

MSc Data Mining

Topic 05 : Classification

Foundation

Data Handling

Exploratory Data
Analysis

Part 01 : Introduction to Classification

Data Modelling
Fundamentals

Data Modelling
Advanced

Rule Based

Association Rules

Recommender Systems

Unsupervised

Clustering

Anomaly Detection

Supervised

Regression

Basic Classification

Dr Bernard Butler and Dr Kieran Murphy


Department of Computing and Mathematics, WIT.
(bernard.butler@wit.ie; kmurphy@wit.ie)

Spring Semester, 2022

Outline

- How classification differs from regression
- Classification metrics
- Lazy vs Eager learners

Data Mining (Week 5)




Outline

1. Introduction	3
1.1. Classification vs Regression	4
1.2. Summary of Classification Models	7
1.3. Lazy vs Eager Learners	8
2. Evaluating Classification Models	9
2.1. Imperfect Tests	10
2.2. Multiclass Classification	14
3. IRIS Dataset — Classification using Logistic Regression	15

Classification vs Regression


Supervised data models have a target.

If target is quantitate (continuous) then have a **regression model**, if categorical then **classification model**.



Classification models aim to:

- predict class/label for each new observation,
- define a decision boundary between classes,
- and possibly the probability of being in each class.





Regression models aim to:

- predict a continuous value for each new observation.

Classification vs Regression

- Unlike regression, statistical distributions play a limited role in evaluating a classifier:
 - Scope for hypothesis testing is limited (there is no equivalent of the statsmodels diagnostic output (covered by Bernard, in week 4).
 - Depend on empirical metrics — accuracy, precision, recall, f1-score, auc, ...
- Classification metrics tend to be easier to use/understand than those in regression — classification metrics are based on counts of correct (or incorrect) cases divided by a subset of cases.
- Central concept in classification model is the **confusion matrix**:

		Predicted		
		Negative	Positive	
Actual	Negative	 True Negative (TN)	Type I error False Positive (FP)	N
	Positive	Type II error False Negative (FN)	 True Positive (TP)	P
		\hat{N}	\hat{P}	T

Unbalanced Classification Datasets

Practical classification datasets are often **unbalanced** — where the frequency of the classes in the target are very uneven:

- Telecommunication customer churn datasets.
- Credit Card Fraud Detection
- National Institutes of Health Chest X-Ray Dataset

Churn rate of 2%–10%.

0.172% (492 frauds / 284,807 transactions).

14 cases in 5,606 cases

Solutions

Use suitable metrics and/or



Summary of Classification Models

Model	Data Pre-processing*		Impact from		Summary
	Normalisation	Scaling	Collinearity	Outliers	
Logistic Regression	✓	✗	✓	✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Descriptive with good accuracy Reasonable computational requirements
Naïve Bayes	NA	NA	✓	✗	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Works with categorical features only Suitable for small train datasets
KNN	✓	✓	✓	✗	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Local approximation, lazy learner Heavy computational requirements
Random Forest (Week 8)	✗	✗	✗	✗	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High prediction accuracy Limited explainability Works with both continuous and categorical features
Support Vector Classifier (Week 8)	✗	✗	✗/✓	✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High prediction accuracy Explainability depends on kernel Computational effort depends on kernel
Neural Networks (Week 12)	✗	✓	✓	✓	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> High prediction accuracy Self-extract features Heavy computational requirements

*Use `StandardScaler`, or `RobustScaler` if have outliers.

Lazy vs Eager Learners

Lazy learner

Stores training data (or only minor processing) and uses this to compute prediction when given test data.

- Does not generalise until after training
- Does not produce a standalone model
- Training data must be kept for prediction
- Local approximations
- Often based on *search*
- If new data is just added to the training data, it can respond more easily to changing conditions

Usually an (eager) model requires much less memory than a (lazy) training set.

Eager learner

Builds a model from the train set, before receiving new data for prediction

- Training has an extra goal: to generalise from the data
- Training has an extra output: standalone model
- Training data can be discarded after use
- Local and/or global approximations
- Based on *computation*
- Models *drift* with time, so not suited to highly dynamic contexts, as it needs retraining

Lazy vs Eager Learners

Lazy learner

Stores training data (or only minor processing) and uses this to compute prediction when given test data.

- Does not generalise until after training
- Does not produce a standalone model
- Training data must be kept for prediction
- Local approximations
- Often based on *search*
- If new data is just added to the training data, it can respond more easily to changing conditions

Usually an (eager) model requires much less memory than a (lazy) training set.

