

TEAM 1
8:30-8:42

Machine Learning: Quality Prediction of a Mining Operation

Federico Aguilar Castellanos
Michel Chamoun


December 6th, 2021

Background Information

Ores (i.e., mined rocks) do not naturally occur as single valuable mineral, like iron or gold; instead, they are mixtures containing unwanted rocks or minerals, such as silica.

The valuable mineral (iron) is separated from the **impurity mineral** (silica) by froth flotation.

Froth Flotation is the process of physically separating particles based in their ability to adhere to air bubbles. Specifically **iron minerals** remain in the water, while **silica particles** attach to the bubbles and float to the surface. The efficiency of the process is measured by the purity of the flotation concentrate.



Pu, Y., Szmigiel, A. & Apel, D.B. Purities prediction in a manufacturing froth flotation plant: the deep learning techniques. *Neural Comput & Applic* **32**, 13639–13649 (2020).
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00521-020-04773-2>

Task and Dataset

Objective: Apply ML techniques to forecast the percent of silica in the flotation concentrate.

- Evaluate the effect of measurement interpolation of sequential data.
- Assess the performance of the ML models under a smaller lookback and forecast window (20-sec window vs. 1 and 6-hr window).

Type of task: Supervised Learning

Dataset: Sensor measurements sampled every 20 seconds during a 6-month period from March 2017 to September 2017.

- Total of 737,453 entries:
- Timestamp of measurements
- Process input variables
- Process equipment variables
- Process output variables
- **Label: % Silica Concentrate**

RangeIndex: 737453 entries, 0 to 737452

Data columns (total 24 columns):

#	Column	Non-Null Count	Dtype
0	date	737453	datetime64[ns]
1	% Iron Feed	737453	float64
2	% Silica Feed	737453	float64
3	Starch Flow	737453	float64
4	Amina Flow	737453	float64
5	Ore Pulp Flow	737453	float64
6	Ore Pulp pH	737453	float64
7	Ore Pulp Density	737453	float64
8	Flotation Column 01 Air Flow	737453	float64
9	Flotation Column 02 Air Flow	737453	float64
10	Flotation Column 03 Air Flow	737453	float64
11	Flotation Column 04 Air Flow	737453	float64
12	Flotation Column 05 Air Flow	737453	float64
13	Flotation Column 06 Air Flow	737453	float64
14	Flotation Column 07 Air Flow	737453	float64
15	Flotation Column 01 Level	737453	float64
16	Flotation Column 02 Level	737453	float64
17	Flotation Column 03 Level	737453	float64
18	Flotation Column 04 Level	737453	float64
19	Flotation Column 05 Level	737453	float64
20	Flotation Column 06 Level	737453	float64
21	Flotation Column 07 Level	737453	float64
22	% Iron Concentrate	737453	float64
23	% Silica Concentrate	737453	float64

dtypes: datetime64[ns](1), float64(23)

count	737453.000000
mean	2.326763
std	1.125554
min	0.600000
25%	1.440000
50%	2.000000
75%	3.010000
max	5.530000

Name: % Silica Concentrate, dtype: float64

Feature Analysis

Challenge: Sensor timestamps of the original data did not reflect the 20 sec sampling frequency – as the 180 measurements per hour were stored under the same hourly timestamp label.


- Reindexing of the data creating a Pandas date-range
- Matching the 180 measurement recordings to new index

Challenge: Regions of linear interpolation were observed for all the variables in the dataset.

- The period between April 2017 to May 2017 showed the least amount of linear interpolation

Challenge: The % Silica Feed was strongly correlated to the % Iron Feed, which is to be expected as these are introduced simultaneously in the process. Additionally, there was a correlation between the process variables of the different flotation columns.

- Collinear data points were removed to prevent model overfitting
- The variable % Silica Feed was dropped from the data
- Only the process variables for the Flotation Column 02, Flotation Column 05, and Flotation Column 07 were kept for the model



Approach

ML models considered:

Multilayered Perceptron (MLP) Neural Network

Random Forest Regression – with and without time-step consideration

Long-Short Term Memory (LSTM) Neural Network

Objective:

Compare the forecasting performance of different ML models with varying degrees of complexity

- Random Forest vs. Neural Networks
- Univariate LSTM vs. Multivariate LSTM

Asses the effect of the time-dependency of the measurements on the generated predictions

- MLP vs. LSTM
- Random Forest Regression with time consideration vs. without time consideration

Time-Series Approach: The time-series data was transformed into input samples of past observations and output samples of future observations. Explicitly, the lagged observations ($t-1$) of the input variables were used to forecast the % Silica Concentrate at time (t).

Regression Approach: The data is treated as observations not taking into consideration any notion of time nor the effect of past observations.

Evaluation Setup

What is the baseline? The baseline performance for the time-series models were their less complex (regression) counterparts, which did not account for the time-dependency of the dataset.


Splitting of the data

Regression models: train – test split by scikit-learn machine learning library.

- 70% training data was used to fit the models
- 20% validation data used for hyperparameter tuning
- 10% test data used to make predictions and report the performance of the model

Time-Series models: train – test split into chronological sets (by indexing) to check parameter stability of the model over time.

- Train/test/validation split (60%/20%/20%)
- Non-random split to maintain the time dependency of the measurements
- **Random Forest Cross-Validation** - TimeSeriesSplit by scikit-learn machine learning library setting the number of splits to 3 for cross-validation.
- **LSTM Cross-Validation:** GridSearchCV scikit-learn




2007 - 2021, scikit-learn developers (BSD License)

Results – Regression Models

RANDOM FOREST

Mean squared error: 0.047


Root Mean squared error: 0.2168



MLP

Mean Squared Error: 0.1888

Root Mean squared error: 0.4264




Results – Time Series Models

RANDOM FOREST FORECAST EVALUATION

Mean absolute error : 0.0398



Root Mean squared error: 0.1039



MULTIVARIATE LSTM MODEL EVALUATION

Mean absolute error : 0.10896

Root Mean squared error: 0.1685



Conclusion

- Time-series models performed better than the regression models at predicting the % Silica Concentrate.
- Random Forest with time series consideration performed slightly better than the LSTM neural network.
- Random Forest regression algorithm performed better than the MLP neural network.
- The better performance of the Random Forest models could be attributed to the susceptibility of neural networks to hyperparameter tuning, which was evidenced during the cross-validation of these models.
- Most importantly, all the considered models converged; thus, the objective to predict the percentage of silica in the concentrate using a 20-second time step was met with great accuracy.

TEAM 2

8:42-8:54

Ulabox customer segmentation

Team members
Kiana Sharifpour
Hanie Ghalambor
Soroosh Sabaei

Goal of the Project

Business Goals?

- **How Do Customers Shop Online**
- **Explore Online Shopping Behavior**

Technical Goal?

- **How to determine the number of clusters?**

Task and Dataset

What is the task?



- **Unsupervised Learning**

Statistics Related to the dataset?

- **The number of customers: 10239**
- **The number of orders: 30000**
- **The products are related to: Food, Fresh, Drinks, Home, Beauty, Health, Baby, and pets**


Approach: Road map of the task

1) Overview of data:



Approach: Road map of the task

1) Overview of data:



Approach: Road map of the task



2) Outlier detection:

- In the most general sense, an *outlier* is a data point which differs significantly from other observations.

$$\text{IQR} = Q3 - Q1$$

$$\text{Lower Bound} = (Q1 - 1.5 * \text{IQR})$$


$$\text{Upper Bound} = (Q3 + 1.5 * \text{IQR})$$



Approach: Road map of the task

3) Dimensionality Reduction: Principal Component Analysis (PCA)


- PCA reduces the dimensions with the lowest ability to explain variances
- First, scaling the data
- Choose the number of components which explain most of the variances
- Using PCA, the columns lose their meanings



Approach: Road map of the task

4) Clustering Approach: 1) K-means


- It assigns data points to a cluster such that the sum of the squared distance between the data points and the cluster's centroid (arithmetic mean of all the data points that belong to that cluster) is at the minimum.
- The optimal number of [clusters](#):



Approach: Road map of the task

4) Clustering Approach: 1) K-means


- It assigns data points to a cluster such that the sum of the squared distance between the data points and the cluster's centroid (arithmetic mean of all the data points that belong to that cluster) is at the minimum.
- The optimal number of [clusters](#):



Approach: Road map of the task

4) Clustering Approach: 1) K-means

- It assigns data points to a cluster such that the sum of the squared distance between the data points and the cluster's centroid (arithmetic mean of all the data points that belong to that cluster) is at the minimum.
- The optimal number of clusters: [Silhouetted method \(6\)](#)




Approach: Road map of the task

4) Clustering Approach: 2) Mean shift

Given a set of data points, the algorithm iteratively assigns each data point towards the closest cluster centroid and direction to the closest cluster centroid is determined by where most of the points nearby are at.


- The optimal number of clusters: 3



Approach: Road map of the task

4) Clustering Approach: 3) Agglomerative Hierarchical method

- A **Hierarchical clustering** method works via grouping data into a tree of clusters. Hierarchical clustering begins by treating every data points as a separate cluster. Then, it repeatedly executes the subsequent steps:
 - Identify the 2 clusters which can be closest together
 - Merge the 2 maximum comparable clusters. We need to continue these steps until all the clusters are merged together.
- The optimal number of clusters: 3



Approach: Road map of the task

4) Clustering Approach: 4) Gaussian Mixture Models (GMM)

Gaussian Mixture Models (GMMs) assume that there are a certain number of Gaussian distributions, and each of these distributions represent a cluster. Hence, a Gaussian Mixture Model tends to group the data points belonging to a single distribution together.

