Supplementary Material:

Regularized target encoding outperforms traditional methods in supervised machine learning with high cardinality features

1 Implementations

Feature encoding techniques are implemented in several general preprocessing packages. We provide an overview of existing implementations for R in Table 1. For python, an extension to scikit-learn (Pedregosa et al., 2011), category encoders (McGinnis et al., 2018) is available. To enable a fair and reliable comparison in our study, we implemented all methods outlined above on top of the mlrCPO package. All code can be found in our online repository (https://github.com/compstat-lmu/paper_2021_categorical_feature_encodings).

encoding method	regularization	package	
indicator	_	stats	
		embed	
		mlrCPO	
		mlr3pipelines	
hash	_	FeatureHashing	
		embed	
impact	smoothing	embed	
		mlrCPO	
		mlr3pipelines	
impact	cross-validation	vtreat	
		mlr3pipelines (via vtreat)	
regularized impact (glmm)	_	embed	
		mlr3pipelines	

Table 1: Overview over existing encoding implementations in R. Implementations can deviate from the algorithms described in our manuscript by minor implementation details. Indicator encoding encloses a variety of methods (one-hot, dummy, helmert encoding etc.)

2 Pseudocode for all encoding strategies

Algorithm 1 to 10 contain the pseudocode for all encoding strategies studied in our manuscript in order to improve reproducibility and to provide further hints towards subtle differences in encoders and implementations.

```
Algorithm 1 Integer Encoding \frac{\overline{\text{Training:}}}{\text{compute random permutation } int = (int_1, \dots, int_k, \dots, int_L)^T \text{ of } (1, \dots, L)^T for all x_i^{train} \in \boldsymbol{x}^{train} do \hat{x}_i^{train} = int_k with x_i^{train} = l_k, \ k = 1, \dots, L \frac{\text{Prediction:}}{\text{for } x^{new} \text{ do}} if x^{new} \in \mathcal{L}^{train} then \hat{x}^{new} = int_k with x^{new} = l_k, \ k = 1, \dots, L else \hat{x}^{new} = NA
```

Algorithm 2 Frequency Encoding

```
Training:
```

```
\begin{array}{l} \textbf{for all } x_i^{train} \in \boldsymbol{x}^{train} \ \textbf{do} \ \hat{x}_i^{train} = \frac{N_l}{N} \ \text{with } x_i^{train} = l \\ \underline{\text{Prediction:}} \\ \textbf{for } x^{new} \ \textbf{do} \\ \textbf{if } x^{new} \in \mathcal{L}^{train} \ \textbf{then } \hat{x}^{new} = \frac{N_l}{N} \ \text{with } x^{new} = l \ \textbf{else } \hat{x}^{new} = 1 \end{array}
```

Algorithm 3 One-Hot Encoding

```
\begin{split} & \frac{\text{Training:}}{\text{for all } x_i^{train} \in \boldsymbol{x}^{train} \text{ do}} \\ & \quad \text{for all } l \in \mathcal{L}^{train} \text{ do } \hat{x}_{il}^{train} = I(x_i^{train} = l) \\ & \frac{\text{Prediction:}}{\text{for } x^{new} \text{ do}} \\ & \quad \text{for all } l \in \mathcal{L}^{train} \text{ do} \\ & \quad \text{if } x^{new} \in \mathcal{L}^{train} \text{ then } \hat{x}_l^{new} = I(x^{new} = l) \text{ else } \hat{x}_l^{new} = 0 \end{split}
```