Eager learner

Builds a model from the train set, before receiving new data for prediction

- Training has an extra goal: to generalise from the data
- Training has an extra output: standalone model
- Training data can be discarded after use
- Local and/or global approximations
- Based on *computation*
- Models *drift* with time, so not suited to highly dynamic contexts, as it needs retraining

Outline



1. Introduction	3
1.1. Classification vs Regression	4
1.2. Summary of Classification Models	7
1.3. Lazy vs Eager Learners	8
2. Evaluating Classification Models	9
2.1. Imperfect Tests	10
2.2. Multiclass Classification	14
3. IRIS Dataset — Classification using Logistic Regression	15

A Non-perfect Test — Type I and Type II Errors

Consider an imperfect test with two outcomes, there are four possible outcomes:

A Non-perfect Test — Type I and Type II Errors



Consider an imperfect test with two outcomes, there are four possible outcomes:

		Predicted		
		Negative	Positive	
Actual	Negative	 True Negative (TN)		N
	Positive		 True Positive (TP)	P
		\hat{N}	\hat{P}	T

A Non-perfect Test — Type I and Type II Errors

Consider an imperfect test with two outcomes, there are four possible outcomes:

Confusion Matrix

		Predicted		
		Negative	Positive	
Actual	Negative	 True Negative (<i>TN</i>)	Type I error False Positive (<i>FP</i>)	<i>N</i>
	Positive	Type II error False Negative (<i>FN</i>)	 True Positive (<i>TP</i>)	<i>P</i>
		\hat{N}	\hat{P}	<i>T</i>

A Non-perfect Test — Type I and Type II Errors

Consider an imperfect test with two outcomes, there are four possible outcomes:

Confusion Matrix


		Predicted		
		Negative	Positive	
Actual	Negative	<div>✓</div> True Negative (TN)	Type I error False Positive (FP)	N
	Positive	Type II error False Negative (FN)	<div>✓</div> True Positive (TP)	P
		\hat{N}	\hat{P}	T

- If the test is applied to $T = P + N = \hat{P} + \hat{N}$ observations / subjects / instances then we have four independent quantities TP , TN , FP , and FN .
- How do we combine these quantities into a single metric?
- The fraction of correct results seems like a good idea


$$\text{accuracy} = \frac{TP + TN}{P + N}$$

But what happens, if we are testing for an rare event? Maximising accuracy will result in the test always returning negative.

Type I error
(false positive)



Type II error
(false negative)



- Ideally we want the probability of either error to be zero but that may not be possible.
- Depending on the conditions we often modify the test to reduce probability of the type of error we don't want at the expense of increasing the probability of the other — think court case vs medical condition.

A Non-perfect Test — Type I and Type II Errors

Consider an imperfect test with two outcomes, there are four possible outcomes:

Confusion Matrix


		Predicted		
		Negative	Positive	
Actual	Negative	<div>✓</div> True Negative (TN)	Type I error False Positive (FP)	N
	Positive	Type II error False Negative (FN)	<div>✓</div> True Positive (TP)	P
		\hat{N}	\hat{P}	T

- If the test is applied to $T = P + N = \hat{P} + \hat{N}$ observations / subjects / instances then we have four independent quantities TP , TN , FP , and FN .
- How do we combine these quantities into a single metric?
- The fraction of correct results seems like a good idea


$$\text{accuracy} = \frac{TP + TN}{P + N}$$

But what happens, if we are testing for an rare event? Maximising accuracy will result in the test always returning negative.

Type I error
(false positive)



Type II error
(false negative)



- Ideally we want the probability of either error to be zero but that may not be possible.
- Depending on the conditions we often modify the test to reduce probability of the type of error we don't want at the expense of increasing the probability of the other — think court case vs medical condition.

A Non-perfect Test — Type I and Type II Errors

Consider an imperfect test with two outcomes, there are four possible outcomes:

Confusion Matrix


		Predicted		
		Negative	Positive	
Actual	Negative	<div>✓</div> True Negative (TN)	Type I error False Positive (FP)	N
	Positive	Type II error False Negative (FN)	<div>✓</div> True Positive (TP)	P
		\hat{N}	\hat{P}	T

- If the test is applied to $T = P + N = \hat{P} + \hat{N}$ observations / subjects / instances then we have four independent quantities TP , TN , FP , and FN .
- How do we combine these quantities into a single metric ?
- The fraction of correct results seems like a good idea


$$\text{accuracy} = \frac{TP + TN}{P + N}$$

But what happens, if we are testing for an rare event? Maximising accuracy will result in the test always returning negative.

