} , ϕ_{C1}^{cba} , and ϕ_{C7}^{of1} can also improve the performance measure of ϕ_{C11}^{cr} , they can be among the candidate objective metrics to be selected.

The algorithm also distributes computational resources according to the knowledge map. Consider the knowledge map shows that the top k settings previously improved O_i by $x_1\%$, $x_2\%$, ..., $x_k\%$, the algorithm distributes the computational resources proportionally to the i -th setting as $(x_i / \sum x_j)\%$ of the total resources available.

The algorithm adds the best model in each loop to a model pool P_m . At the end of the process, the best model can be selected from P_m based on a predefined numerical criterion (e.g., a weighted sum of different objective measurement) or by human experts who brought additional operational knowledge into the decision process. Alternatively, one can select a few best models to create an ensemble classification model.

Further Experiments. We conducted further experiments to study the scenarios of multi-phase model improvement for a single objective and for multiple objectives. Figure 5 illustrates the process and results of a set of experiments with a single objective. The business requirement considered class T13 as an important and would like to improve its accuracy. It was first translated to an optimization specification, for which five different processes were invoked, (a) knowledge-based approach, (b,c,d) three brute-force approaches that targeting T13 directly with three different strategies, and (e) a randomly selecting strategy-metric-class combinations. Each approach makes attempts in five phases. For a single-objective, one can select the best model according to the highest performance measurement ΔCBA_{T13} , i.e., 11.81% resulted from the knowledge-based approach. We conducted similar experiments with different types of single objective, and the knowledge-based approach performed better in the majority of the experiments.

Figure 5 illustrates the process and results of a set of experiments with two objectives. The business requirements are to improve the recall of classes T7 and T12. The requirements were first translated to maximization of ϕ_{T7}^{cr} and ϕ_{T12}^{cr} , together with a multi-objective assessment function. For this group of experiments, we define a simple function $S = \phi_{T7}^{cr} + \phi_{T12}^{cr}$, which will trigger actions of adding a model into the model pool P_m and adding the corresponding synthetic data to the training data for subsequent phases. In practice, one can define a more complex assessment function and trigger actions, e.g., giving some objectives a high priority, or updating P_m more frequently than the training data. In the brute-force approach (b) on the right, the first four phases made improvement gradually, and then further improvement became difficult. The knowledge-based approach (a) invoked three different settings for each objective, and made improvement in more distributed manner, reaching




Figure 5: Examples of multi-phase model improvement with and without using a knowledge map.




Figure 6: Examples of multi-objective model improvement with and without using a knowledge map.

the highest S value in the 11th inner phase. We conducted similar experiments with different types of multi-objective settings, and the knowledge-based approach performed better in the majority of the experiments.

6 Conclusions

In this work, we developed an automated workflow, AutoGeTS, for improving text classification models, and an approach for using the knowledge discovered in the workflow to guide subsequent model improvement processes. While the work was motivated by challenges in an industrial application, we followed three **research questions**, conducted experiments at a large scale, and validated our findings using public datasets (TREC-6 [20] and Amazon Reviews 2023 [17]) in addition to the ticketing data, and compared LLMs approach with a traditional data augmentation approach.

In many machine learning workflows, it is common that none of the known individual techniques is superior over others, though most of us are inspired to find the very best solution. A knowledge

map is a divide-and-conquer map showing the best solution in each context. Hence a knowledge-based ensemble is piecewise optimization of using the best solution(s) in each context. We envisage that this approach can be adapted in many other practical applications.

The work also confirmed that using LLMs to generate synthetic data can address a common challenge in the industrial workflow for improving models for ticketing systems deployed in different organization. As LLMs are not part of these classification models, they do not add extra burden on the models. As LLMs improve through version update, they provide sustainable technical support to the AutoGeTS workflow.

In future work, we plan to conduct more large-scale experiments and analyze the results to gain deep understanding of different factors that make some example messages more effective than others, and we hope the use such analysis as useful knowledge for guideline the development of more intelligent and effective techniques to select examples for generating synthetic data.

929 Acknowledgments

930 *Removed as required by the anonymous submission process.*

932 References

- [1] Victor Kwaku Agbesi, Wenyu Chen, Sophyani Banaamwini Yussif, Chiagoziem C Ukwuoma, Yeong Hyeon Gu, and Mugahed A Al-Antari. 2024. MuTCELM: An optimal multi-TextCNN-based ensemble learning for text classification. *Helijon* 10, 19 (2024).
- [2] Feras Al-Hawari and Hala Barham. 2021. A machine learning based help desk system for IT service management. *Journal of King Saud University-Computer and Information Sciences* 33, 6 (2021), 702–718.
- [3] Anonymous Authors. 2024. iGAIVA: Integrated Generative AI and Visual Analytics in a Machine Learning Workflow for Text Classification. *Anonymous Venue* (2024).
- [4] Tom Bersano, Brad Clement, and Leonid Shilkrot. 1997. Synthetic Data for Testing in Databases. *University of Michigan* (1997).
- [5] Leo Breiman. 1996. Bagging predictors. *Machine learning* 24 (1996), 123–140.
- [6] Tom B Brown. 2020. Language models are few-shot learners. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.14165* (2020).
- [7] Marc Chalé and Nathaniel D Bastian. 2022. Generating realistic cyber data for training and evaluating machine learning classifiers for network intrusion detection systems. *Expert Systems with Applications* 207 (2022), 117936.
- [8] Nitesh V Chawla, Kevin W Bowyer, Lawrence O Hall, and W Philip Kegelmeyer. 2002. SMOTE: synthetic minority over-sampling technique. *Journal of artificial intelligence research* 16 (2002), 321–357.
- [9] Andoni Cortés, Clemente Rodríguez, Gorka Vélez, Javier Barandiarán, and Marcos Nieto. 2020. Analysis of classifier training on synthetic data for cross-domain datasets. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems* 23, 1 (2020), 190–199.
- [10] Danilo Croce, Giuseppe Castellucci, and Roberto Basili. 2020. GAN-BERT: Generative adversarial learning for robust text classification with a bunch of labeled examples. In *Proceedings of the 58th annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics*. 2114–2119.
- [11] Bradley Efron. 1992. Bootstrap methods: another look at the jackknife. In *Breakthroughs in statistics: Methodology and distribution*. Springer, 569–593.
- [12] Maayan Frid-Adar, Idit Diamant, Eyal Klang, Michal Amitai, Jacob Goldberger, and Hayit Greenspan. 2018. GAN-based synthetic medical image augmentation for increased CNN performance in liver lesion classification. *Neurocomputing* 321 (2018), 321–331.
- [13] Maayan Frid-Adar, Eyal Klang, Michal Amitai, Jacob Goldberger, and Hayit Greenspan. 2018. Synthetic data augmentation using GAN for improved liver lesion classification. In *2018 IEEE 15th international symposium on biomedical imaging (ISBI 2018)*. IEEE, 289–293.
- [14] Phani Krishna Kollapur Gandra, Rajesh Kumar Verma, Chhabi Rani Panigrahi, and Bibudhendu Pati. 2024. *Ticket Classification Using Machine Learning*. Springer Nature Singapore, 487–501.
- [15] Ian Goodfellow, Jean Pouget-Abadie, Mehdi Mirza, Bing Xu, David Warde-Farley, Sheril Ozair, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. 2014. Generative adversarial nets. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 27 (2014).
- [16] Xuanli He, Islam Nassar, Jamie Kiros, Gholamreza Haffari, and Mohammad Norouzi. 2022. Generate, annotate, and learn: NLP with synthetic text. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 10 (2022), 826–842.
- [17] Yupeng Hou, Jiacheng Li, Zhankui He, An Yan, Xiusi Chen, and Julian McAuley. 2024. Bridging Language and Items for Retrieval and Recommendation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.03952* (2024).
- [18] M Jaderberg, K Simonyan, A Vedaldi, and A Zisserman. 2014. Synthetic data and artificial neural networks for natural scene text recognition. In *NIPS Deep Learning Workshop*. Neural Information Processing Systems.
- [19] Qian Li, Hao Peng, Jianxin Li, Congying Xia, Renyu Yang, Lichao Sun, Philip S Yu, and Lifang He. 2022. A survey on text classification: From traditional to deep learning. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology (TIST)* 13, 2 (2022), 1–41.
- [20] Xin Li and Dan Roth. 2002. Learning question classifiers. In *COLING 2002: The 19th International Conference on Computational Linguistics*.
- [21] Zhuoyan Li, Hangxiao Zhu, Zhuoran Lu, and Ming Yin. 2023. Synthetic Data Generation with Large Language Models for Text Classification: Potential and Limitations. In *The 2023 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*.
- [22] Yingzhou Lu, Minjie Shen, Huazheng Wang, Xiao Wang, Capucine van Rechem, and Wenqi Wei. 2023. Machine learning for synthetic data generation: a review. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.04062* (2023).
- [23] Alan K Meier, John Busch, and Craig C Conner. 1988. Testing the accuracy of a measurement-based building energy model with synthetic data. *Energy and buildings* 12, 1 (1988), 77–82.
- [24] Alhassan Mumuni, Fuseini Mumuni, and Nana Kobina Gerrar. 2024. A survey of synthetic data augmentation methods in computer vision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.10075* (2024).
- [25] Neha Patki, Roy Wedge, and Kalyan Veeramachaneni. 2016. The synthetic data vault. In *2016 IEEE international conference on data science and advanced analytics (DSAA)*. IEEE, 399–410.
- [26] Vamsi K Potluri, Daniel Borrajo, Andrea Coletta, Niccolò Dalmaso, Yousef El-Laham, Elizabeth Fons, Mohsen Ghassemi, Sriram Gopalakrishnan, Vikesh Gosai, Eleonora Kreacić, et al. 2023. Synthetic data applications in finance. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.00081* (2023).
- [27] Alec Radford, Jeffrey Wu, Rewon Child, David Luan, Dario Amodei, Ilya Sutskever, et al. 2019. Language models are unsupervised multitask learners. *OpenAI blog* 1, 8 (2019), 9.
- [28] Taylor Shin, Yasaman Razeghi, Robert L Logan IV, Eric Wallace, and Sameer Singh. 2020. AutoPrompt: Eliciting Knowledge from Language Models with Automatically Generated Prompts. In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- [29] Zhihang Song, Zimin He, Xingyu Li, Qiming Ma, Ruibo Ming, Zhiqi Mao, Huaxin Pei, Lihui Peng, Jianming Hu, Danya Yao, et al. 2023. Synthetic datasets for autonomous driving: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles* (2023).
- [30] Clifton D Sutton. 2005. Classification and regression trees, bagging, and boosting. *Handbook of statistics* 24 (2005), 303–329.
- [31] D Garcia Torres. 2018. Generation of synthetic data with generative adversarial networks. *Unpublished doctoral dissertation*. Ph. D. Thesis, Royal Institute of Technology, Stockholm, Sweden 26 (2018).
- [32] Xinyuan Wang, Chenxi Li, Zhen Wang, Fan Bai, Haotian Luo, Jiayou Zhang, Nebojsa Jojic, Eric Xing, and Zhiteng Hu. 2023. PromptAgent: Strategic Planning with Language Models Enables Expert-level Prompt Optimization. In *The Twelfth International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [33] Zirui Wang, Adams Wei Yu, Orhan Firat, and Yuan Cao. 2021. Towards zero-label language learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.09193* (2021).
- [34] Jason Wei and Kai Zou. 2019. EDA: Easy Data Augmentation Techniques for Boosting Performance on Text Classification Tasks. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*. 6382–6388.
- [35] Ran Xu, Hejiu Cui, Yue Yu, Xuan Kan, Wenqi Shi, Yuchen Zhuang, May Dongmei Wang, Wei Jin, Joyce Ho, and Carl Yang. 2024. Knowledge-infused prompting: Assessing and advancing clinical text data generation with large language models. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics ACL 2024*. 15496–15523.
- [36] Yuhong Xu, Zhiwen Yu, Wenming Cao, and C. L. Philip Chen. 2022. Adaptive Dense Ensemble Model for Text Classification. *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics* 52, 8 (2022), 7513–7526. doi:10.1109/TCYB.2021.3133106
- [37] Andrew Yale, Saloni Dash, Ritik Dutta, Isabelle Guyon, Adrien Pavao, and Kristin P Bennett. 2020. Generation and evaluation of privacy preserving synthetic health data. *Neurocomputing* 416 (2020), 244–255.
- [38] Kang Min Yoo, Dongju Park, Jaewook Kang, Sang-Woo Lee, and Wooyoung Park. 2021. GPT3Mix: Leveraging Large-scale Language Models for Text Augmentation. In *Findings of the Association for Computational Linguistics: EMNLP 2021*. 2225–2239.
- [39] Yizhe Zhang, Zhe Gan, Kai Fan, Zhi Chen, Ricardo Henao, Dinghan Shen, and Lawrence Carin. 2017. Adversarial feature matching for text generation. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 4006–4015.
- [40] Fengwei Zhou, Jiawei Li, Chuanlong Xie, Fei Chen, Lanqing Hong, Rui Sun, and Zhenguo Li. 2021. MetaAugment: Sample-aware data augmentation policy learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 35. 11097–11105.