Algorithm 4 Dummy Encoding

Algorithm 5 Hash Encoding

```
Training: require hash.size \in \mathbb{N} for all l \in \mathcal{L}^{train} do ind_l = (hash(l) \mod hash.size) + 1, ind_l \in \mathbb{N}, hash(l) \in \mathbb{N} 1. define matrix \mathbf{D}^{N \times hash.size} with d_{ih} = 1 if ind_l = h and d_{ih} = 0 if ind_l \neq h, x_i^{train} = l 2. \mathbf{D} \to \tilde{\mathbf{D}}^{N \times V} with V \leq hash.size, by dropping constant columns in \mathbf{D} for all x_i^{train} \in \mathbf{x}^{train} do \hat{x}_{iv}^{train} = \tilde{d}_{iv} \frac{Prediction:}{for \ x^{new} \ do} ind^{new} = (hash(x^{new}) \mod hash.size) + 1 d^{new} = (hash(x^{new}) \mod hash.size) + 1 if ind^{new} = h and d_h^{new} = 1 if ind^{new} \neq h d^{new} \to \tilde{d}^{new} of length V, by dropping columns which were constant in \mathbf{D} for all V columns in \tilde{\mathbf{D}} do \hat{x}_i^{new} = \tilde{d}_i^{new}
```

Algorithm 6 Leaf Encoding

```
Training: require number of cross-validation folds K \in \mathbb{N} fit CART tree on \mathcal{D}^{train} with complexity pruning based on K-fold cross-validation for all x_i^{train} \in \boldsymbol{x}^{train} do \tilde{x}_i = t with x_i^{train} in terminal node t

Prediction: for x^{new} do

if x^{new} \in \mathcal{L}^{train} then \tilde{x}^{new} = t with x^{new} in terminal node t

else \tilde{x}^{new} = b where b indicates the biggest terminal node
```

Algorithm 7 Impact Encoding Regression

Training: require smoothing parameter $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}$

for all
$$l \in \mathcal{L}^{train}$$
 do $\delta_l = \frac{\sum_{i:x_i^{train}=l} y_i^{train} + \epsilon \cdot \bar{y}^{train}}{N_l + \epsilon} - \bar{y}^{train}$ with $\bar{y}^{train} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N y_i^{train}}{N}$ for all $x_i^{train} \in \boldsymbol{x}^{train}$ do $\hat{x}_i^{train} = \delta_l$ with $x_i^{train} = l$

Prediction:

for x^{new} do

if $x^{new} \in \mathcal{L}^{train}$ then $\hat{x}^{new} = \delta_l$ with $x^{new} = l$ else $\hat{x}^{new} = 0$

Algorithm 8 Impact Encoding Classification

Training: require smoothing parameter $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\overline{\mathbf{for\ all\ }c} \in \mathcal{C}\ \mathbf{do}$$
 $p_c = \frac{N_c}{N}, \, p_c^{new} =$

$$\begin{array}{l} \text{for all } c \in \mathcal{C} \text{ do} \\ p_c = \frac{N_c}{N_c}, p_c^{new} = \frac{N_c + \epsilon}{N + 2\epsilon}, logit_c = \log(\frac{p_c}{1 - p_c}), logit_c^{new} = \log(\frac{p_c^{new}}{1 - p_c^{new}}) \\ \delta_c^{new} = logit_c^{new} - logit_c \\ \text{for all } l \in \mathcal{L}^{train} \text{ do} \\ p_{lc} = \frac{\sum_{i: x_i^{train} = l} I(y_i^{train} = c) + \epsilon}{N_l + 2\epsilon}, logit_{lc} = \log(\frac{p_{lc}}{1 - p_{lc}}) \\ \delta_{lc} = logit_{lc} - logit_c \\ \text{for all } x_i^{train} \in \boldsymbol{x}^{train} \text{ do } \hat{x}_{ic}^{train} = \delta_{lc} \text{ with } x_i^{train} = l \end{array}$$

for all
$$l \in \mathcal{L}^{train}$$
 do

$$p_{lc} = \frac{\sum_{i:x_i^{train}=l}^{I(y_i^{train}=c)+\epsilon}}{\sum_{l:x_i^{train}=l}^{N_l+2\epsilon}}, logit_{lc} = \log(\frac{p_{lc}}{1-p_{lc}})$$

$$\delta_{lc} = logit_{lc} - logit_{c}$$

Prediction:

for x^{new} do

for all c in C do

if $x^{new} \in \mathcal{L}^{train}$ then $\hat{x}_c^{new} = \delta_{lc}$ with $x^{new} = l$ else $\hat{x}_c^{new} = \delta_c^{new}$

