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| SBFL ranking metric | $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{\lambda}\left(\Omega_{f}\right)$ |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \text { max } \\ \text { improv. } \end{gathered}$ | $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{\lambda}^{*}\left(\Omega_{f}\right)$ |  |  |  | max improv. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\lambda=1$ | $\lambda=0.7$ | $\lambda=0.5$ | $\lambda=0.3$ |  | $\lambda=1$ | $\lambda=0.7$ | $\lambda=0.5$ | $\lambda=0.3$ |  |
| Ample | 900.6 | 819.5 | 807.8 | 804.9 | 10.6\% | 504.3 | 252.0 | 216.4 | 200.4 | 60.3\% |
| Anderberg | 750.9 | 689.5 | 694.3 | 714.1 | 8.2\% | 238.9 | 180.3 | 171.5 | 170.0 | 28.9\% |
| Arithmetic Mean | 703.6 | 666.2 | 678.8 | 704.4 | 5.3\% | 238.7 | 178.7 | 169.6 | 168.5 | 29.4\% |
| Cohen | 746.1 | 688.4 | 693.7 | 713.9 | 7.7\% | 239.0 | 180.1 | 171.2 | 169.9 | 28.9\% |
| Dice | 750.5 | 689.2 | 694.2 | 714.1 | 8.2\% | 239.0 | 180.3 | 171.5 | 170.0 | 28.9\% |
| Euclid | 699.6 | 670.2 | 687.9 | 718.0 | 4.2\% | 246.3 | 179.4 | 170.9 | 171.8 | 30.6\% |
| Fleiss | 698.6 | 667.9 | 686.5 | 718.5 | 4.4\% | 273.8 | 189.8 | 177.9 | 174.1 | 36.4\% |
| Geometric Mean | 701.1 | 665.7 | 679.6 | 705.7 | 5.1\% | 236.9 | 180.4 | 172.4 | 170.8 | 27.9\% |
| Goodman | 750.4 | 689.3 | 694.3 | 714.1 | 8.1\% | 238.8 | 180.1 | 171.3 | 169.9 | 28.8\% |
| GP13 | 1019.1 | 902.1 | 878.6 | 860.5 | 15.6\% | 538.0 | 260.6 | 224.3 | 201.2 | 62.6\% |
| Hamann | 699.6 | 670.2 | 687.9 | 718.0 | 4.2\% | 246.3 | 179.4 | 170.9 | 171.8 | 30.6\% |
| Hamming etc. | 699.6 | 670.2 | 687.9 | 718.0 | 4.2\% | 246.3 | 179.4 | 170.9 | 171.8 | 30.6\% |
| Harmonic Mean | 699.4 | 665.1 | 679.2 | 705.3 | 4.9\% | 243.7 | 186.5 | 179.6 | 174.7 | 28.3\% |
| Jaccard | 750.7 | 689.4 | 694.3 | 714.1 | 8.2\% | 239.0 | 180.3 | 171.5 | 170.0 | 28.9\% |
| Kulczynski1 | 750.8 | 689.3 | 694.3 | 714.1 | 8.2\% | 239.0 | 180.3 | 171.5 | 170.0 | 28.9\% |
| Kulczynski2 | 969.5 | 858.5 | 837.9 | 823.9 | 15.0\% | 392.4 | 218.4 | 194.9 | 181.4 | 53.8\% |
| M1 | 699.6 | 670.2 | 687.9 | 718.0 | 4.2\% | 246.3 | 179.4 | 170.9 | 171.8 | 30.6\% |
| M2 | 975.6 | 861.6 | 839.2 | 825.9 | 15.3\% | 482.6 | 241.9 | 212.1 | 194.9 | 59.6\% |
| Ochiai | 816.2 | 736.6 | 731.0 | 739.5 | 10.4\% | 252.5 | 183.6 | 174.9 | 172.5 | 31.7\% |
| Ochiai2 | 704.2 | 667.1 | 680.5 | 706.4 | 5.3\% | 236.1 | 180.1 | 172.4 | 170.7 | 27.7\% |
| Naish2 (Op2) | 1018.9 | 902.6 | 879.3 | 861.4 | 15.5\% | 537.5 | 261.5 | 226.3 | 202.3 | 62.4\% |
| Overlap | 1096.8 | 972.1 | 961.0 | 951.3 | 13.3\% | 720.8 | 255.6 | 242.6 | 236.1 | 67.2\% |
| Rogers \& Tanimoto | 699.6 | 670.2 | 687.9 | 718.0 | 4.2\% | 246.3 | 179.4 | 170.9 | 171.8 | 30.6\% |
| Rogot1 | 690.1 | 657.1 | 673.9 | 703.9 | 4.8\% | 249.6 | 178.6 | 169.6 | 168.4 | 32.5\% |
| Rogot2 | 699.2 | 665.0 | 679.2 | 705.3 | 4.9\% | 243.7 | 186.5 | 179.6 | 174.7 | 28.3\% |
| Russell d̛ Rao | 1187.1 | 1022.5 | 1002.0 | 982.2 | 17.3\% | 854.2 | 293.2 | 264.8 | 248.3 | 70.9\% |
| Scott | 690.1 | 657.1 | 673.9 | 703.9 | 4.8\% | 249.6 | 178.6 | 169.6 | 168.4 | 32.5\% |
| Simple Matching | 699.6 | 670.2 | 687.9 | 718.0 | 4.2\% | 246.3 | 179.4 | 170.9 | 171.8 | 30.6\% |
| Sokal | 699.6 | 670.2 | 687.9 | 718.0 | 4.2\% | 246.3 | 179.4 | 170.9 | 171.8 | 30.6\% |
| Sørensen-Dice | 750.8 | 689.4 | 694.3 | 714.1 | 8.2\% | 239.0 | 180.3 | 171.5 | 170.0 | 28.9\% |
| Tarantula | 724.1 | 676.5 | 685.0 | 708.8 | 6.6\% | 227.4 | 177.6 | 168.7 | 168.9 | 25.8\% |
| Wong1 | 1187.1 | 1022.5 | 1002.0 | 982.2 | 17.3\% | 854.2 | 293.2 | 264.8 | 248.3 | 70.9\% |
| Wong 3 | 800.6 | 752.9 | 758.1 | 769.4 | 6.0\% | 307.4 | 212.7 | 197.2 | 187.5 | 39.0\% |
| Wong2 | 699.6 | 670.2 | 687.9 | 718.0 | 4.2\% | 246.3 | 179.4 | 170.9 | 171.8 | 30.6\% |
| Zoltar | 877.4 | 783.6 | 773.3 | 774.2 | 11.9\% | 330.1 | 197.5 | 183.8 | 173.2 | 47.5\% |

