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Table S1A: Pairwise ANOVA p-values calculated from the classification accuracy plots (Figures 3A1-A3).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| OPLS |  |  |  |  |
| PLS | SVM | RF |  |  |
| (A1) | 0.8008 |  |  |  |
| PLS | 0.8297 | 0.998 |  |  |
| SVM | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| RF | 0.0026 | 0.0036 | 0.0061 | 0.0027 |
| PC-LDA | 0.0101 |  |  |  |
| (A2) | 0.1783 | 0.3605 |  |  |
| PLS | 0.0001 | 0.005 | 0.0074 |  |
| SVM | RF | 0.0013 | 0.0256 | 0.0083 |
| PC-LDA | 0.4982 |  |  |  |
| (A3) | 0.0092 |  |  |  |
| PLS | 0.0245 | 0.1571 |  |  |
| SVM | 0.159 | 0.0043 | 0.0126 |  |
| RF | 0.4159 | 0.0479 | 0.0618 | 0.5751 |
| PC-LDA |  |  |  |  |

Table S1B: Pairwise ANOVA p-values calculated from the classification accuracy plots (Figures 3B1-B3).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (B1) | OPLS | PLS | SVM | RF |
| PLS | 0.3786 |  |  |  |
| SVM | 0.0494 | 0.1045 |  |  |
| RF | 0 | 0 | 0 |  |
| PC-LDA | 0 | 0.0001 | 0.0001 | 0.0323 |
| (B2) | 0.0492 |  |  |  |
| PLS | 0.1036 | 0.5519 |  |  |
| SVM | 0 | 0.0002 | 0.0001 |  |
| RF | 0.0014 | 0.0089 | 0.0065 | 0.1528 |
| PC-LDA | 0.0004 |  |  |  |
| (B3) | 0.0044 | 0.2955 |  |  |
| PLS | 0.2528 | 0.0005 | 0.003 |  |
| SVM | 0.007 | 0.0003 | 0.0021 | 0.0004 |
| RF |  |  |  |  |

Table S2A: Pairwise ANOVA p-values calculated from the AUROC plots (Figures 4A1-A3).

|  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (A1) | OPLS | PLS | SVM | RF |
| PLS | 0.5246 |  |  |  |
| SVM | 0.6347 | 0.0922 |  |  |
| RF | 0 | 0.0001 | 0.0001 |  |
| PC-LDA | 0.0172 | 0.0333 | 0.0241 | 0.7923 |
| (A2) | 0.0005 |  |  |  |
| PLS | 0.001 | 0.6887 |  |  |
| SVM | 0 | 0.0001 | 0 |  |
| RF | 0.0016 | 0.0045 | 0.0033 | 0.3599 |
| PC-LDA | 0.0046 |  |  |  |
| (A3) | 0.0657 | 0.0109 |  |  |
| PLS | 0.9193 | 0.0661 | 0.2382 |  |
| SVM | 0.2472 | 0.5964 | 0.9555 | 0.0973 |
| RF |  |  |  |  |

Table S2B: Pairwise ANOVA p-values calculated from the AUROC plots (Figures 4B1-B3).

| AUROC | OPLS | PLS | SVM | RF |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| (B1) |  |  |  |  |  |
| PLS | 0.1302 |  |  |  |  |
| SVM | 0.0413 | 0.0438 |  |  |  |
| RF | 0.0006 | 0.0004 | 0.0013 |  |  |
| PC-LDA | 0.0019 | 0.0013 | 0.0026 | 0.3616 |  |
| (B2) | 0.0177 |  |  |  |  |
| PLS | 0.1797 | 0.0383 |  |  |  |
| SVM | 0 | 0 | 0.0001 |  |  |
| RF | 0.0024 | 0.0021 | 0.0027 | 0.7929 |  |
| PC-LDA |  |  |  |  |  |
| (B3) | 0.0006 |  |  |  |  |
| PLS | 0.0212 | 0 |  |  |  |
| SVM | 0.6259 | 0.0038 | 0.0436 |  |  |
| RF | 0.1092 | 0.0016 | 0.0214 | 0.2656 |  |

Table S3A: Pairwise ANOVA p-values calculated from the RMSE plots (Figures 5A1-A3).

| RMSE | OPLS | PLS | SVM | RF |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (A1) | 0.0027 |  |  |  |
| PLS | 0.0058 | 0.0158 |  |  |
| SVM | 0.0059 | 0.0175 | 0.1703 |  |
| RF | 0.0019 | 0.0006 | 0.0596 | 0.069 |
| PC-LDA | 0.0076 |  |  |  |
| (A2) | 0.0138 | 0.0217 |  |  |
| PLS | 0.039 | 0.1014 | 0.0509 |  |
| SVM | RF | 0.005 | 0.0031 | 0.1491 |$| 0.6717$.

Table S3B: Pairwise ANOVA p-values calculated from the RMSE plots (Figures 5B1-B3).

| $\boldsymbol{R M S E}$ |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| (B1) | OPLS | PLS | SVM | RF |
| PLS | 0.0026 |  |  |  |
| SVM | 0.0053 | 0.0148 |  |  |
| RF | 0.2114 | 0.9189 | 0.38 |  |
| PC-LDA | 0.0037 | 0.0094 | 0.0119 | 0.1301 |
| (B2) | 0.0036 |  |  |  |
| PLS | 0.0014 | 0.0293 |  |  |
| SVM | 0.2347 | 0.6381 | 0.44 |  |
| RF | PC-LDA | 0.0056 | 0.0096 | 0.0136 |
| 0.336 |  |  |  |  |
| (B3) | 0.0135 |  |  |  |
| PLS | 0.0128 | 0.0038 |  |  |
| SVM | 0.4578 | 0.8312 | 0.8583 |  |
| RF | 0.0109 | 0.0178 | 0.0193 | 0.3915 |
| PC-LDA |  |  |  |  |



Figure S1. Representative 1D ${ }^{1} \mathbf{H}$ NMR spectra for simulated data set. Representative simulated spectra for group 1 (left) and group 2 (right) at different group separations w1, w4, w7, and w9 respectively, as shown in Table 2.


Figure S2. Representative 1D ${ }^{\mathbf{1}} \mathrm{H}$ NMR spectra for experimental data set. Representative experimental spectra for group 1 (left) and group 2 (right) at different group separations w1, w4, w7, and w9 respectively, as shown in Table 2.


Figure S3. ROC curves from OPLS or PLS models. A set of ROC curves are plotted using simulated (left) and experimental (right) datasets for scenario 3. Each plot presents nine different ROC curves corresponding to group separations w1 to w9 as shown in Table 2. As group separation increases from w1 to w9, the ROC curve color changes from darker blue to lighter blue. Black diagonal line represents classification based on random guessing.


Figure S4. ROC curves from SVM, RF or PC-LDA models. A set of ROC curves are plotted using simulated (left) and experimental (right) datasets for scenario 3. Each plot presents nine different ROC curves corresponding to group separations $w 1$ to $w 9$ as shown in Table 2. As group separation increases from w1 to w9, the ROC curve color changes from darker blue to lighter blue. Black diagonal line represents classification based on random guessing.

