

Machine Learning - SS 2021

Exercise 1: Classification

Federico Ambrogi, e1449911@student.tuwien.ac.at

Adam Höfler, e11847620@student.tuwien.ac.at

Matteo Panzeri 12039996@student.tuwien.ac.at

TU Wien

April 25, 2021

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Data Sets Description	1
1.2	Framework and Implementation	3
1.3	Workflow	3
2	Data Exploration and Pre-processing	3
2.1	Asteroids Data Set	4
2.2	Advertising Bidding (Kaggle Data Set)	4
2.3	Breast Cancer (Kaggle Data Set)	4
3	Performance Tests	4
3.1	Model Training Parameters	4
3.2	Confusion Matrix	5
3.3	Holdout and Cross Validation	5
3.4	Class Balance	5
4	Comparison	7
4.1	Drug consumption	7
4.2	Asteroids	8
4.3	Online advertisement bidding	10
4.4	Breast cancer	13
A	Drug consumption - Confusion matrices	17
B	Asteroids classification - Confusion matrices	26

1 Introduction

In this document we describe the results of the implementation of three algorithms to solve classification problems on four different dataset. we will first briefly describe the datasets we will classify; then, the framework and the algorithms chosen for the classification task are introduced. A brief description of the data pre-processing is then given. Finally, the results of the classifications as well as a few comparisons between different settings are discussed.

1.1 Data Sets Description

Here we briefly introduce our four datasets.

Drug consumption data set This is the data set taken from exercise 0, so here we only provide basic details. The primary task of our implementation is to classify the likeliness of the frequency of usage of a certain type of drug (from never used to current usage), given personal aspects such as gender, ethnicity, education background etc. and psychological traits. In detail:

- **attributes:** 'age', 'gender', 'education', 'ethnicity', 'Nscore', 'Escore', 'Oscore', 'Ascore', 'Cscore', 'Impulsive', 'SS'
- **targets:** 'alcohol', 'amphetamines', 'amylNitrite', 'benzodiazepine', 'caffeine', 'cannabis', 'chocolate', 'cocaine', 'crack', 'ecstasy', 'heroin', 'ketamine', 'legal', 'LSD', 'methadone', 'mushrooms', 'nicotine', 'volatileSubstance' divided in **7 classes**: "Never", "10 Years Ago", "Last Decade", "Last Year", "Last Month", "Last Week", "Last Day"

Asteroids data set The asteroids data set is designed to perform a binary classification task. It consists of a total of astrophysical data, such as the distance from the Earth, the size of the major axis of the orbits, their mass etc. as well metadata regarding their name. The target feature for classification is a string variable that maps to boolean values "True" in the case the asteroid represents a concrete hazard for the Earth i.e. with high risk of impact, and "False" otherwise.

In detail:

- **attributes:** 'Absolute Magnitude', 'Est Dia in KM(min)', 'Est Dia in KM(max)', 'Relative Velocity km per sec', 'Miss Dist.(kilometers)', 'Minimum Orbit Intersection', 'Jupiter Tisserand Invariant', 'Eccentricity', 'Semi Major Axis', 'Inclination', 'Asc Node Longitude', 'Orbital Period', 'Perihelion Distance', 'Perihelion Arg', 'Aphelion Dist', 'Perihelion Time', 'Mean Anomaly', 'Mean Motion'
- **target:** 'Hazardous' divided in **classes**: "True" and "False"

Breast Cancer (Kaggle Data Set) ccc

- **attributes:** 'radiusMean', 'textureMean', 'perimeterMean', 'areaMean', 'smoothnessMean', 'compactnessMean', 'concavityMean', 'concavePointsMean', 'symmetryMean', 'fractalDimensionMean', 'radiusStdErr', 'textureStdErr', 'perimeterStdErr', 'areaStdErr', 'smoothnessStdErr', 'compactnessStdErr', 'concavityStdErr', 'concavePointsStdErr', 'symmetryStdErr', 'fractalDimensionStdErr', 'radiusWorst', 'textureWorst', 'perimeterWorst', 'areaWorst', 'smoothnessWorst', 'compactnessWorst', 'concavityWorst', 'concavePointsWorst', 'symmetryWorst', 'fractalDimensionWorst'
- **target:** 'class' divided in **classes**: "True" and "False"

Advertising Bidding (Kaggle Data Set) In detail:

