

# Class Overlap Matters: Revisiting SOUP for Multi-Class Imbalanced Medical Data

Table a1 to Table a9 present the performance results of SOUP method and the three integrated strategies across ten multi-class medical datasets, evaluated using various classifiers and multi-class assessment metrics.

Table a1

Comparison between SOUP and SOUP Combined with Various Feature Selection Strategies, Evaluated by the AvAcc [%] Metric with KNN as the Base Classifier.

Dataset	SOUP + WOA	SOUP + GA	SOUP + PSO	SOUP
cleveland	<b>69.27</b>	<u>68.65</u>	64.4	52.07
dermatology	<b>96.31</b>	<u>95.58</u>	93.46	89.39
dna	<b>79</b>	<u>78.48</u>	73.42	75.64
hungarian	<b>76.32</b>	<u>75.73</u>	73.81	58.49
Laryngeal	<b>93.69</b>	<u>91.92</u>	69.68	78.94
vertebra-column	<b>87.43</b>	<u>86.71</u>	75.98	86.19
burczynski	<b>74.83</b>	<u>74.13</u>	73.32	68.86
chiaretti	<b>85.56</b>	84.51	<u>85</u>	65.61
khan	<u>87.79</u>	<b>88.48</b>	87.76	83.65
sorlie	<b>86.04</b>	<u>85.87</u>	84.51	80.36

Table a2

Comparison between SOUP and SOUP Combined with Various Feature Selection Strategies, Evaluated by the CBA [%] Metric with KNN as the Base Classifier

Dataset	SOUP + WOA	SOUP + GA	SOUP + PSO	SOUP
cleveland	<b>25</b>	<u>24.65</u>	22.26	16.72
dermatology	<u>80.9</u>	<b>83.05</b>	76.65	65.14
dna	<b>59.9</b>	<u>59.62</u>	54.26	53.92
hungarian	<u>24.11</u>	<b>26.18</b>	22.93	17.54
Laryngeal	<b>87.45</b>	<u>84.79</u>	59.24	65.04
vertebra-column	<b>72.48</b>	<u>71.12</u>	58.08	70.29
burczynski	<b>57.59</b>	<u>56.08</u>	55.73	50.52
chiaretti	<b>43.61</b>	<u>43.16</u>	41.19	21.05
khan	<b>72.49</b>	<u>71.45</u>	69.63	59.98
sorlie	<b>61</b>	<u>60.85</u>	58.07	51.42

Table a3

Comparison between SOUP and SOUP Combined with Various Feature Selection Strategies, Evaluated by the macro-F1 [%] Metric with KNN as the Base Classifier

Dataset	SOUP + WOA	SOUP + GA	SOUP + PSO	SOUP
cleveland	<b>27.4</b>	<u>27.2</u>	24.82	24.76
dermatology	<u>83.48</u>	<b>87.13</b>	81.59	71.85
dna	<b>74.33</b>	73.29	67.26	<u>72.55</u>
hungarian	<u>27.99</u>	<b>29.64</b>	27.18	26.55
Laryngeal	<b>90.74</b>	<u>88.53</u>	63.87	71.69
vertebra-column	<b>78.79</b>	77.41	64.29	<u>77.85</u>
burczynski	<b>66.95</b>	<u>66.91</u>	65.81	61.13
chiaretti	<b>58.93</b>	<u>58.2</u>	56.12	44.2
khan	79.91	<b>82.38</b>	<u>81.12</u>	75.4
sorlie	<b>76.09</b>	<u>75.94</u>	73.78	69.69

Table a4

Comparison between SOUP and SOUP Combined with Various Feature Selection Strategies, Evaluated by the AvAcc [%] Metric with MLP as the Base Classifier.

Dataset	SOUP + WOA	SOUP + GA	SOUP + PSO	SOUP
cleveland	<b>74.75</b>	73.25	<u>73.41</u>	54.52
dermatology	<b>98.91</b>	<u>98.74</u>	97.83	98.23
dna	<b>96.18</b>	94.89	91.03	<u>95</u>
hungarian	<b>81.41</b>	<u>81.11</u>	80.13	60.61
Laryngeal	<b>83.2</b>	<u>71.4</u>	66.51	78.88
vertebra-column	<b>87.99</b>	<u>87.31</u>	76.84	84.39
burczynski	59.39	<u>66.74</u>	<b>67.24</b>	63.58
chiaretti	59.81	<u>66.02</u>	<b>67.74</b>	51.67
khan	<b>98.84</b>	<u>98.73</u>	97.94	95.51
sorlie	<b>91.21</b>	<u>90.52</u>	89.86	88.05

Table a5

Comparison between SOUP and SOUP Combined with Various Feature Selection Strategies, Evaluated by the CBA [%] Metric with MLP as the Base Classifier.

