

Capstone Project - 3

Credit Card Default Prediction

**Project By :
JUNAID A R**

Contents

- Introduction
- Problem Statement
- Data Summary
- Exploratory Data Analysis
- Feature Engineering
- Handling Class Imbalance
- Building Models
- Model Evaluation
- Conclusion

Introduction

Credit risk plays a major role in the banking industry business. Banks main activities involve granting loan, credit card, investment, mortgage, and others. Credit card has been one of the most booming financial services by banks over the past years.

However, with the growing number of credit card users, banks have been facing an escalating credit card default rate. Data analytics can provide solutions to tackle the current phenomenon and management credit risks.

Problem Statement

This project is aimed at predicting the case of customers default payments in Taiwan. From the perspective of risk management, the result of predictive accuracy of the estimated probability of default will be more valuable than the binary result of classification - credible or not credible clients.

SCOPE



GATHERING DATA FOR
CREDIT CARD CLIENTS



IDENTIFY KEY DRIVERS THAT
DETERMINE THE
LIKELIHOOD OF CREDIT
CARD DEFAULT



PREDICT LIKELIHOOD OF
CLIENT DEFAULTING ON
THEIR LOAN

Data Summary

Features


- Credit Info: Credit line
- Demographics: Gender, Highest education degree, Age, and Marital Status
- Payment History (Apr ~ Sep 2005): repayment status, payment amount, and bill amount by month

Target


Whether the credit card client will default or not next month

Name	Description
ID	ID of each client
LIMIT_BAL	Amount of given credit in NT dollars (includes individual and family/supplementary credit)
SEX	Gender (1=male, 2=female)
EDUCATION	(1=graduate school, 2=university, 3=high school, 4=others, 5=unknown, 6=unknown)
MARRIAGE	Marital status (1=married, 2=single, 3=others)
AGE	Age in years
PAY_0	Repayment status in September, 2005 (-2=no consumption, -1=pay duly, 0=the use of revolving credit, 1=payment delay for one month, 2=payment delay for two months, ... 8=payment delay for eight months, 9=payment delay for nine months and above)
PAY_2	Repayment status in August, 2005 (scale same as above)
PAY_3	Repayment status in July, 2005 (scale same as above)
PAY_4	Repayment status in June, 2005 (scale same as above)
PAY_5	Repayment status in May, 2005 (scale same as above)
PAY_6	Repayment status in April, 2005 (scale same as above)
BILL_AMT1	Amount of bill statement in September, 2005 (NT dollar)
BILL_AMT2	Amount of bill statement in August, 2005 (NT dollar)
BILL_AMT3	Amount of bill statement in July, 2005 (NT dollar)
BILL_AMT4	Amount of bill statement in June, 2005 (NT dollar)
BILL_AMT5	Amount of bill statement in May, 2005 (NT dollar)
BILL_AMT6	Amount of bill statement in April, 2005 (NT dollar)
PAY_AMT1	Amount of previous payment in September, 2005 (NT dollar)
PAY_AMT2	Amount of previous payment in August, 2005 (NT dollar)
PAY_AMT3	Amount of previous payment in July, 2005 (NT dollar)
PAY_AMT4	Amount of previous payment in June, 2005 (NT dollar)
PAY_AMT5	Amount of previous payment in May, 2005 (NT dollar)
PAY_AMT6	Amount of previous payment in April, 2005 (NT dollar)
default.payment.next.month	Default payment (1=yes, 0=no)

Exploratory Data Analysis




1 = graduate school
2 = university
3 = high school
4 = others



1 = married
2 = single
3 = others

1 = male
2 = female



-2= no consumption

-1= pay duly



1 = payment delay for one month



2 = payment delay for two months



...



