

# An empirical evaluation of imbalanced data strategies from a practitioner’s point of view

**Jacques Wainer**

WAINER@IC.UNICAMP.BR

*RECOD Lab., Institute of Computing (IC)*

*University of Campinas (UNICAMP)*

*Av. Albert Einstein, 1251, Campinas, SP, 13083-852, Brazil*

**Rodrigo A. Franceschinell**

RODRIGOAF61@GMAIL.COM

*Institute of Computing (IC)*

*University of Campinas (UNICAMP)*

*Av. Albert Einstein, 1251, Campinas, SP, 13083-852, Brazil*

**Editor:**

## Abstract

This research tested the following well known strategies to deal with binary imbalanced data on 82 different real life data sets (sampled to imbalance rates of 5%, 3%, 1%, and 0.1%): class weight, SMOTE, Underbagging, and a baseline (just the base classifier). As base classifiers we used SVM with RBF kernel, random forests, and gradient boosting machines and we measured the quality of the resulting classifier using 6 different metrics (Area under the curve, Accuracy, F-measure, G-mean, Matthew’s correlation coefficient and Balanced accuracy). The best strategy strongly depends on the metric used to measure the quality of the classifier. For AUC and accuracy class weight and the baseline perform better; for F-measure and MCC, SMOTE performs better; and for G-mean and balanced accuracy, underbagging.

**Keywords:** Imbalance classification; empirical comparisons; multiple metrics; strong base classifiers

## 1. Introduction

A class imbalance binary classification problem is a classification task where the training data (and one expects the test or future data) does not contain the same proportion of examples from both classes. The *imbalance rate* is the proportion of the minority class on the whole dataset. Although there is no accepted threshold below which one would say the problem is imbalanced, the published research usually deal with imbalance rates of 10% to 1%. Traditionally the minority class in an imbalanced problem is called the *positive class*, and the majority is the *negative*.

There are in general two different problems with imbalanced classification problems. The first is that detecting the positive class is more important than the negative class, or the cost of missing a positive is much higher than the cost of missing a negative case. If the classification problem is being use as a triage, and the positive case is the detection of a disease, to misclassify a person as not having the disease when she does is much more serious than misclassifying a healthy person as having the disease, since in a triage situation,

a positive case will be further analysed (by a more precise and costly test). In this case, the false positive will incur in the cost of this further test, but the false negative will not be further analysed, resulting in a sick person who believe she is healthy and not seeking further treatment, which is a costlier mistake.

The second problem is that the fewer examples of the positive class may result in sub-optimal classifiers. Haixiang et al. (2017) lists five reasons that has been proposed in the previous literature on why classifiers may be sub-optimal when training on imbalanced data. For example, if the classifier is trying to minimize an global metric, it may be reasonable to disregard the errors of the positive examples (since there are so few of them) and minimize the errors of the negative examples. For example, a logistic regression minimizes sum of the square distance between the prediction and the correct value, and a minimal solution may simply accept the errors of all positive examples and minimize the sum of errors of the majority class.

This global problem of a bias of the classifier for the negative class may exacerbated in local regions. For example, the issue known as “small disjuncts” (Jo and Japkowicz, 2004) the positive class is grouped into small clusters, which may seem as isolated from each other. It could be the case that the isolation of the clusters is a artefact of the small number of positive examples in that region, and learning these small isolated regions may be more difficult for the classifier, than learning a larger region. The issue known as “low density” (López et al., 2013) refers to the fact that some positive examples may be spread over large volumes, resulting in low densities, and those examples would be likely interpreted by the classifier as noise. Finally, the issue of “overlapping” (Denil and Trappenberg, 2010; Prati et al., 2004) refer to regions where positive and negative examples have the same quantity of examples, and therefore classifier have no further information on how to assign different probabilities to the classes in these regions.

Thus, strategies or methodologies were created to improve the classification of imbalanced problems. In this paper we will call them *strategies*. He and Ma (2013) place the imbalanced data strategies into four main classes:

- **sampling** These strategies will add or remove data points from the training set so that it present a less skewed distribution to the base classifier. Among the sampling strategies: random oversampling (Estabrooks et al., 2004), random undersampling (Drummond et al., 2003), and synthetic sampling with data generation (Chawla et al., 2002; He et al., 2008). In general terms, oversampling approaches will repeat examples of the minority class to achieve a balanced data set to use as training; undersampling approaches will remove majority class data until balance is achieved. Undersampling can be random, or informed, so that the remaining negative examples are very informative to define the decision frontier. Also undersampling may be associated with bagging - different versions of the original data set will be generated using random undersampling and each version will be used to train different classifiers - a bagging of the resulting classifier instances will be the final classifier. Synthetic data generation will generate new positive examples until the resulting data set is balanced. Finally there are hybrid strategies that will both over- and undersample the training set.
- **cost sensitive** These strategies add a cost to the classification construction algorithm or optimisation so that errors have different costs, and thus the classifier would “try

harder” to predict the minority class. A simple solution is to weight the data differently by classes, but the different classifier algorithms must be adapted to take the weight into account. A classifier independent approach is to incorporate the cost to a boosting approach (Domingos, 1999; Sun et al., 2007).

- **kernel based approaches.** There has been some research specific on modifying kernels for imbalance data in particular for SVM (Wu and Chang, 2005; Liu and Chen, 2007), and extreme learning machines (Wu et al., 2016). We will not discuss further these approaches.
- **one-class approaches.** One-class classifiers, such as one-class SVM (Schölkopf et al., 2001) or autoencoders can be used to learn the rare class (Raskutti and Kowalczyk, 2004). We will not discuss further these approaches.

Another way of classifying the strategies is whether they are **internal** or **external** (Estabrooks et al., 2004). Internal strategies aim at changing the formulation of a particular classifier so that it can deal better with imbalanced data. Cost sensitive approaches such as class weight and kernel based approaches are internal.

External strategies assume an unmodified classifier which we will call a **base classifier**, and construct a larger classifier by usually combining different instances of the base classifier trained on different samples of the original data. All sampling approaches are external, as are the MetaCost(Domingos, 1999) framework for a cost sensitive approach. Another family of external strategies is the boosting formulations for imbalanced data (Chawla et al., 2003; Seiffert et al., 2010; Sun et al., 2007). Some of these boosting strategies combine standard boosting ideas (data weight and vote weight) with sampling (undersampling or oversampling or a combination) to define the subset of data that will be used to train the next boost.

This research attempts to answer the question of what to do with an imbalanced data set from the point of view of a practitioner. We assume that a practitioner:

1. prefer using powerful base classifiers, such as random forests, gradient boosting machines or SVM with RBF kernel. These three families were found to be the three best classifiers for a large set of real life problems (Fernández-Delgado et al., 2014; Wainer, 2016).
2. prefer using already implemented external or internal approaches.
3. may use different metrics.
4. does not have a deep understanding of his or her own data, or an understanding of the literature on solutions that deals with “similar” data.

We understand a practitioner as someone that is tasked to construct a workable solution for a classification of a particular data set in weeks, as opposed to a researcher that has to construct the best solution for a classification problem in months or years. This practitioner will prefer off-the-shelf classifiers and already implemented imbalance strategies, and will likely not spend the effort to understand his own data in depth beyond the fact that it is imbalanced. The practitioner will not have the time, or the tools to understand the intrinsic characteristics of the data set (if there are small disjuncts, overlapping, or low density of the

positive class) that may have an impact on the efficiency of different imbalance mitigation strategies.

