

# Project 1

**Name: Caleb Thian Jia Le 田家樂**

**Student ID: NN6114035**

---

1. Experiment on dataset 2022-DM-release-testdata-2.txt ,let

low min\_sup = 0.05

low min\_conf = 0.1

high min\_sup = 0.1

high min\_conf = 0.5

Record the time used by apriori and FP-tree under different combination of parameters mentioned, with the number of rules found respectively.

min_sup	min_conf	Time(s)		Number of Rules Found	
		Apriori	FP-tree	Apriori	FP-tree
Low	Low	18.36	59.21	10287	1799
Low	High	18.31	59.35	3295	611
High	Low	0.14	58.90	2	2
High	High	0.14	59.11	2	2
(Extra) 0.05	0.1	147.06	59.42	123246	7942
(Extra) 0.05	0.5	150.49	59.70	24960	2662

Observation:

- Increasing min\_sup reduces the time used of Apriori, because more frequent patterns can be pruned in process, thus increase the speed for pattern generation.
- Time used of FP-tree does not be reduces because min\_sup and min\_conf does not reduces the candidate patterns generated, unlike Apriori
- But at the same time, number of rules found decreased in both algorithm as the threshold of support for rules is increased.
- Increasing min\_conf, with low min\_sup, will reduces the number of rules found
- Extra data will be discussed with the next dataset.

2. Experiment on dataset data.txt, which is generated by IBM Generator, let

low min\_sup = 0.0025

low min\_conf = 0.0025

high min\_sup = 0.003

high min\_conf = 0.7

Record the time used by apriori and FP-tree under different combination of parameters mentioned, with the number of rules found respectively

		Time(s)		Number of Rules Found	
min_sup	min_conf	Apriori	FP-tree	Apriori	FP-tree
Low	Low	51.69	5.32	232	192
Low	High	51.85	5.37	217	175
High	Low	9.77	5.34	22	2
High	High	9.8	5.36	22	2

Observation:

- Similar as observations mentioned.
- The only different is the time-used for FP-tree is less than the time-used for Apriori, this should because to the difference of datasets, and suitable min\_sup.
- min\_sup directly affect the number of calculation need to be done of these two algorithms. If min\_sup is unsuitable, Apriori may faster than FP-tree

3. Experiment on Kaggle dataset `kaggle.txt`, which is preprocess by `utils.init_kaggle()` on the dataset `basket_analysis.csv`<sup>1</sup>, let

low `min_sup` = 0.1

low `min_conf` = 0.1

high `min_sup` = 0.2

high `min_conf` = 0.5

Record the time used by apriori and FP-tree under different combination of parameters mentioned, with the number of rules found respectively

min_sup	min_conf	Time(s)		Number of Rules Found	
		Apriori	FP-tree	Apriori	FP-tree
Low	Low	0.74	1.79	438	252
Low	High	0.75	1.81	97	68
High	Low	0.13	1.79	12	54
High	High	0.13	1.77	3	47

Observation:

- Similar as above observation
- The only things different from others is that FP-tree found more rules than Apriori when high `min_sup`. It maybe because of the pruning strategies is different between these two algorithms, making the counting is slightly difference.
- Different dataset may have different range for `min_sup` and `min_conf`, i.e., the maximum for these two parameters that making these algorithms cannot discover any rules from the dataset, can be different, thus low and high definition can also be varying sharply.

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/ahmtcnbs/datasets-for-apriori>