- The optimal number of clusters: 2

Results

Which one has the best performance?

Method of validation of consistency: 1) silhouette method
2) Davies Bouldin

Algorithm	Davies Bouldin	Silhouette Score	Number of Clusters
K-Means	0.9955	0.3495	6
Mean Shift	0.887	0.303	4
GMM	0.5009	0.62608	2
Agglomerative Hierarchical	0.966	0.2059	3

TEAM 3

8:54-9:06

Demand Prediction

with



Jitsama Tanlamai 11299488
Koray Yenal 11302084



Contents

1

Background

Business model and Current situation
Pain Points and Study objectives


2

Data Preparation and Model Development

Data Retrieval and Management
Clustering, Naive, RNN, GRU, and LSTM

3

Testing




1

Background



Context


- Bixi is a bike-rental company in Montreal
- Some stations has a **shortage** in bikes
- The others face an **oversupply** of bikes.
- Bixi has opportunity cost, lost customers and lost revenue.
- Solution: Accurate prediction of demand across time



Context

- Goal: accurately predict the bike-sharing usage of Bixi
- How: Cluster stations, and compare various machine learning methods
- Test the final model in the real setting





2

Data Preparation and Model Development

Data Retrieval

Ride and Stations



Weather
(hourly)

Canada


Shortest Route
Distance




Holiday





Number of Stations




Number of unique routes



Number of Trips (2017 - 2019)




Number of Trips (2017 - 2019)




July		
Year	# Trips	of Total
2017	0.88 m	19%
2018	0.95 m	18%
2019	1.1 m	20%


Workflow - Model Development




Workflow - Field Experiment



Clustering





Clustering Workflow



Clustering Features

- **Start Station (new code)**
- Coordinate (lat, long)
- Avg number of trips (per day weekday, weekend, holiday, part of the day)
 - Morning: 5 am – 12 pm
 - Afternoon: 1 – 5 pm
 - Evening: 6 – 9 pm
 - Night: 10 pm – 4 am
- Avg number of unique destination
- Avg number of unique origin station
- Avg bike distance
- Avg difference between walk and bike distance
- Avg trip duration


Result



Result

Cluster name	Trip Characteristics
● Working	High freq, but shortest duration and large decrease in distance during holiday
● Afternoon Rush	High freq, but each has short distance and duration, and peak at afternoon
● Long Distance	Large diff distance between walk and bike
● Suburban	Low freq, but each has long distance and duration
● Indifferent	Lowest diff distance between walk and bike

Time-series Prediction



Prediction features

Static features

- Start station (new code)
- Date
- Is weekend
- Is holiday
- Cluster number

Dynamic features across hour

- Time (round to the closest hour)
 - Temperature
 - Humidity
 - Wind direction and speed
 - Visibility
- Average bike distance
- Average the difference between bike and walk distance
- Average trip duration

Target

No of trips in the **next** hour

Train-Validation Split

Cluster 1

Station # 1	Day 1 ... Day 31	Hr 1 ... Hr 00
Station # 2	Day 1 ... Day 31	Hr 1 ... Hr 00
Station # 3	Day 1 ... Day 31	Hr 1 ... Hr 00
Station # 4	Day 1 ... Day 31	Hr 1 ... Hr 00
Station # 5	Day 1 ... Day 31	Hr 1 ... Hr 00

Cluster 2



Station # 1	Day 1 ... Day 31	Hr 1 ... Hr 00
Station # 3	Day 1 ... Day 31	Hr 1 ... Hr 00
Station # 5	Day 1 ... Day 31	Hr 1 ... Hr 00
Station # 2	Day 1 ... Day 31	Hr 1 ... Hr 00
Station # 4	Day 1 ... Day 31	Hr 1 ... Hr 00


Data Structure

Data

- X train shape =
 $(26494, 23, 12)$

- X valid shape =
 $(6731, 23, 12) \sim$

20%




Prediction

Algorithms

- Naive (Baseline)
- Simple RNN
- LSTM
- GRU

Hyperparameter Tuning



Performances

Mean Squared Error (MSE)

Model	Train	Valid
Naive	8.9	9.8
RNN	7.4	8.5
GRU	6.6	7.6
LSTM	6.1	7.4

3

Testing




Result

X test shape

= (18.935, 23, 12)

Model

: Stacked LSTM with (Dropout = 0.1, NN = 96)




	Error Pred - Actual = # trips*
Mean	0.2
25 %	-1
50%	1
75%	2

* ceiling if over estimation, floor if under estimation

Analysis of Error (# trips)

New station does not have close old stations (>1 km)



Hr	Is Weekend	
	No	Yes
1	0%	4%
2	38%	31%
3	47%	33%
4	58%	48%
5	70%	62%
6	81%	74%
7	66%	83%
8	22%	57%
9	32%	2%
10	36%	15%
11	15%	7%
12	10%	5%
13	27%	17%
14	30%	28%
15	25%	26%
16	20%	25%
17	40%	33%
18	55%	47%
19	54%	50%
20	36%	29%
21	29%	26%
22	18%	21%
23	11%	21%

Note: cut-off threshold at 50% (red)

Thank you!

Questions?

TEAM 4

9:06-9:18

Ensemble learning

Hao Sun
Jiacheng Wang

Task

This project aimed at the case of customers default payments. To predict whether customers will repay their loans on time based on their socio-demographic information and history payment information. which is a supervised learning.

Dataset

information	
Attribute Characteristics	Integer, Real
Number of Instances	30,000
Number of Attributes	24
Number of Missing Value	0

Dataset

variable	information
LIMIT_BAL	Amount of the given credit (NT dollar).
SEX	Gender (1 = male; 2 = female).
EDUCATION	1 = graduate school; 2 = university; 3 = high school; 4 = others
MARRIAGE	Marital status (1 = married; 2 = single; 3 = others).
AGE	age
PAY_i	the repayment status in ith month
BILL_i	amount of bill statement in ith month
PAY_AMT_i	amount paid in ith month
default payment	default payment (Yes = 1, No = 0),

Approach

Ensemble learning

	Component Learner
1	Logit Regression
2	K-Nearest Neighbor
3	Naive Bayes
4	Support Vector Machine
5	Decision Tree
6	Random Forest
7	Neural Network

Approach


Reasons for choosing Ensemble Learning

To verify two things:

1. Whether the more complex the model, the better the performance.
2. Whether ensemble learning perform better compared to the single machine learning model

Evaluation Setup

Split data into training set and test set




Evaluation Setup

Tuning hyper-parameters: GridsearchCV

Model	Best hyper-parameters
Logit	Penalty: l1 C:1
K-NN	n_neighbors: 14
SVM	C: 1
Tree	max_depth: 4
Forest	max_depth: 6 n_estimators: 44
Neural	activation: identity alpha: 0.001 hidden_layer_sizes: (16, 16, 4) learning_rate_init: 0.001

Results



Results

1. The models with best performance are logit regression, Decision tree and Random forest.
2. Not the more complex the model, the better the performance.
3. There is no best algorithm, only the most suitable one, and this can reflect to some extent the no free lunch theorem

Results

1. The accuracy for ensemble learning : 0.80
2. Compared to models with better performance, the accuracy is very similar.
3. Compared to the model whose performance is not very well, there is an increase in accuracy.

TEAM 5

9:18-9:30

Machine Learning Methods to Predict Electricity Prices

Golshid Aflaki and Nima Rafizadeh

Machine Learning I Course (MATH 80629A)

December 2021

Outline

1 Introduction

2 Data

3 Method and Results

Introduction

- The prediction of electricity prices is one of the most important routines for an electricity market.
- Accurate prediction of electricity prices is extremely beneficial to market participants in risk management and decision making.
- Broadly speaking, the models used for electricity prices prediction fall into one of two main categories:
 - Statistical methods, e.g., ARMA, ARIMA, GARCH, VAR.
 - Machine learning methods
- Machine learning methods are superior to statistical methods:
 - Because their strength of capturing the nonlinear features and rapid changes.

Introduction

- We use supervised learning models because our data is labeled.
- We aim to address the electricity price prediction issue by:
 - We use a basic model as a benchmark, which considers mean of all electricity prices is a predictor for each new observation.
 - Then a linear regression and regularization methods such as lasso and ridge regressions are applied.
 - Then progressing to more advanced methods such as support vector machine, random forest, neural network, and recurrent neural network.
- We conclude this study by comparing their performance to identify the best model.