1045

APPENDICES

1046

AutoGeTS: Automated Generation of Text Synthetics for Improving Text Classification

1047

In the following appendices, we provide further experiment results through visualization plots. The experimental data will be made available on GitHub after the double-blind review process. These appendices include:

1048

- Appendix A provides further experimental results with two additional datasets and with a traditional data augmentation tool. The results confirmed the findings about **research question 1** presented in Section 4.
- Appendix B provides further experimental results in 11 tables. In total, there are 12 tables, only one table (Table 3) was given in the main body of paper. The results in these 12 tables helped us answer **research question 2** and **research question 3**, and provided a knowledge map for the ensemble algorithm presented in Section 5.

1049

A Validation with the EDA Tool and TREC-6 and Amazon Datasets

1050

In this appendix, we report further experiments for validating observation about the lack of a superior search strategy from the experiments with the ticketing data (Table 2). We conducted these further experiments with two public datasets: TREC-6 [20] and Amazon Reviews 2023 [17], in conjunction with the GPT-3.5's API and the Easy Data Augmentation (EDA) tool [34].

1051

A.1 TREC-6 Dataset with EDA and GPT-3.5

1052

The TREC-6 dataset [20] comprises 5542 fact-based questions categorized into six semantic classes with varying class sizes from 86 to 1250 questions. The performance of the original CatBoost classification model trained on TREC-6 (without synthetic data) is shown in Table 4.

1053

Table 4: The performance of the original CatBoost model M_0 trained on the TREC-6 dataset (without synthetic data).

1054

Class	Class Size	Balanced Accuracy	Recall	F1-Score
ENTY	1250	0.861	0.825	0.757
HUM	1223	0.903	0.850	0.846
DESC	1162	0.881	0.802	0.820
NUM	896	0.908	0.836	0.866
LOC	835	0.882	0.789	0.819
ABBR	86	0.761	0.522	0.686
Overall	5542	0.889	0.816	0.816

1055

Similar to the ticketing data, we used both the EDA tool and the GPT-3.5 to generate synthetic data, and ran experiments with all combinations of three strategies, four objective metrics, and six classes where example questions were selected as prompts. The EDA results were shown in Table 5 and the GPT 3.5 results were shown in Table 6.

1056

From these two tables, we can observe:

1057

- The amount of improvement in Table 6 is in general higher than that in Table 5, confirming the advantage of using LLMs to generate synthetic data.
- With the synthetic data generated using the EDA tool, the strategy HSW worked better for several classes when classed-measures were used as the objective measures. The strategy SW worked better in most cases when overall measures were used as the objective measures.
- With the synthetic data generated using the GPT 3.5 API, the strategy SW worked better in most cases when across the whole table. However, there are five cells where SW is not the preferred strategy.
- Both tables confirmed that the knowledge-based approach can enable the selection of more effective strategies for individual classes and objective metrics.

A.2 Amazon Subset with EDA and GPT-3.5

With the Amazon Reviews'2023 dataset [17], a subset of 10000 reviews were randomly selected from the Gift Cards subject. The subset has five rating classes with different class sizes ranging from 121 to 8389 reviews. The performance of the original CatBoost classification model trained on this Amazon Reviews subset (without synthetic data) is shown in Table 7.

Table 7: The performance of the original CatBoost model M_0 trained on the Amazon Review subset (without synthetic data).

Class	Class Size	Balanced Accuracy	Recall	F1-Score
R1	807	0.834	0.705	0.650
R2	121	0.499	0	0
R3	206	0.524	0.049	0.089
R4	477	0.586	0.174	0.288
R5	8389	0.758	0.977	0.950
Overall	10000	0.934	0.816	0.816

We can notice that for class R2, there was no true positive results, and the recall and F1-score are both 0. For R3 and R4, the measure of the recall and F1-score measures are very low. Because these are small classes in comparison with R5, misleadingly, the overall measures appear fairly reasonable.

Similar to the ticketing data and TREC-6 data, we used both the EDA tool and the GPT-3.5 to generate synthetic data, and ran experiments with all combinations of three strategies, four objective metrics, and five classes where example reviews were selected as prompts. The direct testing results of the experiments with the EDA tool were shown in Table 8 and the direct testing results with the GPT 3.5 API were shown in Table 9. Note that in both tables, the recall values (CR) for class R2 are now above zero. Clearly synthetic data helped.

Similarly we showed the amount of improvement in Table 10 and 11 respectively. From these two tables, we can observe:

- The amount of improvement in Table 11 is in general higher than that in Table 10, confirming the advantage of using LLMs to generate synthetic data.

1103

1104

1105

1106

1107

1108

1109

1110

1111

1112

1113

1114

1115

1116

1117

1118

1119

1120

1121

1122

1123

1124

1125

1126

1127

1128

1129

1130

1131

1132

1133

1134

1135

1136

1137

1138

1139

1140

1141

1142

1143

1144

1145

1146

1147

1148

1149

1150

1151

1152

1153

1154

1155

1156

1157

1158

1159

1160

Table 5: Systematic experimentation with the TREC-6 dataset and synthetic data generated by the EDA tool. (a) The results of systematic testing of 72 combinations of 3 strategies, 4 objective metrics, and 6 classes in the ticketing dataset. The bars in cells depict the improvement in the range (0%, 50%), while red texts indicate worsened performance. (b) The results can be summarized as a knowledge map showing the best strategy or strategies for each metric-class combination. For each map region, the strategies within 0.03% difference from the best strategy are also selected.

