

Figure 1: Accuracy vs. Training set size. The graph plots Accuracy (Y-axis, 0 to 1) against Training set size (X-axis, 0 to 30). The methods compared are: Holdout (magenta), K-fold CV (red), .632+ BS (orange), path (blue), pathSuper (cyan), averaged (green), averagedBS (yellow), pathW (purple), pathSuperW (teal), averagedW (dark green), averagedBSW (olive), and pathNI (grey). The 'averagedW' method consistently achieves the highest accuracy, peaking around 0.8 at a training set size of 5. The 'pathNI' method shows the lowest accuracy, remaining relatively flat around 0.6. The 'averagedBS' method shows a sharp increase in accuracy as the training set size increases, peaking around 0.75 at a size of 10. The 'path' and 'pathSuper' methods show a slight decrease in accuracy as the training set size increases, starting around 0.7 and ending around 0.6. The 'K-fold CV' and '.632+ BS' methods show a slight increase in accuracy as the training set size increases, starting around 0.6 and ending around 0.7. The 'averaged' and 'averagedBSW' methods show a slight decrease in accuracy as the training set size increases, starting around 0.7 and ending around 0.6. The 'pathW' and 'pathSuperW' methods show a slight increase in accuracy as the training set size increases, starting around 0.6 and ending around 0.7. The 'Holdout' method shows a slight decrease in accuracy as the training set size increases, starting around 0.6 and ending around 0.5.

