

LabelFusion: Learning to Fuse LLMs and Transformer Classifiers for Robust Text Classification

Michael Schlee¹, Chistoph Weisser¹, Timo Kivimäki², Melchy Mashiku⁴, and Benjamin Saefken³

¹ Centre for Statistics, Georg-August-Universität Göttingen, Germany ² Department of Politics and International Studies, University of Bath, Bath, UK ³ Institute of Mathematics, Clausthal University of Technology, Clausthal-Zellerfeld, Germany ⁴

DOI: [10.xxxxxx/draft](https://doi.org/10.xxxxxx/draft)

Software

- [Review](#) ↗
- [Repository](#) ↗
- [Archive](#) ↗

Editor: [Open Journals](#) ↗

Reviewers:

- [@openjournals](#)

Submitted: 01 January 1970

Published: unpublished

License

Authors of papers retain copyright and release the work under a

Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License ([CC BY 4.0](#)).

Summary

LabelFusion is a fusion ensemble for text classification that learns to combine a traditional transformer-based classifier (e.g., RoBERTa) with one or more Large Language Models (LLMs such as OpenAI GPT, Google Gemini, or DeepSeek) to deliver accurate and cost-aware predictions across multi-class and multi-label tasks. The package provides a simple high-level interface (AutoFusionClassifier) that trains the full pipeline end-to-end with minimal configuration, and a flexible API for advanced users. Under the hood, LabelFusion concatenates vector signals from the ML backbone (logits) and LLM(s) (per-class scores) and trains a compact multi-layer perceptron (FusionMLP) to produce the final prediction. This learned fusion approach captures complementary strengths of LLM reasoning and transformer efficiency, yielding robust performance across domains—achieving 92.4% accuracy on AG News topic classification—while enabling practical trade-offs between accuracy, latency, and cost.

Statement of Need

Modern text classification spans diverse scenarios—from sentiment and topic tagging to policy enforcement and routing—often under constraints that vary per deployment (throughput, cost ceilings, data privacy). While transformer classifiers such as BERT/RoBERTa achieve strong supervised performance (Devlin et al., 2018; Liu et al., 2019), frontier LLMs can excel in low-data, ambiguous, or cross-domain settings (OpenAI, 2023). No single model family is uniformly best: LLMs are powerful yet comparatively costly and rate-limited, whereas fine-tuned transformers are efficient but may struggle with out-of-distribution cases.

LabelFusion addresses this gap by: (1) exposing a minimal “AutoFusion” interface that trains a learned combination of an ML backbone and one or more LLMs; (2) supporting both multi-class and multi-label classification; (3) providing a lightweight fusion learner that directly fits on LLM scores and ML logits; and (4) integrating cleanly with existing ensemble utilities. Researchers and practitioners can therefore leverage LLMs where they add value while retaining the speed and determinism of transformer models.

State of the Field

Ensembles improve robustness by aggregating diverse predictors (Dietterich, 2000; Hansen & Salamon, 1990). Mixture-of-experts approaches further specialize components and learn to combine their outputs (Jacobs et al., 1991). In applied NLP, common tools such as scikit-learn (Pedregosa et al., 2011) and Hugging Face Transformers (Wolf et al., 2019) offer strong baselines but do not provide a turnkey, learned fusion of LLMs with supervised transformers. Orchestration frameworks (e.g., LangChain) focus on tool use rather than classification

41 ensembles. LabelFusion contributes a focused, production-minded implementation of a small
42 learned combiner that operates on per-class signals from both model families.

43 Functionality and Design

44 LabelFusion consists of three layers:

- 45 ▪ ML component: a RoBERTa-style classifier produces per-class logits for input texts.
- 46 ▪ LLM component(s): provider-specific classifiers (OpenAI, Gemini, DeepSeek) return
47 per-class scores via prompting. Scores can be cached to minimize API calls when cache
48 locations are provided.
- 49 ▪ Fusion component: a compact MLP concatenates ML logits and LLM scores and outputs
50 fused logits. The ML backbone is trained/fine-tuned with a small learning rate; the fusion
51 MLP uses a higher rate, enabling rapid adaptation without destabilizing the encoder.

