

# Dynamic classifier chains for multi-label learning

Pawel Trajdos · Marek Kurzynski

the date of receipt and acceptance should be inserted later

**Abstract** In this paper, we deal with the task of building a dynamic ensemble of chain classifiers for multi-label classification. To do so, we proposed two concepts of classifier chains algorithms that are able to change label order of the chain without rebuilding the entire model. Such modes allows anticipating the instance-specific chain order without a significant increase in computational burden. The proposed chain models are built using the Naive Bayes classifier and nearest neighbour approach as a base single-label classifiers. To take the benefits of the proposed algorithms, we developed a simple heuristic that allows the system to find relatively good label order. The heuristic sort labels according to the label-specific classification quality gained during the validation phase. The heuristic tries to minimise the phenomenon of error propagation in the chain. The experimental results showed that the proposed model based on Naive Bayes classifier the above-mentioned heuristic is an efficient tool for building dynamic chain classifiers.

**Keywords** multi-label, classifier chains, naive bayes, dynamic chains, nearest neighbour

## 1 Introduction

Under well-known single-label classification framework, an object is assigned to only one class which provides a full description of the object. However, many real-world datasets contain objects that are assigned to different categories at the same time. All of these categories constitute a full description of the object. Omitting of one of these concepts induces a loss of information. Classification process in which such kind of data is involved is called multi-label classification [14]. A great example of a multi-label dataset is a gallery of tagged photos. Each photo may be described using such tags as mountains, sea, forest, beach, sunset, etc. Multi-label classification is a relatively new idea that is explored extensively for last

two decades. As a consequence, it was employed in a wide range of practical applications including text classification [22], multimedia classification [33] and bioinformatics [44] to name a few.

Multi-label classification algorithms can be broadly partitioned into two main groups i.e. dataset transformation algorithms and algorithm adaptation approaches [14].

Methods belong to the group of algorithm adaptation approaches provides a generalisation of an existing multi-class algorithm. The generalised algorithm is able to solve multi-label classification problem in a direct way. Among the others, the most known approaches from this group are: multi label KNN algorithm [22], the Structured SVM approach [9] or deep-learning-based algorithms [42].

In this paper, we investigate only dataset transformation algorithms that decompose a multi-label problem into a set of single-label classification tasks. To reconstruct a multi-label response, during the inference phase, outputs of the underlying single-label classifiers are combined in order to create a multi-label prediction.

Let's focus on one of the simplest decomposition methods. That is the *binary relevance* (BR) approach that decomposes a multi-label classification task into a set of *one-vs-rest* binary classification problems [1]. This approach assumes that labels are conditionally independent. However the assumption does not hold in most of real-life recognition problems, the BR framework is one of the most widespread multi-label classification methods [41]. This is due to its excellent scalability and acceptable classification quality [25].

To preserve scalability of BR systems, and provide a model of inter-label relations, Read et al. [31,32] provided us with the *Classifier Chain* model (CC) which establish a linked chain of modified one-vs-rest binary classifiers. The modification consists of an extension of the input space of single-label classifiers along the chain sequence. To be more strict, for a given label sequence, the feature space of each classifier along the chain is extended with a set of binary variables corresponding to the labels that precede the given one. The model implies that, during the training phase, input space of given classifier is extended using the ground-truth labels extracted from the training set. During the inference step, due to lack of the ground-truth labels, we employ binary labels predicted by preceding classifiers. The inference is done in a greedy way that makes the best decision for each of considered labels. That is, the described approach passes along the chain, information allowing CC to take into account inter-label relations at the cost of allowing the label-prediction-errors to propagate along the chain [32]. This way of performing classification induces a major drawback of the CC system. That is, the CC classifier uses a kind of greedy strategy during the inference phase. This design allows classification errors to propagate along the chain. As a consequence, the performance of a chain classifier strongly depends on chain configuration [34]. To overcome these effects, the authors suggested to generate an *ensemble of chain classifiers* (ECC). The ensemble consists of classifiers trained using different label sequences [31].

The originally proposed ECC ensemble uses randomly generated label orders. Additionally, each chain classifier is built using a resampled dataset. This approach provides an additional diversity into the ensemble classifier. This simple, yet effective approach allows improving the classification quality significantly in comparison to single chain classifier. However, the intuition says that there is still room for improvement when we employ a more data-driven approach.

Indeed, later research shows that the members of the ensemble may be chosen in such a way that provides further improvement of classification quality. That is, Read et al. proposed a strategy which uses Monte Carlo sampling to explore the label sequence space in order to find a classifier chain that offers the highest classification quality [29]. Another approach was proposed by Liu et al. [24]. They introduced a method that builds a model of inter-label relations as a *directed acyclic graph* (DAG). The weights of the graph are calculated using confusion and support for each pair of labels. Then, the ensemble is generated using topological sorting of the graph. Chen et al. [5] proposed a method that makes clusters of labels. Then, for each cluster of labels, an undirected graph describing inter-label relations is built. Then, a *minimum spanning tree* is created for the graph. After that, *breadth-first search* algorithm determines sequences for a cluster-specific ensemble of CC classifiers. A similar approach was proposed by Huang et al [21]. They proposed to build the clusters using a meta-space that mixes input space and label space. Then inter-label relations are modeled using correlation. The model is expressed using DAG structure. Finally, the CC classifier is built for each cluster. The chain structure may also be induced using Bayesian Network approach [47].

Chain sequence can be also found using meta-heuristic approach. That is, Goncalves et al. developed a strategy that utilises a *genetic algorithm* (GA) to find a good chain structure for the entire dataset [16, 15]. The proposed approach using wrapper-based approach. That is each chromosome codes different chain order. To evaluate those label orders each corresponding classifier must be built and evaluated using a validation set. A similar approach was also used by Trajdos and Kurzynski who proposed to use a multi-objective genetic algorithm to optimize classification quality and chain diversity simultaneously [40]. Although those methods are rather time-consuming, they provide a significant improvement in terms of classification quality.

Another way of dealing with the error propagation is to build a classifier that combines CC algorithm BR-based approach [27]. The authors proposed a stacking based architecture to combine the above-mentioned classifiers. That is, the first layer is a simple BR classifier that predicts each label separately. The attribute set of the classifiers from the second layer is extended using all labels except the predicted one. During the training phase, both layers are trained separately. During the prediction phase, on the other hand, classifiers from the second layer mix outcomes of the BR classifiers with the outcomes provides by preceding classifiers. That is, the first classifier of the chain structure has its attribute space extended by the outcomes of the BR classifier. The second one uses the prediction of the first one and the remaining attributes are taken from the prediction of the BR classifier. Finally, the last classifier along the chain has the attribute space extended using only labels predicted by the preceding classifiers. Another way of combining the CC classifier with the BR classifier is described in [26].

The previously cited methods build ensemble structure during the training procedure. Consequently, throughout this paper, this kind of methods will be called static methods. The dynamic chain classifiers, on the other hand, determines the best label order at the prediction phase [35]. The above-mentioned classifier produces a set of randomly generated label sequences and then validates the chain classifiers. During the validation phase, each point from the validation set is assigned with a label order that produces the most accurate output vector for this

point. As the experimental research shows, the dynamic methods of building a label order may achieve better classification quality [35].

We observed that during the building of a dynamic chain classifier, multiple chain classifiers must be learned. These classifiers are built using the same training set and differ only in chain order. As a consequence, the computational burden of the algorithm may be reduced if there exists a classifier that is trained once and changing the label sequence is done without rebuilding the model. To address this issue, we built two models based on the Naive Bayes [19] approach and the nearest neighbour approach [8] that meet the above-mentioned properties.

Additionally, we proposed a dynamic method of determining the chain order based on classification quality for each label separately.

A part of this paper was previously published in [39]. This paper is an extended version of the previously-published work. The main elements that has been changed/extended:

- The literature review has been extended.
- We have added the results of the experimental comparison of the BR and CC versions of different base classifiers.
- We have proposed a new model of the dynamic chain classifier. That is, we introduce the CC model based on the nearest neighbour approach.
- New experimental results have been provided.

The rest of the paper is organised as follows. Next Section 2 provides a formal description of the multi-label classification problem and describes the developed algorithms. Section 3 contains a description of the conducted experiments. The results are presented and discussed in Section 4. Finally, Section 5 concludes the paper.

## 2 Proposed Methods

In this section, we introduce a formal notation of multi-label classification problem and provide a description of the proposed method.

### 2.1 Preliminaries

Under the *multi-label* (ML) formalism a  $d$ -dimensional object  $\mathbf{x} = [x_1, x_2, \dots, x_d] \in \mathcal{X}$  is assigned to a set of labels indicated by a binary vector of length  $L$ :  $\mathbf{y} = [y_1, y_2, \dots, y_L] \in \mathcal{Y} = \{0, 1\}^L$ , where  $L$  denotes the number of labels.

In this paper, we follow a statistical classification framework. As a consequence, it is assumed that object  $\mathbf{x}$  and its set of labels  $\mathbf{y}$  are realizations of corresponding random vectors  $\mathbf{X} = [\mathbf{X}_1, \mathbf{X}_2, \dots, \mathbf{X}_d]$ ,  $\mathbf{Y} = [\mathbf{Y}_1, \mathbf{Y}_2, \dots, \mathbf{Y}_L]$  and the joint probability distribution  $P(\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y})$  on  $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$  is known.

Because the above-mentioned assumption is never meet in real world, in this study, we assume that multi-label classifier  $h : \mathcal{X} \mapsto \mathcal{Y}$ , which maps feature space  $\mathcal{X}$  to the set  $\mathcal{Y}$ , is built in a supervised learning procedure using the training set  $\mathcal{T}$  containing  $N$  pairs of feature vectors  $\mathbf{x}$  and corresponding class labels  $\mathbf{y}$ :

$$\mathcal{T} = \left\{ (\mathbf{x}^1, \mathbf{y}^1), (\mathbf{x}^2, \mathbf{y}^2), \dots, (\mathbf{x}^N, \mathbf{y}^N) \right\}. \quad (1)$$

## 2.2 Naive Bayes Classifier for Dynamic Classifier Chains

In this paper, we consider ML classifiers build according to the chain rule. That is, the classifier  $h$  is an ensemble of  $L$  single-label classifiers  $\psi_i$  that constitutes a linked chain which is built according to a permutation of label sequence  $\pi$ . As it was mentioned earlier, in this paper we follow the statistical classification framework. Consequently, each single-label classifier  $h_{\pi(i)}$  along with the chain makes its decision according to the following rule:

$$h_{\pi(i)}(\mathbf{x}) = \operatorname{argmax}_{y \in \{0,1\}} P(\mathbf{Y}_{\pi(i)} = y | B_{\pi(i)}(\mathbf{x})), \quad (2)$$

where  $B_{\pi(i)}(\mathbf{x})$  is a random event defined below:

$$\begin{aligned} B_{\pi(i)}(\mathbf{x}) = (\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{Y}_{\pi(i-1)} = h_{\pi(i-1)}(\mathbf{x}) \mathbf{Y}_{\pi(i-2)} = h_{\pi(i-2)}(\mathbf{x}), \dots \\ , \mathbf{Y}_{\pi(1)} = h_{\pi(1)}(\mathbf{x})), \forall i \in \{2, 3, \dots, L\}, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

and for  $i = 1$

$$B_{\pi(1)}(\mathbf{x}) = (\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}). \quad (4)$$

Conditioning on the random event  $B_{\pi(i)}(\mathbf{x})$  instead of  $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{x}$  allows the chain to take inter-label dependencies into account. The above-mentioned classification rule is a greedy rule that calculates the probability (2) using predictions of preceding classifiers. The optimal prediction under the chaining rule may be found using the PCC approach [6]. However, the approach requires the number of calculations that grows exponentially with the number of labels.