(a) the results of systematic testing

Class	ΔCR %			ΔCBA %			ΔOBA %			ΔOF1 %		
	SW	HSW	GA	SW	HSW	GA	SW	HSW	GA	SW	HSW	GA
ENTY	3.62	3.62	1.95	0.97	0.96	0.52	0.51	0.19	0.19	0.93	0.34	0.34
HUM	4.31	8.33	4.31	1.50	2.37	1.64	0.63	0.49	0.37	1.14	0.90	0.67
DESC	9.34	14.84	8.79	2.15	2.97	2.29	0.62	0.49	0.06	1.12	0.90	0.11
NUM	8.86	9.49	8.23	4.02	4.99	3.60	0.88	0.68	0.25	1.59	1.24	0.45
LOC	20.10	18.62	8.40	5.12	5.56	3.02	0.63	0.43	0.06	1.14	0.79	0.11
ABBR	20.50	20.73	25.84	8.34	8.57	8.57	0.64	0.66	0.62	1.16	1.20	1.12

(b) a summary of the best strategy-metric combinations

Class	Measured Performance Metric			
	CR	CBA	OBA	OF1
ENTY	SW/HSW	SW		
HUM	HSW	HSW	SW	SW
DESC				
NUM				
LOC	SW			
ABBR	GA	SW/GA	HSW	HSW

Table 6: Systematic experimentation with the TREC-6 dataset and synthetic data generated by the GPT-3.5 API. (a) The results of systematic testing of 72 combinations of 3 strategies, 4 objective metrics, and 6 classes in the ticketing dataset. The bars in cells depict the improvement in the range (0%, 50%), while red texts indicate worsened performance. (b) The results can be summarized as a knowledge map showing the best strategy or strategies for each metric-class combination. For each map region, the strategies within 0.03% difference from the best strategy are also selected.

(a) the results of systematic testing

Class	ΔCR %			ΔCBA %			ΔOBA %			ΔOF1 %		
	SW	HSW	GA	SW	HSW	GA	SW	HSW	GA	SW	HSW	GA
ENTY	7.39	5.91	3.16	2.40	1.45	0.65	0.91	0.37	0.25	1.64	0.67	0.45
HUM	14.10	13.59	7.35	3.20	3.14	2.26	0.97	0.65	0.75	1.76	1.17	1.37
DESC	25.62	21.47	11.23	4.79	4.01	2.95	0.91	0.66	0.65	1.64	1.20	1.19
NUM	15.70	15.70	15.70	5.85	5.64	5.64	1.09	0.78	0.80	1.98	1.42	1.46
LOC	18.60	20.67	14.82	5.93	6.17	4.43	1.05	0.93	0.62	1.91	1.69	1.12
ABBR	32.38	39.40	30.08	10.31	10.31	10.31	0.91	0.99	0.99	1.64	1.80	1.79

(b) a summary of the best strategy-metric combinations

Class	Measured Performance Metric			
	CR	CBA	OBA	OF1
ENTY				
HUM	SW	SW	SW	SW
DESC				
NUM	SW/HSW/GA			
LOC	HSW	HSW	SW/HSW/GA	HSW/GA
ABBR	HSW	SW/HSW/GA	HSW/GA	HSW/GA

Table 8: Amazon Reviews Subset EDA-Based Results

Class	CR			CBA			OBA			OF1		
	SW	HSW	GA									
R1	0.732	0.763	0.732	0.845	0.852	0.846	0.936	0.936	0.938	0.898	0.898	0.900
R2	0.067	0.053	0.067	0.526	0.526	0.526	0.938	0.938	0.938	0.901	0.900	0.900
R3	0.122	0.098	0.098	0.560	0.560	0.559	0.937	0.937	0.937	0.900	0.899	0.899
R4	0.221	0.233	0.233	0.601	0.603	0.603	0.936	0.938	0.936	0.898	0.900	0.898
R5	0.984	0.984	0.984	0.782	0.784	0.784	0.938	0.938	0.938	0.900	0.901	0.901

Table 9: Amazon Reviews Subset LLM-Based Results

Class	CR			CBA			OBA			OF1		
	SW	HSW	GA									
R1	0.745	0.797	0.745	0.855	0.866	0.854	0.938	0.938	0.938	0.901	0.902	0.901
R2	0.158	0.158	0.158	0.579	0.579	0.579	0.940	0.939	0.938	0.904	0.902	0.901
R3	0.146	0.188	0.146	0.573	0.570	0.571	0.938	0.938	0.938	0.901	0.902	0.901
R4	0.348	0.348	0.348	0.615	0.614	0.608	0.938	0.938	0.938	0.901	0.901	0.901
R5	0.989	0.997	0.995	0.828	0.822	0.825	0.938	0.939	0.940	0.902	0.903	0.905

- Using synthetic data resulted in noticeable improvement on the recall measures of classes R2, R3, and R4.
- There was no obvious superior strategy.
- Both tables confirmed that the knowledge-based approach can enable the selection of more effective strategies for individual classes and objective metrics.

Table 10: Systematic experimentation with a subset of the Amazon Review dataset and synthetic data generated by the EDA tool. (a) The results of systematic testing of 60 combinations of 3 strategies, 4 objective metrics, and 5 classes in the ticketing dataset. The bars in cells depict the improvement in the range (0%, 50%), while red texts indicate worsened performance. For the six dark green cells on the left, the original recall measures were zero or near zero. Hence the improvement is well over 50%. The $\Delta CR\%$ values are shown as white text over dark green background. ##### indicates infinity. (b) The results can be summarized as a knowledge map showing the best strategy or strategies for each metric-class combination. For each map region, the strategies within 0.03% difference from the best strategy are also selected.

(a) the results of systematic testing

Class	$\Delta CR\%$			$\Delta CBA\%$			$\Delta OBA\%$			$\Delta OF1\%$		
	SW	HSW	GA	SW	HSW	GA	SW	HSW	GA	SW	HSW	GA
R1	3.81	8.23	3.81	1.38	2.25	1.48	0.27	0.27	0.40	0.45	0.45	0.67
R2	#####	#####	#####	5.37	5.37	5.37	0.44	0.40	0.40	0.73	0.67	0.67
R3	150.0	100.0	100.0	6.98	6.89	6.64	0.37	0.33	0.33	0.62	0.56	0.56
R4	26.67	33.33	33.33	2.54	2.80	2.76	0.23	0.40	0.27	0.39	0.67	0.45
R5	0.66	0.72	0.66	3.10	3.40	3.43	0.40	0.44	0.44	0.67	0.73	0.73

(b) a summary of the best strategy-metric combinations

Class	Measured Performance Metric			
	CR	CBA	OBA	OF1
R1	HSW	HSW	GA	GA
R2	SW/GA	SW/HSW/GA		SW
R3	SW	SW	SW	SW
R4	HSW/GA	HSW	HSW	HSW
R5	HSW	GA	HSW/GA	HSW/GA

Table 11: Systematic experimentation with a subset of the Amazon Review dataset and synthetic data generated by the GPT-3.5 API. (a) The results of systematic testing of 60 combinations of 3 strategies, 4 objective metrics, and 5 classes in the ticketing dataset. The bars in cells depict the improvement in the range (0%, 50%), while red texts indicate worsened performance. For the nine dark green cells on the left, the original recall measures were 0 or near zero. Hence the improvement is well over 50%. The $\Delta CR\%$ values are shown as white text over dark green background. ##### indicates infinity. (b) The results can be summarized as a knowledge map showing the best strategy or strategies for each metric-class combination. For each map region, the strategies within 0.03% difference from the best strategy are also selected.

(a) the results of systematic testing

Class	$\Delta CR\%$			$\Delta CBA\%$			$\Delta OBA\%$			$\Delta OF1\%$		
	SW	HSW	GA	SW	HSW	GA	SW	HSW	GA	SW	HSW	GA
R1	5.71	13.04	5.71	2.58	3.85	2.38	0.47	0.50	0.47	0.78	0.84	0.78
R2	#####	#####	#####	15.86	15.91	15.86	0.64	0.54	0.47	1.06	0.89	0.78
R3	200.0	284.4	200.0	9.31	8.82	8.92	0.44	0.50	0.47	0.73	0.84	0.78
R4	99.7	99.7	86.8	4.82	4.65	3.70	0.47	0.47	0.44	0.78	0.78	0.73
R5	1.20	2.04	1.81	9.21	8.44	8.85	0.50	0.60	0.70	0.84	1.01	1.17

(b) a summary of the best strategy-metric combinations

Class	Measured Performance Metric			
	CR	CBA	OBA	OF1
R1	HSW		HSW	HSW
R2	SW/HSW/GA		SW	SW
R3	HSW		HSW	HSW
R4	SW/HSW		SW/HSW	SW/HSW
R5	HSW		GA	GA

Most importantly, the data in such tables provides the ensemble algorithm in Section 5 with the knowledge map.

B Impact on Other Performance Metrics

As mentioned in Section 4, with the ticketing data, there are 180 combinations of three strategies, four objective metrics, and 15 classes where examples were selected from their training data as the prompts for generating synthetic data. Given each of these combinations, in addition to the objective metric on the specific class, we also measure other performance metrics, including two overall metrics (overall balanced accuracy (OBA) and overall F1-score (OF1)) as well as two class-based metrics (recall (CR) and balanced accuracy (CBA)) on all classes. Table 3 showed the cross-impact results of 15 of the 180 combinations, i.e., SW strategy, ϕ^{cr} (class-based recall), and 15 classes. In this appendix, we provide the cross-impact results for the other 15×11 combinations in Tables 12 ~ 22.

In addition, from these tables, we can also observe many interesting phenomena, for example:

- Most targeted classes, i.e., the yellow cells in these tables benefited from the improvement process with positive values (black numbers) in these cell. Red numbers in yellow cells are in general uncommon.
- The recall measure of T12 is often improved noticeable even when it was not the target class, e.g., in Tables 3, 14, 15, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22, where the green bars in the column $\Delta CR\%$ T12 are noticeable.

