



Model Optimization and Tuning Phase Template

| Date | 24 June 2025 |
|---------------|---|
| Team ID | SWTID1749708868 |
| Project Title | Revolutionizing Liver Care: Predicting Liver Cirrhosis Using Advanced Machine Learning Techniques |
| Maximum Marks | 10 Marks |

Model Optimization and Tuning Phase

The Model Optimization and Tuning Phase involves refining machine learning models for peak performance. It includes optimized model code, fine-tuning hyperparameters, comparing performance metrics, and justifying the final model selection for enhanced predictive accuracy and efficiency.

Performance Metrics Comparison Report (2 Marks):

| Model | В | aselir | ie Me | tric | | Optimized Metric | | | | |
|---------------------|---|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------|---------------------------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| Logistic Regression | Classification Re | | recall f | 1-score s | upport | Classification | Report: precision | recall | f1-score | support |
| | 0 1 2 | 0.00 0.85 0.82 | 0.00 0.85 0.85 | 0.00 0.85 0.83 | 11 4 172 | 0 1 2 | 0.00 1.00 0.94 | 0.00 1.00 0.97 | 0.00 1.00 0.95 | 11 4 172 |
| | accuracy macro avg weighted avg | 0.56 0.76 | 0.57 0.78 | 0.78 0.56 0.77 | 187 187 187 | accuracy macro avg weighted avg | 0.65 0.88 | 0.66 0.91 | 0.91 0.65 0.90 | 187 187 187 |
| SVM (RBF) | Classification Report: precision recall f1-score support | | | | Classification | Report: precision | recall | f1-score | support | |
| | 0 1 2 | 0.00 1.00 0.94 | 0.00 1.00 1.00 | 0.00 1.00 0.97 | 11 4 172 | 0 1 2 | 0.00 1.00 0.94 | 0.00 1.00 1.00 | 0.00 1.00 0.97 | 11 4 172 |
| | accuracy macro avg weighted avg | 0.65 0.89 | 0.67 0.94 | 0.94 0.66 0.91 | 187 187 187 | accuracy macro avg weighted avg | 0.65 0.89 | 0.67 0.94 | 0.94 0.66 0.91 | 187 187 187 |
| KNN | Classification precision | | | re suppoi | rt | Classification | Report: precision | recall | f1-score | support |
| | 1 1.00 2 0.94 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 4 172 | | 0 1 2 | 0.00 1.00 0.94 | 0.00 1.00 1.00 | 0.00 1.00 0.97 | 11 4 172 |
| | accuracy 0. macro avg 0 weighted avg | | | .66 187 0.91 | 7 187 | accuracy macro avg weighted avg | 0.65 0.89 | 0.67 0.94 | 0.94 0.66 0.91 | 187 187 187 |





| Decision Tree | Classificat | | recall | f1-score | support | Classification | n Report: precision | recall | f1-score | support |
|---------------|--------------------------------------|----------------|--------------|------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------|--------------|----------------------|-------------------|
| | 0 | 0.60 | 0.55 | 0.57 | 11 | 0 | 0.60 | 0.55 | 0.57 | 11 |
| | 1 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 4 | 1 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 4 |
| | 2 | 0.97 | 0.98 | 0.97 | 172 | 2 | 0.97 | 0.98 | 0.97 | 172 |
| | accurac macro av weighted av | 9 0.86 | | 0.95 0.85 0.95 | 5 187 187 187 | accuracy macro avg weighted avg | 0.86 0.95 | 0.84 0.95 | 0.95 0.85 0.95 | 187 187 187 |
| Random Forest | Classification Report: | | | Classification Report: | | | | | | |
| | precisi | | | | | | precision | recall | f1-score | support |
| | 0 0.0 | | 0.00 | | 1 | 0 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 11 |
| | 1 1.0 | 0 1.00 | 1.00 |) | 4 | 1 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 4 |
| | 2 0.9 | 4 0.98 | 0.96 | 5 17 | '2 | 2 | 0.94 | 0.98 | 0.96 | 172 |
| | accuracy macro avg weighted av | 0.65 g 0.88 | 0.66 0.93 | 0.93 0.65 0.90 | 187 187 187 | accuracy macro avg weighted avg | 0.65 0.88 | 0.66 0.93 | 0.93 0.65 0.90 | 187 187 187 |





Final Model Selection Justification (2 Marks):

| Final Model | Reasoning |
|---------------|--|
| | The Decision Tree was chosen for its strong performance, |
| Decision Tree | interpretability, and clinical relevance. It provided clear, traceable |
| | decision rules for cirrhosis diagnosis while maintaining good |
| | accuracy. Feature importance rankings identified key biomarkers, and |
| | tuning prevented overfitting. |