The probability defined in (2) is then computed using the Bayes rule:

$$P(\mathbf{Y}_{\pi(i)} = y | B_{\pi(i)}(\mathbf{x})) = \frac{P(\mathbf{Y}_{\pi(i)} = y)}{P(B_{\pi(i)}(\mathbf{x}))} P(B_{\pi(i)}(\mathbf{x}) | \mathbf{Y}_{\pi(i)} = y). \quad (5)$$

The term  $P(B_{\pi(i)}(\mathbf{x}))$  does not depend on event  $\mathbf{Y}_{\pi(i)} = y$ . Consequently, the decision rule (2) is rewritten:

$$h_{\pi(i)}(\mathbf{x}) = \operatorname{argmax}_{y \in \{0,1\}} P(\mathbf{Y}_{\pi(i)} = y) P(B_{\pi(i)}(\mathbf{x}) | \mathbf{Y}_{\pi(i)} = y) \quad (6)$$

Now, to improve the readability we simplify the notation:

$$P(B_{\pi(i)}(\mathbf{x}) | \mathbf{Y}_{\pi(i)} = y) = P(B_{\pi(i)}(\mathbf{x}) | y). \quad (7)$$

Then, following the Naive Bayes rule, we assume that all random variables that constitute  $B_{\pi(i)}(\mathbf{x})$  are conditionally independent given  $\mathbf{Y}_{\pi(i)} = y$ . Consequently,  $P(B_{\pi(i)}(\mathbf{x}) | y)$  is defined using the following formula:

$$P(B_{\pi(i)}(\mathbf{x}) | y) = \prod_{m=1}^d P(\mathbf{X}_m = \mathbf{x}_m | y) \prod_{l=1}^{l=i-1} P(\mathbf{Y}_{\pi(l)} = h_{\pi(l)}(\mathbf{x}) | y). \quad (8)$$

Now, it is easy to see that the term  $\prod_{l=1}^{l=i-1} P(\mathbf{Y}_{\pi(l)} = h_{\pi(l)}(\mathbf{x}) | y)$ , contrary to  $\prod_{m=1}^d P(\mathbf{X}_m = \mathbf{x}_m | y)$ , depends on the chain structure. Furthermore, all probability distributions used in the above-mentioned terms can be estimated during the training phase when the chain structure is unknown.

The training and inference phases are described in detail using pseudocode shown in Algorithms 1 and 2.

**Algorithm 1** Pseudocode of the learning procedure of the Naive Bayes classifier.

---

```

Input data:
 $\mathcal{T}$  - training set;
BEGIN
Split  $\mathcal{T}$  into  $\mathcal{T}_A$  and  $\mathcal{V}$  so that:
 $|\mathcal{T}_A| = t|\mathcal{T}|$  and  $|\mathcal{V}| = (1-t)|\mathcal{T}|$ ,  $t \in (0, 1)$ 
 $\mathcal{T}_A \cap \mathcal{V} = \emptyset$ ;
Using  $\mathcal{T}_A$  build estimators of
the following distributions:
 $P(\mathbf{Y}_{\pi(i)} = y) \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, L\}, y \in \{0, 1\}$ 
 $P(\mathbf{X}_m | \mathbf{Y}_{\pi(i)} = y) \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, L\}, y \in \{0, 1\}, m \in \{1, 2, \dots, d\}$ 
 $P(\mathbf{Y}_{\pi(i)} | \mathbf{Y}_{\pi(i)} = y) \forall i, l \in \{1, 2, \dots, L\}; i \neq l$ 
END

```

---

**Algorithm 2** Pseudocode of the inference procedure of the Naive Bayes classifier.

---

```

Input data:
 $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$  -- input instance;
 $\mathcal{V}$  -- validation set;
BEGIN
#Query the BR models
FOR  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, L\}$ :
 $e_i^0 = \prod_{m=1}^d P(\mathbf{X}_k = \mathbf{x}_m | \mathbf{Y}_i = 0)$ ;
 $e_i^1 = \prod_{m=1}^d P(\mathbf{X}_k = \mathbf{x}_m | \mathbf{Y}_i = 1)$ ;
END FOR;
Determine label permutation  $\pi$  using  $\mathcal{V}$  and  $\mathbf{x}$ ;
SET  $i = 1$ ;
DO:
 $h_{\pi(i)}(\mathbf{x}) = \operatorname{argmax}_{y \in \{0, 1\}} e_{\pi(i)}^y P(\mathbf{Y}_{\pi(i)} = y)$ 
FOR  $j \in \{i+1, i+2, \dots, L\}$ :
 $d_{\pi(j)}^0 := e_{\pi(j)}^0 * P(\mathbf{Y}_{\pi(i)} = h_{\pi(i)}(\mathbf{x}) | \mathbf{Y}_{\pi(j)} = 0)$ 
 $d_{\pi(j)}^1 := e_{\pi(j)}^1 * P(\mathbf{Y}_{\pi(i)} = h_{\pi(i)}(\mathbf{x}) | \mathbf{Y}_{\pi(j)} = 1)$ 
END FOR;
 $i := i + 1$ ;
WHILE( $i < L$ );
RETURN  $[h_1(\mathbf{x}), h_2(\mathbf{x}), \dots, h_L(\mathbf{x})]$ ;
END

```

---

*2.2.1 Computational complexity*

In this section, we assess the increase in computational complexity that the proposed algorithm causes.

First of all, it is easy to see that for both the original and the proposed algorithm the number of estimators that must be built to assess  $P(\mathbf{X}_m | \mathbf{Y}_{\pi(i)} = y) \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, L\}, y \in \{0, 1\}$  is:  $2Ld$ .

The number of estimators of  $P(\mathbf{Y}_{\pi(i)} = y) \forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, L\}, y \in \{0, 1\}$  that must be built is also the same for both classifiers:  $L$ .

The key difference is in the number of estimators of  $P(\mathbf{Y}_{\pi(i)} | \mathbf{Y}_{\pi(i)} = y)$  that must be built. For the original CC classifier the number of estimators that is built is  $L(L-1)$ . On the other hand our method builds  $2L^2$  estimators.

At the inference phase, the only additional calculations are performed to determine the permutation of labels. Since the validation set is involved in this process, a number of calculations is proportional to  $O(|\mathcal{V}|L)$ .

---

**Algorithm 3** Pseudocode of the learning procedure of the nearest neighbour classifier.

---

```

Input data:
 $\mathcal{T}$  - training set;
BEGIN
  Split  $\mathcal{T}$  into  $\mathcal{T}_A$  and  $\mathcal{V}$  so that:
   $|\mathcal{T}_A| = t|\mathcal{T}|$  and  $|\mathcal{V}| = (1-t)|\mathcal{T}|$ ,  $t \in (0, 1)$ 
   $\mathcal{T}_A \cap \mathcal{V} = \emptyset$ ;
  Save the training set  $\mathcal{T}_A$ 
END

```

---

### 2.3 KNN Classifier for Dynamic Classifier Chains

In this section, we define a dynamic classifier chain algorithm based on the nearest neighbours approach. The nearest neighbour algorithm is an instance-based classifier that does not build an explicit model of mapping between the feature space and the label space. Instead, the classifier performs classification in a lazy manner. That is, the  $R$  nearest instances and then the class is predicted using labels of the neighbour instances.

Let's begin with the definition of a distance function that depends on label permutation and the position along the chain. The distance function is defined in the extended feature space that combines the input space and the label space. For the first position, the distance is a simple Euclidean distance in the input space:

$$\delta_{\pi, i=1}((\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}), (\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y}')) = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^d (\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}'_j)^2}. \quad (9)$$

For the other positions, the distance function uses both the input space and the label space:

$$\delta_{\pi, i}((\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}), (\mathbf{x}', \mathbf{y}')) = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^d (\mathbf{x}_j - \mathbf{x}'_j)^2 + \sum_{l=1}^{i-1} (\mathbf{y}_{\pi(l)} - \mathbf{y}'_{\pi(l)})^2}. \quad (10)$$

Such defined distance function allows us to make the prediction using chaining rule. Since the distance is modified in order to fit the chain structure. During the inference phase, the distance calculates the extended distance using labels predicted at the preceding steps of the procedure. The above-defined distance function is used to build the neighbourhood of a given point in the extended feature space:  $M_{\pi, i}^R((\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y}))$ . The neighbourhood contains the  $R$  closest instances selected from the training set according to the distance function  $\delta_{\pi, i}$ .

Given the neighbourhood, the probability  $P(\mathbf{Y}_{\pi(i)} = y | B_{\pi(i)}(\mathbf{x}))$  is estimated as follows:

$$P(\mathbf{Y}_{\pi(i)} = y | B_{\pi(i)}(\mathbf{x})) \approx \frac{\left| \left\{ (\mathbf{x}^n, \mathbf{y}^n) \mid (\mathbf{x}^n, \mathbf{y}^n) \in M_{\pi, i}^R((\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{h}(\mathbf{x}))), \mathbf{y}_i^n = y \right\} \right|}{R}. \quad (11)$$

The label  $\pi(i)$  is also predicted using rule (2).

The training procedure is described in Algorithm 3. The procedure is very simple. That is, it splits the original training set into actual training set  $\mathcal{T}_A$  and the validation set  $\mathcal{V}$ .

---

**Algorithm 4** Pseudocode of the inference procedure of the nearest neighbour classifier.

---

```

Input data:
 $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$  -- input instance;
 $\mathcal{V}$  -- validation set;
 $\mathcal{T}_A$  -- Training set;
BEGIN
SET:  $\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{x}) = [h_1(\mathbf{x}) = \emptyset, h_2(\mathbf{x}) = \emptyset, \dots, h_L(\mathbf{x}) = \emptyset]$ ;
Determine label permutation  $\pi$  using  $\mathcal{V}$  and  $\mathbf{x}$ ;
For  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, L\}$ 
BEGIN
 $h_{\pi(i)}(\mathbf{x}) = \operatorname{argmax}_{y \in \{0,1\}} \left| \frac{\left| \{(\mathbf{x}^n, \mathbf{y}^n) \mid (\mathbf{x}^n, \mathbf{y}^n) \in M_{\pi,i}^R((\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{h}(\mathbf{x}))), \mathbf{y}_i^n = y\} \right|}{R} \right|$ 
END
RETURN  $[h_1(\mathbf{x}), h_2(\mathbf{x}), \dots, h_L(\mathbf{x})]$ ;
END

```

---

The inference procedure begins with assigning undefined values  $\emptyset$  into the prediction vector  $\mathbf{h}(\mathbf{x})$ . Then the predictions are updated sequentially according to the permutation  $\pi$ . The procedure is shown in Algorithm 4

#### 2.4 Dynamic Chain order

In this subsection, we define a local measure of classification quality. To do so, we employed a modified version of the well-known  $F_1$  measure.

First of all, we defined a fuzzy neighbourhood in the input space. The neighbourhood of an instance  $\mathbf{x}$  is defined using the following fuzzy set [46]:

$$\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x}) = \{(\mathbf{x}^n, \mathbf{y}^n, \mu(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^n)) : (\mathbf{x}^n, \mathbf{y}^n) \in \mathcal{V}\}, \quad (12)$$

where each triplet  $(\mathbf{x}^n, \mathbf{y}^n, \zeta)$  defines fuzzy set with the membership coefficient  $\zeta$ . The membership function  $\mu(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^n)$  is defined using gaussian potential function:

$$\mu(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^n) = \exp(-\beta\delta(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^n)^2). \quad (13)$$

The distance function  $\delta(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^n)$  is simple euclidean distance and the  $\beta$  coefficient is tuned during the experiments.


Then, we define set of points that belongs to given label  $\mathcal{V}_l$  and that are classified as given label  $\mathcal{D}_l$ :

$$\mathcal{V}_l = \{(\mathbf{x}^n, \mathbf{y}^n, 1) : (\mathbf{x}^n, \mathbf{y}^n) \in \mathcal{V}, \mathbf{y}_l^n = 1\} \quad (14)$$

$$\mathcal{D}_l = \{(\mathbf{x}^n, \mathbf{y}^n, 1) : (\mathbf{x}^n, \mathbf{y}^n) \in \mathcal{V}, h_l^{BR}(\mathbf{x}^n) = 1\} \quad (15)$$

The above-mentioned classifier responses are related to the binary relevance classifier that can be built without knowing the order of the chain. The classifier is defined using the following classification rule:

$$h_{\pi(i)}^{BR}(\mathbf{x}) = \operatorname{argmax}_{y \in \{0,1\}} P(\mathbf{Y}_{\pi(i)} = y) \prod_{m=1}^d P(\mathbf{X}_m = \mathbf{x}_m \mid \mathbf{Y}_{\pi(i)} = y) \quad (16)$$



**Fig. 1** Visualisation of ground truth labels and the decision set of the algorithm.

Since the neighbourhood of a given instance is defined as a fuzzy set, consistently the above-mentioned sets are also defined as fuzzy. However, the sets are fuzzy singletons. The visualisation of aforementioned sets is provided in Fig. 1.

Using the above-mentioned sets we define local True Positive rate, False Positive rate, False Negative rate respectively:

$$TP_l(\mathbf{x}) = |\mathcal{V}_l \cap \mathcal{D}_l \cap \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x})|, \quad (17)$$

$$FP_l(\mathbf{x}) = |(\mathcal{D}_l \setminus \mathcal{V}_l) \cap \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x})|, \quad (18)$$

$$FN_l(\mathbf{x}) = |(\mathcal{V}_l \setminus \mathcal{D}_l) \cap \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{x})|, \quad (19)$$

where  $|\cdot|$  is the cardinality of a fuzzy set [11]. Then, we define the local measure of classification quality:

$$F_l(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{2TP_l(\mathbf{x})}{2TP_l(\mathbf{x}) + FP_l(\mathbf{x}) + FN_l(\mathbf{x})} \quad (20)$$

Finally, the label order  $\pi$  is chosen so that the following inequalities are met:

$$F_{\pi(1)}(\mathbf{x}) \geq F_{\pi(2)}(\mathbf{x}) \geq \dots \geq F_{\pi(L)}(\mathbf{x}). \quad (21)$$

That is labels for whom the classification quality is higher precedes other labels in the chain structure. In other words, this simple heuristic is aimed at dealing with error propagation in the chain structure by employing the most accurate models at the beginning of the chain.