1277
1278
1279
1280
1281
1282
1283
1284
1285
1286
1287
1288
1289
1290
1291
1292
1293
1294
1295
1296
1297
1298
1299
1300
1301
1302
1303
1304
1305
1306
1307
1308
1309
1310
1311
1312
1313
1314
1315
1316
1317
1318
1319
1320
1321
1322
1323
1324
1325
1326
1327
1328
1329
1330
1331
1332
1333
1334
1335
1336
1337
1338
1339
1340
1341
1342
1343
1344
1345
1346
1347
1348
1349
1350
1351
1352
1353
1354
1355
1356
1357
1358
1359
1360
1361
1362
1363
1364
1365
1366
1367
1368
1369
1370
1371
1372
1373
1374
1375
1376
1377
1378
1379
1380
1381
1382
1383
1384
1385
1386
1387
1388
1389
1390
1391
1392

Table 12: Similar to Table 3, when a model is improved with the HSW strategy and objective metric ϕ^{cr} (class-based recall) for classes T_1, T_2, \dots, T_{15} in the ticketing dataset, the direct improvement of the target classes can be seen in the yellow cells on the left part of the table. Meanwhile, there are positive and negative impact on other classes and other performance metrics. The green bars in cells depict the improvement in the range (0%, 50%), while red texts indicate negative impact. The last row shows the baseline performance.

Class	% T1 T2 T3 T4 T5 T6 T7 T8 T9 T10 T11 T12 T13 T14 T15	Optimization: HSW-CR-Class[row]; Performance Metric: $\Delta OF1\%$, $\Delta CR\%$														Optimization: HSW-CR-Class[row]; Performance Metric: $\Delta OBA\%$, $\Delta CBA\%$																	
		$\Delta OF1\%$							$\Delta CR\%$							$\Delta OBA\%$							$\Delta CBA\%$										
		T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	T7	T8	T9	T10	T11	T12	T13	T14	T15	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	T7	T8	T9	T10	T11	T12	T13	T14	T15		
T1	-0.4	0.4	-0.4	0.6	1.3	-0.9	-2.8	1.6	-5.1	0.0	1.1	0.0	9.7	-20.0	-6.8	-28.3	-0.2	-0.2	-0.1	0.2	0.5	-0.5	-1.1	0.7	-1.9	0.1	0.3	0.0	3.1	-5.0	-2.4	-8.9	
T2	0.5	-0.2	0.8	0.4	0.4	0.0	1.6	1.6	-2.4	2.8	0.0	3.2	0.0	-0.1	0.2	0.4	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.7	0.8	1.1	-1.0	0.9	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.1	-0.6				
T3	-0.1	-0.2	-0.8	2.0	1.3	-1.2	2.0	-2.9	2.5	0.5	0.0	3.2	0.0	1.4	-3.8	0.0	-0.1	-0.2	0.6	0.6	-0.5	0.8	-1.3	1.2	0.3	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.5	-1.2			
T4	0.1	-0.2	-0.5	0.0	9.8	-0.7	-2.8	1.6	1.9	-2.9	5.5	0.0	9.7	-13.3	-2.7	-7.5	0.0	-0.1	0.0	0.0	4.1	-0.3	-1.1	0.7	0.8	-1.2	1.9	0.0	3.2	-3.3	-0.9	-2.4	
T5	0.3	-0.5	0.4	0.4	0.9	4.3	0.0	1.3	0.0	-2.9	0.6	0.0	6.5	-6.7	1.4	-3.8	0.2	-0.2	0.3	0.1	0.4	1.6	0.2	0.7	0.1	-1.2	0.1	0.0	2.1	-1.7	0.5	-1.2	
T6	0.1	-0.4	0.1	-0.2	1.8	1.7	6.5	0.3	-1.9	-2.4	0.6	0.0	-3.2	0.0	1.4	-9.4	0.1	-0.2	-0.1	0.8	0.8	2.4	0.2	-0.7	-1.0	0.2	0.0	-1.1	0.0	-0.5	-3.0		
T7	0.7	-0.2	0.7	0.2	2.7	1.7	1.2	5.8	3.2	-3.4	3.9	0.0	6.5	-6.7	-1.4	-5.7	0.4	0.1	0.5	0.1	1.2	0.8	0.6	2.6	1.3	-1.4	1.4	0.0	2.1	-1.7	-0.5	-1.8	
T8	-0.2	-0.2	-0.6	-0.7	1.3	-0.9	-1.2	-0.6	11.5	0.5	1.7	0.0	-6.5	-6.7	-4.1	-7.5	-0.1	-0.1	-0.3	-0.4	0.6	-0.3	-0.5	-0.3	4.3	0.3	0.6	0.0	-2.1	-1.7	-1.4	-2.3	
T9	0.4	-0.2	0.4	0.1	1.3	1.9	-2.0	1.9	-2.5	5.4	4.0	0.0	9.7	0.0	-6.8	-5.7	0.2	-0.1	0.2	0.1	0.6	0.9	-0.7	0.9	-1.0	2.2	1.7	0.0	3.2	0.0	-2.4	-1.8	
T10	0.1	-0.1	-0.1	0.4	-1.3	0.0	0.8	0.0	-2.5	0.5	11.0	0.0	-6.5	0.0	-6.8	-7.5	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.2	-0.6	-0.1	0.5	0.1	-0.9	0.2	3.2	0.0	-2.1	0.0	-2.4	-2.3	
T11	0.6	-0.3	0.1	0.9	2.7	1.9	0.4	2.6	2.5	-2.9	9.4	1.1	3.2	-6.7	2.7	-9.4	0.3	-0.2	0.4	0.4	1.2	0.9	0.3	1.2	1.1	-1.1	3.2	0.5	1.0	-1.7	0.9	-3.0	
T12	0.3	-0.2	0.0	0.4	3.6	0.9	-2.4	1.3	-0.6	0.0	3.9	0.0	32.3	-6.7	-1.4	-7.5	0.1	-0.1	0.2	0.1	1.5	0.4	-0.8	0.6	-0.1	0.0	1.3	0.0	10.4	-1.7	-0.4	-2.4	
T13	0.0	-0.3	-0.2	0.0	0.9	0.7	3.2	0.3	3.2	0.5	2.2	0.0	-3.2	33.0	0.0	-1.9	0.0	-0.1	-0.1	0.0	0.4	0.3	-1.3	0.2	1.2	0.2	0.8	0.0	-1.0	0.0	8.2	0.0	-0.6
T14	-1.0	-0.2	-1.1	-0.5	2.2	-1.2	-3.6	0.0	-6.4	-4.4	-5.0	0.0	-12.9	-6.7	16.2	-11.3	-0.5	-0.1	-0.4	-0.3	1.0	-0.5	-1.5	0.0	-2.5	-1.9	-1.8	0.0	-4.2	-1.7	5.1	-3.5	
T15	0.2	-0.3	-0.3	0.5	1.8	0.0	-4.4	2.6	1.9	-1.0	3.3	0.0	9.7	-13.3	1.4	20.8	0.1	-0.1	0.1	0.2	0.8	-0.1	-1.7	1.1	0.8	-0.3	1.1	0.0	3.1	-3.3	0.5	6.1	
M0	0.86	0.98	0.94	0.91	0.80	0.79	0.66	0.78	0.67	0.74	0.54	0.95	0.48	0.88	0.33	0.55	0.45	0.92	0.99	0.95	0.95	0.90	0.89	0.82	0.88	0.83	0.86	0.76	0.97	0.74	0.67	0.77	0.73

Table 13: Similar to Table 3 and Table 12, this table shows the impact of the GA strategy and objective metric ϕ^{cr} (class-based recall) for classes T_1, T_2, \dots, T_{15} in the ticketing dataset.

