CROSS VALIDATION

Overview

This document describes the process of saving best machine learning models into single files and evaluating their performance on a test dataset. The models used are logistic regression from balanced data set and support vector machine for imbalanced data set

Saving Multiple Models

To efficiently manage multiple models, we stored them in dictionaries and saved them using **Joblib**, a Python library for serializing objects.

Best Models for Cross Test

The objective of this section is to evaluate and compare the best-performing models obtained from cross-validation under both balanced and imbalanced datasets based on best accuracy select

Dataset Type Selected Model

Balanced Data Logistic Regression

Imbalanced Data Support Vector Machine (SVM)

Model 1: Balanced Dataset Models

CODE:

```
import joblib
# Dictionary of models
all_models = {
  'logistic_regression': log_reg,
}
# Save models to a single file
joblib.dump(all_models, 'model1.pkl')
Model 2: Imbalanced Dataset Models
CODE:
# Dictionary of models
all_models = {
  'random_forest': rf2
# Save models to a single file
joblib.dump(all_models, 'model2.pkl')
```

model1.pkl contains models trained on balanced data.

model2.pkl contains models trained on imbalanced data.

Model Evaluation

Model Evaluation (Model 1)

Each model was evaluated on the **same test dataset** using **TF-IDF features** (X test tfidf1) and the true labels (y test).

Logistic Regression

Code:

y_pred1 = model1['logistic_regression'].predict(X_test_tfidf1)
accuracy1 = accuracy_score(y_test, y_pred1)

Accuracy: 0.202

Class Precision Recall F1-Score Support

1	0.17	0.33	0.22	1375
2	0.10	0.25	0.15	909
3	0.28	0.29	0.28	2246
4	0.24	0.11	0.15	1750
5	0.33	0.10	0.16	2554

Macro Avg: Precision = 0.22, Recall = 0.22, F1 = 0.19

Weighted Avg: Precision = 0.25, Recall = 0.20, F1 = 0.20

Model Evaluation (Model 2)

Random Forest

y_pred2= model2['random_forest'].predict(X_test_tfidf)

accuracy2 = accuracy_score(y_test1, y_pred2)

print(f"Model 2 Test Accuracy: {accuracy2:.4f}")

Accuracy: 0.2063

• Accuracy: 0.2063

Classification Report:

precision recall f1-score support

1	0.25	0.16	0.19	1831
2	0.07	0.00	0.01	1820
3	0.20	0.67	0.31	1792
4	0.23	0.05	0.08	1755
5	0.19	0.15	0.17	1702

- Macro Average: Precision = 0.19, Recall = 0.21, F1 = 0.15
- Weighted Average: Precision = 0.19, Recall = 0.21, F1 = 0.15

Interpretation:

Random Forest achieves a slightly lower accuracy compared to Naive Bayes.

The model performs relatively well for Class 3, but poorly on others. This suggests the model is biased toward the dominant class and struggles with imbalance.

. Conclusion

The Model 2 (Imbalanced) evaluation shows that class imbalance significantly reduces overall performance.

Among all algorithms tested, Naive Bayes continues to demonstrate superior results due to its ability to handle sparse word distributions effectively.

Further optimization of preprocessing and model tuning can lead to notable improvements in accuracy and generalization.

TRAIN AGAIN THE MODEL FOR IMPROVE ACCURACY

Vectorization

tfidf7 = TfidfVectorizer(max_features=5000, ngram_range=(1,2))

 Converts text data into TF-IDF vectors using top 5000 features with 1-gram and 2-gram combinations.

Model 1 (Balanced Data)

Models Trained

Logistic Regression

Performance

Model

Accuracy Key Observations

```
Saving Models
import joblib
model1 = {
  'logistic_regression': log_reg2,
}
joblib.dump(model1, 'model1.pkl')
Model 2 (Imbalanced Data)
Models Trained
      Random Forest
Performance
 Model
                 Accuracy Key Observations
Random Forest
                                      0.53
Saving Models
model2 = {
```

'random_forest': rf3

joblib.dump(model2, 'model2.pkl')

}

Conclusion

- Both models use TF-IDF with bi-grams and balanced class weighting.
- Model 2 performs better overall due to better feature representation and tuned parameters.
- Models are saved as:

```
_{\circ} model1.pkl \rightarrow Balanced training data _{\circ}
```

model2.pkl → Imbalanced training data