## 2.5 The Ensemble Classifier

Now, let us define a ML  $K$  – element classifier ensemble:  $eH = \{H_1, \dots, H_K\}$ . The ensemble is built using classifier chain algorithms defined in previous sections. Each ensemble classifier is built using a subset of the original dataset. The size of subset is 66% of the original training set.

The BR transformation may produce imbalanced single-label dataset. To prevent the classifier from learning from a highly imbalanced dataset, we applied the random undersampling technique [13]. The majority class is undersampled when imbalance ratio is higher than 20. The goal of undersampling is to keep the imbalance ratio at the level of 20.

The research on the application of Naive Bayes algorithm under the CC framework shows that when the number of features in the input space is significantly higher in comparison to the number of labels the Naive Bayes classifier may not perform well [35]. To prevent the proposed system from being affected by this phenomenon, we applied the feature selection procedure for each single-label separately. That is, the attributes are selected in order to improve the classification

quality for given label. The feature selection removes only attributes related to the original input space. Features related to labels are passed through the chain without selection. We employed the selection procedure based on correlation. In other words, we select attributes that are highly correlated to the predicted label and their inter-correlations are low [18]. Additionally, if the number of selected features is higher than 300, we select 300 random features from the set of previously selected features.

The final prediction vector of the ensemble is obtained via a simple averaging of response vectors corresponding to base classifiers of the ensemble followed by the thresholding procedure:

$$\tilde{h}_i(\mathbf{x}) = \left[ \left[ K^{-1} \sum_{k=1}^K h_i^k(\mathbf{x}) > 0.5 \right] \right], \quad (22)$$

where  $[\cdot]$  is the Iverson bracket.

### 3 Experimental Setup

The experimental study is divided into three main sections. The first one assesses the impact of employing chaining approach. In the section, we compare binary relevance and classifier chains algorithms built using the following base classifiers:

- J48 Classifier (C4.5 algorithm implemented in Weka) [28].
- SVM algorithm with radial based kernel [7, 2].
- Naive Bayes Classifier [19].
- Nearest Neighbour classifier [8].

In this section, we compare BR and CC ensembles built using a genetic algorithm tailored to optimise the macro-averaged  $F_1$  loss. For each ensemble, the size of the committee was set to  $K = 20$ . For the algorithm based on the genetic algorithm, the initial size of the committee was set to  $3K$ . Each numeric attribute in the training and validation datasets was also standardised. After the standardisation, the mean value of the attribute is 0 and its standard deviation is 1.

During the experimental study, the parameters of the SVM classifier ( $C \in \{0.001, 1, 2, \dots, 10\}$ ,  $\gamma \in \{0.001, 1, 2, \dots, 5\}$ ) were tuned using grid search and 3-fold cross validation. The number of nearest neighbours was also tuned using 3-fold cross validation. The number of neighbours was chosen among the following values  $R \in \{1, 3, 5, \dots, 11\}$ .

In two remaining sections, the conducted experimental study provides an empirical evaluation of the classification quality of the proposed methods and compares it to reference methods. Namely, we conducted our experiments using the following algorithms of building a CC ensemble:

1. The proposed approach (Section 2.4).
2. Static ensemble generated using a genetic algorithm [40]. The ensemble is tuned to optimise the macro-averaged  $F_1$  measure
3. ECC ensemble with randomly generated chain orders [31].
4. OOCC dynamic method proposed by da Silva et al. [35]. The ensemble is tuned to optimise the example based  $F_1$  measure. Additionally, the reference method uses single split into training and validation sets.

The above-mentioned methods of building CC systems were evaluated using Naive Bayes and the nearest neighbour algorithms as base classifiers. Systems built using different base classifiers are investigated in two separate sections. In the sections, we will refer to the investigated algorithms using the above-said numbers.

The reference algorithm also uses Naive Bayes/nearest neighbour algorithm with data preprocessing procedures described in Section 2.5.

The extraction of training and test datasets was performed using 10 fold cross-validation. For each ensemble, the proportion of the training set  $\mathcal{T}_A$  was fixed at  $t = 0.6$  of the original training set (see Algorithm 1). For each ensemble, the size of the committee was set to  $K = 20$ . For the algorithm based on the genetic algorithm, the initial size of the committee was set to  $3K$ . Each numeric attribute in the training and validation datasets was also standardised. After the standardisation, the mean value of the attribute is 0 and its standard deviation is 1.

The  $\beta$  coefficient was tuned during the training procedure using 3 CV approach. The best value among  $\{1, 2, \dots, 10\}$  is chosen.

Single label classifiers were implemented using WEKA software [17]. Multi-label classifier were implemented using Mulan software [36].

The experiments were conducted using 30 multi-label benchmark sets. The main characteristics of the datasets are summarized in Table 1. We used datasets from the sources abbreviated as follows: A [4], B [30] M-[37]; W-[44]; X-[45]; Z-[48]; T-[38]; O - [23]. Some of the employed sets needed some preprocessing. That is, we used multi-label multi-instance [48] sets (sources Z and W) which were transformed to single-instance multi-label datasets according to the suggestion made by Zhou et al. [48]. Multi-target regression sets (No 9, 30) were binarised using simple thresholding strategy. That is if the response is greater than 0 the resulting label is set relevant. Two of the used datasets are synthetic ones (source T) and they were generated using algorithm described in [38]. To reduce the computational burden, we use only a subset of original Tmc2007 and IMDB sets. Additionally, the number of labels in Stackex datasets is reduced to 15.

The algorithms were compared in terms of 11 different quality criteria coming from three groups [25]: Instance-based (Hamming, Zero-One,  $F_1$ , False Discovery Rate, False Negative Rate); Label-based. The last group contains the following measures: Macro Averaged (False Discovery Rate (FDR, 1- Precision), False Negative Rate (FNR, 1-Recall),  $F_1$ ) and Micro Averaged versions of the above-mentioned criteria.

Statistical evaluation of the results was performed using the Wilcoxon signed-rank test [10,43] and the family-wise error rates were controlled using the Holm procedure [10,20]. For all statistical tests, the significance level was set to  $\alpha = 0.1$ . Additionally, we also applied the Friedman [12] test followed by the Nemenyi post-hoc procedure [10].

## 4 Results and Discussion

### 4.1 Assessing the impact of chaining approach

In this section, we assess the consequences of employing chaining approach. That is, we compare binary relevance ensembles with classifier chain ensembles built using the same base classifier. The results are shown in Figure 2 and Table 2.

**Table 1** Summarised properties of the datasets employed in the experimental study. Sr denotes the source of dataset, No. is the ordinal number of a set,  $N$  is the number of instances,  $d$  is the dimensionality of input space,  $L$  denotes the number of labels. LC, LD, avIR are label cardinality, label density and average imbalance ratio respectively [25, 3].

No	Name	Sr	$N$	$d$	$L$	LC	LD	avIR
1	Arts1	M	7484	1733	26	1.654	.064	94.74
2	Azotobacter	W	407	20	13	1.469	.113	2.225
3	Birds	M	645	260	19	1.014	.053	5.407
4	Caenorhabditis	W	2512	20	21	2.419	.115	2.347
5	Drosophila	W	2605	20	22	2.656	.121	1.744
6	Emotions	M	593	72	6	1.868	.311	1.478
7	Enron	M	1702	1001	53	3.378	.064	73.95
8	Flags	X	194	43	7	3.392	.485	2.255
9	Flare2	M	1066	27	3	0.209	.070	14.15
10	Genbase	M	662	1186	27	1.252	.046	37.32
11	Geobacter	W	379	20	11	1.264	.115	2.750
12	Haloarcula	W	304	20	13	1.602	.123	2.419
13	Human	X	3106	440	14	1.185	.085	15.29
14	Image	M	2000	294	5	1.236	.247	1.193
15	IMDB	M	3042	1001	28	1.987	.071	24.61
16	LLOG	B	1460	1004	75	1.180	.016	39.27
17	Medical	M	978	1449	45	1.245	.028	89.50
18	MimlImg	Z	2000	135	5	1.236	.247	1.193
19	Ohsumed	O	13929	1002	23	1.663	.072	7.869
20	Plant	X	978	440	12	1.079	.090	6.690
21	Pyrococcus	W	425	20	18	2.136	.119	2.421
22	Saccharomyces	W	3509	20	27	2.275	.084	2.077
23	Scene	X	2407	294	6	1.074	.179	1.254
24	SimpleHC	T	3000	30	10	1.900	.190	1.138
25	SimpleHS	T	3000	30	10	2.307	.231	2.622
26	SLASHDOT	B	3782	1079	22	1.181	.054	17.69
27	Stackex_chess	A	1675	585	15	1.137	.076	4.744
28	Tmc2007-500	M	2857	500	22	2.222	.101	17.15
29	water-quality	M	1060	16	14	5.073	.362	1.767
30	yeast	M	2417	103	14	4.237	.303	7.197

Full results are presented in the appendix in Tables 5, 6 and 7. The compared algorithms are numbered as follows:


1. BR ensemble built using J48 algorithm.
2. CC ensemble built using J48 algorithm.
3. BR ensemble built using SVM algorithm.
4. CC ensemble built using SVM algorithm.
5. BR ensemble built using NB algorithm.
6. CC ensemble built using NB algorithm.
7. BR ensemble built using KNN algorithm.
8. CC ensemble built using KNN algorithm.

The analysis of the results clearly shows that there is a noticeable difference between two groups of measures. That is, the differences between BR-based and CC-based algorithms are greater in terms of example based criteria. On the other hand, the differences in mean ranks are lower for example based measures.

For the example based measures, the average ranks achieved by CC-based algorithms are lower than for BR-based algorithms. However, only for algorithms based on J48 classifier, the differences are significant for example-based FDR, FNR and  $F_1$  measures. A similar trend is observed for the zero-one loss. In this case, only differences for the nearest neighbour classifier are insignificant. It means that CC-based classifiers obtain the higher number of 'perfect match' results.

On the other hand, for the label-based measures and Hamming loss, almost no significant differences are observed. However, the average ranks suggest that for this group of measures, the classification quality may deteriorate.

The results clearly show that although label-specific quality measures do not change in a significant way, the prediction of the entire label-vector improves.



**Fig. 2** Base classifier comparison. Visualisation of average ranks achieved by algorithms and corresponding critical distances for the Nemenyi post-hoc test. Each axis of the radar plot corresponds to given quality criterion. The closer a point is to the centre of the radar plot, the lower average rank is (lower is better). Black bars parallel to criterion-specific axes denote critical difference for the Nemenyi tests.

This is an expected result since the CC-based approach incorporates the inter-label relations. This is a well-known fact that has been reported by authors that have previously compared both approaches [26].

The results also show that there are almost no significant differences between J48, NB and KNN based algorithms. Contrary, SVM algorithm tends to outperform the remaining ones in terms of example-based criteria, hamming loss and zero-one loss. It means that although J48 algorithm takes the biggest advantage of employing the chain rule, NB and KNN based classifiers are comparable to J48-based ensembles.


#### 4.2 Naive Bayes Classifier

The results of the experimental study are presented in Table 3 and Figure 3a. Tables 8, 6 and 10 show full results of the experiment. Table 3 provides results of the statistical evaluation of the experiments. Figure 3a visualises the average ranks and provide a view of the Nemenyi post-hoc procedure.

First, let's analyse differences between the proposed heuristic and the simple ECC ensemble. The proposed method is tailored to optimise the macro-averaged  $F_1$  loss so we begin with investigating macro-averaged measures. It is easy to see that both methods are comparable in terms of recall but the proposed one is significantly better in terms of precision. It means that the proposed method makes significantly less false positive predictions. Consequently, under the macro-averaged  $F_1$  loss the proposed method outperforms the ECC ensemble. The same pattern is also present in results related to micro-averaged measures. However, the difference for the micro-averaged  $F_1$  measure is not significant. In contrast, under example based measures, except the Hamming loss, there are no significant differences between investigated methods.

**Table 2** Base classifier comparison. Result of the statistical evaluation. Rnk stands for average rank over all datasets, Frd is the p-value obtained using the Friedman test and Wp-i denotes the p-value associated with the Wilcoxon test that compares the i-th algorithm against the others.