8 = payment delay for eight months

9 = payment delay for nine months and above












Inferences from EDA



- ❑ As the value 0 for default payment means 'not default' and value 1 means 'default', the mean of 0.221 means that there are 22.1% of credit card contracts that will default next month. There is huge difference between non-defaulter(0) and defaulter(1).
- ❑ Number of Male credit holder(represented as 1) is less than Female(represented as 2).
- ❑ More number of credit holders are university students(represented as 2) followed by Graduates(represented as 1) and then High school students(represented as 3).
- ❑ More number of credit cards holder are Single.
- ❑ Mostly, payments are not due(0) from april to september.
- ❑ The average value for the amount of credit card limit is 167,484 NT dollars. The standard deviation is 129,747 NT dollars, ranging from 10,000 to 1M NT dollars.
- ❑ Average age is 35.5 years, with a standard deviation of 9.2 years. Age above 60 years old rarely uses the credit card.







Handling Class Imbalance



In undersampling, we pull all the rare events while pulling a sample of the abundant events in order to equalize the datasets.

Abundant dataset Rare dataset

These methods can be used separately or together; one is not better than the other. Which method a data scientist uses depends on the dataset and analysis.

Model Evaluation Parameters

A 'Confusion Matrix' is a consolidation of the number of times a model gives a correct or an incorrect inference or simply, the number of times a model rightly identifies the truth (actual classes) and the number of times it gets confused in identifying one class from another.

CONFUSION MATRIX	ACTUAL	
	PREDICTED	
	True Positive (TP)	False Positive (FP)
	False Negative (FN)	True Negative (TN)

$$\text{Precision} = \frac{TP}{TP+FP}$$



$$\text{Accuracy} = \frac{TP+TN}{TP+FP+TN+FN}$$

$$\text{F1-Score} = \frac{2 * \text{Precision} * \text{Recall}}{\text{Precision} + \text{Recall}}$$

$$\text{Recall} = \frac{TP}{TP+FN}$$

Logistic Regression

Input features



- Poor performance on non-linear data
- Not very powerful
- Requires moderate or no multicollinearity between independent variables

$$\hat{y} = \text{logistic}(\hat{b} + \hat{w}_1 \cdot x_1 + \dots \hat{w}_n \cdot x_n)$$

$$= \frac{1}{1 + \exp[-(\hat{b} + \hat{w}_1 \cdot x_1 + \dots \hat{w}_n \cdot x_n)]}$$

Model : Logistic Regression


Recall : 0.787

Accuracy : 0.901

Precision : 0.667

AUC_ROC : 0.855

F1: 0.722



Model : Logistic Regression


Recall : 0.787

Accuracy : 0.901

Precision : 0.667


AUC_ROC : 0.855

F1: 0.722



Decision Tree

Decision Tree Process



Pros:

- Normalization or scaling of data not needed.
- Handling missing values
- Easy to explain
- Automatic Feature selection

Cons:

- Prone to overfitting.
- Sensitive to data

Model : Decision Trees


Recall : 0.728

Accuracy : 0.9

Precision : 0.679

AUC_ROC : 0.83

F1: 0.702



Model : Decision Trees

Recall : 0.766

Accuracy : 0.894


Precision : 0.648

AUC_ROC : 0.843

F1: 0.702



Random Forest



Pros:

- Good Performance on Imbalanced datasets.
- Handling of huge amount of data
- No problem of overfitting

Cons:

- Features need to have some predictive power
- Appears as Black Box

Model : Random Forest


Recall : 0.71

Accuracy : 0.919

Precision : 0.772

AUC_ROC : 0.835

F1: 0.74



Model : Random Forest


Recall : 0.813

Accuracy : 0.902


Precision : 0.66

AUC_ROC : 0.866

F1: 0.729



K-Nearest Neighbor




Pros:

- Simple to understand and implement.
- No assumption about data
- Constantly evolving

Cons:

- Slow for large datasets.
- Scaling of data absolute must.
- Curse of dimensionality
- Does not work well on Imbalanced data.