Table 1: Overview of all examined SBFL metrics with $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{\lambda}\left(\Omega_{f}\right)$ and $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{\lambda}^{*}\left(\Omega_{f}\right)$ For $\lambda \in\{1.0,0.7,0.5,0.3\}$ and the maximum improvements for the highest values with regard to $\lambda=1$. Highest rankings are printed with a bold font for each set of values.

Can Statistical Language Models be used to improve Spectrum Based Fault Localization Rankings?
(Reduced Spectra - Additional Material)
ISSTA, 2017, Santa Barbara

| SBFL ranking metric | $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\lambda}\left(\Omega_{f}\right)$ |  |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \max \\ \text { improv. } \end{gathered}$ | $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\lambda}^{*}\left(\Omega_{f}\right)$ |  |  |  | max improv. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $\lambda=1$ | $\lambda=0.7$ | $\lambda=0.5$ | $\lambda=0.3$ |  | $\lambda=1$ | $\lambda=0.7$ | $\lambda=0.5$ | $\lambda=0.3$ |  |
| Ample | 218.0 | 230.0 | 224.0 | 232.0 | 0.0\% | 33.0 | 15.0 | 16.0 | 19.0 | 54.5\% |
| Anderberg | 200.0 | 215.0 | 213.0 | 222.0 | 0.0\% | 25.0 | 13.0 | 14.0 | 17.0 | 48.0\% |
| Arithmetic Mean | 218.0 | 228.0 | 222.0 | 226.5 | 0.0\% | 25.0 | 13.0 | 14.0 | 17.0 | 48.0\% |
| Cohen | 200.5 | 222.0 | 219.0 | 224.0 | 0.0\% | 25.0 | 13.0 | 14.0 | 17.0 | 48.0\% |
| Dice | 200.0 | 215.0 | 213.0 | 222.0 | 0.0\% | 25.0 | 13.0 | 14.0 | 17.0 | 48.0\% |
| Euclid | 200.0 | 213.5 | 215.5 | 218.0 | 0.0\% | 27.0 | 14.0 | 15.0 | 17.0 | 48.1\% |
| Fleiss | 201.0 | 222.0 | 222.0 | 235.0 | 0.0\% | 32.0 | 13.0 | 14.0 | 17.0 | 59.4\% |
| Geometric Mean | 220.0 | 228.0 | 223.5 | 229.0 | 0.0\% | 26.0 | 12.0 | 13.0 | 17.0 | 53.8\% |
| Goodman | 200.0 | 215.0 | 213.0 | 222.0 | 0.0\% | 25.0 | 13.0 | 14.0 | 17.0 | 48.0\% |
| GP13 | 259.0 | 234.0 | 229.0 | 232.5 | 11.6\% | 31.0 | 14.0 | 16.0 | 19.0 | 54.8\% |
| Hamann | 200.0 | 213.5 | 215.5 | 218.0 | 0.0\% | 27.0 | 14.0 | 15.0 | 17.0 | 48.1\% |
| Hamming etc. | 200.0 | 213.5 | 215.5 | 218.0 | 0.0\% | 27.0 | 14.0 | 15.0 | 17.0 | 48.1\% |
| Harmonic Mean | 215.0 | 219.0 | 215.0 | 220.0 | 0.0\% | 26.0 | 12.0 | 14.0 | 17.0 | 53.8\% |
| Jaccard | 200.0 | 215.0 | 213.0 | 222.0 | 0.0\% | 25.0 | 13.0 | 14.0 | 17.0 | 48.0\% |
| Kulczynski1 | 200.0 | 215.0 | 213.0 | 222.0 | 0.0\% | 25.0 | 13.0 | 14.0 | 17.0 | 48.0\% |
| Kulczynski2 | 239.0 | 232.0 | 226.0 | 230.5 | 5.4\% | 24.0 | 12.0 | 13.0 | 17.0 | 50.0\% |
| M1 | 200.0 | 213.5 | 215.5 | 218.0 | 0.0\% | 27.0 | 14.0 | 15.0 | 17.0 | 48.1\% |
| M2 | 235.0 | 227.0 | 220.5 | 226.0 | 6.2\% | 32.0 | 14.0 | 17.0 | 19.0 | 56.3\% |
| Ochiai | 200.0 | 222.5 | 221.0 | 229.5 | 0.0\% | 26.0 | 12.0 | 14.0 | 17.0 | 53.8\% |
| Ochiai2 | 210.0 | 220.5 | 219.0 | 225.0 | 0.0\% | 26.0 | 12.0 | 13.0 | 17.0 | 53.8\% |
| NAISH2 (Op2) | 259.0 | 234.0 | 229.0 | 233.0 | 11.6\% | 31.0 | 14.0 | 16.0 | 19.0 | 54.8\% |
| Overlap | 584.0 | 302.0 | 283.0 | 279.0 | 52.2\% | 142.0 | 24.0 | 26.0 | 27.0 | 83.1\% |
| Rogers \&f Tanimoto | 200.0 | 213.5 | 215.5 | 218.0 | 0.0\% | 27.0 | 14.0 | 15.0 | 17.0 | 48.1\% |
| Rogot1 | 200.0 | 217.0 | 216.0 | 222.0 | 0.0\% | 26.0 | 13.0 | 14.0 | 17.0 | 50.0\% |
| Rogot2 | 215.0 | 219.0 | 215.0 | 220.0 | 0.0\% | 26.0 | 12.0 | 14.0 | 17.0 | 53.8\% |
| Russell \& RaO | 465.0 | 311.0 | 289.5 | 283.0 | 39.1\% | 190.0 | 29.0 | 28.0 | 28.0 | 85.3\% |
| Scott | 200.0 | 217.0 | 216.0 | 222.0 | 0.0\% | 26.0 | 13.0 | 14.0 | 17.0 | 50.0\% |
| Simple Matching | 200.0 | 213.5 | 215.5 | 218.0 | 0.0\% | 27.0 | 14.0 | 15.0 | 17.0 | 48.1\% |
| Sokal | 200.0 | 213.5 | 215.5 | 218.0 | 0.0\% | 27.0 | 14.0 | 15.0 | 17.0 | 48.1\% |
| Sørensen-Dice | 200.0 | 215.0 | 213.0 | 222.0 | 0.0\% | 25.0 | 13.0 | 14.0 | 17.0 | 48.0\% |
| Tarantula | 200.0 | 216.5 | 215.5 | 223.0 | 0.0\% | 27.0 | 13.0 | 14.0 | 19.0 | 51.9\% |
| Wong1 | 465.0 | 311.0 | 289.5 | 283.0 | 39.1\% | 190.0 | 29.0 | 28.0 | 28.0 | 85.3\% |
| Wong 3 | 200.0 | 224.0 | 214.0 | 224.0 | 0.0\% | 33.0 | 15.0 | 14.0 | 17.0 | 57.6\% |
| Wong2 | 200.0 | 213.5 | 215.5 | 218.0 | 0.0\% | 27.0 | 14.0 | 15.0 | 17.0 | 48.1\% |
| Zoltar | 215.0 | 231.5 | 228.0 | 230.0 | 0.0\% | 25.0 | 14.0 | 14.0 | 17.0 | 44.0\% |

