Exercise 1:

library(boot)

```
# 1. Execute the code above.
   Based on the results, rank the models from "most underfit" to "most overfit".
#install.packages("kernlab")
library(kernlab)
data("spam")
tibble::as.tibble(spam)
is.factor(spam$type)
levels(spam$type)
set.seed(42)
# spam idx = sample(nrow(spam), round(nrow(spam) / 2))
spam idx = sample(nrow(spam), 1000)
spam trn = spam[spam idx, ]
spam tst = spam[-spam idx, ]
fit caps = glm(type ~ capitalTotal,
        data = spam trn, family = binomial)
fit selected = glm(type ~ edu + money + capitalTotal + charDollar,
          data = spam trn, family = binomial)
fit additive = glm(type \sim .,
          data = spam trn, family = binomial)
fit_over = glm(type ~ capitalTotal * (.),
        data = spam trn, family = binomial, maxit = 50)
# training misclassification rate
mean(ifelse(predict(fit caps) > 0, "spam", "nonspam") != spam trn$type)
mean(ifelse(predict(fit_selected) > 0, "spam", "nonspam") != spam_trn$type)
mean(ifelse(predict(fit additive) > 0, "spam", "nonspam") != spam trn$type)
mean(ifelse(predict(fit over) > 0, "spam", "nonspam") != spam trn$type)
```

```
set.seed(1)
cv.glm(spam trn, fit caps, K = 5)$delta[1]
cv.glm(spam trn, fit selected, K = 5)$delta[1]
cv.glm(spam trn, fit additive, K = 5)$delta[1]
cv.glm(spam trn, fit over, K = 5)$delta[1]
# most underfit to most overfit:
# fit caps
# fit selected
# fit over
# fit_additive
# 2. Re-run the code above with 100 folds and a different seed. Does your conclusion
change?
#install.packages("kernlab")
library(kernlab)
data("spam")
tibble::as.tibble(spam)
is.factor(spam$type)
levels(spam$type)
set.seed(42)
# spam idx = sample(nrow(spam), round(nrow(spam) / 2))
spam idx = sample(nrow(spam), 1000)
spam trn = spam[spam idx, ]
spam tst = spam[-spam idx, ]
fit caps = glm(type ~ capitalTotal,
        data = spam trn, family = binomial)
fit selected = glm(type ~ edu + money + capitalTotal + charDollar,
          data = spam trn, family = binomial)
fit additive = glm(type \sim .,
```

```
data = spam trn, family = binomial)
fit over = glm(type ~ capitalTotal * (.),
        data = spam trn, family = binomial, maxit = 50)
# training misclassification rate
mean(ifelse(predict(fit caps) > 0, "spam", "nonspam") != spam trn$type)
mean(ifelse(predict(fit_selected) > 0, "spam", "nonspam") != spam_trn$type)
mean(ifelse(predict(fit additive) > 0, "spam", "nonspam") != spam trn$type)
mean(ifelse(predict(fit over) > 0, "spam", "nonspam") != spam trn$type)
library(boot)
set.seed(10)
cv.glm(spam trn, fit_caps, K = 100)$delta[1]
cv.glm(spam_trn, fit_selected, K = 100)$delta[1]
cv.glm(spam trn, fit additive, K = 100)$delta[1]
cv.glm(spam_trn, fit_over, K = 100)$delta[1]
# the results are still in the same order of most overfit to most underfit
make conf mat = function(predicted, actual) {
 table(predicted = predicted, actual = actual)
}
#additive
spam add pred = ifelse(predict(fit additive, spam tst) > 0,
             "spam",
             "nonspam")
spam add pred = ifelse(predict(fit additive, spam tst, type = "response") > 0.5,
             "spam",
             "nonspam")
#caps
spam caps pred = ifelse(predict(fit caps, spam tst) > 0,
             "spam",
             "nonspam")
spam caps pred = ifelse(predict(fit caps, spam tst, type = "response") > 0.5,
             "spam",
```

```
"nonspam")
#selective
spam sel pred = ifelse(predict(fit selected, spam tst) > 0,
              "spam".
              "nonspam")
spam sel pred = ifelse(predict(fit selected, spam tst, type = "response") > 0.5,
              "spam",
              "nonspam")
#over
spam over pred = ifelse(predict(fit over, spam tst) > 0,
             "spam",
             "nonspam")
spam over pred = ifelse(predict(fit over, spam tst, type = "response") > 0.5,
             "spam",
             "nonspam")
(conf_mat_50 = make_conf_mat(predicted = spam_add pred, actual = spam_tst$type))
(conf mat 50 = make conf mat(predicted = spam caps pred, actual =
spam tst$type))
(conf mat 50 = make conf mat(predicted = spam sel pred, actual = spam tst$type))
(conf mat 50 = make conf mat(predicted = spam over pred, actual = spam tst$type))
table(spam tst$type) / nrow(spam tst)
```

#3

The third model is the best model for predicting the classification of spam vs nonspam emails. When running a 5 fold cross validation we found that models one, two, and 4 all had a prediction error of at least 10% or more. Our third model had a prediction error of 6.8% which isn't fantastic however it was the best of the bunch.

Some of the errors that occured are worse than others. It is better for a model to be specific as opposed to sensitive. This is because a specific model will weigh true positives against false negatives instead of weighing true negatives over false positives. What this means is, a more specific model will base its accuracy off of the nonspam emails classified as nonspam divided by the nonspam emails classified as spam.

- # 1. Use the bank data and create a train / test split.
- # Based on the results, rank the models from "most underfit" to "most overfit".

```
set.seed(10)
num_obs = nrow(spam)

train_index = sample(num_obs, size = trunc(0.50 * num_obs))
train_data = Ames[train_index, ]
test data = Ames[-train_index, ]
```


2. Run any logistic regression you like with 10-fold cross-validation in order to predict the yes/no variable (y).

```
In [32]: mykNN.best_params_
Out[32]: {'C': 1}
```

4. Create a confusion matrix of your preferred model, evaluated against your test data.