```
In [5]: pip install scikit-learn
        Requirement already satisfied: scikit-learn in c:\users\chomo\appdata\local\programs
        \python\python312\lib\site-packages (1.5.1)
        Requirement already satisfied: numpy>=1.19.5 in c:\users\chomo\appdata\local\program
        s\python\python312\lib\site-packages (from scikit-learn) (2.0.0)
        Requirement already satisfied: scipy>=1.6.0 in c:\users\chomo\appdata\local\programs
        \python\python312\lib\site-packages (from scikit-learn) (1.14.0)
        Requirement already satisfied: joblib>=1.2.0 in c:\users\chomo\appdata\local\program
        s\python\python312\lib\site-packages (from scikit-learn) (1.4.2)
        Requirement already satisfied: threadpoolctl>=3.1.0 in c:\users\chomo\appdata\local
        \programs\python\python312\lib\site-packages (from scikit-learn) (3.5.0)
        Note: you may need to restart the kernel to use updated packages.
        [notice] A new release of pip is available: 24.0 -> 24.1.1
        [notice] To update, run: python.exe -m pip install --upgrade pip
In [10]: import pandas as pd
         url = 'https://raw.githubusercontent.com/datasciencedojo/datasets/master/titanic.cs
         titanic df = pd.read csv(url)
         titanic_df['AgeGroup'] = pd.cut(titanic_df['Age'], bins=[0, 12, 18, 35, 60, 100], l
         from sklearn.model_selection import train_test_split
         from sklearn.preprocessing import StandardScaler, LabelEncoder
         titanic_ml = titanic_df.drop(columns=['Name', 'Ticket', 'Cabin', 'Embarked'])
         titanic_ml['Age'] = titanic_ml['Age'].fillna(titanic_ml['Age'].median())
         titanic ml['Fare'] = titanic ml['Fare'].fillna(titanic ml['Fare'].median())
         label encoder = LabelEncoder()
         titanic_ml['Sex'] = label_encoder.fit_transform(titanic_ml['Sex'])
         titanic_ml['AgeGroup'] = label_encoder.fit_transform(titanic_ml['AgeGroup'])
         X = titanic ml.drop(columns=['Survived'])
         y = titanic_ml['Survived']
         X_train, X_test, y_train, y_test = train_test_split(X, y, test_size=0.2, random_sta
         scaler = StandardScaler()
         X_train[['Age', 'Fare']] = scaler.fit_transform(X_train[['Age', 'Fare']])
         X_test[['Age', 'Fare']] = scaler.transform(X_test[['Age', 'Fare']])
In [11]: print(X train.head())
         print(X_test.head())
         print(y_train.head())
         print(y test.head())
```

```
PassengerId Pclass Sex
                                            Age
                                                 SibSp Parch
                                                                    Fare AgeGroup
        331
                     332
                               1
                                    1 1.253641
                                                      0
                                                             0 -0.078684
                                                                                 2
        733
                     734
                               2
                                    1 -0.477284
                                                      0
                                                             0 -0.377145
        382
                     383
                               3
                                    1 0.215086
                                                      0
                                                             0 -0.474867
                                                                                 2
        704
                     705
                               3
                                    1 -0.246494
                                                      1
                                                             0 -0.476230
                                                                                 2
        813
                     814
                               3
                                    0 -1.785093
                                                      4
                                                             2 -0.025249
                                                                                 0
             PassengerId Pclass Sex
                                            Age SibSp Parch
                                                                    Fare AgeGroup
        709
                               3
                                    1 -0.092634
                                                      1
                                                             1 -0.333901
                                                                                 5
                     710
                                                                                 2
        439
                     440
                               2
                                    1 0.138156
                                                      0
                                                             0 -0.425284
                                                             0 -0.474867
                                                                                 2
        840
                     841
                               3
                                    1 -0.708074
                                                      0
                     721
        720
                               2
                                    0 -1.785093
                                                      0
                                                             1 0.007966
                                                                                 0
        39
                      40
                               3
                                    0 -1.169653
                                                      1
                                                             0 -0.411002
                                                                                 1
        331
               0
        733
               0
        382
               0
        704
               0
        813
               0
        Name: Survived, dtype: int64
        709
               1
        439
               0
               0
        840
        720
               1
        39
               1
        Name: Survived, dtype: int64
In [12]: from sklearn.linear model import LogisticRegression
         from sklearn.tree import DecisionTreeClassifier
         from sklearn.ensemble import RandomForestClassifier
         from sklearn.svm import SVC
         from sklearn.metrics import accuracy_score, classification_report
         log reg = LogisticRegression(solver='lbfgs', max iter=1000, random state=42)
         decision tree = DecisionTreeClassifier(random state=42)
         random_forest = RandomForestClassifier(random_state=42)
         svc = SVC(random state=42)
         models = {
             'Logistic Regression': log_reg,
              'Decision Tree': decision_tree,
             'Random Forest': random forest,
              'Support Vector Machine': svc
         }
         for name, model in models.items():
             # Train the model
             model.fit(X train, y train)
             # Make predictions
             y_pred = model.predict(X_test)
             # Evaluate the model
             accuracy = accuracy_score(y_test, y_pred)
             print(f'{name} Accuracy: {accuracy:.4f}')
             print(f'Classification Report for {name}:')
             print(classification_report(y_test, y_pred))
             print('-' * 50)
```

