Mini-batch Regression Neural Network Predicting for Median Housing Prices in the 1990 California, U.S. Census Nyasha M, 15 May 2021 Background: This dataset comes from Chapter 2 of Aurélien Géron's book 'Hands-On Machine learning with Scikit-Learn and TensorFlow' (2017). The dataset itself contains various information on 1426 households from the 1990 California, U.S. census. In total, the dataset contains 20,640 observations and 9 variables as well as some missing data. The .csv file used in this project came from the following webpage by Luís Torgo at the University of Porto: https://www.dcc.fc.up.pt/~ltorgo/Regression/cal_housing.html. His main webpage is located here: https://www.dcc.fc.up.pt/~ltorgo/. Objective: The goal of this notebook was to predict median house values (\$) in the California 1990 census dataset by performing regression with an artificial Neural Network. Methods: Regression was done with a 3-layer neural network with He-initialized weights. The model used mini-batch gradient descent with gradient clipping and cross-validation while training. Batch normalization and dropout were also used to facilitate learning and add regularization to the model, respectively. Some missing data analysis was performed pre-modeling. Package imports In [456]: import warnings; warnings.filterwarnings('ignore'); import matplotlib.pyplot as plt In [65]: import pandas as pd import numpy as np import seaborn as sns # Missing data analysis import missingno as msno # Enable R functions import rpy2.robjects.numpy2ri from rpy2.robjects.packages import importr rpy2.robjects.numpy2ri.activate() # Modeling import tensorflow as tf import sklearn.preprocessing as preprocess from sklearn.model_selection import train_test_split from sklearn.metrics import mean squared error **Data Exploration and Pre-processing** In [461]: | df = pd.read csv('housing.csv') df.head(4)Out[461]: longitude latitude housing_median_age total_rooms total_bedrooms population households median_income median_house_value c 0 -122.23 37.88 41.0 0.088 129.0 322.0 126.0 8.3252 452600.0 -122.22 1 37.86 7099.0 1106.0 2401.0 1138.0 8.3014 358500.0 21.0 -122.24 37.85 52.0 1467.0 190.0 496.0 177.0 7.2574 352100.0 -122.25 37.85 52.0 1274.0 235.0 341300.0 558.0 219.0 5.6431 In [462]: df.shape Out[462]: (20640, 10) In [463]: df.columns Out[463]: Index(['longitude', 'latitude', 'housing_median_age', 'total_rooms', 'total bedrooms', 'population', 'households', 'median income', 'median house value', 'ocean proximity'], dtype='object') df.hist(figsize=(18,10), layout=(3,4), bins=25) # Some bimodal distributions. In [464]: plt.tight layout() plt.show() households latitude housing_median_age longitude 1400 4000 8000 4000 1200 3000 6000 1000 3000 2500 800 2000 600 1500 400 2000 200 3000 2000 34 -122 -120 -118 population median_house_value total_bedrooms median_income 3000 1750 12000 8000 1500 2500 10000 1250 6000 2000 8000 1000 1500 6000 750 4000 500 2000 250 200000 300000 400000 500000 5000 10000 15000 20000 25000 30000 35000 1000 2000 3000 4000 5000 8000 6000 2000 Is there missing data? If so, where, and what does the surrounding data look like? In [10]: df[df.isna().any(axis=1)] Out[10]: longitude latitude housing_median_age total_bedrooms population households median_income median_house_valu total_rooms 290 -122.16 37.77 47.0 1256.0 NaN 570.0 218.0 4.3750 161900 341 -122.17 37.75 38.0 992.0 NaN 732.0 259.0 1.6196 85100 -122.28 5154.0 3741.0 538 37.78 29.0 NaN 1273.0 2.5762 173400 563 -122.2437.75 45.0 891.0 NaN 384.0 146.0 4.9489 247100 178400 696 -122.10 37.69 41.0 746.0 NaN 387.0 161.0 3.9063 -119.19 3171.0 779.0 220500 20267 34.20 18.0 3620.0 NaN 3.3409 167400 20268 -119.18 34.19 19.0 2393.0 NaN 1938.0 762.0 1.6953 410700 20372 -118.88 34.17 15.0 4260.0 NaN 1701.0 669.0 5.1033 5512.0 20460 -118.75 34.29 17.0 NaN 2734.0 814.0 6.6073 258100 20484 -118.72 34.28 17.0 3051.0 NaN 1705.0 495.0 5.7376 218600 207 rows × 10 columns Examining the missing data pattern. This might inform of us what imputation method we might be able to use on the data. It looks like the data might follow a missing completely at random (MCAR) pattern. Let's check: In [15]: msno.matrix(df) # white strips indicate missing data plt.show() 20640 In [465]: # Add a flag to indicate where the data is missing, to enable us to do some missing data analyses. df['missing flag'] = (df.total bedrooms.isna() == True) .astype(int) fig, axs = plt.subplots(3,3, figsize=(15,10), sharey=False) In [466]: df.boxplot(by='missing flag', ax=axs, grid=False) plt.suptitle("") plt.tight layout() plt.show() households