Type I error
(false positive)



Type II error
(false negative)



- Ideally we want the probability of either error to be zero but that may not be possible.
- Depending on the conditions we often modify the test to reduce probability of the type of error we don't want at the expense of increasing the probability of the other — think court case vs medical condition.

A Non-perfect Test — Type I and Type II Errors

Consider an imperfect test with two outcomes, there are four possible outcomes:

Confusion Matrix


		Predicted		
		Negative	Positive	
Actual	Negative	<div>✓</div> True Negative (TN)	Type I error False Positive (FP)	N
	Positive	Type II error False Negative (FN)	<div>✓</div> True Positive (TP)	P
		\hat{N}	\hat{P}	T

- If the test is applied to $T = P + N = \hat{P} + \hat{N}$ observations / subjects / instances then we have four independent quantities TP , TN , FP , and FN .
- How do we combine these quantities into a single metric ?
- The fraction of correct results seems like a good idea


$$\text{accuracy} = \frac{TP + TN}{P + N}$$

But what happens, if we are testing for an rare event? Maximising accuracy will result in the test always returning negative.

Type I error
(false positive)



Type II error
(false negative)



- Ideally we want the probability of either error to be zero but that may not be possible.
- Depending on the conditions we often modify the test to reduce probability of the type of error we don't want at the expense of increasing the probability of the other — think court case vs medical condition.

Confusion matrix (Contingency table) Metrics

I

$$\text{Accuracy} = \frac{TP + TN}{P + N}$$

(How often is the classifier correct?)

		Predicted		
		Negative	Positive	
Actual	Negative	✓ True Negative (TN)	Type I error False Positive (FP)	N
	Positive	Type II error False Negative (FN)	✓ True Positive (TP)	P
		\hat{N}	\hat{P}	T

- False negative rate (FNR) = $\frac{FN}{P} = 1 - TPR$
- Sensitivity = Recall** = True positive rate (TPR) = $\frac{TP}{P} = 1 - FNR$
(Of positive cases that exist how many did we mark positive?)
- Specificity** = $\frac{TN}{N} = 1 - FPR$
(When it's actually no, how often does we predict no?)
(Of cases that are negative, how many did we mark negative?)
- False positive rate (FPR) = false acceptance = $\frac{FP}{N} = 1 - \text{Specificity}$
- Precision** = positive predictive value (PPV) = $\frac{TP}{\hat{P}} = \frac{TP}{TP + FP}$
(Of cases that we marked positive, how many were correct?)

Confusion matrix (Contingency table) Metrics

I

$$\text{Accuracy} = \frac{TP + TN}{P + N}$$

(How often is the classifier correct?)

- False negative rate (FNR) = $\frac{FN}{P} = 1 - TPR$

- Sensitivity = Recall = True positive rate (TPR) = $\frac{TP}{P} = 1 - FNR$
(Of positive cases that exist how many did we mark positive?)

- Specificity = $\frac{TN}{N} = 1 - FPR$
(When it's actually no, how often does we predict no?)
(Of cases that are negative, how many did we mark negative?)

- False positive rate (FPR) = false acceptance = $\frac{FP}{N} = 1 - \text{Specificity}$

- Precision = positive predictive value (PPV) = $\frac{TP}{\hat{P}} = \frac{TP}{TP + FP}$
(Of cases that we marked positive, how many were correct?)

		Predicted		
		Negative	Positive	
Actual	Negative	✓ True Negative (TN)	Type I error False Positive (FP)	N
	Positive	Type II error False Negative (FN)	✓ True Positive (TP)	P
		\hat{N}	\hat{P}	T

Confusion matrix (Contingency table) Metrics

I

$$\text{Accuracy} = \frac{TP + TN}{P + N}$$

(How often is the classifier correct?)

- False negative rate (FNR) = $\frac{FN}{P} = 1 - TPR$

- Sensitivity = Recall** = True positive rate (TPR) = $\frac{TP}{P} = 1 - FNR$

(Of positive cases that exist how many did we mark positive?)

- Specificity** = $\frac{TN}{N} = 1 - FPR$

(When it's actually no, how often does we predict no?)

(Of cases that are negative, how many did we mark negative?)

