GIM-dataset: The QMA parameters fixed to the four interaction classes were $p = 0.60$, $q = 0.50$ (black curve). The QMA parameters adjusted to the positive (PS) and negative classes (SL, SS, and PE) were $p = 0.15$, $q = 0.95$ and $p = 0.80$, $q = 0.25$, respectively (blue curve). The original fitness measurements (red curve) are shown as reference. The minimum function was used for scoring the PS and SS categories, and the scaled epistatis function for scoring the SL and PE categories. In case the maximum scoring function was used in the PS category, then the QMA adjusted parameters were $p = 0.05$, $q = 0.95$ (brown curve).
GIM-dataset: The ARF parameter fixed to the four interaction classes were $t = 0.80$, $a = 0$ (black curve). The ARF parameters adjusted to the positive (PS) and negative classes (SL, SS, and PE) were $t = 0.80$, $a = 0$ and $t = 0.95$, $a = 0$, respectively (blue curve). The original fitness measurements (red curve) are shown as reference. The minimum function was used for scoring the PS and SS categories, and the scaled epistatis function for scoring the SL and PE categories.