	2.Kruthika Natarajan Nirmala(kxn190008)							
	Classification  Classification Task:  Apply two voting classifiers - one with hard voting and one with soft voting  Apply any two models with bagging and any two models with pasting.  Apply any two models with adaboost boosting  Apply one model with gradient boosting  Apply PCA on data and then apply all the models in project 1 again on data you get from PCA. Compare your results with results in project 1. You don't need to apply all the models twice. Just copy the result table from project 1, prepare similar table for all the model after PCA and compare both tables. Does PCA help in getting better results?							
ı [1]:	DataSet  This dataset is taken from kaggel from Global Health Observatory (GHO) data repository under World Health Organization (WHO). It contains hotel booking information and includes information such as for which date booking was made, the lead time, the week night and weekend night stay, the number of adults, children, and/or babies, and the number of available parking spaces etc. There are 1207 total observations with 19 columns. Out of this 19 columns we have 6 categorical variables and the target column is with 1 representing a cancellation made and 0 representing no cancellation.  The target variable in this is is_canceled variable. The model works to predict the life expectancy of a person given his living conditions.  Importing necessary libraries for the project  #Importing the required libraries import numpy as np import pandas as pd import matplotlib.pyplot as plt import seaborn as sns							
	import matplotlib.pyplot as plt							
n [2]:	Dataset for classification							
	lead_time: No. of days between booking and hotel checkin arrival_date_month: Month of hotel booking arrival_date_week_number: Week number of hotel booking arrival_date_day_of_month: Day of hotel booking stays_in_weekend_nights: No. of weekend nights stayed stays_in_week_nights: No. of week nights stayed adults: No. of adults children: No. of children babies: No. of babies meal: Meal plan booked market_segment: Market segment of the customer distribution_channel: distribution channel the customer is in							
	booking_changes: No. of booking changes made deposit_type: Deposite type made days_in_waiting_list: No. of days in waiting for booking adr: Dollars paid required_car_parking_spaces: No. of car parking spaces reservation_status: status of reservation  Exploratory Data Analysis  The exploratory data analysis is performed on the dataset to understand the variations, range, detect outliers and collinearity if it exists in							
ı [3]:	Check for null  Upon checking for null we find that 1728 of the data cells in the dataset have a randomly disbursed null presence  #Checking data information df_hotel.info() <class 'pandas.core.frame.dataframe'=""> RangeIndex: 1207 entries, 0 to 1206</class>							
	Data columns (total 19 columns):  # Column							
	11 market_segment 1125 non-null object 12 distribution_channel 1107 non-null object 13 booking_changes 1110 non-null float64 14 deposit_type 1117 non-null object 15 days_in_waiting_list 1114 non-null float64 16 adr 1117 non-null float64 17 required_car_parking_spaces 1127 non-null float64 18 reservation_status 1108 non-null object dtypes: float64(13), object(6) memory usage: 179.3+ KB  There are totally 19 columns with more than two categorical columns							
nt[4]:	<pre>#Count of null by column df_hotel.isna().sum()  is_canceled 95 lead_time 75 arrival_date_month 87 arrival_date_week_number 88</pre>							
	arrival_date_day_of_month 110 stays_in_weekend_nights 96 stays_in_week_nights 93 adults 91 children 90 babies 83 meal 89 market_segment 82 distribution_channel 100 booking_changes 97 deposit_type 90 days_in_waiting_list 93 adr 90 required car parking spaces 80							
n [6]: nt[6]:	df_hotel.head()							
ı [7]:	2 0.0 0.0 April 16.0 12.0 0.0 3 0.0 0.0 May 21.0 NaN 1.0 4 0.0 138.0 NaN 13.0 NaN 0.0  Handle Null To handle the null, we choose to impute the mean value of the numeric columns and for categorical variables we have imput the value with most count  #Fill NULL with mean of the column data df_hotel['is_canceled'].mean(), inplace=True) df_hotel['lead_time'].fillna(df_hotel['lead_time'].mean(), inplace=True)							
	<pre>df_hotel['arrival_date_day_of_month'].fillna(df_hotel['arrival_date_day_of_month'].mean(), inplace=True) df_hotel['stays_in_weekend_nights'].fillna(df_hotel['stays_in_weekend_nights'].mean(), inplace=True) df_hotel['adults'].fillna(df_hotel['adults'].mean(), inplace=True) df_hotel['adults'].fillna(df_hotel['adults'].mean(), inplace=True) df_hotel['adilts'].fillna(df_hotel['children'].mean(), inplace=True) df_hotel['booking_changes'].fillna(df_hotel['booking_changes'].mean(), inplace=True) df_hotel['market_segment'].fillna(df_hotel['market_segment'].value_counts().index[0], inplace=True) df_hotel['arrival_date_week_number'].fillna(df_hotel['arrival_date_week_number'].mean(), inplace=True) df_hotel['babies'].fillna(df_hotel['babies'].mean(), inplace=True) df_hotel['babies'].fillna(df_hotel['babies'].mean(), inplace=True) df_hotel['distribution_channel'].fillna(df_hotel['distribution_channel'].value_counts().index[0], inplace=True) df_hotel['required_car_parking_spaces'].fillna(df_hotel['distribution_channel'].value_counts().index[0], inplace=True) df_hotel['reservation_status'].fillna(df_hotel['reservation_status'].value_counts().index[0], inplace=True) df_hotel['disy_in_waiting_list'].fillna(df_hotel['days_in_waiting_list'].mean(), inplace=True) df_hotel['days_in_waiting_list'].fillna(df_hotel['days_in_waiting_list'].mean(), inplace=True) df_hotel['days_in_waiting_list'].fillna(df_hotel['days_in_waiting_list'].mean(), inplace=True) df_hotel['deposit_type'].fillna(df_hotel['deposit_type'].value_counts().index[0], inplace=True)</pre> <pre>We check to see if all the columns have 0 null presence</pre>							
	<pre>#checking for nulls in each column df_hotel.isna().sum()  is_canceled</pre>							
1 [9]:	<pre>market_segment</pre>							
	<pre>df_hotel['stays_in_weekend_nights']=df_hotel['stays_in_weekend_nights'].astype(int) df_hotel['stays_in_week_nights']=df_hotel['stays_in_week_nights'].astype(int) df_hotel['stays_in_weekend_nights']=df_hotel['stays_in_weekend_nights'].astype(int) df_hotel['adults']=df_hotel['adults'].astype(int) df_hotel['children']=df_hotel['children'].astype(int) df_hotel['booking_changes']=df_hotel['booking_changes'].astype(int) df_hotel['is_canceled']=df_hotel['is_canceled'].astype(int)</pre> Data Visualisation We check the spread of the target variable is_canceled. We see that most of the hotel bookings in our dataset are not canceled.							
[10]:	#Plot depicting the number of cancellations sns.countplot(data=df_hotel,x=df_hotel.is_canceled) plt.show()  700 600 500 15 400 8 300							
[11]:	<pre>plt.figure(figsize=(16, 6)) plot2=sns.countplot(data=df_hotel, x=df_hotel.arrival_date_month, hue=df_hotel.is_canceled, color='Pink'</pre>							
	plot2=sns.countplot(data=df_hotel,x=df_hotel.arrival_date_month,hue=df_hotel.is_canceled,color='Pink' plot2.set(xlabel="Arrival_month", ylabel="Number of bookings") plt.show()  is_canceled							
	Checking the presence of outliera in is_canceled with respect to the lead time which is the number of days between the booking made and the date of hotel stay We find that as the lead days increases, the outliers are present in both cancelled as well as confirmed bookings. But we dont remove these to as it would be the case in real time data							
[12]:								
	300 - Fee 200 - 10							
[13]:	Cancelled a booking always puts a hole in the pocket. We can see the variation in the dollars spent in this case.  # Plotting the box plot depicting the dollar amount spent for canceled and confirmed bookings plt.figure(figsize=(16, 6)) plot3=sns.boxplot(data=df_hotel,x='is_canceled', y='adr', palette=["m", "g"]) #sns.despine(offset=10, trim=True) plot3.set(xlabel="is_canceled", ylabel="Dollars") plt.show()							
	300 - 250 - 200 - 100 -							
[14]:	Weekends are always for getaways and sometime it ends up with a spoiler. This can be seen in the plot below showing that cancellations are more in weekend night stays as people tentatively make a booking  #Plotting the count of canceled and confirmed bookings having weekend and week nights plt.figure(figsize=(20, 6))							
	fig, ax =plt.subplots(1,2) sns.countplot(data=df_hotel,x='stays_in_weekend_nights',hue='is_canceled',color='Pink', ax=ax[0]) sns.countplot(data=df hotel,x='stays in week nights',hue='is canceled',color='Pink', ax=ax[1])							
	<pre>Figure size 1440x432 with 0 Axes&gt;</pre> 300 250 250 200 175 150 125							
	<pre>plt.show()  <figure 0="" 1440x432="" axes="" size="" with="">  300</figure></pre>							
