Project 5 & Project 9 report

Xiaolin Zhang	Ziyang Xu	Wangzhihui Mei	Xiaohuan Pei
2019xxxxxx xxxxxxx	2019xxxxxx xxxxxxx	2019124044 6603385	2019xxxxxx xxxxxxx

CCNU-UOW JI

1 Project 5

1.1 Dataset: Artificial Characters Learning Problem

This database has been artificially generated by using a first order theory which describes the structure of ten capital letters of the English alphabet and a random choice theorem prover which accounts for etherogeneity in the instances. The capital letters represented are the following: A, C, D, E, F, G, H, L, P, R. Each instance is structured and is described by a set of segments (lines) which resemble the way an automatic program would segment an image.

Each instance is stored in a separate file whose format is the following:

```
CLASS OBJNUM TYPE XX1 YY1 XX2 YY2 SIZE  DIAG
1     0      line 0   0   0   13  13.00 45.28
1     1      line 20  0   22  15  15.13 45.28
1     2      line 0   13  22  15  22.09 45.28
1     3      line 0   13  0   27  14.00 45.28
1     4      line 22  15  23  39  24.02 45.28
1     5      line 0   27  23  39  25.94 45.28
```

where CLASS is an integer number indicating the class as described below, OBJNUM is an integer identifier of a segment (starting from 0) in the instance and the remaining columns represent attribute values. **?**.

The generated character image is like Figure **??**

1.2 Data pre-process

The character described by segments is represented as the vertex pair, we transform them to binary grid (12×8), like Figure **??**.

Then the problem is transformed into one like the MNIST classification problem. The feature is the flattened 0-1 pixel, whose dimension is 96×1, the label is "A", "C", "D", "E", "F", "G", "H", "L", "P", "R", which correspond to the numbers 0 through 9.

Figure 1: The generated characters



Figure 2: The representation of "C"

We got 6000 training data from the primitive dataset. We shuffled them and use 70% of the data as training data, 30% as test data. The label distribution of training data is like Figure **??**

1.3 Model construction

1.3.1 Ensembling Model

Ensemble modeling is a process where multiple diverse models are created to predict an outcome, either by using many different modeling algorithms or using different training data sets. The ensemble model then aggregates the prediction of each base model and results in once final prediction for the unseen data. The motivation for using ensemble models is to reduce the generalization error of the prediction. As long as the base models are diverse and independent, the prediction error of the model decreases when the ensemble



Figure 3: The label distribution of training data

approach is used. The approach seeks the wisdom of crowds in making a prediction. Even though the ensemble model has multiple base models within the model, it acts and performs as a single model. Most of the practical data mining solutions utilize ensemble modeling techniques. Chapter 4 Classification covers the approaches of different ensemble modeling techniques and their implementation in detail.

In this task, We applied Voting method. Voting is a combination strategy for classification problems in integrated learning. The basic idea is to select the most output class among all machine learning algorithms.

There are two types of output of classification machine learning algorithms: one is to directly output class labels, and the other is to output class probabilities. Using the former to vote is called hard voting (majority/hard voting), and using it to classify is called soft voting (Soft voting). VotingClassifier in sklearn is the implementation of voting method.

In this project, We compared hard voting classifier and soft voting classifier, and got better performance in hard voting classifier, which ensemble Logistic Regression, SGD, SVM, Decision Tree, Random Forest, Extra Tree, MLP as one classifier. The structure is like Figure **??**.



Figure 4: The Ensembled Voting classifier

Performance

We calculated the Recall, Precision, Accuracy and F1-score of the model. As this is a multi-class classification, so each label correspond to one micro value, we can calculate the mean of micro value and get marco value.

Accuracy: 0.97 (+/- 0.00) [Ensemble(hard voting)]
The classification report:

	precision	recall	f1-score	support
A	0.97	0.97	0.97	183
C	0.98	1.00	0.99	182
D	0.98	0.99	0.99	182
E	0.99	0.98	0.98	167
F	0.96	0.93	0.94	185
G	1.00	0.98	0.99	166
H	0.98	0.97	0.98	190
L	1.00	1.00	1.00	168
P	0.93	0.95	0.94	190
R	0.98	0.99	0.99	187
accuracy			0.98	1800
macro avg	0.98	0.98	0.98	1800
weighted avg	0.98	0.98	0.98	1800

Figure 5: The Ensembling (Hard voting) performance

So, we can draw the conclusion that Ensemble Model perform well on both micro and marco f1-score.

References

Schapire, R. E. and Singer, Y. (1999). Improved boosting algorithms using confidence-rated predictions. *Machine learning*, 37(3):297–336.