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# Introduction

## Purpose of Report

The purpose of this report is to explain the structure applied to a Jupyter Notebooks Python project that attempts to implement a Machine Learning model for the predictive H&M Fashion Kaggle project.

## Project Strategy/Approach

An established Machine Learning workflow is applied in this project to;

1. Load the H&M Kaggle datastores from CSV files.
2. Clean and augment this data, before splitting into Train and Test datasets
3. Building a KNN model using the Train datasets to generate predictions on future customer purchases.
4. Evaluate model effectiveness using the Test dataset and a bespoke derived metric on valid predictions.
5. Declare this model as a ‘Baseline’ and then iterate through a series of optimisation steps to improve model accuracy.
6. Apply this model to submit a file to the Kaggle competition.

## Python Coding Good Practice

A number of best practice techniques were applied in the writing of the Python code to implement this project.

* Use of a Jupyter Notebook plug-in for a Table of Contents (TOC). This clearly delimitate the separate sections in the project and acts as a means of navigation between code blocks. The TOC also provides a *de facto* comments structure around specific code blocks to explain the purpose of the Python code.
* Use of Python functions to minimise the need for code re-use. Particularly useful in the part so the project that implement data preparation routines, visualisations, and the actual KNN models.

# Data Preparation + Project Implementation

## Data Import + Analysis

<Diagram>

Figure 1: Data Flow Diagram

## Data Preparation + Enrichment
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Figure 1: Data Flow Diagram

## Creating Training and Test Datasets
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Figure 1: Data Flow Diagram

## Scaling Datasets

<Diagram>

Figure 1: Data Flow Diagram

## Implementation of Nearest Neighbour Model

<Diagram>

Including features used, prediction algorithm(s) used, parameters, etc.;

# Model Evaluation Strategy

## Find Predicted Products for Each Customer

<Diagram>

Including features used, prediction algorithm(s) used, parameters, etc.;

## Find Actual Products for Each Customer (Local Test Data)

<Diagram>

Including features used, prediction algorithm(s) used, parameters, etc.;

## Local Evaluation Metric

<Diagram>

Including features used, prediction algorithm(s) used, parameters, etc.;

## Local Evaluation Results

### Small Sample – 1% of Transaction Data

The volume of data in the Kaggle transaction csv file is significant (31.8M rows). In order to iteratively build up the project code a 1% sample was used for most of the development phase (317K rows).

In the example below, which is consistent with other development phase 1% test runs, evaluating the KNN model performance on such a sample size produced a Train and Test set of ***6387*** and ***17083*** rows respectively.

Section 2.3 of this report shows how the Train/Test datasets are a deliberate subset of transaction data that attempts to mimic the required Kaggle prediction criteria.

The figures below shows the proportion of Train/Test datasets when compared against the full sample of transaction data.
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Figure - n - Bar Chart breakdown of Test v Train v Full Trxn dataset sizes (1% Sample)

Using the evaluation metric described in Section 3.3, the 1% sample result produces the following output of **35%** accuracy in purchase prediction.
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Figure – n - KNN Prediction Accuracy on 1% Sample of H&M Kaggle Transactions

### Low Medium Sample – 10% of Transaction Data

Extracting a 10% sample of the Kaggle transaction data (3.18M rows) took a considerable amount of time for model building and evaluation and was only executed twice. The figures and metrics below are from the final test run.
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Figure – n - Bar Chart breakdown of Test v Train v Full Trxn dataset sizes (10% Sample)

Again, using the evaluation metric described in Section 3.3, a sample 10x time larger than in Section 3.4.1 produced an output of **56%** accuracy in purchase prediction.
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Figure – n - KNN Prediction Accuracy on 10% Sample of H&M Kaggle Transactions

### Higher Volume Sample – 99% of Transaction Data

Extracting Training and Test datasets from the (almost) full 31.8 M transactions in the source Kaggle files, with the subsequent modelling and evaluation, was also an extremely processor intensive activity. (Processing took 2+ days).

It was necessary to export the Jupyter Notebook *.ipynb* file into a standard *.py* Python file and run in a PowerShell Window on a local PC. Hence, the output looks different to the other local evaluation screenshots, and the code had not yet been refined to include Train and Test dataset sizes.
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Figure – n – Command Line Output - KNN Prediction Accuracy on 99% Sample of Transactions

One can infer the probable size of the Train and Test datasets from the previous 1% and 10% runs. The accuracy of **40%** shows a degradation in performance from the 10% run.

The fact that the number of Predicted Purchases is lower than Actual Purchases (from the Test Data) is discussed in Section 4.2.1 of this report and is affected by the value of the ‘Neighbour’ parameter when building the KNN Model.

# Observations + Conclusions

## Establishing a ‘Baseline’ Set of Evaluations

Section 3.4 of this report provides a set of evaluation results for the KNN model built to generate H&M purchase predictions, with samples of varying sizes. The code to build and train this model was considered a ‘baseline’ from which additional optimisations to improve prediction accuracy can be applied.

Observations from this ‘Baseline’ set of evaluation results can be summarised as follows;

* **Actual purchases are less than 12 per customer**. Our Train and Test days is deliberately limited to a specific time window. Thus, even the ‘full’ 99% sample data does not contain enough Test data transactions for each customer to generate 12 ‘actual’ purchases. This seems logical as presumably very few customers are likely to buy twelve products in the one-week window for the Kaggle competition. Thus, this project has assumed that the predictions will almost always be a superset of ‘actual’ transactions. Accuracy is based only on how many actual transactions are predicted.
* **Setting an initial value for the number of nearest neighbours of ‘15’**. The project code always attempts to generate 12 predictions. Experimenting with the Kaggle submission, as part of the Baseline, shows that the parameter value used for number of ‘nearest neighbours’ in the KNN model will influence the number of predictions. An initial value of ‘15’ was selected because this was found to be the lowest number that consistently generated 12 predictions for the Kaggle submission. Any lower would fail to consistently create 12 predictions based on the purchases of the nearest neighbour for each customer (higher values add computational overhead). This is an optimisation step we revisit in Section 4.2.1 of this report.
* **Limit customer numbers to those who might actually buy a product in the prediction window.** Kaggle shows that the number of customers in the competition csv file is 1.38M. Our final 99% sample only involves just over 158K unique customers. This project has deliberately limited focus to that subset of customers likely to make any actual purchase in the one-week competition window. Every customer in the transaction train period must have a prediction made for the Kaggle submission. However, customers who did not make a purchase in that 7-day period are excluded from scoring. Hence, it seems reasonable to focus predictions in this project on a very specific subset of H7M customers.

Section 4.2 below describes the steps taken to attempt to improve on the accuracy of this project’s KNN prediction model/process.

## Optimisation Steps

<Diagram>

### Refine the ‘Nearest Neighbour’ Value for the KNN Model

Ispo facto..

### Feature Reduction

Ispo facto..

### Alter Default Parameter Values for the KNN Model

Ispo facto..

### Implement Cross Validation When Training KNN Model

Ispo facto..

## Project Observations/Future Suggestions

<Diagram>

Including features used, prediction algorithm(s) used, parameters, etc.;
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# Kaggle Submission

One could ipso lorem…
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