



**Academic Year: 2023-24**

**Semester: VI**

**Class / Branch: TE-IT**

**Subject: BI Lab**

**Name of Instructor: Prof. Apeksha Mohite**

**Name of Student: Aashay Ingale**

**Student ID: 21104006**

**Date of Performance: 30/03/2023**

**Date of Submission: 30/03/2023**

### **Experiment No. 13**

**Aim: Business Intelligence Mini Project.**

**1. Problem Definition: Will Construction of Motorway harm the nearby Amphibians.**

**2. Data mining task to be performed:**

The data mining task performed is clustering. Specifically, the two algorithms mentioned are Simple K Means and EM (Expectation-Maximization). Both algorithms are commonly used for clustering tasks in data mining.

- a. **Simple K Means (K-Means):** This algorithm aims to partition the dataset into K clusters, where each instance belongs to the cluster with the nearest mean. It iteratively assigns instances to clusters based on the Euclidean distance between the instance and cluster centroids, then updates the centroids based on the mean of instances in each cluster. In the provided information, Simple K Means was applied to cluster the dataset into two clusters.
- b. **EM (Expectation-Maximization):** EM algorithm is a probabilistic approach to clustering that assumes the data is generated from a mixture of several Gaussian distributions. It iteratively estimates the parameters of these Gaussian distributions (mean and variance) to maximize the likelihood of the observed data. EM algorithm is particularly useful when dealing with data that may have overlapping clusters or clusters with different shapes and sizes.

Therefore, the data mining tasks performed in the provided information are indeed Simple K Means and EM clustering algorithms.



**3. Dataset identified: Amphibians**

**4. Source of dataset: <https://archive.ics.uci.edu/dataset/528/amphibians>**

**5. Details of the dataset:**

The dataset is a multilabel classification problem. The goal is to predict the presence of amphibian's species near the water reservoirs based on features obtained from GIS systems and satellite images.

The information we're talking about comes from maps, satellite images, and studies done to see how building new roads might affect nature, specifically amphibians like frogs and salamanders, in two places in Poland.

For Road A, which is part of a big motorway plan, researchers checked out a stretch of land about 500 meters wide on each side of where the road would go. They did this in 2010 and 2011, and also later from 2014 to 2016. They found about 80 places where amphibians were likely to lay eggs or live.

For Road B, which is part of another motorway plan, they looked at two different routes in a certain area. They looked at maps, old data, and went out into the field to see where amphibians were. They did this all-in springtime. They found about 125 places where amphibians lived or might live. They did a similar thing with the land about 500 meters wide on each side of the road paths. This time, they found 109 spots where amphibians were likely to be.



## 6. Algorithms to accomplish the task:

### Clustering :

#### a. SimplekMeans

The Simple K Means clustering algorithm was applied to a dataset consisting of 190 instances with 24 attributes. This clustering process yielded two distinct clusters, where Cluster 0 comprises 110 instances, representing approximately 58% of the dataset, while Cluster 1 contains 80 instances, accounting for around 42% of the data. Each cluster demonstrates unique characteristics as illustrated by their centroids, which act as representative points for the cluster. Cluster 0's centroid exhibits relatively lower values for attributes such as 'SR', 'NR', 'TR', and 'Green frogs' compared to Cluster 1, suggesting a different profile for this group. Conversely, Cluster 1 displays higher values for attributes like 'SR', 'NR', 'FR', 'OR', 'Green frogs', 'Brown frogs', 'Common toad', and 'Common newt', indicating distinct patterns within this cluster. This analysis underscores the heterogeneous nature of the dataset and furnishes valuable insights for further exploration and decision-making processes.