latitude housing_median_age 42 6000 50 5000 40 4000 30 3000 20 36 2000 10 1000 34 [missing_flag] [missing_flag] [missing flag] longitude median_house_value median_income -114500000 14 -116400000 12 10 -118300000 -120200000 -122 100000 -124[missing_flag] [missing_flag] [missing_flag] population total_bedrooms total_rooms 0 35000 8 6000 30000 0 5000 30000 25000 4000 20000 20000 3000 15000 10000 1000 5000 [missing_flag] [missing_flag] [missing_flag] (df.isnull().sum().sum()/df.isnull().count().sum())*100Out[467]: 0.09117336152219874 Out of all observations, <0.10% of the data is missing. Let's examine the distribution of missing data along our categorical variable (ocean proximity), however, before we proceed with assuming that the missing data pattern for total bedrooms is truly MCAR. Examining ocean_proximity for its distribution of missing values In [60]: print(df.ocean proximity.value counts(dropna=False), "\n\nNumber of unique values: ", len(df.ocean proximity.value counts().unique())) 9136 <1H OCEAN INLAND 6551 NEAR OCEAN 2658 NEAR BAY 2290 ISLAND Name: ocean proximity, dtype: int64 Number of unique values: 5 stats = importr('stats') # import R package 'stats' In [61]: In [92]: crosstab cat = pd.crosstab(df['ocean proximity'], df['missing flag']) # Compute proportions of missing data for each ocean proximity class and add to count table crosstab cat['percent col 0'] = 100*(crosstab cat[0]/df['missing flag'].value counts()[0]) crosstab_cat['percent_col_1'] = 100*(crosstab_cat[1]/df['missing_flag'].value_counts()[1]) crosstab cat Out[92]: missing_flag 1 percent_col_0 percent_col_1 ocean_proximity <1H OCEAN 9034 102 44.212793 49.275362 31.791709 INLAND 6496 26.570048 0.024470 0.000000 **ISLAND** 5 NEAR BAY 2270 11.109480 9.661836 14.492754 NEAR OCEAN 2628 12.861547 In [95]: print(stats.fisher test(np.array(crosstab cat[0]), np.array(crosstab cat[1]))) # Significant, but massi ve sample sizes Fisher's Exact Test for Count Data data: structure(c(9034L, 6496L, 5L, 2270L, 2628L), .Dim = 5L) and structure(c(102L, 55L, 0L, 20L, 30 L), .Dim = 5L) p-value = 1 alternative hypothesis: two.sided The Fischer's Exact test was statistically significant, but we also have massive sample sizes. Looking at the frequencies for each category of ocean proximity where there is missing data versus non-missing data, it doesn't appear as though there is a significant association between the missing data and ocean proximity. It really does appear as though the data is MCAR. Furthermore, we also have a very low percentage of missing data in the dataset. Therefore, we will proceed with a complete case analysis. In [470]: df = df[df.total_bedrooms.isna() == False] # Drop the rows with missing data. df = df.reset index(drop=True) df.tail() # Showing the end of the dataframe. Out[470]: longitude latitude housing_median_age total_rooms total_bedrooms population households median_income median_house_valu -121.09 20428 39.48 25.0 1665.0 374.0 845.0 330.0 78100 1.5603 20429 -121.21 39.49 697.0 150.0 356.0 114.0 2.5568 77100 18.0 20430 -121.22 39.43 17.0 2254.0 485.0 1007.0 433.0 1.7000 92300 20431 -121.32 39.43 18.0 1860.0 409.0 741.0 349.0 1.8672 84700 20432 -121.24 16.0 2785.0 616.0 1387.0 530.0 2.3886 89400 39.37 OneHotEncoding and train-test splits x, y = df.loc[: , df.columns!='median_house_value'], df['median_house_value'] In [471]: In [472]: # OneHotEncode 'ocean proximity'. enc = preprocess.OneHotEncoder() trans = enc.fit_transform(x[['ocean_proximity']]).toarray() trans df = pd.DataFrame(trans, columns = enc.get feature names(['ocean proximity'])) x = pd.concat([x, trans df], axis=1)x = x.drop(['ocean proximity', 'missing flag'], axis = 1) x.head(3)Out[472]: ocean_proximity_<1H longitude latitude housing_median_age total_rooms total_bedrooms population households median_income **OCEAN** -122.23 322.0 0 37.88 41.0 880.0 129.0 126.0 8.3252 0.0 1 -122.22 37.86 21.0 7099.0 1106.0 2401.0 1138.0 8.3014 0.0 -122.24 1467.0 190.0 496.0 177.0 0.0 37.85 52.0 7.2574 In [473]: seed = 100test size = 0.20x train, x test, y train, y test = train test split(x, y, test size=test size, random state=seed) # tra in-test split **Feature Standardization** In [475]: sc = preprocess.MinMaxScaler(feature range = (0,1)) # NN like normalized data # only perform feature scaling on the non-dummy variables. x train = sc.fit transform(x train.loc[:,:'median income']) x test = sc.transform(x test.loc[:,:'median income']) In [476]: y_train = sc.fit_transform(np.array(y_train).reshape(-1,1)) Creating the neural network Here is where we add the layers to