Table 2: Overview of all examined SBFL metrics with $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\lambda}\left(\Omega_{f}\right)$ and $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\lambda}^{*}\left(\Omega_{f}\right)$ for $\lambda \in\{1.0,0.7,0.5,0.3\}$ and the maximum improvements FOR THE HIGHEST VALUES WITH REGARD to $\lambda=1$. Highest rankings are printed with a bold font for each set of values.

| SBFL ranking metric | $\widetilde{\lambda_{p}},\left(\overline{\lambda_{p}}\right),[\min , \max ]$ | $\widetilde{R I}_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}}^{S B F L},\left(\overline{R I}_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}}^{S B F L}\right),[$ min, max] | $\widetilde{\widetilde{R I}}_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}}^{L M},\left(\overline{R I}_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}}^{L M}\right),[\mathrm{min}, \mathrm{max}]$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ample | 0.34, (0.33), [0.2,0.44] | 7.0\%, (-2.1\%), [-62.1\%,33.8\%] | 13.4\%, (15.0\%), [-16.0\%,57.7\%] |
| Anderberg | 0.67, (0.67), [0.6,0.74] | 7.6\%, (4.0\%), [-23.9\%,31.8\%] | 23.8\%, (27.8\%), [-16.9\%,73.8\%] |
| Arithmetic Mean | 0.82, (0.81), [0.7,0.86] | 2.1\%, (5.4\%), [-8.9\%,27.6\%] | 25.7\%, (28.8\%), [-21.2\%,77.0\%] |
| Cohen | 0.66, (0.67), [0.62,0.76] | 6.4\%, (4.4\%), [-22.8\%,31.0\%] | 24.7\%, (28.1\%), [-17.5\%,74.1\%] |
| Dice | 0.67, (0.67), [0.6,0.74] | 7.6\%, (4.1\%), [-22.1\%,31.8\%] | 23.8\%, (27.9\%), [-16.9\%,74.2\%] |
| Euclid | 0.85, (0.84), [0.76,0.9] | 2.8\%, (5.3\%), [-8.8\%,26.7\%] | 27.4\%, (27.7\%), [-24.5\%,66.0\%] |
| Fleiss | 0.85, (0.84), [0.76,0.88] | 3.0\%, (5.3\%), [-8.0\%,25.3\%] | 28.2\%, (28.1\%), [-24.2\%,74.6\%] |
| Geometric Mean | 0.84, (0.83), [0.7,0.88] | 2.8\%, (5.6\%), [-5.2\%,26.1\%] | 27.8\%, (29.1\%), [-16.8\%,77.1\%] |
| Goodman | 0.67, (0.67), [0.6,0.74] | 7.6\%, (3.9\%), [-23.9\%,31.8\%] | 23.8\%, (27.9\%), [-16.9\%,73.8\%] |
| GP13 | 0.14, (0.15), [0.08,0.26] | 17.2\%, (4.3\%), [-84.2\%,41.0\%] | 9.2\%, (9.1\%), [-17.4\%,39.8\%] |
| Hamann | 0.85, (0.84), [0.76,0.9] | 2.8\%, (5.3\%), [-8.8\%,26.7\%] | 27.4\%, (27.7\%), [-24.5\%,66.0\%] |
| Hamming etc. | 0.85, (0.84), [0.76,0.9] | 2.8\%, (5.3\%), [-8.8\%,26.7\%] | 27.4\%, (27.7\%), [-24.5\%,66.0\%] |
| Harmonic Mean | 0.84, (0.85), [0.8,0.92] | 2.3\%, (5.1\%), [-4.9\%,23.1\%] | 32.8\%, (29.7\%), [-3.6\%,76.6\%] |
| Jaccard | 0.67, (0.67), [0.6,0.74] | 7.6\%, (3.9\%), [-23.9\%,31.8\%] | 23.8\%, (27.8\%), [-16.9\%,73.8\%] |
