**ASSIGNMENT - 2** 22nd-June-2022 **Q3**: RBF Neural Network In [1]: mport numpy as np import matplotlib.pyplot as plt def \_\_init\_\_(self, x, y, method, sigma): self.sigma = sigma self.w = None #weight : updated with Gaussian kernel function based on number of centres def distance(self, x1, x2): def gaussian matrix(self): self.v = self.x #x as centres elif self.method == 2: #150 random centres index = np.random.randint(self.x.shape[0], size=150) #random selection of 150 elif self.method == 3: #KMeans centroids passed as centres self.v = kmeans.cluster centers G = np.array([[(1 / np.exp(-self.distance(x, c)/(2\*(self.sigma\*\*2))))) for c in self.v]for x in self.x) self.w = np.dot(np.dot(np.linalg.pinv(np.dot(G.T, G)), G.T), self.y) # w = G inverse\*D , def prediction(self, x): yhat = np.dot(np.array([[(1 / np.exp(-self.distance(x, c) / (2 \* (self.sigma \*\* 2))))))return yhat # predicted labels def mean square error(self, y, yhat): total\_records = y.shape[0] return np.dot((yhat-y).T, (yhat-y))[0][0] / total\_records def accuracy(self, y, yhat): correct = 0 for i in range(0, len(y)): # for all labels in true\_labels correct += 1 if (y[i] == yhat[i]) else 0 **Preparing data** In [2]: data = np.array([[-2+0.2\*i, -2+0.2\*j] for i in range(21) for j in range(21)])index = np.random.permutation(data.shape[0]) data = data[index label = label[index split index = int(441\*0.8) train data = data[:split index] train label = label[:split index test data = data[split index test label = label[split index In [3]: data In [4]: train data.shape}, {test data.shape In [5]: scatter=plt.scatter(train data[:,0], plt.title( plt.legend(\*scatter.legend elements(),loc= "best", title = "label") plt.xlabel("x") plt.ylabel("y") Out[5]: Data samples with their classes 2.0 1.5 1.0 0.5 0.0 -0.5-1.0-1.50.0 1.0 Based on the label assignment condition, it is evident from the plot that when x1 and x2 both are close to zero are assigned label Method-1: centres same as train\_data In [6]: sigmas = train\_accuracy\_list = [] sigma **in** sigmas nn = RBF(x=train\_data, y=train\_label, method=1, sigma=sigma) #initialize object as class nn.gaussian matrix() #update weights yhat = nn.prediction(train data mse\_list.append(nn.mean\_square\_error(train\_label, yhat)) y output = np.where(yhat < 0, -1, 1)</pre> train\_accuracy\_list.append(nn.accuracy(train label, y output)) yhat = nn.prediction(test data) y output = np.where(yhat < 0, -1, 1) test accuracy list.append(nn.accuracy(test label, y output)) plt.figure( plt.plot(sigmas, mse\_list, plt.xlabel('Sigma') plt.ylabel('mean square error') plt.show() plt.figure( plt.plot(sigmas, train accuracy list, 'b:') plt.plot(sigmas, test accuracy list, 'g-') plt.xlabel('Sigma') plt.ylabel('Accuracy') plt.show 0.8 mean square error 0.6 0.2 10 20 30 50 Sigma 1.00 Training Accuracy Testing Accuracy 0.95 0.90 0.85 0.80 0.75 10 Sigma In [7]: In [8]: In [9]: In [10]: print(f'The maximum training accuracy is {max(train\_accuracy\_list)} and sigmas[(train\_accuracy\_list.index(max(train\_accuracy\_list)))]} sigma') In [11]: test accuracy list In [12]: print sigmas[(test\_accuracy\_list.index(max(test\_accuracy\_list)))]} sigma') We observe that sigma 1.5 gave the least mse and highest training accuracy. This implies that larger sigmas may not be that helpful in generalizing the fit as test accuracy reaches maxima at 3 sigma and is considerably high for 1.5 sigma Method-2: 150 random centres from train\_data In [13]: sigmas = [0.5]test\_accuracy\_list = [] for sigma **in** sigmas nn = RBF(x=train\_data, y=train\_label, method=2, sigma=sigma) #initialize object as class nn.gaussian\_matrix() #update weights yhat = nn.prediction(train\_data y\_output = np.where(yhat < 0, -1, 1)</pre> train\_accuracy\_list.append(nn.accuracy(train\_label, y\_output)) yhat = nn.prediction(test\_data y output = np.where(yhat < 0, -1, 1) test\_accuracy\_list.append(nn.accuracy(test\_label, y\_output)) plt.plot(sigmas, mse\_list, 'r--') plt.ylabel('mean square error') plt.show() plt.figure() plt.plot(sigmas, train\_accuracy\_list, 'b:') plt.plot(sigmas, test\_accuracy\_list, 'g-') plt.xlabel('Sigma') plt.ylabel('Accuracy') 0.8 mean square error 0.6 0.4 0.2 20 30 Sigma 1.00 Training Accuracy Testing Accuracy 0.95 0.90 0.85 0.80 0.75 50 10 20 30 Method-3: 150 centrid points from KMeans as centres In [14]: sigmas = sigma **in** sigmas nn = RBF(x=train\_data, y=train\_label, method=2, sigma=sigma) #initialize object as class nn.gaussian\_matrix() #update weights yhat = nn.prediction(train\_data) mse\_list.append(nn.mean\_square\_error(train\_label, yhat)) y\_output = np.where(yhat < 0, -1, 1)</pre> train\_accuracy\_list.append(nn.accuracy(train\_label, y\_output)) yhat = nn.prediction(test\_data) y\_output = np.where(yhat < 0, -1, 1)</pre> test\_accuracy\_list.append(nn.accuracy(test\_label, y\_output)) plt.figure( plt.plot(sigmas, mse\_list, 'r--') plt.xlabel('Sigma') plt.ylabel('mean square error') plt.show( plt.figure() plt.plot(sigmas, train\_accuracy\_list, 'b:') plt.plot(sigmas, test\_accuracy\_list, 'g-') plt.xlabel('Sigma') plt.ylabel('Accuracy') plt.legend(['Training Accuracy', 'Testing Accuracy']) plt.show 0.8 mean square error 0.6 0.4 0.2 30 50 Sigma 1.00 Training Accuracy Testing Accuracy 0.95 0.90 Accuracy 0.85 0.80 0.75 0.70 10 30 40 50 In [15]: yhat = nn.prediction(train\_data) y\_output = np.where(yhat < 0, -1, 1)</pre> print(nn.accuracy(train\_label, y\_output)) yhat = nn.prediction(test\_data) y\_output = np.where(yhat < 0, -1, 1)</pre> print(nn.accuracy(test\_label, y\_output) In [16]: nn = RBF(x=train\_data, y=train\_label, method=2, sigma=3) yhat = nn.prediction(train\_data) y\_output = np.where(yhat < 0, -1, 1)</pre> print(nn.accuracy(train\_label, y\_output)) yhat = nn.prediction(test\_data) y\_output = np.where(yhat < 0, -1, 1)</pre> print(nn.accuracy(test\_label, y\_output) In [17]: nn = RBF(x=train\_data, y=train\_label, method=3, sigma=3) yhat = nn.prediction(train\_data) y output = np.where(yhat < 0, -1, 1)</pre> print(nn.accuracy(train\_label, y\_output)) yhat = nn.prediction(test\_data) y output = np.where(yhat < 0, -1, 1)print(nn.accuracy(test\_label, y\_output) Conclusion 1. We observed that when sigma is chosen beyond 10, mse is quite high and stable for all the three methods 2. Training and testing accuracy oscialltes between higer 90% accuracy mark below 10 but steeps down beyond 10 sigma 3. The above two observations highligts that suitable choice of sigma in this use case is around 3 and higher sigma tend to worsen the fit. 4. Out if the three centre methods used in this problem, centres with same centres as data performed well and reached higher accuracy faster compared to the two other method which also perform similarly on testing accuracy but choosing centres as Kmeans cluster gave better accuracy performance. References [1]. Retreived from URL: https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Radial basis function network [2]. Retreived from URL: https://towardsdatascience.com/radial-basis-function-neural-network-simplified-6f26e3d5e04d [3]. Retreived from URL: https://github.com/paulwong16/