[15]:	#Plotting the booking changes done for canceled and confirmed bookings plot2=sns.catplot(data=df_hotel, x='is_canceled', y='booking_changes', color='Pink') plt.show()  **Plotting the booking changes done for canceled', y-'booking_changes', color='Pink') plot2.set(xlabel="is_canceled", ylabel="No of booking changes")							
[15]:	CFigure size 1440x432 with 0 Axes>  300  100  100  100  100  100  100  10							
	The number of changes made to a booking are visualised and can be infered that people who dont cancel make more changes to their bookings  **Proceedings** the booking changes done for canceled and confirmed bookings**  **Proceding** the booking changes done for canceled and confirmed bookings**  **Proceding** the booking changes done for canceled and confirmed bookings**  **Proceding** the booking changes done for canceled and confirmed bookings**  **Proceding** the booking changes done for canceled and confirmed bookings**  **Proceding** the booking changes done for canceled and confirmed bookings**  **Proceding** the booking changes done for canceled and confirmed bookings**  **Proceding** the decaded proceding**, ylabel="No of booking changes", color="pink")  **plots_sec_(sk)_bole="so_canceled upfront to make a booking, people are seen to book more and cancel it as well  **Proceding** the decaded type for confirmed and canceled bookings**  **Proceding** the decaded type for confirmed and canceled bookings**  **plots_sec_(sk)_bole="so_canceled", pink", pink done and canceled and canceled bookings**  **plots_sec_(sk)_bole="so_canceled", pink done and canceled and canceled bookings**  **plots_sec_(sk)_bole="so_canceled", pink done and canceled and							
	### CFigure 91xx 1446x432 with 0 Axes    Axes   Axe							
	### CFL.   1449.6432 with C Avera  #### CFL.   1449.6432 with C Avera  ##### CFL.   1449.6432 with C Avera  ##### CFL.   1449.6432 with C Avera  ###### CFL.   1449.6432 with C Avera  ###################################							
[16]:	# Control of the property of the Control of the Con							
[16]:	Conjugate and a Constant Within 3 According to the Conjugate of Conjugate and Conjugat							
[16]:	The reachest consistent where it is provided and consistent and consistent as well as the reachest of consistent and consisten							
<pre>[16]:</pre>	Excitation this description of the control of the c							
<pre>[16]:</pre>	Secretary Control (1987) The control of the control							
<pre>[16]:</pre>	Appropriate processor of the control							
<pre>[16]:</pre>	The control of the co							
<pre>[16]:</pre>	## Control Con							
<pre>[16]:</pre>	Control for the first of the fi							
[18]:	And the continue with region and the continue with a second and the region does not all the continue with the continue with a second and the continue with t							
[18]: [17]: [20]: [21]:	According to the control of the cont							
[18]: [20]: [21]: [22]:	Compared							
[18]: [20]: [21]: [22]:	The content of the							
[18]: [27]: [27]: [27]: [27]:	Column							
[16]: [17]: [17]: [21]: [22]: [23]: [24]:	The content of the							
[16]: [17]: [17]: [21]: [22]: [23]: [24]:	Company   Comp							
[16]: [17]: [17]: [21]: [22]: [23]: [24]:	The content of the							
[18]: [17]: [27]: [27]: [27]: [27]: [27]:	Column							
[18]: [17]: [27]: [27]: [27]: [27]: [27]:	The content of the							
[18]: [17]: [27]: [27]: [27]: [27]: [27]:	The content of the							
[16]: [17]: [18]: [20]: [21]: [22]: [23]: [24]: [25]:	The content of the							
[16]: [17]: [18]: [21]: [22]: [23]: [24]: [25]:	The content of the							
[16]: [17]: [18]: [21]: [22]: [23]: [24]: [25]:	Company							
[16]: [17]: [18]: [21]: [22]: [23]: [24]: [25]:	Company							

Out[32]:	<pre>array([[ 26., 12., 17.,, 0., 1., 0.],</pre>
In [33]:	Scaling is done with MinMax scaler which scales the data with respect to the minimum and maximum values, this is better than the standard scaler which will mostly incline towards the mean of the data.  # Scaling the dataset #through histogram we see that data is not much normally distributed for some of the columns. #Hence we use Standard Scaler to normalize and scale from sklearn.preprocessing import MinMaxScaler scaler = MinMaxScaler() X_train = scaler.fit_transform(X_train) X_test = scaler.transform(X_test)
	1) Voting Classifier  Voting is an ensemble classifier which is a combination from multiple machine learning algorithms. It helps in lowering error and lessen overfitting  from sklearn.ensemble import VotingClassifier from sklearn.linear model import LogisticRegression
	from sklearn.svm import SVC from sklearn.tree import DecisionTreeClassifier  Hard voting: Case where the class with more votes are selected  a) Voting Classifier - Hard  Logistic regression is run with c=1, penalty set as I2 and liblinear solver is used.
In [36]:	SVM poly kernel is run with gamma=0.1, c=1  KNN with neighbor = 9 is run  These models are used with voting to find a best model with highest votes  logistic_clf = LogisticRegression(C=1, penalty= '12', solver='liblinear') svc_clf = SVC(kernel = 'poly', gamma = 0.1, C=1, probability=True) knn_clf=KNeighborsClassifier(9)  Train data is fit into the different models without voting
	<pre>logistic_clf.fit(X_train, y_train) svc_clf.fit(X_train, y_train) #decisiontree_clf.fit(X_train, y_train) knn_clf.fit(X_train, y_train)  KNeighborsClassifier(algorithm='auto', leaf_size=30, metric='minkowski',</pre>
	<pre>Voting is done with the three models  voting = VotingClassifier(estimators=[('lr', logistic_clf), ('svc', svc_clf), ('kn', knn_clf)], voting = 'hard')  The scores of the training set of the models are shown:  print('log_clf: ', logistic_clf.score(X_train, y_train)) print('svc_clf: ', svc_clf.score(X_train, y_train)) print('kn_clf: ', knn_clf.score(X_train, y_train))</pre>
In [40]:	log_clf: 0.9461139896373058 svc_clf: 0.9471502590673575 kn_clf: 0.938860103626943  The train and test score for the voting classifier is obtained  voting.fit(X_train, y_train) print('vot_clf Train:{0:.4f}'.format(voting.score(X_train, y_train))) print('vot_clf Test: {0:.4f}'.format(voting.score(X_test, y_test)))
In [41]:	<pre>from sklearn.metrics import confusion_matrix, classification_report pred_hardvotingclf = voting.predict(X_test) print(metrics.accuracy_score(y_test,pred_hardvotingclf))</pre>
	<pre>confusion = confusion_matrix(y_test, pred_hardvotingclf) import seaborn as sns import matplotlib.pyplot as plt  ax= plt.subplot() sns.heatmap(confusion, annot=True, fmt='d', ax = ax); #annot=True to annotate cells  # labels, title and ticks ax.set_xlabel('Predicted labels') ax.set_ylabel('True labels')  print(classification_report(y_test, pred_hardvotingclf))</pre>
	0.9380165289256198  precision recall f1-score support  0 0.95 0.95 0.95 151 1 0.92 0.91 0.92 91  accuracy macro avg 0.93 0.93 0.93 242 weighted avg 0.94 0.94 0.94 242
	- 120 - 100 - 80 - 60 - 40 - 20
In [42]:	The F1 score and Recall is obtained  from sklearn.metrics import precision_recall_fscore_support as score  precision, recall, fscore, support=score(y_test, pred_hardvotingclf)  print ('Recall : {}'.format(recall[0]))  print ('F1Score : {}'.format(fscore[0]))
In [43]:	Recall : 0.9536423841059603 F1Score : 0.9504950495049505  Classification_Scores.update({'Hard voting Classifier':[metrics.accuracy_score(y_test,pred_hardvotingcf),recall[0],fscore[0]]})  b) Voting Classifier - Soft  Soft voting is done with probability vector of each class summed and averaged
In [44]: In [45]:	<pre>soft_voting = VotingClassifier(estimators=[('lr', logistic_clf), ('svc', svc_clf), ('kn', knn_clf)], v ting = 'soft')  The train and test of the soft voting classifier is obtained  soft_voting.fit(X_train, y_train) print('vot_clf Train: {0:.4f}'.format(soft_voting.score(X_train, y_train))) print('vot_clf Test: {0:.4f}'.format(soft_voting.score(X_test, y_test)))  vot_clf Train: 0.9451 vot clf Test: 0.9380</pre>
In [46]:	The confusion matrix of the soft voting classifier is printed
	<pre>ax= plt.subplot() sns.heatmap(confusion, annot=True,fmt='d', ax = ax); #annot=True to annotate cells  # labels, title and ticks ax.set_xlabel('Predicted labels') ax.set_ylabel('True labels')  print(classification_report(y_test,pred_softvotingclf)) 0.9380165289256198</pre>
	precision recall f1-score support  0 0.95 0.95 0.95 151 1 0.92 0.91 0.92 91  accuracy 0.94 242 macro avg 0.93 0.93 0.93 242 weighted avg 0.94 0.94 0.94 242
	- 120 - 100 - 80 - 60 - 40 - 20
In [47]:	<pre>precision, recall, fscore, support=score(y_test, pred_softvotingclf)  print ('Recall : {}'.format(recall[0])) print ('F1Score : {}'.format(fscore[0]))</pre>
In [48]:	Recall: 0.9536423841059603 F1Score: 0.9504950495049505  Classification_Scores.update({'Soft voting calssifier': [metrics.accuracy_score(y_test,pred_softvotingcf),recall[0],fscore[0]]})  2)Bagging  Bagging is an aggregation ensemble meta-algorithm designed to improve the stability and accuracy of algorithms.