Algorithm 9 GLMM Encoding Regression

Training: require $n.folds \in \mathbb{N}$

fit simple random intercept model: $y_i^{train} = \beta_{0l} + \epsilon_i = \gamma_{oo} + u_l + \epsilon_i$ on \mathcal{D}^{train}

with $u_l \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N(0, \tau^2)$, $\epsilon_i \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N(0, \sigma^2)$ and $x_i^{train} = l$, $l \in \mathcal{L}^{train}$

if n.folds = 1 then

for all
$$r^{train} \in r^{train}$$
 do

for all
$$x_i^{train} \in \boldsymbol{x}^{train}$$
 do $\hat{x}_i^{train} = \hat{\beta}_{0l}^{\mathcal{D}^{train}}$ with $x_i^{train} = l$

else use n.folds cross-validation scheme to make training sets $\mathcal{D}_1^{train}, \dots, \mathcal{D}_{n.folds}^{train}$

and fit simple random intercept model on each
$$\mathcal{D}_m^{train}$$
 for all $x_i^{train} \in \boldsymbol{x}^{train}$ do $\hat{x}_i^{train} = \hat{\beta}_{0l}^{\mathcal{D}^{train}}$ with $x_i^{train} = l$ based on the model m with $(x_i^{train}, y_i^{train}) \notin \mathcal{D}_m^{train}$

Prediction:

for x^{new} do

if
$$x^{new} \in \mathcal{L}^{train}$$
 then

 $\hat{x}^{new} = \hat{\beta}^{\mathcal{D}^{train}}_{0l}$ with $x^{new} = l$ based on full model fitted on \mathcal{D}^{train}

else $\hat{x}^{new} = \hat{\gamma}_{00}$ based on full model fitted on \mathcal{D}^{train}

Algorithm 10 GLMM Encoding Binary Classification

```
Training: require n.folds \in \mathbb{N} fit simple glmm: E(y_i^{train}) = h(\eta_i) = \frac{\exp(\eta_i)}{1+\exp(\eta_i)}, \ \eta_i = \beta_{0l} = \gamma_{00} + u_l \text{ on } \mathcal{D}^{train} with u_l \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N(0,\sigma^2), \ y_i^{train} \stackrel{ind}{\sim} Be(h(\eta_i)) and x_i^{train} = l, \ l \in \mathcal{L}^{train} if n.folds = 1 then for all x_i^{train} \in \boldsymbol{x}^{train} do  \hat{x}_i^{train} = \hat{\beta}_{0l}^{\mathcal{D}^{train}} \text{ with } x_i^{train} = l  else use n.folds cross-validation scheme to make training sets \mathcal{D}_1^{train}, \dots, \mathcal{D}_{n.folds}^{train} and fit simple glmm on each \mathcal{D}_m^{train} for all x_i^{train} \in \boldsymbol{x}^{train} do  \hat{x}_i^{train} = \hat{\beta}_{0l}^{\mathcal{D}^{train}} \text{ with } x_i^{train} = l \text{ based on the model } m  with (x_i^{train}, y_i^{train}) \notin \mathcal{D}_m^{train} Prediction: for x^{new} do if x^{new} \in \mathcal{L}^{train} then  \hat{x}^{new} = \hat{\beta}_{0l}^{\mathcal{D}^{train}} \text{ with } x^{new} = l \text{ based on full model fitted on } \mathcal{D}^{train}  else \hat{x}^{new} = \hat{\gamma}_{00} based on full model fitted on \mathcal{D}^{train}
```