- **attributes:** 'Region', 'City', 'AdExchange', 'Adslotwidth', 'Adslotheight', 'Adslotfloorprice', 'CreativeID', 'Biddingprice', 'AdvertiserID', 'interest_news', 'education', 'automobile', 'interest_realestate', 'IT', 'electronicgame', 'interest_fashion', 'entertainment', 'luxury', 'homeandlifestyle', 'interest_health', 'food', 'interest_divine', 'interest_motherhood_parenting', 'sports', 'interest_travel_outdoors', 'interest_social', 'Inmarket_3cproduct', 'Inmarket_appliances', 'Inmarket_clothing_shoes_bags', 'Inmarket_Beauty_PersonalCare', 'Inmarket_infant_momproducts', 'Inmarket_sportsitem', 'Inmarket_outdoor', 'Inmarket_healthcareproducts', 'Inmarket_luxury', 'Inmarket_realestate', 'Inmarket_automobile', 'Inmarket_finance', 'Inmarket_travel', 'Inmarket_education', 'Inmarket_service', 'art_photography_design', 'onlineliterature', 'Inmarket_electronicgame', '3c', 'Inmarket_book', 'Inmarket_medicine', 'Inmarket_fooddrink', 'culture', 'sex', 'Demographic_gender_male', 'Demographic_gender_famale', 'Inmarket_homeimprovement', 'Payingprice', 'imp', 'click', 'Browser', 'Adslotvisibility', 'Adslotformat'

- **target:** 'conv' divided in **classes:** "True" and "False"

In detail:

- **attributes:** 'Absolute Magnitude', 'Est Dia in KM(min)', 'Est Dia in KM(max)', 'Relative Velocity km per sec', 'Miss Dist.(kilometers)', 'Minimum Orbit Intersection', 'Jupiter Tisserand Invariant', 'Eccentricity', 'Semi Major Axis', 'Inclination', 'Asc Node Longitude', 'Orbital Period', 'Perihelion Distance', 'Perihelion Arg', 'Aphelion Dist', 'Perihelion Time', 'Mean Anomaly', 'Mean Motion'

- **target:** 'Hazardous' divided in **classes:** "True" and "False"

1.2 Framework and Implementation

We implemented our analysis using the **python3.8** language, with its library for machine learning application *scikit-learn* as well as *numpy* and *pandas* for data statistical analysis and data manipulation. In the attached package, two distinct files can be found: the first, called *data_preparation.py*, cleans and standardizes the input data set, so that they are ready for data processing. The main script for the data analysis is called *classifier.py*. This code will run the different classifiers on the data sets, and will produce the comparison data and plots that will be found in this report.

1.3 Workflow Overview

Without giving particular details on the implementations of the various classifier, which can be read inside the scripts, we summarize here how the workflow is constructed, as well as how the classification tasks have been implemented. First, the cleaned data (i.e. processed by *data_preparation.py*) are imported as *pandas* data frame. For each data set, a dictionary provided the list of names of features that will be used to predict the target feature. Then, we analyse the class balancing of the predicting features; it is possible to decide to apply a balancing procedure before processing further(see Section 3.4 for details). The data can now be trained: the splitting of the data into a training and testing set is done differently depending on the chosen methods between "hold out" (by the *model_selection.train_test_split*) or "kNN-cross validation" (by the *sklearn.model_selectionKFold*); see Section 3.3. At this point, the classification algorithms are applied to the training and testing sets. The following algorithms have been chosen.

Decision Three We use the *DecisionTreeClassifier* module, where we try two implementation of the "Gini" and "entropy" (parameter *criterion*) criteria for the Gini impurity and for the information gain,respectively, to measure the quality of a split.

kNN - k Nearest Neighbours We use the *KNeighborsClassifier* module, where we vary the number of neighbours (parameter *n_neighbors*) in the set [5, 10, 50].

naive Bayes We use the *GaussianNB* module, with default parameters.

2 Data Exploration and Pre-processing

In this section we describe the necessary preliminary steps to import and prepare the data to make them suitable for the learning algorithms. The steps are handled by the script *data_preparation.py* which includes dedicated function to pre-process each data set.

Drug consumption Since this dataset was already preprocessed (transformation of the nominal features) and cleaned of missing values or outliers by the providers of the dataset [1], the data preparation is not given. As can be seen in Fig.2 we deal with heavily imbalanced data. Normally, the approach would be to resample the data (see Sec.3.4) but with our later on discussed approach we would run into problems due to low statistics - we decided to keep the dataset as it is.