| Kulczynski1 | 0.67, (0.67), [0.6,0.74] | 7.7\%, (4.1\%), [-22.1\%,31.8\%] | 23.8\%, (27.9\%), [-16.9\%,74.2\%] |
| Kulczynski2 | 0.22, (0.22), [0.1,0.4] | 12.7\%, (2.3\%), [-90.7\%,38.2\%] | 9.9\%, (11.6\%), [-19.0\%,42.5\%] |
| M1 | 0.85, (0.84), [0.76,0.9] | 2.8\%, (5.3\%), [-8.8\%,26.7\%] | 27.4\%, (27.7\%), [-24.5\%,66.0\%] |
| M2 | 0.24, (0.23), [0.14,0.4] | 14.9\%, (4.5\%), [-72.1\%,39.6\%] | 10.5\%, (12.1\%), [-19.9\%,48.4\%] |
| Ochiai | 0.5, (0.52), [0.42,0.64] | 5.8\%, (1.5\%), [-35.6\%,35.6\%] | 19.1\%, (23.7\%), [-15.1\%,69.1\%] |
| Ochiai2 | 0.84, (0.83), [0.7,0.86] | 3.1\%, (5.4\%), [-6.6\%,26.5\%] | 29.8\%, (29.3\%), [-18.1\%,76.8\%] |
| Naish2 (Op2) | 0.14, (0.15), [0.08,0.26] | 17.0\%, (4.1\%), [-84.4\%,40.9\%] | 9.2\%, (9.1\%), [-17.6\%,39.7\%] |
| Overlap | 0.0, (0.03), [0.0,0.24] | 16.0\%, (12.7\%), [-18.1\%,31.9\%] | 0.0\%, (-1.1\%), [-9.6\%,0.0\%] |
| Rogers \& Tanimoto | 0.85, (0.84), [0.76,0.9] | 2.8\%, (5.3\%), [-8.8\%,26.7\%] | 27.4\%, (27.7\%), [-24.5\%,66.0\%] |
| Rogot1 | 0.84, (0.83), [0.72,0.88] | 3.3\%, (5.3\%), [-9.5\%,26.5\%] | 27.6\%, (29.1\%), [-23.5\%,73.8\%] |
| Rogot2 | 0.84, (0.85), [0.8,0.92] | 2.3\%, (5.1\%), [-5.0\%,23.1\%] | $32.8 \%$, (29.7\%), [-3.6\%,76.6\%] |
| Russell d RaO | 0.0, (0.0), [0.0,0.0] | 18.5\%, (17.9\%), [-4.7\%,45.9\%] | 0.0\%, (0.0\%), [0.0\%,0.0\%] |
| Scott | 0.84, (0.83), [0.72,0.88] | 3.3\%, (5.3\%), [-9.5\%,26.5\%] | 27.6\%, (29.1\%), [-23.5\%,73.8\%] |
| Simple Matching | 0.85, (0.84), [0.76,0.9] | 2.8\%, (5.3\%), [-8.8\%,26.7\%] | 27.4\%, (27.7\%), [-24.5\%,66.0\%] |
| Sokal | 0.85, (0.84), [0.76,0.9] | 2.8\%, (5.3\%), [-8.8\%,26.7\%] | 27.4\%, (27.7\%), [-24.5\%,66.0\%] |
| Sørensen-Dice | 0.68, (0.67), [0.6,0.74] | 7.6\%, (3.9\%), [-23.9\%,31.8\%] | 23.8\%, (27.8\%), [-16.9\%,73.8\%] |
| Tarantula | 0.76, (0.74), [0.66,0.8] | 6.4\%, (4.1\%), [-20.9\%,26.3\%] | 36.8\%, (30.1\%), [-20.4\%,73.9\%] |
| Wong1 | 0.0, (0.0), [0.0,0.0] | 18.5\%, (17.9\%), [-4.7\%,45.9\%] | 0.0\%, (0.0\%), [0.0\%,0.0\%] |
| Wong3 | 0.73, (0.73), [0.6,0.84] | 3.2\%, (3.1\%), [-14.9\%,26.6\%] | 14.6\%, (19.1\%), [-12.4\%,73.8\%] |
| Wong2 | 0.85, (0.84), [0.76,0.9] | 2.8\%, (5.3\%), [-8.8\%,26.7\%] | 27.4\%, (27.7\%), [-24.5\%,66.0\%] |
| Zoltar | 0.42, (0.4), [0.26,0.46] | 10.2\%, (6.8\%), [-44.6\%,35.1\%] | 15.2\%, (17.6\%), [-10.3\%,61.4\%] |

Table 3: Results of the 10-fold cross validation of $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{\lambda_{p}}\left(\Omega_{f}\right)$.

Can Statistical Language Models be used to improve Spectrum Based Fault Localization Rankings?
(Reduced Spectra - Additional Material)
ISSTA, 2017, Santa Barbara