There has been some research that compare different strategies (as opposed to the majority of research that *propose* a new strategy - and usually compare it to some of the others). Three of those published research inform this research: Prati et al. (2015), Galar et al. (2012), and López et al. (2013) and they are discussed in detail in Section 1.1. One characteristic of these researches is that in general they use less powerful base classifiers, such as decision trees, kNN, naive Bayes, and so on. Two of them use SVMs among the classifiers tested, which is one of our classifiers. The goal of this research is to discover if the results they report remain the same if more powerful classifiers are used.

It is possible that by using less powerful base classifiers, the researchers are exploring more clearly the differences between the strategies - if the classifier by itself cannot do much, most of the observed difference will be the effect of the strategies themselves. In this case, the goal of the research is to inform other scientists (as indeed they informed us) as to which strategies are probably more useful for further exploration and development. But those results may be misleading to a practitioner, who we believe, will start by using more powerful classifiers.

Regarding the second point above, we believe that a practitioner will prefer to use either already implemented strategies, or if none of them are available, the practitioner would prefer implementing the simpler strategies. Thus in this research, when previous empirical research has pointed out a set of strategies as “winning” strategies, we select from them the ones that are either widely available or are easier to implement. In particular, Galar et al. (2012) empirically determined that SMOTEBagging and RUSBoost are good ensemble strategies, but we considered RUSBoost easier to implement and that was the one we incorporated into this research. Similarly, López et al. (2013) list SMOTE+ENN and SMOTE as the (empirically determined) best oversampling strategies, and we decided to test only SMOTE since there are many implementations available; they also list MetaCost and class weight as good cost based solutions, but we only tested class weight in this research since it is already available in all implementations of classifiers.

Regarding the third point above, the similar published researches only use AUC as the quality metric. We do not know that a practitioner will necessarily use AUC as metric. As we discuss in Section 2.2 there are other metrics that can be used in situations of imbalanced data, and as this paper will show, the best strategies are **very** dependent on the metric used! So we will perform all comparisons using 6 different quality metrics (AUC, Accuracy, F-measure, G-mean, Balanced accuracy, and Matthew’s correlation coefficient), all of which have been argued in the literature as useful metrics. We will give a small emphasis on AUC, to compare our results with the literature, but results in all other 5 metrics will be displayed and discussed.

Finally regarding the third point above, López et al. (2013) among many others have pointed out that it is not only the skewed class distributions that is the source of all difficulties in imbalance problems, but that the skewness accentuates other problems, which we are calling intrinsic (imbalanced) characteristics of the data set, such as small disjuncts, lack of density, overlapping regions, noisy data, borderline examples, and these characteristics may be the cause of the lower performance of the classifiers. Some strategies were developed exactly to counteract one or more of these intrinsic characteristics (Holte et al., 1989;

Han et al., 2005; Napierała et al., 2010) and it could be the case that these strategies are indeed the “winning” strategies even when using strong base classifiers, if one knows that one or more of these intrinsic characteristics are salient on one’s data set. But we assume that a practitioner has no tools to determine that, nor has knowledge of previous published research that shows these characteristics for “similar” data.

## 1.1 Related literature

This research follows and extends three previous researches with a similar goal of empirically testing different strategies for imbalanced data (Prati et al., 2015; Galar et al., 2012; López et al., 2013). The main comparative characteristics of the three papers are listed below in Table 1.

Prati et al. (2015) model the problem as how much does each strategy recover the losses when an artificially imbalanced data set is created from a balanced one. Thus, the balanced AUC is the “correct” or “limit” AUC, and they measure how much each strategy approaches this limit when dealing with versions of the data set with up to 1% imbalance. They show that SVM is the base classifier less sensitive to imbalance. They also show that in general the loss in relation to the “correct” AUC, is small (5%) for imbalance rates up to 10%. For more severe imbalances (up to 1%) there is a loss of about 20%. The research reports the detailed comparisons of the different strategies for each of 7 base classifiers, but they conclude that the effect of the different strategies is limited, only recovering on average 30% of the loss due to class imbalance.

Galar et al. (2012) focus on ensemble based strategies to deal with imbalanced data. They compare 7 different proposals for cost-based boosting where the weight update rules of AdaBoost are changed to take into consideration the cost of making a minority class error; 4 different algorithms in the family of boosting based ensembles, where sampling strategies of adding or removing data for the training set of each boost are used; 4 different bagging-based ensembles, which use sampling and bagging; and 2 algorithms classified as hybrid. They use only C4.5 as the base classifier. They conclude that SMOTEBagging, RUSBoost, and UnderBagging are the best strategies in terms of the AUC values, and RUSBoost seems to be the less computationally complex solution.

López et al. (2013) compare a 7 synthetic minority sampling strategies; 3 cost sensitive learning; and 5 ensemble based strategies, using three base classifiers (kNN, C4.5, and SVM). They first compare the strategies within each family and then compare the best in each family to each other. Within the synthetic minority sampling they conclude that SMOTE and SMOTE+ENN perform better. For the cost sensitive, class weight is the winning strategy. And among the ensembles, RUSBoost, SMOTEBagging, and EasyEnsemble perform better. When comparing the winners among themselves and a no-strategies approach (which we call baseline in this paper), they concluded that in general class weight, SMOTE and SMOTE+ENN perform better than the other strategies and better than the baseline.

López et al. (2013) then explore artificially altered data sets that make it more explicit the different intrinsic characteristics of imbalanced data, such as small disjuncts, low density on the positive region, overlapping of classes, noisy data, differences between the training

Table 1: Summary of the relevant literature.

	(Prati et al., 2015)	(Galar et al., 2012)	(López et al., 2013)
Number of data sets	22	44	66
Imbalance range	from 50% to 1% with steps between 5% and 10%	17 data sets with imbalance between 1% to 5% the rest between 10% and 35%	40% to 1% (mean 10%)
Algorithms	C4.5, C4.5Rules, CN2, RIPPER, Neural networks, Naive Bayes, SVM	C4.5	C4.5, kNN, SVM
Strategies	<b>Sampling:</b> SMOTE, ADASYN, SMOTE BORDERLINE, Random Oversampling <b>Cost:</b> MetaCost	<b>Sampling:</b> SMOTE <b>Ensembles:</b> AdaBoost, Adaboost.M1, AdaBoost.M2, Bagging, AdaC2, RUSBoost, SMOTEBoost, MSMOTEBoost, UnderBagging, OverBagging, UnderOverBagging, SMOTEBagging, MSMOTEBagging, IIVotes, EasyEnsemble, BalanceCascade	<b>Sampling:</b> SMOTE, SMOTE+ENN, borderline SMOTE, ADASYN, SL-SMOTE, SPIDER2, DB-SMOTE <b>Cost:</b> Cl-Weight, MetaCost, CS-Classifer WEKA <b>Ensemble:</b> Adaboost.M1, AdaBoostC2, RUSBoost, SMOTEBagging, EasyEnsemble
Metric “Winning” strategies	AUC Random oversampling	AUC SMOTEBagging, RUSBoost, UnderBagging	AUC SMOTE, SMOTE+ENN Cl-Weight, MetaCost RUSBoost, SMOTEBagging

and test data sets, and illustrate some of the strategies for dealing with these characteristics, but using a very weak base classifiers (a decision tree).

This paper only deals with binary imbalanced problems. There has been a recent literature on multiclass imbalanced literature (Fernández et al., 2013; Liao, 2008; Wang and Yao, 2012; Abdi and Hashemi, 2016). For these problems, some research follow the path of decomposing the multiclass problem into either OVO or OVA binary imbalanced problems (Fernández et al., 2013; Liao, 2008) while other research tackle the full multiclass problem directly (Wang and Yao, 2012; Abdi and Hashemi, 2016).

