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8.1 Comparison of average classification rates for UCI Musk data. SubXPCA based subspace classifier (FP-SC) outperforms both PCA based and SubPCA-based subspace classifiers. It is clear that SubXPCA based method (FP-SC) shows (i) 7% higher classification rate as compared to PCA based subspace classifier and (ii) 2.5% higher classification rate by using less number of projection eigenvectors as compared to SubPCA based subspace classifier. SubXPCA based method uses 1 eigenvector from each of sub-pattern sets.

8.2 Comparison of computational time for UCI Musk data. SubXPCA based subspace classifier (FP-SC) shows less computational time as compared to PCA and SubPCA based subspace classifiers.

8.3 Comparison of best classification rates for UCI Musk data. SubXPCA based subspace classifier (FP-SC) outperforms both PCA based and SubPCA-based subspace classifiers. It is clear that SubXPCA based method (FP-SC) shows (i) 12.4% higher classification rate as compared to PCA based subspace classifier and (ii) 8.4% higher classification rate by using less number of projection eigenvectors as compared to SubPCA based subspace classifier. SubXPCA based method uses 1 eigenvector from each of sub-pattern sets.
8.4 Comparison of PCA, SubPCA and SubXPCA based subspace classifiers with respect to both computational time and classification rate for UCI Musk data. SubXPCA based method (FP-SC) forms all its points at the top-left corner of the plot, which is the indication of high classification rate at less computational time. Other two methods have the points concentrated away from top-left corner which indicates that both PCA and SubPCA based classifiers either show lower classification rate or high computational time or both. 280

8.5 Comparison of average classification rates with varied number of sub-patterns (blocks) for UCI Musk data. SubXPCA based subspace classifier (FP-SC) consistently shows good performance as compared to SubPCA based subspace classifier with different number of blocks. Please note that PCA based classifier shows lower classification rate as compared to (i) FP-SC classifier (with all \(k\) values) and (ii) SubPCA based classifier (except for \(k = 15, 33\)) 281

8.6 Comparison of best classification rates with varied number of sub-patterns (blocks) for UCI Musk data. SubXPCA based subspace classifier (FP-SC) consistently shows good performance as compared to SubPCA based subspace classifier with different number of blocks. Please note that PCA based classifier shows lower classification rate as compared to (i) FP-SC classifier (with all \(k\) values) and (ii) SubPCA based classifier (except for \(k = 15, 33\)). 282

8.7 Comparison of computational time with different number of blocks for UCI Musk data. It is to be noted that SubXPCA based subspace classifier (FP-SC) is computationally more efficient as compared to other two methods. Also SubPCA based method shows less computational time over PCA based subspace classifier. 283
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8.11 *Comparison of average classification rates with varied number of sub-patterns (blocks) for UCI Waveform data.* SubXPCA based subspace classifier (FP-SC) consistently shows good performance as compared to SubPCA based subspace classifier with different number of blocks. SubXPCA based method shows slight improvement over PCA based subspace classifier. It is clear that SubPCA based classifier shows lower performance as compared to other two methods. 287
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