

Tables of the statistical tests for all the tested contrast pattern-based classifiers, according to the GM measure.

Octavio Loyola-González octavioloyola@inaoep.mx	Miguel Angel Medina-Pérez migue@itesm.mx
José Fco. Martínez-Trinidad fmartine@inaoep.mx	Jesús Ariel Carrasco-Ochoa ariel@inaoep.mx
Raúl Monroy raul@itesm.mx	Milton García-Borroto mgarciab@ceis.cujae.edu.cu

August 30, 2016

## 1 Average rankings of Friedman test

Average ranks obtained by each method in the Friedman test.

Algorithm	Ranking
Our Proposal	1.6211
iCAEP	2.5263
SMOTE-TL + LCMine	1.8526

Table 1: Average Rankings of the algorithms (Friedman)

Friedman statistic (distributed according to chi-square with 2 degrees of freedom): 42.021053.

P-value computed by Friedman Test: 0.

## 2 Post hoc comparison (Friedman)

P-values obtained in by applying post hoc methods over the results of Friedman procedure.

$i$	algorithm	$z = (R_0 - R_i)/SE$	$p$	Finner
2	iCAEP	6.239096	0	0.025321
1	SMOTE-TL + LCMine	1.596048	0.110478	0.05

Table 2: Post Hoc comparison Table for  $\alpha = 0.05$  (FRIEDMAN)

Finner's procedure rejects those hypotheses that have an unadjusted p-value  $\leq 0.05$ .

### 3 Adjusted P-Values (Friedman)

Adjusted P-values obtained through the application of the post hoc methods (Friedman).

i	algorithm	unadjusted $p$
1	iCAEP	0
2	SMOTE-TL + LCMine	0.110478

Table 3: Adjusted  $p$ -values (FRIEDMAN) (I)

i	algorithm	unadjusted $p$	$p_{Finner}$
1	iCAEP	0	0
2	SMOTE-TL + LCMine	0.110478	0.110478

Table 4: Adjusted  $p$ -values (FRIEDMAN) (II)