Alg.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8											
	Hamming								Zero-One								EX FDR								EX FNR										
Rnk	4.94	5.03	2.81	3.03	4.72	4.63	5.38	5.47	5.50	5.00	3.30	2.25	5.17	4.16	5.88	4.75	5.64	4.44	3.13	2.66	5.00	4.66	5.61	4.88	5.47	4.66	4.22	3.53	3.97	3.91	5.19	5.06			
Frd				.000018								.000000								.000002								.056423							
Wp-1	1.00	.002	.148	1.00	1.00	1.00	.432		.032	.001	.000	1.00	.478	1.00	1.00		.070	.001	.001	1.00	.650	1.00	1.00		.011	1.00	.009	.205	.054	1.00	1.00				
Wp-2		.000	.025	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00			1.00	.001	1.00	1.00	.044	1.00		.845	.001	1.00	1.00	.056	1.00			1.00	.223	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00				
Wp-3			1.00	.014	.022	.000	.000				.032	.005	.627	.001	.597					1.00	.002	.097	.001	.573			.937	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00				
Wp-4				.552	.552	.017	.002					.000	.004	.000	.002						.002	.006	.000	.002			1.00	1.00	.169	.113					
Wp-5					1.00	1.00	.591						.041	1.00	1.00							1.00	.964	1.00				1.00	.221	1.00					
Wp-6						1.00	1.00						.478	1.00								.666	1.00					.090	.266						
Wp-7							1.00							.220								1.00							1.00						
	EX $F_1$								Macro FDR								Macro FNR								Macro $F_1$										
Rnk	5.72	4.47	4.06	2.53	4.53	4.25	5.63	4.81	4.25	5.50	3.00	4.91	3.97	5.25	4.00	5.13	4.63	4.45	5.20	4.97	4.03	4.78	3.41	4.53	4.81	5.09	4.25	4.84	3.94	5.16	3.41	4.50			
Frd				0.000030								0.002491								0.312535								0.224854							
Wp-1		.005	.041	.000	.200	.072	1.00	1.00		.019	.552	1.00	1.00	.390	1.00	.479		1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	.022	1.00		1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	.000	1.00			
Wp-2		1.00	.001	1.00	1.00	.189	1.00			.003	1.00	.697	1.00	.152	1.00			1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	.441	1.00			1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	.031	1.00				
Wp-3			.272	1.00	1.00	.089	1.00				.066	.552	.023	.349	.003					1.00	.077	1.00	.058	1.00			1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00			
Wp-4				.014	.007	.000	.005					1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00						.419	1.00	.501	1.00			1.00	1.00	.824	1.00					
Wp-5					1.00	.200	1.00						.208	1.00	1.00						.998	1.00	1.00					.355	1.00	1.00					
Wp-6						.090	1.00						.101	1.00								1.00	1.00					.278	1.00						
Wp-7							1.00						.552									.143							.203						
	Micro FDR								Micro FNR								Micro $F_1$																		
Rnk	4.81	4.84	2.72	3.13	4.81	4.78	5.19	5.72	4.66	4.44	5.31	4.66	4.31	4.66	3.78	4.19	4.56	4.69	4.41	3.75	4.69	5.03	4.25	4.63											
Frd				0.000014								0.777721								0.777721															
Wp-1	1.00	.001	.141	1.00	1.00	1.00	.045			1.00	.706	1.00	1.00	1.00	.136	1.00		1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00			
Wp-2		.000	.023	1.00	1.00	1.00	.564			1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00			
Wp-3			1.00	.001	.001	.000	.001				1.00	.233	1.00	.215	.132						1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00		1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00		
Wp-4				.091	.079	.015	.007					1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00						1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00			1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00		
Wp-5					1.00	1.00	1.00						1.00	1.00	1.00							1.00	1.00	1.00			1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00		
Wp-6						1.00	1.00							1.00	1.00								1.00	1.00				1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	
Wp-7							1.00								1.00								1.00	1.00					1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	



**Fig. 3** Visualisation of average ranks achieved by algorithms.

The results show that the proposed heuristic provides an effective way of improving classification quality for classifier chains ensemble. Moving the best performing label-specific models at the beginning of the chain reduces the error that propagates along the chain. What is more, the experimental study also showed that the Naive Bayes classifier combined with proper data preprocessing may be effectively employed in classifier chain ensembles.

Now, let's compare the proposed method to the other algorithm based on the dynamic chain approach. When we investigate the example-based criteria it is easy to see that the OOC algorithm outperforms the proposed one in terms of FDR and Hamming loss. Those results combined with results achieved in terms of macro and micro averaged measures shows that the OOC method seems to be too much conservative. That is, it tends to make many false negative predictions in comparison to the other methods. The outstanding results for the Hamming loss are a consequence of the imbalanced nature of the multi-label data. That is, the presence of labels is relatively rare and the prediction that contains many false negatives may achieve inadequately high performance under the Hamming loss [25].

On the other hand, the average ranks clearly show that the method based on genetic algorithm achieves the best results in comparison to the other investigated methods. The main reason is that the GA-based approach optimises the entire ensemble structure, whereas the investigated dynamic chain methods, choose the best label order for single classifier chain. Then the locally chosen chains are combined into an ensemble. It gives us an important clue. That is when we consider an algorithm for dynamic chain order selection, we should think about a single chain and the global structure of the entire ensemble as well.

**Table 3** Naive Bayes Based CC. Results of the statistical evaluation.

Alg.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
	Hamming				Zero-One				EX FDR				EX FNR			
Rnk	2.45	2.67	3.03	<b>1.84</b>	2.52	<b>2.14</b>	2.97	2.38	2.84	<b>1.97</b>	2.91	2.28	2.56	<b>2.03</b>	2.53	2.88
Frd		.02113				.19410				.03824				.19410		
Wp-1		.702	.025	.063		.358	.199	.761		.019	.295	.134		.053	.700	.700
Wp-2			.319	.319			.006	.368			.005	.239			.136	.015
Wp-3				.001				.097				.040				.136
	EX $F_1$				Macro FDR				Macro FNR				Macro $F_1$			
Rnk	2.69	<b>2.03</b>	2.84	2.44	2.31	<b>2.22</b>	3.16	2.31	2.56	<b>1.94</b>	2.36	3.14	2.47	<b>1.81</b>	2.84	2.88
Frd		.19410				.04402				.02113				.02113		
Wp-1		.066	.821	.821		1.00	.012	1.00		.035	.919	.022		.156	.096	.248
Wp-2			.017	.112			.031	1.00			.174	.002			.003	.022
Wp-3				.590				.012				.105				.733
	Micro FDR				Micro FNR				Micro $F_1$							
Rnk	2.47	2.66	3.22	<b>1.66</b>	2.69	<b>1.72</b>	2.34	3.25	2.75	<b>1.78</b>	2.81	2.66				
Frd		.00027				.00029				.02242						
Wp-1		1.00	.028	.000		.005	.254	.239		.044	.610	1.00				
Wp-2			1.00	.008			.052	.000			.002	.044				
Wp-3				.000				.014				1.00				

### 4.3 Nearest Neighbour Classifier

The results of the experimental study are presented in Table 4 and Figure 3b. Tables 11, 12 and 13 show full results of the experiment. Table 3 provides results of the statistical evaluation of the experiments. Figure 3b visualises the average ranks and provide a view of the Nemenyi post-hoc procedure.

The results show that for the group of example based measures and the zero-one loss, there are no significant differences in classification quality between all investigated algorithms.

For macro and micro averaged measures, the best performing algorithm is an ensemble optimised using the genetic algorithm. The proposed nearest-neighbour-based classifier does not differ significantly from ECC OOC algorithms. However, it tends to be more conservative because it achieves lower FDR and higher FDR. In other words, the classifier tends to decrease the false positive rate at the cost of decreasing the true positive rate. This phenomenon causes the highest classification quality in terms of the Hamming loss. The reason is that for the multi-label set with low label density, it is easy to obtain high classification by setting all possible labels as irrelevant.

The results confirm the findings described in Section 4.1. The nearest-neighbour-based CC algorithm is unable to take all benefits of the chaining approach. On the other hand, the method is still comparable to chains built using different base classifiers. The main goal of this paper was to propose the model that can change the chain structure without retraining. This goal was achieved.

## 5 Conclusions

The main goal of this research was to provide an effective chain classifier that allows changing label order at relatively low computational cost. We achieved it using a classifier based on the Naive Bayes approach. To prove that the proposed method allows handling inter-label relations in an efficient way, we proposed a simple heuristic method that determines label order that should minimise label propagation error. Indeed, the experimental results showed that the proposed method is able to produce a good chain structure at a low computational cost. However,

**Table 4** Nearest Neighbour based CC. Result of statistical evaluation.

Alg.	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
	Hamming				Zero-One				EX FDR				EX FNR			
Rnk	1.72	2.83	2.80	2.65	2.22	2.73	2.42	2.63	2.17	2.57	2.57	2.70	2.60	2.47	2.40	2.53
Frd	.008583				1.00000				1.00000				1.00000			
Wp-1	.004 .000 .006				1.00 1.00 1.00				1.00 1.00 .948				1.00 .985 1.00			
Wp-2	.441 .173				1.00 1.00				1.00 1.00				1.00 1.00			
Wp-3	.441				1.00				1.00				1.00			
	EX $F_1$				Macro FDR				Macro FNR				Macro $F_1$			
Rnk	2.43	2.57	2.47	2.53	2.27	1.67	3.10	2.97	2.97	1.70	2.78	2.55	2.600	1.533	3.033	2.833
Frd	1.00000				.000265				.004979				.000259			
Wp-1	1.00 1.00 1.00				.017 .010 .012				.000 .617 .617				.000 .276 .579			
Wp-2	1.00 1.00				.000 .003				.000 .004				.000 .000			
Wp-3	1.00				.271				.561				.579			
	Micro FDR				Micro FNR				Micro $F_1$							
Rnk	1.67	2.97	2.77	2.60	2.97	1.70	2.77	2.57	2.63	1.63	3.00	2.73				
Frd	.003725				.004979				.002113							
Wp-1	.009 .000 .028				.000 .926 .926				.002 .532 .657							
Wp-2	.382 .070				.002 .019				.001 .006							
Wp-3	.715				.926				.657							

the proposed method of building a dynamic ensemble does not allow to outperform the static system that optimizes the entire ensemble structure. The obtained results are very promising. We believe that there is still a room for improvement. In our opinion, the performance of the system may be improved if we provide better, a better heuristic that optimises the entire ensemble in a dynamic way. The proposed dynamic classifier is a first step in the process of investigating dynamic classifier chain ensembles.

Another way of improving this idea is to build different classifiers that would be able to change the chain structure without retraining the entire model.

## Acknowledgment

The work was supported by the statutory funds of the Department of Systems and Computer Networks, Wroclaw University of Science and Technology, under agreement 0401/0159/16.

