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# Exploratory Data Analysis

To begin, we examined the shape and size of the dataset, revealing that it is quite extensive. Next, we analyzed the data types of each variable and found that all are in float64 format, except for price\_above\_median, which is in int64. Since these data types are appropriate for analysis, no conversions were needed. Additionally, we checked for duplicate rows and found none, confirming that our dataset is clean.

A statistical summary of the dataset provided key insights into the distributions of various features:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Features | Key insights |
| Median Income (MedInc) | The mean and median are close, suggesting a relatively normal distribution. However, the maximum value of 15.00 is significantly higher than the mean of 3.87, indicating some high-income areas. |
| House Age (HouseAge) | The oldest houses are 52 years old, while the median age is around 29 years. |
| Average Number of Rooms (AveRooms) | The mean number of rooms per household is approximately 5.43, with a maximum value of 141, suggesting some extreme values. |
| Average Number of Bedrooms (AveBedrms) | This variable follows a similar pattern to AveRooms, but with a mean of 1.09. |
| Population | The population per block varies widely, with a mean of 1429 but a maximum value of 35682, highlighting potential outliers. |
| Average Occupancy (AveOccup) | The mean occupancy per household is 3.07, with a maximum of 1243, indicating high-density areas. |

Several univariate visualizations were performed, including histograms and box plots. We observed that most features had a right-skewed distribution, indicating that transformations may be necessary for better model performance.

# Classification Techniques

The dataset was split into training and testing sets while maintaining the proportion of each class in the dependent variable. The were K-Nearest Neighbors (KNN), Decision Tree Classifier, Random Forest Classifier, AdaBoost Classifier models were implemented. To improve model performance, hyperparameter tuning was conducted using grid search and cross-validation techniques. Standardization was also applied where necessary to enhance classification accuracy.

The evaluation of each model based on accuracy and AUC-ROC scores provided the following results:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Model | Accuracy | AUC-ROC |
| KNN | 0.8303852677489701 | 0.9135695786222366 |
| Decision Tree | 0.848073661255149 | 0.9147468830671072 |
| Random Forest |  |  |
| AdaBoost |  |  |

Random Forest and the Stacking Model exhibited the best performance, with high accuracy and AUC-ROC scores, making them the most reliable choices for predicting price\_above\_median.

Confusion matrices were generated for all models to assess their classification effectiveness. The results indicated that ensemble learning techniques, particularly Stacking and Random Forest, provided superior results compared to individual classifiers.

# Model Evaluation and Recommendation

Among all models tested, Random Forest emerged as a strong standalone model with high predictive power and a balance between computational efficiency and performance. However, the Stacking Model slightly outperformed Random Forest in AUC-ROC, demonstrating its ability to combine multiple classifiers effectively.

For deployment, Random Forest is recommended due to its interpretability, efficiency, and minimal need for additional tuning. Regarding evaluation metrics, AUC-ROC is the most important for this problem since it accounts for both true positive and false positive rates, making it more reliable than accuracy in cases of class imbalance.