	It helps to reduce overfitting. One main parameter passed is the bootstrap parameter. It uses sampling with replacement.  N_estimators and max_samples are parameters that control the number of decision trees and sample size used.  The bagging is done with KNN and decision Tree  Bagging-Decision tree  Bagging is run with decision tree with n_estimator=500, max_features=0.5
In [49]:	<pre>from sklearn.tree import DecisionTreeClassifier from sklearn.ensemble import BaggingClassifier from sklearn.ensemble import BaggingClassifier bag_clf = BaggingClassifier(DecisionTreeClassifier(),bootstrap=True,n_jobs=-1,random_state=0,max_features=0.5,n_estimators=500,max_samples=0.6) bag_clf.fit(X_train, y_train) print("Accuracy on training set: {:.3f}".format(bag_clf.score(X_train, y_train))) print("Accuracy on test set: {:.3f}".format(bag_clf.score(X_test, y_test)))</pre>
In [50]:	Accuracy on training set: 0.977 Accuracy on test set: 0.942  Cross validation score for the bagging classifier  scores = cross_val_score(bag_clf, X_train, y_train, cv = 10, scoring = 'accuracy') print("Cross-validation scores: {}".format(scores))  print("Average cross-validation score: {:.2f}".format(scores.mean()))  Cross-validation scores: [0.93814433 0.95876289 0.88659794 0.96907216 0.96907216 0.91666667 0.94791667 0.88541667 0.97916667 0.94791667]
In [51]:	Average cross-validation score: 0.94  Grid Search is done with max_samples, max_features and n_estimators to find the best parameters  param_grid = {'max_samples': [0.5,0.6,0.8],
In [52]:	<pre>grid_search_bagclf.fit(X_train, y_train)  print("Best parameters: {}".format(grid_search_bagclf.best_params_)) print("Best cross-validation score: {:.2f}".format(grid_search_bagclf.best_score_))  Best parameters: {'max_features': 0.5, 'max_samples': 0.6, 'n_estimators': 500} Best cross-validation score: 0.94  Confusion matrix is printed for the above classifier  import sklearn.metrics as metrics</pre>
	<pre>from sklearn.metrics import confusion_matrix, classification_report pred_bagclf = grid_search_bagclf.predict(X_test) print(metrics.accuracy_score(y_test,pred_bagclf))  confusion = confusion_matrix(y_test, pred_bagclf) import seaborn as sns import matplotlib.pyplot as plt  ax= plt.subplot() sns.heatmap(confusion, annot=True,fmt='d', ax = ax); #annot=True to annotate cells # labels, title and ticks</pre>
	ax.set_xlabel('Predicted labels')  ax.set_ylabel('True labels')  print(classification_report(y_test,pred_bagclf))  0.9421487603305785
	macro avg 0.94 0.94 0.94 242 weighted avg 0.94 0.94 0.94 242
In [53]:	The Recall and F1 score for the decision tree with bagging is obtained  from sklearn.metrics import precision_recall_fscore_support as score
In [54]:	<pre>precision, recall, fscore, support=score(y_test, pred_bagclf)  print ('Recall : {}'.format(recall[0])) print ('F1Score : {}'.format(fscore[0]))  Recall : 0.9536423841059603 F1Score : 0.9536423841059603  Classification_Scores.update({'Bagging-Decision Tree Classifier':[metrics.accuracy_score(y_test,pred_bagclf),recall[0],fscore[0]]})</pre>
In [55]:	<pre>Bagging - KNN The KNN model is run with neighbors = 4 with bagging  from sklearn.ensemble import BaggingClassifier  bagknn_clf = BaggingClassifier(KNeighborsClassifier(n_neighbors=4), bootstrap=True, n_jobs=-1, random_tate=0)  bagknn clf.fit(X train, y train)</pre>
In [56]:	<pre>print("Accuracy on training set: {:.3f}".format(bagknn_clf.score(X_train, y_train))) print("Accuracy on test set: {:.3f}".format(bagknn_clf.score(X_test, y_test)))  Accuracy on training set: 0.945 Accuracy on test set: 0.938  The cross validation score is calculated with cv=5  scores = cross_val_score(bagknn_clf, X_train, y_train, cv = 5, scoring = 'accuracy') print("Cross-validation scores: {}".format(scores))</pre>
In [57]:	<pre>print("Average cross-validation score: {:.2f}".format(scores.mean()))  Cross-validation scores: [0.93264249 0.89119171 0.94818653 0.9119171 0.94818653] Average cross-validation score: 0.93  Grid search is used to find the best parameters for max_sample, max_features and n_estimators  param_grid = {'max_samples': [0.5,0.6],</pre>
	<pre>grid_search_bagclfknn = GridSearchCV(BaggingClassifier(KNeighborsClassifier(n_neighbors=4), random_stat =0,bootstrap=True,n_jobs=-1), param_grid, cv=5, return_train_score=True)  grid_search_bagclfknn.fit(X_train, y_train)  print("Best parameters: {}".format(grid_search_bagclf.best_params_)) print("Best cross-validation score: {:.2f}".format(grid_search_bagclf.best_score_))  Best parameters: {'max_features': 0.5, 'max_samples': 0.6, 'n_estimators': 500} Best cross-validation score: 0.94</pre> Confusion matrix is printed
In [58]:	<pre>import sklearn.metrics as metrics from sklearn.metrics import confusion_matrix, classification_report pred_bagknn_clf = grid_search_bagclfknn.predict(X_test) print(metrics.accuracy_score(y_test,pred_bagknn_clf))  confusion = confusion_matrix(y_test, pred_bagknn_clf) import seaborn as sns import matplotlib.pyplot as plt  ax= plt.subplot() sns.heatmap(confusion, annot=True,fmt='d', ax = ax); #annot=True to annotate cells</pre>
	<pre># labels, title and ticks ax.set_xlabel('Predicted labels') ax.set_ylabel('True labels') #ax.xaxis.set_ticklabels(['Attrition', 'No-Attrition']) #ax.yaxis.set_ticklabels(['Attrition', 'No-Attrition']) print(classification_report(y_test,pred_bagknn_clf))  0.9380165289256198</pre>
	1 0.92 0.91 0.92 91  accuracy 0.94 242 macro avg 0.93 0.93 0.93 242 weighted avg 0.94 0.94 0.94 242
	The Recall and F1 score is calculated
In [59]: In [60]:	<pre>from sklearn.metrics import precision_recall_fscore_support as score  precision, recall, fscore, support=score(y_test, pred_bagknn_clf)  print ('Recall : {}'.format(recall[0])) print ('F1Score : {}'.format(fscore[0]))  Recall : 0.9536423841059603 F1Score : 0.9504950495049505</pre> Classification Scores.update({'Bagging-KNN Classifier': [metrics.accuracy score(y test, pred bagknn clf))  Classification Scores.update(('Bagging-KNN Classifier': [metrics.accuracy score(y test, pred bagknn clf))
	3)Pasting  Pasting is an aggregation ensemble meta-algorithm designed to improve the stability and accuracy of algorithms. It helps to reduce overfitting. One main parameter passed is the bootstrap parameter which is set to false. It uses sampling without replacement.  N_estimators and max_samples are parameters that control the number of decision trees and sample size used.
In [61]:	Pasting is done on Decision Tree and KNN models  Pasting - Decision Tree  Decision tree is run with bootstrap=false for pasting  from sklearn.ensemble import BaggingClassifier  pasteknn_clf = BaggingClassifier(DecisionTreeClassifier(random_state = 0, max_depth= 2), bootstrap=Fal
	<pre>e, n_jobs=-1, random_state=0, n_estimators=150, max_samples=100)  pasteknn_clf.fit(X_train, y_train) print("Accuracy on training set: {:.3f}".format(bagknn_clf.score(X_train, y_train))) print("Accuracy on test set: {:.3f}".format(bagknn_clf.score(X_test, y_test)))  Accuracy on training set: 0.945 Accuracy on test set: 0.938  Cross validation is done on the model with cv=10</pre>
In [62]:	<pre>scores = cross_val_score(bagknn_clf, X_train, y_train, cv = 10, scoring = 'accuracy') print("Cross-validation scores: {}".format(scores))  print("Average cross-validation score: {:.2f}".format(scores.mean()))  Cross-validation scores: [0.91752577 0.95876289 0.87628866 0.89690722 0.97938144 0.91666667 0.91666667 0.88541667 0.95833333 0.9375 ]  Average cross-validation score: 0.92  The gridsearch is used to find best parameters for max_samples, max_features and n_estimators for the decision tree  param_grid = {'max_samples': [0.5,0.6],</pre>
	<pre>'max_features': [0.4,0.5],</pre>
In [64]:	<pre>from sklearn.metrics import confusion_matrix, classification_report pred_pasteclf = pasteknn_clf.predict(X_test) print(metrics.accuracy_score(y_test,pred_pasteclf))  confusion = confusion_matrix(y_test, pred_pasteclf) import seaborn as sns</pre>
	<pre>import matplotlib.pyplot as plt  ax= plt.subplot() sns.heatmap(confusion, annot=True, fmt='d',ax = ax); #annot=True to annotate cells  # labels ax.set_xlabel('Predicted labels') ax.set_ylabel('True labels') print(classification_report(y_test,pred_pasteclf))  0.9380165289256198</pre>
	0 0.95 0.95 0.95 151 1 0.92 0.91 0.92 91  accuracy 0.94 242 macro avg 0.93 0.93 0.93 242 weighted avg 0.94 0.94 0.94 242
	- 100 - 80 - 60 - 40 - 20 Predicted labels
