Report

pid=61652) {'eval\_loss': 0.6657862663269043, 'eval\_metric\_accuracy': 0.6165137614678899, 'eval\_metric\_f1\_score': 0.7627695800227015, 'eval\_metric\_precision\_score': 0.616513761467

8899, 'eval\_metric\_recall\_score': 1.0, 'eval\_runtime': 12.4294, 'eval\_samples\_per\_second': 131.543, 'eval\_steps\_per\_second': 16.493, 'epoch': 0.42}

+---------------------+----------+-----------------+-----------------+---------+

| Trial name | status | loc | learning\_rate | seed |

|---------------------+----------+-----------------+-----------------+---------|

| \_objective\_b157091e | RUNNING | 127.0.0.1:61652 | 2.49816e-05 | 38.0779 |

+---------------------+----------+-----------------+-----------------+---------+

My hyperparameters and performance indicators are shown in the data above. From the results, the results of BayesOptSearch are not particularly ideal. The reason may be that my evaluation\_fn function is not carefully designed, but uses the general mean\_loss evaluation method. Other models should perform better. In the training process, there is a large gap with the target value. The reason may be that the search space is still not enough, and BayesSearch needs a longer search time. In this experiment, the two search methods, BayesOptSearch and HyperOptSearch, are compared, and it is found that the HyperOptSearch search method can search for better performance results in a similar search time.