Class	% T1 T2 T3 T4 T5 T6 T7 T8 T9 T10 T11 T12 T13 T14 T15	Optimization: GA-CR-Class[row]; Performance Metric: $\Delta OF1\%$, $\Delta CR\%$														Optimization: GA-CR-Class[row]; Performance Metric: $\Delta OBA\%$, $\Delta CBA\%$																
		$\Delta OF1\%$							$\Delta CR\%$							$\Delta OBA\%$							$\Delta CBA\%$									
		T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	T7	T8	T9	T10	T11	T12	T13	T14	T15	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	T7	T8	T9	T10	T11	T12	T13	T14	T15	
T1	0.2	0.4	-0.6	0.8	1.3	-0.7	-0.4	1.3	-2.5	0.5	10.5	0.0	3.2	0.0	-4.1	-13.2	0.1	-0.1	0.0	0.4	0.5	-0.3	-0.1	0.6	-0.1	0.3	3.7	0.0	1.0	0.0	-1.5	-4.1
T2	0.0	0.4	0.8	-0.5	-0.9	0.9	-2.8	-0.6	-5.7	1.0	5.0	0.0	3.2	-13.3	-2.7	-17.0	0.0	0.2	-0.1	-0.2	-0.4	0.4	-0.9	-0.2	-2.3	0.6	1.8	0.0	1.0	-3.3	-1.0	-5.3
T3	0.3	-0.2	0.0	2.0	1.3	0.5	0.8	1.0	-0.6	-1.5	3.9	0.0	-6.5	-6.7	-5.4	-5.7	0.1	-0.1	0.1	0.7	0.6	0.2	0.3	0.5	-0.2	-0.5	1.6	0.0	-2.1	-1.7	-1.9	-1.7
T4	0.4	0.0	0.0	1.1	8.4	-0.7	0.8	1.0	-2.5	0.5	3.3	0.0	-3.2	0.0	-2.7	-3.8	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.5	3.6	-0.3	0.2	0.5	0.9	0.2	1.3	0.0	-1.1	0.0	-0.9	-1.2
T5	0.2	-0.3	-0.3	0.9	0.4	2.8	1.2	1.0	-2.5	2.4	3.3	0.0	3.2	-20.0	-14	-9.4	0.1	-0.1	0.3	0.6	0.2	0.7	0.6	0.4	-0.9	1.1	1.2	0.0	1.0	-5.0	-0.5	-3.0
T6	-0.1	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.9	4.8	1.0	-2.5	-3.4	0.0	0.0	-3.2	-13.3	-4.1	-15.1	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.0	0.3	1.2	0.5	-0.8	-1.4	0.0	-0.1	0.0	-0.9	-4.7	
T7	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.5	2.4	-0.3	1.9	-2.0	1.7	0.0	-3.2	0.0	-6.8	-5.7	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.1	0.1	0.9	-0.3	0.8	0.6	0.0	-1.1	0.0	-2.4	-1.8		
T8	-0.4	-0.2	-0.5	0.1	-0.9	1.2	-3.2	0.6	5.1	-2.0	-4.4	0.0	3.2	-6.7	0.0	-9.4	-0.2	-0.1	-0.2	0.1	-0.4	0.5	-1.3	0.3	1.7	-0.8	0.6	0.0	-1.0	0.0	-3.0	
T9	-0.1	-0.2	0.1	0.2	-0.4	-0.2	0.0	1.3	-3.2	2.9	-2.2	0.0	6.5	0.0	-1.4	-9.4	0.0	-0.1	0.2	0.1	-0.2	0.1	0.6	-1.2	0.9	-0.7	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.4	-0.3	-3.0
T10	0.1	-0.5	-0.2	0.2	-0.4	1.2	-0.4	1.0	-3.2	0.5	12.1	-1.1	3.2	-6.7	-1.4	-11.3	0.0	-0.2	0.2	0.1	-0.2	0.5	0.0	0.5	-1.2	0.3	3.7	-0.5	1.1	-1.6	-0.4	-3.5
T11	0.2	-0.1	0.1	0.5	0.0	-2.6	-1.6	-1.0	-1.6	-1.1	0.0	0.0	-6.7	-5.4	-3.8	-0.2	0.0	-0.1	0.6	0.0	-1.3	-0.8	0.6	0.1	-0.2	-0.4	0.0	0.0	-1.7	-1.9	-1.2	
T12	0.1	-0.4	-0.2	0.2	1.8	1.9	-2.4	1.3	-2.0	2.8	0.0	0.0	-3.2	0.0	-2.7	-7.5	0.3	-0.1	0.4	0.1	0.0	2.1	2.3	0.1	1.6	0.1	0.3	0.0	-1.1	0.0	-1.0	-2.4
T13	0.1	-0.6	0.1	0.2	1.3	-1.4	-2.0	5.2	1.9	-2.4	1.1	0.0	3.2	33.3	-1.4	-3.8	0.0	-0.3	0.3	0.1	0.5	-0.6	-0.8	2.2	0.7	-1.0	0.4	0.0	1.0	8.2	0.0	-1.2
T14	0.0	-0.2	0.1	0.1	0.4	-0.9	-0.8	0.6	-2.5	0.0	-1.7	0.0	0.0	-13.3	16.2	-5.7	0.0</															

1509 **Table 15:** Similar to Table 3 and Tables 12~14, this table shows the impact of the HSW strategy and objective metric ϕ^{cba}
 1510 (class-based balanced accuracy) for classes T_1, T_2, \dots, T_{15} in the ticketing dataset.

1511	Optimization: HSW-CBA-Class[row]; Performance Metric: $\Delta\text{OF1}\%$, $\Delta\text{CR}\%$															Optimization: HSW-CBA-Class[row]; Performance Metric: $\Delta\text{OBA}\%$, $\Delta\text{CBA}\%$																	
	ΔOF1		$\Delta\text{CR}\%$													ΔOBA		$\Delta\text{CBA}\%$															
	Class	%	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	T7	T8	T9	T10	T11	T12	T13	T14	T15	%	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	T7	T8	T9	T10	T11	T12	T13	T14	T15
1512	T1	-0.1	-0.1	0.1	0.4	1.3	-0.5	-1.2	1.3	0.0	-1.0	-1.7	0.0	0.0	-6.7	-2.7	-3.8	0.0	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.6	-0.3	-0.5	0.6	0.1	-0.4	-0.6	0.0	0.0	-1.7	-1.0	-1.2
1513	T2	0.7	0.1	0.6	0.2	2.7	0.9	0.4	2.9	3.8	-1.5	5.0	0.0	12.9	-13.3	1.4	-3.8	0.4	0.0	0.5	0.1	1.1	0.4	0.3	1.4	1.5	-0.4	1.7	0.0	4.2	-3.3	0.5	-1.2
1514	T3	0.3	-0.2	-0.2	1.4	-0.4	0.6	1.6	2.3	1.9	-0.5	1.7	0.0	3.2	0.0	0.0	-3.8	0.1	-0.1	0.0	0.6	-0.2	0.1	0.6	1.1	0.7	-0.2	0.6	0.0	1.0	0.0	0.0	-1.2
1515	T4	0.1	-0.2	-0.5	0.0	9.8	-0.7	-2.8	1.6	1.9	-2.9	5.5	0.0	9.7	-13.3	-2.7	-7.5	0.0	-0.1	0.0	0.0	4.1	-0.3	-1.1	0.7	0.8	-1.2	1.9	0.0	3.2	-3.3	-0.9	-2.4
1516	T5	0.3	-0.5	0.4	0.4	9.4	4.3	0.0	1.3	0.0	-2.9	0.6	0.0	6.5	-6.7	1.4	-3.8	0.2	-0.2	0.3	0.1	0.4	1.6	0.2	0.7	0.1	-1.2	0.1	0.0	2.1	-1.7	0.5	-1.2
1517	T6	-0.3	-0.1	0.6	-0.4	-0.4	-1.4	4.8	0.6	-1.3	-1.5	-0.6	0.0	0.0	-6.7	-1.4	-7.5	-0.2	0.0	-0.3	-0.2	-0.2	-0.6	1.8	0.3	-0.5	-0.6	-0.2	0.0	0.0	-1.7	-0.5	-2.4
1518	T7	0.7	-0.2	0.7	0.2	2.7	1.7	1.2	5.8	3.2	-3.4	3.9	0.0	6.5	-6.7	-1.4	-5.7	0.4	0.1	0.5	0.1	1.2	0.8	0.6	2.6	1.3	-1.4	1.4	0.0	2.1	-1.7	-0.5	-1.8
1519	T8	-0.2	-0.2	-0.6	-0.7	1.3	-0.9	-1.2	-0.6	11.5	0.5	1.7	0.0	-6.5	-6.7	-4.1	-7.5	-0.1	-0.1	-0.3	-0.4	0.6	-0.3	-0.5	-0.3	4.3	0.3	0.6	0.0	-2.1	-1.7	-1.4	-2.3
1520	T9	0.4	-0.2	0.4	0.1	1.3	1.9	-2.0	1.9	-2.5	5.4	4.4	0.0	9.7	0.0	-6.8	-5.7	0.2	-0.1	0.2	0.1	0.6	0.9	-0.7	0.9	-1.0	2.2	1.7	0.0	3.2	0.0	-2.4	-1.8
1521	T10	0.1	-0.1	-0.1	0.4	-1.3	0.0	0.8	0.0	-2.5	0.5	11.0	0.0	-6.5	0.0	-6.8	-7.5	0.0	0.0	0.2	0.2	-0.6	-0.1	0.5	0.1	-0.9	0.2	3.2	0.0	-2.1	0.0	-2.4	-2.3
1522	T11	0.6	-0.3	0.1	0.9	2.7	1.9	0.4	2.6	2.5	-2.9	9.4	1.1	3.2	-6.7	2.7	-9.4	0.3	-0.2	0.4	0.4	1.2	0.9	0.3	1.2	1.1	3.2	0.5	1.0	-1.7	0.9	-3.0	
1523	T12	0.3	-0.2	0.0	0.4	3.6	0.9	-2.4	1.3	-0.6	0.0	3.9	0.0	32.3	-6.7	-1.4	-7.5	0.1	-0.1	0.2	0.1	1.5	0.4	-0.8	0.6	-0.1	0.0	1.3	0.0	10.4	-1.7	-0.4	-2.4
1524	T13	0.0	-0.3	-0.2	0.0	0.9	0.7	-3.2	0.3	3.2	0.5	2.2	0.0	-3.2	33.3	0.0	-1.9	0.0	-0.1	-0.1	0.0	0.3	-0.3	1.0	-0.5	0.2	0.2	0.8	0.0	-2.5	-1.9	-1.8	-0.6
	M0	0.86	0.98	0.94	0.91	0.80	0.79	0.66	0.78	0.67	0.74	0.54	0.95	0.48	0.33	0.55	0.45	0.92	0.99	0.95	0.95	0.90	0.89	0.82	0.88	0.83	0.86	0.76	0.97	0.74	0.67	0.77	0.73

1525 **Table 16:** Similar to Table 3 and Tables 12~15, this table shows the impact of the GA strategy and objective metric ϕ^{cba} (class-based balanced accuracy) for classes T_1, T_2, \dots, T_{15} in the ticketing dataset.