In [65]:	The recall and F1 score of the model is printed  from sklearn.metrics import precision_recall_fscore_support as score  precision,recall,fscore,support=score(y_test,pred_pasteclf)  print ('Recall : {}'.format(recall[0]))  print ('F1Score : {}'.format(fscore[0]))  Recall : 0.9536423841059603  F1Score : 0.9504950495049505
	<pre>Classification_Scores.update({'Pasting-Decision Tree':[metrics.accuracy_score(y_test,pred_pasteclf),reall[0],fscore[0]]})</pre> <pre>Pasting - KNN  KNN classfier with Pasting is modelled with bootstrap=false  from sklearn.ensemble import BaggingClassifier  pasteknn clf = BaggingClassifier(KNeighborsClassifier(n_neighbors=4), bootstrap=False, n_jobs=-1, rand</pre>
	<pre>pasteknn_clf = BaggingClassifier(KNeighborsClassifier(n_neighbors=4), bootstrap=False, n_jobs=-1, rand m_state=0)  pasteknn_clf.fit(X_train, y_train) print("Accuracy on training set: {:.3f}".format(bagknn_clf.score(X_train, y_train))) print("Accuracy on test set: {:.3f}".format(bagknn_clf.score(X_test, y_test)))  Accuracy on training set: 0.945 Accuracy on test set: 0.938  Cross validation score is printed for the model</pre>
In [68]:	<pre>scores = cross_val_score(bagknn_clf, X_train, y_train, cv = 5, scoring = 'accuracy') print("Cross-validation scores: {}".format(scores))  print("Average cross-validation score: {:.2f}".format(scores.mean()))  Cross-validation scores: [0.93264249 0.89119171 0.94818653 0.9119171 0.94818653] Average cross-validation score: 0.93  Gridsearch is used to find the best parameters for max_samples, max_features and n_estimators are found  param grid = {'max samples': [0.5,0.6],</pre>
	<pre>'max_features': [0.4,0.5],</pre>
In [70]:	Confusion matrix is printed for the model  import sklearn.metrics as metrics from sklearn.metrics import confusion_matrix, classification_report pred_pasteclf = pasteknn_clf.predict(X_test) print(metrics.accuracy_score(y_test,pred_pasteclf))  confusion = confusion_matrix(y_test, pred_pasteclf) import seaborn as sns
	<pre>import matplotlib.pyplot as plt  ax= plt.subplot() sns.heatmap(confusion, annot=True, fmt='d', ax = ax); #annot=True to annotate cells  # labels, title and ticks ax.set_xlabel('Predicted labels') ax.set_ylabel('True labels')  print(classification_report(y_test,pred_pasteclf))  0.9380165289256198</pre>
	0 0.95 0.95 0.95 151 1 0.91 0.92 0.92 91  accuracy 0.94 242 macro avg 0.93 0.94 0.93 242 weighted avg 0.94 0.94 0.94 242  -140 -120
	143 8 - 100 - 80 - 60 - 40 - 20 Predicted labels
In [71]:	Recall and F1 score are printed  from sklearn.metrics import precision_recall_fscore_support as score  precision, recall, fscore, support=score(y_test, pred_pasteclf)  print ('Recall : {}'.format(recall[0]))  print ('F1Score : {}'.format(fscore[0]))  Recall : 0.9470198675496688  F1Score : 0.9501661129568105
In [72]:	
In [73]:	Adaboost with Decision tree  The best parameter in learning_rate and n_estimators are identified  from sklearn.ensemble import AdaBoostClassifier train_score_array = [] test_score_array = [] best_score=0
	<pre>for n in range(1,10):     for learning_rate in [0.001,0.01]:         for n_estimators in [50,100]:             dtree_reg=DecisionTreeClassifier(max_depth=n)                 ada_reg_dtree = AdaBoostClassifier(dtree_reg, n_estimators=n_estimators,learning_rate=lear ing_rate,random_state=0)             ada_reg_dtree.fit(X_train, y_train)                 train_score_array.append(ada_reg_dtree.score(X_train, y_train))                 test_score_array.append(ada_reg_dtree.score(X_test, y_test))                 score=ada_reg_dtree.score(X_test, y_test)                 if(score&gt;best_score):</pre>
In [741.	<pre>if(score&gt;best_score):</pre>
	<pre>dt_reg = DecisionTreeClassifier (max_depth=5, random_state=0) ada_reg_dt = AdaBoostClassifier (dt_reg, n_estimators=50, learning_rate=0.01, random_state=0) ada_reg_dt.fit(X_train, y_train) y_pred=ada_reg_dt.predict(X_test) print('Train score: {:.4f} %'.format(ada_reg_dt.score(X_train, y_train)*100)) print('Test score: {:.4f} %'.format(ada_reg_dt.score(X_test, y_test)*100))</pre> Train score: 98.5492 % Test score: 94.6281 %
In [75]:	<pre>Test score: 94.6281 %  Confusion matrix is printed  pred_ada = ada_reg_dt.predict(X_test) print(metrics.accuracy_score(y_test,pred_ada))  confusion = confusion_matrix(y_test, pred_ada) import seaborn as sns import matplotlib.pyplot as plt  ax= plt.subplot()</pre>
	<pre>ax= plt.subplot() sns.heatmap(confusion, annot=True,fmt='d', ax = ax); #annot=True to annotate cells  # labels, title and ticks ax.set_xlabel('Predicted labels') ax.set_ylabel('True labels')  print(classification_report(y_test,pred_ada))  0.9462809917355371     precision recall f1-score support  0 0.97 0.95 0.96 151 1 0.91 0.95 0.93 91</pre>
	1 0.91 0.95 0.93 91  accuracy macro avg 0.94 0.95 0.94 242 weighted avg 0.95 0.95 0.95 242  - 140 - 120 - 100
	Recall and F1 score is calculated
In [76]:	

In [77]: Classification\_Scores.update({'Adaboosting-Decision Tree':[metrics.accuracy\_score(y\_test,pred\_ada),reca 11[0],fscore[0]]}) Adaboost with SVC Poly Kernel =poly, n\_estimators=200 and learning\_rate=0.1 are used for SVC poly model with adaboost In [78]: from sklearn.svm import SVC svc\_clf=SVC(C=1,gamma=0.1, kernel='poly',probability=True) ada clf svc = AdaBoostClassifier(svc clf, n estimators=200,learning rate=0.1,random state=0) ada clf svc.fit(X train, y train) y\_pred=ada\_clf\_svc.predict(X\_test) print('Train score: {:.4f} %'.format(ada clf svc.score(X train, y train)\*100)) print('Test score: {:.4f} %'.format(ada clf svc.score(X test, y test)\*100)) Train score: 93.8860 % Test score: 90.9091 % Confusion matrix is printed for the above model In [79]: pred adasvc = ada clf svc.predict(X test) print(metrics.accuracy score(y test,pred adasvc)) confusion = confusion\_matrix(y\_test, pred\_adasvc) import seaborn as sns import matplotlib.pyplot as plt ax= plt.subplot() sns.heatmap(confusion, annot=True, fmt='d',ax = ax); #annot=True to annotate cells # labels, title and ticks ax.set\_xlabel('Predicted labels') ax.set ylabel('True labels') print(classification report(y test, pred adasvc)) 0.9090909090909091 precision recall f1-score support 0.91 0.95 0.93 151 1 0.91 0.85 0.87 91 242 accuracy 0.91 0.91 0.90 0.90 242 macro avg 0.91 0.91 0.91 242 weighted avg - 140 - 120 143 0 -- 100 True labels - 80 - 60 14 1 0 Predicted labels In [80]: from sklearn.metrics import precision recall fscore support as score precision, recall, fscore, support=score(y\_test, pred\_adasvc) print ('Recall : {}'.format(recall[0])) print ('F1Score : {}'.format(fscore[0])) Recall : 0.9470198675496688 F1Score : 0.9285714285714285 In [81]: Classification\_Scores.update({'Adaboosting-SVC Poly Classifier':[metrics.accuracy\_score(y\_test,pred\_ada svc), recall[0], fscore[0]]}) **Gradient Boosting** Gradient boosting is a technique which minimizes the overall prediction error. The key idea is to set the target outcomes for the next best model in order to minimize the error. Gradient boosting model is primarily used with decision tree. The key parameters used are n\_estimators and learning\_rate In [82]: from sklearn.ensemble import GradientBoostingClassifier gradient boosting = GradientBoostingClassifier(max depth=2, random state=0) param\_grid={'n\_estimators':[50,100,150],'learning\_rate':[0.5,1]} grid7=GridSearchCV(gradient\_boosting,param\_grid,cv=5,return\_train\_score=True) grid7.fit(X\_train, y\_train) train7=grid7.cv\_results\_['mean\_train\_score'] print("Best Parameters: {}".format(grid7.best\_params\_)) print("Train score: {0:.3f}".format(train7.mean())) print("Test score: {0:.3f}".format(grid7.score(X\_test,y\_test))) Best Parameters: {'learning\_rate': 0.5, 'n\_estimators': 50} Train score: 0.994 Test score: 0.909 The best params learning\_rate=0.5 and n\_estimators:20 are used with max\_depth=2 for decision tree In [83]: grad clf = GradientBoostingClassifier(max depth=2, n estimators=50,learning rate=0.5,random state=0) grad\_clf.fit(X\_train, y\_train) y\_pred=grad\_clf.predict(X\_test) In [84]: print('Train score: {:.4f} %'.format(grad\_clf.score(X\_train, y\_train)\*100)) print('Test score: {:.4f} %'.format(grad\_clf.score(X\_test, y\_test)\*100)) Train score: 97.9275 % Test score: 90.9091 % Confusion Matrix is printed for the model grad = grad clf.predict(X test) In [85]: print(metrics.accuracy\_score(y\_test,grad)) confusion = confusion\_matrix(y\_test, grad) import seaborn as sns import matplotlib.pyplot as plt ax= plt.subplot() sns.heatmap(confusion, annot=True, fmt='d',ax = ax); #annot=True to annotate cells # labels, title and ticks ax.set xlabel('Predicted labels') ax.set ylabel('True