## Results

# August 27, 2023

# Tables of Friedman, Bonferroni-Dunn, Holm, Hochberg and Hommel Tests

Table 1: Average Rankings of the algorithms

Kanking	2.259259259259	2.685185185185186	2.462962962963	2.5925925925926
Algorithm	SMOTE	ROS	VAE	GAN

Friedman statistic considering reduction performance (distributed according to chi-square with 3 degrees of freedom: 1.655555555556003. P-value computed by Friedman Test: 0.6468595851395035.

Iman and Davenport statistic considering reduction performance (distributed according to F-distribution with 3 and 78 degrees of freedom: 0.5425010502730859.

P-value computed by Iman and Daveport Test: 0.6546355580526126.

Table 2: Holm / Hochberg Table for  $\alpha = 0.05$ algorithm  $z = \frac{(R_0 - R_i)}{SE}$  Holm/Hochberg/Hoi

3 ROS 1.2122064363978815 0.22543336830507435 0.0 CAN 0.9486832980505142 0.3427817111479111			1/3-	4	ì
GAN 0.9486832980505142 0.3427817111	3	ROS	122064363978	0.22543336830507435	0.01666666666666666
	2	GAN	0.9486832980505142	0.3427817111479111	0.025
1 $VAE$ 0.579750904364203 0.5620826100354468	1	VAE	7509043642	0.5620826100354468	0.05

Table 3: Holm / Hochberg Table for  $\alpha = 0.10$ 

Holm/Hochberg/Hommel	0.033333333333333	0.05	0.1	
d	0.22543336830507435	0.3427817111479111	0.5620826100354468	
$z = (R_0 - R_i)/SE$	1.2122064363978815	0.9486832980505142	0.579750904364203	
algorithm	ROS	GAN	VAE	
2	3	7	-	

Holm's procedure rejects those hypotheses that have a p-value  $\leq 0.03333333333333$ .

Table 4: Adjusted p-values

				The state of the s		
	algorithm	unadjusted $p$	pBonf	$p_{Holm}$	$^{pHoch}$	$p_{Homm}$
-	ROS	0.22543336830507435	0.6763001049152231	0.6763001049152231	0.5620826100354468	0.5141725667218666
2	GAN	0.3427817111479111	1.0283451334437332	0.6855634222958222	0.5620826100354468	0.5620826100354468
3	VAE	0.5620826100354468	1.6862478301063404	0.6855634222958222	0.5620826100354468	0.5620826100354468

Bergmann's procedure rejects these hypotheses:

### Table 5: Holm / Shaffer Table for $\alpha=0.05$

i	algorithms	$z = (R_0 - R_i)/SE$	p	Holm	Shaffer
6	SMOTE vs. ROS	1.2122064363978815	0.22543336830507435	0.0083333333333333333	0.008333333333333333
5	SMOTE vs. GAN	0.9486832980505142	0.3427817111479111	0.01	0.01
4	ROS vs. VAE	0.6324555320336787	0.5270892568655363	0.0125	0.0125
3	SMOTE vs. VAE	0.579750904364203	0.5620826100354468	0.01666666666666666	0.0166666666666666
2	VAE vs. GAN	0.3689323936863113	0.7121781172552225	0.025	0.025
1	ROS vs. GAN	0.2635231383473674	0.7921473917958956	0.05	0.05

### Table 6: Holm / Shaffer Table for $\alpha=0.10$

i	algorithms	$z = (R_0 - R_i)/SE$	p	Holm	Shaffer
- 6	SMOTE vs. ROS	1.2122064363978815	0.22543336830507435	0.01666666666666666	0.0166666666666666
5	SMOTE vs. GAN	0.9486832980505142	0.3427817111479111	0.02	0.02
4	ROS vs. VAE	0.6324555320336787	0.5270892568655363	0.025	0.025
3	SMOTE vs. VAE	0.579750904364203	0.5620826100354468	0.03333333333333333	0.03333333333333333
2	VAE vs. GAN	0.3689323936863113	0.7121781172552225	0.05	0.05
1	ROS vs. GAN	0.2635231383473674	0.7921473917958956	0.1	0.1

### Table 7: Adjusted p-values

i	hypothesis	unadjusted $p$	$p_{Neme}$	$p_{Holm}$	$p_{Shaf}$	$p_{Berg}$
1	SMOTE vs .ROS	0.22543336830507435	1.3526002098304462	1.3526002098304462	1.3526002098304462	1.3526002098304462
2	SMOTE vs .GAN	0.3427817111479111	2.0566902668874665	1.7139085557395557	1.3526002098304462	1.3526002098304462
3	ROS vs .VAE	0.5270892568655363	3.162535541193218	2.1083570274621453	1.581267770596609	1.581267770596609
4	SMOTE vs .VAE	0.5620826100354468	3.3724956602126808	2.1083570274621453	1.6862478301063404	1.581267770596609
5	VAE vs .GAN	0.7121781172552225	4.273068703531335	2.1083570274621453	1.6862478301063404	1.581267770596609
6	ROS vs .GAN	0.7921473917958956	4.752884350775373	2.1083570274621453	1.6862478301063404	1.581267770596609