Dataset	SOUP + WOA	SOUP + GA	SOUP + PSO	SOUP
cleveland	<b>27.83</b>	<u>26.55</u>	25.51	18.37
dermatology	<b>95.25</b>	<u>94.21</u>	90.88	92.95
dna	<b>92.59</b>	<u>90.09</u>	84.56	88.74
hungarian	<b>25.72</b>	<u>25.5</u>	24.83	18.5
Laryngeal	<b>72.55</b>	50.86	48.33	<u>62.39</u>
vertebra-column	<b>72.37</b>	<u>72.31</u>	54.76	68.3
burczynski	34.11	<b>41.29</b>	<u>40.16</u>	36.09
chiaretti	<b>9.96</b>	<u>9.91</u>	9.15	6.28
khan	<u>93.36</u>	<b>96.01</b>	93.34	86.56
sorlie	<b>73.36</b>	<u>71.33</u>	70.65	66.62

Table a6

Comparison between SOUP and SOUP Combined with Various Feature Selection Strategies, Evaluated by the macro-F1 [%] Metric with MLP as the Base Classifier.

Dataset	SOUP + WOA	SOUP + GA	SOUP + PSO	SOUP
cleveland	<b>31.99</b>	<u>31.94</u>	31.16	26.46
dermatology	<b>96.49</b>	<u>95.88</u>	93.21	94.77
dna	<b>93.77</b>	91.81	86.06	<u>92.26</u>
hungarian	<u>32.87</u>	<b>34</b>	32.5	26.41
Laryngeal	<b>77.87</b>	63.79	58.19	<u>71.54</u>
vertebra-column	<b>76.74</b>	<u>75.45</u>	61.89	73.57
burczynski	53.24	<u>55.41</u>	<b>55.63</b>	52.3
chiaretti	<b>28.82</b>	24.81	<u>27.17</u>	21.23
khan	<u>96.72</u>	<b>97.9</b>	96.66	92.88
sorlie	<b>80.66</b>	<u>79.2</u>	77.91	76.18

Table a7

Comparison between SOUP and SOUP Combined with Various Feature Selection Strategies, Evaluated by the AvAcc [%] Metric with NB as the Base Classifier.

Dataset	SOUP + WOA	SOUP + GA	SOUP + PSO	SOUP
cleveland	60.86	60.6	<b>64.56</b>	<u>64.34</u>
dermatology	<b>97.09</b>	96.01	95.2	<u>96.5</u>
dna	<b>95.31</b>	91.73	84.57	<u>95.22</u>
hungarian	<u>58.25</u>	48.89	50.95	<b>70.79</b>
Laryngeal	<u>92.67</u>	<b>94.69</b>	75.99	86.7
vertebra-column	<b>87.35</b>	<u>86.82</u>	78.01	85.16
burczynski	<b>80.87</b>	<u>80.82</u>	80.62	78.84
chiaretti	<b>85.28</b>	<u>84.99</u>	84.63	74.12
khan	<b>81.59</b>	80.18	<u>81.56</u>	79.72
sorlie	<u>86.12</u>	<b>86.42</b>	85.39	84.43

Table a8

Comparison between SOUP and SOUP Combined with Various Feature Selection Strategies, Evaluated by the CBA [%] Metric with NB as the Base Classifier.

Dataset	SOUP + WOA	SOUP + GA	SOUP + PSO	SOUP
cleveland	<u>23.05</u>	22.02	22.32	<b>23.99</b>
dermatology	<b>81.46</b>	80.13	77.44	<u>81.41</u>
dna	<b>88.93</b>	80.49	68.42	<u>88.77</u>
hungarian	<u>18.46</u>	14.23	14.77	<b>24.09</b>
Laryngeal	<u>85.12</u>	<b>89.11</b>	63.71	78.16
vertebra-column	<b>71.55</b>	<u>70.92</u>	60.37	67.61
burczynski	<b>60.84</b>	60.04	60.1	<u>60.82</u>
chiaretti	<b>26.97</b>	<b>26.97</b>	<u>26.87</u>	20.57
khan	<b>55.58</b>	52.44	<u>54.9</u>	54.83
sorlie	<u>55.37</u>	55.32	53.84	<b>58.52</b>

Table a9

Comparison between SOUP and SOUP Combined with Various Feature Selection Strategies, Evaluated by the macro-F1 [%] Metric with NB as the Base Classifier.

Dataset	SOUP + WOA	SOUP + GA	SOUP + PSO	SOUP
cleveland	<b>33.04</b>	31.54	30.65	<u>31.78</u>
dermatology	<b>90.39</b>	88.56	86.41	<u>90.27</u>
dna	<b>92.63</b>	87.69	80.37	<u>92.54</u>
hungarian	<u>31.09</u>	27.81	28.72	<b>36.01</b>
Laryngeal	<u>89.13</u>	<b>92.16</b>	71.38	81.42
vertebra-column	<b>77.6</b>	<u>77.21</u>	66.2	75.75
burczynski	<b>72.44</b>	<u>72.43</u>	72.07	68.83
chiaretti	<b>42.31</b>	<u>42.1</u>	41.6	35.44
khan	<u>73.77</u>	72.69	<b>74.27</b>	73.08
sorlie	<u>72.13</u>	<b>72.3</b>	70.88	71.16