## **Paper Rock Scissor Report**

#### Overview

This report provides an analysis of three machine learning models - Support Vector Machine (SVM), K-Nearest Neighbors (KNN), and Random Forest (RF) - used in the task of classifying images into three categories: rock, paper, and scissors. The project involved applying these models to two different datasets: a standard dataset and a custom dataset.

## **Model Selection and Rationale**

# 1. Support Vector Machine (SVM):

- **Selected for**: Chosen for its ability to handle the multidimensional nature of images effectively and its efficiency in classification problems. Its capability to find the optimal decision boundary between categories makes it suitable for distinguishing between "rock," "paper," and "scissors" images.
- **Performance on Standard Dataset**: Exhibited high accuracy, particularly effective in classifying "rock" category.
- **Performance on Custom Dataset**: Achieved 100% accuracy, indicating excellent suitability for this specific dataset.

## 2. K-Nearest Neighbors (KNN):

- **Selected for**: Selected for its simplicity and flexibility. KNN is effective in scenarios where the relationship between features is relatively straightforward and can classify images based on the similarity of their features to those of nearest neighbors.
- **Performance on Standard Dataset**: Slightly lower accuracy compared to SVM and RF, with some difficulties in accurately classifying the "paper" category.
- **Performance on Custom Dataset**: Showed good accuracy but slightly underperformed in the "paper" category.

### 3. Random Forest (RF):

- **Selected for**: Selected for its robustness and ability to handle overfitting. RF is particularly effective in managing large datasets with high-dimensional features, making it well-suited for image classification tasks.
- Performance on Standard Dataset: Strong performance, demonstrating its ability to manage the complexity of image data.
- **Performance on Custom Dataset**: Achieved 100% accuracy, solidifying its effectiveness for the dataset.

## **Techniques and Implementation**

- **Data Preprocessing**: The preprocessing steps, such as flattening images and normalizing pixel values are crucial for the success of these models. These steps ensure that the models can interpret the image data effectively.
- **Hyperparameter Tuning**: The tuning of hyperparameters, especially for SVM, plays a significant role in optimizing the model's performance. Adjusting parameters like the kernel, C-value, and gamma can significantly affect the model's ability to classify images accurately.
- **Evaluation and Metrics**: Using metrics like precision, recall, F1-score and visualizations like confusion matrix and line plots provides a comprehensive view of the model's performance, beyond just accuracy. This is important in scenarios where class imbalance might be present or where certain types of misclassifications are more critical than others.

# **Results Analysis**

#### • Standard Dataset:

- SVM and RF performed well, with RF showing a slightly better balance across different categories.
- The slightly lower performance of KNN, compared to SVM and RF, could be due to
  its reliance on the local neighborhood of data points, which may not always capture
  the complex patterns necessary for classifying images as effectively as the other
  models

#### Custom Dataset:

- All models, particularly SVM and RF, achieved remarkable accuracy.
- The custom dataset's characteristics (e.g., clarity, distinct features) likely contributed to this high performance.

### Conclusion

In this image classification project, the effectiveness of the chosen models was distinctly demonstrated, with SVM and RF showing exceptional strength. Their high performance on the custom dataset underscores the critical importance of selecting appropriate models that align well with the quality and characteristics of the dataset. While KNN's performance was slightly lower in comparison, it highlighted a key consideration in model selection, which is the balance between accuracy and operational efficiency. KNN, despite being marginally less effective in this specific context, stood out for its time efficiency and simplicity, making it a valuable tool in scenarios where rapid processing is prioritized. This project thus sheds light on the multidimensional decision-making process in machine learning, emphasizing that the choice of models should not only be driven by performance metrics but also by practical considerations such as computational efficiency and ease of implementation.