Algorithm 11 GLMM Encoding Multiclass Classification

```
Training: require n. folds \in \mathbb{N}
define response matrix \mathbf{Y}^{N\times C} with y_{ic}=1 if y_i^{train}=c and y_{ic}=0 if y_i^{train}\neq c:
\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{train} = \{(x_i^{train}, y_{i1}^{train}, \dots, y_{iC}^{train}), \dots, (x_N^{train}, y_{N1}^{train}, \dots, y_{NC}^{train})\}
for all C classes do
      fit simple glmm: E(y_{ic}^{train}) = h(\eta_i) = \frac{\exp(\eta_i)}{1 + \exp(\eta_i)}, \ \eta_i = \beta_{0l} = \gamma_{00} + u_l \text{ on } \mathbf{y}_c^{train} \text{ from } \tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{train}
      with u_l \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N(0, \sigma^2), y_{ii}^{train} \stackrel{ind}{\sim} Be(h(\eta_i)) and x_i^{train} = l, l \in \mathcal{L}^{train}
if n.folds = 1 then
      for all C models do
             for all x_i^{train} \in \mathbf{x}^{train} do \hat{x}_{ic}^{train} = \hat{\beta}_{0l}^{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{train}} with x_i^{train} = l
else use n.folds cross-validation scheme to make training sets \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_1^{train}, \dots, \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{n.folds}^{train}
      for all C classes do
             fit simple glmm on \boldsymbol{y}_{c}^{train} from each \tilde{\mathcal{D}}_{m}^{train}
             for all x_i^{train} \in \boldsymbol{x}^{train} do \hat{x}_{ic}^{train} = \hat{\beta}_{0l}^{\mathcal{D}^{train}} \text{ with } x_i^{train} = l \text{ based on the model } m \text{ for class } c \text{ with } (x_i^{train}, y_i^{train}) \notin \mathcal{D}_m^{train}
Prediction:
for x^{new} do
      for all C class models do
                    \hat{x}_c^{new}=\hat{\beta}_{0l}^{\tilde{\mathcal{D}}^{train}} with x^{new}=l based on full model for class c
             else \hat{x}_c^{new} = \hat{\gamma}_{00} based on full model for class c
```

Note on GLMM Encoders: To speed up the computation of the GLMM encoders, we followed the performance tips from the lme4 vignette (https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/lme4/vignettes/lmerperf.html): we did not compute derivations (calc.derivs = FALSE) and used the NLOPT_LN_BOBYQA optimizer from the nloptr package with liberal stopping criteria (maxeval = 1000, xtol_abs = 1e-6, ftol_abs = 1e-6).

Table 2: Win Percentages of One-hot over Dummy Encoding

Learner	Binary Class	Multi Class	Regression
LASSO	80	94	75
RF	83	71	71
GB	63	71	54
KNN	67	59	50
SVM	68	82	52

Note. Percentage of encoding conditions in which one-hot performs better than dummy per task setting.

3 Comparison of One-Hot and Dummy Encoding

A frequently asked question is, whether one-hot encoding or dummy encoding is to be preferred. While dummy encoding clearly is commonly preferred for non-regularized linear models, the answer is less clear for general machine learning algorithms studied in our setting.

From the results shown in Table 2 we can observe, that for most algorithms and datasets, one-hot encoding is to be preferred over dummy-encoding.

4 Additional encoders not mentioned in the manuscript

In addition to the encoders mentioned in the manuscript, the benchmark results available in our online repository (https://github.com/compstat-lmu/paper_2021_categorical_feature_encodings) contain two additional experimental encoders that were newly developed. We do not mention them in our manuscript because they did not perform well, and in hindsight, we are not satisfied with their design. We briefly mention them here for transparency.

Algorithm 12 Cluster Encoding

Training: require number of desired levels $V \in \mathbb{N}$

if task is regression then

for all
$$l \in \mathcal{L}^{train}$$
 do $\bar{y}_l^{train} = \frac{\sum_{i:x_i^{train}=l} y_i^{train}}{N_l}$ define $\boldsymbol{v}_l = (\bar{y}_l^{train}, \delta_l)^T$ with $\delta_l = \left| N_l - \frac{\sum_{k=1}^L N_k}{L} \right|$

if task is classification then

for all
$$l \in \mathcal{L}^{train}$$
 do

for all
$$c \in \mathcal{C}$$
 do $s_{lc} = \sum_{i:x_i^{train}=l} I(y_i^{train} = c)$
define $\mathbf{v}_l = (s_{l1}, \dots, s_{lC}, \delta_l)^T$ with $\delta_l = \left| N_l - \frac{\sum_{k=1}^L N_k}{L} \right|$