## 2. Methods

### 2.1 Strategies

In this research we tested the following strategies to deal with imbalanced data. These are strategies that the previous empirical research (Prati et al., 2015; Galar et al., 2012; López et al., 2013) has singled out as the “winning” strategies, and when there were more than one of the strategies within the same family we selected either the one with publicly available implementation or the simpler one to implement (according to our second assumption about the practitioner’s preferences).

- **baseline** is the null case - the use of a single base classifier, without any different weighting for the classes.
- **class weight**. This strategy weights the positive examples with a higher value so that erring the positive examples is costlier than negative examples. This is an internal strategy and so it depends on changing the base classifier appropriately. Fortunately, the R implementations of random forest, gradient boosting, and SVM already accept a class weight parameter. The same is true for the Python implementation of such algorithms. So this is a low cost alternative for the practitioner. In fact, the Scikit-learn implementation of the three base classifier algorithms assume by default that the class weight is set as we did in this paper.

We fixed the class weight for the negative class as 1 and for the positive as the inverse of the imbalance rate, that is, for an imbalance rate of 1%, the positive class has a weight of 100, and the negative weight 1.

- **SMOTE** Synthetic minority over-sampling strategy (Chawla et al., 2002) is probably the best known method to generate new positive data. For each positive data point, the method will search among the  $k$  nearest neighbours for those that are also positive, and create a new data point (randomly placed) in the line segment that joins the original point and each of those positive neighbours.

We used the SMOTE implementation of the R package MLR (Bischl et al., 2016). We generated new examples until the two classes were balanced and used  $k = 5$  (number of nearest neighbours).

- **Underbagging** is the bagging of the base classifier, where each instance is trained on a balanced sample of the data set, where the positive class is preserved, and the negative class is randomly under-sampled. We created  $n$  (a hyperparameter) of these balanced sets for each data set and trained the base classifier on them. The final classifier is the bagging of the  $n$  base classifiers.

- **RUSBoost** Besides external strategies and class weight we will test a special purpose classifier that was well ranked in both Galar et al. (2012) and López et al. (2013). RUSBoost (Seiffert et al., 2010) is a boosting strategy that uses random undersampling (removing negative data) for training the different boosts, and ADABOOST.M1 (Freund et al., 1996) for the weight update and voting weights. The weight updates for the examples are computed on the whole training set, not the undersampled set.

RUSBoost as proposed by Seiffert et al. (2010) is a general boosting strategy, that is, it can be applied on any base classifier. For this comparison we are not using it as a general boosting strategy). We fixed the base classifier as the CART decision tree (the same decision tree used in random forests and gradient boosting), and we use RUSBoost as a special purpose classifier for imbalanced data.

We implemented our R version of RUSBoost based on one available at <https://github.com/SteveOhh/RUSBoost>. The undersampling was set to achieve a 50% imbalance rate. The number of boosts *nboost* is a hyperparameter.

## 2.2 Metrics

There has been a large body of discussion on how to assess the quality of classifiers on imbalance problems, and a large set of metrics proposals that address one or more of the problems.

The main problem with the standard metric, accuracy – the proportion of correct predictions – is that it assigns the same cost for both misclassification of positive and negative examples. As we discussed above, an important aspect of imbalanced problems is that there is some understanding that misclassifying a positive case (a false positive) should be costlier than misclassifying a negative case (a false negative). Accuracy does not take those differences into consideration.

Different metrics have been proposed to “balance” the mistakes of the classifier on both the positive and negative classes (Japkowicz, 2013).

This paper will focus on 6 metrics:

- **accuracy** abbreviated as **acc**
- **area under the ROC curve** abbreviated as **auc**
- **F-measure** abbreviated as **f1**
- **G-mean** (Kubat et al., 1998) abbreviated as **gmean**
- **Matthew’s correlation coefficient**(Matthews, 1975) abbreviated as **mcc**
- **balanced accuracy** abbreviated as **bac**

Let us denote TP as the number of true positives, that is, the correct positive predictions of the classifier; TN as the number of true negatives; FP is the number of false positives, that is data that the classifier predicted as positive which were in fact negative; and FN as the number of false negatives. Then:



$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{acc} &= \frac{TP + TN}{TP + FP + TN + FN} \\
 \text{precision} &= \frac{TP}{TP + FP} \\
 \text{recall} &= \frac{TP}{TP + FN} \\
 \text{specificity} &= \frac{TN}{TN + FP} \\
 f1 &= \frac{2}{\frac{1}{\text{precision}} + \frac{1}{\text{recall}}} = \frac{2TP}{2TP + FP + FN} \\
 \text{bac} &= \frac{\text{recall} + \text{specificity}}{2} = \frac{\frac{TP}{TP+FN} + \frac{TN}{TN+FP}}{2} \\
 \text{gmean} &= \sqrt{\text{recall} \times \text{specificity}} = \sqrt{\frac{TP}{TP + FN} \times \frac{TN}{TN + FP}} \\
 \text{mcc} &= \frac{TP \times TN - FP \times FN}{\sqrt{(TP + FP)(TP + FN)(TN + FP)(TN + FN)}}
 \end{aligned}$$

*Accuracy* is the proportion of correct predictions. Notice that  $TP+FN$  is the total number of positive examples, and thus *recall* is the accuracy for positive examples (the proportion of true predictions for the positive examples).  $TN+FP$  is the total number of negative examples, and thus *specificity* is the accuracy for the negative examples. *Precision* is the probability that the classifier is correct if it outputs the positive class ( $TP+FP$  are all the cases the classifier predicted as positive).

Classifiers usually compute internally a score value for each data. Let us assume that higher scores are associated with the positive class. Besides computing the score, the classifier also defines a threshold, above which it classifies the example as positive. Changing this threshold, one can change which examples are classified as positive or negative. Lowering the threshold will change the classification of some examples that before were negative to positive. Let assume that some of these were indeed positive (before they were false negative) but not all of them. Lowering the threshold caused an increase of the true positives and thus an increase in recall. But the newly false positives decrease specificity - the accuracy of negative cases. Therefore, by changing the threshold one can trade *recall* for *specificity*, increasing one while decreasing the other. Similarly, one can trade *recall* for *precision*.

The metrics *bac*, *f1* and *gmean* attempt to balance two of these conflicting/tradable metrics. *bac* balances the accuracy of the positive cases (recall) with the accuracy of the negative cases (specificity) by taking the arithmetic mean of both figures. *f1* computes the harmonic mean between *recall* and *precision*. *gmean* computes the geometric means between *recall* and *specificity*.

MCC is the Pearson correlation between the predicted and the correct classes. The usual Pearson correlation formula:

$$\rho(X, Y) = \frac{E[XY] - E[X]E[Y]}{\sqrt{E[X^2] - E[X]^2} \sqrt{E[Y^2] - E[Y]^2}} \quad (1)$$

where  $X$  is the predicted class, and  $Y$  is the correct class reduces to the *mcc* formula above when one realises that:

- $X$  and  $Y$  are binary, and thus  $E[X^2] = E[X]$
- $E[X]$  is the proportion of examples classified as positive  $((TP + FP)/N)$ , where  $N = TP + FP + TN + FN$  is the total number of examples
- $E[Y]$  is the proportion of positive examples  $((TP + FN)/N)$ ,
- $E[XY]$  is the proportion of true positives  $(TP/N)$

Area under the curve (AUC) is defined in terms of the receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve, which is constructed by plotting the recall and specificity (actually 1-specificity) of the classifier for different values of the score threshold discussed above. The ROC is the convex hull of those points, and the AUC is the area of that ROC.