The screenshot displays the WEKA software interface with the SimpleKMeans clustering algorithm applied. The left panel shows the 'Cluster mode' settings, where 'Use training set' is selected. The 'Ignore attributes' field is empty, and the 'Start' button is visible. The 'Result list' shows '11:36:51 - SimpleKMeans'. The right panel, titled 'Clusterer output', displays the following information:

```
=== Run information ===  
  
Scheme: weka.clusterers.SimpleKMeans -init 0 -max-candidates 100 -periodic-pruning 10000 -min-density 2.0 -t1 -1.35 -t2 -1.0 -N 2 -A ~  
Relation: ambhibians2-weka.filters.unsupervised.attribute.Normalize-S1.0-T0.0-weka.filters.unsupervised.attribute.Normalize-S1.0-T0.0  
Instances: 190  
Attributes: 24  
i=1  
ID  
Motorway  
SR  
NR  
TR  
VR  
SUR1  
SUR2  
SUR3  
UR  
FR  
OR  
RR  
BR  
MR  
CR  
Green frogs  
Brown frogs  
Common toad  
Fire-bellied toad  
Tree frog  
Common newt  
Great crested newt  
Test mode: evaluate on training data  
  
=== Clustering model (full training set) ===
```



```
=====
Number of iterations: 5
Within cluster sum of squared errors: 461.2770383033899

Initial starting points (random):

Cluster 0: 0.657895,0.656085,S52,0.0006,0.083333,0.8,0.5,0.714286,0.909091,0.181818,0,0,0.5,0.2,0.5,0,0.5,0,1,0,0,0,0
Cluster 1: 0.752632,0.751323,S52,0.0082,0.416667,0.066667,0.25,0.071429,0.909091,0.181818,1,0.75,1,0,0.1,0,0.5,1,1,0,1,0,0

Missing values globally replaced with mean/mode

Final cluster centroids:

Attribute          Full Data          Cluster#
                   (190.0)          (110.0)          (80.0)
=====
i>_l              0.5026          0.3708          0.6839
ID                 0.5           0.3675          0.6822
Motorway           S52           A1           S52
SR                 0.0192          0.006          0.0373
NR                 0.1298          0.1091          0.1583
TR                 0.3284          0.4709          0.1325
VR                 0.4737          0.5159          0.4156
SUR1               0.3008          0.2773          0.333
SUR2               0.4876          0.4372          0.5568
SUR3               0.5282          0.5248          0.533
UR                 0.2789          0.1848          0.4083
FR                 0.2105          0.1386          0.3094
OR                 0.8949          0.9021          0.885
RR                 0.2321          0.2645          0.1875
BR                 0.2489          0.3045          0.1725
MR                 0.0237          0.0364          0.0063
CR                 0.5053          0.5045          0.5062

CR                 0.5053          0.5045          0.5062
Green frogs        0.5684          0.3364          0.8875
Brown frogs        0.7789          0.6545          0.95
Common toad        0.6526          0.5182          0.8375
Fire-bellied toad  0.3053          0.1273          0.55
Tree frog          0.3737          0.2273          0.575
Common newt        0.3053          0.1          0.5875
Great crested newt 0.1105          0.0455          0.2

Time taken to build model (full training data) : 0.02 seconds

=== Model and evaluation on training set ===

Clustered Instances

0      110 ( 58%)
1       80 ( 42%)
```

Log



## b. EM

- i. **Clustering Model:** The Expectation-Maximization (EM) algorithm was used to cluster the dataset. The algorithm was configured with various parameters such as the number of iterations, maximum clusters, and convergence criteria.
- ii. **Number of Clusters:** The EM algorithm determined that there are five clusters in the dataset.



**iii. Cluster Information:**

- Cluster 0: 55 instances (29%)
- Cluster 1: 36 instances (19%)
- Cluster 2: 30 instances (16%)
- Cluster 3: 8 instances (4%)
- Cluster 4: 61 instances (32%)

**iv. Cluster Centroids:** For each cluster, the output provides the mean and standard deviation of attribute values. Attributes include various features such as motorway type, surface type, and the presence of different amphibian species. These centroid values give insights into the typical characteristics of instances within each cluster.

**v. For example:**

- Cluster 0 has higher mean values for attributes such as "Motorway A1", "Green frogs", "Common toad", and "Common newt".
- Cluster 4 has higher mean values for attributes such as "Motorway S52", "Brown frogs", "Fire-bellied toad", and "Great crested newt".

**vi. Log Likelihood:** The log likelihood value of 17.50416 indicates how well the model fits the data. Higher log likelihood values generally indicate better model fit.

**vii.** In summary, the EM algorithm clustered the dataset into five distinct groups based on the attributes provided. Analysis of cluster centroids provides insights into the characteristics of each cluster, while the log likelihood value assesses the overall quality of the clustering model.



Parshvanath Charitable Trust's  
**A. P. SHAH INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, THANE**  
(All Programs Accredited by NBA)  
**Department of Information Technology**



Clusterer

Choose **EM** -I 100 -N -1 -X 10 -max -1 -ll-cv 1.0E-6 -ll-iter 1.0E-6 -M 1.0E-6 -K 10 -num-slots 1 -S 100

Cluster mode

☒ Use training set  
☐ Supplied test set Set...  
☐ Percentage split % 66  
☐ Classes to clusters evaluation (Num) Great crested newt  
☒ Store clusters for visualization

Ignore attributes

Start Stop

Result list (right-click for options)

11:36:51 - SimpleKMeans  
11:48:40 - EM  
11:48:50 - EM

Clusterer output

=== Run information ===

Scheme: weka.clusterers.EM -I 100 -N -1 -X 10 -max -1 -ll-cv 1.0E-6 -ll-iter 1.0E-6 -M 1.0E-6 -K 10 -num-slots 1 -S 100  
Relation: ambhilians2-weka.filters.unsupervised.attribute.Normalize-S1.0-T0.0-weka.filters.unsupervised.attribute.Normalize-S1.0-T0.0-wek  
Instances: 190  
Attributes: 24  
ID  
Motorway  
SR  
NR  
TR  
VR  
SUR1  
SUR2  
SUR3  
UR  
FR  
OR  
RR  
BR  
MR  
CR  
Green frogs  
Brown frogs  
Common toad  
Fire-bellied toad  
Tree frog  
Common newt  
Great crested newt  
Test mode: evaluate on training data

=== Clustering model (full training set) ===

Status  
OK

Log x 0

Number of clusters selected by cross validation: 5  
Number of iterations performed: 1

