Case 4 Customer Retention

# Executive Summary

*Brief introduction of problem. Summarizes key findings. Summarizes insights behind key findings.*

# Problem

*Clear description of the problem, from an application and theoretical point of view. Outlines the report.*

# Lit. Review

*Discusses and cites existing works in the theoretical and application realm.*

The research we found evaluates ten machine-learning models, including Support Vector Machines (SVM) and Random Forest, to assess their effectiveness in predicting customer churn. The results show significant differences in performance among these models. Random Forest achieved the highest accuracy at approximately 96%, showing how good it is at handling complex datasets. SVM also performed well, with an accuracy rate of around 94%, making it a strong candidate for churn prediction. Simpler models like Logistic Regression showed lower accuracy, around 86%, suggesting limitations in capturing complex relationships within the data. These findings emphasize the importance of selecting appropriate models based on the complexity of the problem and the nature of the dataset.

Link https://thesai.org/Publications/ViewPaper?Volume=9&Issue=2&Code=ijacsa&SerialNo=38

# Methods

*Discusses types of variables, sample size, and sampling techniques (if any). Discusses the model(s) and its assumptions and limitations.*

## Logistic

## SVM – double check model

## Our SVM model was trained using a radial basis function (RBF) kernel, with hyperparameters tuned over a range of values for gamma (0.01 to 0.1) and cost (0.1 to 1). The optimal parameters identified were gamma = 0.1 and cost = 0.6, which were used to train the final model. The model resulted in 123 support vectors, with a balanced representation from both classes.

## Model performance was evaluated using a confusion matrix and the mean average precision (MAP). The confusion matrix revealed that the model correctly classified 76 observations (37 from class 0 and 39 from class 1) while misclassifying 22 instances. However, the MAP score was low at 0.0017, suggesting that the model faced challenges in ranking and predicting outcomes effectively.

## Decision Trees

## 

## Random Forest

# Data

*Discusses how data was handled, i.e. cleaned and preprocessed. Discusses distributions, correlations, etc.*

Our dataset included 15 variables and 500 observations, with no missing values or NA's. While we observed a number of zeroes, these were correlated with the acquisition column, which indicates whether a prospect was acquired. As part of the data cleaning process, we looked into the correlations (graph below) among these variables and removed those with the highest correlation to reduce multicollinearity. Also, we removed one of the customer ID fields. The variables removed from the dataset include *customer, duration, profit, ret\_exp, ret\_exp\_sq, freq, freq\_sq, crossbuy, and sow*. No additional data cleaning was necessary.

## Correlation Plot
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# Results

*Presents and discusses the results from model(s). Discusses relationships between covariates and response, if possible, and provides deep insights behind relationships in the context of the application.*

\*\*Should we add a table with the MAP for each model?\*\*

Evaluate models – SVM sucked OR I did it wrong

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Metric** | **Logistic** | **SVM** | **Random Forest** | **Decision Trees** |
| Mean Average Precision |  | 0.0017 |  |  |

# Conclusions

*Concludes with a summary of the aim and results. Discusses alternative methods that can be used.*