- False positive rate (FPR) = false acceptance = $\frac{FP}{N} = 1 - \text{Specificity}$

- Precision** = positive predictive value (PPV) = $\frac{TP}{\hat{P}} = \frac{TP}{TP + FP}$

(Of cases that we marked positive, how many were correct?)

		Predicted		
		Negative	Positive	
Actual	Negative	✓ True Negative (TN)	Type I error False Positive (FP)	N
	Positive	Type II error False Negative (FN)	✓ True Positive (TP)	P
		\hat{N}	\hat{P}	T

Confusion matrix (Contingency table) Metrics

I

$$\text{Accuracy} = \frac{TP + TN}{P + N}$$

(How often is the classifier correct?)

- False negative rate (FNR) = $\frac{FN}{P} = 1 - TPR$

- Sensitivity = Recall** = True positive rate (TPR) = $\frac{TP}{P} = 1 - FNR$

(Of positive cases that exist how many did we mark positive?)

- Specificity** = $\frac{TN}{N} = 1 - FPR$

(When it's actually no, how often does we predict no?)

(Of cases that are negative, how many did we mark negative?)

- False positive rate (FPR) = false acceptance = $\frac{FP}{N} = 1 - \text{Specificity}$

- Precision** = positive predictive value (PPV) = $\frac{TP}{\hat{P}} = \frac{TP}{TP + FP}$

(Of cases that we marked positive, how many were correct?)

		Predicted		
		Negative	Positive	
Actual	Negative	✓ True Negative (TN)	Type I error False Positive (FP)	N
	Positive	Type II error False Negative (FN)	✓ True Positive (TP)	P
		\hat{N}	\hat{P}	T

Confusion matrix (Contingency table) Metrics

I

$$\text{Accuracy} = \frac{TP + TN}{P + N}$$

(How often is the classifier correct?)

- False negative rate (FNR) = $\frac{FN}{P} = 1 - TPR$

- Sensitivity = Recall** = True positive rate (TPR) = $\frac{TP}{P} = 1 - FNR$

(Of positive cases that exist how many did we mark positive?)

- Specificity** = $\frac{TN}{N} = 1 - FPR$

(When it's actually no, how often does we predict no?)

(Of cases that are negative, how many did we mark negative?)

- False positive rate (FPR) = false acceptance = $\frac{FP}{N} = 1 - \text{Specificity}$

- Precision** = positive predictive value (PPV) = $\frac{TP}{\hat{P}} = \frac{TP}{TP + FP}$

(Of cases that we marked positive, how many were correct?)

		Predicted		
		Negative	Positive	
Actual	Negative	✓ True Negative (TN)	Type I error False Positive (FP)	N
	Positive	Type II error False Negative (FN)	✓ True Positive (TP)	P
		\hat{N}	\hat{P}	T

Confusion matrix (Contingency table) Metrics

I

$$\text{Accuracy} = \frac{TP + TN}{P + N}$$

(How often is the classifier correct?)

- False negative rate (FNR) = $\frac{FN}{P} = 1 - TPR$

- Sensitivity = Recall** = True positive rate (TPR) = $\frac{TP}{P} = 1 - FNR$

(Of positive cases that exist how many did we mark positive?)

- Specificity** = $\frac{TN}{N} = 1 - FPR$

(When it's actually no, how often does we predict no?)

(Of cases that are negative, how many did we mark negative?)

- False positive rate (FPR) = false acceptance = $\frac{FP}{N} = 1 - \text{Specificity}$

- Precision** = positive predictive value (PPV) = $\frac{TP}{\hat{P}} = \frac{TP}{TP + FP}$

(Of cases that we marked positive, how many were correct?)

		Predicted		
		Negative	Positive	
Actual	Negative	✓ True Negative (TN)	Type I error False Positive (FP)	N
	Positive	Type II error False Negative (FN)	✓ True Positive (TP)	P
		\hat{N}	\hat{P}	T

Confusion matrix (Contingency table) Metrics

I

Accuracy — how well model is trained and performs in general

$$\text{Accuracy} = \frac{TP + TN}{P + N}$$

(How often is the classifier correct?)

		Predicted		
		Negative	Positive	
Actual	Negative	✓ True Negative (TN)	Type I error False Positive (FP)	N
	Positive	Type II error False Negative (FN)	✓ True Positive (TP)	P
		\hat{N}	\hat{P}	T

- False negative rate (FNR) = $\frac{FN}{P} = 1 - TPR$

- Sensitivity = Recall** = True positive rate (TPR) = $\frac{TP}{P} = 1 - FNR$

(Of positive cases that exist how many did we mark positive?)