1526	Optimization: GA-CBA-Class[row]; Performance Metric: $\Delta\text{OF1}\%$, $\Delta\text{CR}\%$															Optimization: GA-CBA-Class[row]; Performance Metric: $\Delta\text{OBA}\%$, $\Delta\text{CBA}\%$																		
	ΔOF1		$\Delta\text{CR}\%$													ΔOBA		$\Delta\text{CBA}\%$																
	Class	%	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	T7	T8	T9	T10	T11	T12	T13	T14	T15	%	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	T7	T8	T9	T10	T11	T12	T13	T14	T15	
1527	T1	0.3	0.2	-0.5	0.9	0.0	-0.5	0.0	2.3	1.9	2.9	3.9	0.0	12.9	-20.0	-4.1	-1.9	0.1	-0.2	0.0	0.4	0.0	-0.1	0.1	1.0	0.8	1.3	1.3	0.0	4.2	-5.0	-1.4	-0.6	
1528	T2	0.0	0.4	0.8	-0.5	-0.9	0.9	-2.8	-0.6	-5.7	1.0	5.0	0.0	3.2	-13.3	-2.7	-17.0	0.0	0.2	-0.1	-0.2	-0.4	0.4	-0.9	-0.2	-2.3	0.6	1.8	0.0	1.0	-3.3	-1.0	-5.3	
1529	T3	0.3	-0.2	0.0	2.0	1.3	0.5	0.8	1.0	-0.6	-1.5	3.9	0.0	-6.5	-6.7	-5.4	-5.7	0.1	-0.1	-0.1	0.7	0.6	0.2	0.3	0.5	-0.2	-0.5	1.6	0.0	-2.1	-1.7	-1.9	-1.7	
1530	T4	0.4	0.0	0.0	1.1	8.4	-0.7	0.8	1.0	-2.5	0.5	3.3	0.0	-3.2	-0.7	-1.4	-7.5	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.5	3.6	-0.3	0.2	0.5	-0.9	2.1	0.2	1.3	0.0	-2.1	-1.7	-1.9	-1.7
1531	T5	0.2	-0.3	-0.3	0.9	0.4	2.8	1.2	1.0	-2.5	2.4	3.3	0.0	3.2	-20.0	-14.4	-9.4	0.1	-0.3	0.6	0.2	0.7	0.6	0.4	-0.9	1.1	0.2	1.0	-5.0	-0.5	-3.0			
1532	T6	-0.2	-0.1	0.4	0.5	-0.4	0.5	4.0	0.3	-3.8	-2.4	-3.3	-1.1	19.4	-13.3	-2.7	-7.5	-0.1	0.0	0.2	0.2	-0.2	0.9	0.1	-0.4	0.5	6.3	-3.3	-0.9	-2.4				
1533	T7	0.0	0.0	0.4	0.0	5.5	0.6	5.1	-2.0	-4.4	0.0	3.2	-6.7	0.0	-9.4	-0.2	-0.1	-0.2	-0.1	0.1	-0.2	0.1	0.9	0.0	-1.4	0.5	-1.7	0.0	-3.0					
1534	T8	-0.4	-0.2	-0.5	0.1	1.2	-3.2	0.6	5.1	-2.0	-4.4	0.0	3.2	-6.7	0.0	-9.4	-0.2	-0.1	-0.2	-0.1	-0.4	-0.5	1.3	-0.5	-1.7	0.0	-2.1	-1.7	-1.9	-1.7				
1535	T9	-0.1	-0.2	0.1	0.2	-0.4	0.0	1.3	-3.2	2.9	-2.2	0.0	6.5	0.0	-14	-9.4	0.0	-0.1	0.2	0.1	-0.2	-0.1	0.0	-1.2	0.9	-0.7	0.0	2.1	0.0	-0.4	-3.0			
1536	T10	0.6	-0.2	-0.3	0.6	-0.4	4.0	2.0	1.6	-3.8	3.9	9.4	0.0	3.2	0.0	2.7	-7.5	0.3	-0.1	0.2	0.3	-0.2	1.8	0.9	0.8	-1.4	1.8	2.7	0.0	1.1	0.0	-2.3		
1537	T11	0.2	-0.1	0.1	0.5	0.0	-1.9	3.2	2.6	1.9	-2.4	3.3	1.1	-3.2	0.0	0	-11.3	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.2	0.0	-0.9	1.2	1.1	0.8	-0.9	1.1	0.5	0.0	0.0	-3.6		
1538	T12	0.1	-0.4	-0.2	0.2	1.8	-0.7	0.4	1.0	0.0	-2.0	1.7	0.0	3.2	33.3	-6.7	-1.4	-5.7	0.1	-0.2	0.1	0.1	0.8	0.7	-0.2	0.4	0.1	-0.9	0.6	0.0	10.4	1.7	-0.5	-1.8
1539	T13	0.1	-0.6	0.1	2.3	-1.4	-2.0	5.2	1.9	-2.4	1.1	0.0	3.2	-33.3	-14	-3.8	0.0	-0.3	0.3	0.1	0.5	-0.6	-0.8	2.2	0.7	-1.0	0.4	0.0	1.0	8.2	-0.4	-1.2		
1540	T14	0.0	-0.2	0.1	0.1	0.4	-0.9	-0.8	0.6	-2.5	0.0	-1.7	0.0	0.0	-13.3	16.2	-5.7	0.0	-0.1	0.2	0.1	0.2	-0.3	-0.2	0.3	-1.0	0.1	-0.5	0.0	0.0	-3.3	5.1	-1.8	
1541	T15	0.1	-0.4	0.0	1.3	0.2	-1.6	1.0	-3.8	-1.5	2.8	0.0	3.2	-6.7	0.0	24.5	0.1	-0.1	0.2	0.1	0.6	0.1	-0.5	0.4	-1.5	-0.6	0.9	0.0	1.1	-1.7	0.0	7.3		
	M0	0.86	0.98	0.94	0.91	0.80	0.79	0.66	0.78	0.67	0.74	0.54																						

Table 18: Similar to Table 3 and Tables 12~17, this table shows the impact of the HSW strategy and objective metric ϕ^{oba} (overall balanced accuracy) for classes T_1, T_2, \dots, T_{15} in the ticketing dataset.

1628	Optimization: HSW-OBA-Class[row]; Performance Metric: $\Delta\text{OF1}\%$, $\Delta\text{CR}\%$															Optimization: HSW-OBA-Class[row]; Performance Metric: $\Delta\text{OBA}\%$, $\Delta\text{CBA}\%$																	
	ΔOF1		$\Delta\text{CR}\%$													ΔOBA		$\Delta\text{CBA}\%$															
	Class	%	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	T7	T8	T9	T10	T11	T12	T13	T14	T15	%	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	T7	T8	T9	T10	T11	T12	T13	T14	T15
1629	T1	0.6	-0.3	0.6	0.4	2.2	1.7	0.4	1.9	3.8	-3.4	3.9	0.0	19.4	-6.7	2.7	-1.9	0.3	-0.1	0.5	0.2	1.0	0.7	0.3	0.9	1.5	-1.4	1.4	0.0	6.3	-1.7	0.9	-0.6
1630	T2	0.7	0.1	0.6	0.2	2.7	0.9	0.4	2.9	3.8	-1.5	5.0	0.0	12.9	-13.3	1.4	-3.8	0.4	0.0	0.5	0.1	1.1	0.4	0.3	1.4	1.5	-0.4	1.7	0.0	4.2	-3.3	0.5	-1.2
1631	T3	0.6	-0.1	0.3	0.4	3.1	2.6	2.0	1.6	-1.9	1.0	2.8	0.0	6.5	0.0	0.0	-0.5	0.3	0.0	0.3	0.1	1.3	1.1	0.8	0.8	-0.7	0.6	1.1	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	-1.8
1632	T4	0.7	-0.4	0.4	-0.1	4.4	1.9	-0.4	4.9	0.6	2.0	6.1	0.0	12.9	-6.7	-1.4	-5.7	0.4	-0.1	0.5	0.0	1.9	0.9	0.0	2.2	0.2	0.9	2.2	0.0	4.2	-1.7	-0.5	-1.8
1633	T5	0.7	-0.1	0.8	0.2	0.4	1.9	0.8	3.2	0.6	0.5	6.1	0.0	3.2	-6.7	-2.7	1.9	0.4	0.0	0.6	0.1	0.2	0.8	0.4	1.5	0.3	0.2	2.3	0.0	1.1	-1.7	-0.9	0.6
1634	T6	0.7	-0.4	0.6	0.2	0.9	-0.5	5.6	4.2	1.9	0.5	3.9	0.0	9.7	6.7	-5.4	-3.8	0.3	-0.1	0.4	0.2	0.4	-0.2	2.3	1.8	0.8	0.2	1.4	0.0	3.2	1.7	-1.9	-1.2
1635	T7	0.7	-0.2	0.7	0.2	2.7	1.7	1.2	5.8	3.2	-3.4	3.9	0.0	6.5	-6.7	-1.4	-5.7	0.4	-0.1	0.5	0.1	1.2	0.8	0.6	2.6	1.3	-1.4	1.4	0.0	2.1	-1.7	-0.5	-1.8
1636	T8	0.6	0.1	0.3	0.7	2.2	1.7	-0.4	1.9	5.7	1.5	2.8	0.0	3.2	-6.7	0.0	-7.5	0.3	0.0	0.5	0.4	1.0	0.8	-0.1	0.9	2.3	0.7	0.8	0.0	1.1	-1.7	0.0	-2.3
1637	T9	0.6	-0.3	0.8	0.6	2.2	0.7	-1.2	3.9	4.5	-1.0	3.3	0.0	3.2	-6.7	0.0	-9.4	0.3	-0.1	0.7	0.3	1.0	0.3	-0.4	1.8	1.8	-0.4	1.2	0.0	1.1	-1.7	-0.1	-2.9
1638	T10	1.0	-0.1	0.5	1.1	4.0	2.1	0.4	3.9	3.8	-1.5	3.3	0.0	9.7	0.0	1.4	1.9	0.5	-0.1	0.5	0.5	1.8	1.0	0.3	1.8	1.6	-0.6	1.2	0.0	3.1	0.0	0.5	0.6
1639	T11	0.7	-0.1	0.5	1.1	2.2	-0.2	-1.2	2.3	4.5	-1.0	8.3	0.0	3.2	0.0	0.0	-5.7	0.3	-0.1	0.5	0.5	1.0	-0.1	-0.4	1.1	1.8	-0.4	2.9	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	-1.8
1640	T12	0.7	-0.2	0.6	0.1	3.6	0.5	-1.2	2.3	4.5	0.5	7.7	0.0	19.4	0.0	-1.4	-7.5	0.3	-0.1	0.5	0.1	1.6	0.2	-0.3	1.0	1.9	0.2	2.8	0.0	6.3	0.0	-0.5	-2.4
1641	M0	0.86	0.98	0.94	0.91	0.80	0.79	0.66	0.78	0.67	0.74	0.54	0.95	0.48	0.33	0.55	0.45	0.92	0.99	0.95	0.95	0.90	0.89	0.82	0.88	0.83	0.86	0.76	0.97	0.74	0.67	0.77	0.73