| SBFL ranking metric | $\widetilde{\lambda_{p}},\left(\overline{\lambda_{p}}\right),[\min , \max ]$ | $\widetilde{R I} \overline{\mathcal{R}}^{\text {SBFL }}$, $\left(\overline{R I}_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}^{*}}^{S B F L}\right),[\mathrm{min}, \mathrm{max}]$ | $\widetilde{R I}_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}^{*}}^{L M},\left(\overline{R I}_{\overline{\mathcal{R}}^{*}}^{L M}\right),[\mathrm{min}, \max ]$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ample | 0.14, (0.15), [0.12,0.2] | 61.9\%, (60.1\%), [25.8\%,80.4\%] | 17.6\%, (16.5\%), [-20.9\%,43.8\%] |
| Anderberg | 0.32, (0.37), [0.26,0.52] | 23.0\%, (22.3\%), [-21.4\%,65.7\%] | 27.9\%, (20.8\%), [-30.0\%,58.4\%] |
| Arithmetic Mean | 0.32, (0.37), [0.28,0.54] | 29.0\%, (24.3\%), [-37.8\%,66.6\%] | 27.4\%, (22.0\%), [-27.0\%,58.3\%] |
| Cohen | 0.31, (0.37), [0.28,0.52] | 25.4\%, (22.7\%), [-22.3\%,66.7\%] | 27.9\%, (21.4\%), [-29.3\%,58.5\%] |
| Dice | 0.32, (0.37), [0.26,0.52] | 23.0\%, (22.3\%), [-21.4\%,65.9\%] | 27.8\%, (20.8\%), [-30.0\%,58.4\%] |
| Euclid | 0.4, (0.39), [0.26,0.4] | 34.4\%, (23.8\%), [-51.6\%,68.9\%] | 29.7\%, (23.0\%), [-21.2\%,65.9\%] |
| Fleiss | 0.32, (0.33), [0.24,0.4] | 39.2\%, (33.5\%), [-44.2\%,70.6\%] | 22.8\%, (22.3\%), [-24.2\%,62.3\%] |
| Geometric Mean | 0.36, (0.35), [0.2,0.4] | 30.4\%, (26.6\%), [-44.6\%,59.7\%] | 26.2\%, (24.2\%), [-24.6\%,60.6\%] |
| Goodman | 0.32, (0.37), [0.26,0.52] | 23.0\%, (22.3\%), [-21.4\%,65.7\%] | 28.1\%, (20.9\%), [-29.2\%,58.4\%] |
| GP13 | 0.14, (0.13), [0.08,0.14] | 68.7\%, (65.4\%), [34.1\%,79.1\%] | 17.9\%, (17.8\%), [-11.4\%,53.3\%] |
| Hamann | 0.4, (0.39), [0.26,0.4] | 34.4\%, (23.8\%), [-51.6\%,68.9\%] | 29.7\%, (23.0\%), [-21.2\%,65.9\%] |
| Hamming etc. | 0.4, (0.39), [0.26,0.4] | 34.4\%, (23.8\%), [-51.6\%,68.9\%] | 29.7\%, (23.0\%), [-21.2\%,65.9\%] |
| Harmonic Mean | 0.3, (0.3), [0.28,0.36] | 29.0\%, (28.8\%), [-15.2\%,52.6\%] | 26.9\%, (23.8\%), [-26.0\%,58.9\%] |
| Jaccard | 0.32, (0.37), [0.26,0.52] | 23.0\%, (22.3\%), [-21.4\%,65.9\%] | 27.9\%, (20.9\%), [-30.0\%,58.4\%] |
| Kulczynski1 | 0.32, (0.37), [0.26,0.52] | 23.0\%, (22.3\%), [-21.4\%,66.0\%] | 27.8\%, (20.8\%), [-30.0\%,58.4\%] |
| Kulczynski2 | 0.14, (0.15), [0.14,0.16] | 57.9\%, (54.6\%), [26.9\%,76.5\%] | 21.0\%, (23.1\%), [-14.0\%,52.7\%] |
| M1 | 0.4, (0.39), [0.26,0.4] | 34.4\%, (23.8\%), [-51.6\%,68.9\%] | 29.7\%, (23.0\%), [-21.2\%,65.9\%] |
| M2 | 0.16, (0.15), [0.12,0.16] | 65.4\%, (61.8\%), [34.6\%,76.1\%] | 19.4\%, (19.0\%), [-14.8\%,53.3\%] |
| Ochiai | 0.34, (0.34), [0.2,0.4] | 29.5\%, (26.6\%), [-28.8\%,64.1\%] | 29.0\%, (22.5\%), [-29.5\%,60.3\%] |
| Ochiai2 | 0.36, (0.35), [0.2,0.4] | 27.1\%, (25.3\%), [-53.7\%,61.5\%] | 26.5\%, (23.6\%), [-23.7\%,60.6\%] |
| NAISH2 (Op2) | 0.14, (0.13), [0.08,0.14] | 68.5\%, (65.3\%), [33.8\%,79.0\%] | 17.7\%, (17.7\%), [-11.6\%,52.9\%] |
| Overlap | 0.08, (0.08), [0.0,0.16] | 73.6\%, (67.3\%), [34.4\%,81.3\%] | -0.8\%, (-1.1\%), [-5.7\%,3.6\%] |
| Rogers \&ூ Tanimoto | 0.4, (0.39), [0.26,0.4] | 34.4\%, (23.8\%), [-51.6\%,68.9\%] | 29.7\%, (23.0\%), [-21.2\%,65.9\%] |
| Rogot1 | 0.34, (0.38), [0.3,0.52] | 33.9\%, (27.8\%), [-44.2\%,69.7\%] | 27.3\%, (23.4\%), [-23.0\%,61.7\%] |
| Rogot2 | 0.3, (0.3), [0.28,0.36] | 29.0\%, (28.8\%), [-15.2\%,52.6\%] | 26.9\%, (23.8\%), [-26.0\%,58.9\%] |
| Russell ひ RaO | 0.0, (0.01), [0.0,0.14] | 78.0\%, (72.7\%), [55.7\%,84.8\%] | 0.0\%, (-0.9\%), [-9.1\%,0.0\%] |
| Scott | 0.34, (0.38), [0.3,0.52] | 33.9\%, (27.8\%), [-44.2\%,69.7\%] | 27.3\%, (23.4\%), [-23.0\%,61.7\%] |
| Simple Matching | 0.4, (0.39), [0.26,0.4] | 34.4\%, (23.8\%), [-51.6\%,68.9\%] | 29.7\%, (23.0\%), [-21.2\%,65.9\%] |
| Sokal | 0.4, (0.39), [0.26,0.4] | 34.4\%, (23.8\%), [-51.6\%,68.9\%] | 29.7\%, (23.0\%), [-21.2\%,65.9\%] |
| Sørensen-Dice | 0.32, (0.36), [0.26,0.52] | 23.5\%, (22.5\%), [-21.4\%,65.9\%] | 27.8\%, (21.1\%), [-29.3\%,58.4\%] |
| Tarantula | 0.34, (0.38), [0.26,0.5] | 24.3\%, (18.2\%), [-23.1\%,65.4\%] | 28.9\%, (21.0\%), [-31.8\%,60.7\%] |
| Wong1 | 0.0, (0.01), [0.0,0.14] | 78.0\%, (72.7\%), [55.7\%,84.8\%] | 0.0\%, (-0.9\%), [-9.1\%,0.0\%] |
| Wong3 | 0.18, (0.19), [0.16,0.26] | 42.0\%, (40.1\%), [12.2\%,63.6\%] | 25.8\%, (18.8\%), [-18.9\%,43.9\%] |
| Wong2 | 0.4, (0.39), [0.26,0.4] | 34.4\%, (23.8\%), [-51.6\%,68.9\%] | 29.7\%, (23.0\%), [-21.2\%,65.9\%] |
| Zoltar | 0.15, (0.18), [0.14,0.3] | 47.0\%, (43.3\%), [-9.1\%,80.1\%] | 22.7\%, (23.0\%), [-21.9\%,53.2\%] |