52 Key features:

- 53 ▪ **Multi-class and multi-label support** with consistent data structures and unified training
54 pipeline.
- 55 ▪ **Optional LLM response caching** reuses on-disk predictions when cache paths are supplied,
56 with dataset-hash validation to guard against stale files.
- 57 ▪ **Batched scoring** processes multiple texts efficiently with configurable batch sizes for both
58 ML tokenization and LLM API calls.
- 59 ▪ **Results management** via ResultsManager tracks experiments, stores predictions, com-
60 puts metrics, and enables reproducible research workflows.
- 61 ▪ **Flexible interfaces:** Command-line training via `train_fusion.py` with YAML configs for
62 research; or minimal AutoFusion API for quick deployment.
- 63 ▪ **Composable design:** LabelFusion can serve as a strong base learner in higher-level
64 ensembles (e.g., voting/weighted combinations of multiple fusion models).

65 Minimal Example (AutoFusion)

```
from textclassify import AutoFusionClassifier

config = {
    'llm_provider': 'deepseek',
    'label_columns': ['positive', 'negative', 'neutral']
}

clf = AutoFusionClassifier(config)
clf.fit(train_dataframe) # trains ML backbone, gathers LLM scores, fits fus
pred = clf.predict(["This is amazing!"]) # fused prediction
```

66 CLI and Configuration

67 Users can generate a starter config and train via the command line:

- 68 ▪ Create config: `python train_fusion.py --create-config fusion_config.yaml`
- 69 ▪ Train: `python train_fusion.py --config fusion_config.yaml`
- 70 ▪ Optional test data and output artifacts are also supported.

71 Quality Control

72 The repository ships legacy unit tests under `tests/evaluation/old/` that cover configuration
73 handling, core types, and package integration. Fusion-specific logic is currently exercised
74 through CLI-driven workflows and notebooks that run end-to-end training with deterministic
75 seeds where applicable.

76 Evaluation scripts (tests/evaluation/) provide comprehensive benchmarking on standard
 77 datasets: - **AG News** (Zhang et al., 2015): 4-class topic classification with experiments
 78 across varying training data sizes (20%–100%) - **GoEmotions** (Demszky et al., 2020): 28-class
 79 multi-label emotion classification for validating multi-label fusion performance

80 LLM scoring paths implement retries and disk caching; transformer training supports standard
 81 sanity checks (overfit a small batch, reduced batch sizes for constrained hardware). Metrics
 82 (accuracy/F1, per-label scores) are computed automatically and stored with run artifacts to
 83 facilitate regression tracking and reproducibility.

84 Availability and Installation

85 LabelFusion is distributed as part of the textclassify package under the MIT license and
 86 is available at <https://github.com/DataandAIResearch/LabelFusion>. The fusion components
 87 require Python 3.8+ and common scientific Python dependencies (PyTorch, transformers,
 88 scikit-learn, numpy, pandas, PyYAML). Optional plotting depends on matplotlib/seaborn.
 89 Installation and quick-start snippets are provided in the README and FUSION_README.md.

90 Production-Ready Features

91 Beyond the core fusion methodology, LabelFusion includes features for practical deployment:

- 92 ■ **LLM Response Caching:** Optional disk-backed caches reuse prior predictions when cache
 93 paths are supplied, with dataset hashes to flag inconsistent inputs.
- 94 ■ **Results Management:** Built-in ResultsManager tracks experiments, stores predictions,
 95 and computes metrics automatically. Supports comparison across runs and configuration
 96 tracking.
- 97 ■ **Batch Processing:** Efficient batched scoring of texts with configurable batch sizes for
 98 both ML and LLM components.

99 Impact and Use Cases

100 Empirical Performance

101 LabelFusion has been evaluated on standard benchmark datasets to validate its effectiveness.
 102 Key findings demonstrate consistent improvements over individual model components:

103 AG News Topic Classification

104 Evaluation on the AG News dataset (Zhang et al., 2015) (4-class topic classification) with
 105 5,000 test samples shows:

Training Data	Model	Accuracy	F1-Score	Precision	Recall
20% (800)	Fusion	92.2%	0.922	0.923	0.922
20% (800)	RoBERTa	89.8%	0.899	0.902	0.898
20% (800)	OpenAI	84.4%	0.844	0.857	0.844
40% (1,600)	Fusion	92.2%	0.922	0.924	0.922
40% (1,600)	RoBERTa	91.0%	0.911	0.913	0.910
40% (1,600)	OpenAI	84.4%	0.844	0.857	0.844
100% (4,000)	Fusion	92.4%	0.924	0.926	0.924
100% (4,000)	RoBERTa	92.2%	0.922	0.923	0.922
100% (4,000)	OpenAI	84.4%	0.844	0.857	0.844

