

spam_classifier_report

June 17, 2020

Benjamin H Pepper

B.H.Pepper@gmail.com

<https://www.linkedin.com/in/benjamin-pepper-62936714b/>

1 Deep Neural Network Spam Email Classifier

1.1 Introduction:

The goal of this project was to train a neural network to classify emails as either “spam” or “nonspam”. This was done on the provided Spambase dataset from the UCI Machine Learning Repository which contains 57 features representing the word frequency within 4601 emails. The response column “type” is the only categorical variable with “spam” and “nonspam” as the two factors.

1.2 Methods:

For the response variable “type”, “spam” was encoded as 1 for the positive class and “nonspam” was encoded as 0 for the negative class.

A multilayer perceptron was then trained and tested via **4-fold cross validation** on the Spambase dataset with the **batch size** set high enough to ensure that all of the samples are propagated through the network in a single pass for each of 10,100 **epochs**, resulting in only a single update to the perceptron’s parameters for each epoch.

The structure of the perceptron consisted of an **input layer** with 57 nodes to correspond to each of the 57 features, a **hidden layer** with 12 nodes, and an **output layer** with 2 nodes: the first can be interpreted as the probability of an email being “nonspam” and the second as the probability of “spam”. The output node with the highest probability determines the classification of an email.

The **sigmoid function** was chosen as the activation function for each of the three layers, **binary cross entropy** as the loss function, and the **Adam optimizer algorithm** for its adaptive learning rate and momentum.

To **prevent overfitting**, generous **dropout layers** of 0.5 were implemented between the three layers. This randomly set 50% of the input elements from a previous layer to 0 which prevented nodes from relying on the output of other nodes, requiring them to be independently useful.

To ensure **reproducible results**, all random seeds were set to 1: `tf.random.set_seed()` from tensorflow and `np.random.seed()` from numpy.

Finally, an **early stopping** measure was implemented whereby the network would cease training after failing to lower the loss across 1000 epochs.

```
[ ]: import numpy as np
      #import importlib

      import spam_functions
      import spam_nested_cv

      dat = spam_functions.get_spam_dat()
      dat = dat.dropna()

      X = dat.drop(57, axis=1)
      y = np.array(dat[57])

      #importlib.reload(spam_functions)
      res_nn = spam_nested_cv.nested_cv(spam_functions.nn_mod, X, y, spam_functions.
      ↪nn_score,

                                      spam_functions.nn_outer_perf, cv_k1 = 4, seed = 1)
```

1.3 Results:

The accuracy for the 4-folds of the cross validation:

```
[2]: res_nn['Perf']

[2]: [0.9539530842745438,
      0.9460869565217391,
      0.9556521739130435,
      0.9547826086956521]
```

The mean accuracy across the 4-folds:

```
[3]: np.mean(res_nn['Perf'])

[3]: 0.9526187058512445
```

1.4 Analysis and Discussion:

Despite the accuracy for fold 2 being slightly lower than the other three folds, all performed similarly. The mean accuracy of 95.26% is high; however, it should be noted that the classifier weighted the cost of making a false positive equal to that of a false negative. This may not be the case if we view filtering out genuine emails into the spam folder to be worse than leaving spam in the main folder. Then, we would want to weigh false positives more costly.