- Specificity** = $\frac{TN}{N} = 1 - FPR$

(When it's actually no, how often does we predict no?)

(Of cases that are negative, how many did we mark negative?)

- False positive rate (FPR) = false acceptance = $\frac{FP}{N} = 1 - \text{Specificity}$

- Precision** = positive predictive value (PPV) = $\frac{TP}{\hat{P}} = \frac{TP}{TP + FP}$

(Of cases that we marked positive, how many were correct?)

Recall — important when the costs of false negatives are high

Precision — important when the costs of false positives are high

Confusion matrix (Contingency table) Metrics

F₁ Score

The F-measure or balanced F-score (F₁ score) is the harmonic mean of precision and recall:

$$F_1 = 2 \left[\frac{1}{\frac{1}{\text{precision}} + \frac{1}{\text{recall}}} \right] = 2 \left[\frac{\text{precision} \times \text{recall}}{\text{precision} + \text{recall}} \right]$$

A word of Caution ...

Consider the three binary classifiers A, B and C

	A		B		C	
	T	F	T	F	T	F
T	0.9	0.1	0.8	0	0.78	0
F	0	0	0.1	0.1	0.12	0.1

Confusion matrix (Contingency table) Metrics

F₁ Score

The F-measure or balanced F-score (F₁ score) is the harmonic mean of precision and recall:

$$F_1 = 2 \left[\frac{1}{\frac{1}{\text{precision}} + \frac{1}{\text{recall}}} \right] = 2 \left[\frac{\text{precision} \times \text{recall}}{\text{precision} + \text{recall}} \right]$$

A word of Caution ...

Consider the three binary classifiers A, B and C

	A		B		C	
	T	F	T	F	T	F
T	0.9	0.1	0.8	0	0.78	0
F	0	0	0.1	0.1	0.12	0.1

Confusion matrix (Contingency table) Metrics

F₁ Score

The F-measure or balanced F-score (F₁ score) is the harmonic mean of precision and recall:

$$F_1 = 2 \left[\frac{1}{\frac{1}{\text{precision}} + \frac{1}{\text{recall}}} \right] = 2 \left[\frac{\text{precision} \times \text{recall}}{\text{precision} + \text{recall}} \right]$$

A word of Caution ...

Consider the three binary classifiers A, B and C

	A		B		C	
	T	F	T	F	T	F
T	0.9	0.1	0.8	0	0.78	0
F	0	0	0.1	0.1	0.12	0.1

Clearly classifier **A** is useless since it always predicts label **T** regardless of the input. Also, B is slightly better than C (lower off- diagonal total).

Confusion matrix (Contingency table) Metrics

F₁ Score

The F-measure or balanced F-score (F₁ score) is the harmonic mean of precision and recall:

$$F_1 = 2 \left[\frac{1}{\frac{1}{\text{precision}} + \frac{1}{\text{recall}}} \right] = 2 \left[\frac{\text{precision} \times \text{recall}}{\text{precision} + \text{recall}} \right]$$

A word of Caution ...

Consider the three binary classifiers A, B and C

	A		B		C	
	T	F	T	F	T	F
T	0.9	0.1	0.8	0	0.78	0
F	0	0	0.1	0.1	0.12	0.1

Metric	A	B	C	(best)
Accuracy	0.9	0.9	0.88	AB
Precision	0.9	1.0	1.0	BC
Recall	1.0	0.888	0.8667	A
F-score	0.947	0.941	0.9286	A

Clearly classifier **A** is useless since it always predicts label **T** regardless of the input. Also, B is slightly better than C (lower off- diagonal total).

Yet look at the performance metrics – B is never the clear winner.

Confusion matrix (Contingency table) Metrics

F₁ Score

The F-measure or balanced F-score (F₁ score) is the harmonic mean of precision and recall:

$$F_1 = 2 \left[\frac{1}{\frac{1}{\text{precision}} + \frac{1}{\text{recall}}} \right] = 2 \left[\frac{\text{precision} \times \text{recall}}{\text{precision} + \text{recall}} \right]$$

A word of Caution ...

