Team 6 - Jonathan Zaremba, Tyler Kramer, Alex Holland, Maura Glynn April 31, 2020

## Lab 4 Write-Up

## Exercise 1

1. Execute the code above. Based on the results, rank the models from "most underfit" to "most overfit".

Having executed the code, we found that the most underfit model was fit\_caps, followed by fit\_selected, fit\_additive, and fit\_over — in that order.

2. Re-run the code above with 100 folds and a different seed. Does your conclusion change?

The code was re-run using 100 folds (K = 100 in the cv.glm function) and a different seed (seed set to 21). The conclusion does not change: the most underfit model was  $fit\_caps$ , followed by  $fit\_selected$ ,  $fit\_additive$ , and  $fit\_over$  — in that order.

3. Generate four confusion matrices for each of the four models fit in Part 1.

```
actual
            predicted nonspam spam
              nonspam 2022 1066
                        162 351
 Fit_caps:
                      actual
               predicted nonspam spam
                nonspam 2073 615
                spam
Fit selected:
                      actual
              predicted nonspam spam
                nonspam 2057 157
                spam
                          127 1260
Fit additive: >
               actual
             predicted nonspam spam
              nonspam 1725 103
                        459 1314
              spam
```

4. Which is the best model? Write 2 paragraphs justifying your decision. You must mention (a) the overall accuracy of each model; and (b) whether some errors are better or worse than others, and you must use the terms specificity and sensitivity. For (b) think carefully... misclassified email is a pain in the butt for users!

The fit\_caps model predicted 162 false positives (positive meaning it was flagged as spam) and 1066 false negatives. The fit\_selected model predicted 111 false positives and 615 false negatives. The fit\_additive model predicted 127 false positives and 157 false negatives. The fit\_over model predicted 459 false positives and 103 false negatives. In this situation, we believe false positives (non-spam email misclassified as spam) is a worse error than false negatives — this is because it can be annoying and costly for important messages to get "lost" in a spam folder. Since this is the case, a model with high sensitivity is more important than a model with high specificity.

Considering that misclassified email is a pain in the butt for users

## Exercise 2

In our fit\_education model, the educationtertiary and educationsecondary are both positive meaning that a person having gotten a college degree or above made it more likely that they would deposit money with the bank, while a negative educationunkown means a person whose education was unknown is more likely to not have made a deposit.

In our fit\_selected model, the education variables all have the same sign as in the previous model. The balance coefficient is near zero indicating people with small balances have roughly the same likelihood of making a deposit as people with large balances. The housingyes coefficient is negative to a larger degree indicating that people with housing were less likely to make a deposit. For the month coefficients, it appears that observations taking place in March, September, October, and December were most likely to yield a positive result.

Describing every single coefficient in our fit\_over model would take several pages, but essentially they describe the interactions between each variable, each level of education, and y.