

Tables of the statistical tests for all the tested classifiers not directly based on contrast patterns, 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	2.6263
HeDex	6.0842
RUSBoost	3.2368
RBBoost	4.8947
CTC	4.2526
Coverage	3.9947
OCC	9.7474
OCSVM	8.0895
KLPART	6.1263
kENN	5.9474

Table 1: Average Rankings of the algorithms (Friedman)

Friedman statistic (distributed according to chi-square with 9 degrees of freedom): 448.198852.
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
9	OCC	16.210085	0	0.005683
8	OCSVM	12.436118	0	0.011334
7	KLPART	7.967263	0	0.016952
6	HeDex	7.871416	0	0.022539
5	kENN	7.559914	0	0.028094
4	RBBoost	5.163745	0	0.033617
3	CTC	3.702081	0.000214	0.039109
2	Coverage	3.11502	0.001839	0.04457
1	RUSBoost	1.389778	0.164596	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 ≤ 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	OCC	0
2	OCSVM	0
3	KLPART	0
4	HeDex	0
5	k ENN	0
6	RBBoost	0
7	CTC	0.000214
8	Coverage	0.001839
9	RUSBoost	0.164596

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

i	algorithm	unadjusted p	p_{Finner}
1	OCC	0	0
2	OCSVM	0	0
3	KLPART	0	0
4	HeDex	0	0
5	k ENN	0	0
6	RBBoost	0	0
7	CTC	0.000214	0.000275
8	Coverage	0.001839	0.002069
9	RUSBoost	0.164596	0.164596

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