Outline


1 Introduction

2 Data

3 Method and Results

Data

- We exploit the data of the hourly real-time electricity prices in the state of New York from 1th January 2015, 00:00 to 31th December 2020 23:00.
 - Resulting in a total of 52,603 observations.
- Time series of electricity prices:



Data

Table: Descriptive Statistics for the Hourly Electricity Prices

Descriptive Statistics	
Observations	52,603
Mean	27.05
Median	22.07
Maximum	1173.00
Minimum	-415.40
Standard Deviation	26.52
Skewness	9.26
Kurtosis	225.10


Data

- Head of Data:


	Time	Date	Year	Month	Day	Hour	RealTimePrice	DayAheadPrice	TotalLoad	lagDayAheadPrice	lagTotalLoad	lagprice_hour	lagprice_day	lagprice_week
168	2015-01-08 00:00	2015-01-08	2015	1	8	0	67.723953	75.534004	266.248699	77.315331	240.192700	75.687279	54.872890	26.500668
169	2015-01-08 01:00	2015-01-08	2015	1	8	1	46.695000	70.643997	220.537899	75.534004	266.248699	67.723953	49.495499	32.918835
170	2015-01-08 02:00	2015-01-08	2015	1	8	2	50.571499	67.751999	215.700199	70.643997	220.537899	46.695000	45.589722	29.593000
171	2015-01-08 03:00	2015-01-08	2015	1	8	3	50.260777	66.902664	213.908999	67.751999	215.700199	50.571499	55.981998	22.408890
172	2015-01-08 04:00	2015-01-08	2015	1	8	4	69.597954	73.708664	253.271400	66.902664	213.908999	50.260777	54.897446	21.746778
...
52587	2020-12-31 09:00	2020-12-31	2020	12	31	9	27.504000	22.190666	212.484153	22.235332	205.559729	21.230333	16.688477	12.095612
52588	2020-12-31 10:00	2020-12-31	2020	12	31	10	36.169445	21.195999	217.018450	22.190666	212.484153	27.504000	21.095667	14.020056
52589	2020-12-31 11:00	2020-12-31	2020	12	31	11	47.124290	20.952000	291.815539	21.195999	217.018450	36.169445	15.485778	19.039333
52590	2020-12-31 12:00	2020-12-31	2020	12	31	12	26.322390	20.606001	217.851096	20.952000	291.815539	47.124290	15.570389	23.310278
52591	2020-12-31 13:00	2020-12-31	2020	12	31	13	21.341000	21.253334	217.424115	20.606001	217.851096	26.322390	20.540611	20.464945

52424 rows × 14 columns

Data




(a) Heat Map plot




(d) Electricity Price vs.
Previous Week Price


Figure: Data Visualization




(b) Electricity Price vs.
Previous Hour Price



(c) Electricity Price vs.
Previous Day Price



(e) Electricity Price vs.
Previous Hour's Total
Load



(f) Electricity Price vs.
Previous Hour's Day
Ahead Price

Outline

1 Introduction

2 Data

3 Method and Results

Method and Results

- Real time prices are the target variable in our prediction model.
- The main features are the year, month, day, hour, the previous hour day ahead price, and the previous hour total load.
- We also develop some other features that may improve the precision of the prediction process:
 - Real time prices for the previous hour, day, and week based on the date and real time price columns.

Method and Results

- We begin with linear regression and the methods for regularizing it, namely lasso and ridge regressions.
- We then progress to more advanced methods such as:
 - support vector machine (SVM), random forest (RF), neural network (NN), and recurrent neural network (RNN).
- Our train-test split strategy is based on the K -fold cross-validation for all models except for RNN.
 - Throughout this study, we use $k = 5$.
- We use a basic model as a benchmark, which considers mean of all electricity prices is a predictor for each new observation.
- To compare the accuracy of models, we report the MSE on the averaged across folds.
- To improve the learning ability, we use K -fold cross-validation and grid searching.

Method and Results

Table: Hyperparameters for Each Model

Model	Hyperparameters
Linear Regression	-
Lasso Regression	Learning Rate: [1,0.1,0.01,0.001,0.0001,0]
Ridge Regression	Learning Rate: [1,0.1,0.01,0.001,0.0001,0]
SVM	'C': [0.1, 1], 'kernel': ['rbf', 'linear']
RF	'max_depth': [80, 50], 'max_features': [4, 6], 'min_samples_leaf': [20, 15], 'min_samples_split': [50, 100], 'n_estimators': [100, 200]
NN	'hidden_layer_sizes': [(50,50), (20, 30)], 'activation': ['relu','tanh'], 'alpha': [0.0001, 0.05], 'learning_rate': ['constant','adaptive'], 'solver': ['adam']
RNN	-


Method and Results

Table: MSE of the Models

Model	MSE
Basic Model	702.679139
Linear Regression	318.842355
Lasso Regression	318.815245
Ridge Regression	318.842354
SVM	322.744595
RF	312.507097
NN	314.651678
RNN	103.191267

TEAM 6

9:30-9:42



Federated Learning for Credit Modeling

2021-12-06



Jesse Thibodeau
Hamid Aliakbarlou
Rongde Liang

CONTENT

- 01 *PROBLEM DESCRIPTION*
- 02 *PROPOSED SOLUTION*
- 03 *IMPLEMENTATION*
- 04 *FINDINGS*

Part 01

PROBLEM DESCRIPTION



CHALLENGES

Big Data

The cornerstone of machine learning is big data.
Complex deep learning systems rely on millions of training datasets.

VS

Small Data

With the exception of a few large corporations (Google, Facebook, Apple, Amazon, Microsoft), the majority of organizations only collect **SMALL DATA**.

Centralization

Integration is an indispensable part of traditional data processing.
Data resources might be from multiple fields, but processing, cleaning and modeling must be done by one party.

VS

Distribution

Data integration is costly, even between different departments of same company.
Data integration sometimes is prohibited due to the **DATA PRIVACY** problem.

GDPR

The General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) aims to protect the individual's privacy and enhance data security.

For example, businesses should allow users to delete or withdraw their personal data. Any autonomous activities in collecting, transferring or using private/sensitive data are prohibited.

Example: Facebook (Meta) is dealing with repeated privacy lawsuits.




Data breaches commonly occur in the financial sector.

They are:

- Costly
- Lower client trust
- Threatening

Financial data is therefore *sensitive*.


Part 02 PROPOSED SOLUTION




Federated Learning

Definition: "A modeling approach that leaves the training data distributed on the [local] devices, and learns a shared model by aggregating locally-computed updates."

source: McMahan, et. al.




Categorization




Horizontally Federated Learning

Data A and Data B have the same features but different sample sizes



Vertically Federated Learning

Data A and Data B are from the same users but different in features.




Federated Transfer Learning

Data A and Data B are both different in samples and features.

Part 03

IMPLEMENTATION



OBJECTIVES



Build
A credit risk model



Implement
Horizontal Federated Learning
framework



Compare
the performance of
federated learning and
centralized approaches

Dataset Header


▲	ID_TRAIN	ST_EMPL	NB_EMPT	AGE_D	DEFAULT	PROFIT_LOSS	
1	5000000	R		1	68	0	1575.00
2	5000001	T		1	57	0	840.00
3	5000002	R		1	19	0	1110.00
4	5000003	R		1	58	0	300.00
5	5000004	T		2	42	0	980.00
6	5000005	R		1	29	0	1510.00
7	5000006	T		1	32	0	1255.00
8	5000007	R		1	47	0	1925.00
9	5000008	R		1	23	1	-29584.70
10	5000009	P		1	46	0	1565.00
11	5000010	P		1	43	0	330.00
12	5000011	P		1	45	0	280.00
13	5000012			2	19	0	920.00
14	5000013			1	20	0	1875.00

Description (31 features)

Variable name	Description
ID_TRAIN	Unique borrower ID
TYP_FIN	Type of funding requested (Car, Mortgage, or Credit)
NB_EMPT	Number of borrowers (borrower variables are only for the principal borrower)
R_ATD	Total Debt Amortization (TDA) Ratio, i.e., monthly financial commitments over monthly income
PRT_VAL	The requested loan amount over the value of the goods
DUREE	Requested loan duration
AGE_D	Age of the borrower
REV_BT	Gross Income
REV_NET	Net Income
TYP_RES	Residence Type – P: Owner, L: Tenant, A: Others
ST_EMPL	Employment Status – R: Regular, P: Part-Time, T: Self Employed
MNT_EPAR	Savings Value
NB_ER_6MS	Number of transactions refused due to insufficient funds in the last 6 months
NB_ER_12MS	Number of transactions refused due to insufficient funds in the last 12 months
NB_DEC_12MS	Number of overdrafts in the last 12 months
NB_OPER	Total number of transactions in record
NB_SATI	Total number of satisfactory transactions in record (No payment delay)
NB_COUR	Number of current transactions
NB_INTR_1M	Number of inquiries in the last month
NB_INTR_12M	Number of inquiries in the last 12 months
PIR_DEL	Worst current delinquency
NB_DEL_30	Number of 30–59 day delinquency in the last 12 months
NB_DEL_60	Number of 60–89 day delinquency in the last 12 months
NB_DEL_90	Number of 90+ day delinquency in the last 12 months
MNT_PASS	Value of financial Liabilities
MNT_ACT	Value of financial Assets
MNT_AUT_REN	Total authorized amount of revolving credit
MNT_UTIL_REN	Total used amount of revolving credit
MNT_DEMANDE	Loan amount requested
DEFAULT	Default is considered when payment is 90 days or more late within 24 months 1: Default, 0: Did not default
PROFIT_LOSS	Profit made or loss incurred with this loan after two years

...

DATA DISTRIBUTION (for a few selected features)



Centralized Approach

Name	Users Count	LR Accuracy	LR Profit
Royal Bank of Canada	120000	69.32%	107960
Toronto-Dominion Bank	40000	64.52%	93570
Bank of Nova Scotia	40000	64.57%	93280
Bank of Montreal	40000	64.36%	92900
Canadian Imperial Bank of Commerce	40000	67.82%	90100

Description

Use **Logistic Regression** to predict loan default.

Suppose RBC has the full dataset while each other bank just has the subset of dataset.