Consider the three binary classifiers A, B and C

	A		B		C	
	T	F	T	F	T	F
T	0.9	0.1	0.8	0	0.78	0
F	0	0	0.1	0.1	0.12	0.1

Metric	A	B	C	(best)
Accuracy	0.9	0.9	0.88	AB
Precision	0.9	1.0	1.0	BC
Recall	1.0	0.888	0.8667	A
F-score	0.947	0.941	0.9286	A

Clearly classifier **A** is useless since it always predicts label **T** regardless of the input. Also, B is slightly better than C (lower off-diagonal total).

Yet look at the performance metrics – B is never the clear winner.

We use some metrics because they are easy to understand, and not because they always give the “correct” result.

Mutual Information is a Better Metric

The **mutual information** between predicted and actual label (case) is defined

$$I(\hat{y}, y) = \sum_{\hat{y}=\{0,1\}} \sum_{y=\{0,1\}} p(\hat{y}, y) \log \frac{p(\hat{y}, y)}{p(\hat{y})p(y)}$$

where $p(\hat{y}, y)$ is the **joint probability distribution** function.

This gives the intuitively correct rankings $B > C > A$

Metric	A	B	C
Accuracy	0.9	0.9	0.88
Precision	0.9	1.0	1.0
Recall	1.0	0.888	0.8667
F-score	0.947	0.941	0.9286
Mutual information	0	0.1865	0.1735

Multiclass Classifier — Micro Average vs Macro Average Performance

In a multi-class classifier we have more than two classes. To combine the metrics for individual classes to get an overall system metrics, we can apply either

Micro-Average Method

Sum up the individual true positives, false positives, and false negatives of the system for different classes and then apply totals to get the statistics.

Macro-average Method

Average the precision and recall of the system on different classes.


See `classification_report` from `sklearn.metrics` (Example: IRIS dataset)

	precision	recall	f1-score	support
setosa	1.00	0.95	0.97	19
versicolor	0.81	0.74	0.77	23
virginica	0.71	0.83	0.77	18
accuracy			0.83	60
macro avg	0.84	0.84	0.84	60
weighted avg	0.84	0.83	0.84	60

Outline

1. Introduction	3
1.1. Classification vs Regression	4
1.2. Summary of Classification Models	7
1.3. Lazy vs Eager Learners	8
2. Evaluating Classification Models	9
2.1. Imperfect Tests	10
2.2. Multiclass Classification	14
3. IRIS Dataset — Classification using Logistic Regression	15

Example: IRIS Dataset — Load



UCI Machine Learning Repository: Iris Data Set

Iris Data Set
Download [Data Folder](#) [Data Set Description](#)

Abstract: Famous database; from Fisher, 1936

Data Set Characteristics:	Multivariate	Number of Instances:	150	Area:	Life
Attribute Characteristics:	Real	Number of Attributes:	4	Date Donated:	1988-07-01
Associated Tasks:	Classification	Missing Values?	No	Number of Web Hits:	2852935

Source:
Creator:
R.A. Fisher
Donor:

iris.feature_names

`['sepal length (cm)',
'sepal width (cm)',
'petal length (cm)',
'petal width (cm)']`

```
from sklearn import datasets
iris = datasets.load_iris()
```

```
df = pd.DataFrame(iris.data)
df.columns = iris.feature_names
df['target'] = iris.target_names[iris.target]
df.sample(4)
```

	sepal length (cm)	sepal width (cm)	petal length (cm)	petal width (cm)	target
17	5.1	3.5	1.4	0.3	setosa
80	5.5	2.4	3.8	1.1	versicolor
97	6.2	2.9	4.3	1.3	versicolor
99	5.7	2.8	4.1	1.3	versicolor

The data set contains, four numeric features, 3 classes of 50 instances each, where each class refers to a type of iris plant. One class is **linearly separable** from the other 2; the latter are NOT linearly separable from each other.

Example: IRIS Dataset — Preprocess Data

We will cover some classifiers in a moment, but for now just treat the classifiers (LogisticRegression) as a black box and focus on the general process:

➤ Extract the data (features and target)

➤ Split dataset into `train` and `test`

Example: IRIS Dataset — Preprocess Data

We will cover some classifiers in a moment, but for now just treat the classifiers (LogisticRegression) as a black box and focus on the general process:

➤ Extract the data (features and target)

The IRIS dataset has 4 features, but to simplify visualisation we are only going to use the first two[†] (‘sepal length’ and ‘sepal width’):

```
5 dataset_name = "IRIS"  
X, y, target_names = iris.data[:, :2], iris.target, iris.target_names
```