Table 4: Results of the 10-fold cross validation of $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{\lambda_{p}}^{*}\left(\Omega_{f}\right)$.

| SBFL ranking metric | $\overline{\lambda_{p}},\left(\overline{\lambda_{p}}\right),[\min , \max ]$ | $\widetilde{R I}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}}^{S B F L},\left(\overline{R I}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}}^{S B F L}\right),[\mathrm{min}, \mathrm{max}]$ | $\widetilde{R I}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}}^{L M},\left(\overline{R I}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}}^{L M}\right),[\min , \max ]$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ample | 0.84, (0.76), [0.42,1.0] | 0.3\%, (7.2\%), [-19.6\%,31.7\%] | 17.0\%, (14.1\%), [-35.0\%,59.8\%] |
| Anderberg | 1.0, (0.95), [0.5,1.0] | 0.0\%, (0.6\%), [-8.6\%,12.4\%] | 11.9\%, (7.5\%), [-168.7\%,77.0\%] |
| Arithmetic Mean | 0.68, (0.71), [0.4,1.0] | 0.0\%, (-6.1\%), [-60.8\%,9.5\%] | 15.1\%, (-3.4\%), [-206.3\%,63.4\%] |
| Cohen | 1.0, (0.83), [0.46,1.0] | 0.0\%, (-1.5\%), [-8.8\%,2.5\%] | 14.6\%, (-1.4\%), [-207.2\%,77.3\%] |
| Dice | 1.0, (0.95), [0.5,1.0] | 0.0\%, (0.6\%), [-8.6\%,12.4\%] | 11.9\%, (7.5\%), [-168.7\%,77.0\%] |
| Euclid | 1.0, (0.95), [0.52,1.0] | 0.0\%, (4.5\%), [0.0\%,30.9\%] | 21.0\%, (1.0\%), [-249.6\%,78.0\%] |
| Fleiss | 1.0, (0.95), [0.46,1.0] | 0.0\%, (2.8\%), [0.0\%,27.5\%] | 9.5\%, (-9.9\%), [-247.0\%,76.7\%] |
| Geometric Mean | 0.66, (0.71), [0.42,1.0] | 0.0\%, (-5.6\%), [-64.2\%,11.7\%] | 14.1\%, (-1.2\%), [-161.5\%,62.7\%] |
| Goodman | 1.0, (0.95), [0.5,1.0] | 0.0\%, (0.6\%), [-8.6\%,12.4\%] | 11.9\%, (7.5\%), [-168.7\%,77.0\%] |
| GP13 | 0.44, (0.44), [0.4,0.48] | 15.4\%, (10.7\%), [-39.2\%,50.7\%] | 16.5\%, (17.4\%), [-28.4\%,59.9\%] |
| Hamann | 1.0, (0.95), [0.52,1.0] | 0.0\%, (4.5\%), [0.0\%,30.9\%] | 21.0\%, (1.0\%), [-249.6\%,78.0\%] |
| Hamming etc. | 1.0, (0.95), [0.52,1.0] | 0.0\%, (4.5\%), [0.0\%,30.9\%] | 21.0\%, (1.0\%), [-249.6\%,78.0\%] |
| Harmonic Mean | 0.43, (0.56), [0.34,1.0] | 0.0\%, (-2.8\%), [-75.0\%,22.5\%] | 24.0\%, (17.5\%), [-38.8\%,58.4\%] |
| Jaccard | 1.0, (0.95), [0.5,1.0] | 0.0\%, (0.6\%), [-8.6\%,12.4\%] | 11.9\%, (7.5\%), [-168.7\%,77.0\%] |
| Kulczynski1 | 1.0, (0.95), [0.5,1.0] | 0.0\%, (0.6\%), [-8.6\%,12.4\%] | 11.9\%, (7.5\%), [-168.7\%,77.0\%] |
| Kulczynski2 | 0.46, (0.55), [0.22,1.0] | 0.0\%, (0.9\%), [-49.5\%,38.7\%] | 13.5\%, (12.0\%), [-37.0\%,60.2\%] |
| M1 | 1.0, (0.95), [0.52,1.0] | 0.0\%, (4.5\%), [0.0\%,30.9\%] | 21.0\%, (1.0\%), [-249.6\%,78.0\%] |
| M2 | 0.44, (0.44), [0.4,0.46] | 14.4\%, (11.1\%), [-37.1\%,50.8\%] | 24.0\%, (21.1\%), [-23.7\%,60.1\%] |
| Ochiai | 1.0, (0.92), [0.48,1.0] | 0.0\%, (2.3\%), [-5.3\%,15.5\%] | 11.5\%, (2.6\%), [-151.2\%,77.0\%] |
| Ochiai2 | 0.93, (0.77), [0.42,1.0] | 0.0\%, (-4.9\%), [-60.2\%,12.2\%] | 14.3\%, (3.2\%), [-155.1\%,63.6\%] |
| Naish2 (Op2) | 0.44, (0.44), [0.4,0.48] | 15.4\%, (10.7\%), [-41.4\%,50.7\%] | 16.5\%, (17.5\%), [-28.4\%,59.9\%] |
| Overlap | 0.06, (0.08), [0.0,0.34] | 36.7\%, (34.3\%), [-16.5\%,76.4\%] | 0.0\%, (-1.9\%), [-25.3\%,7.5\%] |
| Rogers \& Tanimoto | 1.0, (0.95), [0.52,1.0] | 0.0\%, (4.5\%), [0.0\%,30.9\%] | 21.0\%, (1.0\%), [-249.6\%,78.0\%] |
| Rogot1 | 1.0, (0.95), [0.48,1.0] | 0.0\%, (-0.6\%), [-6.0\%,0.0\%] | 13.8\%, (-4.6\%), [-248.9\%,77.3\%] |
| Rogot2 | 0.44, (0.56), [0.34,1.0] | 0.0\%, (-2.3\%), [-75.0\%,22.5\%] | 23.5\%, (18.0\%), [-38.8\%,58.4\%] |
| Russell dூ Rao | 0.05, (0.09), [0.02,0.3] | $39.5 \%$, (32.5\%), [-30.5\%,75.1\%] | -0.1\%, (-2.3\%), [-34.4\%,11.0\%] |
| Scott | 1.0, (0.95), [0.48,1.0] | 0.0\%, (-0.6\%), [-6.0\%,0.0\%] | 13.8\%, (-4.6\%), [-248.9\%,77.3\%] |
| Simple Matching | 1.0, (0.95), [0.52,1.0] | 0.0\%, (4.5\%), [0.0\%,30.9\%] | 21.0\%, (1.0\%), [-249.6\%,78.0\%] |
| Sokal | 1.0, (0.95), [0.52,1.0] | 0.0\%, (4.5\%), [0.0\%,30.9\%] | 21.0\%, (1.0\%), [-249.6\%,78.0\%] |
| Sørensen-Dice | 1.0, (0.95), [0.5,1.0] | 0.0\%, (0.6\%), [-8.6\%,12.4\%] | 11.9\%, (7.5\%), [-168.7\%,77.0\%] |
| Tarantula | 1.0, (0.95), [0.5,1.0] | 0.0\%, (1.3\%), [0.0\%,12.5\%] | 13.4\%, (6.4\%), [-169.4\%,80.7\%] |
| Wong1 | 0.05, (0.09), [0.02,0.3] | 39.5\%, (32.5\%), [-30.5\%,75.1\%] | -0.1\%, (-2.3\%), [-34.4\%,11.0\%] |
| Wong3 | 1.0, (0.84), [0.44,1.0] | 0.0\%, (-0.5\%), [-29.3\%,20.0\%] | 13.5\%, (10.9\%), [-47.9\%,73.1\%] |
| Wong2 | 1.0, (0.95), [0.52,1.0] | 0.0\%, (4.5\%), [0.0\%,30.9\%] | 21.0\%, (1.0\%), [-249.6\%,78.0\%] |
| Zoltar | 1.0, (0.83), [0.4,1.0] | 0.0\%, (-2.9\%), [-31.6\%,9.5\%] | 16.2\%, (-4.3\%), [-216.0\%,73.4\%] |