Model : K-Nearest Neighbors
Recall : 0.771
Accuracy : 0.885
Precision : 0.618
AUC_ROC : 0.839
F1: 0.686



Model : K-Nearest Neighbors
Recall : 0.728
Accuracy : 0.889
Precision : 0.64
AUC_ROC : 0.824
F1: 0.681



Naive Bayes

GAUSSIAN NAIVE BAYES CLASSIFIER

"Gaussian" because this is a normal distribution

This is our prior belief

$$P(\text{class} | \text{data}) = \frac{P(\text{data} | \text{class}) \times P(\text{class})}{P(\text{data})}$$

We don't calculate this in naive bayes classifiers

ChrisAlbon


Pros:

- It is very fast and can be used in real time.
- Insensitive to irrelevant features.
- Good performance with high dimensional data.


Cons:

- Independence of features does not hold.
- Bad estimator.


Model : Naive Bayes
Recall : 0.955
Accuracy : 0.554
Precision : 0.261
AUC_ROC : 0.716
F1: 0.41



Model : Naive Bayes
Recall : 0.927
Accuracy : 0.689
Precision : 0.335
AUC_ROC : 0.785
F1: 0.492



XGBoost




Pros:

- Less feature engineering required
- Handles large sized datasets
- Good model performance
- Less prone to overfitting


Cons:

- Difficult interpretation
- Harder to tune

Model : XGB
Recall : 0.774
Accuracy : 0.912
Precision : 0.709
AUC_ROC : 0.856
F1: 0.74




Model : XGB
Recall : 0.803
Accuracy : 0.9
Precision : 0.657
AUC_ROC : 0.861
F1: 0.723




LightGBM

Level-wise Tree Growth



→ Can expand (max. S)
→ Cannot expand

Leaf-wise Tree Growth




Pros:

- Faster training speed and higher efficiency
- Lower memory usage
- Compatibility with Large Datasets

Cons:

- It is not suitable for small data set as it will overfit.

Model : LGBM
Recall : 0.726
Accuracy : 0.915
Precision : 0.743
AUC_ROC : 0.839
F1: 0.735



Model : LGBM
Recall : 0.785
Accuracy : 0.909
Precision : 0.693
AUC_ROC : 0.859
F1: 0.736



Model Selection

Model	Recall	Accuracy	Precision	AUC	F1
Logistic Regression	0.79	0.9	0.67	0.86	0.72
Decision Tree	0.77	0.89	0.65	0.84	0.7
Random Forest	0.81	0.9	0.66	0.87	0.73
K-Nearest Neighbors	0.72	0.89	0.64	0.82	0.68
Naive Bayes	0.92	0.69	0.33	0.79	0.5
XGBoost	0.8	0.9	0.66	0.86	0.72
LGBM	0.79	0.91	0.69	0.86	0.74

For our task, we can consider that achieving a high recall is more important since we would like to detect as maximum default transactions as possible to prevent losses.

Random Forest Classifier and XGBoost both have high recall values more than 80% and high AUC scores so we can choose either one of these models for our task.

Conclusion

- In general, all models have comparable accuracy. Nevertheless, because the classes are imbalanced (the proportion of non-default credit cards is higher than default) this metric is misleading.
- Furthermore, accuracy does not consider the rate of false positives (non-default credits cards that were predicted as default) and false negatives (default credit cards that were incorrectly predicted as non-default).
- Both cases have negative impact on the bank, since false positives leads to unsatisfied customers and false negatives leads to financial loss.
- XGBoost Classifier and Random Forest Classifier are giving us the best Recall, F1-score, and AUC Score among other algorithms. We can conclude that these two algorithms are the best to predict whether the credit card is default or not default according to our analysis.

Challenges

- Imbalanced dataset for minority class.
- Hyperparameter tuning
- Problem of overfitting.
- Choosing the right features for modelling.
- Choosing the right model to get the best scores.

THANK YOU !!