MCC Hw-2

MFCC without noise:

precision	recall	f1-score	support
precioion	i ccan	11 00010	Support

0	0.73	0.67	0.69	260
1	0.50	0.45	0.48	230
2	0.44	0.27	0.34	236
3	0.52	0.62	0.56	248
4	0.59	0.71	0.64	280
5	0.55	0.60	0.57	242
6	0.59	0.77	0.67	262
7	0.73	0.58	0.64	263
8	0.48	0.56	0.52	243
9	0.61	0.45	0.52	230

accuracy	0.57 2494			4
macro avg	0.57	0.57	0.56	2494
weighted avg	0.58	0.57	0.57	2494

MFCC with noise:

precision recall f1-score support

0	0.64	0.57	0.60	260
1	0.39	0.35	0.37	230
2	0.44	0.27	0.33	236
3	0.48	0.50	0.49	248
4	0.55	0.62	0.58	280
5	0.53	0.61	0.57	242
6	0.61	0.72	0.66	262
7	0.65	0.56	0.60	263
8	0.42	0.53	0.46	243
9	0.55	0.50	0.52	230

accuracy		0.53	249	4
macro avg	0.52	0.52	0.52	2494
weighted avg	0.53	0.53	0.52	2494

Spectrogram without noise:

precision	reca	ll f1-sc	ore sup	port	
0	0.71	0.67	0.69	260	
1	0.50	0.49	0.49	230	
2	0.49	0.35	0.41	236	
3	0.54	0.63	0.58	248	
4	0.58	0.74	0.65	280	
5	0.60	0.59	0.60	242	
6	0.65	0.73	0.69	262	
7	0.71	0.59	0.64	263	
8	0.51	0.60	0.55	243	
9	0.61	0.47	0.53	230	
			0.50	0.40.4	ı
accurac	у		0.59	2494	
macro a	vg	0.59	0.59	0.58	2494
weighted a	ava	0.59	0.59	0.59	2494

Spectrogram with noise:

precision	reca	ll f1-sc	ore sup	port	
0	0.62	0.58	0.60	260	
1	0.41	0.46	0.43	230	
2	0.42	0.31	0.35	236	
3	0.52	0.56	0.54	248	
4	0.61	0.71	0.66	280	
5	0.63	0.63	0.63	242	
6	0.61	0.71	0.65	262	
7	0.63	0.56	0.59	263	
8	0.50	0.55	0.53	243	
9	0.59	0.46	0.52	230	
accurac	y		0.56	2494	ļ.
macro av	vg	0.55	0.55	0.55	2494
weighted a	avg	0.56	0.56	0.55	2494

Inferences: We can observe that the accuracy drops when noise is added to the input. Noise coefficient was taken as 0.1. The performance of both the methods is almost the same without

noise $\sim 60\%$ and with noise Mfcc's accuracy drops to 53% while Spectrogram's accuracy drops to 56%. Overall class-7 is the best-predicted class with the highest F1 and precision scores.