Mohammed Abrar Ahmed

CS 585 Spring 2024 Programming Assignment #02

Due: Sunday, March 24, 2023 at 11:59 PM CST

Points: **100**

Instructions:

1. Place all your deliverables (as described below) into a single ZIP file named:

2. Submit it to Blackboard Assignments section before the due date. **No late submissions will be accepted**.

Objectives:

1. (100 points) Implement and evaluate a Naïve Bayes classifier algorithm.

Task:

Your task is to implement, train, and test a Naïve Bayes classifier using a publicly available data set. You can work in groups of two or by yourself. Two individual students / groups can use the same data set.

Data set:

Pick a publicly available data (follow the guidelines provided in Blackboard) set first and do an initial exploratory data analysis.

Deliverables:

Your submission (if you are working as a group of two, both partners should submit the same work) should include:

Python code file(s). Your py file should be named:

where AXXXXXXX is your IIT A number (this is REQUIRED!). If your solution uses multiple files, makes sure that the main (the one that will be run to solve the problem) is named that way and others include your IIT A number in their names as well.

Presentation slides in PPTX or PDF format. Name it:

■ This document with your observations and conclusions. You should rename it to:

Implementation:

Your task is to implement (<u>from scratch – you can't use out-of-the-box Python package classifier</u>), train, and test a Naïve Bayes classifier (as outlined in class) and apply it to classify sentences entered using keyboard.

Your program should:

Accept one (1) command line argument, i.e. so your code could be executed with

where:

- CS585_P02_AXXXXXXXX.py is your python code file name,
- TRAIN_SIZE is a number between 20 and 80 defining the size (in percentages) of the training set. For example: 60 would mean FIRST (as ordered in the dataset file) 60% of samples. Note that your test set is always going to be the LAST (as ordered in the dataset file) 20% of samples.

Example:

If the number of arguments provided is NOT one (none, two or more) or the ${\tt TRAIN_SIZE}$ argument is out of the specified range, assume that the value for ${\tt TRAIN_SIZE}$ is ${\tt 80}$.

- Load and process input data set:
 - Apply any data clean-up / wrangling you consider necessary first (mention and discuss your choices in the Conclusions section below).
 - Text pre-processing:
 - treat every document in the data set as a single sentence, even if it is made of many (no segmentation needed),
- Train your classifier on your data set:
 - assume that vocabulary V is the set of ALL words in the data set,
 - divide your data set into:
 - ◆ training set: FIRST (as they appear in the data set) TRAIN_SIZE % of samples / documents,
 - test set: LAST 20 % of samples / documents,
 - use **binary** BAG OF WORDS with "add-1" smoothing representation for documents,
 - train your classifier (find its parameters. HINT: use Python dictionary to store them),
- Test your classifier:
 - use the test set to test your classifier,
 - calculate (and display on screen) following metrics:

- number of true positives,
- number of true negatives,
- number of false positives,
- number of false negatives,
- sensitivity (recall),
- specificity,
- precision,
- negative predictive value,
- accuracy,
- ◆ F-score,
- Ask the user for keyboard input (a single sentence S):
 - use your Naïve Bayes classifier to decide (HINT: use log-space calculations to avoid underflow but bring it back to linear space after!) which class S belongs to,
 - display classifier decision along with P(CLASS_A | S) and P(CLASS_B | S) values on screen

Your program output should look like this (if pre-processing step is NOT ignored, output NONE):

```
Last Name, First Name, AXXXXXXXX solution:
Training set size: 80 %
Training classifier...
Testing classifier...
Test results / metrics:
Number of true positives: xxxx
Number of true negatives: xxxx
Number of false positives: xxxx
Number of false negatives: xxxx
Sensitivity (recall): xxxx
Specificity: xxxx
Precision: xxxx
Negative predictive value: xxxx
Accuracy: xxxx
F-score: xxxx
Enter your sentence:
Sentence S:
<entered sentence here>
was classified as <CLASS LABEL here>.
P(\langle CLASS A \rangle \mid S) = xxxx
P(\langle CLASS B \rangle | S) = xxxx
```

Do you want to enter another sentence [Y/N]?

If user responds Y, classify new sentence (you should not be re-training your classifier).

where:

- 80 would be replaced by the value specified by TRAIN SIZE,
- xxxx is an actual numerical result,
- <entered sentence here> is actual sentence entered y the user,
- <CLASS LABEL here> is the class label decided by your classifier,
- <CLASS_A>, <CLASS_B> are available labels (SPAM/HAM,
 POSITIVE/NEGATIVE, etc.).

Classifier testing results:

Enter your classifier performance metrics below:

With TRAIN_SIZE set to 80:	With TRAIN_SIZE set to 60_ (not 80)
Training size: 80 %	Training size: 60 %
Training classifier	Training classifier
Testing classifier	Testing classifier
Test results / metrics:	Test results / metrics:
Number of true positives: 460	Number of true positives: 447
Number of true negatives: 242	Number of true negatives: 222
Number of false positives: 366	Number of false positives: 386
Number of false negatives: 91	Number of false negatives: 104
Sensitivity (recall):	Sensitivity (recall):
0.8348457350272233	0.8112522686025408
Specificity: 0.3980263157894737	Specificity: 0.3651315789473684
Precision: 0.5569007263922519	Precision: 0.5366146458583433
Negative predictive value:	Negative predictive value:
0.7267267267267268	0.6809815950920245
Accuracy: 0.6056945642795514	Accuracy: 0.5772217428817946
F-score: 0.6681190994916486	F-score: 0.6459537572254335

What are your observations and conclusions? When did the algorithm perform better? a summary below

Summary / observations / conclusions

Based on the metrics, the algorithm performed better when trained on 80% of the data compared to 60%:

- With 80% training data, the algorithm achieved higher precision (0.5569 vs. 0.5366), specificity (0.3980 vs. 0.3651), accuracy (0.6057 vs. 0.5772), and F-score (0.6681 vs. 0.6460).
- The sensitivity (recall) was slightly higher with 60% training data (0.8113 vs. 0.8348), but this came at the cost of lower precision and overall accuracy.

In general, a larger training set size tends to improve the performance of machine learning models, as it provides more diverse examples for the algorithm to learn from. However, in this case, the improvement in performance from 60% to 80% training data was relatively modest, suggesting that the algorithm may have reached a point of diminishing returns, or there could be other factors limiting its performance, such as the quality or complexity of the data.