As can be seen in Fig.2 the majority of the drugs can be grouped by their imbalance towards either CL0 ("Never used") or CL6 ("Last day") - those two groups give a rough representation of "everyday drugs" like chocolate and "marginal drugs" like heroin. Since the total number of respondents is constant,

a vast majority of one class implies a small occurrence of the other classes and equalizing the samples results in low statistics and no usable outcome of the classification - this was the result of our tests.

2.1 Asteroids Data Set

The original data set contained 40 columns of different variable types (numeric and categorical). However, some columns were unnecessary, not usable or redundant for classification purposes, or contained constant values.

2.2 Advertising Bidding (Kaggle Data Set)

In the dataset we have both nominal and ordinal data. An example of nominal attribute is the Browser where is specified the browser used by the user in that observation. An example of ordinal data is the "Inmarket_realestate" which indicates the tendency of an user to bid (1) or not to bid (0) on a real estate. In this dataset there are 12500 observations and 65 attributes. In the dataset there are missing values in particular the 4% of the rows has the URL attribute missing and the 38This dataset is characterized by the presence of several attributes with low information, for example the attribute "Inmarket_sportsitem" has 98% of the observations with value 1(yes) or the attribute "Inmarket_outdoor" with the percentage above the 99%, this is solved thanks at the balancing process that we will perform before splitting the dataset.

The following columns have been removed under the assumption that they depends only on the single observation and consequently generate noise without bringing additional information. the columns are: "RowID", "UserID", "BidID", "IP" , "Domain", "URL", "Time_Bid", "AdslotID". In the dataset the columns "Browser", "Adslotvisibility' , "Adslotformat" have been converted using a label encoder.

2.3 Breast Cancer (Kaggle Data Set)

In this dataset every attribute is a measurement done during a medical exam. The attributes are all numerical. Examples of the attributes are: "concavePointsMean", "symmetryMean", "fractalDimensionMean", "radiusStdErr", "textureStdErr". There are no missing values and we did not preprocesse any attribute. Due the domain of the attributes there are no low information columns so we have used them all in order to fit the classifiers.

3 Performance Tests

3.1 Model Training Parameters

We remind here the definition of the parameters we will used to quantify the performance of our classifiers i.e. precision (P), recall (R) and accuracy (A):

$$P = \frac{TP}{TP + FP} \quad R = \frac{TP}{TP + FN} \quad A = \frac{TP + TN}{\#all} \quad (1)$$

It is straightforward to calculate these parameters for binary classification tasks out of the confusion matrix. In case of multiple labels, the parameters are calculated as:

- TPs are the values in the diagonal;
- FNs for a certain class are the sum of values in the corresponding row excluding the TP ;
- FPs for a certain class are the sum of values in the corresponding column excluding the TP ;
- TNs for a certain class are the sum of all rows and columns, excluding the class's column and row.

Another convenient metric, particularly because it is calculated directly from the proper *scikit-learn* function, is called *f1*-score, which is defined as the harmonic mean of the precision and recall:

$$f1 = 2 \times \frac{P \cdot R}{P + R} \quad (2)$$

3.2 Confusion Matrix

For each classifier, we produce a confusion matrix where each entry i, j corresponds to the number of observations in group i , but predicted to be in group j . We chose to normalize the entries according to the sum of each row. In case of binary classification, the matrix reduces to the number of true negatives (TN), false positives (FP), false negatives (FN) and true positives (TP).

3.3 Holdout and Cross Validation

Here we describe briefly the techniques of "holdout" and "cross validation" that are used to evaluate a model. The **holdout** method is essentially based on the splitting on the input data set into two subset, one used for training the model, and one used for testing the model, for example in 80% – 20% proportion, although there is not fix recipe for this split. Once the model is trained, the evaluation can be performed on the test data set, and this is therefore possible to check if the prediction of the model predict well the data. One big issue of this model is that the training strongly depend on the splitting of the initial data set, for example if the characteristic of the training data set are not representative of the whole data set.

A more powerful method is the **cross-validation** or "k-fold cross validation". Form the full dataset, a test is held out for final evaluation, but the validation set is no longer needed. For this, the training set is split into k sets, so that the model is trained using $k - 1$ folds as training data, and the remaining one is used for the validation as a test set (to compute the interesting metric of the model). Once we obtain such k number of metrics, the final result is the average of these parameters, obtained for each iteration of the cross-validation on each distinct fold.