labels') print(classification report(y test, grad)) 0.9090909090909091 recall f1-score precision support 0.91 0.95 0.93 151 0.91 0.85 0.87 91 0.91 242 accuracy 0.91 0.90 0.90 242 macro avg 0.91 242 0.91 0.91 weighted avg - 140 - 120 143 0 -- 100 True labels - 80 - 60 14 Predicted labels In [86]: from sklearn.metrics import precision recall fscore support as score precision,recall,fscore,support=score(y\_test,grad) print ('Recall : {}'.format(recall[0])) print ('F1Score : {}'.format(fscore[0])) : 0.9470198675496688 Recall : 0.9285714285714285 F1Score In [87]: Classification\_Scores.update({'Gradient boosting':[metrics.accuracy\_score(y\_test,grad),recall[0],fscore [0]]}) Random Forest The random forest is a classifier consisting of many decisions trees In [88]: from sklearn.ensemble import RandomForestClassifier forest = RandomForestClassifier(random state=0) forest.fit(X\_train, y\_train) print("Accuracy on training set: {:.3f}".format(forest.score(X train, y train))) print("Accuracy on test set: {:.3f}".format(forest.score(X\_test, y\_test))) Accuracy on training set: 0.997 Accuracy on test set: 0.938 Confusion Matrix is generated In [89]: import sklearn.metrics as metrics from sklearn.metrics import confusion matrix, classification report pred forestclf = forest.predict(X test) print (metrics.accuracy\_score (y\_test, pred\_forestclf)) confusion = confusion\_matrix(y\_test, pred\_forestclf) import seaborn as sns import matplotlib.pyplot as plt ax= plt.subplot() sns.heatmap(confusion, annot=True, fmt='d',ax = ax); #annot=True to annotate cells # labels, title and ticks ax.set xlabel('Predicted labels') ax.set ylabel('True labels') print(classification\_report(y\_test,pred\_forestclf)) 0.9380165289256198 precision recall f1-score support 0 0.95 0.95 0.95 151 1 0.92 0.91 0.92 91 0.94 242 accuracy 0.93 0.93 0.93 242 macro avg weighted avg 0.94 0.94 0.94 242 - 140 - 120 144 0 -- 100 True labels - 80 - 60 40 1 Predicted labels The recall and F1 score are printed In [90]: from sklearn.metrics import precision\_recall\_fscore\_support as score precision, recall, fscore, support=score(y\_test, pred\_forestclf) print ('Recall : {}'.format(recall[0])) print ('F1Score : {}'.format(fscore[0])) : 0.9536423841059603 Recall F1Score : 0.9504950495049505 In [91]: Classification Scores.update({'Random Forest':[metrics.accuracy score(y test,pred forestclf),recall[0], fscore[0]]}) In [92]: forest.feature importances Out[92]: array([0.0629187 , 0.06364299, 0.02162273, 0.01250533, 0.02042624, 0.00529865, 0.00404272, 0.00353806, 0.00871052, 0.00425258, 0.04741042, 0.02148329, 0.00285393, 0.00668045, 0.00122707, 0.00173329, 0.00176495, 0.00229307, 0.00082871, 0.00435428, 0.0019443 , 0.00645337, 0.00466284, 0.00269751, 0.00331846, 0.00221829, 0.00220869, 0.00113739, 0.00128925, 0.00165149, 0.00361966, 0.0095361 , 0.00724962, 0.00976158, 0.00791325, 0.01682447, 0.00158011, 0.00061867, 0.00340788, 0.00454487, 0.28132018, 0.32447714, 0.00397691]) **PCA** PCA is statistical technique using dimensionality reduction with sole basis that large number of features add to high dimensionality which essentially leads to overfitting. PCA thus reduces the number of feautures taken into consideration. In [93]: from sklearn.decomposition import PCA # intialize pca and logistic regression model pca = PCA(n\_components=0.95) In [94]: X\_train\_pca= pca.fit\_transform(X\_train) X test pca = pca.transform(X test) print(X\_train\_pca.shape) print(y\_train.shape) print(X\_test\_pca.shape) print(y test.shape) (965, 24)(965,)(242, 24)(242,)PCA is run on all the models KNN with PCA KNN classifier is modeled with cv=5 and the cross val score is calculated GridSearch is used to find the best neighbor that can be used In [95]: k range = list(range(1, 11))param\_grid = dict(n\_neighbors=k\_range) grid search knn = GridSearchCV(KNeighborsClassifier(), param grid, cv=5, return train score=True) grid search knn.fit(X train pca, y train) df = pd.DataFrame(grid search knn.cv results ) %matplotlib inline x axis = range(1,11)plt.plot(x axis, df.mean train score, c = 'g', label = 'Train Score') plt.plot(x axis, df.mean test score, c = 'b', label = 'Validation Score') plt.legend() plt.xlabel('k') plt.ylabel('CV Score') print("Best parameters: {}".format(grid\_search\_knn.best\_params\_)) print("Best cross-validation score: {:.2f}".format(grid search knn.best score )) Best parameters: {'n neighbors': 5} Best cross-validation score: 0.93 1.00 Train Score Validation Score 0.98 0.96 0.94 0.92 0.90 0.88 8 10 Neighbour=5 is taken for the KNN classifier In [96]: knn = KNeighborsClassifier(n neighbors=5) knn.fit(X train pca, y train) print('Train score on best parameters {:.4f}'.format(knn.score(X train pca,y train))) print('Test score on best parameters {:.4f}'.format(knn.score(X test pca, y test))) Train score on best parameters 0.9461 Test score on best parameters 0.9380 Cross validation score for the KNN is found In [97]: from sklearn.model\_selection import cross val score from sklearn.model\_selection import GridSearchCV knn grid = KNeighborsClassifier(5) scores = cross\_val\_score(knn\_grid, X\_train\_pca, y\_train, cv =5, scoring = 'accuracy') print("Cross-validation scores: {}".format(scores)) print("Average cross-validation score: {:.2f}".format(scores.mean())) Cross-validation scores: [0.94818653 0.91709845 0.94300518 0.92227979 0.93782383] Average cross-validation score: 0.93 Confusion Matrix is printed for the model In [98]: import sklearn.metrics as metrics from sklearn.metrics import confusion matrix, classification report pred knn = knn.predict(X test pca) print(metrics.accuracy score(y test,pred knn)) confusion = confusion matrix(y test, pred knn) import sklearn.metrics as metrics from sklearn.metrics import confusion matrix, classification report import seaborn as sns import matplotlib.pyplot as plt ax= plt.subplot() sns.heatmap(confusion, annot=True, fmt='d',ax = ax); #annot=True to annotate cells # labels, title and ticks ax.set xlabel('Predicted labels') ax.set\_ylabel('True labels') print(classification\_report(y\_test,pred\_knn)) 0.9380165289256198 precision recall f1-score support 0.95 0.95 0.95 151 0.91 0.92 0.92 91 accuracy 0.94 242 0.93 0.94 0.93 242 macro avg 0.94 0.94 0.94 242 weighted avg - 140 - 120 - 100 - 80 True 1 Predicted labels Recall and F1 score is printed In [99]: from sklearn.metrics import precision\_recall\_fscore\_support as score precision, recall, fscore, support=score(y\_test, pred\_knn) print ('Recall : {}'.format(recall[0])) print ('F1Score : {}'.format(fscore[0])) Recall : 0.9470198675496688 F1Score : 0.9501661129568105 In [100]: Classification\_Scores.update({'KNN Classification with PCA':[metrics.accuracy\_score(y\_test,pred\_knn),r ecall[0],fscore[0]]}) Logistic reg after PCA Logistic regression is run after the PCA is done on the dataset In [101]: # import warnings filter from warnings import simplefilter # ignore all future warnings simplefilter(action='ignore', category=FutureWarning) from sklearn.linear\_model import LogisticRegression  $c_range = [0.001, 0.01, 0.1, 1, 10, 100, 1000]$ train\_score\_l1 = [] train\_score\_12 = [] valid score 11 = [] valid\_score\_12 = [] best score = 011 = '11' 12 = '12'for c in c range: log 11 = LogisticRegression(penalty = '11', C = c, solver='liblinear') log\_12 = LogisticRegression(penalty = '12', C = c, solver='lbfgs') log\_l1.fit(X\_train\_pca, y\_train) log\_12.fit(X\_train\_pca, y\_train) train\_score\_l1.append(log\_l1.score(X\_train\_pca, y\_train)) train\_score\_12.append(log\_12.score(X\_train\_pca, y\_train)) score = log\_l1.score(X\_test\_pca, y\_test) valid score l1.append(score) if score > best score: best score = score best parameters = {'C': c , 'penalty': 11} best C = cbest Penalty = '11' score = log 12.score(X test pca, y test) valid score 12.append(score) if score > best score: best\_score = score best parameters = {'C': c , 'penalty' : 12} best C = cbest Penalty = '12' plt.subplot(1,2,1)plt.plot(c\_range, train\_score\_11, label = 'Train score, penalty = 11') plt.plot(c range, valid score 11, label = 'Test score, penalty = 11') plt.xscale('log') plt.legend() plt.subplot(1,2,2)plt.plot(c range, train score 12, label = 'Train score, penalty = 12') plt.plot(c range, valid score 12, label = 'Test score, penalty = 12') plt.xscale('log') plt.legend() print("Best score: {:.2f}".format(best\_score)) print("Best parameters: {}".format(best\_parameters)) Best score: 0.94 Best parameters: {'C': 0.01, 'penalty': '12'} 0.95 0.95 0.90 0.90 0.85 0.85 0.80 