## References

1. Alvares Cherman, E., Metz, J., Monard, M.C.: A simple approach to incorporate label dependency in multi-label classification. In: *Advances in Soft Computing*, pp. 33–43. Springer Berlin Heidelberg (2010). DOI 10.1007/978-3-642-16773-7\_3
2. Chang, C.C., Lin, C.J.: LIBSVM. *ACM Transactions on Intelligent Systems and Technology* **2**(3), 1–27 (2011). DOI 10.1145/1961189.1961199
3. Charte, F., Rivera, A., del Jesus, M.J., Herrera, F.: Concurrence among imbalanced labels and its influence on multilabel resampling algorithms. In: *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pp. 110–121. Springer International Publishing (2014). DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-07617-1\_10
4. Charte, F., Rivera, A.J., del Jesus, M.J., Herrera, F.: Quinta: A question tagging assistant to improve the answering ratio in electronic forums. In: *IEEE EUROCON 2015 - International Conference on Computer as a Tool (EUROCON)*. IEEE (2015). DOI 10.1109/eurocon.2015.7313677
5. Chen, B., Li, W., Zhang, Y., Hu, J.: Enhancing multi-label classification based on local label constraints and classifier chains. In: *2016 International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN)*. IEEE (2016). DOI 10.1109/ijcnn.2016.7727370

6. Cheng, W., Hüllermeier, E., Dembczynski, K.J.: Bayes optimal multilabel classification via probabilistic classifier chains. In: Proceedings of the 27th international conference on machine learning (ICML-10), pp. 279–286 (2010)
7. Cortes, C., Vapnik, V.: Support-vector networks. *Machine Learning* **20**(3), 273–297 (1995). DOI 10.1007/bf00994018
8. Cover, T., Hart, P.: Nearest neighbor pattern classification. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **13**(1), 21–27 (1967). DOI 10.1109/tit.1967.1053964
9. Díez, J., Luaces, O., del Coz, J.J., Bahamonde, A.: Optimizing different loss functions in multilabel classifications. *Progress in Artificial Intelligence* **3**(2), 107–118 (2014). DOI 10.1007/s13748-014-0060-7
10. Demšar, J.: Statistical comparisons of classifiers over multiple data sets. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* **7**, 1–30 (2006)
11. Dhar, M.: On cardinality of fuzzy sets. *International Journal of Intelligent Systems and Applications* **5**(6), 47–52 (2013). DOI 10.5815/ijisa.2013.06.06
12. Friedman, M.: A comparison of alternative tests of significance for the problem of  $m$  rankings. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics* **11**(1), 86–92 (1940). DOI 10.1214/aoms/1177731944
13. García, V., Sánchez, J., Mollineda, R.: On the effectiveness of preprocessing methods when dealing with different levels of class imbalance. *Knowledge-Based Systems* **25**(1), 13–21 (2012). DOI 10.1016/j.knosys.2011.06.013
14. Gibaja, E., Ventura, S.: Multi-label learning: a review of the state of the art and ongoing research. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery* **4**(6), 411–444 (2014). DOI 10.1002/widm.1139
15. Gonçalves, E.C., Plastino, A., Freitas, A.A.: Simpler is better. In: Proceedings of the 2015 on Genetic and Evolutionary Computation Conference - GECCO '15. ACM Press (2015). DOI 10.1145/2739480.2754650
16. Goncalves, E.C., Plastino, A., Freitas, A.A.: A genetic algorithm for optimizing the label ordering in multi-label classifier chains. In: 2013 IEEE 25th International Conference on Tools with Artificial Intelligence. IEEE (2013). DOI 10.1109/ictai.2013.76
17. Hall, M., Frank, E., Holmes, G., Pfahringer, B., Reutemann, P., Witten, I.H.: The weka data mining software. *ACM SIGKDD Explorations Newsletter* **11**(1), 10 (2009). DOI 10.1145/1656274.1656278
18. Hall, M.A.: Correlation-based feature selection for machine learning. Ph.D. thesis, The University of Waikato (1999)
19. Hand, D.J., Yu, K.: Idiot’s bayes: Not so stupid after all? *International Statistical Review / Revue Internationale de Statistique* **69**(3), 385 (2001). DOI 10.2307/1403452
20. Holm, S.: A Simple Sequentially Rejective Multiple Test Procedure. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics* **6**(2), 65–70 (1979). DOI 10.2307/4615733
21. Huang, J., Li, G., Wang, S., Zhang, W., Huang, Q.: Group sensitive classifier chains for multi-label classification. In: 2015 IEEE International Conference on Multimedia and Expo (ICME). IEEE (2015). DOI 10.1109/icme.2015.7177400
22. Jiang, J.Y., Tsai, S.C., Lee, S.J.: Fsknn: Multi-label text categorization based on fuzzy similarity and k nearest neighbors. *Expert Systems with Applications* **39**(3), 2813–2821 (2012). DOI 10.1016/j.eswa.2011.08.141
23. Joachims, T.: Text categorization with suport vector machines: Learning with many relevant features. In: Proc. 10th European Conference on Machine Learning, pp. 137–142 (1998)
24. Liu, X., Shi, Z., Li, Z., Wang, X., Shi, Z.: Sorted label classifier chains for learning images with multi-label. In: Proceedings of the international conference on Multimedia - MM '10. ACM Press (2010). DOI 10.1145/1873951.1874121
25. Luaces, O., Díez, J., Barranquero, J., del Coz, J.J., Bahamonde, A.: Binary relevance efficacy for multilabel classification. *Progress in Artificial Intelligence* **1**(4), 303–313 (2012). DOI 10.1007/s13748-012-0030-x
26. Madjarov, G., Kocev, D., Gjorgjevikj, D., Džeroski, S.: An extensive experimental comparison of methods for multi-label learning. *Pattern Recognition* **45**(9), 3084–3104 (2012). DOI 10.1016/j.patcog.2012.03.004
27. Montañes, E., Senge, R., Barranquero, J., Ramón Quevedo, J., José del Coz, J., Hüllermeier, E.: Dependent binary relevance models for multi-label classification. *Pattern Recognition* **47**(3), 1494–1508 (2014). DOI 10.1016/j.patcog.2013.09.029
28. Quinlan, J.R.: C4.5 : Programs for machine learning. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc., San Francisco, CA, USA (1993)

29. Read, J., Martino, L., Luengo, D.: Efficient monte carlo methods for multi-dimensional learning with classifier chains. *Pattern Recognition* **47**(3), 1535–1546 (2014). DOI 10.1016/j.patcog.2013.10.006
30. Read, J., Peter, R.: Meka:<http://meka.sourceforge.net/> (2017). URL <http://meka.sourceforge.net/>
31. Read, J., Pfahringer, B., Holmes, G., Frank, E.: Classifier chains for multi-label classification. In: *Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*, pp. 254–269. Springer Berlin Heidelberg (2009). DOI 10.1007/978-3-642-04174-7\_17
32. Read, J., Pfahringer, B., Holmes, G., Frank, E.: Classifier chains for multi-label classification. *Machine Learning* **85**(3), 333–359 (2011). DOI 10.1007/s10994-011-5256-5
33. Sanden, C., Zhang, J.Z.: Enhancing multi-label music genre classification through ensemble techniques. In: *Proceedings of the 34th international ACM SIGIR conference on Research and development in Information - SIGIR '11*. ACM Press (2011). DOI 10.1145/2009916.2010011
34. Senge, R., del Coz, J.J., Hüllermeier, E.: On the problem of error propagation in classifier chains for multi-label classification. In: *Studies in Classification, Data Analysis, and Knowledge Organization*, pp. 163–170. Springer International Publishing (2013). DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-01595-8\_18
35. da Silva, P.N., Gonçalves, E.C., Plastino, A., Freitas, A.A.: Distinct chains for different instances: An effective strategy for multi-label classifier chains. In: *Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*, pp. 453–468. Springer Berlin Heidelberg (2014). DOI 10.1007/978-3-662-44851-9\_29
36. Spyromitros-Xioufis, E., Tsoumakas, G., Groves, W., Vlahavas, I.: Multi-target regression via input space expansion: treating targets as inputs. *Machine Learning* **104**(1), 55–98 (2016). DOI 10.1007/s10994-016-5546-z
37. Spyromitros-Xioufis, E., Tsoumakas, G., Groves, W., Vlahavas, I.: Multi-target regression via input space expansion: treating targets as inputs. *Machine Learning* **104**(1), 55–98 (2016). DOI 10.1007/s10994-016-5546-z
38. Tomás, J.T., Spolaór, N., Cherman, E.A., Monard, M.C.: A framework to generate synthetic multi-label datasets. *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science* **302**, 155–176 (2014). DOI 10.1016/j.entcs.2014.01.025
39. Trajdos, P., Kurzynski, M.: Naive bayes classifier for dynamic chaining approach in multi-label learning. *International Journal of Education and Learning Systems* **2**, 133–142 (2017). URL [http://www.iaras.org/iaras/filedownloads/ijels/2017/002-0019\(2017\).pdf](http://www.iaras.org/iaras/filedownloads/ijels/2017/002-0019(2017).pdf)
40. Trajdos, P., Kurzynski, M.: Permutation-based diversity measure for classifier-chain approach. In: *Advances in Intelligent Systems and Computing*, pp. 412–422. Springer International Publishing (2017). DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-59162-9\_43
41. Tsoumakas, G., Katakis, I., Vlahavas, I.: Effective and efficient multilabel classification in domains with large number of labels, p. 30–44 (2008)
42. Wei, Y., Xia, W., Lin, M., Huang, J., Ni, B., Dong, J., Zhao, Y., Yan, S.: Hcp: A flexible cnn framework for multi-label image classification. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* **38**(9), 1901–1907 (2016). DOI 10.1109/tpami.2015.2491929
43. Wilcoxon, F.: Individual comparisons by ranking methods. *Biometrics Bulletin* **1**(6), 80 (1945). DOI 10.2307/3001968
44. Wu, J.S., Huang, S.J., Zhou, Z.H.: Genome-wide protein function prediction through multi-instance multi-label learning. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Computational Biology and Bioinformatics* **11**(5), 891–902 (2014). DOI 10.1109/tcbb.2014.2323058
45. Xu, J.: Fast multi-label core vector machine. *Pattern Recognition* **46**(3), 885–898 (2013). DOI 10.1016/j.patcog.2012.09.003
46. Zadeh, L.: Fuzzy sets. *Information and Control* **8**(3), 338–353 (1965). DOI 10.1016/s0019-9958(65)90241-x
47. Zhang, P., Yang, Y., Zhu, X.: Approaching multi-dimensional classification by using bayesian network chain classifiers. In: *2014 Sixth International Conference on Intelligent Human-Machine Systems and Cybernetics*. IEEE (2014). DOI 10.1109/ihmsc.2014.129
48. Zhou, Z.H., Zhang, M.L., Huang, S.J., Li, Y.F.: Multi-instance multi-label learning. *Artificial Intelligence* **176**(1), 2291–2320 (2012). DOI 10.1016/j.artint.2011.10.002

## A Full results

**Table 5** Base classifier comparison – full results – example based criteria.

No.	Macro FDR								Macro FNR								Macro $F_1$							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	.668	.622	.758	.645	.789	.780	.666	.590	.682	.642	.775	.604	.802	.782	.692	.622	.694	.651	.781	.649	.810	.796	.697	.625
2	.639	.608	.507	.527	.568	.565	.722	.664	.638	.593	.529	.530	.564	.561	.678	.623	.663	.620	.528	.534	.575	.570	.729	.678
3	.386	.402	.384	.418	.367	.389	.394	.402	.408	.429	.411	.423	.400	.413	.422	.438	.410	.432	.411	.433	.398	.414	.424	.433
4	.526	.449	.409	.447	.449	.440	.534	.678	.556	.486	.428	.471	.464	.474	.567	.655	.557	.481	.425	.468	.467	.470	.572	.693
5	.582	.476	.411	.453	.453	.482	.547	.623	.605	.487	.434	.469	.459	.496	.565	.608	.621	.486	.438	.467	.470	.494	.586	.639
6	.351	.365	.330	.333	.368	.373	.342	.343	.335	.337	.322	.310	.264	.265	.324	.302	.376	.382	.359	.350	.353	.352	.365	.354
7	.466	.510	.442	.498	.493	.517	.481	.515	.408	.398	.397	.414	.418	.419	.404	.399	.472	.485	.450	.483	.495	.506	.476	.492
8	.293	.280	.280	.283	.276	.271	.284	.294	.208	.216	.231	.215	.248	.213	.194	.221	.262	.258	.271	.263	.276	.255	.251	.267
9	.210	.216	.196	.198	.194	.204	.195	.190	.210	.216	.198	.200	.196	.207	.198	.192	.211	.217	.198	.200	.196	.207	.197	.192
10	.007	.006	.008	.007	.009	.008	.007	.005	.051	.052	.052	.049	.052	.053	.051	.052	.037	.037	.038	.035	.038	.038	.037	.037
11	.617	.543	.532	.528	.552	.556	.693	.598	.628	.550	.549	.548	.565	.581	.677	.601	.640	.561	.553	.551	.568	.577	.714	.609
12	.507	.538	.527	.512	.574	.524	.668	.626	.554	.546	.575	.527	.597	.571	.662	.628	.551	.562	.565	.532	.597	.565	.691	.646
13	.730	.703	.700	.640	.703	.699	.724	.739	.667	.633	.615	.577	.590	.575	.628	.594	.719	.691	.682	.628	.676	.668	.703	.699
14	.416	.405	.380	.336	.530	.524	.411	.393	.427	.431	.400	.378	.239	.264	.411	.425	.439	.434	.410	.374	.453	.454	.430	.424
15	.838	.785	.836	.746	.812	.716	.834	.751	.794	.690	.794	.683	.793	.731	.785	.680	.841	.769	.839	.739	.827	.756	.833	.743
16	.713	.728	.716	.699	.692	.704	.715	.699	.689	.680	.720	.711	.647	.672	.682	.652	.715	.723	.727	.712	.689	.706	.714	.692
17	.258	.244	.259	.228	.266	.262	.256	.232	.213	.227	.211	.235	.220	.239	.211	.233	.255	.249	.254	.243	.262	.266	.252	.245
18	.522	.498	.446	.411	.469	.488	.472	.470	.516	.511	.447	.440	.387	.388	.472	.489	.537	.521	.465	.443	.459	.471	.491	.494
19	.525	.471	.516	.452	.542	.524	.526	.459	.516	.488	.488	.474	.540	.522	.511	.493	.554	.513	.538	.499	.573	.556	.553	.511
20	.800	.761	.783	.727	.774	.751	.806	.757	.693	.604	.706	.605	.714	.652	.707	.638	.772	.717	.762	.688	.760	.724	.779	.721
21	.703	.664	.606	.610	.648	.627	.742	.749	.701	.686	.630	.644	.652	.671	.642	.712	.725	.687	.630	.639	.666	.663	.748	.762
22	.541	.486	.455	.457	.489	.476	.826	.720	.560	.502	.467	.470	.497	.486	.785	.689	.564	.501	.468	.469	.501	.487	.841	.728
23	.366	.335	.346	.289	.380	.366	.323	.277	.354	.342	.332	.303	.191	.210	.273	.281	.369	.345	.348	.302	.324	.320	.313	.287
24	.261	.232	.165	.117	.200	.198	.190	.166	.485	.471	.433	.414	.404	.398	.438	.440	.428	.408	.361	.331	.361	.358	.373	.365
25	.568	.636	.543	.580	.551	.561	.698	.706	.673	.596	.765	.679	.713	.699	.486	.500	.664	.652	.710	.669	.682	.676	.651	.657
26	.694	.572	.677	.546	.682	.561	.701	.559	.687	.551	.667	.551	.656	.524	.681	.576	.701	.577	.684	.560	.684	.559	.704	.577
27	.578	.553	.562	.555	.591	.577	.562	.570	.575	.559	.575	.581	.590	.570	.575	.582	.596	.576	.586	.585	.609	.594	.586	.595
28	.345	.348	.334	.333	.350	.343	.349	.355	.357	.342	.344	.342	.295	.291	.357	.348	.396	.391	.384	.379	.369	.364	.397	.396
29	.509	.506	.419	.510	.531	.529	.502	.484	.335	.319	.458	.334	.240	.256	.351	.360	.460	.457	.470	.468	.445	.447	.464	.460
30	.456	.389	.392	.398	.422	.405	.436	.515	.281	.340	.299	.310	.288	.303	.309	.313	.406	.390	.375	.383	.389	.384	.409	.460

