# Homework 6

Aaron Politsky
November 8, 2015

```
set.seed(99)
library(h2o)
load("data.Rda")
source("~/HelpR/EvaluationMetrics.R")

source("ParseData.R")
data <- parse_human_activity_recog_data()</pre>
```

## 1. Neural Network Models

```
# start or connect to h2o server
h2oServer <- h2o.init(max_mem_size="4g", nthreads=-1)

# we need to load data into h2o format
train_hex = as.h2o(data.frame(x=data$X_train, y=data$y_train))
test_hex = as.h2o(data.frame(x=data$X_test, y=data$y_test))

predictors <- 1:(ncol(train_hex)-1)
response <- ncol(train_hex)</pre>
```

Let's see how different models perform when we try different parameters.

```
dl.grid <- h2o.grid(
   algorithm = "deeplearning",
   x=predictors, y=response,
   training_frame=train_hex,
   activation="Tanh",
   classification_stop=-1, # Turn off early stopping
   l1=1e-5,
   hyper_params = hyper.params
)
summary(dl.grid)
dl.grid.models <- lapply(dl.grid@model_ids, function(id) h2o.getModel(id))
model.paths <- lapply(dl.grid.models, function(m) h2o.saveModel(m, path="models"))</pre>
```

```
# performance on test set
ptest.list <- lapply(dl.grid.models, function(m) h2o.performance(m, test_hex))
cm.test.list <- lapply(ptest.list, function(ptest) h2o.confusionMatrix(ptest))</pre>
```

Which performed the best?

```
## Confusion Matrix - (vertical: actual; across: predicted): vertical: actual; across: predicted
                      Laying Sitting Standing Walking WalkingDownstairs
##
## Laying
                         513
                                   0
                                            24
                                                     0
                                                                        0
## Sitting
                           0
                                 425
                                           63
                                                     0
## Standing
                           0
                                  10
                                           521
                                                     1
                                                                        0
## Walking
                           0
                                   0
                                            0
                                                   491
                                                                        4
## WalkingDownstairs
                           0
                                   0
                                            2
                                                     4
                                                                      403
## WalkingUpstairs
                           0
                                   0
                                            1
                                                    25
                                                                       16
## Totals
                         513
                                 435
                                           611
                                                   521
                                                                      423
##
                     WalkingUpstairs Error
                                                       Rate
                                    0.0447 =
                                                   24 / 537
## Laying
## Sitting
                                    3 \ 0.1344 =
                                                   66 / 491
                                    0.0207 =
                                                   11 / 532
## Standing
## Walking
                                    1 0.0101 =
                                                    5 / 496
                                   11 0.0405 =
## WalkingDownstairs
                                                   17 / 420
## WalkingUpstairs
                                  429 0.0892 =
                                                   42 / 471
## Totals
                                  444\ 0.0560 = 165\ /\ 2,947
```

Model 2 did the best, with a 5.60% test error rate.

How did our choice of epochs and number and levels of neurons parameters affect performance?

```
ptest.df[order(ptest.df$tot.test.error.rate),]
```

```
##
                                         hidden
      tot.test.error.rate epochs
## 2
               0.05598914
                                5
                                             64
## 22
               0.05632847
                                2 128, 128, 128
## 4
               0.06073974
                                2
                                             128
## 8
               0.06073974
                                5
                                            256
## 18
               0.06175772
                               10
                                       256, 256
## 6
               0.06311503
                               10
                                             128
## 19
               0.06345436
                                2
                                     1024, 1024
## 17
               0.06413302
                                5
                                       256, 256
## 1
               0.06515100
                                2
                                             64
                                2
                                            512
## 10
               0.06582966
               0.06650831
## 7
                                            256
```

```
## 12
               0.06684764
                               10
                                             512
                                      1024, 1024
## 20
               0.06718697
                                5
## 11
               0.06820495
                                5
                                             512
                               10
                                            1024
## 15
               0.06820495
## 14
               0.06922294
                                5
                                            1024
## 16
               0.06990159
                                2
                                        256, 256
## 5
               0.07024092
                                5
                                             128
                                      1024, 1024
                               10
## 21
               0.07024092
## 24
               0.07227689
                               10 128, 128, 128
## 3
                               10
               0.07261622
                                              64
## 9
               0.07431286
                               10
                                             256
                                2
                                            1024
## 13
               0.07567017
## 23
               0.07940278
                                5 128, 128, 128
```

I can't make much of a pattern out of that. I guess we can just try different things and see how it performs.

## 2. Tree Models

Let's see how different models perform when we try different parameters.

#### **Random Forests**

Let's try a few random forest parameters:

```
rf.hyper.params <-
list(
   ntrees=c(250,500,1000),
   min_rows = c(50,100)
)</pre>
```

```
rf.grid <- h2o.grid(
   algorithm = "randomForest",
   x=predictors, y=response,
   training_frame=train_hex,
   hyper_params = rf.hyper.params
)
summary(rf.grid)
rf.grid.models <- lapply(rf.grid@model_ids, function(id) h2o.getModel(id))
rf.model.paths <- lapply(rf.grid.models, function(m) h2o.saveModel(m, path="models"))</pre>
```

### **Boosting**

Let's try a few boost parameters.

```
boost.hyper.params <-
list(
  ntrees = c(500,2000),
  learn_rate = c(.2, .01),
  max_depth=c(4,10)
)</pre>
```

```
boost.grid <- h2o.grid(</pre>
  algorithm = "gbm",
  x=predictors, y=response,
  training_frame=train_hex,
 hyper_params = boost.hyper.params
summary(boost.grid)
boost.grid.models <- lapply(boost.grid@model ids, function(id) h2o.getModel(id))
boost.model.paths <- lapply(boost.grid.models, function(m) h2o.saveModel(m, path="models"))
Let's assess performance:
# performance on test set
rf.ptest.list <- lapply(rf.grid.models, function(m) h2o.performance(m, test_hex))</pre>
rf.cm.test.list <- lapply(rf.ptest.list, function(ptest) h2o.confusionMatrix(ptest))
boost.ptest.list <- lapply(boost.grid.models, function(m) h2o.performance(m, test_hex))</pre>
boost.cm.test.list <- lapply(boost.ptest.list, function(ptest) h2o.confusionMatrix(ptest))</pre>
Which did the best?
rf.ptest.df <- ldply(rf.cm.test.list,</pre>
                  function(cm)
                     c(tot.test.error.rate = cm$Error[7]))
rf.ptest.df <- cbind(rf.ptest.df, expand.grid((rf.hyper.params)))</pre>
rf.best.model.index <- which.min(rf.ptest.df$tot.test.error.rate)</pre>
rf.best.model <- rf.grid.models[[rf.best.model.index]]</pre>
boost.ptest.df <- ldply(boost.cm.test.list,</pre>
                  function(cm)
                     c(tot.test.error.rate = cm$Error[7]))
boost.ptest.df <- cbind(boost.ptest.df, expand.grid((boost.hyper.params)))</pre>
boost.best.model.index <- which.min(boost.ptest.df$tot.test.error.rate)</pre>
boost.best.model <- boost.grid.models[[boost.best.model.index]]</pre>
rf.ptest.df[rf.best.model.index,]
## tot.test.error.rate ntrees min_rows
## 3
              0.08618935 1000
boost.ptest.df[boost.best.model.index,]
## tot.test.error.rate ntrees learn_rate max_depth
## 2
            0.06447234 2000
                                        0.2
```

## ptest.df[best.model.index,]

## tot.test.error.rate epochs hidden
## 2 0.05598914 5 64