

ECGR 5105 Homework 7: CNNs and ResNet-Based CNNs

Lauren Bourque (Student ID: 801264851)

December 12, 2023

GitHub Link

[Click here to view the code](#)

Problem 1a.

Training Time, Training Loss, and Evaluation Accuracy Results:

The values for the fully connected network from problem 2a of Homework 6 can be seen below:

The total training time was 8241 seconds or 2.289 hours.

The training loss was 0.5180834466234192 at epoch 291.

The final evaluation accuracy was 49.72%, but the best recorded accuracy was 50.49%

The F1 score was found to be 0.4902.

The confusion matrix can be seen below:

Figure 1: Fully Connected Network Confusion Matrix

```
Final Confusion Matrix:
[[584  35  64  29  37  21  22  35 122  51]
 [ 42 566  38  42  15  24  33  36  67 137]
 [ 89  25 386 100 130  72  89  74  20  15]
 [ 36  23  97 322  68 195 124  53  35  47]
 [ 50   9 158  71 417  64 103  79  30  19]
 [ 36  18  97 192  87 374  65  74  34  23]
 [ 18  17 112 105 101  73 530  11  15  18]
 [ 62  23  77  70  83  77  27 522  19  40]
 [ 83  51  26  34  27  37   9  14 672  47]
 [ 71 164  15  25  21  22  35  44  72 531]]
```

The values for the CNN can be seen below:

The total training time was 4656.42 seconds or 1.293 hours. (Note: the network was run on a GPU while the last assignment was run on a CPU).

The training loss was 0.020175681252966222 at epoch 291.

The final evaluation accuracy was 69.13%.

The F1 score was found to be 0.6899.

The confusion matrix can be seen below:

Figure 2: CNN Confusion Matrix

```
Final Confusion Matrix:
[[744 17 47 19 20 7 15 10 82 39]
 [ 25 793 12 8 3 6 13 6 34 100]
 [ 65 12 542 63 91 77 87 37 10 16]
 [ 26 12 83 507 60 168 68 33 19 24]
 [ 23 4 78 70 607 56 66 78 14 4]
 [ 14 4 39 165 42 628 29 55 18 6]
 [ 5 10 38 55 35 37 800 8 9 3]
 [ 15 7 25 48 58 78 11 736 6 16]
 [ 57 49 11 20 8 5 4 6 812 28]
 [ 35 97 8 16 3 17 9 26 45 744]]
```

These results show that a CNN provides a better training loss, accuracy, and F1 score than an equivalent fully connected network. The training time also proved to be better, though it needs to be taken into account that the CNN model was run on a GPU while the model from the last assignment was run on a CPU.

Problem 1b.

Training Time, Training Loss, and Evaluation Accuracy Results:

The values for a CNN with an extra layer can be seen below:

The total training time was 4147.21 seconds or 1.152 hours.

The training loss was 0.0076383733139385275 at epoch 291.

The final evaluation accuracy was 67.99%.

The F1 score was found to be 0.6779.

The confusion matrix can be seen below:

Figure 3: Fully Connected Network with an Extra Layer Confusion Matrix

```
Final Confusion Matrix:
[[770 21 43 19 15 8 10 7 70 37]
 [ 27 799 11 10 2 7 10 8 26 100]
 [ 78 7 521 69 104 70 67 48 17 19]
 [ 32 10 65 466 63 191 88 42 18 25]
 [ 37 4 74 72 604 42 63 81 14 9]
 [ 23 7 47 158 50 607 30 57 14 7]
 [ 12 12 44 58 42 33 775 8 6 10]
 [ 22 5 28 40 60 76 7 738 5 19]
 [ 76 54 10 16 11 9 8 6 780 30]
 [ 46 109 8 18 5 18 9 20 28 739]]
```

This shows that adding an extra layer with an activation and pooling function provided a faster training time and a better loss, accuracy, and F1 score.

Problem 2a.

Training Time, Training Loss, and Evaluation Accuracy Results:

The values for the RESNET-based CNN can be seen below:

The total training time was 13354.50 seconds or 3.710 hours.
The training loss was 0.0011161646848205653 at epoch 291.
The final evaluation accuracy was 74.06%.
The F1 score was found to be 0.7401.
The confusion matrix can be seen below:

Figure 4: RESNET-Based CNN Confusion Matrix

```
Final F1 Score: 0.7401
Final Precision: 0.7404
Final Recall: 0.7406
Final Confusion Matrix:
[[784 26 47 16 15 12 8 10 48 34]
 [ 19 881 7 4 4 3 4 4 9 65]
 [ 69 4 617 56 86 56 66 23 14 9]
 [ 24 9 62 563 56 163 68 23 8 24]
 [ 25 3 77 61 672 34 57 64 7 0]
 [ 15 5 43 168 43 658 9 43 6 10]
 [ 11 5 45 58 43 30 788 10 7 3]
 [ 16 3 26 36 70 73 8 749 4 15]
 [ 79 31 6 13 10 1 9 5 827 19]
 [ 23 59 4 4 7 6 5 5 20 867]]
```

These results show that the RESNET-based CNN takes three times longer to train, but provides a much better training loss, accuracy, and F1 score.

Problem 2b.

1. Weight Decay with Lambda of 0.001:

Training Time, Training Loss, and Evaluation Accuracy Results:

The values can be seen below:

The total training time was 12253.12 seconds or 3.404 hours.
The training loss was 0.00395170132809109 at epoch 291.
The final evaluation accuracy was 71.88%.
The F1 score was found to be 0.7192.
The confusion matrix can be seen below:

Figure 5: RESNET-Based CNN with Weight Decay Confusion Matrix

```
Final Confusion Matrix:
[[625  20 126  17  29   8  14  17 103  41]
 [ 11 849   9   6   6   8  15   3  18  75]
 [ 42   0 726  35  72  35  64  19   7   0]
 [   5   3 160 440  74 176  95  21  15  11]
 [   7   0 137  25 699  37  52  36   6   1]
 [   3   1 100 115  61 648  29  36   2   5]
 [   4   2  93  30  34  31 802   2   2   0]
 [   8   1  73  21 112  74   7 690   5   9]
 [  37  20  21   9  13   5   9   2 864  20]
 [  11  58  17   4   9  12  10  11  23 845]]
```

These results show that this model took less time to train than the model from Problem 2a, but it had a worse training loss, accuracy, and F1 score.

2. Dropout with $p = 0.3$:

Training Time, Training Loss, and Evaluation Accuracy Results:

The values can be seen below:

The total training time was 12440.79 seconds or 3.456 hours.

The training loss was 0.23845631339589654 at epoch 291.

The final evaluation accuracy was 83.11%.

The F1 score was found to be 0.8312.

The confusion matrix can be seen below:

Figure 6: RESNET-Based CNN with Dropout Confusion Matrix

```
Final Confusion Matrix:
[[729   3  78  12  38   0  24   3  91  22]
 [   4 881   3   2   9   3  21   0  30  47]
 [  23   0 854  12  34   6  55  10   6   0]
 [   4   0  93 724  52  44  62  13   7   1]
 [   1   0  59  15 876   1  41   5   2   0]
 [   3   0  76 149  65 654  44   8   0   1]
 [   2   0  22   9   6   1 957   2   1   0]
 [   3   0  30  15 130  11  14 795   2   0]
 [   7   3   8   7   7   1  14   0 951   2]
 [  13  23   9  13  12   0  14   2  24 890]]
```

These results show that this model took less time to train the model from Problem 2a, but had a worse training loss than the model from 2a. However, it had a better accuracy and F1 score.