
Documentation for automl Package

Anonymous¹

¹Anonymous Institution

Abstract Create with `\begin{abstract} ... \end{abstract}`.

The automl package provides a L^AT_EX style for the AutoML Conference. This document provides some notes regarding the package and tips for typesetting manuscripts. The package and this document is maintained at the following GitHub repository:

<https://github.com/automl-conf/LatexTemplate>

Users are encouraged to submit issues, bug reports, etc. to:

<https://github.com/automl-conf/LatexTemplate/issues>

A barebones submission is also available as `barebones.tex` in the same repository.

1 Package options

With no options, the automl package prepares an anonymized manuscript with hidden supplemental material. Two options are supported changing this behavior:

- `final` – produces non-anonymized camera-ready version for distribution and/or publication
- `hidesupplement` – hides supplementary material (following `\appendix`); for example, for submitting or distributing the main paper without supplement

Note that `final` may be used in combination with `hidesupplement` to prepare a non-anonymized version of the main paper with hidden supplement.

2 Supplemental material

Please provide supplemental material in the main document. You may begin the supplemental material using `\appendix`. Any content following this command will be suppressed in the final output if the `hidesupplement` option is given.

3 Note regarding line numbering at submission time

To ensure that line numbering works correctly with display math mode, please do *not* use T_EX primitives such as `$$` and `eqnarray`. (You shouldn't be using these anyway!)¹² Please use L^AT_EX equivalents such as `\[... \]` (or `\begin{equation} ... \end{equation}`) and the `align` environment from the `amsmath` package.³

¹<https://tex.stackexchange.com/questions/196/eqnarray-vs-align>

²<https://tex.stackexchange.com/questions/503/why-is-preferable-to>

³<http://tug.ctan.org/info/short-math-guide/short-math-guide.pdf>

Table 1: An example table using the booktabs package.

method	metric	
	accuracy	time
baseline	10	100
our method	100	10

Amazing figure!

(a) Subfigure caption.

Another amazing figure!

(b) Another subfigure caption.

Figure 1: An example figure with subfigures. (a): an amazing figure. (b): another amazing figure.

4 References 29

Authors may use any citation style as long as it is consistent throughout the document. By default we propose author–year citations. Code is provided in the preamble to achieve such citations using either natbib/bibtex or the more modern biblatex/biber. 30 31 32

You may create a parenthetical reference with \citep, such as appears at the end of this sentence (Author, 2000). You may create a textual reference using \citet, as Author (2000) also demonstrated. 33 34 35

5 Tables 36

We recommend the booktabs package for creating tables, as demonstrated below and in Table 1. Note that table captions appear *above* tables. 37 38

6 Figures and subfigures 39

The automl style loads the subcaption package, which may be used to create and caption subfigures. Please note that this is *incompatible* with the (obsolete and deprecated) subfigure package. A figure with subfigures is demonstrated below and in Figure 1. Note that figure captions appear *below* figures. 40 41 42 43

7 Pseudocode 44

To add pseudocode, we suggest the use of the algorithm and algpseudocode packages, included here. An example algorithm listing (in a floating algorithm environment) is provided below and in Algorithm 1. 45 46 47

Algorithm 1 Euclid’s algorithm	
1: procedure EUCLID(a, b)	▷ The g.c.d. of a and b
2: $r \leftarrow a \bmod b$	
3: while $r \neq 0$ do	▷ We have the answer if r is 0
4: $a \leftarrow b$	
5: $b \leftarrow r$	
6: $r \leftarrow a \bmod b$	
7: end while	
8: return b	▷ The gcd is b
9: end procedure	

8 Adding acknowledgments

You may add acknowledgments of funding, etc. using the acknowledgments environment. Acknowledgments will be automatically commented out at submission time. An example is given below in the source code for this document; it will be hidden in the PDF unless the final option is given.

9 Required Material

All authors must include the following two sections in their manuscripts, both at submission and camera-ready time.

10 Broader Impact Statement

All authors must include a broader impact statement regarding the approach, datasets and applications proposed/used in your paper. It should reflect on the environmental, ethical and societal implications of your work. The statement should require at most one page.

