
Major HW 1 – Data Exploration and Preparation


Orad Barel, 311288203, [oradbarel@campus.technion.ac.il](mailto:oradbarel@campus.technion.ac.il)

Ofir Manor, 316084623, [ofir.manor@campus.technion.ac.il](mailto:ofir.manor@campus.technion.ac.il)

Q1.



Q2.



Q3.




The best value we found while doing the k-cross validation (which we interpreted as the value which led to the highest mean validation score as it best simulates the accuracy on unseen data) is 19, with a mean training accuracy of 0.863 and validation accuracy of 0.859.


Lower values, such as 1 and 3, cause overfitting on the training data, as seen by the high training accuracy and low validation accuracy. This is cause by the minimal amount of neighbors taken into account. When looking at a small amount of neighbors, and testing on the training data, the original data point (whose Euclidian distance from itself is 0) is given great weight () of the decision, and thus the model easily classifies them. But as to unseen data, the model does not take into account the more general trend of the area surrounding (in Euclidian distance) of the tested datapoint, as only a few training datapoints are taken into account.


Higher values, such as those above 100, cause underfitting, as seen by the downwards trend of the accuracy score of both the training accuracy and validation accuracy. This is caused by the large amount of training datapoint taken into consideration when deciding the label of the tested datapoint. The decision area slowly morphs into 2 continuous area (one for each label), only looking at where the vast majority of each label’s training datapoints lie, without taking into consideration any nuances.

Q4.



The test accuracy is 0.912

Q5.



We find that for , as opposed to the optimal we found, the boundaries consist of many smaller decision areas, and while the training accuracy is 1, the test accuracy is 0.823 (lower than the optimal ), these are all signs of overfitting. As for , we find that the boundary between the decision area if far closer to a straight line for the optimal , and that both the training and test accuracies are lower than the optimal , with the test accuracy being 0.764, sign pointing to underfitting.

Q6.




Here we see the training and validation accuracy curves when considering all features. We found that the optimal is 105 and that the training accuracy of that is 0.67 while the validation accuracy is 0.652. These are both considerably lower than when we used only PCR\_01 and PCR\_02. To us, this is logical considering how kNN works and why we originally chose PCR\_01 and PCR\_02.

When we chose those two features in the previous homework assignment, we saw that they divided the datapoints marked with and those marked with into nearly two homogonous areas divided by a sinuous line (as can be seen in the joint plot in Q1). Seeing as kNN works off the Euclidian distance between a datapoint to all other datapoints the model was trained on, this meant that, assuming the training data is indictive of the validation data, most datapoints would be found not far from other datapoints with the same label (in Euclidian distance). Thus, the results were relatively high.

When we now considered all features, we have no such promise that they can be divided into mostly homogenous areas based on the label. The different features might spread the data differently, thus causing the general area of each datapoint to be filled with datapoint of the opposite label. Hence, the accuracy is far lower when considering all features, and not just those specifically chosen.

Q7.



Q8.