0.80 Train score, penalty = 11Train score, penalty = I2 Test score, penalty = I1 Test score, penalty = I2 0.75 0.75 0.70 0.70 0.65 0.65 0.60 0.60  $10^{-2}$  $10^{-2}$ 10° 10<sup>2</sup>  $10^{2}$ Train and test score are calculated In [102]: | lg = LogisticRegression(C=0.01, penalty='12').fit(X train pca, y train) print('Train score on best parameters for Logistic Regression model {:.4f}'.format(lg.score(X train pc a,y train))) print('Test score on best parameters for Logistic Regression model {:.4f}'.format(lg.score(X test pca, y\_test))) Train score on best parameters for Logistic Regression model 0.9420 Test score on best parameters for Logistic Regression model 0.9380 Logistic regression is modelled with penalty L2 and C=0.01 In [103]: log grid = LogisticRegression(penalty = '12', C = 0.01) scores = cross val score(log grid, X train pca, y train, cv =5, scoring = 'accuracy') print("Cross-validation scores: {}".format(scores)) print("Average cross-validation score: {:.2f}".format(scores.mean())) Cross-validation scores: [0.96373057 0.92227979 0.93782383 0.9119171 0.97409326] Average cross-validation score: 0.94 In [104]: pred\_log = lg.predict(X\_test\_pca) print(metrics.accuracy\_score(y\_test,pred\_log)) confusion = confusion\_matrix(y\_test, pred\_log) import seaborn as sns import matplotlib.pyplot as plt ax= plt.subplot() sns.heatmap(confusion, annot=True,fmt='d', ax = ax); #annot=True to annotate cells # labels, title and ticks ax.set xlabel('Predicted labels') ax.set ylabel('True labels') print(classification\_report(y\_test,pred\_log)) 0.9380165289256198 precision recall f1-score support 0.95 0.95 0.95 151 1 0.92 0.91 0.92 91 242 0.94 accuracy 0.93 0.93 0.93 242 macro avg 0.94 0.94 0.94 242 weighted avg - 140 - 120 144 0 -- 100 - 80 - 60 8 Predicted labels In [105]: from sklearn.metrics import precision recall fscore support as score precision, recall, fscore, support=score(y\_test, pred\_log) : {}'.format(recall[0])) print ('Recall print ('F1Score : {}'.format(fscore[0])) Recall : 0.9536423841059603 F1Score : 0.9504950495049505 In [106]: Classification\_Scores.update({'Logistic Regression with PCA':[metrics.accuracy\_score(y\_test,pred\_log), recall[0], fscore[0]]}) **Linear SVC with PCA** Linear SVC is modeled with with grid search for best param for C In [107]: **from sklearn.svm import** LinearSVC param grid = {'C': [0.001, 0.01, 0.1, 1, 10, 100, 1000]} grid search lsvc = GridSearchCV(LinearSVC(max iter=100000000), param grid, cv=5, return train score=Tr ue) grid\_search\_lsvc.fit(X\_train\_pca, y\_train) df = pd.DataFrame(grid\_search\_lsvc.cv\_results\_) %matplotlib inline x range = [0.001, 0.01, 0.1, 1, 10, 100, 1000]plt.plot(x\_range, df.mean\_train\_score, c = 'g', label = 'Train Score') plt.plot(x\_range, df.mean\_test\_score, c = 'b', label = 'Validation Score') plt.xscale('log') plt.legend(loc = 3)plt.xlabel('Regularization Parameter') print("Best parameters: {}".format(grid\_search\_lsvc.best\_params\_)) print("Best cross-validation score: {:.2f}".format(grid\_search\_lsvc.best\_score\_)) Best parameters: {'C': 0.01} Best cross-validation score: 0.94 0.9440 0.9438 0.9436 0.9434 0.9432 Train Score Validation Score 0.9430  $10^{3}$ Regularization Parameter The train and test score are calculated for this model In [108]: from sklearn.svm import SVC clf1 = SVC(kernel='linear', C=0.01).fit(X train pca, y train) print('Train score on best parameters for LinearSVC - {:.4f}'.format(clf1.score(X train pca, y train print('Test score on best parameters ffor LinearSVC - {:.4f}'.format(clf1.score(X\_test\_pca,y\_test))) Train score on best parameters for LinearSVC - 0.9440 Test score on best parameters ffor LinearSVC - 0.9380 In [109]: linear svc grid = LinearSVC(C = 0.01, max iter=10000) scores = cross\_val\_score(linear\_svc\_grid, X\_train\_pca, y\_train, cv = 5, scoring = 'accuracy') print("Cross-validation scores: {}".format(scores)) print("Average cross-validation score: {:.2f}".format(scores.mean())) Cross-validation scores: [0.96373057 0.92227979 0.94300518 0.91709845 0.97409326] Average cross-validation score: 0.94 Confusion Matrix is printed In [110]: pred linear svc = clf1.predict(X test pca) print(metrics.accuracy\_score(y\_test,pred\_linear\_svc)) confusion = confusion\_matrix(y\_test, pred\_linear\_svc) import seaborn as sns import matplotlib.pyplot as plt ax= plt.subplot() sns.heatmap(confusion, annot=True, fmt='d', ax = ax); #annot=True to annotate cells # labels, title and ticks ax.set xlabel('Predicted labels') ax.set ylabel('True labels') print(classification\_report(y\_test,pred\_linear\_svc)) 0.9380165289256198 precision recall f1-score support 0.95 0 0.95 0.95 1.5.1 1 0.92 0.91 0.92 91 0.94 242 accuracy 0.93 0.93 0.93 242 macro avg weighted avg 0.94 0.94 0.94 242 - 120 144 0 -- 100 - 80 60 8 Predicted labels RECALL and F1 score are printed In [111]: from sklearn.metrics import precision recall fscore support as score precision, recall, fscore, support=score(y test, pred linear svc) print ('Recall : {}'.format(recall[0])) print ('F1Score : {}'.format(fscore[0])) : 0.9536423841059603 Recall : 0.9504950495049505 F1Score In [112]: Classification Scores.update({'Linear SVC with PCA': [metrics.accuracy score(y test,pred linear svc),re call[0], fscore[0]]}) SVC-rbf pca Gridsearch is used to find the best param of gamma and C In [113]: | param grid = { 'gamma': [0.001, 0.01, 0.1, 1, 10, 100], 'C': [0.001, 0.01, 0.1, 1, 10, 100]} grid\_search\_svcr = GridSearchCV(SVC(kernel='rbf'), param\_grid, cv=5, return\_train\_score=True) grid\_search\_svcr.fit(X\_train\_pca, y\_train) df = pd.DataFrame(grid\_search\_svcr.cv\_results\_) print("Best parameters: {}".format(grid search svcr.best params )) print("Best cross-validation score: {:.2f}".format(grid\_search\_svcr.best\_score\_)) Best parameters: {'C': 0.1, 'gamma': 0.1} Best cross-validation score: 0.95 The best param of C=0.1 and gamma=0.1 are used In [114]: | clf2 = SVC(kernel='rbf', C=0.1,gamma=0.1).fit(X\_train\_pca, y\_train) print('Train score on best parameters for LinearSVC - {:.4f}'.format(clf1.score(X\_train\_pca, y\_train\_ print('Test score on best parameters ffor LinearSVC - {:.4f}'.format(clf1.score(X\_test\_pca,y\_test))) Train score on best parameters for LinearSVC - 0.9440 Test score on best parameters ffor LinearSVC - 0.9380 In [115]: from sklearn.model\_selection import cross\_val\_score svc\_rbf\_grid = SVC(kernel='rbf', gamma = 0.1, C = 0.1) scores = cross\_val\_score(svc\_rbf\_grid, X\_train\_pca, y\_train, cv =10, scoring = 'accuracy') print("Cross-validation scores: {}".format(scores)) print("Average cross-validation score: {:.2f}".format(scores.mean())) Cross-validation scores: [0.94845361 0.96907216 0.89690722 0.95876289 0.96907216 0.91666667 0.95833333 0.875 0.98958333 0.95833333] Average cross-validation score: 0.94 Confusion Matrix is printed In [116]: pred\_rbf = clf2.predict(X\_test\_pca) print(metrics.accuracy\_score(y\_test,pred\_rbf)) confusion = confusion\_matrix(y\_test, pred\_rbf) import seaborn as sns import matplotlib.pyplot as plt ax= plt.subplot() sns.heatmap(confusion, annot=True,fmt='d', ax = ax); #annot=True to annotate cells # labels, title and ticks ax.set\_xlabel('Predicted labels') ax.set\_ylabel('True labels') print(classification\_report(y\_test,pred\_rbf)) 0.9380165289256198 precision recall f1-score support 0 0.95 0.95 0.95 151 0.92 1 0.91 0.92 91 0.94 242 accuracy 0.93 0.93 0.93 242 macro avg weighted avg 0.94 0.94 0.94 242 - 140 - 120 144 0 -- 100 True labels - 80 - 60 Predicted labels In [117]: from sklearn.metrics import precision\_recall\_fscore\_support as score precision, recall, fscore, support=score(y test, pred rbf) print ('Recall : {}'.format(recall[0])) print ('F1Score : {}'.format(fscore[0])) Recall : 0.9536423841059603 F1Score : 0.9504950495049505 In [118]: Classification\_Scores.update({'SVC-rbf with PCA':[metrics.accuracy\_score(y\_test,pred\_rbf),recall[0],fs core[0]]})

In [119]:	SVC Poly PCA  SVC Poly is modeled with grid dearch for best param - gamma, C, degree  : param_grid = {'gamma': [0.01,0.1],								
	Train and Test score of the linear SVC  : clf3 = SVC(kernel='rbf', C=0.1,gamma=0.1,degree=1).fit(X_train_pca, y_train)     print('Train score on best parameters for LinearSVC - {:.4f}'.format(clf1.score(X_train_pca, y_train)))     print('Test score on best parameters ffor LinearSVC - {:.4f}'.format(clf1.score(X_test_pca,y_test)))  Train score on best parameters for LinearSVC - 0.9440 Test score on best parameters ffor LinearSVC - 0.9380  : svc_poly_grid = SVC(kernel='poly',degree = 1, C=0.01, gamma=1)     scores = cross_val_score(svc_poly_grid, X_train_pca, y_train, cv = 5, scoring = 'accuracy')     print("Cross-validation scores: {}".format(scores))								