Attribute	Cluster				
	0	1	2	3	4
	(0.19)	(0.3)	(0.13)	(0.15)	(0.23)
=====					
I>cl					
mean	0.746	0.2315	0.1885	0.715	0.6962
std. dev.	0.1758	0.1226	0.1262	0.1425	0.1646
ID					
mean	0.7446	0.2275	0.1845	0.7135	0.6946
std. dev.	0.1767	0.1233	0.1265	0.1433	0.1655
Motorway					
A1	1.1238	57.5656	25.2809	1.0112	1.0184
SS2	37.8554	2.0346	1.1246	29.122	43.8634
[total]	38.9792	59.6002	26.4055	30.1333	44.8818
SR					
mean	0.001	0.0072	0.0158	0.0204	0.052
std. dev.	0.0014	0.0231	0.0227	0.0501	0.1825
NR					
mean	0.0833	0.0991	0.1755	0.1498	0.172
std. dev.	0.0003	0.0699	0.1501	0.0991	0.2021
TR					
mean	0.876	0.3441	0.1272	0.0845	0.1097
std. dev.	0.2187	0.3521	0.1109	0.0629	0.1597
VR					
mean	0.4381	0.7117	0.1361	0.3175	0.4792



Parshvanath Charitable Trust's  
**A. P. SHAH INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, THANE**  
(All Programs Accredited by NBA)  
**Department of Information Technology**



SUR1						
mean	0.2751	0.265	0.295	0.3572	0.3372	
std. dev.	0.2707	0.2073	0.2196	0.2509	0.2657	
SUR2						
mean	0.5035	0.3804	0.5213	0.5488	0.5583	
std. dev.	0.348	0.2868	0.2762	0.3223	0.321	
SUR3						
mean	0.5582	0.4896	0.5162	0.5967	0.5162	
std. dev.	0.3017	0.3237	0.2974	0.2464	0.29	
UR						
mean	0.009	0.0156	0.8694	0.5307	0.3642	
std. dev.	0.0541	0.0705	0.2893	0.491	0.4757	
FR						
mean	0	0.0135	0.6363	0.3996	0.2904	
std. dev.	0.0004	0.0565	0.3281	0.3909	0.3334	
OR						
mean	0.9524	0.9327	0.7586	0.7819	0.9463	
std. dev.	0.1283	0.1498	0.3009	0.2676	0.1524	
RR						
mean	0.2459	0.3182	0.189	0.1451	0.1862	
std. dev.	0.2548	0.2885	0.2244	0.2272	0.1764	
BR						
mean	0.2856	0.3787	0.1439	0.1236	0.185	
std. dev.	0.259	0.3102	0.2223	0.1722	0.1675	
MR						
mean	0.0271	0.0521	0	0.0178	0	

CR						
mean	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5355	0.5	
std. dev.	0.0022	0.0012	0.1431	0.1285	0	
Green frogs						
mean	0.1306	0.4189	0.6145	0.8582	0.9304	
std. dev.	0.337	0.4934	0.4867	0.3488	0.2545	
Brown frogs						
mean	0.8377	0.6751	0.4966	0.8223	1	
std. dev.	0.3688	0.4683	0.5	0.3823	0.0008	
Common toad						
mean	0.3719	0.5554	0.7426	0.6466	0.9781	
std. dev.	0.4833	0.4969	0.4372	0.478	0.1465	
Fire-bellied toad						
mean	0.1817	0.2087	0.205	0.0214	0.7848	
std. dev.	0.3856	0.4064	0.4037	0.1448	0.4109	
Tree frog						
mean	0.1302	0.3489	0.1232	0.379	0.756	
std. dev.	0.3365	0.4766	0.3287	0.4851	0.4295	
Common newt						
mean	0.0524	0.174	0.123	0.114	0.9289	
std. dev.	0.2228	0.3791	0.3285	0.3178	0.2571	
Great crested newt						
mean	0.0003	0.0865	0.0003	0.0006	0.3726	
std. dev.	0.0183	0.2812	0.0178	0.0235	0.4835	



```
Fire-bellied toad
mean          0.1817 0.2087 0.205 0.0214 0.7848
std. dev.     0.3856 0.4064 0.4037 0.1448 0.4109

Tree frog
mean          0.1302 0.3489 0.1232 0.379 0.756
std. dev.     0.3365 0.4766 0.3287 0.4851 0.4295

Common newt
mean          0.0524 0.174 0.123 0.114 0.9289
std. dev.     0.2228 0.3791 0.3285 0.3178 0.2571

Great crested newt
mean          0.0003 0.0865 0.0003 0.0006 0.3726
std. dev.     0.0183 0.2812 0.0178 0.0235 0.4835

Time taken to build model (full training data) : 0.61 seconds

=== Model and evaluation on training set ===

Clustered Instances

0      55 ( 29%)
1      36 ( 19%)
2      30 ( 16%)
3       8 (  4%)
4      61 ( 32%)

Log likelihood: 17.50416
```

7. **Conclusion:** Thus, we can conclude that these studies helped us understand where amphibians were living so that road construction could be planned in a way that would cause the least harm to them.