# Comprehensive Comparison of Machine Learning Models: Pros and Cons

## July 2025

## 1 Introduction

Machine learning (ML) models, encompassing both traditional ML and deep learning (DL), are pivotal in solving a wide range of tasks, from predictive analytics to computer vision. This document provides a detailed comparison of major ML models, highlighting their strengths and weaknesses to aid in model selection for specific applications. The models covered include Linear Regression, Logistic Regression, Decision Trees, Random Forests, Support Vector Machines (SVM), k-Nearest Neighbors (k-NN), Gradient Boosting (e.g., XGBoost), Naive Bayes, Convolutional Neural Networks (CNN), Recurrent Neural Networks (RNN), Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM), Gated Recurrent Units (GRU), Transformers, and Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs).

# 2 Comparison of Machine Learning Models

Table 1: Pros and Cons of Machine Learning Models

Model	Pros	Cons
Linear Regression	<ul> <li>Simple and computationally efficient.</li> <li>Highly interpretable, with coefficients indicating feature importance.</li> <li>Works well for linearly separable data.</li> <li>Fast training and inference times.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Assumes linear relationship between features and target, limiting its use for complex patterns.</li> <li>Sensitive to outliers, which can skew coefficients.</li> <li>Requires feature scaling and assumes no multicollinearity.</li> <li>Poor performance on non-linear data without feature engineering.</li> </ul>

Table 1: Pros and Cons of Machine Learning Models (Continued)

Model	Pros	Cons
Logistic Regression	<ul> <li>Simple and effective for binary classification.</li> <li>Interpretable probabilities for class predictions.</li> <li>Robust to small datasets and noise if regularized.</li> <li>Low computational cost.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Limited to linear decision boundaries unless combined with kernel tricks.</li> <li>Struggles with complex, non-linear relationships.</li> <li>Requires careful feature selection to avoid overfitting.</li> <li>Less effective for multiclass problems without extensions.</li> </ul>
Decision Trees	<ul> <li>Intuitive and easy to interpret.</li> <li>Handles non-linear relationships and mixed data types.</li> <li>No need for feature scaling.</li> <li>Can model interactions between features.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Prone to overfitting, especially with deep trees.</li> <li>Sensitive to small changes in data, leading to high variance.</li> <li>Biased toward features with many categories.</li> <li>Poor generalization without pruning or ensemble methods.</li> </ul>
Random Forests	<ul> <li>Reduces overfitting through ensemble averaging.</li> <li>Robust to outliers and noise.</li> <li>Handles non-linear relationships and high-dimensional data.</li> <li>Provides feature importance metrics.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Computationally expensive for large datasets.</li> <li>Less interpretable than single decision trees.</li> <li>Slower inference times compared to simpler models.</li> <li>Requires tuning of hyperparameters (e.g., number of trees).</li> </ul>

Table 1: Pros and Cons of Machine Learning Models (Continued)

Model	Pros	Cons
Support Vector Machines (SVM)	<ul> <li>Effective in high-dimensional spaces with kernel tricks.</li> <li>Robust to overfitting with proper regularization.</li> <li>Flexible for both linear and non-linear problems.</li> <li>High accuracy for small, clean datasets.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Computationally intensive for large datasets.</li> <li>Requires careful selection of kernel and hyperparameters.</li> <li>Less interpretable due to complex decision boundaries.</li> <li>Sensitive to feature scaling and noisy data.</li> </ul>
k-Nearest Neighbors (k-NN)	<ul> <li>Simple and non-parametric, no training phase.</li> <li>Adapts to complex patterns with sufficient data.</li> <li>Effective for small datasets with clear clusters.</li> <li>Intuitive and easy to implement.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Computationally expensive during inference for large datasets.</li> <li>Sensitive to irrelevant features and noise.</li> <li>Requires feature scaling and optimal k value.</li> <li>Poor performance in high-dimensional spaces (curse of dimensionality).</li> </ul>
Gradient Boosting (e.g., XG- Boost)	<ul> <li>High predictive accuracy through iterative boosting.</li> <li>Handles missing data and non-linear relationships.</li> <li>Provides feature importance for interpretability.</li> <li>Outperforms many models in structured data tasks.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Computationally intensive and slow to train.</li> <li>Requires extensive hyperparameter tuning.</li> <li>Prone to overfitting if not properly regularized.</li> <li>Less effective for unstructured data like images.</li> </ul>

Table 1: Pros and Cons of Machine Learning Models (Continued)