TABLE 5: Results of the 10-fold cross validation of $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\lambda_{p}}\left(\Omega_{f}\right)$.
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| SBFL ranking metric | $\widetilde{\lambda_{p}},\left(\overline{\lambda_{p}}\right),[\min , \max ]$ | $\widetilde{R I}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}^{*}}^{S B F L},\left(\overline{R I}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}^{*}}^{S B F L}\right),[$ min, max] | $\widetilde{R I}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}^{*}}^{L M},\left(\overline{R I}_{\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}^{*}}^{L M}\right),[\mathrm{min}, \mathrm{max}]$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ample | 0.62, (0.61), [0.4,0.74] | 34.0\%, (31.5\%), [-25.0\%,76.7\%] | 51.3\%, (40.4\%), [-29.5\%,61.5\%] |
| Anderberg | 0.66, (0.66), [0.62,0.76] | 40.0\%, (38.7\%), [13.2\%,76.5\%] | 59.5\%, (56.0\%), [38.5\%,70.8\%] |
| Arithmetic Mean | 0.66, (0.66), [0.62,0.74] | 38.4\%, (37.8\%), [9.5\%,76.2\%] | 58.3\%, (55.4\%), [38.5\%,70.8\%] |
| Cohen | 0.66, (0.66), [0.62,0.74] | 39.1\%, (38.2\%), [9.5\%,76.7\%] | 58.3\%, (55.8\%), [38.5\%,70.8\%] |
| Dice | 0.66, (0.66), [0.62,0.76] | 40.0\%, (38.7\%), [13.2\%,76.5\%] | 59.5\%, (56.0\%), [38.5\%,70.8\%] |
| Euclid | 0.61, (0.62), [0.58,0.7] | 32.8\%, (29.4\%), [-21.9\%,73.1\%] | 51.8\%, (48.8\%), [27.3\%,63.1\%] |
| Fleiss | 0.74, (0.73), [0.66,0.78] | 30.9\%, (32.3\%), [-1.4\%,71.3\%] | 46.2\%, (42.1\%), [-11.4\%,63.6\%] |
| Geometric Mean | 0.68, (0.68), [0.6,0.76] | 33.6\%, (32.4\%), [-5.9\%,71.2\%] | 51.5\%, (49.6\%), [9.1\%,70.8\%] |
| Goodman | 0.66, (0.66), [0.62,0.76] | 40.0\%, (38.7\%), [13.2\%,76.5\%] | 59.5\%, (56.0\%), [38.5\%,70.8\%] |
| GP13 | 0.66, (0.65), [0.6,0.7] | 36.9\%, (36.4\%), [0.0\%,76.3\%] | 52.3\%, (46.6\%), [20.7\%,61.7\%] |
| Hamann | 0.61, (0.62), [0.58,0.7] | $32.8 \%$, (29.4\%), [-21.9\%,73.1\%] | 51.8\%, (48.8\%), [27.3\%,63.1\%] |
| Hamming etc. | 0.61, (0.62), [0.58,0.7] | 32.8\%, (29.4\%), [-21.9\%,73.1\%] | 51.8\%, (48.8\%), [27.3\%,63.1\%] |
| Harmonic Mean | 0.62, (0.64), [0.58,0.78] | 24.4\%, (31.2\%), [3.1\%,78.9\%] | 58.1\%, (51.1\%), [6.8\%,63.6\%] |
| Jaccard | 0.66, (0.66), [0.62,0.76] | 40.0\%, (38.7\%), [13.2\%,76.5\%] | 59.5\%, (56.0\%), [38.5\%,70.8\%] |
| Kulczynski1 | 0.66, (0.66), [0.62,0.76] | 40.0\%, (38.7\%), [13.2\%,76.5\%] | 59.5\%, (56.0\%), [38.5\%,70.8\%] |
| Kulczynski2 | 0.62, (0.62), [0.58,0.66] | 25.0\%, (28.8\%), [-11.8\%,79.1\%] | 56.4\%, (52.8\%), [27.6\%,69.2\%] |
| M1 | 0.61, (0.62), [0.58,0.7] | 32.8\%, (29.4\%), [-21.9\%,73.1\%] | 51.8\%, (48.8\%), [27.3\%,63.1\%] |
| M2 | 0.66, (0.67), [0.62,0.76] | 33.3\%, (27.4\%), [-21.9\%,74.2\%] | 39.2\%, (40.5\%), [0.0\%,61.5\%] |
| Ochiai | 0.66, (0.68), [0.62,0.74] | 37.8\%, (37.1\%), [-7.4\%,72.6\%] | 51.1\%, (52.1\%), [9.1\%,73.8\%] |
| Ochiai2 | 0.74, (0.7), [0.6,0.76] | 31.7\%, (32.9\%), [-5.9\%,71.2\%] | 50.0\%, (50.3\%), [13.6\%,70.8\%] |
| Naish2 (Op2) | 0.66, (0.65), [0.6,0.7] | 36.9\%, (36.4\%), [0.0\%,76.3\%] | 52.3\%, (46.6\%), [20.7\%,61.7\%] |
| Overlap | 0.65, (0.66), [0.52,0.82] | 76.4\%, (77.7\%), [58.5\%,93.7\%] | 7.9\%, (9.3\%), [-1.9\%,30.8\%] |
| Rogers ひூ Tanimoto | 0.61, (0.62), [0.58,0.7] | 32.8\%, (29.4\%), [-21.9\%,73.1\%] | 51.8\%, (48.8\%), [27.3\%,63.1\%] |
| Rogot1 | 0.66, (0.66), [0.62,0.74] | 39.1\%, (36.7\%), [4.8\%,76.7\%] | 57.2\%, (54.8\%), [38.5\%,70.8\%] |
| Rogot2 | 0.62, (0.64), [0.58,0.78] | 24.4\%, (31.2\%), [3.1\%,78.9\%] | 58.1\%, (51.1\%), [6.8\%,63.6\%] |
| Russell ひ RaO | 0.16, (0.38), [0.02,0.82] | 86.4\%, (84.5\%), [69.8\%,91.1\%] | 0.0\%, (-5.4\%), [-54.5\%,4.6\%] |
| Scott | 0.66, (0.66), [0.62,0.74] | 39.1\%, (36.7\%), [4.8\%,76.7\%] | 57.2\%, (54.8\%), [38.5\%,70.8\%] |
| Simple Matching | 0.61, (0.62), [0.58,0.7] | 32.8\%, (29.4\%), [-21.9\%,73.1\%] | 51.8\%, (48.8\%), [27.3\%,63.1\%] |
| Sokal | 0.61, (0.62), [0.58,0.7] | 32.8\%, (29.4\%), [-21.9\%,73.1\%] | 51.8\%, (48.8\%), [27.3\%,63.1\%] |
| Sørensen-Dice | 0.66, (0.66), [0.62,0.76] | 40.0\%, (38.7\%), [13.2\%,76.5\%] | 59.5\%, (56.0\%), [38.5\%,70.8\%] |
| Tarantula | 0.78, (0.78), [0.78,0.8] | 41.4\%, (36.3\%), [4.3\%,69.0\%] | 52.6\%, (49.2\%), [0.0\%,71.8\%] |
| Wong1 | 0.16, (0.38), [0.02,0.82] | 86.4\%, (84.5\%), [69.8\%,91.1\%] | 0.0\%, (-5.4\%), [-54.5\%,4.6\%] |
| Wong3 | 0.52, (0.53), [0.4,0.7] | 30.5\%, (30.7\%), [-13.5\%,76.0\%] | 49.5\%, (42.7\%), [-34.1\%,63.6\%] |
| Wong2 | 0.61, (0.62), [0.58,0.7] | 32.8\%, (29.4\%), [-21.9\%,73.1\%] | 51.8\%, (48.8\%), [27.3\%,63.1\%] |
| Zoltar | 0.66, (0.63), [0.5,0.66] | 29.2\%, (33.4\%), [-13.2\%,77.4\%] | 58.4\%, (53.4\%), [20.7\%,68.2\%] |

