**Table 2.7.** Comparision of the results when applying NN (problem adaptation approach)

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author(s)** | **Methods** | **Approx. accuracy** | **Comments** |
| D. Goštautaitė (2024) | Neural network | 0.505 | Uses back propagation and Adam optimizer. Predicts the probability for each class label. |
| Santos et al. (2011) | BPMLL | 0.185-0.212 | Predicts the probability for each class label. |
| Bernard (2017) | Artificial neural network | 0.774 | Both individual and ensemble training modes assessed. Predicts the probability for each class label. |
| Gomede at al.(2020) | Artificial neural network | 0.750-0.850 depending on the dimension | Predicts the probability for each class label. |
| Villaverde et al. (2006) | Feed-forward neural network | 0.693 | Hyperbolic tangent activation function was used. Predicts the probability for each class label. Not all learning style dimensions used. |
| Luna (2018) | Neural network | 0.77 | Uses back propagation. Input data was fuzzified in a pre-processing stage |