Model	Pros	Cons
Naive Bayes	<ul> <li>Fast and efficient for text classification tasks.</li> <li>Works well with small datasets and categorical data.</li> <li>Robust to irrelevant features due to independence assumption.</li> <li>Simple and interpretable.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Assumes feature independence, which is often unrealistic.</li> <li>Limited performance on complex, non-linear problems.</li> <li>Struggles with imbalanced datasets.</li> <li>Less effective for continuous data without discretization.</li> </ul>
Convolutional Neural Net- works (CNN)	<ul> <li>Excels in image and spatial data processing.</li> <li>Automatic feature extraction reduces need for manual engineering.</li> <li>Highly accurate for computer vision tasks.</li> <li>Scalable with large datasets and GPU support.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Requires large amounts of labeled data.</li> <li>Computationally expensive, needing powerful hardware.</li> <li>Black-box nature limits interpretability.</li> <li>Sensitive to hyperparameter tuning and overfitting.</li> </ul>
Recurrent Neural Net- works (RNN)	<ul> <li>Effective for sequential data like time series or text.</li> <li>Captures temporal dependencies in data.</li> <li>Flexible for variable-length inputs.</li> <li>Suitable for tasks like speech recognition.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Prone to vanishing/exploding gradient problems.</li> <li>Slow training due to sequential processing.</li> <li>Limited memory for long-term dependencies.</li> <li>High computational cost and complexity.</li> </ul>

Table 1: Pros and Cons of Machine Learning Models (Continued)

Model	Pros	Cons
Long Short- Term Mem- ory (LSTM)	<ul> <li>Handles long-term dependencies in sequential data.</li> <li>Robust to vanishing gradient problem.</li> <li>Effective for time-series forecasting and NLP.</li> <li>Flexible architecture for complex tasks.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Computationally intensive and slow to train.</li> <li>Requires large datasets for optimal performance.</li> <li>Complex architecture, hard to interpret.</li> <li>Sensitive to hyperparameter tuning.</li> </ul>
Gated Recurrent Units (GRU)	<ul> <li>Simpler than LSTM, faster to train.</li> <li>Handles long-term dependencies effectively.</li> <li>Suitable for sequential tasks with less complexity.</li> <li>Good balance of performance and efficiency.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Still computationally expensive compared to traditional ML.</li> <li>Less interpretable than simpler models.</li> <li>May underperform LSTMs on very complex tasks.</li> <li>Requires large datasets for best results.</li> </ul>
Transformers	<ul> <li>State-of-the-art for NLP and sequence modeling.</li> <li>Parallel processing enables faster training.</li> <li>Captures long-range dependencies effectively.</li> <li>Highly scalable with large datasets.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Extremely resource-intensive, requiring GPUs/TPUs.</li> <li>Needs massive datasets for training.</li> <li>Black-box nature, low interpretability.</li> <li>High cost for deployment and maintenance.</li> </ul>

Table 1: Pros and Cons of Machine Learning Models (Continued)

Model	Pros	Cons
Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs)	<ul> <li>Generates realistic data (e.g., images, text).</li> <li>Powerful for creative applications like image synthesis.</li> <li>Can augment small datasets for training.</li> <li>Innovative for unsupervised learning tasks.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Difficult to train, prone to mode collapse.</li> <li>Computationally expensive and unstable training.</li> <li>Limited interpretability of generated outputs.</li> <li>Requires careful balancing of generator and discriminator.</li> </ul>

### 3 Discussion

The choice of a machine learning model depends on several factors, including data type, size, computational resources, and interpretability requirements. Traditional ML models like Linear Regression, Logistic Regression, and Naive Bayes are ideal for small, structured datasets and tasks requiring high interpretability. Ensemble methods like Random Forests and Gradient Boosting (e.g., XGBoost) offer robust performance for structured data but require more computational resources. Deep learning models, such as CNNs, LSTMs, and Transformers, excel in handling unstructured data (e.g., images, text, time series) but demand large datasets and significant computational power. Their black-box nature also poses challenges for interpretability, which is critical in domains like healthcare and finance.

For time-series forecasting, studies have shown that traditional ML models like XGBoost can outperform DL models on high-stationarity data due to lower computational requirements and better interpretability. In contrast, DL models like CNNs and Transformers dominate in tasks involving unstructured data, such as image classification and NLP, due to their ability to automatically extract features. Hybrid approaches, combining traditional ML for feature extraction and DL for pattern detection, can leverage the strengths of both paradigms.

### 4 Conclusion

This comparison highlights the trade-offs between traditional ML and DL models. Selecting the appropriate model requires balancing performance, data availability, computational resources, and interpretability. For resource-constrained environments or small datasets, traditional ML models are often sufficient. For complex, unstructured data tasks, DL models provide superior performance but at a higher computational cost. Future advancements in transfer learning and model optimization may further bridge the gap between these approaches.