3.4 Class Balance

In this section we discuss the problem of imbalanced data. Whenever classes are not represented equally (imbalanced data), the result of the training and testing of the model might be biased. In particular, a metric such the accuracy might appear very satisfying while, in fact, it is only representing the underlying class distribution. The model in in fact favoured to learn the class with the majority of instances.

Fig. 2 shows the distribution of the various class attributes for our datasets. Starting with the binary classification problems we see that the "breast cancer" dataset is slightly imbalanced (37,5%- 62,5%) recurrence events vs non recurrence, while the imbalance is more pronounced for the other dataset, in particular we see (17%-83%) hazardous vs non hazardous, and (2%-98%) buy vs non buy classes.

In the case of the drug consumption dataset, the situation it is more complicated to analyse since it varies largely depending on the considered drug. For this reason, we decided not to try to balance this dataset.

In order to balance the dataset for the binary classification, we implemented and algorithm that performs the following steps. First, it extracts the number of entries in the under-represented class (which by chance is always class "True" for the three binary classification tasks). Then we randomly select a number of rows from the remaining data of where class is equal to "False", adding an extra 10% to this total. Then, we create a final dataset combining the rows with the class "True" and the randomly selected "False". This step is done at a preliminary phase before any splitting into the training and testing subsets.

4 Analysis

In this section we finally present the results of our classification tasks.

4.1 Drug consumption

Overall the performance of the classification is rather insufficient. Looking at the confusion matrices we can see the expected influence of the data imbalance (Fig.3 App.A). The overall fitting strategy is




Figure 1: Distribution of classes for the target attributes for the multiclass classification (top panel, drug dataset) and binary classification (bottom panel, asteroids, breast cancer and advertising bidding datasets).

towards the most dominant class whereas the decision tree seems to be the most resistant against this bias when looking at the distribution around the main diagonal.

This bias can also influence the performance metrics (P,R,A) - looking at Eqs.1 one can see that guessing the major class will give values closer and closer to 1 the bigger the imbalance is. This is illustrated in Tab.1 where we look at the accuracies under the kNN classifier of a selection of drugs. Together with the class distribution (Fig.2) one can observe a positive correlation between the accuracy and the imbalance of the data - this will make it hard to compare drugs to each other using the accuracy as the metric. The influence on the accuracy is also given within the same drug. The kNN classifier shows the same behavior for all drugs, that is, to fixate on the major class(es) with increasing number k of considered neighbors. By comparison of the confusion matrices the kNN classifier isn't only showing this behavior the most out of all classifiers, it also always has the highest accuracy out of all.

The remaining metrics in general didn't show any such monotonic behavior. Since the precision and recall were very case-sensitive and an opposing behavior (one high, one low) was observed frequently, we decided to use the $f1$ -score as the performance. Tab.2 shows the best performing classifier for each




Figure 2: Confusion matrices for the used classifiers on the drug alcohol.

Drug	k=5 (%)	k=10 (%)	k=50 (%)
Alcohol	29.51	34.45	37.63
Amyl Nitrite	66.08	68.90	70.67
Cocaine	49.65	54.77	56.18
Methadone	71.91	73.50	73.32

Table 1: Accuracy of the kNN classifier for the used neighborhood sizes and a selection of drugs.


drug and the achieved $f1$ -score. The early assumption that the decision tree is the most resistant and therefore best performing classifier can not be confirmed. Overall we see all classifiers equally represented - the $k=50$ variant is never best performing and the $k=10$ only once. In the 4 least imbalanced datasets (alcohol, cannabis, chocolate and nicotine) is no dominant classifier (2x DT, 1x GNB, 1x kNN).

Drug	Classifier	$f1$ -score
Alcohol	DT (gini)	0.172
Amphetamines	GNB	0.220
Amyl Nitrite	GNB	0.197
Benzodiazepine	GNB	0.222
Caffeine	kNN (k=5)	0.168
Cannabis	GNB	0.246
Chocolate	DT (entropy)	0.169
Cocaine	GNB	0.219
Crack	DT (entropy)	0.236
Ecstasy	kNN (k=5)	0.202
Heroin	kNN (k=5)	0.181
Ketamine	DT (gini)	0.157
Legal	GNB	0.233
LSD	GNB	0.281
Methadone	DT (gini)	0.164
Mushrooms	kNN (k=10)	0.264
Nicotine	kNN (k=5)	0.204
Volatile substance	DT (gini)	0.190

Table 2: Best performing classifier for each drug with the achieved $f1$ -score.

