Report.md 2024-11-24

# Semantic Classification Implementation Report

## Objective

The goal is to classify business reviews as positive or negative using different machine learning models. My implementation covers data preprocessing, feature extraction, model training, and evaluation for best-possible accuracy.

### Preprocessing

#### Taken Steps:

- 1. Remove Punctuation & Numbers: This will ensure that only meaningful text remains.
- 2. Convert to Lowercase: This will standardize the text.
- 3. Stopword Removal: The most common English stopwords were removed using NLTK to reduce noise.
- 4. Stemming: using PorterStemmer for normalizing words into their root form, such that "running" will become "run."
- 5. Reasoning: This is in order to reduce the dimensions and enhance model performance since it removes extraneous variation from the data.

#### **Feature Extraction**

#### TF-IDF Vectorization:

- Captures the importance of terms within a document relative to the corpus.
- Parameters:
  - o ngram\_range=(1, 2): include unigrams and bigrams that capture contextual relationships.
  - o max\_features=5000: limits vocabulary size to balance performance and memory usage.

#### SMOTE (Synthetic Minority Oversampling Technique):

Class imbalance had been addressed by oversampling, also improving the recall on the minority class.

#### **Models Trained**

#### Four different machine learning models have been evaluated:

#### K-Nearest Neighbors (K-NN):

Underperformed because of the curse of dimensionality in high-dimensional TF-IDF data.

#### **Decision Tree:**

It achieved a moderate accuracy but was highly subject to overfitting.

#### Logistic Regression:

Parameters: Tuned hyperparameters including:

Report.md 2024-11-24

- C=10.0 (regularization strength).
- penalty='l2' (ridge regression).
- solver='liblinear' (suitable for smaller datasets).

Highest performance among other models, which is well-balanced between precision, recall, and F1-score.

**Neural Network:** 

Performed well but required more computational resources.

#### **Evaluation**

### **Output:**

Performance of			f1-score	support	
'	pi ecision	recarr	11-30016	Suppor C	
0	1.00	0.01	0.01	2114	
1	0.30	1.00	0.46	886	
accuracy			0.30	3000	
macro avg	0.65	0.50	0.23	3000	
weighted avg	0.79	0.30	0.14	3000	
 Training Decis	ion Tree				
Performance of			lidation S	et:	
1	precision	recall	f1-score	support	
0	0.85	0.84	0.84	2114	
1	0.62	0.64	0.63	886	
accuracy			0.78	3000	
macro avg	0.73	0.74	0.74	3000	
weighted avg	0.78	0.78	0.78	3000	
 Training Logis <sup>.</sup>					
Performance of	_		on Valida	tion Set:	
ı	precision	recall	f1-score	support	
0	0.94	0.91	0.92	2114	
1	0.80	0.85	0.82	886	
accuracy			0.89	3000	
macro avg	0.87	0.88	0.87	3000	
weighted avg	0.89	0.89	0.89	3000	
Training Neura Performance of			alidation S	Set:	

Report.md 2024-11-24

	precision	recall	f1-score	support
0	0.93	0.92	0.92	2114
1	0.80	0.82	0.81	886
accuracy			0.89	3000
macro avg	0.87	0.87	0.87	3000
weighted avg	0.89	0.89	0.89	3000

Highest performance is the **Logistic Regression** model

### Validation Metrics and Test Set Predictions

- Logistic Regression achieved best balance between precision and recall.
- It effectively handled imbalanced datasets with well-tuned hyperparameters and class-weight balancing.