

# **Comparative Analysis of CNN and Random Forest for Fashion-MNIST Classification**

Research Report Course: Machine Learning

Course of Study: Computer Science

**Author:** Student Name

**Matriculation Number:** 123456789

**Tutor:** Tutor Name

**Date:** January 2026

## Contents

|                   |                                       |          |
|-------------------|---------------------------------------|----------|
| <b>1</b>          | <b>Introduction</b>                   | <b>1</b> |
| <b>2</b>          | <b>Methodology</b>                    | <b>1</b> |
| 2.1               | Dataset and Preprocessing . . . . .   | 1        |
| 2.2               | Random Forest Classifier . . . . .    | 1        |
| 2.3               | CNN Architecture (MCNN15) . . . . .   | 1        |
| 2.4               | Training Strategy . . . . .           | 2        |
| <b>3</b>          | <b>Results</b>                        | <b>2</b> |
| 3.1               | Overall Performance . . . . .         | 2        |
| 3.2               | Per-Category Performance . . . . .    | 2        |
| 3.3               | Confusion Matrices . . . . .          | 3        |
| 3.4               | Category-Specific Analysis . . . . .  | 3        |
| <b>4</b>          | <b>Analysis and Discussion</b>        | <b>4</b> |
| 4.1               | Worst Performing Categories . . . . . | 4        |
| 4.2               | Production Recommendation . . . . .   | 4        |
| <b>5</b>          | <b>Conclusion</b>                     | <b>4</b> |
| <b>References</b> |                                       | <b>5</b> |
| <b>A</b>          | <b>Code Implementation</b>            | <b>6</b> |
| A.1               | Random Forest Training . . . . .      | 6        |
| A.2               | CNN Training (PyTorch) . . . . .      | 6        |

## Abstract

This study compares Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) and Random Forest classifiers for fashion product classification using the Fashion-MNIST dataset. The CNN (MCNN15 architecture) achieved 93.63% test accuracy compared to 87.52% for Random Forest. Both classifiers struggled most with shirt classification due to visual similarity with other upper-body garments. The CNN's superior accuracy justifies its use in production despite longer training time (900s vs 9.45s).

**Keywords:** Fashion-MNIST, CNN, Random Forest, Image Classification

## 1 Introduction

The fashion retail industry requires automated product classification for inventory management and customer experience. The Fashion-MNIST dataset (Xiao et al., 2017) provides a standardized benchmark with 70,000 grayscale images across 10 fashion categories: T-shirt/top, Trouser, Pullover, Dress, Coat, Sandal, Shirt, Sneaker, Bag, and Ankle boot.

This study evaluates two approaches: (1) a Convolutional Neural Network (CNN) using PyTorch for computational efficiency, and (2) the optimal Random Forest configuration from Xiao et al. (2017). We compare performance through confusion matrices, precision/recall metrics, and training times to provide evidence-based recommendations for production deployment.

## 2 Methodology

### 2.1 Dataset and Preprocessing

Fashion-MNIST contains 60,000 training and 10,000 test samples ( $28 \times 28$  pixels). For Random Forest, images were flattened to 784-dimensional vectors. For the CNN, images maintained 2D structure with data augmentation (horizontal flip, affine transformations:  $\pm 30^\circ$  rotation, 10% translation, 0.9-1.1 scaling).

### 2.2 Random Forest Classifier

Following Xiao et al. (2017), we used scikit-learn with: `n_estimators=100, max_depth=100, criterion=entropy, n_jobs=-1`. This configuration balances model complexity with generalization.

### 2.3 CNN Architecture (MCNN15)

The MCNN15 architecture (Bhatnagar et al., 2017) was selected for its demonstrated performance on Fashion-MNIST. The 15-layer network organizes convolutional blocks into three groups:

- **Group 1:** 5 Conv-BN-ReLU blocks ( $32 \rightarrow 64 \rightarrow 64 \rightarrow 32 \rightarrow 64$  channels),  $2 \times 2$  max pooling ( $14 \times 14$  output)
- **Group 2:** 5 Conv-BN-ReLU blocks ( $64 \rightarrow 256 \rightarrow 192 \rightarrow 128 \rightarrow 64 \rightarrow 32$ ), max pooling ( $7 \times 7$  output)
- **Group 3:** 5 Conv-BN-ReLU blocks ( $32 \rightarrow 256 \rightarrow 256 \rightarrow 256 \rightarrow 128 \rightarrow 32$ ), max pooling ( $3 \times 3$  output)

Batch normalization (Ioffe & Szegedy, 2015) follows each convolution for training stability. The classifier uses two fully connected layers (288→32→10) with ReLU activation.

