

Short Report: Mycotoxin Prediction in Corn Using Machine Learning

1. Preprocessing Steps & Rationale

1.1 Data Cleaning & Normalization

- **Outlier Removal:** Applied the **Interquartile Range (IQR) method** to remove extreme values, ensuring model stability.
- **Log Transformation:** Transformed the target variable (DON concentration) using `log1p()` to reduce skewness.
- **Feature Scaling:** Used **MinMaxScaler** to normalize spectral reflectance data, ensuring all features are within the same range for better model convergence.

1.2 Dimensionality Reduction (PCA)

- **Applied Principal Component Analysis (PCA)** to retain **95% variance**, reducing 448 spectral bands to a smaller set of meaningful components.
- **Rationale:** PCA helped remove noise and redundant information, improving model performance.
- **Insights:** **PC2, PC3, and PC1 were the most influential components**, indicating that not all spectral bands contribute equally to prediction.

2. Model Selection, Training & Evaluation

2.1 Models Tested

| Model | PCA Used? | MAE (Lower is Better) | RMSE (Lower is Better) | R² Score (Higher is Better) |
|-----------------------|-----------|-----------------------|------------------------|-----------------------------|
| Random Forest | ☑ Yes | ☑ 1.81 | ☑ 2.46 | ☑ 0.24 |
| Random Forest (Tuned) | ☑ Yes | ☑ 1.76 | ☑ 2.37 | ☑ 0.30 |
| XGBoost | ☑ Yes | ☑ 1.70 | ☑ 2.35 | ☑ 0.31 ☑ |
| XGBoost (Tuned) | ☑ Yes | ☑ 1.82 | ☑ 2.48 | ☑ 0.23 |
| MLP (Neural Network) | ☑ Yes | ☑ 1.85 | ☑ 2.44 | ☑ 0.26 |
| MLP (Tuned) | ☑ Yes | ☑ 3.00 | ☑ 4.05 | ☑ -1.05 |

2.2 Best Model: XGBoost (Untuned)

- **Performance:**
 - MAE: 1.70
 - RMSE: 2.35
 - R² Score: 0.31 (Best among all models tested)
- **Feature Importance Insights:**
 - PC3 (29.5%) & PC2 (27.8%) were the most important features.

3. Key Findings & Suggestions for Improvement

3.1 Key Findings

- ☑ **XGBoost (Untuned) performed best** among all models tested based on raw performance.
- ☑ **PCA significantly improved model accuracy** by removing noise from spectral bands.
- ☑ **Random Forest was a strong alternative** due to **stability & interpretability**.
- ☑ **Deep Learning model (MLP) improved slightly with tuning** but **was still outperformed by tree-based models**.

3.2 Observations

- **XGBoost (Untuned)** had the best overall accuracy, but tuning worsened its performance, likely due to overfitting.
- **Random Forest (Tuned)** provided the second-best results, showing that tuning helped this model.
- **MLP** had inconsistent results, indicating that deep learning models need more data to perform well.
- **PCA** was essential in improving model accuracy by removing redundant spectral bands.

3.3 Areas for Improvement

- ☑ **Increase Dataset Size** → Deep learning models (MLP) may improve with more training data.
- ☑ **Try Advanced Hyperparameter Tuning** → Bayesian Optimization instead of GridSearchCV.

- ⌘ **Test Different Feature Engineering Approaches** → Instead of PCA, extract domain-specific spectral features.
 - ⌘ **Explore Hybrid Models with Different Base Models** → Combine RF + MLP instead of RF + XGB.
-