**Table 6** Base classifier comparison – full results – macro-averaged criteria and Hamming.

No.	Macro FDR								Macro FNR								Macro $F_1$								Hamming							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	.569	.613	.563	.648	.583	.635	.564	.647	.760	.767	.811	.754	.798	.798	.769	.771	.715	.732	.768	.755	.769	.778	.718	.744	.060	.064	.061	.086	.062	.065	.058	.068
2	.797	.879	.804	.909	.835	.901	.807	.856	.804	.857	.894	.919	.896	.926	.729	.817	.822	.883	.875	.918	.880	.924	.784	.853	.168	.168	.124	.113	.135	.124	.214	.199
3	.717	.739	.708	.738	.713	.729	.697	.738	.777	.783	.777	.809	.789	.790	.767	.825	.768	.779	.761	.793	.768	.779	.752	.803	.054	.055	.053	.058	.051	.054	.053	.053
4	.606	.917	.282	.941	.502	.866	.565	.870	.774	.970	.807	.982	.792	.974	.726	.775	.726	.962	.720	.976	.723	.959	.675	.838	.127	.118	.099	.115	.111	.117	.126	.258
5	.724	.981	.520	.975	.584	.980	.682	.856	.764	.985	.812	.981	.796	.983	.701	.829	.758	.984	.757	.979	.753	.983	.697	.852	.156	.122	.117	.121	.130	.123	.155	.228
6	.335	.345	.310	.327	.391	.394	.329	.341	.360	.353	.341	.320	.275	.279	.340	.319	.358	.356	.338	.332	.344	.349	.345	.338	.207	.212	.195	.200	.224	.223	.202	.207
7	.763	.770	.751	.767	.759	.773	.759	.766	.729	.731	.739	.750	.716	.733	.728	.735	.758	.762	.757	.768	.752	.766	.755	.761	.066	.070	.060	.066	.070	.076	.066	.071
8	.320	.342	.342	.357	.338	.308	.326	.347	.280	.295	.312	.327	.339	.300	.264	.307	.324	.332	.345	.362	.358	.325	.312	.344	.248	.244	.255	.250	.248	.239	.240	.253
9	.618	.625	.547	.618	.554	.573	.566	.563	.693	.690	.692	.721	.647	.645	.692	.682	.672	.673	.654	.691	.621	.627	.656	.644	.081	.084	.075	.078	.075	.079	.075	.073
10	.250	.245	.255	.238	.242	.245	.246	.240	.246	.242	.250	.235	.239	.245	.242	.241	.248	.244	.252	.237	.241	.246	.244	.241	.005	.005	.005	.005	.005	.005	.005	.005
11	.847	.873	.831	.859	.844	.864	.829	.821	.818	.844	.853	.857	.870	.894	.745	.885	.847	.872	.852	.865	.864	.892	.805	.868	.152	.137	.126	.120	.126	.122	.206	.145
12	.820	.843	.859	.844	.806	.883	.819	.834	.839	.807	.881	.831	.852	.880	.811	.837	.844	.841	.877	.849	.841	.889	.829	.852	.123	.146	.123	.128	.127	.127	.176	.171
13	.837	.832	.800	.789	.795	.802	.817	.862	.846	.808	.806	.790	.789	.796	.803	.782	.847	.831	.812	.803	.812	.822	.832	.843	.111	.123	.112	.110	.108	.114	.124	.156
14	.291	.304	.275	.268	.502	.488	.323	.287	.447	.455	.425	.404	.269	.290	.439	.449	.383	.393	.361	.346	.445	.443	.389	.382	.169	.175	.162	.158	.305	.293	.178	.170
15	.911	.903	.906	.907	.907	.899	.908	.914	.899	.866	.890	.895	.902	.896	.893	.891	.914	.902	.912	.912	.907	.903	.909	.911	.124	.136	.129	.114	.117	.110	.127	.118
16	.653	.662	.668	.669	.651	.650	.658	.657	.658	.651	.672	.671	.646	.653	.658	.650	.662	.662	.674	.673	.653	.656	.662	.659	.020	.025	.018	.018	.022	.022	.022	.026
17	.382	.380	.381	.380	.383	.388	.383	.384	.360	.366	.358	.375	.361	.372	.360	.377	.377	.378	.375	.382	.378	.384	.377	.385	.012	.012	.012	.011	.013	.012	.012	.011
18	.407	.417	.342	.357	.477	.504	.398	.381	.536	.529	.469	.463	.408	.404	.490	.503	.483	.484	.417	.420	.453	.468	.454	.455	.213	.219	.190	.196	.240	.256	.208	.205
19	.513	.505	.536	.513	.505	.507	.524	.504	.591	.581	.567	.580	.610	.595	.581	.594	.578	.564	.574	.566	.585	.574	.577	.569	.064	.062	.065	.063	.064	.063	.065	.062
20	.849	.848	.814	.805	.835	.819	.816	.849	.784	.749	.811	.759	.834	.773	.806	.782	.837	.819	.821	.802	.843	.812	.832	.834	.151	.172	.128	.151	.122	.138	.145	.161
21	.809	.891	.857	.945	.853	.904	.830	.887	.810	.933	.919	.947	.898	.940	.692	.851	.826	.929	.911	.948	.888	.934	.789	.878	.168	.135	.127	.121	.141	.123	.240	.209
22	.825	.952	.826	.950	.828	.934	.882	.894	.927	.970	.964	.973	.945	.969	.756	.809	.909	.970	.945	.968	.923	.965	.843	.866	.098	.087	.084	.085	.091	.087	.215	.206
23	.185	.182	.172	.173	.346	.332	.249	.207	.356	.343	.335	.311	.202	.220	.280	.289	.286	.275	.268	.253	.290	.287	.272	.256	.092	.090	.088	.085	.129	.122	.100	.090
24	.151	.131	.106	.091	.202	.211	.141	.111	.583	.572	.543	.527	.516	.513	.542	.546	.446	.432	.400	.382	.405	.405	.407	.402	.126	.122	.114	.110	.124	.125	.118	.115
25	.680	.721	.733	.762	.679	.657	.744	.750	.787	.695	.882	.788	.828	.809	.563	.576	.774	.726	.881	.803	.809	.787	.678	.687	.249	.308	.221	.274	.234	.240	.392	.396
26	.516	.505	.522	.469	.535	.517	.523	.502	.633	.588	.620	.594	.609	.566	.621	.619	.598	.570	.591	.558	.589	.557	.596	.585	.048	.051	.049	.046	.052	.051	.052	.048
27	.598	.597	.586	.608	.574	.605	.571	.608	.644	.647	.681	.674	.701	.697	.673	.682	.658	.661	.676	.678	.671	.676	.669	.679	.083	.080	.077	.079	.080	.081	.077	.084
28	.449	.466	.434	.455	.438	.454	.423	.459	.545	.521	.506	.549	.464	.485	.550	.558	.528	.521	.498	.528	.474	.489	.520	.538	.074	.075	.073	.073	.073	.073	.075	.076
29	.532	.533	.491	.533	.534	.526	.534	.522	.374	.356	.531	.374	.285	.287	.393	.406	.473	.463	.543	.475	.458	.452	.477	.475	.365	.368	.307	.378	.400	.395	.367	.353
30	.625	.668	.572	.662	.588	.640	.608	.668	.494	.610	.519	.567	.483	.555	.507	.511	.573	.665	.558	.630	.546	.624	.569	.608	.282	.239	.238	.248	.257	.248	.271	.335

