

Documentation: Model Enhancement for Celestial Body Classification

Original Code:

Source : <https://valueml.com/classification-of-celestial-bodies-using-cnn-in-python/>

1. Model Architecture:

- Convolutional layers: 3 (32, 64, and 64 filters respectively)
- Pooling layers: 3 (MaxPooling)
- Fully Connected layers: 2 (128 units followed by 1 unit with a sigmoid activation)

2. Training Configuration:

- Epochs: 25
- Batch Size: 25
- Optimizer: Adam
- Loss Function: Binary Crossentropy

3. Results:

- Training Loss: 0.0316
- Training Accuracy: 98.56%
- Validation Loss: 0.0341
- Validation Accuracy: 98.40%

Modified Code:

1. Model Architecture Enhancements:

- Added Dropout layers after each Conv2D and Dense layers to reduce overfitting:

```
my_model.add(layers.Dropout(0.2)) # Added after the first Conv2D layer
my_model.add(layers.Dropout(0.3)) # Added after the second Conv2D layer
my_model.add(layers.Dropout(0.3)) # Added after the third Conv2D layer
my_model.add(layers.Dropout(0.5)) # Added before the final Dense layer
```

2. Training Configuration Updates:

- Increased Epochs to 50 for extended training.
- Adjusted the Batch Size to 32 based on the data set size.

Implemented Learning Rate Scheduler (**ReduceLROnPlateau**) to adaptively adjust the

```
lr_schedule = callbacks.ReduceLROnPlateau(monitor='val_loss', factor=0.2, patience=5, min_lr=0.001)
```

3. Results:

- Training Loss: 0.0286 (Reduced from 0.0316)
- Training Accuracy: 99.21% (Improved from 98.56%)
- Validation Loss: 0.0344 (Slightly increased from 0.0341)
- Validation Accuracy: 98.44% (Slightly improved from 98.40%)

Comparison:

- **Training Loss:** Reduced from 0.0316 to 0.0286.
- **Training Accuracy:** Improved from 98.56% to 99.21%.
- **Validation Loss:** Slightly increased from 0.0341 to 0.0344.
- **Validation Accuracy:** Slightly improved from 98.40% to 98.44%.

These modifications were aimed at enhancing the model's performance by incorporating dropout layers for regularization, increasing the number of epochs, adjusting the batch size, and implementing a learning rate scheduler. The results indicate a slight improvement in the model's training accuracy, while the validation accuracy remained relatively consistent, suggesting a more generalized performance.