➤ Split dataset into train and test

[†]Python for Data Science — Cheat Sheet Numpy Basics

Example: IRIS Dataset — Preprocess Data

We will cover some classifiers in a moment, but for now just treat the classifiers (LogisticRegression) as a black box and focus on the general process:

➤ Extract the data (features and target)

The IRIS dataset has 4 features, but to simplify visualisation we are only going to use the first two[†] ('sepal length' and 'sepal width'):

```
7 dataset_name = "IRIS"
  X, y, target_names = iris.data[:, :2], iris.target, iris.target_names
```

➤ Split dataset into train and test

We will keep 40% of the data for testing. Setting the parameter `random_state` to a value means that we will get a random — but still reproducible — split.

```
8 from sklearn.model_selection import train_test_split
  X_train, X_test, y_train, y_test = train_test_split(X, y, train_size=0.6, random_state=666):
```

[†]Python for Data Science — Cheat Sheet Numpy Basics

Example: IRIS Dataset — Fit Model and Predict

Select classifier

Train model

Predict

Example: IRIS Dataset — Fit Model and Predict

Select classifier

Scikit-learn supports a **large set of classifiers**, and aims to have a consistent interface to all. First import classifier and create instance ...

```
12 from sklearn.linear_model import LogisticRegression  
model = LogisticRegression(max_iter=500)
```

Train model

Predict

Example: IRIS Dataset — Fit Model and Predict

Select classifier

Scikit-learn supports a [large set of classifiers](#), and aims to have a consistent interface to all. First import classifier and create instance ...

```
15 from sklearn.linear_model import LogisticRegression  
model = LogisticRegression(max_iter=500)
```

Train model

Then we train (fit) the classifier/model using only the features (`X_train`) and targets (`y_train`) from the train dataset ...

```
16 model.fit(X_train, y_train)
```

```
LogisticRegression(max_iter=500)
```

Predict

Example: IRIS Dataset — Fit Model and Predict

Select classifier

Scikit-learn supports a [large set of classifiers](#), and aims to have a consistent interface to all. First import classifier and create instance ...

```
18 from sklearn.linear_model import LogisticRegression  
model = LogisticRegression(max_iter=500)
```

Train model

Then we train (fit) the classifier/model using only the features (`X_train`) and targets (`y_train`) from the train dataset ...

```
19 model.fit(X_train, y_train)
```

```
LogisticRegression(max_iter=500)
```

Predict

Now that model is trained, we can use it to generate predictions, using the features (`X_test`) from the test dataset ...

```
20 y_pred = model.predict(X_test)
```


Example: IRIS Dataset — Evaluate

I

Scoring and confusion matrix

Example: IRIS Dataset — Evaluate

Scoring and confusion matrix

We could just compute the score using whatever metric we have picked ...

```
24 from sklearn.metrics import accuracy_score
   accuracy_score(y_test, y_pred)
```

```
0.8333333333333334
```

But this needs context, and even if good it can hide critical flaws. Lets look at the confusion matrix ...

```
25 from sklearn.metrics import confusion_matrix
   cm = confusion_matrix(y_test, y_pred)
   cm
```

```
array([[18, 1, 0],
       [ 0, 17, 6],
       [ 0, 3, 15]])
```

or, to get a nicer output, convert to a DataFrame ...


```
26 df_cm = pd.crosstab(target_names[y_test], target_names[y_pred])
   df_cm.index.name = 'Actual'
   df_cm.columns.name = 'Predicted'
   df_cm
```

	Predicted		
	setosa	versicolor	virginica
Actual			
setosa	18	1	0
versicolor	0	17	6
virginica	0	3	15

Example: IRIS Dataset — Evaluate

The confusion matrix is fundamental in evaluating a classifier, so find a presentation/visualisation that you like and use it. Here I have a heat map representation that I tend to use.

Predicted setosa versicolor virginica			
Actual			
setosa	18	1	0
versicolor	0	17	6
virginica	0	3	15



```

27 plt.figure(figsize=(6,6))
   g = sns.heatmap(df_cm, annot=True, cmap="Blues")
   g.xaxis.set_ticks_position("top")
   g.xaxis.set_label_position('top')


```

Example: IRIS Dataset — Evaluate

The confusion matrix is fundamental in evaluating a classifier, so find a presentation/visualisation that you like and use it. Here I have a heat map representation that I tend to use.