A more intuitive definition is that the AUC is an estimate of the probability that a random positive example will have a higher score than a randomly selected negative example. Under this interpretation, assuming that  $f(x)$  is the score for example  $x$ ,  $X_+$  is the set of positive examples, and  $X_-$  the set of negative examples, then

$$auc = \frac{1}{|X_+| \times |X_-|} \sum_{p \in X_+, n \in X_-} H(f(p) - f(n)) \quad (2)$$

where  $H(x) = +1$  if  $x > 0$ , and 0 otherwise, is the Heaviside step function. The formula just counts the number of times the score of a positive example is higher than the score of a negative example, divided by the number of pairs.

There are other metrics proposed in the literature (Scott, 2007; Japkowicz, 2013; Branco et al., 2016). In this paper we focus on the 6 metrics listed above: auc, acc, f1, gmean, mcc, and bac.

Haixiang et al. (2017) reviewed the recent literature in both techniques and application of imbalanced problems and discovered that AUC, accuracy, gmean, and f1 are the four most used metrics in those papers (in this order). The next most used metrics were: recall, specificity and precision, followed by balanced accuracy and MCC.

Given the frequency of use, we believe that auc, accuracy, gmean, and f1 must be included in the analysis of this paper. The next three measures are “one sided” in the sense that one can always artificially increase one of them (by changing the decision threshold) and thus should not be used in empirical comparisons. Finally we also add the other two less used metrics bac and mcc.

We understand that accuracy is a metric that violates one of the characteristics of an imbalance problem, the intuition that misclassifying positive examples should be more costly than misclassifying negative examples, and thus it is inappropriate as a metric for an imbalanced problem. But given our goal answering a practitioner’s need for practical knowledge on how to solve a imbalanced problem, we cannot disregard that they seem to use the metric with frequency.

### 2.3 Data and classifiers

In this paper we used the some of the UCI public data sets collected by Fernández-Delgado et al. (2014). For each data set:

- If the data set was multiclass, we selected as *positive* the class with the lowest frequency just above 5%. If the frequencies for all classes were below 5%, we selected as positive the most frequent class. All the other classes would be named as *negative*.
- If the data set was binary, we selected the less frequent class as *positive*.

After this procedure, the transformed data set was binary, and the positive class was less frequent than the negative.

- If the positive class had an imbalance higher than 5%, we randomly removed random positive examples until it reached an imbalance of 5%.
- If the positive class had an imbalance below 5%, we removed random negative examples until the positive class reached an imbalance of 5%.

Finally we removed random positive examples of the data set to achieve imbalance rates of 3%, 1% and 0.1% provided there were at least 10 positive cases remaining. The limit of 10 positive cases was set so that in the experimental set up (discussed below) the test set would have at least two positive examples.

Table 2 displays the number of data sets for each imbalance level. At the lowest imbalance (5%) we started with 82 different data sets, but for the more severe levels (1% and 0.1%) we could use only produce 40 of them.

Table 2: Number of data sets for each imbalance rate.

Imbalance rate	number of datasets
0.1%	40
1.0%	40
3.0%	66
5.0%	82

The base classifiers used were:

- **random forest (rf)**. We used the R randomForest implementation. The hyperparameter range was:  $mtry \in [1, \text{number of dimensions}]$  and  $ntree \in [2^4, 2^{12}]$ .
- **SVM with RBF kernel (svm)**. We used the R implementation. The hyperparameters were  $C \in [2^{-5}, 2^{15}]$  and  $\gamma \in [2^{-15}, 2^3]$ .
- **Extreme gradient boosting (xgb)**. We used the R implementation. Hyperparameters:  $max\_depth \in [1, 6]$ ,  $eta \in [0.005, 0.05]$ ,  $nrounds \in \{20, 40, 60, \dots, 140\}$ .

Besides the base classifiers, two other algorithms have hyperparameters:

- **RUSBoost** is treated in this paper as a special purpose classifier for imbalanced problems based on boosting of decision trees. The number of trees is a hyperparameter whose possible values are  $nboost \in \{10, 20, 30, 40, 60\}$ .

- **Underbagging** is a general strategy that combines sampling and bagging and can be used with any base classifier. Underbagging also has a hyperparameter – the number of bags  $n$  which was selected from  $n \in \{10, 20, 30, 40, 60\}$ . The search for the best value of this hyperparameter is performed in parallel with the search for the base classifier’s hyperparameter.

## 2.4 Experimental setup

For each data set, for each imbalanced level we randomly selected 20% of the data set as test. The proportion of classes was the same in both the training and test set but we did not impose any other constraint on the partitioning (against the warnings of López et al. (2014)) .

Let us call *solution* a combination of a strategy and a base classifier, or the RUSBoost classifier. We performed a 3-fold cross validation on the training set to select the best set of hyperparameters for the solution. The hyperparameters were selected from 10 random samples from the ranges described above. For the case of underbagging, all base classifiers in the ensemble used the same set of hyperparameters. The hyperparameters were selected based on each of the 6 metrics used.

Once the hyperparameters were selected, we trained the solution with those hyperparameters using the whole training set, and measure it on the test set using the same metric used to select the hyperparameters.

We repeated the process (starting at the random selection of the test set) 3 times, that is, we have three measures of the quality of the solution, which we averaged to have a better estimate.

Formally, we used a 3-repetition of a 20% holdout procedure with a nested 3-fold for selecting the hyperparameters.

We are interested in answering four questions for the practitioner, and thus we perform four comparisons (for each metric). We are also interested in answering one question for the scholars working on the problem of imbalance data.

- The first question is “what is in general the best strategy for imbalance data (for each metric)?”. This question is independent of the base classifier, the data set, and the imbalance rate, and thus these factors are marginalised out of the comparison: we compare the 4 strategies, for all combinations of base classifiers, imbalance rates, and data sets.
- The second questions is “what is the best strategy for moderately imbalance data?” and “what is the best strategy for severely imbalanced data?”. In our experiment we consider the 5% imbalance as moderate, and the 0.1% imbalance as severe. Thus we compare the 4 strategies on all classifiers, and all data sets with imbalance of 5%, and the same for all data sets with imbalance of 0.1%.
- If the practitioner have control over which base classifier to use, we would like to answer the question “What is the best combination of base classifier and strategy?”. Thus we compare all combinations of strategies and classifiers ( $4 \times 3$ ) for all data sets and all imbalance rates.

- Although we mentioned that we assume that a practitioner will prefer an out-of-the-box implementation, we believe that if a less known solution is clearly a good one, the practitioner would use it (and that would suggest that such strategy should be soon placed “in-the-box”). The question we would like to answer is “How does the best combination of standard classifiers and strategies compare to the best special purpose solution?”. In this case we follow some research (Galar et al., 2012; López et al., 2013) that found that RUSBoost as one of the best ensemble strategies and we use a RUSBoost of decision trees as a special purpose solution for imbalanced problems. We compare the best combination of classifier and strategy (discovered above) with a RUSBoost solution, for all data sets and all imbalance rates.
- Finally, the previous research, in particular Prati et al. (2015), determined that SVM is the base classifier less sensitive to imbalance of the data. But none of the previous research had evaluated random forests or gradient machines. Therefore we would like to answer the question “what is the best base classifier?” using the baseline strategy, for all datasets and imbalance rates. We believe that this answer will be of value to scholars in the area.