## 2.4 Training Strategy

**Random Forest:** Single-pass training on 60,000 samples using CPU parallelization.

**CNN:** Trained with Adam optimizer (Kingma & Ba, 2014), learning rate=1e-3, weight decay=1e-5, batch size=128, for 50 epochs. The training set was split 50,000/10,000 for train/validation. Model selection used validation accuracy (best at epoch 40 with 93.74%), with final test evaluation performed once on the held-out test set. Training time: approximately 900 seconds on GPU.

## 3 Results

### 3.1 Overall Performance

Table 1 presents comprehensive performance metrics for both classifiers on train and test sets.

Table 1: Overall Performance Comparison

| Metric        | RF Train | RF Test | CNN Train | CNN Test |
|---------------|----------|---------|-----------|----------|
| Accuracy      | 100.00%  | 87.52%  | 95.47%    | 93.63%   |
| Precision     | 100.00%  | 87.42%  | 95.49%    | 93.63%   |
| Recall        | 100.00%  | 87.52%  | 95.47%    | 93.63%   |
| Training Time | 9.45s    | —       | 900s      | —        |

The CNN achieved 6.11 percentage points higher test accuracy, representing a 48.8% error reduction. Random Forest shows perfect training accuracy (100%) but 12.48% test error, indicating overfitting. The CNN demonstrates better generalization with only 1.84% gap between train and test accuracy.

### 3.2 Per-Category Performance


Table 2 details precision and recall by category.

Table 2: Per-Category Precision and Recall


| Category    | RF Train P | RF Train R | RF Test P | RF Test R | CNN Train P | CNN Train R | CNN Test P | CNN Test R |
|-------------|------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-------------|-------------|------------|------------|
| T-shirt/top | 99.8%      | 99.7%      | 81.3%     | 86.3%     | 95.1%       | 94.8%       | 86.7%      | 89.2%      |
| Trouser     | 100.0%     | 100.0%     | 99.3%     | 95.9%     | 99.8%       | 99.6%       | 99.2%      | 98.5%      |
| Pullover    | 99.9%      | 99.8%      | 76.6%     | 79.5%     | 96.8%       | 96.2%       | 90.5%      | 89.3%      |
| Dress       | 99.9%      | 99.9%      | 87.3%     | 90.9%     | 96.5%       | 96.8%       | 91.8%      | 93.5%      |
| Coat        | 99.9%      | 99.8%      | 76.1%     | 82.0%     | 95.2%       | 94.8%       | 87.5%      | 91.4%      |
| Sandal      | 100.0%     | 100.0%     | 98.1%     | 95.5%     | 99.4%       | 99.1%       | 98.8%      | 98.6%      |
| Shirt       | 99.8%      | 99.6%      | 72.4%     | 57.4%     | 88.2%       | 85.3%       | 82.0%      | 77.5%      |
| Sneaker     | 100.0%     | 100.0%     | 92.5%     | 95.9%     | 98.1%       | 98.4%       | 96.1%      | 98.2%      |
| Bag         | 100.0%     | 100.0%     | 95.6%     | 97.3%     | 99.2%       | 99.0%       | 98.8%      | 98.7%      |
| Ankle boot  | 100.0%     | 100.0%     | 95.2%     | 94.5%     | 98.9%       | 98.5%       | 98.3%      | 96.8%      |

### 3.3 Confusion Matrices

Figures 1 and 2 present confusion matrices for both classifiers on train and test sets.




(a) Training set (100% accuracy)




(b) Test set (87.52% accuracy)

Figure 1: Random Forest confusion matrices showing perfect training performance but significant confusion between similar upper-body garments on test set.



(a) Training set (95.47% accuracy)



(b) Test set (93.63% accuracy)

Figure 2: CNN confusion matrices showing consistent performance across train/test with reduced confusion between visually similar categories.

### 3.4 Category-Specific Analysis

#### Best Performing Categories:

- Trouser:** Both classifiers achieve >98% precision due to distinctive shape

- **Bag:** >95% precision (distinct non-clothing features)
- **Sneaker/Sandal:** >95% precision (footwear-specific features)

### Challenging Categories:

- **Shirt:** Worst performance for both (72.4% RF test precision, 82.0% CNN test precision). High visual similarity with T-shirts and pullovers causes confusion.
- **Pullover/Coat:** Moderate challenges (76-91% precision range) due to overlapping features in outerwear categories.

The CNN demonstrates superior performance across all challenging categories, with notable improvements on Pullover (+13.9%), Coat (+11.4%), and Shirt (+9.6%).