Predicted setosa versicolor virginica			
Actual			
setosa	18	1	0
versicolor	0	17	6
virginica	0	3	15

The first class **setosa** was only misclassified once, while the classifier had more difficulty between the second two classes.



```


28 plt.figure(figsize=(6,6))
   g = sns.heatmap(df_cm, annot=True, cmap="Blues")
   g.xaxis.set_ticks_position("top")
   g.xaxis.set_label_position('top')

```

Example: IRIS Dataset — Evaluate

The classification report, constructed from the confusion matrix, summaries the most common metrics per class and for overall averages ...

29 `from sklearn.metrics import classification_report`
`print(classification_report(y_test, y_pred, target_names=target_names))`




	precision	recall	f1-score	support
setosa	1.00	0.95	0.97	19
versicolor	0.81	0.74	0.77	23
virginica	0.71	0.83	0.77	18
accuracy			0.83	60
macro avg	0.84	0.84	0.84	60
weighted avg	0.84	0.83	0.84	60

Example: IRIS Dataset — Evaluate

The classification report, constructed from the confusion matrix, summarizes the most common metrics per class and for overall averages ...

```
30 from sklearn.metrics import classification_report
    print(classification_report(y_test, y_pred, target_names=target_names))
```

$$\text{precision (setosa)} = TP/\hat{P} = 18/(18 + 0 + 0) = 1$$



	precision	recall	f1-score	support
setosa	1.00	0.95	0.97	19
versicolor	0.81	0.74	0.77	23
virginica	0.71	0.83	0.77	18
accuracy			0.83	60
macro avg	0.84	0.84	0.84	60
weighted avg	0.84	0.83	0.84	60


Example: IRIS Dataset — Evaluate

The classification report, constructed from the confusion matrix, summaries the most common metrics per class and for overall averages ...

```
31 from sklearn.metrics import classification_report
print(classification_report(y_test, y_pred, target_names=target_names))
```

$$\text{precision (setosa)} = TP/\hat{P} = 18/(18 + 0 + 0) = 1$$

$$\text{recall (setosa)} = TP/P = 18/(18 + 1 + 0) = 0.95$$



	precision	recall	f1-score	support
setosa	1.00	0.95	0.97	19
versicolor	0.81	0.74	0.77	23
virginica	0.71	0.83	0.77	18
accuracy			0.83	60
macro avg	0.84	0.84	0.84	60
weighted avg	0.84	0.83	0.84	60


Example: IRIS Dataset — Evaluate

The classification report, constructed from the confusion matrix, summarizes the most common metrics per class and for overall averages ...

```
32 from sklearn.metrics import classification_report
print(classification_report(y_test, y_pred, target_names=target_names))
```

$$\text{precision (setosa)} = TP/\hat{P} = 18/(18 + 0 + 0) = 1$$

$$\text{recall (setosa)} = TP/P = 18/(18 + 1 + 0) = 0.95$$



	precision	recall	f1-score	support
setosa	1.00	0.95	0.97	19
versicolor	0.81	0.74	0.77	23
virginica	0.71	0.83	0.77	18
accuracy			0.83	60
macro avg	0.84	0.84	0.84	60
weighted avg	0.84	0.83	0.84	60

$$\text{accuracy} = (TP + TN)/(P + N) = (18 + 17 + 15)/60 = 0.83$$


Example: IRIS Dataset — Evaluate

The classification report, constructed from the confusion matrix, summarizes the most common metrics per class and for overall averages ...

```
33 from sklearn.metrics import classification_report
print(classification_report(y_test, y_pred, target_names=target_names))
```

$$\text{precision (setosa)} = TP/\hat{P} = 18/(18 + 0 + 0) = 1$$

$$\text{recall (setosa)} = TP/P = 18/(18 + 1 + 0) = 0.95$$



	precision	recall	f1-score	support
setosa	1.00	0.95	0.97	19
versicolor	0.81	0.74	0.77	23
virginica	0.71	0.83	0.77	18
accuracy			0.83	60
macro avg	0.84	0.84	0.84	60
weighted avg	0.84	0.83	0.84	60

$$\text{accuracy} = (TP + TN)/(P + N) = (18 + 17 + 15)/60 = 0.83$$

$$\text{f1-score (virginica)} = 2 / \left(\frac{1}{\text{precision}} + \frac{1}{\text{recall}} \right) = 2 / \left(\frac{1}{0.71} + \frac{1}{0.83} \right) = 0.77$$