RBC vs 'The Avengers'
Other four banks want to team up as 'The Avengers' to compete with RBC, but do not want to share their data.

Answer: Federated Learning?

AVENGERS




Scikit-learn x Flower

Scikit-learn for training logistic model

Flower for federated learning.




Here, we have one server and four clients for our federated learning implementation.



(def.) FedAvg:

FedAvg allows local nodes to perform more than one batch update on local data and exchanges the updated weights rather than the gradients



Algorithm 1 FederatedAveraging. The K clients are indexed by k ; B is the local minibatch size, E is the number of local epochs, and η is the learning rate.

Server executes:

```

initialize  $w_0$ 
for each round  $t = 1, 2, \dots$  do
     $m \leftarrow \max(C \cdot K, 1)$ 
     $S_t \leftarrow (\text{random set of } m \text{ clients})$ 
    for each client  $k \in S_t$  in parallel do
         $w_{t+1}^k \leftarrow \text{ClientUpdate}(k, w_t)$ 
     $w_{t+1} \leftarrow \sum_{k=1}^K \frac{n_k}{n} w_{t+1}^k$ 

```

ClientUpdate(k, w): // Run on client k

```

 $\mathcal{B} \leftarrow (\text{split } \mathcal{P}_k \text{ into batches of size } B)$ 
for each local epoch  $i$  from 1 to  $E$  do

```

```

    for batch  $b \in \mathcal{B}$  do

```

```

         $w \leftarrow w - \eta \nabla \ell(w; b)$ 

```

```

    return  $w$  to server

```

RESULTS

```
(20, 'accuracy: 0.6889666666666666 profit: 106710'])}
```




Hyper parameters to tune:

Logistic regression

- Regularization via CV
- L-GFBS solver


FedAvg

- C = proportion of clients per round



Accuracy

RBC Benchmark:
69.32%




Profit

RBC Benchmark:
107960

Part 04

FINDINGS



COMPARISON

Name	Client Size	LR Accuracy	FD Acc	Improved Accuracy	LR Profit	FD Profit	Improved *Profit
RBC	120000	69.32%	—	—	107960	—	—
TD	40000	64.52%	68.89%	4.37%	93570	106710	14.04%
Scotia	40000	64.57%	68.89%	4.32%	93280	106710	14.39%
BMO	40000	64.36%	68.89%	4.53%	92900	106710	14.86%
CICB	40000	67.82%	68.89%	1.07%	90100	106710	18.43%

* improved_profit = (fd_profit - lr_profit) / lr_profit

Conclusion

- (1) Federated Learning improved each bank's accuracy and profit.
- (2) RBC with all dataset still perform better than 'the avengers' model, but the difference is small.
- (3) The Federated Model's performance might ideally match the all-dataset' model but never better.
- (4) The fluctuant result of each FD training round might depends on the client's data structure.

REFERENCES

1. Brendan McMahan, Eider Moore, Daniel Ramage, Seth Hampson, and Blaise Aguera y Arcas. Communication-efficient learning of deep networks from decentralized data. In *Artificial intelligence and statistics*, pages 1273–1282. PMLR, 2017.
2. WeBank AI Group. Federated Learning White Paper V1.0. Shenzhen, 2018.
3. Scikit-learn documentation (<https://scikit-learn.org/stable/>)
4. Flower framework documentation (<https://flower.dev/>)

2021-12-06

THANK YOU



FEDERATED LEARNING

Characteristics



Data contained in each client, maintaining privacy and w/o compliance violation.



Each entity profits mutually from a virtual shared model in a federated system.



The virtual shared model's performance is nearly same as the model obtained through centralized approaches

TEAM 7

9:42-9:54

Multiclass Text Classification

—An Application in News Categorization

Michael Gimple
Zichun Liu


Task and Dataset

Task: Assign news articles to specific categories

- Supervised learning
- Classification

Data

- 200,000+ news data from Huffpost from 2012 to 2018
headline, short description, category, date, author
- Label: 41 categories merged into 20, ex: merged business and money
- Text was cleaned to remove stopwords, punctuation, irregular characters and headline + short description were merged together
- The 10 most common words are: new, one, trump, us, photos, people, time, like, day, get



Approach

Feature representation:

- Tf-Idf -> term frequency and inverse document frequency
- Tokenizer -> encode words to numbers, lower numbers are more important, then transforms text to sequences of numbers, then pad sequences

Learning algorithm:

- Multinomial Naive Bayes -> Multiplies probabilities of text given a category for all text
- Logistic Regression -> sigmoid function, consider dependence of features
- XGBoost -> ‘improved’ gradient boosting decision tree
- RNN with LSTM -> Using sequential input, 1) encoder, 2)embed -> represent words as vectors, 3) Spatial Dropout to reduce noise and work with reduced features, 4)LSTM, 5)Dense with regularization and softmax, 6)Categorical Cross Entropy loss, 7)Adam/Gradient Descent
- RNN with GRU

Evaluation Setup

- Baseline is majority voting, classify all text as politics category
- Train (and Val) are 2012,2013, 2015-2017, Test is 2014, 2018
- Split is about 80 % to 20% and 64%, 16%, 20%
- Vocabulary size 50,000
- NB: Smoothing Param ranged between 0 - 1 , incremented by 0.1
- XGBoost: max_depth 3, 6, 9; learning_rate 0.05, 0.1, 0.3; min_child_weight 1, 3, 5, 7
- RNN: Learning, Dense L1, L2 regularization, softmax activation, DropoutID, early stopping, 5,082,420 parameters worked best
- Also tried multiple LTSM layers, Bidirectional, ConvID, GRU -> 5,062,620

Results

Feature representation	Learning algorithm	Test Accuracy
Majority Voting	NA	0.15
Tf-Idf	logistic regression	0.54
Tf-Idf	XGBoost(learning rate 0.05, max depth 3, min child weight 1)	0.56
Tf-Idf	Naive Bayes(smoothing = 0.1) Naive Bayes(smoothing = 1)	0.57 0.48
RNN with early stopping	embed=100, spatial dropout1D = 0.2, LSTM(100,dropout, recurrent(0.2)), dense(20), l1,l2=0, learning rate =0.005,	0.62
RNN 2 with early stopping	Same, spatial dropout1D = 0.25, GRU, learning rate= 0.001	0.61

TEAM 8
9:54-10:06

CLASSIFYING TRADE DIRECTION

Saim Ayberk Sert

HEC Montréal

December 6, 2021

INTRODUCTION

- Task:

- Implementing machine learning methods to offer trade signing model alternatives, if possible, to mostly used Lee and Ready (1991) algorithm.
- Can machine learning discover Lee and Ready algorithm using same inputs?
- Can machine learning improve LR algorithm by adding its prediction as an explanatory variable?

- Motivation:

- Essential to comprehend market dynamics and security price behavior, i.e. market quality, price impact, order dynamics, dealer behavior, spreads.
- Generally not recorded in intra-day databases, inducing less accurate inferences.
- Increasing accessibility to intra-day databases provide opportunity to improve trade classification algorithms.

LEE AND READY (1991)

- I evaluate Lee and Ready (1991)'s algorithm to examine its performance as a simple benchmark.

LEE AND READY (1991)'S ALGORITHM

- A transaction is classified as buyer-initiated (seller-initiated) if its execution price is closer to the prevailing ask (bid) quote than to the bid (ask).
- Any transaction effectuated exactly at the mid-quote is classified as buyer-initiated (seller-initiated) if there is an uptick (downtick).
- If the book is empty or there is no price change, zero-upticks are buys, and zero-downticks are sells.

RAW DATA

TABLE 1: A Snapshot from the Transaction Records

TradeNo	Time	BuySell	OrderNo	Price	Quantity	CpiCoeff	Status
784	11:16:58	B	14360	93.075	500000	1	M
784	11:16:58	S	14061	93.075	500000	1	M
785	11:16:58	B	14360	93.1	1500000	1	M
785	11:16:58	S	14028	93.1	1500000	1	M
4383	13:42:44	B	14342	93.0	100000	1	M
4383	13:42:44	S	19469	93.0	100000	1	M

TABLE 2: A Snapshot from the Order Records

OrderNo	OrderTime	BuySell	Price	Quantity	Balance	AmendTime	LinkedOrderNo	Status
14300	11:13:19.726	S	93.325	5000000	5000000	11:55:15.860	0	W
14334	11:14:47.576	B	93.0	2000000	2000000	11:16:58.788	0	A
14342	11:15:11.627	B	93.0	2000000	1900000	13:47:39.949	0	W
14360	11:16:58.788	B	93.1	2000000	0	11:16:58.788	14334	M

STATISTICS OF DATASET

- Buyer- and seller-initiated trades are balanced across train and test set.
- On average, market conditions are similar; however, variation in spread is higher in train set.
- Intervals of traded quantity of bonds, and associated trade values are same across train and test set.