Table 19: Similar to Table 3 and Tables 12~18, this table shows the impact of the GA strategy and objective metric ϕ^{oba} (overall balanced accuracy) for classes T_1, T_2, \dots, T_{15} in the ticketing dataset.

1644	Optimization: GA-OBA-Class[row]; Performance Metric: $\Delta\text{OF1}\%$, $\Delta\text{CR}\%$															Optimization: GA-OBA-Class[row]; Performance Metric: $\Delta\text{OBA}\%$, $\Delta\text{CBA}\%$																	
	ΔOF1		$\Delta\text{CR}\%$													ΔOBA		$\Delta\text{CBA}\%$															
	Class	%	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	T7	T8	T9	T10	T11	T12	T13	T14	T15	%	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	T7	T8	T9	T10	T11	T12	T13	T14	T15
1645	T1	0.3	0.2	-0.5	0.9	0.0	-0.5	0.0	2.3	1.9	2.9	3.9	0.0	12.9	-20.0	-4.1	-1.9	0.1	-0.2	0.0	0.4	0.0	-0.1	0.1	1.0	0.8	1.3	1.3	0.0	4.2	-5.0	-1.4	-0.6
1646	T2	0.2	0.1	0.7	-0.4	0.9	1.2	-3.2	2.3	-4.5	-2.4	4.4	0.0	9.7	-13.3	-2.7	-1.9	0.1	0.1	-0.2	-0.1	0.4	0.5	-1.1	1.0	-1.8	-0.8	1.6	0.0	3.1	-3.3	-1.0	-0.6
1647	T3	0.6	0.1	0.4	1.2	3.6	1.2	0.4	1.9	-2.5	-0.5	7.2	0.0	3.2	-6.7	-5.4	-9.4	0.3	0.1	0.3	0.4	1.5	0.5	0.2	0.9	-0.9	-0.1	2.7	0.0	1.0	-1.6	-1.9	-2.9
1648	T4	0.8	0.0	0.6	0.2	6.2	1.4	2.4	0.3	-0.6	2.0	5.0	0.0	6.5	-6.7	-1.4	-3.8	0.4	0.0	0.5	0.2	2.6	0.7	1.0	0.2	-0.1	0.8	1.9	0.0	2.1	-1.7	-0.5	-1.2
1649	T5	0.2	-0.3	-0.3	0.9	0.4	2.8	1.2	1.0	-2.5	2.4	3.3	0.0	3.2	-20.0	-14.4	-9.4	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.6	0.2	0.7	0.6	0.4	-0.9	1.1	1.2	0.0	1.0	-5.0	-0.5	-3.0
1650	T6	0.3	0.3	0.0	0.6	2.2	2.6	2.0	1.6	-1.3	-2.0	0.0	0.0	12.9	-13.3	-2.7	-15.1	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.3	1.0	1.1	0.2	0.9	-0.4	-0.8	0.2	0.0	4.2	-3.3	-0.9	-4.7
1651	T7	0.3	0.0	0.3	0.1	2.7	0.9	2.0	-4.5	0.6	2.4	1.7	0.0	9.7	-13.3	-4.1	1.9	0.1	0.0	0.5	0.1	1.2	0.4	0.8	-2.2	0.3	1.1	0.5	0.0	3.1	-3.3	-1.5	0.5
1652	T8	0.4	0.2	-0.1	0.6	1.8	2.4	2.3	1.3	0.0	4.4	0.0	3.2	-6.7	0.0	-7.5	0.2	0.1	0.2	0.3	0.8	0.8	-0.8	1.1	0.3	0.9	1.6	0.0	1.0	-1.7	0.0	-2.4	
1653	T9	0.5	-0.1	0.4	0.8	-0.4	1.4	0.0	1.6	0.0	-1.5	2.2	0.0	9.7	0.0	4.1	1.9	0.2	0.0	0.4	0.5	-0.6	0.1	0.9	0.0	-0.8	0.8	0.0	3.1	0.0	1.4	0.5	
1654	T10	0.6	-0.2	-0.3	0.6	-0.4	4.0	2.0	1.6	-3.8	3.9	9.4	0.0	3.2	0.0	2.7	-7.5	0.3	-0.1	0.2	0.3	-0.2	1.8	0.9	0.8	-1.4	1.8	2.7	0.0	1.1	0.0	1.0	-2.3
1655	T11	0.9	-0.1	0.7	0.1	1.8	2.8	3.6	2.3	0.0	2.4	6.6	0.0	0.0	-0.4	-1.4	-9.4	0.4	0.0	0.4	1.1	0.5	1.2	1.5	0.2	0.1	1.1	2.4	0.0	0.0	0.0	-0.5	-2.9
1656	T12	0.7	0.0	0.4	-0.1	3.1	1.7	3.2	1.3	0.0	6.6	0.0	3.2	-13.3	-14	-3.8	0.3	-0.1	0.4	0.1	1.6	1.4	-0.4	1.5	0.6	0.0	2.4	0.0	1.1	-3.3	-0.5	-1.2	
1657	T13	0.7	-0.1	0.6	0.5	4.0	1.9	-0.4	3.6	1.3	0.0	1.1	0.0	25.8	-6.7	14	-1.9	0.4	0.0	0.5	0.3	0.8	0.9	1.0	1.5	0.5	-0.7	1.0	0.0	3.1	-3.3	0.0	-0.6
1658	T14	0.8	-0.1	0.4	0.2	3.1	1.4	-1.2	3.6	1.3	1.5	3.3	0.0	9.7	20.0	1.4	1.9	0.3	-0.2	0.4	0.1	1.3	0.7	-0.3	1.6	0.6	0.6	1.2	0.0	3.2	4.9	1.5	-2.4
1659	T15	0.7	0.1	0.0	0.5	2.7	1.9	0.8	0.6	1.5	5.0	0.0	6.5	0.0	0.0	18.9	0.4	0.1	0.3	0.2	1.2	0.8	0.5	0.4	2.1	-0.5	1.8	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	0.5	5.6
1660	M0	0.86	0.98	0.94	0.91	0.80	0.79	0.66	0.78	0.67	0.74	0.54	0.95	0.48	0.33	0.55	0.45	0.92	0.99	0.95	0.95	0.90	0.89	0.82	0.88	0.83	0.86	0.76	0.97	0.74	0		

1741 **Table 21:** Similar to Table 3 and Tables 12~20, this table shows the impact of the HSW strategy and objective metric ϕ^{OF1} (overall
 1742 F1-score) for classes T_1, T_2, \dots, T_{15} in the ticketing dataset.