106 **Key Observations:** - Fusion consistently outperforms individual models across all training
 107 data sizes - With only 20% training data, Fusion achieves 92.2% accuracy—matching its
 108 performance with full data - Demonstrates superior **data efficiency**: fusion learning extracts

maximum value from limited examples - RoBERTa alone requires 100% of data to approach Fusion's 20% performance - LLM (OpenAI) shows stable but lower performance, highlighting the value of combining approaches

These results validate that learned fusion captures complementary strengths: the LLM provides robust reasoning even with limited training data, while the ML backbone adds efficiency and domain-specific patterns.

Application Domains

Learned fusion excels in scenarios where model strengths complement each other:

- **Customer feedback analysis** with nuanced multi-label taxonomies where LLMs handle ambiguous sentiment while ML models efficiently process clear cases
- **Content moderation** where uncertain cases benefit from LLM reasoning while routine items rely on the fast ML backbone, enabling real-time processing with accuracy guarantees
- **Scientific literature classification** across heterogeneous topics where domain shift is common and LLMs provide robustness to new terminology
- **Low-resource settings** where limited training data is available but task complexity requires sophisticated reasoning

The approach enables pragmatic cost control (e.g., the fusion layer learns when to rely more heavily on the efficient ML backbone versus the more expensive LLM signal) while retaining a single trainable decision surface that optimizes for the specific deployment constraints.

Acknowledgements

We thank contributors and users who reported issues and shared datasets. LabelFusion builds on the open-source ecosystem, notably Hugging Face Transformers (Wolf et al., 2019), scikit-learn (Pedregosa et al., 2011), PyTorch (Paszke et al., 2019), and LLM provider SDKs. We acknowledge the use of the AG News and GoEmotions benchmark datasets for evaluation.

References

- Demszky, D., Movshovitz-Attias, D., Ko, J., Cowen, A., Nemade, G., & Ravi, S. (2020). GoEmotions: A dataset of fine-grained emotions. *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 4040–4054.
- Devlin, J., Chang, M.-W., Lee, K., & Toutanova, K. (2018). BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv Preprint arXiv:1810.04805*.
- Dietterich, T. G. (2000). Ensemble methods in machine learning. *International Workshop on Multiple Classifier Systems*, 1–15.
- Hansen, L. K., & Salamon, P. (1990). Neural network ensembles. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 12(10), 993–1001.
- Jacobs, R. A., Jordan, M. I., Nowlan, S. J., & Hinton, G. E. (1991). Adaptive mixtures of local experts. *Neural Computation*, 3(1), 79–87.
- Liu, Y., Ott, M., Goyal, N., Du, J., Joshi, M., Chen, D., Levy, O., Lewis, M., Zettlemoyer, L., & Stoyanov, V. (2019). RoBERTa: A robustly optimized BERT pretraining approach. *arXiv Preprint arXiv:1907.11692*.
- OpenAI. (2023). GPT-4 technical report. *arXiv Preprint arXiv:2303.08774*.
- Paszke, A., Gross, S., Massa, F., Lerer, A., Bradbury, J., Chanan, G., Killeen, T., Lin, Z., Gimelshein, N., Antiga, L., & others. (2019). PyTorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*,

153 32.

- 154 Pedregosa, F., Varoquaux, G., Gramfort, A., Michel, V., Thirion, B., Grisel, O., Blondel, M.,
155 Prettenhofer, P., Weiss, R., Dubourg, V., & others. (2011). Scikit-learn: Machine learning
156 in python. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 12(Oct), 2825–2830.
- 157 Wolf, T., Debut, L., Sanh, V., Chaumond, J., Delangue, C., Moi, A., Cistac, P., Rault, T.,
158 Louf, R., Funtowicz, M., & others. (2019). HuggingFace's transformers: State-of-the-art
159 natural language processing. *arXiv Preprint arXiv:1910.03771*.
- 160 Zhang, X., Zhao, J., & LeCun, Y. (2015). Character-level convolutional networks for text
161 classification. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 28, 649–657.

DRAFT