ECE 20875 Project Student names: *1- Mohmmad Alwakeel* *2- Faisal Alkishi* Purdue username: *1- malwake* *2- falkishi* **PUID:** *1- 0031509371* *2- 0031883032* path 1: Bike traffic Introduction: In path 1, the data gives information on bike traffic across several bridges in New York City. The data are provided in a CSV file that consists of 10 columns and 214 rows. The columns tell row data about the traffic each day, where each row provides the following raw data: Date/Day, Precipitation, Max and Min temperature in F, traffic in each bridge, and the total traffic. Our analysis started with understanding the shape and values of the given data and then cleaning and wrangling the data to answer the analysis questions. In [629]: # Cleaning and wrangling the data In [795]: # Import needed libraries import pandas as pd import matplotlib.pyplot as plt import numpy as np from sklearn.linear model import Ridge from sklearn.model selection import train test split from sklearn import linear model from sklearn import datasets from sklearn.linear_model import LinearRegression from sklearn.metrics import mean_squared_error, r2_score from sklearn.ensemble import RandomForestRegressor from sklearn.datasets import make regression from sklearn.ensemble import RandomForestClassifier from sklearn.preprocessing import StandardScaler import math import re In [659]: #import CSV file using Pandas data = pd.read csv('NYC Bicycle Counts 2016 Corrected.csv') In [660]: # understand the shape of the data data.describe() Out[660]: High Temp (°F) Low Temp (°F) 214.000000 214.000000 74.933645 61.972430 mean 12.545418 39.900000 26.100000 min 53.225000 25% 66.050000 50% 78.100000 64.900000 75% 84.900000 71.100000 96.100000 82.000000 max In [661]: # understand the shape of the data data.head() Out[661]: Williamsburg **High Temp** Brooklyn Manhattan Queensboro Low Temp **Precipitation** Date Day **Total Bridge Bridge Bridge Bridge** (°F) (°F) 0 66.0 0.01 1,704 3,126 4,115 2,552 11,497 Friday 78.1 Apr Saturday 48.9 827 2,565 55.0 0.15 1,646 1,884 6,922 Apr 34.0 0.09 526 1,695 4,759 Sunday 39.9 1,232 1,306 33.1 521 4,335 Monday 44.1 0.47 (S) 1,067 1,440 1,307 Apr 5-0 1,416 2,617 3,081 9,471 Tuesday 42.1 26.1 2,357 In [662]: # rename columns for convenience data = data.rename(columns={"Brooklyn Bridge":"Brooklyn", "Manhattan Bridge": "Manhattan", "Williamsburg Bridge":"Williamsburg", "Queensboro Bridge": "Queensboro", "High Temp (°F)": "High_F", "Low Temp (°F)": "Lo w_F"}) In [663]: # First step to turn values into floats and integers # getting rid of commas in values data.Brooklyn = [i.replace(",","") for i in data.Brooklyn] data.Manhattan = [i.replace(",","") for i in data.Manhattan] data.Williamsburg = [i.replace(",","") for i in data.Williamsburg] data.Queensboro = [i.replace(",","") for i in data.Queensboro] data.Total = [i.replace(",","") for i in data.Total] In [664]: | # remove non floats def only num(data): filter = re.compile(r'[^\d.]+') filtered = [] for i in data: temp = filter.sub('', i) if temp == '': temp = None filtered.append(temp) return filtered In [665]: # remove non floats from the Precipitation column data.Precipitation = only_num(data.Precipitation) In [666]: | # drop empty rows for i in range(len(data.Precipitation)): if data.Precipitation[i] is None: data = data.drop([i]) # understand the shape of the data In [667]: data.describe() Out[667]: High_F Low_F count 196.00000 196.000000 mean 74.67500 12.68469 11.804616 std 39.90000 26.100000 min 25% 66.00000 53.100000 50% 77.00000 64.900000 75% 84.90000 70.275000 96.10000 82.000000 max In [669]: data.head() Out[669]: Day High_F Low_F Precipitation Brooklyn Manhattan Williamsburg Queensboro Date Total 66.0 11497 0 1-Apr Friday 78.1 0.01 1704 3126 4115 2552 1 2-Apr Saturday 55.0 48.9 0.15 827 1646 2565 1884 6922 34.0 0.09 526 1232 1695 4759 2 3-Apr Sunday 39.9 1306 4-Apr Monday 33.1 0.47 521 1067 1440 1307 4335 42.1 0 1416 2617 3081 2357 9471 5-Apr Tuesday 26.1 A section (or more) describing the results of each analysis, and what your answers to the questions are based on your results. Visual aids are helpful here, if necessary to back