1743	Optimization: HSW-OF1-Class[row]; Performance Metric: $\Delta OF1\%$, $\Delta CR\%$															Optimization: HSW-OF1-Class[row]; Performance Metric: $\Delta OBA\%$, $\Delta CBA\%$																	
	$\Delta OF1$		$\Delta CR\%$													ΔOBA		$\Delta CBA\%$															
	Class	%	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	T7	T8	T9	T10	T11	T12	T13	T14	T15	%	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	T7	T8	T9	T10	T11	T12	T13	T14	T15
1744	T1	0.6	-0.3	0.6	0.4	2.2	1.7	0.4	1.9	3.8	-3.4	3.9	0.0	19.4	-6.7	2.7	-1.9	0.3	-0.1	0.5	0.2	1.0	0.7	0.3	0.9	1.5	-1.4	1.4	0.0	6.3	-1.7	0.9	-0.6
1745	T2	0.6	-0.1	0.4	0.1	3.1	0.9	3.2	1.3	-0.6	-2.0	7.2	0.0	9.7	-6.7	-1.4	0.0	0.3	-0.1	0.2	0.0	1.4	0.5	1.4	0.7	-0.2	-0.8	2.5	0.0	3.2	-1.7	-0.5	0.0
1746	T3	0.6	-0.1	0.3	0.4	3.1	2.6	2.0	1.6	-1.9	1.0	2.8	0.0	6.5	0.0	0.0	-0.5	0.3	0.0	0.3	0.1	1.3	1.1	0.8	0.8	-0.7	0.6	1.1	0.0	2.1	0.0	0.0	-1.8
1747	T4	0.7	-0.4	0.4	-0.1	4.4	1.9	-0.4	4.9	0.6	2.0	6.1	0.0	12.9	-6.7	-1.4	-5.7	0.4	-0.1	0.5	0.0	1.9	0.9	0.0	2.2	0.2	0.9	2.2	0.0	4.2	-1.7	-0.5	-1.8
1748	T5	0.7	-0.1	0.8	0.2	0.4	1.9	0.8	3.2	0.6	0.5	6.1	0.0	3.2	-6.7	-2.7	1.9	0.4	0.0	0.6	0.1	0.2	0.8	0.4	1.5	0.3	0.2	2.3	0.0	1.1	-1.7	-0.9	0.6
1749	T6	0.7	-0.4	0.6	0.2	0.9	-0.5	5.6	4.2	1.9	0.5	3.9	0.0	9.7	6.7	-5.4	-3.8	0.3	-0.1	0.4	0.2	0.4	-0.2	2.3	1.8	0.8	0.2	1.4	0.0	3.2	1.7	-1.9	-1.2
1750	T7	0.7	-0.2	0.7	0.2	2.7	1.7	1.2	5.8	3.2	-3.4	3.9	0.0	6.5	-6.7	-1.4	-5.7	0.4	-0.1	0.5	0.1	1.2	0.8	0.6	2.6	1.3	-1.4	1.4	0.0	2.1	-1.7	-0.5	-1.8
1751	T8	0.6	0.1	0.3	0.7	2.2	1.7	-0.4	1.9	5.7	1.5	2.8	0.0	3.2	-6.7	0.0	-7.5	0.3	0.0	0.5	0.4	1.0	0.8	-0.1	0.9	2.3	0.7	0.8	0.0	1.1	-1.7	0.0	-2.3
1752	T9	0.6	-0.3	0.8	0.6	2.2	0.7	-1.2	3.9	4.5	-1.0	3.3	0.0	3.2	-6.7	0.0	-9.4	0.3	-0.1	0.7	0.3	1.0	0.3	-0.4	1.8	1.8	-0.4	1.2	0.0	1.1	-1.7	-0.1	-2.9
1753	T10	1.0	-0.1	0.5	1.1	4.0	2.1	0.4	3.9	3.8	-1.5	3.3	0.0	9.7	0.0	1.4	1.9	0.5	-0.1	0.5	0.5	1.8	1.0	0.3	1.8	1.6	-0.6	1.2	0.0	3.1	0.0	0.5	0.6
1754	T11	0.7	-0.1	0.5	1.1	2.2	-0.2	-1.2	2.3	4.5	-1.0	8.3	0.0	3.2	0.0	0.0	-5.7	0.3	-0.1	0.5	0.5	1.0	-0.1	-0.4	1.1	1.8	-0.4	2.9	0.0	1.1	0.0	0.0	-1.8
1755	T12	0.7	-0.2	0.6	0.1	3.6	0.5	-1.2	2.3	4.5	0.5	7.7	0.0	19.4	0.0	-1.4	-7.5	0.3	-0.1	0.5	0.1	1.6	0.2	-0.3	1.0	1.9	0.2	2.8	0.0	6.3	0.0	-0.5	-2.4
1756	T13	0.8	-0.2	0.4	0.7	2.7	1.7	1.6	3.6	3.2	-2.0	4.4	0.0	9.7	20.0	-1.4	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.4	0.4	1.2	0.7	0.8	1.6	1.3	-0.8	1.6	0.0	3.2	4.8	-0.5	0.0
1757	T14	0.6	-0.4	0.2	0.5	3.1	1.7	-2.4	3.9	3.2	0.5	5.0	0.0	16.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.3	-0.2	0.3	0.2	1.4	0.6	-0.9	1.7	1.4	0.2	1.8	0.0	5.3	0.0	0.0	0.0
1758	T15	0.7	-0.1	0.9	0.4	1.3	-0.9	-2.0	2.6	1.9	2.0	4.4	0.0	16.1	-6.7	0.0	11.3	0.4	0.0	0.7	0.2	0.6	-0.4	-0.6	1.2	0.8	0.9	1.6	0.0	5.2	-1.7	0.0	3.3
1759	M0	0.86	0.98	0.94	0.91	0.80	0.79	0.66	0.78	0.67	0.74	0.54	0.95	0.48	0.33	0.55	0.45	0.92	0.99	0.95	0.95	0.90	0.89	0.82	0.88	0.83	0.86	0.76	0.97	0.74	0.67	0.77	0.73

1755 **Table 22:** Similar to Table 3 and Tables 12~21, this table shows the impact of the GA strategy and objective metric ϕ^{OF1} (overall
 1756 F1-score) for classes T_1, T_2, \dots, T_{15} in the ticketing dataset.

1760	Optimization: GA-OF1-Class[row]; Performance Metric: $\Delta OF1\%$, $\Delta CR\%$															Optimization: GA-OF1-Class[row]; Performance Metric: $\Delta OBA\%$, $\Delta CBA\%$																	
	$\Delta OF1$		$\Delta CR\%$													ΔOBA		$\Delta CBA\%$															
	Class	%	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	T7	T8	T9	T10	T11	T12	T13	T14	T15	%	T1	T2	T3	T4	T5	T6	T7	T8	T9	T10	T11	T12	T13	T14	T15
1761	T1	0.1	-0.1	-0.6	1.3	0.9	-0.5	-1.6	0.3	0.6	2.4	7.7	0.0	6.5	-20.0	-4.1	-3.8	0.1	-0.3	-0.1	0.6	0.4	-0.1	-0.6	0.1	0.3	1.1	2.6	0.0	2.1	-5.0	-1.4	-1.2
1762	T2	0.2	-0.3	0.5	0.1	1.8	0.2	-2.4	2.9	-2.5	1.5	0.0	0.0	9.7	-33.3	1.4	-1.9	0.1	-0.1	-0.3	0.1	0.8	0.1	-0.8	1.3	-0.9	0.7	0.1	0.0	3.2	-8.3	0.5	-0.6
1763	T3	0.6	-0.1	-0.2	1.5	2.2	2.4	4.8	1.0	0.6	-2.0	8.8	0.0	6.5	0.0	-8.1	-9.4	0.3	0.0	0.0	0.5	1.0	1.1	2.0	0.5	0.3	-0.7	3.2	0.0	2.1	0.0	-2.8	-2.9
1764	T4	0.8	-0.1	0.1	0.8	4.4	0.9	2.8	2.3	3.2	1.5	6.1	0.0	0.0	6.7	-8.1	-5.7	0.4	0.0	0.3	0.4	1.8	0.5	1.2	1.1	0.7	2.2	0.0	0.0	1.7	-0.5	-1.8	
1765	T5	0.2	-0.1	0.2	0.8	-1.3	-1.2	1.6	1.6	-5.7	3.4	3.9	0.0	6.5	-13.3	-4.1	-5.7	0.1	0.0	0.4	0.4	-0.6	-1.1	0.7	1.4	0.0	2.1	-3.1	-1.4	-1.7			
1766	T6	0.1	0.0	0.1	0.9	0.9	1.9	3.2	2.3	-4.5	-3.9	2.8	-1.1	3.2	-13.3	-4.1	-20.8	0.1	0.0	0.4	0.5	0.4	0.8	0.6	1.1	-1.8	-1.6	1.1	-0.5	1.1	-3.3	-1.4	-6.5
1767	T7	0.2	0.1	0.5	0.9	3.6	1.2	2.8	-1.6	-6.4	0.5	0.0	0.0	6.5	-13.3	-2.7	-7.5	0.1	0.0	0.5	0.5	1.6	0.6	1.2	-0.9	-2.5	0.3	0.0	0.0	-2.1	-3.3	-0.9	-2.4
1768	T8	0.4	0.0	0.3	0.7	1.8	1.2	-3.2	2.6	0.6	1.5	3.9	0.0	3.2	0.0	-4.1	-3.8	0.2	0.0	0.4	0.3	0.8	0.5	-1.2	1.2	-0.1	0.7	1.4	0.0	1.0	0.0	-1.5	-1.2
1769	T9	0.6	-0.2	0.7	0.4	1.8	3.1	0.4	2.3	2.5	-2.9	-2.2	0.0	12.9	0.0	4.1	-3.8	0.3	-0.1	0.4	0.2	0.8	1.4	0.3	1.1	-1.3	-0.7	0.0	4.2	0.0	1.4	-1.2	
1770	T10	0.4	-0.2	0.0	-0.1	0.0	2.4	2.8	2.9	-3.8	2.9	4.4	0.0	6.5	0.0	-1.4	-5.7	0.2	-0.1	0.2	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.3	1.3	-1.4	1.3	1.1	0.0	2.1	0.0	-0.4	-1.7
1771	T11	0.8	-0.2	0.7	0.7	2.7	2.4	-0.4	3.9	3.2	-1.5	3.9	0.0	3.2	-6.7	1.4	-5.7	0.4	-0.1	0.5	0.4	1.2	1.1	-0.1	1.8	1.3	-0.5	1.4	0.0	1.1	-1.7	0.5	-1.8
1772	T12	0.8	-0.1	0.3	0.8	1.3	-0.2	1.2	3.2	5.1	-1.0	7.2	0.0	22.6	-6.7	1.4	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.4	0.4	0.6	-0.1	0.5	1.5	2.1	-0.3	2.6	0.0	7.3	-1.6	0.4	0.0
1773	T13	0.7	-0.2	0.7	0.2	2.7	0.9	2.4	3.9	3.2	0.5	2.8	0.0	9.7	13.3	-9.5	0.0	0.4	0.0	0.6	0.1	1.1	0.5	1.1	1.7	1.3	0.2	1.0	0.0	3.2	3.2	-3.3	0.0
1774	T14	0.3	0.0	0.6	-0.2	-0.4	0.0	0.4	1.0	-1.9	0.5																						