

**Opened:** Tuesday, 18 November 2025, 4:00 PM

**Due:** Monday, 1 December 2025, 11:59 PM

- Task 1: Obtain and prepare the data
- Task 2: Build a neural network regression workflow with Keras
- Task 3: Perform cross-validation and model selection

## Task 1: Obtain a data set

Download the data set at the following address of the UCI Machine Learning Repository:

<https://archive.ics.uci.edu/dataset/316/condition+based+maintenance+of+naval+propulsion+plants>.

The data are in file `data.txt` (would you guess it?) and are in CSV format, directly readable with the Pandas function `read_csv`.

The task is to predict the value of two quantities that express the health status of a ship gas turbine, given a set of 16 measurements. This is therefore a **regression** task, estimating a function of 16 inputs to produce 2 outputs.

The data, both observations and targets, are in a single matrix. You have to build  $X$  (the matrix of observations) by extracting the first 16 columns and  $Y$  (the matrix of target output values) by extracting the last 2 columns.

### NORMALISING THE INPUTS

This is not strictly necessary. However, Keras will initialise the input weights as random values in a fixed range, so if the input data are also in a fixed range then convergence may be easier. Recall the "Min-Max Normalisation" (or scaling).

### NORMALISING THE OUTPUTS

This is more important if you use a "squashing" activation function at the output layer, like a sigmoid (logistic or tanh), which is bounded above and below. But **you don't usually use an activation function at the output in a regression task**.

However, you may need a squashing function if you have to ensure that the output range is finite, for instance if you are driving an electric motor that can accept only a certain voltage range.

So, if you have a squashing function at the output, remember that the extreme values (min 0 for logistic or -1 for tanh, max +1 for both) can be attained only at infinity where the derivative is 0. So it is better to normalise the targets in a narrower interval (e.g. [0.1, 0.9] for logistic, [-0.9, +0.9] for tanh).

## Task 2: Build a neural network regression workflow with Keras

Here you have to create a program that implements the whole workflow from data input to training to final test. It should:

- Load the data from file
- Prepare the data
- Sets the parameters of the training algorithm
- Sets the hyperparameters of the model. Since this is a shallow neural network, with only one hidden layer, the only free hyperparameter is  $h$ , the number of units in the hidden layer.
- Build a neural network model with `tensorflow.keras`, using the mean square error as a loss
- Run simple cross-validation (hold out a test set to be used at the end)
- Repeat training several times (multi-start approach) and collect the best result.
- Show the mse value obtained in test. Show the history of the loss for some optimisation runs, highlighting the differences between some that ended in a bad local minimum (high mse) and some others that ended in a better minimum.

## Task 3: Perform cross-validation and model selection

Here you have to create another program, based on the previous one. It should:

- Select a list of possible values of  $h$ , and for each:
  - Run  $k$ -fold cross-validation and obtain  $k$  estimates of quality
  - For each "fold", repeat training several times (multi-start approach) and collect the best result, saving it in a list
  - Perform statistics on the list and store the result in *another* list, as a typical mse value and a typical range [`mse_lower`, `mse_upper`] (e.g. median, 25th percentile, 75th percentile)
- Select the best value for  $h$  based on the cross-validated test results.

?

**Remark:** Note that this is a multi- (two-)criterion optimisation: we want the best typical mse (low error), but also the narrowest range (good generalisation).

This is an instance of the bias/variance dilemma. As such, there is no hard-and-fast rule to decide. Explain your choice.

**Hints:**

- Note that your code will have a certain number of nested loops: outermost, on values of  $h$ ; then on  $k$  "folds"; then on a number of restarts.
- Larger errors may have larger variability. It may then be advisable to compare not directly the range extension, but the ratio  $(mse_{upper} - mse_{lower}) / mse_{typical}$ . This is equivalent to reasoning in log scale. Take care of possible numerical issues (e.g. what if typical mse = 0?)
- For each value of  $h$ , store all the histories to plot. Decide afterward, by inspection, which ones are interesting and should be plotted.

Add submission

## Submission status

Attempt number	This is attempt 1.
Submission status	No submissions have been made yet
Grading status	Not graded
Time remaining	13 days 6 hours remaining