**Table 7** Base classifier comparison – full results – micro-averaged criteria and zero one.

No.	Micro FDR								Micro FNR								Micro $F_1$								Zero one							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	.421	.478	.404	.636	.462	.504	.409	.553	.723	.696	.809	.667	.827	.812	.736	.683	.628	.621	.715	.668	.739	.733	.635	.630	.809	.767	.861	.840	.887	.876	.811	.753
2	.735	.722	.558	.491	.707	.584	.797	.817	.778	.844	.883	.923	.885	.923	.694	.789	.770	.826	.828	.868	.840	.880	.758	.816	.759	.668	.575	.560	.617	.598	.852	.744
3	.463	.487	.484	.551	.454	.500	.458	.479	.668	.682	.688	.741	.695	.706	.686	.745	.605	.617	.614	.680	.613	.636	.615	.663	.529	.544	.522	.532	.510	.516	.539	.523
4	.584	.593	.217	.444	.444	.551	.547	.858	.763	.966	.803	.977	.781	.968	.707	.756	.700	.937	.687	.956	.689	.942	.651	.822	.612	.499	.455	.477	.497	.484	.638	.744
5	.685	.593	.459	.450	.575	.595	.655	.851	.748	.983	.799	.978	.786	.981	.682	.824	.720	.968	.708	.959	.716	.964	.670	.845	.707	.490	.488	.473	.517	.499	.685	.675
6	.327	.340	.307	.326	.381	.380	.323	.340	.342	.337	.325	.304	.262	.264	.320	.302	.335	.339	.317	.316	.327	.328	.322	.322	.734	.735	.703	.683	.733	.725	.705	.714
7	.509	.538	.472	.516	.539	.567	.508	.537	.430	.419	.417	.445	.444	.444	.431	.423	.474	.486	.447	.484	.497	.516	.475	.490	.907	.918	.914	.907	.929	.913	.920	.924
8	.283	.271	.278	.277	.264	.262	.275	.283	.193	.208	.225	.212	.235	.204	.181	.208	.241	.241	.254	.247	.251	.236	.231	.248	.820	.786	.793	.813	.821	.777	.771	.778
9	.592	.606	.555	.568	.546	.578	.552	.524	.727	.705	.741	.758	.646	.642	.740	.732	.683	.677	.679	.700	.606	.616	.676	.660	.218	.227	.204	.209	.204	.216	.204	.198
10	.008	.007	.009	.007	.008	.007	.008	.004	.101	.101	.104	.098	.100	.102	.101	.102	.057	.056	.059	.054	.056	.057	.057	.056	.107	.109	.109	.104	.109	.107	.107	.107
11	.681	.632	.571	.558	.606	.595	.776	.719	.767	.791	.821	.815	.838	.850	.686	.851	.745	.759	.757	.742	.780	.789	.742	.812	.725	.636	.623	.607	.614	.628	.847	.644
12	.483	.543	.445	.482	.539	.494	.697	.714	.769	.742	.822	.769	.822	.824	.753	.776	.686	.705	.738	.691	.749	.753	.739	.761	.655	.665	.655	.614	.664	.657	.812	.743
13	.660	.676	.650	.620	.627	.635	.688	.747	.676	.639	.626	.588	.595	.578	.634	.594	.670	.665	.639	.612	.612	.614	.666	.693	.859	.845	.848	.791	.864	.862	.875	.912
14	.295	.314	.279	.280	.569	.558	.331	.300	.452	.458	.431	.407	.281	.305	.443	.453	.384	.396	.364	.350	.461	.460	.392	.387	.591	.564	.563	.509	.864	.854	.587	.550
15	.827	.809	.838	.757	.807	.761	.827	.766	.803	.717	.805	.713	.797	.749	.794	.707	.816	.772	.823	.737	.803	.756	.812	.740	.985	.988	.986	.979	.975	.950	.986	.982
16	.701	.782	.615	.628	.725	.735	.746	.788	.818	.810	.852	.845	.775	.801	.812	.779	.782	.804	.797	.787	.754	.776	.790	.787	.795	.808	.787	.763	.790	.792	.803	.795
17	.222	.203	.222	.178	.229	.206	.220	.184	.218	.230	.215	.241	.224	.241	.216	.240	.220	.217	.219	.211	.227	.224	.219	.213	.409	.374	.409	.342	.414	.394	.406	.355
18	.409	.426	.357	.376	.485	.511	.405	.391	.544	.536	.474	.468	.418	.416	.498	.510	.486	.488	.423	.427	.454	.469	.456	.458	.689	.662	.619	.589	.706	.728	.645	.617
19	.425	.410	.439	.429	.420	.419	.435	.413	.544	.519	.518	.508	.566	.550	.539	.529	.493	.471	.483	.472	.503	.493	.494	.477	.814	.778	.814	.776	.821	.810	.815	.776
20	.745	.765	.711	.724	.687	.703	.738	.750	.696	.618	.714	.612	.718	.657	.708	.643	.734	.713	.714	.682	.708	.688	.736	.715	.891	.897	.875	.872	.860	.855	.897	.894
21	.687	.670	.508	.534	.704	.546	.786	.827	.774	.904	.903	.926	.878	.916	.624	.797	.773	.864	.852	.874	.836	.865	.728	.818	.833	.729	.687	.683	.722	.706	.925	.844
22	.744	.645	.497	.535	.699	.658	.876	.891	.919	.967	.957	.971	.940	.968	.744	.800	.880	.940	.922	.945	.901	.941	.833	.860	.594	.514	.480	.479	.518	.500	.924	.774
23	.187	.186	.184	.188	.393	.369	.275	.226	.369	.355	.344	.318	.203	.222	.287	.297	.290	.281	.273	.259	.311	.304	.281	.264	.444	.394	.419	.352	.595	.557	.431	.348
24	.159	.138	.113	.096	.217	.227	.148	.114	.582	.570	.542	.525	.514	.510	.542	.545	.442	.427	.396	.378	.401	.401	.404	.399	.726	.712	.683	.662	.719	.726	.697	.684
25	.555	.649	.447	.615	.512	.531	.706	.710	.685	.607	.768	.684	.721	.706	.499	.508	.632	.629	.673	.653	.645	.639	.629	.636	.954	.977	.947	.973	.952	.952	.994	.996
26	.392	.448	.412	.396	.472	.470	.454	.425	.690	.570	.672	.571	.659	.545	.683	.596	.591	.523	.580	.500	.587	.511	.605	.526	.785	.689	.776	.651	.798	.688	.804	.656
27	.552	.524	.504	.524	.538	.538	.505	.561	.628	.614	.649	.627	.671	.654	.641	.623	.596	.577	.593	.585	.617	.607	.588	.598	.741	.723	.716	.720	.737	.724	.720	.743
28	.360	.372	.355	.354	.372	.370	.364	.376	.390	.373	.378	.379	.322	.315	.387	.377	.375	.373	.367	.367	.348	.344	.376	.377	.805	.797	.794	.777	.790	.780	.806	.808
29	.502	.504	.417	.515	.530	.527	.503	.488	.328	.316	.462	.331	.241	.249	.349	.359	.428	.426	.441	.438	.421	.421	.438	.432	.995	.996	.991	.995	.999	1.00	.997	.994
30	.475	.398	.408	.416	.440	.422	.454	.537	.283	.352	.307	.322	.296	.315	.316	.323	.394	.378	.362	.375	.376	.374	.395	.450	.948	.871	.900	.862	.910	.900	.918	.946

**Table 8** Naive Bayes – Full results – micro-averaged criteria.

No.	Micro FDR				Micro FNR				Micro $F_1$			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
1	.523	.578	.636	.519	.926	.822	.923	.934	.873	.751	.873	.884
2	.513	.453	.437	.318	.956	.953	.958	.956	.922	.915	.923	.921
3	.469	.603	.541	.413	.636	.674	.633	.648	.573	.648	.596	.563
4	.462	.437	.409	.143	.845	.825	.848	.846	.761	.734	.760	.741
5	.550	.518	.546	.451	.839	.885	.868	.874	.764	.816	.797	.796
6	.392	.381	.389	.377	.279	.268	.277	.288	.340	.330	.338	.336
7	.742	.755	.777	.700	.511	.454	.517	.520	.663	.662	.695	.632
8	.256	.261	.262	.264	.210	.211	.217	.230	.234	.237	.241	.248
9	.628	.547	.640	.602	.673	.664	.691	.678	.659	.616	.674	.649
10	.215	.071	.469	.127	.443	.046	.419	.425	.351	.060	.450	.308
11	.415	.449	.458	.315	.927	.916	.938	.927	.873	.860	.891	.871
12	.303	.436	.355	.341	.874	.865	.867	.882	.790	.785	.785	.803
13	.586	.593	.592	.579	.639	.604	.620	.641	.615	.599	.607	.613
14	.574	.555	.574	.581	.308	.303	.305	.286	.473	.457	.472	.472
15	.692	.759	.724	.646	.926	.888	.907	.909	.881	.849	.863	.857
16	.971	.976	.984	.973	.654	.542	.511	.673	.947	.954	.969	.951
17	.335	.238	.415	.326	.681	.412	.686	.620	.571	.341	.596	.514
18	.482	.479	.489	.480	.455	.472	.458	.445	.469	.476	.474	.463
19	.334	.425	.340	.310	.728	.532	.728	.747	.614	.484	.615	.629
20	.553	.568	.577	.559	.844	.842	.828	.843	.771	.771	.756	.771
21	.448	.479	.530	.306	.958	.931	.933	.956	.923	.883	.883	.917
22	.641	.553	.522	.477	.954	.963	.960	.968	.919	.932	.927	.939
23	.402	.393	.403	.409	.198	.211	.195	.194	.315	.314	.315	.318
24	.262	.235	.254	.240	.504	.508	.503	.513	.407	.402	.404	.407
25	.410	.445	.421	.418	.781	.754	.773	.778	.681	.659	.674	.679
26	.235	.335	.239	.208	.841	.620	.834	.856	.738	.516	.728	.757
27	.359	.341	.348	.357	.838	.792	.834	.839	.742	.685	.736	.744
28	.389	.406	.390	.361	.316	.306	.312	.325	.355	.360	.354	.344
29	.500	.509	.503	.492	.333	.325	.350	.369	.429	.432	.437	.437
30	.364	.352	.367	.353	.344	.350	.346	.358	.355	.351	.357	.356

**Table 9** Naive Bayes – Full results – Example based criteria, Hamming and zero-one.

No.	Hamming				Zero-One				EX FDR				EX FNR				EX $F_1$			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
1	.064	.068	.068	.064	.936	.871	.936	.945	.902	.790	.902	.912	.910	.794	.907	.921	.912	.807	.911	.922
2	.112	.112	.111	.111	.553	.558	.555	.546	.540	.538	.536	.526	.527	.530	.527	.525	.536	.537	.534	.528
3	.052	.065	.058	.048	.496	.513	.510	.494	.349	.396	.361	.338	.376	.399	.381	.377	.380	.417	.390	.374
4	.113	.111	.110	.101	.480	.473	.475	.432	.435	.433	.434	.415	.425	.416	.420	.421	.438	.431	.433	.422
5	.125	.122	.124	.118	.473	.483	.481	.472	.439	.456	.456	.437	.421	.447	.441	.437	.440	.456	.455	.444
6	.232	.224	.231	.225	.709	.712	.711	.710	.399	.385	.395	.375	.282	.271	.283	.286	.368	.358	.367	.363
7	.123	.137	.141	.106	.871	.879	.867	.871	.495	.496	.513	.467	.482	.436	.487	.491	.546	.525	.560	.531
8	.234	.238	.241	.246	.789	.803	.814	.799	.264	.269	.272	.274	.218	.219	.226	.236	.252	.256	.260	.267
9	.088	.075	.088	.083	.217	.203	.218	.210	.200	.191	.203	.197	.190	.192	.193	.191	.198	.193	.201	.196
10	.028	.006	.045	.024	.560	.063	.554	.538	.514	.022	.523	.497	.511	.030	.494	.493	.518	.031	.521	.499
11	.113	.113	.112	.111	.565	.573	.573	.562	.546	.546	.554	.546	.536	.545	.544	.539	.544	.549	.552	.545
12	.115	.120	.115	.116	.622	.645	.625	.641	.560	.557	.554	.559	.585	.593	.578	.594	.579	.585	.572	.585
13	.097	.100	.099	.096	.839	.842	.846	.836	.704	.690	.699	.704	.632	.601	.615	.635	.690	.670	.681	.690
14	.307	.290	.307	.316	.874	.844	.872	.881	.542	.517	.541	.544	.266	.259	.263	.242	.466	.447	.464	.462
15	.077	.089	.082	.076	.960	.952	.962	.952	.862	.812	.833	.827	.915	.878	.901	.898	.901	.865	.886	.879
16	.196	.303	.481	.201	.838	.838	.985	.950	.795	.786	.943	.900	.549	.463	.570	.680	.787	.777	.932	.890
17	.023	.017	.026	.022	.777	.534	.796	.722	.657	.424	.687	.593	.686	.429	.698	.620	.683	.438	.705	.619
18	.238	.237	.242	.237	.684	.680	.693	.686	.467	.476	.477	.466	.427	.444	.431	.417	.472	.482	.479	.467
19	.063	.064	.063	.062	.844	.798	.848	.851	.644	.509	.644	.659	.701	.503	.702	.720	.695	.540	.696	.711
20	.094	.095	.096	.094	.875	.872	.870	.877	.847	.847	.833	.848	.840	.836	.825	.838	.847	.845	.834	.847
21	.118	.121	.120	.116	.683	.697	.692	.659	.638	.626	.620	.617	.646	.653	.624	.637	.648	.651	.632	.632
22	.087	.085	.085	.084	.482	.476	.486	.476	.463	.457	.468	.457	.467	.464	.474	.467	.471	.465	.475	.466
23	.132	.129	.132	.135	.604	.592	.601	.616	.382	.382	.378	.388	.188	.201	.185	.184	.323	.327	.319	.326
24	.130	.126	.128	.127	.740	.730	.739	.732	.216	.203	.212	.213	.390	.396	.389	.401	.363	.360	.359	.367
25	.216	.220	.216	.217	.952	.942	.952	.951	.553	.512	.546	.547	.782	.753	.773	.778	.724	.693	.716	.719
26	.048	.044	.048	.048	.855	.662	.849	.870	.818	.579	.811	.834	.833	.597	.825	.849	.829	.597	.822	.845
27	.070	.068	.070	.070	.724	.701	.724	.722	.637	.604	.641	.636	.667	.630	.667	.666	.662	.628	.663	.660
28	.076	.079	.076	.071	.772	.777	.769	.772	.341	.354	.342	.330	.292	.284	.290	.300	.365	.368	.364	.360
29	.363	.372	.365	.355	.998	1.000	.998	.999	.505	.512	.508	.497	.330	.323	.349	.365	.454	.458	.463	.462
30	.218	.213	.220	.214	.839	.835	.837	.837	.353	.345	.358	.344	.334	.342	.336	.347	.370	.369	.373	.373