up your conclusions. Note that it is OK if you do not get "positive" answers from your analysis, but you must explain why that might be. **Analysis:** After cleaning the data, we are ready now to answer the following questions: 1 - You want to install sensors on the bridges to estimate overall traffic across all the bridges. But you only have enough budget to install sensors on three of the four bridges. Which bridges should you install the sensors on to get the best prediction of overall traffic? Since we were given the data of the traffic on each bridge and the total traffic, we decided to analyze the data to find the representation of every three bridges from the total traffic. Therefore, we will use the mean of the traffic representation of every three bridges of each day. 2- The city administration is cracking down on helmet laws, and wants to deploy police officers on days with high traffic to hand out citations. Can they use the next day's weather forecast to predict the number of bicyclists that day? We assume logically that the precipitation rate would affect the traffic on bridges. To confirm that hypothesis, we will investigate two methods. The first is linear regression, where we will examine 5-degree polynomials models based on our independent variable and try to look for a pattern on the graph. Moreover, we will use linear regression to find MSE and R squared values at best-fit lamda based on the founded model. 3- Can you use this data to predict whether it is raining based on the number of bicyclists on the bridges? Rationally, flipping the access doesn't make sense. We know that a precipitation rate will affect someone's decision in leaving the house or stay. Nevertheless, People in the streets can only have a butterfly effect on the perception rate. Henceforth, we will test two regression models. The first is linear regression, where will follow the same procedure as question two. Furthermore, we will use random forest regression, where we will use the MSE and R squared values to interpret our final answer regarding the representation and effect of traffic on precipitation rates. The regression model will take into account the four bridges (independent variable) and precipitation rate (dependent variable) to reveal the results. **Problem 1:** In here, we will find the representation of every three bridges from the total traffic. # Turning columns values into floats def turn float(data): calc = []for i in data: temp = []for j in i: temp.append(float(j)) calc.append(temp) return calc In [671]: # Combining all briges in one column and turning variables' types into floats # # of bridges $Num_of_bridges = 4$ # Total representation bridges = [data.Brooklyn, data.Manhattan,data.Williamsburg , data.Queensboro] bridges = np.array(bridges) total = np.array(data.Total) #print(bridges) bridges_calc = turn_float(bridges) total_calc = [] #for i in bridges: # temp = []# for j in i: # temp.append(float(j)) #bridges_calc.append(temp) for j in total: total_calc.append(float(j)) In [672]: # Find the representation def representation(bridges, total, Num_of_bridges): total_rep = [] for i in range(Num_of_bridges): #i = 0 => Brooklyn, Manhattan, Williamsburg #i = 1 => Manhattan, Williamsburg, Queensboro **if** i < 2: temp = np.array(bridges[i]) + np.array(bridges[i+1]) + np.array(bridges[i+2]) temp = temp/np.array(total) #i = 2 => Brooklyn, Williamsburg, Queensboro **elif** i == 2: temp = np.array(bridges[i]) + np.array(bridges[i-2]) + np.array(bridges[i+1]) temp = temp/np.array(total) #i = 3 => Brooklyn, Manhattan, Queensboro temp = np.array(bridges[i]) + np.array(bridges[i-2]) + np.array(bridges[i-3]) temp = temp/np.array(total) total_rep.append(temp) return total rep In [673]: | #total representation total rep = representation(bridges calc, total calc, Num of bridges); #total representation mean mean_rep = [np.mean(i) for i in total_rep] print(mean_rep) [0.7645454300787278, 0.8396983345390486, 0.7295617094534255, 0.6661945259287985] Final results: In [684]: print("Brooklyn, Manhattan, and Williamsburg bridges represent {:.2f}% \n".format(mean_rep[0]*100)) print("Manhattan, Williamsburg, Queensboro