	Price	Quantity	Value	Spread (bps)	Buy	Sell
Train Set						
N	150,177	150,177	150,177	150,177	78,004	72,173
Mean	100.44	1,352,782	1,374,902	12.61		
Sd	3.46	103,738.3	131,094.5	6.98		
Max	105.01	1,488,808	1,562,281	22.28		
Min	95.95	1,193,193	1,192,324	3.41		
Test Set						
N	26,475	26,475	26,475	26,475	14,074	12,401
Mean	94.23	1,199,734	1,156,518	16.12		
Sd	0.59	55,872.46	52,014.68	2.34		
Max	94.64	1,243,777	1,194,210	18.07		
Min	93.55	1,136,885	1,097,175	13.53		

SETUP

- I employ a supervised learning approach, training on labeled data where trade direction is accurately signed using order history.
- I experiment 3 machine learning models to look for an effective model that classifies trade direction in Turkish bond market.
- Machine learning algorithms for the classification problem:
 - Logistic Regression
 - Random Forest
 - Neural Network

SETUP

- Train and test split in accordance with 80% – 20%
 - Train set includes 12 months of data from 2013-01 to 2013-12.
 - Test set contains first 3 months of 2014.
- Time-series cross validation
 - 7 Folds: 5 months train + 1 month validation with sliding window.




FIGURE 1: Time based cross validation

(Source: <https://towardsdatascience.com/time-based-cross-validation-d259b13d42b8>)

HYPER-PARAMETER TUNING

- Conducted a grid search
 - 54 candidate for each 7 folds, totalling 378 fits.

Model	Hyper-parameter	Grid
Logistic Regression	Penalty C	['l1', 'l2'] logspace(-4, 4, 5)
Random Forest	n_estimators	[10, 40, 70, 100]
	max_features	[6, 9, 12, 15, 18, 21]
Neural Network	hidden_layer_size	[(8),(8,4,2),(6,3),(12,6)]
	learning_rate_init	[0.1,0.01]
	alpha	[0.001, 0.01,0.1]

FEATURE SETS

Variable	{1}	{2}	{3}	{4}
Price	✓	✓	✓	✓
Price lag 1	✓	✓	✓	✓
Price lag 2	✓	✓	✓	✓
Price lag 3	✓	✓	✓	✓
Mean price of last 3 trade	✓	✓	✓	✓
Min price of last 3 trade	✓	✓	✓	✓
Max price of last 3 trade	✓	✓	✓	✓
Sd of last 3 trade prices	✓	✓	✓	✓
Trade day	✓	✓	✓	✓
Trade month	✓	✓	✓	✓
Trade year	✓	✓	✓	✓
Trade hour	✓	✓	✓	✓
Trade minute	✓	✓	✓	✓
Trade second	✓	✓	✓	✓
Weekday of trade	✓	✓	✓	✓
Best Ask Price	✓	✓	✓	✓
Best Bid Price	✓	✓	✓	✓
Mid Quote	✓	✓	✓	✓
Quantity	✓	✓	✓	✓
Volume	✓	✓	✓	✓
Volume lag 1		✓		✓
Volume lag 2		✓		✓
Volume lag 3		✓		✓
Mean volume of last 3 trade	✓		✓	
Sd of last 3 trade volumes	✓		✓	
Lee and Ready flag		✓		✓

RESULTS

- Best fitted model is Logistic regression with L1 filter in feature set 3 and 4, inducing the model yield a sparse model concentrated around LR prediction variable.

	Parameters	Test Score
Best Fits		
{1} - Random Forest	(max_features=6, n_estimators=100)	0.635
{2} - Logistic Regression	(penalty='l1', C=1)	0.581
{3} - Logistic Regression	(penalty='l1', C=0.01)	0.853
{4} - Logistic Regression	(penalty='l1', C=0.01)	0.853
Benchmarks		
Majority Voting	Vote=1 (Buy)	0.532
Lee and Ready Algorithm		0.849

CONCLUSION

- Machine learning experiments that use same price inputs with LR method, i.e. feature set 1 and 2, could not discover LR algorithm.
- Adding LR prediction as an input significantly improved the accuracy in test set.
- Best fitted model is Logistic regression with L1 filter in feature set 3 and 4, inducing the model yield a sparse model concentrated around LR prediction variable.
- Further investigation:
 - Expanding time horizon of the data over 20 years.
 - Additional to time series controls, adding controls for cross sectional variation, i.e. across bonds characteristics and market dynamics.
 - Increasing the number of models tested, e.g. boosting models like XGBoost.
 - Incorporating trade direction forecasts into a trade algorithm to control direction of the market & information flow.

THANK YOU!

TEAM 9

10:06-10:18

Prediction for NCAA Basketball Tournament

Tiange Li
tiange.li@mail.mcgill.ca

Task and Dataset

Dataset consists of two sections:

(1) each year's game result: 3 columns [season, winning team, losing team]

data size: from 2002 to 2019 * 64-68 games each year (1175 in total)

(2) each team's general performance and coach data each year (e.g. seed, fg3pct, pt_coach_season_wins)

data size: 40 features* 1175 games

Data transformation:

(1) Build an rnn baseline model based on data section 1 (team-level, supervised regression)

	2002wins	2003wins	2017wins	2018wins	2019wins
Team1						
Team2						
Team3.....						

An orange oval highlights the '2019wins' column, which is labeled 'to predict'.

Task and Dataset

Dataset consists of two sections:

(1) each year's game result: 3 columns [season, winning team, losing team]

data size: from 2002 to 2019 * 64~68 games each year

(2) each team's general performance and coach data each year (e.g. seed, fg3pct, pt_coach_season_wins)

data size: 40 features* 1175 games

Data transformation:


(2) Include both data sections, and build supervised binary classifier at season-game level

			seed1-seed2	fg3pct1-fg3pct2	coachwins1-coachwins2	Result
train	2002	Team1	Team2				1(win)
		Team1	Team3				0(lose)
				
	2017				
val →	2018						
test →	2019						

Baseline results

Data section 1 baseline: n=252

Method: LSTM, dropout, early stopping,gridsearchcv




For two teams in a game, the team with a higher RNN-predicted number of wins will be classified as the winning team

Prediction accuracy for season 2018: 77.61%

Prediction accuracy for season 2019: 77.78%

Data section 1&2 baseline: n=1175

Method: Two dense layers with dropout, early stopping,gridsearchcv






Training accuracy: 72.7%

Validation accuracy: 69%


Feature Engineering

1. Anomaly detection: isolation forest
 2. Genetic Algorithm: 5 features that can produce strongest offsprings
 3. Add Last years performance
 4. Remove redundant features



Model Results


Tuned models	baseline MLP	KNN	NB	SVC	MLP	CNN1D	Random Forest	Gradient Boost	CatBoost
Train AUC	72.7%	79.5%	71.8%	72.7%	86.4%	76.3%	94.5%	82.2%	83.5%
Val AUC	69%	71.6%	73.1%	71.6%	76.1%	77.6%	79.1%	79.1%	83.6%



Test accuracy: (based on CatBoost) 83.0%


Result Interpretation

Feature importance plot
(based on SHAP value)




Two examples:

Michigan vs LSU



Kentucky vs Auburn



TEAM 10
10:18-10:30



GROUP HOPE

Birce Adsanver

Motahhareh Safdari Shadlou

Post-disaster Damage Classification for Buildings

Introduction

-
- Pre-disaster information
 - Features

 - Post-disaster information
 - Labels (i.e., damage grade)



Problem Definition

- **Case 1**

- Building damage information (i.e., labels) is collected randomly.
- Imbalanced information for labels.

- **Case 2**

- Building damage information (i.e., labels) is collected based on clustering.
- Balanced information for labels.

- **Data Availability**

- 25%
- 50%
- 75%

} **Model Training**
Training Set + Validation Set

Data Set


■ DrivenData

- Richter's Predictor: Modeling Earthquake Damage
- 260601 data points
- 38 features (Categorical, binary, numerical)

■ Labels

- 1: Low Damage
- 2: Medium Damage
- 3: High Damage

Index	count_floors_pre_eq	age	area_percentage	height_percentage
count	260601	260601	260601	260601
mean	2.12972	26.535	8.01805	5.43437
std	0.727665	73.5659	4.39223	1.91842
min	1	0	1	2
25%	2	10	5	4
50%	2	15	7	5
75%	2	30	9	6
max	9	995	100	32



Approach

K Nearest Neighbors	Neural Network
Advantages	
Easy to implement for multi-class problems	Ability to learn complex relationships
No assumption is needed	Works well with large datasets
One hyper-parameter	Fast after training
Intuitive	Flexible
Simple	
Disadvantages	
Curse of dimensionality	Dependency on the training data
Prone to imbalanced data	Expensive Training
Prone to outliers	

Evaluation Setup

■ Steps

1. Data Analysis and Data Preparation

3. Creating the Training Set

- Case 1: Random
- Case 2: Clustering

4. Outlier Detection

IQR

5. Model Implementation and Hyper-Parameter Tuning

- Cross-validation (K=5)
- K-NN
 - K = [10, 20, ..., 200]
- NN
 - Neurons = [2,4,8,16]
 - Alpha = [0.001,0.01,0.1]
 - Learning Rate = [0.1,0.01,0.001]
 - Hidden Layers = [2,4]

6. Model Selection


- Baseline: 1-NN
- Performance Metrics
 - Computation Time (including training time)
 - Accuracy
 - True Positives for Damage Grade 3

7. Feature Selection

Results – Model Comparison

		1-NN			Neural Network				K-NN			
		Test		Test			Train	Test			Train	
		Test Accuracy	TP3	Comp. time (s)	Test Accuracy	TP3	Comp. time (s)	Comp. time (s)	Train Accuracy	TP3	Comp. time (s)	Comp. time (s)
Case 1	25%	55%	47%	124	63%	67%	4	40	58%	62%	135	278
	50%	56%	48%	278	63%	69%	0.9	138	59%	63%	147	1048
	75%	57%	50%	148	64%	75%	0.6	227	60%	63%	152	2522
Case 2	25%	55%	47%	125	63%	64%	0.8	50	59%	63%	134	245
	50%	56%	48%	180	63%	66%	1.1	125	60%	63%	182	2350
	75%	57%	50%	152	67%	69%	3	192	60%	65%	340	2678


Feature Selection




Results – Feature Selection

Neural Network					
		Before Feature Selection		After Feature Selection	
		Test		Test	
		Test Accuracy	TP3	Test Accuracy	TP3
Case 1	25%	63%	67%	60%	66%
	50%	63%	69%	62%	70%
	75%	64%	75%	65%	71%
Case 2	25%	63%	64%	64%	68%
	50%	63%	66%	65%	70%
	75%	67%	69%	66%	71%

Thank You For Your Attention!



Results



TEAM 11
10:30-10:42

What should you read next?



Building a book recommender

Monday December 6, 2021

Machine Learning 1(Prof. Golnoosh Farnadi)

Olivier Simard-Hanley, Yifan Yin, Jingyi Zou.

Background



Context:

- Popularity of ebooks and ereaders
- Pandemic : renewed interest in books and sharing reviews online
- Recommender System are crucial to user experience and may increase revenue



Experience:

- Goodbooks10k dataset (2017)
- 6M reviews, 53k users
- 3 files : Books, Ratings, Wishlist



Task :

- Build a recommender system for users with satisfactory performance

Performance

- **How will we evaluate** our models ?
 - **Ground truth = wishlist**
 - We will ask each model to predict 10 books

Performance

1. Precision

- # of wishlist books in the recommendations

2. Recall

- # of recommendations in the wishlist

3. Binary True positives

- If there is at least 1 accurate recommendation

4. Coverage


- What % of the 9958 books are we recommending ?



Data Exploration




Star ratings (1 to 5)



- Most ratings are high
- Could be a problem a recommender system (few examples of unwanted books)

Average rating per user



- Mean rating : 3.92
- Pretty high
- Idiosyncratic
 - we will adjust predictions according to individual rating habits

Process



Sampling:

10% of users (5300)


Then selected users with
130+ reviews
Total 1025 users

2 Baselines



3 models

Data structure



Baseline 1 : Linear regression

- Goal : predict rating on 5
- Feature engineering, Scaling, Train-test split
- Pros :
 - Regression is explainable
- Problems :
 - 10k+ covariates
 - Speed (sparse matrix > Pandas)
 - Everyone gets the same recommendation
 - Popular books have too much weight
 - Interactions have little impact

Baseline 2 : Popular Recommender

- Recommend 10 most popular books (highest average rating)
- **Pros:**
 - Very simple to implement
 - Could deal with the cold start problem of new users
- **Cons :**
 - **Same recommendations for every user**
 - New books would never be recommended



Better strategies

Tweaked linear Regression

- Adjust ratings according to genre preferences
- Build a **genre preference ratio**
- How likely is it that user **i** would read book **x** ?
- **New rating = predicted rating * ratio**
- For example :
 - Dune (Frank Herbert)
 - Predicted rating of **4.5** with linear regression
 - Ratio is **0.17**
 - New predicted rating is **0.77** ($4.5 * 0.17$)

Tweaked linear Regression

- **Problems :**
 - Long to run
 - Need to build an input matrix for every user
 - Preprocessing is slow (interactions...)

Content-based Filtering

- Compare a book to all other books
- **Text-based features:**
 - “author”, “book_genre” and “book_description”
- **Encode** content with TF-IDF vectorizer
- Build a **similarity matrix** for all pairs of books with cosine similarity

Prediction steps

1. Find a user's **highest rated book**
2. Pick **top 10 similar books**
3. Example: *The Great Dune Trilogy* :
 - a. ['Hunters of Dune (Dune Chronicles #7)',
 - b. 'Chapterhouse: Dune (Dune Chronicles #6)',
 - c. 'The Butlerian Jihad (Legends of Dune, #1)',
 - d. 'Heretics of Dune (Dune Chronicles #5)',
 - e. 'House Atreides (Prelude to Dune #1)',
 - f. ...]
4. Highly explainable

User-based Filtering

- Compare a user to other similar users
- Find vectors of common rated books
- Build a **similarity matrix** for all user pairs with cosine similarity
- Prediction:
 - For a user i , find k -most similar users
 - Pick top rated book of every similar user
- Pro: easy to explain
- Con: cold start problem on new user and new book

• • •

Results & Discussion

Final results

Models ↓	Averages →	Precision	Recall	Binary true positives	Coverage
1. Baseline- LinReg	0.01%	0.0001%	0.1%	7.1%	
2. Baseline- Popular	0.05%	0.00048%	0.49%	0.14%	
3. Tweaked LinReg	0.39%	0.00381%	3.71%	2.55%	
4. Content-based	0.66%	0.00652%	5.72%	37.37%	
5. User-based	0.75%	0.00733%	7.12%	2.82%	

Potential improvements

- Try hybrid model for solving cold start problem:
 - Popular recommending to new users
 - Content-based model to recommend new books
- Add novelty, serendipity and diversity
 - Recommend a random book in one of the recommendations
 - Might impair the evaluation scores.
- Other evaluation strategies:
 - We did not have time of rating
 - Would have been logical evaluation method
- Try complex models like neural networks

Thanks for listening



Building a book recommender

Monday December 6, 2021

Machine Learning 1(Prof. Golnoosh Farnadi)

Olivier Simard-Hanley, Yifan Yin, Jingyi Zou.

TEAM 12

10:42-10:54

Customer churn prediction with the hybrid model in the financial institution

Behdad Ehsani

Negar Aminpour

Task and Dataset

What is the task?

Hybrid model



combination of supervised learning and
unsupervised learning
(clustering and classification)



1. Increasing the accuracy of the classification models
2. Detecting more probable churners by grouping them


Dataset structure

- {
- Socio-demographic data (Gender – Nationality – Age - Tenure – Salary)
 - Account data (Account balance – Credit score)
 - Customer data(Active member? – Number of used bank services? - Has credit card?)


Label?



Churner or non-churner



Dataset is unbalanced



Dataset is balanced



Over-sampling technique

SMOTE MODEL

On TRAIN SET


Approach

Hybrid model

Hybrid models using unsupervised clustering

Customer ID
Feature 1
Feature 2
Feature 3
Feature 4
...
Feature n

Clustering




Customer ID
Feature 1
Feature 2
Feature 3
Feature 4
...
Feature n
Cluster label

Baseline model

Baseline model
Classification models

Customer ID
Feature 1
Feature 2
Feature 3
Feature 4
...
Feature n



Customer ID
Churner or not

Clustering: K-means
Classification: RF-XGB-LR-SVM

Why??

Is Categorizing customers impactful
on churn prediction?

Evaluation Setup

Hyper-parameter?


1. Supervised learning hyper-parameter
2. K (number of clusters) in K-means model

Which supervised learning model?

All of them should be tuned




Conducted by Holdout cross-validation



Results - validation

With Clustering - hybrid				
For k = 2				
models	LR	RF	XGB	SVM
accuracy	0.7497	0.8493	0.8343	0.8408
precision	0.3857	0.6289	0.5956	0.5928
recall	0.4165	0.6085	0.5436	0.6608
AUC	0.6868	0.8629	0.8442	-
For K = 3				
models	LR	RF	XGB	SVM
accuracy	0.7513	0.8529	0.8293	0.8383
precision	0.3894	0.6354	0.5789	0.5874
recall	0.4214	0.6259	0.5486	0.6534
AUC	0.6868	0.8673	0.8471	-
For K = 4				
models	LR	RF	XGB	SVM
accuracy	0.7492	0.8493	0.8328	0.8378
precision	0.3858	0.6289	0.5884	0.5873
recall	0.4214	0.6085	0.5561	0.6459
AUC	0.6868	0.8629	0.8432	-
For K = 5				
models	LR	RF	XGB	SVM
accuracy	0.7508	0.8498	0.8388	0.8328
precision	0.3875	0.6272	0.6076	0.5724
recall	0.4165	0.6209	0.5561	0.6608
AUC	0.6863	0.8624	0.8386	-

Without Clustering - Baseline				
models	LR	RF	XGB	SVM
accuracy	0.7513	0.8524	0.8303	0.8383
precision	0.3894	0.6366	0.5783	0.5867
recall	0.4214	0.616	0.5711	0.6584
AUC	0.6868	0.8653	0.8503	-




Improvement (in validation set)




But, Result in unseen
data (test data) is
important


K=5




K=4



K=3



K=2



Results - test

Selected hybrid model:

$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} k=3 \\ \text{RF} \\ \text{Max_depth}=10 \\ \text{n_estimators}=30 \end{array} \right.$

models	RF
accuracy	0.8300
precision	0.5738
recall	0.6796

baseline model:

$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{RF} \\ \text{Max_depth}=10 \\ \text{n_estimators}=80 \end{array} \right.$

models	RF
accuracy	0.8350
precision	0.5880
recall	0.6650




In test set, the hybrid model
does not outperform the
baseline model



New approach

Hybrid model - Second version

Classification on each cluster



Results - validation

With Clustering - hybrid				
For k = 2				
models	LR	RF	XGB	SVM
accuracy	0.7528	0.8413	0.8348	0.8303
precision	0.4264	0.5611	0.5586	0.6384
recall	0.3931	0.6148	0.5942	0.5689
For K = 3				
models	LR	RF	XGB	SVM
accuracy	0.7497	0.8378	0.8368	0.8328
precision	0.4364	0.5885	0.5835	0.6409
recall	0.3898	0.5975	0.5954	0.5749
For K = 4				
models	LR	RF	XGB	SVM
accuracy	0.7623	0.8408	0.8268	0.8308
precision	0.4389	0.5711	0.5511	0.6409
recall	0.4131	0.6107	0.5711	0.5698
For K = 5				
models	LR	RF	XGB	SVM
accuracy	0.7618	0.8418	0.8278	0.8303
precision	0.2968	0.5860	0.5586	0.611
recall	0.3802	0.6104	0.5729	0.5724

Without Clustering - Baseline				
models	LR	RF	XGB	SVM
accuracy	0.7513	0.8524	0.8303	0.8383
precision	0.3894	0.6366	0.5783	0.5867
recall	0.4214	0.616	0.5711	0.6584
AUC	0.6868	0.8653	0.8503	-



There is no improvement in validation set



But, Results in test set is important

Results - test

Selected hybrid model:

$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} k=5 \\ \text{RF} \\ \text{Max_depth} = 10,15,15,15,15 \text{ (for each cluster)} \\ \text{n_estimators} = 60,60,70,20,20 \text{ (for each cluster)} \end{array} \right.$

models	RF
accuracy	0.8440
precision	0.6699
recall	0.6106

baseline model:

$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{RF} \\ \text{Max_depth}=10 \\ \text{n_estimators}=80 \end{array} \right.$

models	RF
accuracy	0.8350
precision	0.5880
recall	0.6650



In test set, the hybrid model outperform the baseline model

TEAM 13
10:54-11:06

Goodreads Book Recommender System

Lin Lin, Gurpreet Singh, Lihua Pan

Task and Dataset

What is the task?




The task is to build a book recommender system based on techniques like cosine similarity and matrix factorization.

Statistics related to dataset?

Dataset size: (847700, 3)



Mean	Median	Mode	Variance	Standard Deviation
3.850897	4	4	0.964129	0.981901

Dataset



Pre-processing

- Books with no titles are excluded
- Sample 1,000 books and 10,000 users



Collaborative Filtering

Memory Based

- Item-based : Cosine Similarity
- User-based : Cosine Similarity

Algorithm	RMSE
SVD++	0.909
SVD	0.916
NMF	1.066
Random	1.318

Model Based

Matrix Factorization based models using Surprise library.
Attempted algorithm:

- SVD
- SVD++
- NMF
- Random Predictor (baseline)



Cross-validation results (3-fold)

Before hyper-parameter tuning

Collaborative Filtering – Model Based

Hyper-parameter tuning over cross-validation (Grid Search)

Algorithm	Parameter	Best	RMSE
SVD++	No. of factors	50, 75, 100	0.898
	No. of iterations	50, 75, 100	
	Learning rate	0.005, 0.01	
	Regularization	0.1, 0.5	
SVD	No. of factors	25, 50, 100	0.899
	No. of iterations	50, 75	
	Learning rate	0.005, 0.01, 0.05	
	Regularization	0.1, 0.5	
NMP	No. of factors	25, 50, 100	1.015
	No. of iterations	25, 50, 75	

Evaluation

Training and test data split ratio – 75:25

Algorithm	RMSE
SVD++	0.89
SVD	0.89
NMF	1.01
User-Based (Cosine)	1.89
Item-Based (Cosine)	3.72
Random (Baseline)	1.32

Results

Top 3 books recommended for a user using different algorithms

Algorithm	Model-Based (SVD)		User-Based (Cosine)	
	Book Names	Tags	Book Names	Tags
Top 3 books recommended	Heartburn	fiction; humour; audiobooks	The Art of Travel	paranormal; paranormal romance
	Bad Feminist	Feminism; non-fiction; essay	Desire Unchained (Shadow Lover)	paranormal romance; paranormal
	Essays in Love	philosophy; romance, love, psychology	Ecstasy Unveiled	paranormal romance; paranormal

TEAM 14

11:06-11:18

Predicting the subject of academic papers using ML

**Machine Learning for Large-Scale Data Analysis and Decision Making
(MATH80629A) – Fall 2021**

Timothée Moreau – 11222720

Vladimir Sonin – 11303253



Introduction and Data Investigation

Our goal in this project was to create reliable models that automate the task of multi-label text classification, using Naïve Bayes, K-Nearest Neighbors and Recurrent Neural Networks

Data at a glance

- > arXiv is a **research-sharing platform open to the public**, run by Cornell University since 1991
- > It now hosts nearly **2 million scholarly articles** in **8 STEM subject areas**
- > For the entry of each paper in the dataset we have the **following information**: ID, Submitter, Authors, Title, Comments, Journal-ref, DOI (Digital Object Identifier), Abstract, Categories and Versions

Focusing on the Abstract of the papers

- > The **abstract** is a short text that summarises the subject and findings of each paper. We will use this text to **train our models**
- > **Categories will be used as targets** for our predictions. To alleviate running time, we used only 4 out of the 8: **Math, Physics, Comp. Sci and Nuclear Theory**
- > There are 1.9 million different articles in our dataset, we have chosen to **work with a subset of 15,733 data points** because of limited resources. The training set contains 70% of the data, the validation set has 20% and the test set 10%



Cornell University

We gratefully acknowledge support from
the Simons Foundation and member institutions.

arXiv

Search...

All fields

Search

Help | Advanced Search

Distribution of Our Data



Among the chosen categories, the sample was taken randomly. Therefore the distribution of our sample should reflect the entire dataset

 Min: 5 words

 Max: 385 words

 Mean: 154 words

 Std. Dev: 66 words



Preprocessing the Data: Keeping What is Relevant for our Model

For our model to take into account only meaningful data, a certain amount of preprocessing was necessary:

1. Remove all special characters and numbers
2. Trim white spaces
3. Lowercase all letters
4. Remove stop words such "a", "the" and "is"
5. Strip accents
6. Pair co-occurring words using n_grams (1, 2)

Example

Before



After

```
In [87]: sample_data['abstract'].iloc[5]
Out[87]: ' We are conducting a transit survey of the open cluster M37 using the Megacam\ninstrument on the 6.5 m Multiple-Mirror Telescope.
We have obtained ~4500\nimages of this cluster over 18.5 nights and have achieved the precision\nnecessary to detect planets smaller than
Saturn. In this presentation we\nprovide an overview of the project, describe the ongoing data\nreduction/analysis and present some of our
preliminary results.\n'

In [88]: sample_data['abstract_tensor'].iloc[5]
Out[88]: 'conducting transit survey open cluster using megacam instrument multiple mirror telescope obtained images cluster nights achieved
precision necessary detect planets smaller saturn presentation provide overview project describe ongoing data reduction analysis present
preliminary results'
```

Model Choice – Training Bag of Words and TF-IDF Using Naive Bayes

Model Choice

- > We chose to use the Naive Bayes, KNN and RNN models for this multi-class text classification problem

Why Naive Bayes and KNN?


- > Suited for multi-class classification
- > Fast (NB) and simple to implement
- > KNN particularities:
 - > No training needed
 - > Large real time computation

Why RNN?

- > More sophisticated and usually has good accuracy
- > LSTM allows for a memory of the word sequences, keeping the meaning of sentences
- > A lot of options for hyperparameter tuning and architecture (Deep vs Wide)


Bag of Words

Validation Accuracy for Naive Bayes by Alpha in BOW



TF-IDF

Validation Accuracy for Naive Bayes by Alpha in TF_IDF



Alpha represents the smoothing parameter

Validation results for BOW:

	precision	recall	f1-score	support
astro-ph	0.611	0.912	0.732	1525
cs.CV	0.733	0.202	0.317	599
math.PR	0.306	0.151	0.202	397
nucl-th	0.326	0.203	0.250	311
accuracy			0.577	2832
macro avg	0.494	0.367	0.375	2832
weighted avg	0.563	0.577	0.517	2832

Validation results for TF_IDF:

	precision	recall	f1-score	support
astro-ph	0.603	0.936	0.734	1525
cs.CV	0.690	0.285	0.404	599
math.PR	0.349	0.096	0.150	397
nucl-th	0.370	0.129	0.191	311
accuracy			0.592	2832
macro avg	0.503	0.362	0.370	2832
weighted avg	0.560	0.592	0.523	2832

KNN and RNN Hyperparameter Tuning

KNN

Hyperparameters:

Training 500 training and 100 validation
Average Experiment time ~4 Hour/K

K-Neighbors	Validation Accuracy
1	0.79
3	0.81
5	0.79
7	0.78


Wider Model ↑

RNN

Hyperparameters:

1000 Abstracts in training set, 200 abstracts in validation set, 10 Epochs, batch size=32
Average Experiment time ~1 Hour
First Activation layer = 'relu'; Last Activation = 'softmax'
*Other hyperparameters have been tested with little variability of accuracy (learning rate, batch size, # nodes etc.)