## 2.5 Statistical analysis

We broadly follow Demsar’s procedure (Demšar, 2006) to compare multiple classifiers on multiple data sets but with some of the modifications as proposed by Garcia and Herrera (2008); García et al. (2010). In particular, instead of using the Nemenyi test as proposed by Demsar, we used the Friedman post hoc test, with multi-comparison adjustment of the p-value following Bergmann and Hommel (Bergmann and Hommel, 1988) (we used the Holm procedure (Holm, 1979) for the case where more than 9 classifiers were compared). We used the R package `scmp` (Calvo and Santafe, 2016) to perform the computations.

Demsar proposed a graphical representation of the resulting comparisons. We will use a more compact representation, using a table to both display the order of the different strategies, and whether the differences are significant (with 95% confidence) or not (Piepho, 2004). The top left corner of Table 3 is an example of such table. The mean rank, which orders the different strategies is displayed in the second column. The third column shows the statistical significance: if two lines share a letter then the difference between the corresponding results is **not** statistically significant. In the case of first pane of Table 3, the difference between first and second lines are not statistically significant, but both of them have significant differences with the third and fourth. The third and fourth are also not significantly different. The first and second panes of Table 9 in the appendix show more complex examples where the lines are not grouped into not-statistically-different blocks.

## 2.6 Reproducibility

The imbalanced datasets, the programs that run the experiments, the results of all experiments, and the R program to perform the analysis are available at <https://figshare.com/s/96b3d7f8d3f74de>

### 3. Results

#### 3.1 General comparison

Table 3 reports the comparison of all strategies, for the 5 metrics. The second column “rank” is the mean rank of the strategy across all databases (lower is better). The third column indicates the groups of not-statistically significant differences, as discussed in above. For AUC and accuracy, baseline and class weight perform equally well. For F-measure, SMOTE performs better than the alternatives. For G-mean, underbagging is the sole winner, and for MCC, all strategies but underbagging perform equally well.

Table 3: Comparisons of the strategies across all algorithms, and imbalance rates for all 5 metrics.

algorithm	rank		algorithm	rank	
auc			acc		
baseline	2.29	a	baseline	1.95	a
weight	2.34	a	weight	1.96	a
smote	2.47	b	smote	2.41	b
underbagging	2.91	c	underbagging4		c
f1			gmean		
smote	2.26	a	underbagging	1.46	a
weight	2.51	b	smote	2.57	b
baseline	2.52	b	baseline	2.97	c
underbagging	2.71	c	weight	3.00	c
mcc			bac		
smote	2.37	a	underbagging	1.68	a
baseline	2.48	a	smote	2.59	b
weight	2.50	a	baseline	2.84	c
underbagging	2.65	b	weight	2.89	c

#### 3.2 Different imbalance rates

Table 4 displays the comparisons of the strategies across all algorithms for the moderate imbalance case (5%) and the severe imbalance case (0.1%). For AUC, class weight, the baseline and SMOTE perform at similar levels for both the moderate and severe imbalance. Underbagging perform significantly worse than the best strategy.

For accuracy, baseline and class weight perform better in both situations, and smote and underbagging perform significantly worse. For F-measure, SMOTE performs significantly better than the other strategies for the moderate imbalance, but it is joined by class weight and the baseline in the severe case. For g-mean, underbagging perform significantly better than the other strategies for both cases. And for MCC, SMOTE performs better than the alternatives in the moderate case, but all strategies are equivalent in the severe case.

Table 4: Comparisons of the strategies across all algorithms, and 5% and 0.1% imbalance rates for the auc metric

5%			0.1%		
algorithm	rank		algorithm	rank	
auc					
weight	2.36	a	baseline	2.21	a
baseline	2.37	a	weight	2.30	a
smote	2.40	a	smote	2.55	ab
underbagging	2.87	b	underbagging	2.93	b
acc					
baseline	1.96	a	weight	1.94	a
weight	2.00	a	baseline	1.99	a
smote	2.31	b	smote	2.48	b
underbagging	3.73	c	underbagging	3.60	c
f1					
smote	2.12	a	weight	2.39	a
baseline	2.57	b	smote	2.45	a
underbagging	2.64	b	baseline	2.46	a
weight	2.67	b	underbagging	2.70	a
gmean					
underbagging	1.49	a	underbagging	1.46	a
smote	2.39	b	smote	2.76	b
baseline	3.04	c	weight	2.87	b
weight	3.09	c	baseline	2.90	b
mcc					
smote	2.22	a	weight	2.39	a
baseline	2.55	b	baseline	2.40	a
weight	2.58	b	underbagging	2.59	a
underbagging	2.66	b	smote	2.62	a
ba					
underbagging	1.69	a	underbagging	1.72	a
smote	2.41	b	baseline	2.73	b
baseline	2.92	c	weight	2.74	b
weight	2.97	c	smote	2.82	b

### 3.3 Best combination

For AUC, rf+baseline, rf+smote, rf+weight, xgb+baseline, xgb+weight, and xgb+smote are the best combinations, with no significant difference between them. For accuracy: xgb+baseline, xgb+weight, rf+weight, and rf+baseline are the best combinations.

For F-measure, xgb+smote is the best combination; for G-mean, rf+underbagging and xgb+underbagging. And for mcc, xgb+smote.

The full tables are in Appendix A.

### 3.4 Comparison to RUSBoost

Table 5 compares the best combination of base classifier and strategy with the RUSBoost classifier. For each metric, the table lists the mean rank and the name of the best combination, the mean rank of the RUSBoost, and the p-value of the Wilcoxon signed rank comparison. Note that for all metrics, all best combinations have a lower mean rank than RUSBoost, and that the difference is statistically significant (p-values below  $5e-2$ ).

Table 5: Comparisons of the best solution for each metric and RUSBoost

metric	best combination		rusboost rank	p.value
	rank	name		
auc	1.21	rf+baseline	1.79	1e-15
acc	1.05	xgb+baseline	1.95	3e-37
f1	1.13	xgb+smote	1.87	6e-35
gmean	1.11	rf+underbagging	1.89	2e-31
mcc	1.15	xgb+smote	1.85	1e-33
bac	1.16	xgb+underbagging	1.84	3e-30

### 3.5 Best base classifiers

Table 6 displays the comparison of each base classifier, when operating in baseline, for each metric. For AUC and accuracy, random forest and gradient boosting are equally good; for F-measure, G-mean and MCC gradient boosting performs better. In all cases SVM, is the worst algorithm.

Table 6: Comparison of the base classifiers using baseline for each metric.

algorithm	rank		algorithm	rank	
auc			acc		
rf	1.74	a	xgb	1.73	a
xgb	1.76	a	rf	1.87	a
svm	2.50	b	svm	2.40	b
f1			gmean		
xgb	1.66	a	xgb	1.63	a
rf	1.91	b	rf	1.95	b
svm	2.44	c	svm	2.42	c
mcc			bac		
xgb	1.66	a	xgb	1.65	a
rf	1.88	b	rf	1.91	b
svm	2.46	c	svm	2.44	c



## 4. Discussion

### DEPENDENCY ON THE QUALITY METRIC

A very important aspect of the results reported above is that the selection of the best strategy is strongly related to the metric. As far as we know, this has not been reported in the literature, and it has important consequences to both practitioners and researchers. Practitioners must first define the metric they will to assess the quality of the classifier before attempting different imbalance strategies. If the practitioner is using AUC as metric then the baseline or class weight is likely the best strategies, but they are the worst if one is using MCC, and both differences are significant.

Unfortunately, we cannot provide any advice to the practitioner as to which metric is the most useful or is the “correct” metric. We point the reader to some references that discuss the different metrics: Gu et al. (2009), Jeni et al. (2013), and Japkowicz (2013). The reader should also be aware of literature such as Hernández-Orallo et al. (2012) and Hand (2009) which link performance metrics with expected classification loss when one does not know the operational conditions (such as ratio of imbalance and costs of errors for different classes) in advance.