bridges have the highest representation of $\{:.2f\}$ % \n ".form at(mean rep[1]*100)) print("Brooklyn, Williamsburg, Queensboro bridges represent {:.2f}% \n".format(mean_rep[2]*100)) print("Brooklyn, Manhattan, Queensboro bridges represent {:.2f}%\n".format(mean_rep[3]*100)) print("\nTherefore, the bridge to be omitted is: Brooklyn bridge") Brooklyn, Manhattan, and Williamsburg bridges represent 76.45% Manhattan, Williamsburg, Queensboro bridges have the highest representation of 83.97% Brooklyn, Williamsburg, Queensboro bridges represent 72.96% Brooklyn, Manhattan, Queensboro bridges represent 66.62% Therefore, the bridge to be omitted is: Brooklyn bridge **Problem2:** First, we will examine 5-degree polynomials models based on our independent variable and try to look for a pattern on the graph. In [686]: x = np.array(data.Precipitation)y = np.array(data.Total) x = [float(u) for u in x]y = [float(u) for u in y] In [685]: # Intoduce the functions for polynomial degree representation def Polyfit(X,Y, degrees): paramFits = [] y 1 = [] $y_2 = []$ $y_3 = []$ $y_4 = []$ $y_5 = []$ for j in degrees: mitrx = feature matrix(X, j) paramFits.append(least squares(mitrx, Y)) xsort = sorted(X)for l in sorted(X): res1 = paramFits[0][0] * 1 + paramFits[0][1]res2 = paramFits[1][0] * (1 ** 2) + paramFits[1][1] * 1 + paramFits[1][2]ts[2][3] res4 = paramFits[3][0] * (1 ** 4) + paramFits[3][1] * (1 ** 3) + paramFits[3][2] * (1 ** 2) + paramFits[3][0] * (1 ** 4) + paramFits[3][1] * (1 ** 4) + paramFiparamFits[3][3] * 1 + paramFits[3][4] res5 = paramFits[4][0] * (1 ** 5) + paramFits[4][1] * (1 ** 4) + paramFits[4][2] * (1 ** 3) + paramFits[4][3] * (1 ** 2) + paramFits[4][4] * 1 + paramFits[4][5] y_1.append(res1) y_2.append(res2) y 3.append(res3) y_4.append(res4) y_5.append(res5) plt.scatter(X, Y, color='b', marker='*') plt.plot(sorted(X), y_1, color='g', linestyle='-.') plt.plot(sorted(X), y_2, color='b', linestyle='-.') plt.plot(sorted(X), y 3, color='m', linestyle='-.') plt.plot(sorted(X), y 4, color='y', linestyle='-.') plt.plot(sorted(X), y 5, color='r', linestyle='-.') plt.legend(["data = 1", "data = 2", "data = 3", "data = 4", "data = 5", "Path Data"], loc='upper r ight') plt.ylabel("Y Data") plt.xlabel("X Data") plt.show() ## return paramFits def feature matrix(x, d): # fill in # There are several ways to write this function. The most efficient would be a nested list compreh # which for each sample in x calculates x^d , x^d ..., x^0 . X list = []ind = 0for i in x: d1 = dX list.append([]) **while** d1 >= 0: X list[ind].append(i**d1) d1 -= 1 #d = 1ind += 1return X list # Return the least squares solution based on the feature matrix X and corresponding target variable sa mples in y. # Input: X as a list of features for each sample, and y as a list of target variable samples. # Output: B, a list of the fitted model parameters based on the least squares solution. def least squares(X, y): $X_array = np.array(X)$ $\# X \ array = list(X)$ Y_array = np.array(y) # fill in # Use the matrix algebra functions in numpy to solve the least squares equations. This can be done in just one line. return (np.linalg.inv(X array.T @ X array)) @ (X array.T @ Y array) In [691]: # Find best fit lamda def linearregression(X,y): #Importing dataset [X_train, X_test, y_train, y_test] = train_test_split(X, y, test_size=0.25, random_state=101) X_train = X_train_norm X_test = X_test_norm lmbda = np.logspace(0, 3,endpoint = True) #fill in MODEL = []MSE = []for 1 in 1mbda: #Train the regression model using a regularization parameter of 1 model = train_model(X_train,y_train,1) #Evaluate the MSE on the test set mse = error(X_test, y_test, model) #Store the model and mse in lists for further processing MODEL.append(model) MSE.append(mse) #Plot the MSE as a function of lmbda plt.plot(lmbda, MSE) #fill in plt.xlabel('Lambda') plt.ylabel('MSE') plt.title('MSE as a function of Lambda') plt.show() #Find best value of lmbda in terms of MSE ind = MSE.index(min(MSE)) [lmda_best, MSE_best, model_best] = [lmbda[ind], MSE[ind], MODEL[ind]] print('Best lambda tested is ' + str(lmda_best) + ', which