- 1. compute distance matrix $\mathbf{D}^{L \times L}$ with $d_{ik} = ||\mathbf{v}_i \mathbf{v}_k||$
- 2. fit hierarchical cluster analysis on D
- 3. prune dendrogram to obtain V combined levels

for all
$$x_i^{train} \in \mathbf{x}^{train}$$
 do $\tilde{x}_i^{train} = v$ with x_i^{train} in leaf v

Prediction:
for x^{new} do

if
$$x^{new} \in \mathcal{L}^{train}$$
 then $\tilde{x}^{new} = v$ with x^{new} in leaf v else $\tilde{x}^{new} = NA$

Algorithm 13 RF Encoding Regression and Binary Classification

```
\begin{array}{l} \underline{\text{Training:}} \text{ require number of trees } B \in \mathbb{N} \\ \underline{\text{fit random forest with trees }} T_1, ..., T_B \\ \mathbf{for all } x_i^{train} \in \boldsymbol{x}^{train} \mathbf{ do} \\ \mathbf{if } x_i^{train} \text{ inbag for all } B \text{ trees then } \hat{x}_i^{train} = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B T_b(x_i^{train}) \\ \mathbf{else } \hat{x}_i^{train} = \frac{1}{B_i^{OOB}} \sum_{b: \ x_i^{train} \ OOB \ T_b} T_b(x_i^{train}) \\ \underline{\text{Prediction:}} \\ \mathbf{for } x^{new} \mathbf{ do} \\ \mathbf{if } x^{new} \in \mathcal{L}^{train} \mathbf{ then } \hat{x}^{new} = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B T_b(x^{new}) \\ \mathbf{else } \hat{x}^{new} = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B \frac{1}{L} \sum_{l \in \mathcal{L}^{train}} T_b(l) \end{array}
```

Algorithm 14 RF Encoding Multiclass Classification

```
\begin{array}{l} \underline{\text{Training:}} \text{ require number of trees } B \in \mathbb{N} \\ \hline \text{fit random forest with trees } T_1,...,T_B \\ \textbf{for all } C \text{ classes } \textbf{do} \\ \textbf{ for all } x_i^{train} \in \textbf{x}^{train} \text{ do} \\ \textbf{ if } x_i^{train} \text{ inbag for all } B \text{ trees then } \hat{x}_{ic}^{train} = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^{B} T_b^c(x_i^{train}) \\ \textbf{ else } \hat{x}_{ic}^{train} = \frac{1}{B_i^{OOB}} \sum_{b: \ x_i^{train} \ OOB \ T_b} T_b^c(x_i^{train}) \\ \hline \underline{\text{Prediction:}} \\ \textbf{ for } x^{new} \text{ do} \\ \textbf{ if } x^{new} \in \mathcal{L}^{train} \text{ then } \hat{x}_c^{new} = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^{B} T_b^c(x^{new}) \\ \textbf{ else } \hat{x}_c^{new} = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^{B} \frac{1}{L} \sum_{l \in \mathcal{L}^{train}} T_b^c(l) \\ \end{array}
```

4.1 Additional datasets not mentioned in the manuscript

In addition to the datasets mentioned in the manuscript, the benchmark results available in our online repository (https://github.com/compstat-lmu/paper_2021_categorical_feature_encodings) contain three additional datasets: KDD98 (OmlId: 41435), sf-police-incidents (OmlId: 41436), $Traffic_violations$ (OmlId: 41443). A substantive amount of conditions failed for those rather big datasets due to memory problems, which is why we remove them from the results discussed in our manuscript. We briefly mention them here to provide full transparency.

References

McGinnis, W., hbghhy, Tao, W., andrethrill, Siu, C., Davison, C., Bollweg, N., 2018. scikit-learn-contrib/categorical-encoding: Release for zenodo. Zenodo. doi:10.5281/zenodo.1157110

Pedregosa, F., Varoquaux, G., Gramfort, A., Michel, V., Thirion, B., Grisel, O., Blondel, M., Prettenhofer, P., Weiss, R., Dubourg, V., others, 2011. Scikit-learn: Machine learning in python. Journal of machine learning research 12, 2825–2830.