| | $N \times M$ | Benchmark 1 | Benchmark 2 | Proposed 1 | Proposed 2 |
|-------------|--------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Routine | 100 x 5,000 | 0.58 ± 0.17 | 0.70 ± 0.24 | 0.74 ± 0.21 | $\textbf{0.80} \pm \textbf{0.13}$ |
| Depresjon | 55 x 10,000 | 0.67 ± 0.17 | 0.72 ± 0.17 | 0.73 ± 0.16 | $\textbf{0.82}\pm\textbf{0.16}$ |
| ECG5Days | 23 x 136 | 0.70 ± 0.31 | 0.87 ± 0.28 | 0.90 ± 0.21 | $\textbf{0.90}\pm\textbf{0.21}$ |
| Earthquakes | 139 x 512 | 0.65 ± 0.08 | 0.70 ± 0.08 | 0.71 ± 0.10 | $\textbf{0.73}\pm\textbf{0.15}$ |
| Beef | 60 x 470 | 0.47 ± 0.25 | 0.47 ± 0.25 | 0.48 ± 0.23 | $\textbf{0.55} \pm \textbf{0.20}$ |
| ECG | 200 x 96 | 0.83 ± 0.08 | 0.85 ± 0.09 | $\textbf{0.87} \pm \textbf{0.06}$ | 0.85 ± 0.11 |
| Dodger | 144 x 288 | 0.87 ± 0.06 | 0.89 ± 0.06 | $\textbf{0.90}\pm\textbf{0.06}$ | 0.83 ± 0.09 |
| Melbourne | 434 x 24 | 0.96 ± 0.03 | 0.95 ± 0.03 | $\textbf{0.97}\pm\textbf{0.03}$ | 0.94 ± 0.04 |
| Coffee | 56 x 286 | 0.96 ± 0.06 | $\textbf{0.98} \pm \textbf{0.06}$ | $\textbf{0.98}\pm\textbf{0.06}$ | $\textbf{0.98} \pm \textbf{0.03}$ |
| Strawberry | 983 x 235 | 0.91 ± 0.05 | 0.92 ± 0.04 | $\textbf{0.93}\pm\textbf{0.04}$ | 0.90 ± 0.04 |

Table 1: F-score from RFC trained on each dataset transformed into four feature sets. **Benchmark 1**: all features as proposed by Baldán and Benítez (2020) |K| = 42. **Benchmark 2**: Best performing "Complexity feature" and all "Descriptive Features" as proposed by Baldán and Benítez (2020) |K| = 34. **Proposed 1**: Best performing proposed measure and all "Descriptive Features" |K| = 34. **Proposed 2**: Best performing proposed measure with top four features obtained from RFC feature importance |K| = 5

| | LR | DT | RF | MLP | LSTM FCN |
|-----------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|----------|
| Depresjon Benchmark 2 | 0.73 ± 0.14 | 0.67 ± 0.25 | 0.72 ± 0.18 | 0.76 ± 0.14 | 0.64 |
| Depresjon Proposed 2 | 0.76 ± 0.14 | 0.73 ± 0.17 | 0.85 ± 0.15 | 0.77 ± 0.18 | 0.64 |

Table 2: Accuracy from different classifiers on the Depresjon dataset transformed into feature sets using the method of Baldán and Benítez (2020) |K| = 42 and the proposed feature extraction where |K| = 5. Classifiers are listed in decreasing interpretability and include Logistic Regression (LR), Decision Tree (DT), Random Forest (RF) and Multi Layer Perceptron (MLP). For a comparison to the accuracy achieved through a state of the art deep learning approach, the hybrid LSTM, CNN architecture as proposed by Karim et al. (2018) was applied to the raw time series dataset with no feature extraction.

References

Francisco J Baldán and José M Benítez. Complexity measures and features for times series classification. arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.12036, 2020.

Fazle Karim, Somshubra Majumdar, Houshang Darabi, and Shun Chen. Lstm fully convolutional networks for time series classification. *IEEE Access*, 6:1662–1669, 2018. doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2017.2779939.