As already mentioned, the results aren't good. The imbalance of the data made it hard for the classifiers to find non-trivial patterns in the data and only glimpses could be made. Deeper preprocessing of the data with special attention on single drugs is needed and it could possibly help to drop certain classes, since the drugs can be (apart from few exceptions) split in the two categories "everyday drug" with a big majority in class "Used last day" and the "marginal drugs" with a big majority in "Never used". Focusing on the classes CL1-CL5.

As a final comparison, we show in Fig. ?? the values for the precision and recall for the naive Bayes, the decision trees(Gini) and the kNN(k=10) algorithms.



4.2 Asteroids

For the asteroids dataset we had 4 comparisons - combinations of balancing (yes/no) and holdout/cross-validation. The comparison on whether to balance the datasets or not, goes in favour of the balanced dataset for the kNN and Gaussian Naive Bayes classifier (see Fig.5 as example) whereas the Decision Tree worked very well in both cases (see below). Holdout and cross-validation dont give a significant improvement over each other.

This dataset has a big discrepancy between the classifiers. While both GNB and kNN benefit of reducing the imbalance to avoid a trivial classification, they both don't converge on an acceptable solution. Fig.5 shows how after resampling the best guess seems to be a random one. This is true for all combinations in kNN and GNB - with a single exception for GNB on the balanced dataset with holdout (see appendix B).

This also shows in the performance metrics. With this single exception, accuracy, precision, recall and therefore also $f1$ are apart from small fluctuation the same when looking at the balanced data set (the unbalanced dataset suffers from the same problem as with the drug consumption dataset). For the balanced dataset the metrics for are in the range 0.5-0.55 - the one outlier fluctuates similar to the unbalanced dataset.




Figure 3: Confusion matrices for the Gaussian Naive Bayes classifier — Effect of balancing the data.

Very well performing is the Decision Tree. Not only does it seem to achieve excellent results (Fig.), it also does this independent of the imbalance of the data. Since this result is also achieved with 10-fold cross-validation we are sure that this is not the result of overfitting to the data. With very small fluctuations we achieve scores in the regime of 0.99-1 - the full list can be seen in Tab.3.




Figure 4: Confusion matrices for the Decision Tree classifier — Effect of balancing the data.

Understanding the origin of the classification (e.g. all asteroids within close proximity and above a certain size) of the dataset could give some insight on why the Decision Tree is performing so well. It is not clear to us why the other classification algorithms underperform compared to the Decision Tree. One could invest more time to check which features are relevant and which can be dropped - this may also help improving the other classifiers. Nice about this dataset was the illustration of the balancing through under-sampling. This is a step that is definitely needed for GNB and kNN to perform good, even with a reduced feature set.

Classifier	Balanced	validation	<i>f1-score</i>
DT (gini)	true	holdout	0.989
DT (gini)	true	cv	0.994
DT (gini)	false	holdout	0.992
DT (gini)	false	cv	0.994
DT (entropy)	true	holdout	0.987
DT (entropy)	true	cv	0.993
DT (entropy)	false	holdout	0.993
DT (entropy)	false	cv	0.993

Table 3: *f1*-scores for all Decision Tree combinations.

4.3 Online advertisement bidding

kNN algorithm If we apply the kNN algorithm in order to classify the online advertisement bidding without balancing the data we obtain a clear case of overfitting. No matter what parameter we use or if we do holdout or cross validation every instance is placed in the majority class.



Figure 5: Examples of non balanced datasets.

In order to use the classifier we have used k equal to 5, 10 and 50. From the experiment we can notice that with cross validation the best accuracy is obtained using k=10 (It is close to the 62% while with k=5 or k=50 it is slightly lower)




Figure 6: NKK with Cross validation for k=5;10;50

With holdout the best result is obtained with k=10 too in fact we have an accuracy of the 66% while the k=5 and k=50 have accuracy of the 65% and 64% respectively. If we look at precision and recall we have for k=10 66% and 65% respectively while for k=5 and k=10 we have lower values.





Figure 7: PLACEHOLDER IMAGES. NEED TO BE CHANGED.

Decision Tree If we build the decision tree we can see that from our experiment we get very good results. In fact using the entropy for both cross validation and holdout we get Accuracy, precision and recall equal to 1. The same results are obtained using the Gini index.



