

**Project Development Phase**  
**Model Performance Test**

Date	19 November 2022
Team ID	PNT2022TMID31803
Project Name	Project – Early Detection of Chronic Kidney Disease using Machine Learning
Maximum Marks	10 Marks

**Model Performance Testing:**

Project team shall fill the following information in model performance testing template.

S.No.	Parameter	Values	Screenshot
1.	Metrics	<b>Regression Model:</b> MAE -, MSE -, RMSE -, R2 score -  <b>Classification Model:</b> Confusion Matrix -, Accuray Score- & Classification Report -	See Below
2.	Tune the Model	Hyperparameter Tuning - Validation Method -	See Below

**1. Metrics**

**Model: Random Forest Classification**

**check model performance Random forest gives accurate predictions than logistic regression**

```
In [51]: accuracy_score(y_test,y_pred)
```

```
Out[51]: 0.95
```

```
In [52]: conf_mat=confusion_matrix(y_test,y_pred)
conf_mat
```

```
Out[52]: array([[52,  2],
               [ 2, 24]], dtype=int64)
```

```
In [53]: print(classification_report(y_test,y_pred))
```

	precision	recall	f1-score	support
0	0.96	0.96	0.96	54
1	0.92	0.92	0.92	26
accuracy			0.95	80
macro avg	0.94	0.94	0.94	80
weighted avg	0.95	0.95	0.95	80

```
In [54]: pickle.dump(lgr,open('CKD.pkl','wb'))
```

## 2. Tune the Model

### Hyperparameter Tuning:

- The number of features is important and should be tuned in random forest classification.
- Initially all parameters in the dataset are taken as independent values to arrive at the dependent decision of Chronic Kidney Disease or No Chronic Kidney Disease.
- But the result was not accurate so used only 8 more correlated values as independent values to arrive at the dependent decision of Chronic Kidney Disease or not.

### Validation Method:

It involves **partitioning the training data set into subsets, where one subset is held out to test the performance of the model**. This data set is called the validation data set.

Cross validation is to use different models and identify the best:

### Logistic Regression Model performance values:

#### check model performance Random forest gives accurate predictions than logistic regression

```
In [59]: accuracy_score(y_test,y_pred)
```

```
Out[59]: 0.925
```

```
In [60]: conf_mat=confusion_matrix(y_test,y_pred)
conf_mat
```

```
Out[60]: array([[48,  6],
               [ 0, 26]], dtype=int64)
```

```
In [61]: print(classification_report(y_test,y_pred))
```

	precision	recall	f1-score	support
0	1.00	0.89	0.94	54
1	0.81	1.00	0.90	26
accuracy			0.93	80
macro avg	0.91	0.94	0.92	80
weighted avg	0.94	0.93	0.93	80

```
In [54]: pickle.dump(lgr,open('CKD.pkl','wb'))
```

Hence we tested with Logistic regression and Random Forest Classification wherein the accuracy of Random Forest classification is 99% compared with Logistic Regression.

Metric	Logistic Regression	Random Forest Classification																														
Accuracy	0.925	0.95																														
Other metrics	<pre>accuracy_score(y_test,y_pred)</pre> 0.925	<pre>accuracy_score(y_test,y_pred)</pre> 0.95																														
	<pre>conf_mat=confusion_matrix(y_test,y_pred) conf_mat</pre> array([[48,  6], [ 0, 26]], dtype=int64)	<pre>conf_mat=confusion_matrix(y_test,y_pred) conf_mat</pre> array([[52,  2], [ 2, 24]], dtype=int64)																														
	<pre>print(classification_report(y_test,y_pred))</pre>	<pre>print(classification_report(y_test,y_pred))</pre>																														
	<table><tr><td></td><td>precision</td><td>recall</td><td>f1-score</td><td>support</td></tr><tr><td>0</td><td>1.00</td><td>0.89</td><td>0.94</td><td>54</td></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>0.81</td><td>1.00</td><td>0.90</td><td>26</td></tr></table>		precision	recall	f1-score	support	0	1.00	0.89	0.94	54	1	0.81	1.00	0.90	26	<table><tr><td></td><td>precision</td><td>recall</td><td>f1-score</td><td>support</td></tr><tr><td>0</td><td>0.96</td><td>0.96</td><td>0.96</td><td>54</td></tr><tr><td>1</td><td>0.92</td><td>0.92</td><td>0.92</td><td>26</td></tr></table>		precision	recall	f1-score	support	0	0.96	0.96	0.96	54	1	0.92	0.92	0.92	26
		precision	recall	f1-score	support																											
	0	1.00	0.89	0.94	54																											
1	0.81	1.00	0.90	26																												
	precision	recall	f1-score	support																												
0	0.96	0.96	0.96	54																												
1	0.92	0.92	0.92	26																												
<table><tr><td>accuracy</td><td></td><td></td><td>0.93</td><td>80</td></tr><tr><td>macro avg</td><td>0.91</td><td>0.94</td><td>0.92</td><td>80</td></tr><tr><td>weighted avg</td><td>0.94</td><td>0.93</td><td>0.93</td><td>80</td></tr></table>	accuracy			0.93	80	macro avg	0.91	0.94	0.92	80	weighted avg	0.94	0.93	0.93	80	<table><tr><td>accuracy</td><td></td><td></td><td>0.95</td><td>80</td></tr><tr><td>macro avg</td><td>0.94</td><td>0.94</td><td>0.94</td><td>80</td></tr><tr><td>weighted avg</td><td>0.95</td><td>0.95</td><td>0.95</td><td>80</td></tr></table>	accuracy			0.95	80	macro avg	0.94	0.94	0.94	80	weighted avg	0.95	0.95	0.95	80	
accuracy			0.93	80																												
macro avg	0.91	0.94	0.92	80																												
weighted avg	0.94	0.93	0.93	80																												
accuracy			0.95	80																												
macro avg	0.94	0.94	0.94	80																												
weighted avg	0.95	0.95	0.95	80																												

The above table shows that Random Forest Classification gives better results over Logistic Regression.