

Table II. Statistical comparison of the best performing 12 groups and the NAÏVE_consensus method in QA1.2 mode (global quality estimates assessed on models from all targets pooled together)

	371	0	2	397	426	78	386	407	359	369	119	490	319
<i>QMEANclust</i>	371	35052	0.08	0.02	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
<i>NAÏVE-consensus</i>	0	2.53	35193	0.62	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01	0.02	0.01	0.06	<0.01	<0.01	<0.01
<i>Multicom-cluster</i>	2	8.49	5.96	35158	0.05	0.01	<0.01	<0.01	0.07	0.04	0.15	<0.01	<0.01
<i>ModFOLDclust2</i>	397	8.42	5.9	0.06	34964	0.18	0.02	0.6	0.9	0.94	0.61	<0.01	<0.01
<i>MetaMQAPclust</i>	426	8.37	5.85	0.12	0.06	35102	0.32	0.41	0.14	0.2	0.06	0.24	<0.01
<i>IntFOLD-QA</i>	78	13.54	11.03	5.08	5.13	5.2	34749	0.07	0.02	0.02	<0.01	0.86	<0.01
<i>Mufold</i>	386	13.23	10.75	4.86	4.91	4.97	0.17	33363	0.52	0.65	0.3	0.05	<0.01
<i>United3D</i>	407	16.37	13.88	7.99	8.03	8.1	2.94	3.08	33517	0.84	0.71	<0.01	<0.01
<i>MUFOLD-QA</i>	359	17.18	14.67	8.7	8.75	8.82	3.6	3.73	0.61	35152	0.56	0.01	<0.01
<i>MQAPmulti</i>	369	19.37	16.87	10.95	10.99	11.06	5.87	5.98	2.89	2.31	34141	<0.01	<0.01
<i>Multicom-refine</i>	119	18.64	16.13	10.17	10.21	10.28	5.05	5.17	2.06	1.46	0.86	35158	<0.01
<i>MULTICOM</i>	490	17.65	15.15	9.23	9.27	9.34	4.15	4.28	1.19	0.59	1.71	0.87	34196
<i>Pcons</i>	319	23.48	20.99	15.05	15.09	15.16	9.95	10.02	6.93	6.39	4.05	4.94	5.77
													34420

Table II.1. Results of the Z-tests (below diagonal) and DeLong tests (above diagonal). Each group submitted QA1 quality estimates for the number of models shown on the diagonal. The Pearson's r coefficients were computed on this set of models and compared based on the distributions of their corresponding Fisher's Z (formula 5). Values of the Z statistics are shown in the lower part of the table. Grey cells highlight pairs of statistically indistinguishable groups at the 10^{-2} significance level ($Z<2.576$). The upper part of the table displays p -values from the DeLong pairwise tests on the AUC scores, indicating probability that the difference in the performance of the best groups as binary classifiers (good/bad model) can be attributed to chance. Shaded cells highlight pairs of statistically indistinguishable groups at the 10^{-2} significance level.