Figure 8: Decision trees using Gini index and Entropy

Naive Bayes Also with naive Bayes we get very good results in fact as for the decision tree the accuracy, the precision and the recall are 1.



(a) balanced

Figure 9: Naive Bayes classifier result.

Looking at the experiment results we can notice that for the Online bidding advertisement the decision tree classifier and the Naive Bayes classifier produce better results than the KNN classifier.

4.4 Breast cancer

kNN algorithm Considering the hold out balanced data for $k=5$ we get the values shown in Tab.4. Using cross-validation increases this values to $A=95\%$, $P=95\%$ and $R=94\%$ for $k=5$ and roughly 100% for $k=10$ and $k=50$.

For the kNN classifier the results turn out to be the best for $k=10$.

k	Accuracy (%)	Precision (%)	Recall (%)
5	89	92	88
10	89	92	88
50	83	88	82

Table 4: Performance measurements for kNN and holdout.




Figure 10: PLACEHOLDER IMAGES. NEED TO BE CHANGED.

Naive bayes We can notice that in our experiment there is no relevant difference in balancing the data if we apply a naive bayes classifier. The main thing that we can notice is that the result obtained using cross validation is better than the one obtained using holdout.




Figure 11: Comparison between Naive Bayes using cross validation and holdout.

Decision trees When we compute the decision tree we can notice that the accuracy value for a tree computed with the Gini index and the entropy with cross validation are the same. Using the entropy we have a better outcome in the true positive while we do errors in the true negatives while we obtain the opposite while using the Gini index.



(a) balanced

(b) non-balanced

Figure 12: **Decision tree using entropy and Gini index .**

Using the holdout approach we can notice that we get better results using the entropy instead of the Gini index. If we train the classifier using balanced data from the experiment we can notice that we get better results. Looking at the results of the experiments we can notice that a good classifier is obtained using cross validation and the decision tree that uses the Gini index.

References

- [1] E. Fehrman, A. K. Muhammad, E. M. Mirkes, V. Egan, and A. N. Gorban. The five factor model of personality and evaluation of drug consumption risk. 2017.

A Drug consumption - Confusion matrices




Figure 13: Confusion matrices for the used classifiers on the drug amphetamines.




Figure 14: Confusion matrices for the used classifiers on the drug amylnitrite.




Figure 15: Confusion matrices for the used classifiers on the drug benzodiazepine.




Figure 16: Confusion matrices for the used classifiers on the drug caffeine.




Figure 17: Confusion matrices for the used classifiers on the drug cannabis.




Figure 18: Confusion matrices for the used classifiers on the drug chocolate.




Figure 19: Confusion matrices for the used classifiers on the drug cocaine.




Figure 20: Confusion matrices for the used classifiers on the drug crack.




Figure 21: Confusion matrices for the used classifiers on the drug ecstasy.




Figure 22: Confusion matrices for the used classifiers on the drug heroin.




Figure 23: Confusion matrices for the used classifiers on the drug ketamine.




Figure 24: Confusion matrices for the used classifiers on the drug legal.




Figure 25: Confusion matrices for the used classifiers on the drug LSD.




Figure 26: Confusion matrices for the used classifiers on the drug methadone.




Figure 27: Confusion matrices for the used classifiers on the drug mushrooms.




Figure 28: Confusion matrices for the used classifiers on the drug nicotine.






Figure 29: Confusion matrices for the used classifiers on the drug volatile substance.

B Asteroids classification - Confusion matrices




GaussianNB[naiveB] Confusion Matrix - holdout (Asteroids)

GaussianNB[naiveB] Confusion Matrix - holdout (Asteroids)




GaussianNB[naiveB] Confusion Matrix - crossvalidation (Asterc


GaussianNB[naiveB] Confusion Matrix - crossvalidation (Asteroids)




(a) balanced




(b) non-balanced



(a) balanced




(b) non-balanced




KNeighbors[10] Confusion Matrix - holdout (Asteroids)

(a) balanced




KNeighbors[10] Confusion Matrix - holdout (Asteroids)

(b) non-balanced





KNeighbors[10] Confusion Matrix - crossvalidation (Asteroid:



(a) balanced





KNeighbors[10] Confusion Matrix - crossvalidation (Asteroids)

(b) non-balanced









(a) balanced

(b) non-balanced



(a) balanced

(b) non-balanced