Layer 1	Layer 2	Layer 3	Train Accuracy	Validation Accuracy
LSTM(256)	Dense(64,4)		0.75	0.46
LSTM(128)	Dense(32,4)		0.72	0.53
LSTM(128)	LSTM(64)	Dense(32, 4)	0.71	0.54
LSTM(128)	Dense(64,4)		0.67	0.57
LSTM(128)	Dense(64,4, Dropout =0.1)		0.65	0.51
LSTM(64)	Dense(32,4)		0.63	0.56
LSTM(128)	Dense(64,4, Dropout =0.5)		0.55	0.45



Deeper Model →


Accuracy of Chosen Model Over 20 Epochs

Architecture: 1st Layer: LSTM(128), 2nd Layer: Dense(64,4)

Number of training abstracts: 11,013

Number of validation abstracts: 3,147

13 Epochs was found to be ideal for our given model



Results – Which Model Gave the Best Accuracy for our Test Set?

Models	Training	Validation	Test
Baseline (Astro-Physics)	55.5%	53.8%	55.3%
BOW Naïve Bayes	98.8%	57.7%	47.2%
TF-IDF Naïve Bayes	99.3%	59.2%	51.1%
KNN	-	81%	88%
RNN	67%	57%	60.4%

- > Both Naive Bayes method have very high training accuracy, a somewhat good validation accuracy relative to other tests but a **very poor performance on the test set**. This is a sign of **overfitting** to the training data
- > **RNN performs better** than Naive Bayes and Baseline, but its **accuracy remains modest**
- > The RNN architecture **shows that deeper and wider models aren't always the best**. We need to strike the right balance
- > **KNN performs the best** of all models, both in terms of validation and test accuracy

Difficulties encountered and future improvements

Technical difficulties

- > Not properly inspecting the quality of inputs to our model, and getting very bad accuracy initially
- > Having abstracts with very similar subjects, making it hard to distinguish between them
- > Setting up software for GPU computation to increase speed of computations
- > Understanding hardware bottlenecks

Improvements


- > Extend classification problem to all 8 categories, possibly more for other similar problems
- > Do more hyper-parameter tuning and additional grid searches to find optimal model
- > Allocate more time in preprocessing (increase StopWord list)
- > Implement parallel computing to reduce running time
- > Try additional RNN architectures or BERT

Conclusion

Questions and Answers

TEAM 15

11:18-11:30



Predicting User Unsubscribing Behavior: A Multimodal ML Approach

Team Neural Niche:

Syed-Muhammad-Usman Tayyab, Mitchell Karkheck, Yinte Zhang

Problem Statement:

UNSUBSCRIBE



- Predict whether mobile financial app users will UNSUBSCRIBE
- Through multiple ML predictive models
- Compare the performance


- Why? Assist in building guidelines to minimize the unsubscribing rate and maximize customer retention



Research Questions

- **RQ1:** Which features of user behaviors are most important in predicting the label? (i.e. unsubscribe/stay subscribed)
- **RQ2:** Which Model performs better in predicting the label?

- 
- Task (T)
 - Binary Classification
 - 1 if unsubscribe, 0 otherwise
 - Performance measure (P)
 - ROC-AUC
 - Experience
 - Supervised Learning
 - use >20 features and 1 label to fit a model
 - use the model to make predictions on labelled test set




Data

- Almost 27000 data points
- 29 features including Age, Credit Score, Housing Type, etc...
 - categorical
 - numerical
 - binary
- Target Variable: Unsubscribing Rate (churn)

Data: Features

- ❖ user
- ❖ churn - (target)
- ❖ age
- ❖ housing
- ❖ credit_score
- ❖ deposits
- ❖ withdrawal
- ❖ purchase_partners
- ❖ purchases
- ❖ cc_taken
- ❖ cc_disliked
- ❖ cc_liked
- ❖ cc_application_begin
- ❖ app_downloaded
- ❖ web_user
- ❖ app_web_user

- ❖ android_user
- ❖ registered_phones
- ❖ payment_types
- ❖ waiting_4_loan
- ❖ cancelled_loan
- ❖ recieived_loan
- ❖ rejected_loan
- ❖ zodiac_sign
- ❖ left_for_two_month_plus
- ❖ left_for_one_month
- ❖ rewards_earned
- ❖ reward_rate
- ❖ is_referred



Models


1. Logistic Regression
2. Support Vector Machine
3. AdaBoost Classifier
4. XGBoost Classifier
5. Light GBM Decision Tree

} Deleted two variables b/c
too many NAs

} Kept all variables

Logistic Regression Classifier

- Most commonly used when the target variable is binary.
 - output: $P(y=1 | X)$
- Loss Function
 - Logistic Loss
- Regularization
 - L1 and L2 Regularization
- Simple and Traditional classification model




$$Cost(h_{\theta}(x), y) = -y \log(h_{\theta}(x)) - (1 - y) \log(1 - h_{\theta}(x))$$


Support Vector Machine

- Linear Classifier
- Trade-off between maximizing the margin and minimizing the training error
- Objective: maximize the margin, while softly penalizing outliers
- The penalty term **C** controls the strength of this penalty, and acts as an inverse regularization parameter
- Can map the input data to a higher dimensional space to assign a decision boundary

$$\min_w C \sum_{n=1}^N \mathcal{E}_n + 0.5 \|w\|^2$$



Adaboost Classifier



Hyperparameters:

1. Number of weak learners
2. Depth of weak learners
3. Learning rate


Note: trade-off between 1 and 3

Loss function:

$$L = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N e^{-y_i f(x_i)}$$

XGBoost: Extreme Gradient Boosting

- ❖ Tree based algorithm, boosting weak learners using the gradient descent architecture
- ❖ XGBoost improves on the basic GBM framework by optimizing and enhancing the algorithm
- ❖ System optimization is achieved through parallelization, tree pruning and hardware optimization
- ❖ Algorithmic enhancements include regularization, sparsity awareness, weighted quantile sketches and cross-validation




XGBoost: Hyperparameters

- ❖ **Max Depth:** Maximum depth of a tree. Increasing makes model more complex and likely to overfit
- ❖ **Min child weight:** Minimum sum of instance weights needed in a child. Corresponds to minimum number of instances needed per node.
- ❖ **Subsample:** Subsample ratio of the training instances
- ❖ **colsample_bytree:** subsample ratio of columns when selecting each tree
- ❖ **ETA:** Learning Rate or step size shrinkage used in update to prevent overfitting
- ❖ Parameters were tuned to maximize validation AUC

Light GBM

- a fast, distributed, high-performance gradient boosting framework based on decision tree algorithm
- Similar to XGB, but tree growth is leaf-wise - chooses the split point that has the largest gain



- Objectives
 - Binary classification --- Binary log loss function

Light GBM Hyperparameters

- For best fit
 - **Max depth:** It specifies the maximum depth or level up to which tree can grow. It effects model complexity.
 - **Number of leaves:** the number of leaves to be formed in a tree. Number of leaves must be set to a smaller value otherwise it may lead to overfitting.
 - **Min data in leaf :** It is also one of the important parameters in dealing with overfitting. Setting its value smaller may cause overfitting and hence must be set accordingly.
- For faster speed
 - **Bagging fraction:** Is used to perform bagging for faster results
 - **Feature fraction:** Set fraction of the features to be used at each iteration



Results

Logistic Regression Classifier

Training Results

ACCURACY SCORE: = 0.6499


ROC-AUC SCORE: = 0.6268

Test Results

ACCURACY SCORE: = 0.6420

ROC-AUC SCORE: = 0.6186

Confusion Matrix (Test Accuracy results)



Support Vector Machine

Training Results

ACCURACY SCORE: = 0.7202


ROC-AUC SCORE: = 0.6966

Test Results

ACCURACY SCORE: = 0.6641

ROC-AUC SCORE: = 0.6387

Confusion Matrix (Test Accuracy results)



AdaBoost Classifier

Training Results

ACCURACY SCORE: = 0.7715


ROC-AUC SCORE: = 0.7569

Test Results

ACCURACY SCORE: = 0.7006


ROC-AUC SCORE: = 0.6820

Confusion Matrix (Test Accuracy results)



Predicted Values

AdaBoost Classifier



XGBoost Classifier

Training Results


ROC-AUC SCORE: = 0.9382

Validation Results

ROC-AUC SCORE: = 0.77202

Test Results

ROC-AUC SCORE: = 0.7845



Light GBM Decision Tree

Training Results

Avg precision score = 0.8076

ROC-AUC SCORE = 0.8587

Test Results


Avg precision score = 0.7123

ROC-AUC SCORE = 0.7774

Confusion Matrix (Test Accuracy results)




Features importance (LightGBM)



Model Comparison

Model	With Default settings ROC-AUC SCORE		With Hyperparameter tuning/ regularization ROC-AUC SCORE		ROC-AUC SCORE with Additional Features	
	Train	Test	Train	Test	Train	Test
Logistic Regression	0.6274	0.6182	0.6268	0.6186	--	--
Support Vector Machine	0.6966	0.6387	0.6966	0.6387	--	--
AdaBoost Classifier	0.6599	0.6471	0.7569	0.6820	0.7759	0.7004
XGBoost Classifier	0.7773	0.7481	0.90554	0.76355	0.9382	0.7845
Light GBM Decision Tree	0.7426	0.6888	0.8290	0.7584	0.8587	0.7774

Model Comparison



Conclusions

- All 5 models worked better than the random baseline of 50%
- Tree-base boosting Models performed considerably better than the conventional classification models
- By tuning the modern models, their performance can be considerably improved, but they have a tendency to overfit the training data.
- All models have similar feature importance
 - credit score
 - rewards earned
 - purchases partners