In [122]:	<pre>print("Average cross-validation score: {:.2f}".format(scores.mean()))  Cross-validation scores: [0.96373057 0.92227979 0.94300518 0.91709845 0.97409326] Average cross-validation score: 0.94  Confusion Matrix  # import warnings filter from warnings import simplefilter # ignore all future warnings simplefilter(action='ignore', category=FutureWarning)  pred_poly = clf3.predict(X_test_pca) print(metrics.accuracy_score(y_test,pred_poly))  confusion = confusion_matrix(y_test, pred_poly)</pre>								
	<pre>import seaborn as sns import matplotlib.pyplot as plt  ax= plt.subplot() sns.heatmap(confusion, annot=True,fmt='d', ax = ax); #annot=True to annotate cells  # labels, title and ticks ax.set_xlabel('Predicted labels') ax.set_ylabel('True labels')  print(classification_report(y_test,pred_poly))  0.9380165289256198</pre>								
	accuracy macro avg 0.93 0.93 0.93 242 weighted avg 0.94 0.94 0.94 242								
	Recall and F1 score are printed  from sklearn.metrics import precision_recall_fscore_support as score  precision,recall,fscore,support=score(y_test,pred_poly)  print ('Recall : {}'.format(recall[0]))  print ('F1Score : {}'.format(fscore[0]))  Recall : 0.9536423841059603  F1Score : 0.9504950495049505								
In [125]:	Classification_Scores.update({'SVC-poly with PCA':[metrics.accuracy_score(y_test,pred_poly),recall[0], fscore[0]]})  SVC rbf and linear with PCA  SVC RBF is modelled with gridsearch for selecting the best params for C, gamma  #using Kernel SVM from sklearn.svm import SVC KernelSVC = SVC(max_iter=10000000) kernelSVC_params = ('C':[0.001, 0.01, 0.1, 1],'gamma':[1,0.1,0.001], 'kernel':['rbf','linear']}  # Using Grid search to find the best parameters and fitting the model KernelSVC_clf = GridSearchCV(KernelSVC, kernelSVC_params,cv=5) KernelSVC_clf.fit(X_train_pca,y_train)								
Out[127]:	<pre>print('Train score on best parameters for LinearSVC - {:.4f}'.format(clf1.score(X_train_pca, y_train ))) print('Test score on best parameters ffor LinearSVC - {:.4f}'.format(clf1.score(X_test_pca,y_test)))  Train score on best parameters for LinearSVC - 0.9440 Test score on best parameters ffor LinearSVC - 0.9380  #finding the best parameter KernelSVC_clf.best_params_  {'C': 0.1, 'gamma': 0.1, 'kernel': 'rbf'}  CONFUSION MATRIX  pred_ker_svc = KernelSVC_clf.predict(X_test_pca) print(metrics.accuracy_score(y_test,pred_ker_svc))</pre>								
	<pre>confusion = confusion_matrix(y_test, pred_ker_svc) import seaborn as sns import matplotlib.pyplot as plt  ax= plt.subplot() sns.heatmap(confusion, annot=True, fmt='d', ax = ax); #annot=True to annotate cells  # labels, title and ticks ax.set_xlabel('Predicted labels') ax.set_ylabel('True labels')  print(classification_report(y_test,pred_ker_svc))  0.9380165289256198</pre>								
	1 0.92 0.91 0.92 91  accuracy macro avg 0.93 0.93 0.93 242 weighted avg 0.94 0.94 0.94 242								
In [129]:	Predicted labels  from sklearn.metrics import precision_recall_fscore_support as score  precision,recall,fscore,support=score(y_test,pred_ker_svc)  print ('Recall : {}'.format(recall[0]))  print ('FlScore : {}'.format(fscore[0]))  Recall : 0.9536423841059603  FlScore : 0.9504950495049505  Classification_Scores.update({'SVC-linear with PCA':[metrics.accuracy_score(y_test,pred_ker_svc),recall[0],fscore[0]]})								
In [131]:	Decision Tree PCA  Decision tree is modeled after PCA on the dataset with grid search for best param of max_depth and min_sample_leaf  from sklearn.tree import DecisionTreeClassifier  param_grid = {'criterion': ['gini','entropy'],								
	<pre>print("Best cross-validation score: {:.2f}".format(grid_search_dtree.best_score_))</pre> Best parameters: {'criterion': 'gini', 'max_depth': 1, 'min_samples_leaf': 1}								
In [134]:	<pre>print("Average cross-validation score: {:.2f}".format(scores.mean()))  Cross-validation scores: [0.88601036 0.86528497 0.90673575 0.87564767 0.92227979] Average cross-validation score: 0.89  CONFUSION MATRIX  : import sklearn.metrics as metrics     from sklearn.metrics import confusion_matrix, classification_report     pred_tree = grid_search_dtree.predict(X_test_pca)     print(metrics.accuracy_score(y_test,pred_tree))  confusion = confusion_matrix(y_test, pred_tree)     import seaborn as sns     import matplotlib.pyplot as plt  ax= plt.subplot()</pre>								
	<pre>sns.heatmap(confusion, annot=True,fmt='d', ax = ax); #annot=True to annotate cells  # labels, title and ticks ax.set_xlabel('Predicted labels') ax.set_ylabel('True labels')  print(classification_report(y_test,pred_tree))  0.9338842975206612</pre>								
	- 140 - 120 - 100 - 80 - 60 - 40 - 20								
In [135]:  In [136]:	<pre>precision, recall, fscore, support=score(y_test, pred_tree) print ('Recall : {}'.format(recall[0])) print ('F1Score : {}'.format(fscore[0]))  Recall : 0.9403973509933775 F1Score : 0.946666666666667  : Classification_Scores.update({'Decision Tree with PCA':[metrics.accuracy_score(y_test,pred_tree),recal 1[0],fscore[0]]})  COMPARISON OF ALL MODELS : x1=Classification_Scores.keys()</pre>								
In [137]: Out[137]: In [138]:	df1=pd.DataFrame(Classification_Scores,index=['Accuracy', 'Recall', 'F1Score'])  Hard voting classifier voting Voting Classifier voting Voting Classifier voting Voting Classifier voting V								
Out[138]:	<pre>plt.xticks(np.arange(0,1,step=0.05)) plt.legend(loc='center',prop={'size':12})</pre>								
	Adaboosting-Decision Tree  Adaboosting-SVC Poly Classifier  Gradient boosting  Random Forest  KNN Classification with PCA  Logistic Regression with PCA  Linear SVC with PCA  SVC-rbf with PCA  SVC-poly with PCA  SVC-poly with PCA  SVC-linear with PCA  Decision Tree with PCA								
In [139]:	<pre>project_1=pd.DataFrame({"classifier":["KNN Classification without PCA","KNN Classification with PCA",     "Logistic Regression without PCA","Logistic Regression with PCA","Linear_SVC without PCA","Linear_SVC     with PCA","SVC_RBF Kernel without PCA","SVC_RBF Kernel with PCA","SVC_Poly Kernel without PCA","SVC_P     oly Kernel with PCA","Decision Tree without PCA","Decision Tree with PCA","SVC linear kernal without P         CA ","SVC linear kernal with PCA"],</pre>								
Out[139]:	classifier         Train Score         Test score         Accuracy           0         KNN Classification without PCA         0.9389         0.9380         93.80           1         KNN Classification with PCA         0.9461         0.9380         93.80           2         Logistic Regression without PCA         0.9461         0.9339         93.80           3         Logistic Regression with PCA         0.9420         0.9380         93.80           4         Linear_SVC without PCA         0.9461         0.9380         93.80           5         Linear_SVC with PCA         0.9440         0.9380         93.80           6         SVC_RBF Kernel without PCA         0.6070         0.6240         62.39           7         SVC_RBF Kernel with PCA         0.9440         0.9380         93.80           8         SVC_Poly Kernel without PCA         0.9472         0.9380         93.80           9         SVC_Poly Kernel with PCA         0.9440         0.9380         93.80								
In [140]:	10 Decision Tree without PCA 0.9472 0.9380 62.39  11 Decision Tree with PCA 0.9440 0.9380 93.80  12 SVC linear kernal without PCA 0.9482 0.9380 93.80  13 SVC linear kernal with PCA 0.9400 0.9340 93.38  BEFORE PCA  : import matplotlib.pyplot as plt btrainscore=[0.9389,0.9461,0.9461,0.6070,0.9472,0.9472,0.9482] btestscore =[0.9389,0.9380,0.9380,0.9380,0.9380,0.9380] Models=["KNN Classification", "Logistic Regression", "Linear_SVC", "SVC_RBF Kernel", "SVC_Poly Kernel", "Decision Tree", "SVC linear kernal"]  plt.figure(figsize=(15,5))								
	plt.plot(Models, btrainscore, marker='*', label='Train Score') plt.plot(Models, btestscore, marker='o', label='Test Score') plt.legend(prop={'size': 12}) plt.grid() plt.xticks(rotation='vertical') plt.title('Before PCA, ML Models Train Vs Test score comparison') plt.xlabel('ML Model Name') plt.ylabel('Accuracy') plt.show()  Before PCA, ML Models Train Vs Test score comparison  095 090 0.85								
	0.80 0.70 0.65 0.60 Train Score Test Score Test Score  ML Model Name   Before PCA, we find that SVM Kernel poly was the better model with low test and train score difference.								