We do not believe that the strong dependency of the best strategy on the metric used was a known result in the area. No paper or review of the area explicitly state it. And even if that is common knowledge, and thus does not need to be stated, then researchers in the area are not producing the most useful knowledge because most of the algorithm proposal or empirical comparisons papers published do not use multiple metrics in the comparisons.

This result should also motivate future researchers in the area to compare their new algorithms and strategies using different metrics - a strategy that outperforms the alternatives using one metric may outperform them using other metrics. By making the comparisons in different metric available, the researcher is providing useful information for practitioners that must decide (once they have selected the quality metric) whether to try or not that algorithm and strategy.

### STRONG BASE CLASSIFIERS AND RELATION TO PREVIOUS RESULTS

The second important conclusion is that this research seems to contradict the published results, in particular the results that use AUC as metric (Prati et al., 2015; Galar et al., 2012; López et al., 2013). None of these papers point the baseline and class weight as the best alternatives for improving the AUC in imbalanced data.

The important difference between our research and theirs is that we use much more powerful base classifiers. Prati et al. (2015) and López et al. (2013) include SVMs among less powerful classifiers such as tree and rule induction, and naive bayes while we test only with SVMs, random forest, and boosting machines. We understand that there are good reasons to use simpler base classifiers if the goal of the research is to advance one’s understanding of the strategies themselves. If the base classifier “is not of much help”, all the differences observed are due to differences in the strategies themselves. But under the practitioner’s perspective we adopted, the base classifiers will not be necessarily simple. In particular the two base classifiers we introduced (random forest and boosting machines) are particularly good in dealing with imbalanced data, and the strategies seem to hinder their ability to deal with the problem.

To demonstrate that the use of strong base classifiers is indeed what causes the difference of our results to the previous ones, we run the comparisons of the strategies (and RUSBoost) using 2 weak base classifiers: 1-nearest neighbour and a CART decision tree. Table 7 shows the comparison on the AUC metric. The results partially reproduce the conclusions of the previous research. Galar et al. (2012), which uses only decision trees as base classifiers, list as winning strategies both RUSBoost and Underbagging which are the best two strategies in Table 7 and they are not statistically significantly different.

The results in Table 7 are less congruent to López et al. (2013) which list SMOTE, RUSBoost and class weight as winning strategies, obtained using knn, C4.5 and SVM (all with fixed hyperparameters) as base classifiers. In our case, baseline performs better than class weight, and underbagging is one of the two best strategies which are not conclusions in López et al. (2013). It is likely that this divergence in results is due to the difference in the datasets used, and the fact that López et al. (2013) use also SVM as base classifier (Table 9 shows that underbagging is particularly bad for SVMs which would lower López et al. (2013) ranking for undebagging).

Table 7: Comparisons of the strategies using weaker classifiers (1-nn and CART) for AUC

algorithm	mean.rank	auc
rusboost	2.13	a
underbagging	2.20	a
smote	2.88	b
baseline	3.45	c
weight	4.34	d

## RUSBOOST

As we discussed, RUSBoost is an external strategy that combines boosting and sampling and could be used with any base classifier. By fixing the base classifier to a decision tree we were expecting that it would be a competitive special purpose classifier. In fact, it is competitive when compared to the other strategies using weak base classifiers (Table 7) but not when compared to stronger classifiers, using AUC as metric.

Section 3.4 shows that RUSBoost is not competitive when comparing it to the best combination of strategy and base classifier for all metrics. This seems to indicate that there it is unlikely that a special purpose classifier can outperform, in general, a combination of one of the strategies used in the paper and a strong base classifier.

But surprisingly, RUSBoost is not competitive even when compared to gradient boosting - also a boosting ensemble based on decision trees, just like RUSBoost, but without any special consideration given to imbalance. We compared RUSBoost with XGB+baseline, that is a simple gradient boosting classifier. Table 8 displays the mean rank of gradient boosting with baseline and RUSBoost and the p-value of the Wilcoxon signed rank test between the two algorithms, for all metrics. RUSBoost performs significantly worse than XGB+baseline in all metrics.

Table 8: Comparison between XGB+baseline and RUSBoost for all metrics

metric	rank XGB	rank RUSBoost	p value
auc	1.16	1.84	5.5e-24
acc	1.06	1.94	2.7e-37
f1	1.21	1.79	2.4e-28
gmean	1.65	1.35	4.5e-10
mcc	1.24	1.76	4.4e-28
ba	1.64	1.36	1.0e-07

## TESTING OTHER STRATEGIES

There are many minority oversampling algorithms: SMOTE (Chawla et al., 2002), SMOTE+ENN (Batista et al., 2004), Borderline-SMOTE (Han et al., 2005), ADASYN, (He et al., 2008), Safe-level-SMOTE (Bunkhumpornpat et al., 2009), SPIDER2 (Napierała et al., 2010), Random-SMOTE (Dong and Wang, 2011), DBSMOTE (Bunkhumpornpat et al., 2012), SMOTE-FRST (Ramentol et al., 2012), SMOTE-RSB\* (Ramentol et al., 2012), SMOTE-IPF (Sáez et al., 2015), among others. López et al. (2013) compared SMOTE, SMOTE+ENN, Borderline-SMOTE, ADASYN, Safe-level-SMOTE DBSMOTE, and SPIDER2 and concluded that SMOTE and SMOTE+ENN achieved the highest performance (AUC), and that the difference between the two was not statistically significant. Prati et al. (2015) compared SMOTE, ADASYN and Borderline-SMOTE, and found little (non significant) differences among them (again using AUC). We therefore selected SMOTE to be compared in this paper since both papers concluded that SMOTE seems among the best oversampling solutions.

Should one test the newer oversampling strategies, which have not been tested in the previous research, such as Random-SMOTE, SMOTE-FRST, SMOTE-RSB\*, and SMOTE-IPF? For all metrics but f-measure and MCC, SMOTE is not among the best performing strategies and thus it seems unlikely that the newer variants of SMOTE would be competitive. But for f-measure and MCC it is probably worth it to compare the newer algorithms for oversampling. In fact, one should also compare the older variations of oversampling, such as Borderline-SMOTE, ADASYN, SMOTE+ENN, and SPIDER2 since the conclusions by López et al. (2013) and Prati et al. (2015) of the equivalence of these variations was dependent on the fact that they used AUC as metric. For AUC, one may conclude that oversampling in general is not a worthwhile strategy, but for f-measure it is, and the difference between the algorithms may be of importance.

Therefore, future research should test other variants of the strategies included in this research but probably only for the metrics in which the “standard version” of strategy was the best performing. Therefore one should test:

- variations of SMOTE for f-measure and for MCC.
- variations of underbagging for g-means.

Beyond the testing and comparing newer strategies as discussed above, we feel that an important contribution to the design of future strategies is a deeper understanding on why there is this strong dependency on the quality of the strategy and metric used to evaluate

the quality. Why are SMOTE and possible other versions of minority oversampling the best strategy when one is using f-measure as metric? Why is underbagging the best strategy for g-means and balanced accuracy, but the worse strategy (and significantly so) for almost all other metrics? This paper does not provide insights on this relation between metrics and strategies, but we feel that future research should address that.

## 5. Conclusions

The first important conclusion of this research is that the best strategy strongly depends on the metric used. The practitioner must define which metric will be used to evaluate the quality of the classifier.