Logistic Regre		-		
Classification	•	_	_	
	precision	recall	f1-score	support
0	0.81	0.87	0.83	105
1	0.79	0.70	0.74	74
_	0.75	0.70	0.74	/-
accuracy			0.80	179
macro avg	0.80	0.78	0.79	179
weighted avg	0.80	0.80	0.80	179
Decision Tree	Λεεμ <u>η</u> σεν: 0	727/		
	-		Thoras	
Classification				
	precision	recall	†1-score	support
0	0.77	0.79	0.78	105
1	0.69	0.66	0.68	74
			0.74	170
accuracy	0.73	0.73	0.74	179
macro avg	0.73	0.73	0.73	179
weighted avg	0.74	0.74	0.74	179
Random Forest	-			
Classification	Report for	Random F	orest:	
	precision	recall	f1-score	support
				40-
0	0.82	0.87	0.84	105
1	0.79	0.73	0.76	74
accuracy			0.81	179
macro avg	0.81	0.80	0.80	179
weighted avg	0.81	0.81	0.81	179
weighted avg	0.01	0.01	0.01	1/3
Support Vector	Machine Δc	curacy: 0	5866	
Classification		-		nine.
	precision			
	precision	recarr	11-30016	Support
0	0.59	1.00	0.74	105
1	0.00	0.00	0.00	74
_				, ,
accuracy			0.59	179
accuracy macro avg	0.29	0.50	0.59 0.37	179 179
macro avg			0.37	
•	0.29 0.34	0.50 0.59		179

```
C:\Users\chomo\AppData\Local\Programs\Python\Python312\Lib\site-packages\sklearn\met
rics\_classification.py:1531: UndefinedMetricWarning: Precision is ill-defined and b
eing set to 0.0 in labels with no predicted samples. Use `zero_division` parameter t
o control this behavior.
   _warn_prf(average, modifier, f"{metric.capitalize()} is", len(result))
C:\Users\chomo\AppData\Local\Programs\Python\Python312\Lib\site-packages\sklearn\met
rics\_classification.py:1531: UndefinedMetricWarning: Precision is ill-defined and b
eing set to 0.0 in labels with no predicted samples. Use `zero_division` parameter t
o control this behavior.
   _warn_prf(average, modifier, f"{metric.capitalize()} is", len(result))
C:\Users\chomo\AppData\Local\Programs\Python\Python312\Lib\site-packages\sklearn\met
rics\_classification.py:1531: UndefinedMetricWarning: Precision is ill-defined and b
eing set to 0.0 in labels with no predicted samples. Use `zero_division` parameter t
o control this behavior.
   _warn_prf(average, modifier, f"{metric.capitalize()} is", len(result))
```

```
### Analysis:

#- **Logistic Regression** and **Random Forest** perform relatively well with accur

#and balanced precision and recall scores for both survival classes.

#- **Decision Tree** shows slightly lower accuracy but comparable precision and rec

#- **Support Vector Machine (SVM)** performs poorly in this scenario, showing very

#and precision for predicting survival.

### Recommendations:

#Based on these results, if we prioritize accuracy and balanced performance across

#**Random Forest** appears to be the best-performing model for predicting survival

#It achieves a good balance between precision and recall for both survival classes.

#Further tuning and cross-validation could potentially improve these results,

#especially for models like SVM which performed poorly due to the dataset's charact
```

```
In [14]: from sklearn.linear model import LogisticRegression
         from sklearn.tree import DecisionTreeClassifier
         from sklearn.ensemble import RandomForestClassifier
         from sklearn.svm import SVC
         from sklearn.model_selection import GridSearchCV
         models = {
             'Logistic Regression': LogisticRegression(solver='lbfgs', max iter=1000), # In
              'Decision Tree': DecisionTreeClassifier(),
              'Random Forest': RandomForestClassifier(),
              'SVM': SVC()
         }
         param grids = {
             'Logistic Regression': {'C': [0.1, 1]},
             'Decision Tree': {'max_depth': [5, 10], 'min_samples_split': [10]},
             'Random Forest': {'n_estimators': [50], 'max_depth': [5, 10]},
              'SVM': {'C': [0.1, 1], 'kernel': ['linear']}
         for name, model in models.items():
             grid_search = GridSearchCV(model, param_grids[name], cv=3, scoring='accuracy')
             grid_search.fit(X_train, y_train)
             print(f'Best parameters for {name}: {grid_search.best_params_}')
             print(f'Best cross-validation accuracy for {name}: {grid_search.best_score_:.4f
```

```
Best parameters for Logistic Regression: {'C': 1}
Best cross-validation accuracy for Logistic Regression: 0.7907
Best parameters for Decision Tree: {'max_depth': 5, 'min_samples_split': 10}
Best cross-validation accuracy for Decision Tree: 0.7935
Best parameters for Random Forest: {'max_depth': 5, 'n_estimators': 50}
Best cross-validation accuracy for Random Forest: 0.8244
Best parameters for SVM: {'C': 0.1, 'kernel': 'linear'}
Best cross-validation accuracy for SVM: 0.7907
```

In []: #Analysis:

#Random Forest achieved the highest cross-validation accuracy of approximately 82%, #indicating it performed slightly better than the other models after tuning.
#Logistic Regression and Decision Tree also performed well, with accuracies around #SVM with a linear kernel achieved an accuracy of about 79%, showing improvement fr #Conclusion:

#Based on these results, Random Forest remains the top-performing model after hyper #It balances accuracy and computational efficiency, making it suitable for predicti #Further fine-tuning or ensemble methods could potentially enhance its performance.