In [141]:	<pre>import matplotlib.pyplot as plt btrainscore=[0.9461,0.9420,0.9440,0.9440,0.9440, 0.9440,0.9400] btestscore =[0.9380,0.9380, 0.9380,0.9380,0.9380,0.9380,0.9340] Models=["KNN Classification", "Logistic Regression", "Linear_SVC", "SVC_RBF Kernel", "SVC_Poly Kernel", "De cision Tree", "SVC linear kernal"]  plt.figure(figsize=(15,5)) plt.plot(Models,btrainscore,marker='*',label='Train Score') plt.plot(Models,btestscore,marker='o',label='Test Score') plt.legend(prop={'size': 12}) plt.grid() plt.xticks(rotation='vertical') plt.title('Before PCA, ML Models Train Vs Test score comparison')</pre>								
	plt.xlabel('ML Model Name') plt.ylabel('Accuracy') plt.show()  Before PCA, ML Models Train Vs Test score comparison  O.946  O.944  O.942  O.944  O.942  O.944  O.944  O.944  O.945  O.944  O.945  O.946  O.946  O.947  O.947  O.947  O.948  O.948  O.949  O.94								
	After PCA was performed, we find that KNN model was better with a higher train and lower difference with test and train score  OverAll, we find that after use of PCA on the dataset, KNN and SVC RBF have performed better than before. This is owed to the dimension reduction in the dataset.  For our dataset, we see that KNN has performed better as its accuracy and test and train core difference is less after PCA.								
In [142]:	BEST MODEL OVERALL: KNN Classifier with Train - 0.946 and test= 0.9380 and accuracy 93.80  Deep Learning Tasks  Neural Networks								
In [145]:	<pre>import tensorflow as tf  model = Sequential() model.add(Dense(12, input_dim=43, activation='relu')) model.add(Dense(8, activation='relu')) model.add(Dense(1, activation='sigmoid'))  model.compile(loss='binary_crossentropy', optimizer='adam', metrics=['accuracy'])  X_train=np.asarray(X_train) y_train = np.asarray(Y_train) X_test=np.asarray(X_test) y_test = np.asarray(y_test)</pre>								

In [165]:	model Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch	[=====================================	] -	0s 0s 0s	<pre>lms/step lms/step lms/step</pre>	- loss: - loss: - loss:	0.5995	- accuracy:	0.6508
	33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch	[=====================================	] -	0s 0s 0s 0s	<pre>lms/step lms/step lms/step lms/step lms/step</pre>	- loss: - loss: - loss: - loss: - loss:	0.1988 0.1877 0.1799 0.1761 0.1717	- accuracy: - accuracy: - accuracy: - accuracy: - accuracy:	0.9430 0.9451 0.9461 0.9451
	Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 53/33	[=====================================	] -	0s 0s 0s 0s	<pre>lms/step lms/step lms/step lms/step lms/step</pre>	- loss: - loss: - loss: - loss: - loss:	0.1644 0.1617 0.1589 0.1569 0.1550	- accuracy: - accuracy: - accuracy: - accuracy: - accuracy:	0.9513 0.9482 0.9513 0.9554 0.9523
	Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33	18/100 [===================================	] -	0s 0s 0s 0s	<pre>lms/step lms/step lms/step lms/step lms/step</pre>	- loss: - loss: - loss: - loss: - loss:	0.1488 0.1475 0.1452 0.1442 0.1414	- accuracy: - accuracy: - accuracy: - accuracy: - accuracy:	0.9575 0.9534 0.9534 0.9565 0.9565
	33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33	24/100 [===================================	] -	0s 0s 0s	<pre>lms/step lms/step lms/step lms/step</pre>	- loss: - loss: - loss: - loss:	0.1352 0.1339 0.1323 0.1307	<ul><li>accuracy:</li><li>accuracy:</li><li>accuracy:</li><li>accuracy:</li></ul>	0.9575 0.9596 0.9596 0.9565
	33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33	31/100 [===================================	] -	0s 0s 0s	<pre>lms/step lms/step lms/step lms/step</pre>	- loss: - loss: - loss: - loss:	0.1275 0.1232 0.1220 0.1209	<ul><li>accuracy:</li><li>accuracy:</li><li>accuracy:</li><li>accuracy:</li></ul>	<ul><li>0.9596</li><li>0.9596</li><li>0.9596</li><li>0.9585</li></ul>
	33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch	[=====================================	] -	0s 0s 0s 0s	<pre>lms/step lms/step lms/step lms/step lms/step</pre>	- loss: - loss: - loss: - loss: - loss:	0.1159 0.1148 0.1153 0.1179 0.1118	- accuracy: - accuracy: - accuracy: - accuracy: - accuracy:	0.9617 0.9617 0.9627 0.9585 0.9606
	Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch	[=====================================	] -	0s 0s 0s 0s	<pre>lms/step lms/step lms/step lms/step lms/step</pre>	- loss: - loss: - loss: - loss: - loss:	0.1126 0.1098 0.1055 0.1055 0.1060	- accuracy: - accuracy: - accuracy: - accuracy: - accuracy:	0.9617 0.9606 0.9627 0.9606 0.9606
	Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 53/33	49/100 [===================================	] -	0s 0s 0s 0s	<pre>lms/step lms/step lms/step lms/step lms/step</pre>	- loss: - loss: - loss: - loss: - loss:	0.1084 0.1032 0.1009 0.1054 0.1000	- accuracy: - accuracy: - accuracy: - accuracy: - accuracy:	0.9606 0.9617 0.9648 0.9617 0.9637
	Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33	55/100 [===================================	] -	0s 0s 0s 0s	<pre>lms/step lms/step lms/step lms/step lms/step</pre>	- loss: - loss: - loss: - loss: - loss:	0.0962 0.0966 0.0944 0.0943 0.0916	- accuracy: - accuracy: - accuracy: - accuracy: - accuracy:	0.9648 0.9637 0.9637 0.9648 0.9668
	33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33	61/100 [===================================	] -	0s 0s 0s	<pre>lms/step lms/step lms/step lms/step</pre>	- loss: - loss: - loss: - loss:	0.0900 0.0896 0.0955 0.0867	<pre>- accuracy: - accuracy: - accuracy: - accuracy:</pre>	<ul><li>0.9668</li><li>0.9658</li><li>0.9648</li><li>0.9648</li></ul>
	33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33	67/100 [===================================	] -	0s 0s 0s	<pre>lms/step lms/step lms/step lms/step</pre>	- loss: - loss: - loss: - loss:	0.0872 0.0852 0.0885 0.0835	<pre>- accuracy: - accuracy: - accuracy: - accuracy:</pre>	<ul><li>0.9637</li><li>0.9668</li><li>0.9658</li><li>0.9658</li></ul>
	Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch	[=====================================	] -	0s 0s 0s 0s	<pre>lms/step lms/step lms/step lms/step lms/step</pre>	- loss: - loss: - loss: - loss: - loss:	0.0815 0.0815 0.0821 0.0791 0.0815	- accuracy: - accuracy: - accuracy: - accuracy: - accuracy:	0.9658 0.9658 0.9658 0.9689 0.9658
	Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch	80/100 [===================================	] -	0s 0s 0s 0s	<pre>lms/step lms/step lms/step lms/step lms/step</pre>	- loss: - loss: - loss: - loss: - loss:	0.0802 0.0793 0.0780 0.0782 0.0750	- accuracy: - accuracy: - accuracy: - accuracy: - accuracy:	0.9689 0.9658 0.9699 0.9689
	33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33	86/100 [===================================	] -	0s 0s 0s	<pre>1ms/step 1ms/step 1ms/step 1ms/step</pre>	- loss: - loss: - loss: - loss:	0.0782 0.0765 0.0763 0.0831	- accuracy: - accuracy: - accuracy: - accuracy:	<ul><li>0.9668</li><li>0.9668</li><li>0.9689</li><li>0.9699</li></ul>
	Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 Epoch 53/33	[=====================================	] -	0s 0s 0s 0s	<pre>lms/step lms/step lms/step lms/step lms/step</pre>	- loss: - loss: - loss: - loss: - loss:	0.0726 0.0725 0.0704 0.0728 0.0699	- accuracy: - accuracy: - accuracy: - accuracy: - accuracy:	0.9699 0.9689 0.9710 0.9679 0.9689
	Epoch 33/33 Epoch 33/33 <tens multi<="" th=""><th>[=====================================</th><th>] - ] - .sto:</th><th>0s 0s ry</th><th><pre>lms/step lms/step at 0x1d1fo</pre></th><th>- loss:</th><th>0.0708</th><th>- accuracy:</th><th>0.9699</th></tens>	[=====================================	] - ] - .sto:	0s 0s ry	<pre>lms/step lms/step at 0x1d1fo</pre>	- loss:	0.0708	- accuracy:	0.9699
In [167]:	[0.06 model 8/8 [= [0.42	[=====================================	- 0s	s 1r					
In [169]:	train pred=  print print train test (	Layer Perceptron Precision Sco _pred=model1.predict_classes(X_test)  ("train",precision_score(y_train("test",precision_score(y_test,p)) 0.941320293398533 0.8936170212765957  sklearn.metrics import recall_score	rain n, ti pred)	n) rai	in_pred))				