yields an MSE of ' + str(MSE_best)) return model best def normalize_train(X_train): X = []mean = []std = []#count = 0for i in range(len(X_train)): $k = X_{train[i]}$ col = kmean1 = col.mean()std1 = np.std(col)mean.append(col.mean()) std.append(np.std(col)) x1 = []for j in col: new = (j - mean1) / std1x1.append(new) X.append(x1)return np.array(X).T, mean, std def normalize_test(X_test, trn_mean, trn_std): #fill in X = []x1 = []for i in range(len(X_test)): $k = X_test[i]$ col = kmean = trn_mean[i] std = trn_std[i] x1 = []for j in col: new = (j - mean) / stdx1.append(new) X.append(x1)return np.array(X).T def train model(X, y, 1): model = linear_model.Ridge(alpha = 1, fit_intercept = True) model.fit(X, y) return model def error(X,y,model): y_pred_test = model.predict(X) mse = mean_squared_error(y, y_pred_test) #y_pred = (model * std_y) + mean_y return (mse) In [687]: degrees = [1, 2, 3, 4, 5]paramFits = Polyfit(x,y, degrees)—·- data = 1 --- data = 2 25000 --- data = 3 — ·- data = 5 20000 * Path Data Ž 15000 10000 5000 0.00 0.25 0.75 1.00 The five-degree polynomials models don't fit the raw data. Hence, let's check the MSE and R squared values to check whether precipitation rates predict/interpret traffic on bridges. In []: In [751]: x = np.array(data.Precipitation)y = np.array(data.Total) x = [[float(u)] for u in x]y = [[float(u)] for u in y] In [754]: # at defult lambda X_train, X_test, y_train, y_test = train_test_split(x, y, random_state=0) regr = LinearRegression(fit intercept=True) regr.fit(X_train,y_train) y pred test = regr.predict(X test) print('Mean squared error: %.2f' % mean squared error(y test, y pred test)) # The coefficient of determination: 1 is perfect prediction print('Coefficient of determination: %.2f' % r2 score(y test, y pred test)) plt.scatter(X train, y train, color='black', label='Train data points') plt.scatter(X test, y test, color='red', label='Test data points') plt.plot(X_test, y_pred_test, color='blue', linewidth=1, label='Model') plt.scatter(X_test, y_pred_test, marker='x', color='red', linewidth=3) plt.legend() plt.show() Mean squared error: 26552221.57 Coefficient of determination: 0.23 Model Train data points 25000 Test data points 20000 15000 10000 5000 0.00 0.75 1.00 1.25 0.50 1.50 The MSE and R squared results show poor representation. Therefore, we say that the city administration can't rely on next-day traffic estimation by checking the forecast. Furthermore, the given data have a high number of outliers which makes it difficult for linear regression to predict the result. In [693]: | # check if best fit lamba < 1000 model best = linearregression(x, y)print(model best.coef) print(model_best.intercept) MSE as a function of Lambda 3.61 3.60 3.59 3.58 3.57 3.56 3.55 200 600 800 1000 400 Lambda Best lambda tested is 1000.0, which yields an MSE of 35512659.98294826 [[48.82463029]] [18471.24489796] The best fit model uses lambda > 1000. Therefore, we ignore this result and stick to the previous result, which still tells that the city administration can't rely on next-day traffic estimation by checking the forecast In []: **Problem 3:** First, we will examine 5-degree polynomials models based on our independent variable and try to look for a pattern on the graph. In [695]: y_flip = np.array(data.Precipitation) x flip = np.array(data.Total) y_flip = [float(u) for u in y_flip] _flip = [float(u) **for** u **in** x_flip] In [696]: degrees = [1, 2, 3, 4, 5]paramFits_flip = Polyfit(x_flip,y_flip, degrees) 1.75 --- data = 1 data = 21.50 1.25 data = 51.00 Path Data 0.75 0.50 0.25 0.00 10000 15000 5000 20000 25000 X Data The five-degree polynomials models don't fit the raw data. Hence, let's check the MSE and R squared values to check whether precipitation rates predict/interpret traffic on bridges. In [698]: y_flip = np.array(data.Precipitation) x flip = np.array(data.Total) y_flip = [[float(u)] for u in y_flip] x flip = [[float(u)] for u in x flip] In [699]: # defult lamda X_train, X_test, y_train, y_test = train_test_split(x_flip, y_flip, random_state=0) regr = LinearRegression(fit intercept=True) regr.fit(X_train,y_train) y_pred_test = regr.predict(X_test) print('Mean squared error: %.2f' % mean_squared_error(y_test, y_pred_test)) # The coefficient of determination: 1 is perfect prediction print('Coefficient of determination: %.2f' % r2_score(y_test, y_pred_test)) plt.scatter(X train, y train, color='black', label='Train data points') plt.scatter(X_test, y_test, color='red', label='Test data points') plt.plot(X_test, y_pred_test, color='blue', linewidth=1, label='Model') plt.scatter(X_test, y_pred_test, marker='x', color='red', linewidth=3) plt.legend() plt.show() Mean squared error: 0.04 Coefficient of determination: 0.25 Model Train data points 1.50 Test data points 1.25 1.00 0.75 0.50 0.25 0.00 5000 10000 15000 20000 25000 The MSE and R squared results show inaccurate results. The coefficient of determination provides a low score. On the other hand, MSE shows a very low score (High representation). Therefore, we will further investigate with the best fit lambda and then use the forest random regression model. In []: In [700]: # check if best fit lamba < 1000 model best = linearregression(x flip,y flip) print(model best.coef) print(model best.intercept) MSE as a function of Lambda 0.0632 0.0631 0.0630 0.0629 ₩ 0.0628 0.0627 0.0626 0.0625 200 400 600 800 1000 Best lambda tested is 1000.0, which yields an MSE of 0.06247271363444927 [[-0.00059043]] [0.11517007] The best fit model uses lambda > 1000. Therefore, we ignore this result and the previous result and apply the forest random regression model. In []: In [842]: # Prepering the columns and values to create the model brooklyn bridge = data.Brooklyn.to list() queensboro bridge = data.Queensboro.to list() Williamsburg bridge = data.Williamsburg.to list() manhattan bridge = data.Manhattan.to list() #Turning strings into floats brooklyn bridge = [float(i) for i in brooklyn bridge] queensboro bridge = [float(i) for i in queensboro bridge] Williamsburg_bridge = [float(i) for i in Williamsburg_bridge] manhattan_bridge = [float(i) for i in manhattan_bridge] # Creating our dependent variable for the model bridges_forest = [] for i in range(len(brooklyn)): bridges forest.append([brooklyn bridge[i],queensboro bridge[i],Williamsburg bridge[i],manhattan br idge[i]]) bridges_forest = [[np.sum(i)] for i in bridges_forest] In [843]: # dependent and independant variables x_forest = np.array(bridges_forest) y_forest = np.array(data.Precipitation) y forest = [[float(u)] for u in y forest] y_forest = pd.DataFrame(data=y_forest) #x forest = x forest.astype('int') x forest = pd.DataFrame(data=x forest) In [850]: | #normulize and generate predicted y based on the regression model X_train, X_test, y_train, y_test = train_test_split(x_forest, y_forest, random_state=0) sc = StandardScaler() X_train = sc.fit_transform(X_train) X_test = sc.transform(X_test) regressor = RandomForestRegressor(n estimators=20, random state=0) regressor.fit(X_train, y_train) y_pred = regressor.predict(X_test) D:\Anaconda3\lib\site-packages\ipykernel_launcher.py:8: DataConversionWarning: A column-vector y was passed when a 1d array was expected. Please change the shape of y to (n_samples,), for example using ravel(). In [851]: #Printing and plotting the result print('Mean squared error: %.2f' % mean_squared_error(y_test, y_pred)) # The coefficient of determination: 1 is perfect prediction print('Coefficient of determination: %.2f' % r2_score(y_test, y_pred)) plt.scatter(X_train, y_train, color='black', label='Train data points') plt.scatter(X_test, y_test, color='red', label='Test data points') plt.plot(X_test, y_pred_test, color='blue', linewidth=1, label='Model') plt.scatter(X_test, y_pred_test, marker='x', color='red', linewidth=3) plt.legend() plt.show() Mean squared error: 0.08 Coefficient of determination: Model Train data points Test data points -1.0-0.5In conclusion, based on the analysis parameters and plots, we can interfere that bike traffic prediction is not dependent on precipitation rate and may not be predicted based on the given x value. In addition, using the mean is a better estimation. The random forest regression model explained and proved our previous rational assumption. In []: