

Edward Pascual-Bautista  
ECGR 4105-001  
HW4

<https://github.com/Edward-Cloud9/HW4.git>

1. The results for accuracy, precision and recall:

Linear:					
		precision	recall	f1-score	support
	0	0.9362	0.9362	0.9362	47
	1	0.9552	0.9552	0.9552	67
accuracy				0.9474	114
macro avg		0.9457	0.9457	0.9457	114
weighted avg		0.9474	0.9474	0.9474	114
RBF:					
		precision	recall	f1-score	support
	0	1.0000	0.9787	0.9892	47
	1	0.9853	1.0000	0.9926	67
accuracy				0.9912	114
macro avg		0.9926	0.9894	0.9909	114
weighted avg		0.9914	0.9912	0.9912	114
Poly:					
		precision	recall	f1-score	support
	0	1.0000	0.9574	0.9783	47
	1	0.9710	1.0000	0.9853	67
accuracy				0.9825	114
macro avg		0.9855	0.9787	0.9818	114
weighted avg		0.9830	0.9825	0.9824	114

Accuracy results for Linear, RBF, and Poly: 94.7%, 99.1%, and 98.2% respectively at n = 5

Linear

Precision: 0.9552238805970149

Recall: 0.9552238805970149

RBF

Precision: 0.9852941176470589

Recall: 1.0

Poly

Precision: 0.9710144927536232

Recall: 1.0

Getting any higher for n and the accuracy for RBF and Poly slightly decreases.

	precision	recall	f1-score	support
0	0.9565	0.9362	0.9462	47
1	0.9559	0.9701	0.9630	67
accuracy			0.9561	114
macro avg	0.9562	0.9532	0.9546	114
weighted avg	0.9561	0.9561	0.9561	114

In comparison with the logistic regression with PCA, the RBF and Poly methods have better accuracy compared to this model.

Plotting caused issues, therefore no graphs are posted at the time of this report.

2. The loss results for linear, rbf, and poly methods:

```
Loss: 947860338641.9976 1279027590158.7593 1622321986946.383
```

In comparison to HW1 loss cost, this method seems to be at high values.

Due to coding errors for plotting, no graphs of plots at the time of writing this report.