11 Reproducibility Checklist

The reproducibility checklist is a combination of the NeurIPS '21 checklist and the NAS checklist. For each question, change the default `\answerTODO{}` (typeset **[TODO]**) to `\answerYes{[justification]}` (typeset **[Yes]**), `\answerNo{[justification]}` (typeset **[No]**), or `\answerNA{[justification]}` (typeset **[N/A]**). **You must include a brief justification to your answer**, either by referencing the appropriate section of your paper or providing a brief inline description. For example:

- Did you include the license of the code and datasets? **[Yes]** See Section 7.
- Did you include all the code for running experiments? **[No]** We include the code we wrote, but it depends on proprietary libraries for executing on a compute cluster and as such will not be runnable without modifications. We also include a runnable sequential version of the code that we also report experiments in the paper with.
- Did you include the license of the datasets? **[N/A]** Our experiments were conducted on publicly available datasets and we have not introduced new datasets.

Please note that if you answer a question with `\answerNo{}`, we expect that you compensate for it (e.g., if you cannot provide the full evaluation code, you should at least provide code for a minimal reproducibility of the main insights of your paper).

Please do not modify the questions and only use the provided macros for your answers. Note that this section does not count towards the page limit. In your paper, please delete this instructions block and only keep the Checklist section heading above along with the questions/answers below.

1. For all authors...

- (a) Do the main claims made in the abstract and introduction accurately reflect the paper's contributions and scope? **[TODO]**
- (b) Did you describe the limitations of your work? **[TODO]**
- (c) Did you discuss any potential negative societal impacts of your work? **[TODO]**
- (d) Have you read the ethics review guidelines and ensured that your paper conforms to them? **[TODO]**

2. If you are including theoretical results...

(a) Did you state the full set of assumptions of all theoretical results? [TODO]	87
(b) Did you include complete proofs of all theoretical results? [TODO]	88
3. If you ran experiments...	89
(a) Did you include the code, data, and instructions needed to reproduce the main experimental results, including all requirements (e.g., requirements.txt with explicit version), an instructive README with installation, and execution commands (either in the supplemental material or as a URL)? [TODO]	90
(b) Did you include the raw results of running the given instructions on the given code and data? [TODO]	94
(c) Did you include scripts and commands that can be used to generate the figures and tables in your paper based on the raw results of the code, data, and instructions given? [TODO]	96
(d) Did you ensure sufficient code quality such that your code can be safely executed and the code is properly documented? [TODO]	98
(e) Did you specify all the training details (e.g., data splits, pre-processing, search spaces, fixed hyperparameter settings, and how they were chosen)? [TODO]	100
(f) Did you ensure that you compared different methods (including your own) exactly on the same benchmarks, including the same datasets, search space, code for training and hyperparameters for that code? [TODO]	102
(g) Did you run ablation studies to assess the impact of different components of your approach? [TODO]	105
(h) Did you use the same evaluation protocol for the methods being compared? [TODO]	107
(i) Did you compare performance over time? [TODO]	108
(j) Did you perform multiple runs of your experiments and report random seeds? [TODO]	109
(k) Did you report error bars (e.g., with respect to the random seed after running experiments multiple times)? [TODO]	110
(l) Did you use tabular or surrogate benchmarks for in-depth evaluations? [TODO]	112
(m) Did you include the total amount of compute and the type of resources used (e.g., type of GPUs, internal cluster, or cloud provider)? [TODO]	113
(n) Did you report how you tuned hyperparameters, and what time and resources this required (if they were not automatically tuned by your AutoML method, e.g. in a NAS approach; and also hyperparameters of your own method)? [TODO]	115
4. If you are using existing assets (e.g., code, data, models) or curating/releasing new assets...	118
(a) If your work uses existing assets, did you cite the creators? [TODO]	119
(b) Did you mention the license of the assets? [TODO]	120
(c) Did you include any new assets either in the supplemental material or as a URL? [TODO]	121
(d) Did you discuss whether and how consent was obtained from people whose data you're using/curating? [TODO]	122
(e) Did you discuss whether the data you are using/curating contains personally identifiable information or offensive content? [TODO]	124

5. If you used crowdsourcing or conducted research with human subjects...	126
(a) Did you include the full text of instructions given to participants and screenshots, if applicable? [TODO]	127 128
(b) Did you describe any potential participant risks, with links to Institutional Review Board (IRB) approvals, if applicable? [TODO]	129 130
(c) Did you include the estimated hourly wage paid to participants and the total amount spent on participant compensation? [TODO]	131 132
References	133
Author, A. (2000). <i>The Definitive Resource</i> . Universal Press.	134