

## Task 1

Comparing score distributions could avoid a high chance of drawing false conclusions of single performance scores, which is due to different local minima in cost function optimization.

## Task 2.3

Epoch 00001: val\_categorical\_accuracy improved from -inf to 0.69575, saving model to results\lstm.model  
Epoch 00002: val\_categorical\_accuracy improved from 0.69575 to 0.73184, saving model to results\lstm.model  
Epoch 00003: val\_categorical\_accuracy improved from 0.73184 to 0.75126, saving model to results\lstm.model  
Epoch 00004: val\_categorical\_accuracy improved from 0.75126 to 0.76122, saving model to results\lstm.model  
Epoch 00005: val\_categorical\_accuracy improved from 0.76122 to 0.76956, saving model to results\lstm.model  
Epoch 00006: val\_categorical\_accuracy improved from 0.76956 to 0.77668, saving model to results\lstm.model  
Epoch 00007: val\_categorical\_accuracy improved from 0.77668 to 0.78202, saving model to results\lstm.model  
Epoch 00008: val\_categorical\_accuracy improved from 0.78202 to 0.78540, saving model to results\lstm.model  
Epoch 00009: val\_categorical\_accuracy improved from 0.78540 to 0.78755, saving model to results\lstm.model  
Epoch 00010: val\_categorical\_accuracy improved from 0.78755 to 0.78894, saving model to results\lstm.model  
F1 score on test set: 0.5126219948196673

```
Epoch 00010: val_categorical_accuracy improved from 0.78755 to 0.78894, saving model to results\lstm.model  
C:\Anaconda3\lib\site-packages\sklearn\metrics\_classification.py:1515: UndefinedMetricWarning: F-score is  
F1 score on test set: 0.5126219948196673
```

## Task 2.4

If labels of datasets are extreme (most of labels belong to several taggings, the rest labels supply only a small proportion), categorical\_accuracy could not give a comprehensive metric. In this case f1 score performs better, because it is not sensitive to the distributing of labels.

```
get better f1 score, saving model to results\lstm.model  
F1 score 0.512947  
F1 score on test set: 0.5126219948196673  
-----
```

From result the callback function with F1 score doesn't show any difference from categorical\_accuracy(callback function).

## Task 2.5

```
params = {"model_path": model_path,  
          "predict_file": predict_file,  
          "checkpointer": "f1", # "acc" or "f1"  
          "batch_size": 50,  
          "dropout": 0.3,  
          "hidden_units": 100,  
          "epochs": 100,  
          "embeddings": "glove.6B.50d.txt"}
```

```
F1 score 0.659614  
F1 score on test set: 0.6626742936265421  
-----
```

```
params = {"model_path": model_path,  
          "predict_file": predict_file,  
          "checkpointer": "f1", # "acc" or "f1"  
          "batch_size": 40,  
          "dropout": 0.2,  
          "hidden_units": 100,  
          "epochs": 40,  
          "embeddings": "glove.6B.50d.txt"}
```

```
get better f1 score, saving model to results\lstm.model  
F1 score 0.630219  
F1 score on test set: 0.6341355844702646  
-----
```

```
params = {"model_path": model_path,  
          "predict_file": predict_file,  
          "checkpointer": "f1", # "acc" or "f1"  
          "batch_size": 20,  
          "dropout": 0.5,  
          "hidden_units": 100,  
          "epochs": 20,  
          "embeddings": "glove.6B.50d.txt"}
```

```
get better f1 score, saving model to results\lstm.model  
F1 score 0.527889  
F1 score on test set: 0.5318605177655568
```

## Task 2.6

Most of Prediction is accurate, but in predictions.txt exist also a few prediction errors, such as:

,	,	,	as	IN	IN
leicestershire	NNP	NNP	surrey	NNP	NNP
extended	IN	VBD	closed	IN	VBD
their	PRP\$	PRP\$	on	IN	IN
first	JJ	JJ	179	CD	CD
1936	CD	CD			
by	VBD	IN			
reducing	NN	VBG			
worcestershire	NN	NNP			
to	TO	TO			
133	CD	CD			

From selective examination proves that the model has difficulty in distinguish IN and VBD.

OOV (Out of vocabulary) Words nearly belong to CD and NNP, which could be relative accurate distinguished.