our neural network for regression while incorporating batch normalization, He-initialized weights, minibatch gradient descent, and gradient clipping. Note that I played around with several of the model's parameters and hyperparameters before settling on these ones! In [477]: **def** make model(): model = tf.keras.models.Sequential() model.add(tf.keras.layers.Dense(units= 40, activation='relu', kernel initializer='he normal')) model.add(tf.keras.layers.BatchNormalization()) model.add(tf.keras.layers.Dropout(0.2)) model.add(tf.keras.layers.Dense(units= 40, activation='relu', kernel initializer='he normal')) model.add(tf.keras.layers.BatchNormalization()) model.add(tf.keras.layers.Dropout(0.2)) model.add(tf.keras.layers.Dense(units= 40, activation='relu', kernel initializer='he normal')) model.add(tf.keras.layers.BatchNormalization()) model.add(tf.keras.layers.Dropout(0.2)) model.add(tf.keras.layers.Dense(1, activation='linear')) model.add(tf.keras.layers.BatchNormalization()) # Compile model sgd = tf.keras.optimizers.SGD(learning rate=0.005, momentum=0.9, clipvalue=5.0) #model.compile(loss='mean squared error', optimizer='adam', metrics=['mean squared error']) model.compile(loss='mean squared error', optimizer=sgd, metrics=['mean squared error']) return model In [478]: model = make model() Running the model with cross-validation. In [491]: results = model.fit(x train, y train, epochs=90, batch size=32, validation split=0.2, verbose=0) In [480]: y pred = model.predict(x test) y pred = sc.inverse transform(y pred) # Remember, trained (and predicted) on standardized housing price How does the distribution of our predicted median house values compare to that of the test set's? In [481]: fig, axs = plt.subplots(1,2, figsize=(13,4), sharex=**True**) axs[0].hist(df.median_house_value, bins=30) axs[0].set title('Test set median house value (\$)'), axs[0].set xlabel('Median house value (\$)') axs[1].hist(y pred, bins=30) axs[1].set title('Predicted median house value (\$)'), axs[1].set xlabel('Median house value (\$)') plt.show() Test set median house value (\$) Predicted median house value (\$) 1400 700 1200 600 1000 500 800 400 600 300 400 200 200 100 0 -200000600000 -200000600000 200000 400000 200000 400000 Median house value (\$) Median house value (\$) How did the loss of the model (mean squared error [MSE]) change over time? In [488]: | plt.plot(results.history['loss'], label='train') plt.plot(results.history['val loss'], label='validation set') plt.title('Mean Squared Error'), plt.legend(), plt.xlabel('Number of epochs'), plt.ylabel('MSE') plt.show() Mean Squared Error 0.07 validation set 0.06 0.05 0.04 0.03 0.02 0 20 80 Number of epochs Now evaluating the MSE of our model when it's fitted to the test set. In [483]: train mse = model.evaluate(x train, y train, verbose=1) test_mse = model.evaluate(x_test, y_test, verbose=1) 56108101632.0000 In [484]: print(f'Train MSE: {np.round(train mse,3)[0]}, test MSE: {np.round(test mse,3)[0]}') Train MSE: 0.017, test MSE: 56108101632.0 The MSE here looks highly comparable to the validation error (MSE) we got at the end of our training. This is good. Now we can plot the residuals from our model as well as compute the root mean squared error (RMSE) for more information. In [485]: residuals = np.array(y_test).shape-y_pred In [486]: plt.scatter(y pred, residuals, color='black', s=4) plt.xlabel('predicted'), plt.ylabel('residuals'), plt.title('residuals vs. predicted') plt.axhline(y=0, color='red', linestyle='dashed') plt.show() residuals vs. predicted 200000 -200000 -400000-600000200000 400000 -200000 600000 predicted In [487]: | rmse = np.sqrt(mean_squared_error(y_test, y_pred)) print(f"Average error in predicting house prices: +-{round(rmse, 3)} off from the true median house pri Average error in predicting house prices: +-64332.406 off from the true median house price. Checking the distributions of our target variable (median house value) in both our training and test sets. In [454]: fig, axs = plt.subplots(1,2, figsize=(13,4), sharex=True) axs[0].hist(sc.inverse transform(y train), bins=25) axs[0].set title('Training set median house value (\$)'), axs[0].set xlabel('Median house value (\$)') axs[1].hist(y_test, bins=25) axs[1].set title('Test set median house value (\$)'), axs[1].set xlabel('Median house value (\$)') Test set median house value (\$) Training set median house value (\$) 350 1400 300 1200 250 1000 200 800 150 600 100 400

50

0

100000

200000

300000

Median house value (\$)

400000

500000

200

0

100000

200000

Median house value (\$)

400000

500000