Lab1 - Linear regression (Bike Rental dataset)

WEN Yue CHEN MengYu

1. Before linear regression

(1) About this dataset

The dataset contains 9568 data points collected from a Combined Cycle Power Plant over 6 years (2006-2011), when the power plant was set to work with full load. Features consist of hourly average ambient variables Temperature (T), Ambient Pressure (AP), Relative Humidity (RH) and Exhaust Vacuum (V) to predict the net hourly electrical energy output (EP) of the plant.

| | AT | V | AP | RH | PE |
|---|-------|-------|---------|-------|--------|
| 0 | 14.96 | 41.76 | 1024.07 | 73.17 | 463.26 |
| 1 | 25.18 | 62.96 | 1020.04 | 59.08 | 444.37 |
| 2 | 5.11 | 39.40 | 1012.16 | 92.14 | 488.56 |
| 3 | 20.86 | 57.32 | 1010.24 | 76.64 | 446.48 |
| 4 | 10.82 | 37.50 | 1009.23 | 96.62 | 473.90 |

(2) Basic analyze

After using command *data.info()*, we can see that there are no NULLs in this dataset, which means we do not need to clean this dataset.

```
<class 'pandas.core.frame.DataFrame'>
RangeIndex: 9568 entries, 0 to 9567
Data columns (total 5 columns):
AT     9568 non-null float64
V     9568 non-null float64
AP     9568 non-null float64
RH     9568 non-null float64
PE     9568 non-null float64
dtypes: float64(5)
memory usage: 373.8 KB
```

2. Scikit Learn

(1) We split the data set into two parts.

$$X = data[['AT', 'V', 'AP', 'RH']]$$

 $y = data[['PE']]$

- (2) We use *train_test_split* method to split our data set (X, y) into four parts: X_train, X_test, y_train, y_test.
- (3) By using the linear regression model in sklearn, we can get the linear regression formula:

PE=460.05727267-1.96865472*AT-0.2392946*V+0.0568509*AP-0.15861467*RH

(4) Through the formula we can get the following values

MSE: 20.837191547220353 RMSE: 4.564777272465805 MAE: 3.676950252836232

R2: [0.92979357]

3. Custom method

(1) We split the data set into two parts.

train = data[0:7176] test = data[7176:9568]

(2) We define y_test as 'PE' . We define y_test as 'PE' , modify 'PE' in test to NaN

| | AT | V | AP | RH | PE |
|------|-------|-------|---------|-------|-----|
| 7176 | 10.52 | 41.78 | 1013.54 | 71.52 | NaN |
| 7177 | 26.90 | 60.93 | 1007.10 | 67.32 | NaN |
| 7178 | 24.86 | 44.05 | 1005.69 | 66.65 | NaN |
| 7179 | 13.39 | 49.83 | 1007.14 | 90.88 | NaN |
| 7180 | 27.98 | 71.98 | 1005.58 | 81.00 | NaN |

(3) Because sometimes the independent variable and the dependent variable may be more than the relationship of y=ax+b, so we have added some new variables, hoping to get a better training model and get better results. These variables include AT*AT, V*V, AP*AP, RH*RH, AT*V, V*AP, AP*RH, RH*AT (after data standardization)

| | AT | V | AP | RH | AT_AT | V_V | AP_AP | RH_RH | AT_V | V_AP | AP_RH | RH_AT |
|---|-----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|------------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| 0 | -0.629519 | -0.987297 | 1.820488 | -0.009519 | 0.396295 | 0.974755 | 3.314178 | 0.000091 | 0.621522 | -1.797362 | -0.017330 | 0.005993 |
| 1 | 0.741909 | 0.681045 | 1.141863 | -0.974621 | 0.550429 | 0.463822 | 1.303851 | 0.949885 | 0.505274 | 0.777660 | -1.112883 | -0.723080 |
| 2 | -1.951297 | -1.173018 | -0.185078 | 1.289840 | 3.807561 | 1.375970 | 0.034254 | 1.663686 | 2.288906 | 0.217099 | -0.238720 | -2.516861 |
| 3 | 0.162205 | 0.237203 | -0.508393 | 0.228160 | 0.026311 | 0.056265 | 0.258463 | 0.052057 | 0.038476 | -0.120592 | -0.115995 | 0.037009 |
| 4 | -1.185069 | -1.322539 | -0.678470 | 1.596699 | 1.404388 | 1.749109 | 0.460322 | 2.549449 | 1.567299 | 0.897303 | -1.083313 | -1.892198 |

(4) Define a random gradient drop function,

$$\theta_j := \theta_j - \alpha \frac{1}{m} (y^i - h_{\theta}(x^i)) x_j^i$$

```
def step_grad(points, learn_rate, M):
    N = points.shape[0]
    num_col = points.shape[1]

new_M = np.zeros(num_col)

for i in range(N):
    x = points[i, 0:num_col-1]
    x = np.append(x, 1)
    y = points[i, num_col-1]
    for j in range(num_col):
        new_M[j] += (-2/N) * (y - (M * x).sum()) * x[j]
    M = M - (learn_rate * new_M)

return M
```

(5) Define grad_desc

```
def grad_desc(points, learn_rate, num_iter):
    num_col = points.shape[1]
    M = np.zeros(num_col)

for i in range(num_iter):
    M = step_grad(points, learn_rate, M)
    if i % 100== 0:
        print(i, "Cost= ", cost(points, M))
    print(i, "Cost= ", cost(points, M))
    return M
```

(6) Define cost function,

$$J(\theta_0, \theta_1) = \frac{1}{2m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} (h_{\theta}(x^{(i)}) - y^{(i)})^2$$

```
def cost(points, M):
    total_cost = 0

N = points.shape[0]
    num_col = points.shape[1]

for i in range(N):
        x = points[i,0:num_col-1]
        x = np.append(x, 1)
        y = points[i,num_col-1]
        total_cost += (y - (M * x).sum()) ** 2

total_cost = (1/N) * total_cost
return total_cost
```

(7) Define run function.

```
def run():
    data = data_train_1[:,0:data_train_1.shape[1]]
    # tweak learn_rate & num_iter to get better results; 0.001, 1000
    learn_rate = 0.0001
    num_iter = 1000

m = grad_desc(data, learn_rate, num_iter)
    #print(m)
    return m[0:data_train_1.shape[1]-1], m[data_train_1.shape[1]-1]
```

(8) By calculating, we can get the correlation coefficient of the equation: m, c :

```
\mathsf{m}
                        -3.6311436 ,
array([-13.61642886,
                                         0.79233231,
                                                       -1.91396256,
          0.92490933,
                        -0.12851954,
                                       -0.25278515,
                                                       -0.3947235
          1.00681491,
                         0.30883716,
                                       -0.40036628,
                                                       -0.6160933 ])
С
```

- 453.1648310371076
- (9) Next, we can make predictions with trained models.
- (10) Through the formula we can get the following values

MSE: 19.283391319352173 RMSE: 4.391285838948789 MAE: 3.397251451021495

R2: [0.9335685]

4. Conclusions

By comparing R2 of the two methods, we can see that the accuracy of custom functions is higher than that predicted by sklearn. This may be because we have further processed the dataset, adding new parameters (AT*AT, V*V, etc.). This operation brings the trained model equation closer to the optimal solution.