**Table 10** Naive Bayes – Full results – Macro averaged criteria.

No.	Macro FDR				Macro FNR				Macro $F_1$			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
1	.650	.667	.715	.683	.904	.849	.929	.936	.886	.832	.914	.916
2	.905	.917	.922	.883	.948	.945	.952	.952	.941	.939	.943	.937
3	.629	.705	.661	.587	.716	.753	.710	.709	.702	.749	.707	.682
4	.577	.525	.569	.440	.861	.840	.865	.862	.804	.781	.807	.798
5	.645	.664	.696	.596	.843	.888	.871	.878	.794	.843	.829	.824
6	.406	.391	.403	.393	.292	.282	.289	.302	.366	.352	.361	.364
7	.860	.874	.882	.861	.766	.729	.762	.808	.855	.851	.870	.866
8	.296	.302	.298	.310	.302	.304	.306	.326	.318	.322	.323	.339
9	.728	.534	.750	.689	.689	.629	.728	.707	.739	.601	.765	.717
10	.285	.172	.591	.308	.353	.139	.502	.380	.351	.162	.579	.376
11	.885	.875	.902	.877	.926	.922	.936	.926	.917	.909	.928	.912
12	.831	.855	.848	.858	.908	.907	.904	.918	.888	.892	.889	.900
13	.765	.759	.758	.761	.827	.814	.818	.827	.824	.814	.820	.826
14	.491	.483	.495	.499	.292	.288	.288	.272	.454	.440	.453	.452
15	.920	.908	.903	.909	.979	.954	.962	.973	.972	.949	.958	.968
16	.929	.977	.985	.977	.768	.719	.700	.836	.913	.961	.972	.962
17	.508	.475	.591	.479	.544	.500	.616	.521	.533	.496	.608	.511
18	.469	.460	.482	.463	.441	.459	.443	.431	.475	.476	.483	.467
19	.442	.518	.445	.434	.783	.580	.783	.804	.717	.566	.718	.736
20	.816	.803	.824	.821	.905	.901	.896	.901	.884	.877	.878	.880
21	.895	.913	.933	.916	.965	.951	.941	.963	.951	.945	.942	.955
22	.772	.807	.792	.824	.955	.963	.959	.968	.930	.948	.947	.957
23	.346	.343	.347	.352	.198	.211	.195	.194	.290	.292	.289	.292
24	.245	.219	.239	.225	.508	.511	.507	.518	.415	.406	.410	.415
25	.781	.710	.724	.785	.894	.876	.887	.893	.894	.878	.885	.895
26	.473	.475	.491	.472	.777	.652	.778	.782	.733	.613	.733	.740
27	.683	.568	.629	.671	.898	.837	.890	.897	.853	.783	.840	.850
28	.511	.527	.514	.447	.462	.453	.448	.486	.505	.510	.502	.487
29	.497	.513	.495	.490	.380	.367	.394	.422	.479	.478	.488	.505
30	.544	.537	.554	.530	.570	.588	.575	.581	.580	.595	.587	.583

**Table 11** Nearest Neighbours – Full results – micro-averaged criteria.

No.	Micro FDR				Micro FNR				Micro $F_1$			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
1	.387	.308	.535	.520	.760	.757	.742	.715	.656	.640	.668	.643
2	.467	.856	.500	.442	.985	.937	.983	.977	.971	.913	.968	.955
3	.203	.256	.173	.218	.815	.819	.825	.810	.702	.710	.715	.697
4	.405	.867	.450	.497	.985	.904	.986	.987	.972	.889	.973	.975
5	.403	.851	.472	.484	.980	.900	.983	.983	.961	.881	.967	.967
6	.314	.340	.322	.322	.301	.306	.302	.295	.308	.324	.313	.309
7	.416	.394	.415	.387	.514	.514	.560	.610	.470	.461	.498	.523
8	.259	.281	.271	.273	.226	.215	.208	.191	.243	.250	.242	.235
9	.444	.548	.501	.486	.862	.758	.875	.862	.787	.686	.806	.789
10	.004	.003	.003	.004	.191	.111	.180	.206	.108	.060	.100	.117
11	.337	.689	.440	.443	.967	.900	.964	.961	.939	.851	.934	.930
12	.264	.585	.280	.390	.906	.861	.897	.905	.836	.803	.822	.840
13	.525	.546	.549	.546	.770	.788	.780	.776	.691	.711	.704	.701
14	.309	.312	.353	.323	.463	.437	.474	.461	.396	.381	.420	.400
15	.665	.631	.703	.641	.945	.860	.869	.882	.907	.798	.818	.824
16	.679	.641	.700	.650	.852	.849	.842	.858	.799	.790	.794	.799
17	.189	.187	.197	.195	.240	.239	.272	.262	.215	.214	.237	.230
18	.368	.392	.416	.375	.564	.519	.571	.568	.484	.463	.505	.490
19	.359	.368	.436	.440	.567	.557	.564	.560	.483	.479	.508	.507
20	.543	.610	.518	.545	.879	.871	.839	.818	.810	.808	.760	.741
21	.417	.826	.373	.391	.962	.922	.950	.947	.930	.898	.908	.903
22	.479	.880	.534	.542	.978	.925	.979	.978	.958	.908	.959	.957
23	.231	.239	.266	.272	.309	.291	.310	.320	.272	.266	.289	.296
24	.160	.191	.178	.180	.541	.540	.539	.546	.407	.414	.410	.416
25	.483	.516	.500	.476	.774	.756	.768	.772	.685	.676	.684	.683
26	.347	.320	.520	.574	.665	.639	.644	.658	.561	.529	.592	.621
27	.350	.356	.364	.340	.737	.712	.735	.770	.627	.603	.627	.660
28	.319	.327	.323	.335	.435	.409	.427	.401	.383	.371	.380	.370
29	.431	.439	.433	.424	.449	.436	.472	.468	.440	.438	.454	.447
30	.343	.390	.381	.372	.452	.455	.420	.381	.403	.425	.402	.376

**Table 12** Nearest Neighbours – Full results – Example based, Hamming and zero-one criteria.

No.	Hamming				Zero-One				EX FDR				EX FNR				EX $F_1$			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
1	.058	.055	.066	.065	.777	.763	.756	.732	.658	.648	.630	.591	.715	.703	.685	.654	.700	.689	.672	.639
2	.112	.152	.113	.112	.563	.597	.560	.560	.553	.563	.553	.548	.558	.559	.557	.554	.556	.572	.555	.552
3	.046	.047	.046	.046	.498	.496	.495	.501	.392	.397	.398	.391	.446	.447	.449	.447	.431	.434	.435	.432
4	.115	.175	.115	.115	.473	.596	.475	.477	.459	.565	.461	.465	.469	.568	.471	.473	.467	.576	.469	.472
5	.120	.181	.121	.121	.472	.569	.470	.471	.454	.540	.460	.461	.469	.538	.468	.469	.467	.551	.467	.468
6	.194	.208	.198	.197	.662	.712	.704	.675	.321	.341	.316	.329	.302	.307	.299	.296	.340	.356	.341	.341
7	.055	.053	.056	.055	.978	.876	.905	.887	.445	.402	.430	.393	.552	.483	.544	.564	.525	.472	.518	.517
8	.242	.254	.245	.241	.790	.784	.801	.790	.268	.295	.285	.280	.228	.227	.215	.195	.258	.271	.260	.250
9	.069	.073	.070	.069	.192	.200	.194	.192	.184	.191	.187	.184	.186	.194	.189	.185	.186	.193	.189	.186
10	.009	.005	.008	.010	.153	.109	.151	.156	.022	.004	.026	.026	.092	.055	.087	.098	.071	.039	.068	.078
11	.112	.128	.113	.114	.567	.599	.573	.578	.554	.553	.561	.560	.557	.570	.565	.566	.557	.567	.564	.565
12	.117	.134	.117	.121	.638	.671	.628	.641	.544	.575	.526	.556	.592	.622	.581	.602	.578	.609	.565	.588
13	.087	.088	.089	.088	.825	.835	.830	.825	.750	.769	.757	.757	.767	.784	.778	.772	.766	.783	.775	.771
14	.174	.171	.188	.178	.544	.549	.569	.548	.385	.385	.401	.387	.429	.408	.444	.430	.422	.413	.439	.424
15	.076	.078	.084	.077	.974	.933	.939	.942	.894	.745	.756	.774	.939	.846	.855	.867	.927	.819	.828	.842
16	.018	.018	.019	.018	.762	.763	.774	.772	.701	.700	.703	.711	.717	.714	.705	.722	.716	.714	.713	.724
17	.012	.012	.013	.012	.361	.353	.372	.378	.237	.232	.256	.264	.235	.231	.266	.264	.248	.244	.272	.275
18	.203	.205	.217	.205	.629	.632	.639	.637	.486	.477	.503	.489	.537	.500	.545	.545	.524	.504	.537	.530
19	.059	.059	.065	.066	.762	.766	.766	.772	.462	.462	.463	.465	.528	.520	.526	.523	.527	.523	.527	.527
20	.092	.096	.092	.093	.890	.875	.847	.834	.870	.864	.829	.808	.878	.865	.834	.816	.876	.866	.833	.814
21	.118	.162	.117	.117	.671	.720	.659	.666	.638	.677	.614	.617	.657	.684	.640	.643	.652	.693	.632	.635
22	.084	.125	.085	.085	.474	.547	.482	.480	.454	.523	.462	.460	.468	.525	.475	.473	.466	.532	.473	.471
23	.092	.092	.100	.103	.349	.353	.367	.375	.280	.278	.297	.309	.292	.276	.295	.305	.293	.286	.304	.315
24	.120	.124	.122	.123	.693	.711	.703	.706	.182	.196	.193	.202	.432	.436	.433	.442	.368	.377	.374	.381
25	.227	.235	.231	.226	.954	.953	.947	.955	.601	.593	.600	.593	.772	.750	.762	.766	.730	.716	.724	.725
26	.046	.043	.055	.060	.693	.666	.687	.737	.615	.590	.598	.628	.647	.617	.626	.648	.638	.611	.621	.649
27	.067	.066	.067	.067	.682	.673	.680	.696	.547	.532	.547	.576	.612	.596	.609	.633	.593	.578	.591	.617
28	.071	.070	.071	.071	.778	.775	.775	.774	.324	.321	.319	.324	.404	.377	.395	.367	.408	.392	.401	.387
29	.314	.318	.317	.312	.985	.990	.993	.993	.424	.436	.434	.427	.446	.435	.464	.459	.467	.469	.481	.476
30	.224	.243	.236	.226	.857	.894	.869	.848	.337	.384	.379	.368	.456	.449	.416	.370	.427	.448	.419	.389

**Table 13** Nearest Neighbours – Full results – Macro-averaged criteria.

No.	Macro FDR				Macro FNR				Macro $F_1$			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
1	.565	.550	.692	.579	.823	.822	.823	.803	.772	.768	.791	.766
2	.958	.907	.956	.956	.985	.945	.984	.978	.979	.934	.977	.971
3	.736	.723	.730	.726	.871	.871	.876	.867	.838	.835	.842	.833
4	.972	.873	.973	.976	.987	.914	.988	.989	.983	.900	.983	.985
5	.973	.858	.976	.977	.982	.903	.985	.985	.979	.887	.982	.982
6	.308	.344	.325	.314	.321	.324	.322	.315	.327	.343	.334	.325
7	.746	.748	.744	.744	.789	.787	.792	.796	.783	.782	.781	.792
8	.373	.343	.375	.373	.361	.319	.332	.313	.386	.348	.370	.364
9	.593	.566	.627	.595	.761	.699	.773	.761	.728	.660	.744	.728
10	.324	.254	.317	.358	.344	.258	.333	.359	.338	.256	.328	.359
11	.898	.829	.915	.906	.971	.928	.972	.967	.958	.906	.960	.954
12	.893	.840	.898	.922	.947	.910	.945	.950	.933	.895	.934	.945
13	.766	.782	.805	.785	.913	.918	.916	.916	.894	.900	.899	.900
14	.301	.300	.340	.314	.461	.434	.469	.459	.394	.377	.417	.398
15	.940	.930	.941	.956	.976	.961	.958	.966	.974	.960	.956	.967
16	.649	.649	.649	.652	.671	.671	.667	.673	.669	.668	.668	.670
17	.393	.387	.395	.396	.378	.375	.389	.382	.390	.385	.397	.394
18	.368	.385	.410	.380	.556	.511	.560	.552	.487	.460	.510	.505
19	.479	.471	.549	.499	.625	.616	.623	.616	.582	.574	.601	.590
20	.849	.829	.835	.821	.943	.932	.928	.916	.924	.911	.908	.897
21	.939	.892	.938	.944	.972	.942	.963	.960	.964	.930	.956	.955
22	.961	.877	.961	.964	.981	.929	.981	.980	.975	.913	.976	.975
23	.206	.217	.240	.246	.299	.283	.302	.310	.265	.258	.281	.288
24	.157	.183	.176	.179	.543	.541	.541	.548	.411	.417	.414	.421
25	.709	.716	.691	.680	.872	.857	.865	.870	.856	.840	.850	.853
26	.474	.467	.574	.476	.659	.650	.650	.657	.615	.608	.633	.631
27	.571	.516	.621	.626	.790	.758	.788	.818	.750	.715	.752	.780
28	.422	.414	.410	.415	.639	.607	.632	.606	.592	.563	.579	.561
29	.480	.480	.483	.477	.513	.497	.538	.532	.512	.501	.531	.525
30	.624	.640	.645	.691	.683	.676	.669	.643	.690	.670	.697	.692