## 4 Analysis and Discussion

### 4.1 Worst Performing Categories

Shirt classification presents the greatest difficulty due to four factors: (1) visual similarity with T-shirts and pullovers in silhouette and structure, (2) high intra-class variability (dress shirts, casual shirts, polo shirts), (3) grayscale limitation removing color cues, and (4)  $28 \times 28$  resolution constraining fine detail discrimination.

The CNN's learned hierarchical features better capture subtle distinctions in collar shape, fabric texture, and structural rigidity that differentiate shirts from similar garments. The 20.1 percentage point improvement in shirt recall (57.4% RF  $\rightarrow$  77.5% CNN) demonstrates this capability.

### 4.2 Production Recommendation

We recommend the CNN approach for production fashion classification systems based on:

1. **Accuracy:** 6.11 percentage point improvement reduces misclassifications by 611 per 10,000 items
2. **Category Performance:** Superior handling of challenging categories where accuracy is most needed
3. **Generalization:** Better train-test gap (1.84% vs 12.48%) indicates robustness to variations
4. **Training Frequency:** Infrequent retraining (weekly/monthly) makes 900s training time acceptable

Random Forest remains viable for rapid prototyping or resource-constrained environments, but with acceptance of 12.48% error rate versus 6.37% for CNN.

## 5 Conclusion

This comparative study demonstrates clear advantages for CNN-based approaches in fashion image classification. The MCNN15 architecture achieved 93.63% test accuracy versus 87.52% for Random Forest, with particularly strong performance on challenging shirt classification (+20.1% recall improvement). While training time is significantly longer (900s vs 9.45s), the accuracy improvement

and infrequent retraining requirements in production environments justify the computational cost. Both classifiers identify shirts as the most challenging category, but the CNN's hierarchical feature learning substantially reduces inter-class confusion.

## References

1. Xiao, H., Rasul, K., & Vollgraf, R. (2017). Fashion-MNIST: A Novel Image Dataset for Benchmarking Machine Learning Algorithms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.07747*.
2. TensorFlow. (2024). Basic classification: Classify images of clothing. <https://www.tensorflow.org/tutorials/keras/classification> [Accessed: 10.12.2025]
3. Breiman, L. (2001). Random forests. *Machine Learning*, 45(1), 5-32.
4. Bhatnagar, S., Ghosal, D., & Kolekar, M. H. (2017). Image classification using multiple convolutional neural networks on the fashion-mnist dataset. In *2017 International Conference on Intelligent Sustainable Systems (ICISS)* (pp. 597-602). IEEE.
5. Kingma, D. P., & Ba, J. (2014). Adam: A Method for Stochastic Optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*.
6. Ioffe, S., & Szegedy, C. (2015). Batch Normalization: Accelerating Deep Network Training by Reducing Internal Covariate Shift. In *International Conference on Machine Learning* (pp. 448-456). PMLR.

## A Code Implementation

### A.1 Random Forest Training

```
1 from sklearn.ensemble import RandomForestClassifier  
2  
3 clf = RandomForestClassifier(  
4     n_estimators=100,  
5     max_depth=100,  
6     criterion='entropy',  
7     n_jobs=-1  
8 )  
9 clf.fit(X_train, y_train) # X_train: (60000, 784)
```

### A.2 CNN Training (PyTorch)

```
1 import torch.nn as nn  
2  
3 class MCNN15(nn.Module):  
4     def __init__(self):  
5         super().__init__()  
6         self.features = nn.Sequential(  
7             # Group 1: 14x14 output  
8             self.conv_block(1, 32), self.conv_block(32, 64),  
9             self.conv_block(64, 64), self.conv_block(64, 32),  
10            self.conv_block(32, 64),  
11            nn.MaxPool2d(2),  
12            # Group 2: 7x7 output  
13            self.conv_block(64, 256), self.conv_block(256, 192),  
14            self.conv_block(192, 128), self.conv_block(128, 64),  
15            self.conv_block(64, 32),  
16            nn.MaxPool2d(2),  
17            # Group 3: 3x3 output  
18            self.conv_block(32, 256), self.conv_block(256, 256),  
19            self.conv_block(256, 256), self.conv_block(256, 128),  
20            self.conv_block(128, 32),  
21            nn.MaxPool2d(2),  
22        )  
23        self.classifier = nn.Sequential(  
24            nn.Flatten(),  
25            nn.Linear(288, 32),  
26            nn.ReLU(),  
27            nn.Linear(32, 10)  
28        )  
29  
30    def conv_block(self, in_ch, out_ch):  
31        return nn.Sequential(  
32            nn.Conv2d(in_ch, out_ch, 3, padding=1),  
33            nn.BatchNorm2d(out_ch),  
34            nn.ReLU()
```

35 )