MNIST CLASSIFICATION: NNS vs KNN (prelim)

The MNIST database of handwritten digits, available from this page¹, has a training set of 60,000 examples, and a test set of 10,000 examples. It is a subset of a larger set available from NIST. The digits have been size-normalized and centered in a fixed-size image.

It is a good database for people who want to try learning techniques and pattern recognition methods on real-world data while spending minimal efforts on preprocessing and formatting.

R routines provided at the end of document for downloading and processing the MNIST dataset.

RESULTS

At every step, NNS is significantly more accurate than KNN for k=1 and k=5. We present the R command in red and the output of total errors in blue.

```
> require(devtools); install_github('OVVO-Financial/NNS', ref = "NNS-Beta-Version")
> require(NNS)
```

TEST 1: 10% Train on 10% Test

```
NNS: 90% accuracy
```

```
> sum(pmin(1,abs(round(NNS.reg(train$x[1:6000,],train$y[1:6000],point.est = test$x[1:1000,],n.best=1,dist = "L1",plot=FALSE,order='max')$Point.est)-test$y[1:1000]))) [1] 100
```

KNN 1:

```
> sum(pmin(1,abs(as.numeric(as.character(knn(train = train$x[1:6000,], test = test$x[1:1000,],cl = train$y[1:6000], k=1)))-test$y[1:1000]))) [1] 474
```

KNN 5:

> sum(pmin(1,abs(as.numeric(as.character(knn(train = train\$x[1:6000,], test = test\$x[1:1000,],cl = train\$y[1:6000], k=5)))-test\$y[1:1000]))) [1] 285

¹ http://yann.lecun.com/exdb/mnist/

² k=5 suggestion: http://acgrama.blogspot.com/2012/09/knn-with-euclidean-distance-on-mnist.html

TEST 2: 20% Train on 20% Test

```
NNS: 91.9% accuracy
> sum(pmin(1,abs(round(NNS.reg(train$x[1:12000,],train$y[1:12000],point.est = test$x[1:2000,],n.best=1,dist = "L1",plot=FALSE)$Point.est)-test$y[1:2000])))
[1] 163

KNN 1:
> sum(pmin(1,abs(as.numeric(as.character(knn(train = train$x[1:12000,], test = test$x[1:2000,],cl = train$y[1:12000], k=1)))-test$y[1:2000])))
[1] 888

KNN 5:
> sum(pmin(1,abs(as.numeric(as.character(knn(train = train$x[1:12000,], test = test$x[1:2000,],cl = train$y[1:12000], k=5)))-test$y[1:2000])))
[1] 639

TFST 3: 30% Train on 100 Test Observations
```

```
TEST 3: 30% Train on 100 Test Observations

NNS: Only 1 wrong!

> sum(pmin(1,abs(round(NNS.reg(train$x[1:18000,],train$y[1:18000],point.est = test$x[1:100,],n.best=1,dist = "L1",plot=FALSE,order='max')$Point.est)-test$y[1:100])))
[1] 1

KNN 1:

> sum(pmin(1,abs(as.numeric(as.character(knn(train = train$x[1:18000,], test = test$x[1:100,],cl = train$y[1:18000], k=1)))-test$y[1:100])))
[1] 39

KNN 5:

> sum(pmin(1,abs(as.numeric(as.character(knn(train = train$x[1:18000,], test = test$x[1:100,],cl = train$y[1:18000], k=5)))-test$y[1:100])))
[1] 26
```

TEST 4: 30% Train on 18% Test

```
NNS: 92.67% accuracy
> sum(pmin(1,abs(round(NNS.reg(train$x[1:18000,],train$y[1:18000],point.est =
test$x[1:1800,],n.best=1,dist = "L1",plot=FALSE,order='max')$Point.est)-test$y[1:1800])))
[1] 132

KNN 1:
> sum(pmin(1,abs(as.numeric(as.character(knn(train = train$x[1:18000,], test = test$x[1:1800,],cl =
train$y[1:18000], k=1)))-test$y[1:1800])))
[1] 763

KNN 5:
> sum(pmin(1,abs(as.numeric(as.character(knn(train = train$x[1:18000,], test = test$x[1:1800,],cl =
train$y[1:18000], k=5)))-test$y[1:1800])))
[1] 528
```

TEST 5: 30% Train on 30% Test

```
NNS: 92.4% accuracy
> sum(pmin(1,abs(round(NNS.reg(train$x[1:18000,],train$y[1:18000],point.est = test$x[1:3000,],n.best=1,dist = "L1",plot=FALSE,order='max')$Point.est)-test$y[1:3000])))
[1] 228

KNN 1:
> sum(pmin(1,abs(as.numeric(as.character(knn(train = train$x[1:18000,], test = test$x[1:3000,],cl = train$y[1:18000], k=1)))-test$y[1:3000])))
[1] 1257

KNN 5:
> sum(pmin(1,abs(as.numeric(as.character(knn(train = train$x[1:18000,], test = test$x[1:3000,],cl = train$y[1:18000], k=5)))-test$y[1:3000])))
```

SUMMARY

[1] 883

NNS is consistently more accurate than KNN. Current KNN rates for the full MNIST dataset are > 95% accurate³ suggesting NNS in the upper 98-99% range based on the NNS errors vs KNN errors.

Memory and time constraints prohibited the full dataset analysis. Given NNS' superior performance on this benchmark problem as well as demonstrated excellence in other classification and regression problems⁴, a concentrated effort to optimize NNS' code for memory and processing constraints seems more than warranted. An optimized NNS would offer a viable robust alternative to neural networks currently employed in machine learning.

⁴ See the following:

Classification Using NNS Clustering Analysis https://ssrn.com/abstract=2864711 Clustering and Curve Fitting by Line Segments https://ssrn.com/abstract=2861339

³ http://yann.lecun.com/exdb/mnist/

R Routines

DOWNLOAD MNIST DATA ROUTINE

https://gist.github.com/johnbaums/882ad1e458e13b96a3d1

LOAD MNIST DATA ROUTINE

https://gist.github.com/primaryobjects/b0c8333834debbc15be4

```
library(caret)
load_mnist <- function() {</pre>
load image file <- function(filename) {</pre>
  ret = list()
  f = file(filename,'rb')
  readBin(f,'integer',n=1,size=4,endian='big')
  ret$n = readBin(f,'integer',n=1,size=4,endian='big')
  nrow = readBin(f,'integer',n=1,size=4,endian='big')
  ncol = readBin(f,'integer',n=1,size=4,endian='big')
  x = readBin(f,'integer',n=ret$n*nrow*ncol,size=1,signed=F)
  ret$x = matrix(x, ncol=nrow*ncol, byrow=T)
  close(f)
  ret
 load_label_file <- function(filename) {</pre>
  f = file(filename,'rb')
  readBin(f,'integer',n=1,size=4,endian='big')
  n = readBin(f,'integer',n=1,size=4,endian='big')
  y = readBin(f,'integer',n=n,size=1,signed=F)
  close(f)
  У
train <<- load_image_file('train-images-idx3-ubyte')
 test <<- load_image_file('t10k-images-idx3-ubyte')
```

```
train$y <<- load_label_file('train-labels-idx1-ubyte')
test$y <<- load_label_file('t10k-labels-idx1-ubyte')
}
train <- data.frame()
test <- data.frame()
# Load data.
load_mnist()
# Normalize pixel intensity 255 greyscale.
train$x <- train$x / 255</pre>
```