TABLE 6: Results of the $10-$ FOLD cross validation of $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\lambda_{p}}^{*}\left(\Omega_{f}\right)$.


FIGURE 1: PLOTS of $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{\lambda}\left(\Omega_{f}\right)$ (SOLID) AND $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\lambda}\left(\Omega_{f}\right)$ (DASHED) FOR DIFFERENT SBFL RANKING METRICS.
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FIGURE 2: PLOTS of $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{\lambda}\left(\Omega_{f}\right)$ (SOLID) AND $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\lambda}\left(\Omega_{f}\right)$ (DASHED) FOR DIFFERENT SBFL RANKING METRICS.


Figure 3: Plots of $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{\lambda}\left(\Omega_{f}\right)$ (SOLId) and $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\lambda}\left(\Omega_{f}\right)$ (DASHEd) FOR different SBFL RANKING metrics.
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FIGURE 4: PLOTS OF $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{\lambda}^{*}\left(\Omega_{f}\right)$ (SOLID) $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\lambda}^{*}\left(\Omega_{f}\right)$ (DASHED) FOR DIFFERENT SBFL RANKING METRICS.


FIGURE 5: PLOTS OF $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{\lambda}^{*}\left(\Omega_{f}\right)$ (SOLID) $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\lambda}^{*}\left(\Omega_{f}\right)$ (DASHED) FOR DIFFERENT SBFL RANKING METRICS.
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Figure 6: Plots of $\overline{\mathcal{R}}_{\lambda}^{*}\left(\Omega_{f}\right)$ (solid) $\widetilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\lambda}^{*}\left(\Omega_{f}\right)$ (dashed) for different SbFL ranking metrics.