- If the user is using **AUC** as the metric of quality then baseline or class weight strategies are likely the best alternatives (regardless if the imbalance is moderate (5%) or severe (0.1%). If the practitioner has control over which base classifier to use, then one should opt for a gradient boosting or a random forest.
- If one is using **accuracy** as metric then baseline or class weight are the best strategies and the best classifier is gradient boosting.
- If one is using **f-measure** as metric then SMOTE is a good strategy for any imbalance rate and best classifier is gradient boosting.
- If one is using **G-mean** as metric then Underbagging is the best strategy for any imbalance rate and the best classifiers are random forest and gradient boosting.
- If one is using **Matthew's correlation coefficient** as metric then almost all strategies perform the equally well in general, but SMOTE seems to perform better for less imbalanced data and the best classifier is gradient boosting
- If one is using the **balanced accuracy** as metric then Underbagging is the best strategy for any imbalance rate and best classifier are random forest and gradient boosting.

As suggestions for researchers in the area of imbalance problems, we believe that when proposing new algorithms the researcher should compare it with the alternative algorithms using *different metrics*. Finally, when proposing external strategies, the researcher should test them also using strong base classifiers.

## Appendix A. Best combinations - Tables

### References

Lida Abdi and Sattar Hashemi. To combat multi-class imbalanced problems by means of over-sampling techniques. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge & Data Engineering*, (1): 1–1, 2016.

Table 9: Comparisons of the combination of base algorithm and strategy for the auc, acc, and fl metrics

auc			acc			fl		
algorithm	rank		algorithm	rank		algorithm	rank	
rf_baseline	4.98	a	xgb_baseline	3.97	a	xgb_smote	3.61	a
xgb_baseline	5.03	a	xgb_weight	4.05	a	rf_smote	5.06	b
xgb_weight	5.13	a	rf_weight	4.26	a	xgb_weight	5.07	b
rf_smote	5.19	a	rf_baseline	4.29	a	xgb_baseline	5.20	b
rf_weight	5.20	a	xgb_smote	5.30	b	rf_weight	5.81	b
xgb_smote	5.23	a	rf_smote	5.64	b	rf_baseline	5.84	b
rf_underbagging	6.50	b	svm_baseline	6.17	b	rf_underbagging	6.96	c
xgb_underbagging	6.91	bc	svm_weight	6.19	b	xgb_underbagging	7.18	c
svm_baseline	7.78	c	svm_smote	7.70	c	svm_underbagging	7.21	c
svm_weight	7.91	cd	svm_underbagging	9.48	d	svm_baseline	8.46	d
svm_smote	8.85	de	rf_underbagging	10.29	de	svm_weight	8.55	d
svm_underbagging	9.30	e	xgb_underbagging	10.66	e	svm_smote	9.04	d

Table 10: Comparisons of the combination of base algorithm and strategy for the gmean, mcc, and bac metrics

gmean			mcc			bac		
algorithm	rank		algorithm	rank		algorithm	rank	
rf_underbagging	2.83	a	xgb_smote	4.02	a	xgb_underbagging	3.55	a
xgb_underbagging	3.06	a	xgb_baseline	4.99	ab	rf_underbagging	3.73	ab
xgb_smote	4.62	b	xgb_weight	5.10	b	xgb_smote	4.58	b
svm_underbagging	5.43	bc	rf_smote	5.29	b	svm_underbagging	5.83	c
rf_smote	6.09	cd	rf_baseline	5.73	b	rf_smote	6.22	cd
xgb_weight	6.19	de	rf_weight	5.77	b	xgb_baseline	6.32	cd
xgb_baseline	6.19	de	rf_underbagging	6.80	c	xgb_weight	6.45	cd
rf_weight	7.26	e	xgb_underbagging	6.90	c	rf_baseline	6.88	d
rf_baseline	7.28	e	svm_underbagging	7.34	c	rf_weight	6.91	d
svm_baseline	9.28	f	svm_baseline	8.37	d	svm_baseline	8.85	e
svm_weight	9.36	f	svm_weight	8.46	d	svm_weight	8.99	e
svm_smote	9.64	f	svm_smote	9.23	d	svm_smote	9.69	e

Gustavo EAPA Batista, Ronaldo C Prati, and Maria Carolina Monard. A study of the behavior of several methods for balancing machine learning training data. *ACM SIGKDD explorations newsletter*, 6(1):20–29, 2004.

Beate Bergmann and Gerhard Hommel. Improvements of general multiple test procedures for redundant systems of hypotheses. In *Multiple Hypotheses Testing*, pages 100–115. Springer, 1988.

Bernd Bischl, Michel Lang, Lars Kotthoff, Julia Schiffner, Jakob Richter, Erich Studerus, Giuseppe Casalicchio, and Zachary M. Jones. mlr: Machine learning in r. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 17(170):1–5, 2016.

Paula Branco, Luís Torgo, and Rita P Ribeiro. A survey of predictive modeling on imbalanced domains. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 49(2):31, 2016.

Chumphol Bunkhumpornpat, Krung Sinapiromsaran, and Chidchanok Lursinsap. Safe-level-smote: Safe-level-synthetic minority over-sampling technique for handling the class

- imbalanced problem. In *Pacific-Asia conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 475–482. Springer, 2009.
- Chumphol Bunkhumpornpat, Krung Sinapiromsaran, and Chidchanok Lursinsap. DB-SMOTE: density-based synthetic minority over-sampling technique. *Applied Intelligence*, 36(3):664–684, 2012.
- Borja Calvo and Guzman Santafe. scmamp: Statistical comparison of multiple algorithms in multiple problems. *The R Journal*, 8(1), 2016.
- Nitesh V Chawla, Kevin W Bowyer, Lawrence O Hall, and W Philip Kegelmeyer. Smote: synthetic minority over-sampling technique. *Journal of artificial intelligence research*, 16: 321–357, 2002.
- Nitesh V Chawla, Aleksandar Lazarevic, Lawrence O Hall, and Kevin W Bowyer. Smote-boost: Improving prediction of the minority class in boosting. In *European Conference on Principles of Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, pages 107–119. Springer, 2003.
- Janez Demšar. Statistical comparisons of classifiers over multiple data sets. *Journal of Machine learning research*, 7(Jan):1–30, 2006.
- Misha Denil and Thomas Trappenberg. Overlap versus imbalance. In *Canadian Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 220–231. Springer, 2010.
- Pedro Domingos. Metacost: A general method for making classifiers cost-sensitive. In *Proceedings ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 155–164. ACM, 1999.
- Yanjie Dong and Xuehua Wang. A new over-sampling approach: random-smote for learning from imbalanced data sets. In *International Conference on Knowledge Science, Engineering and Management*, pages 343–352. Springer, 2011.
- Chris Drummond, Robert C Holte, et al. C4.5, class imbalance, and cost sensitivity: why under-sampling beats over-sampling. In *Workshop on learning from imbalanced datasets II*, volume 11, pages 1–8. Citeseer, 2003.
- Andrew Estabrooks, Taeho Jo, and Nathalie Japkowicz. A multiple resampling method for learning from imbalanced data sets. *Computational intelligence*, 20(1):18–36, 2004.
- Alberto Fernández, Victoria López, Mikel Galar, María José Del Jesus, and Francisco Herrera. Analysing the classification of imbalanced data-sets with multiple classes: Binarization techniques and ad-hoc approaches. *Knowledge-based systems*, 42:97–110, 2013.
- Manuel Fernández-Delgado, Eva Cernadas, Senén Barro, and Dinani Amorim. Do we need hundreds of classifiers to solve real world classification problems. *Journal Machine Learning Research*, 15(1):3133–3181, 2014.
- Yoav Freund, Robert E Schapire, et al. Experiments with a new boosting algorithm. In *Icml*, volume 96, pages 148–156. Bari, Italy, 1996.

- Mikel Galar, Alberto Fernandez, Edurne Barrenechea, Humberto Bustince, and Francisco Herrera. A review on ensembles for the class imbalance problem: bagging-, boosting-, and hybrid-based approaches. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics, Part C (Applications and Reviews)*, 42(4):463–484, 2012.
- Salvador Garcia and Francisco Herrera. An extension on “statistical comparisons of classifiers over multiple data sets” for all pairwise comparisons. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 9(Dec):2677–2694, 2008.
- Salvador García, Alberto Fernández, Julián Luengo, and Francisco Herrera. Advanced non-parametric tests for multiple comparisons in the design of experiments in computational intelligence and data mining: Experimental analysis of power. *Information Sciences*, 180(10):2044–2064, 2010.
- Qiong Gu, Li Zhu, and Zhihua Cai. Evaluation measures of the classification performance of imbalanced data sets. In *International Symposium on Intelligence Computation and Applications*, pages 461–471. Springer, 2009.
- Guo Haixiang, Li Yijing, Jennifer Shang, Gu Mingyun, Huang Yuanyue, and Gong Bing. Learning from class-imbalanced data: Review of methods and applications. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 73:220–239, 2017.
- Hui Han, Wen-Yuan Wang, and Bing-Huan Mao. Borderline-smote: a new over-sampling method in imbalanced data sets learning. In *International Conference on Intelligent Computing*, pages 878–887. Springer, 2005.
- David J Hand. Measuring classifier performance: a coherent alternative to the area under the roc curve. *Machine learning*, 77(1):103–123, 2009.
- Haibo He and Yunqian Ma, editors. *Imbalanced learning: foundations, algorithms, and applications*. John Wiley & Sons, 2013.
- Haibo He, Yang Bai, Edwardo A Garcia, and Shutao Li. Adasyn: Adaptive synthetic sampling approach for imbalanced learning. In *Neural Networks, 2008. IJCNN 2008. (IEEE World Congress on Computational Intelligence)*. *IEEE International Joint Conference on*, pages 1322–1328. IEEE, 2008.
- José Hernández-Orallo, Peter Flach, and Cèsar Ferri. A unified view of performance metrics: translating threshold choice into expected classification loss. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 13(Oct):2813–2869, 2012.
- Sture Holm. A simple sequentially rejective multiple test procedure. *Scandinavian journal of statistics*, pages 65–70, 1979.
- Robert C Holte, Liane Acker, Bruce W Porter, et al. Concept learning and the problem of small disjuncts. In *IJCAI*, volume 89, pages 813–818, 1989.
- Nathalie Japkowicz. *Imbalanced learning: foundations, algorithms, and applications*, chapter Assessment metrics for imbalanced learning, pages 187–206. In He and Ma (2013), 2013.

- László A Jeni, Jeffrey F Cohn, and Fernando De La Torre. Facing imbalanced data-recommendations for the use of performance metrics. In *Affective Computing and Intelligent Interaction (ACII), 2013 Humaine Association Conference on*, pages 245–251. IEEE, 2013.
- Taeho Jo and Nathalie Japkowicz. Class imbalances versus small disjuncts. *ACM Sigkdd Explorations Newsletter*, 6(1):40–49, 2004.
- Miroslav Kubat, Robert C Holte, and Stan Matwin. Machine learning for the detection of oil spills in satellite radar images. *Machine learning*, 30(2-3):195–215, 1998.
- T Warren Liao. Classification of weld flaws with imbalanced class data. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 35(3):1041–1052, 2008.
- Yi-Hung Liu and Yen-Ting Chen. Face recognition using total margin-based adaptive fuzzy support vector machines. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, 18(1):178–192, 2007.
- Victoria López, Alberto Fernández, Salvador García, Vasile Palade, and Francisco Herrera. An insight into classification with imbalanced data: Empirical results and current trends on using data intrinsic characteristics. *Information Sciences*, 250:113–141, 2013.
- Victoria López, Alberto Fernández, and Francisco Herrera. On the importance of the validation technique for classification with imbalanced datasets: Addressing covariate shift when data is skewed. *Information Sciences*, 257:1–13, 2014.
- Brian W Matthews. Comparison of the predicted and observed secondary structure of t4 phage lysozyme. *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta (BBA)-Protein Structure*, 405(2):442–451, 1975.
- Krystyna Napierała, Jerzy Stefanowski, and Szymon Wilk. Learning from imbalanced data in presence of noisy and borderline examples. In *International Conference on Rough Sets and Current Trends in Computing*, pages 158–167. Springer, 2010.
- Hans-Peter Piepho. An algorithm for a letter-based representation of all-pairwise comparisons. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, 13(2):456–466, 2004.
- Ronaldo C Prati, Gustavo E Batista, and Maria C Monard. Class imbalances versus class overlapping: an analysis of a learning system behavior. In *Mexican international conference on artificial intelligence*, pages 312–321. Springer, 2004.
- Ronaldo C Prati, Gustavo EAPA Batista, and Diego F Silva. Class imbalance revisited: a new experimental setup to assess the performance of treatment methods. *Knowledge and Information Systems*, 45(1):247–270, 2015.
- Enislay Ramentol, Nelle Verbiest, Rafael Bello, Yailé Caballero, Chris Cornelis, and Francisco Herrera. Smote-first: a new resampling method using fuzzy rough set theory. In *Uncertainty Modeling in Knowledge Engineering and Decision Making*, pages 800–805. World Scientific, 2012.



- Bhavani Raskutti and Adam Kowalczyk. Extreme re-balancing for SVMs: a case study. *ACM Sigkdd Explorations Newsletter*, 6(1):60–69, 2004.
- José A Sáez, Julián Luengo, Jerzy Stefanowski, and Francisco Herrera. Smote–ipf: Addressing the noisy and borderline examples problem in imbalanced classification by a re-sampling method with filtering. *Information Sciences*, 291:184–203, 2015.
- Bernhard Schölkopf, John C Platt, John Shawe-Taylor, Alex J Smola, and Robert C Williamson. Estimating the support of a high-dimensional distribution. *Neural Computation*, 13(7):1443–1471, 2001.
- Clayton Scott. Performance measures for neyman-pearson classification. *IEEE Trans. Information Theory*, 53(8):2852–2863, 2007.
- Chris Seiffert, Taghi M Khoshgoftaar, Jason Van Hulse, and Amri Napolitano. Rusboost: A hybrid approach to alleviating class imbalance. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics-Part A: Systems and Humans*, 40(1):185–197, 2010.
- Yanmin Sun, Mohamed S Kamel, Andrew KC Wong, and Yang Wang. Cost-sensitive boosting for classification of imbalanced data. *Pattern Recognition*, 40(12):3358–3378, 2007.
- Jacques Wainer. Comparison of 14 different families of classification algorithms on 115 binary datasets. Technical Report 1606.00930, arXiv, 2016. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1606.00930>.
- Shuo Wang and Xin Yao. Multiclass imbalance problems: Analysis and potential solutions. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics, Part B (Cybernetics)*, 42(4):1119–1130, 2012.
- Donghui Wu, Zhelong Wang, Ye Chen, and Hongyu Zhao. Mixed-kernel based weighted extreme learning machine for inertial sensor based human activity recognition with imbalanced dataset. *Neurocomputing*, 190:35–49, 2016.
- Gang Wu and Edward Y Chang. Kba: Kernel boundary alignment considering imbalanced data distribution. *IEEE Transactions on knowledge and data engineering*, 17(6):786–795, 2005.