

# Mechine Learning - Assignment 3

Michael Dadush  
206917908

Shay Gali  
315202242

February 2025

## 1 Analysis of KNN Parameters and Results

Based on our experiment results with different k-nearest neighbor parameters, we can make important observations about the classifier performance. We will analyze the results for different k and p values.

### 1.1 Code Output

This is the code output for different k and p values:

round	Average Empirical Errors	Average True Errors	Error Differences
p = 1 k = 1	0.014600	0.130800	0.116200
p = 1 k = 3	0.055800	0.093800	0.038000
p = 1 k = 5	0.060400	0.090000	0.029600
p = 1 k = 7	0.063800	0.090000	0.026200
p = 1 k = 9	0.065400	0.090000	0.024600
p = 2 k = 1	0.014800	0.126200	0.111400
p = 2 k = 3	0.054400	0.092000	0.037600
p = 2 k = 5	0.062800	0.085400	0.022600
p = 2 k = 7	0.064200	0.085200	0.021000
p = 2 k = 9	0.063600	0.084400	0.020800
p = inf k = 1	0.014800	0.136200	0.121400
p = inf k = 3	0.056600	0.090400	0.033800
p = inf k = 5	0.062400	0.085200	0.022800
p = inf k = 7	0.063000	0.086400	0.023400
p = inf k = 9	0.065400	0.084200	0.018800

### 1.2 Best Parameters

From looking at the data results, we found that the best parameters are:

- p = 2 with k = 9 (error rate = 0.0844 or 8.44%)
- Also good is p =  $\infty$  with k = 9 (error rate = 0.0842 or 8.42%)

These parameters give us the lowest Average True Errors, which is most important for real performance.

### 1.3 Analysis of k Parameter

When we look at how k affects the results:

- $k = 1$  gives worst performance on test data for all p values
- When k gets bigger, the true error usually gets smaller
- This shows us that using more neighbors helps make better predictions

### 1.4 Analysis of p Parameter

For the distance metric p:

- $p = 1$  does not work as good as  $p = 2$  or  $p = \infty$
- $p = 2$  (Euclidean) and  $p = \infty$  work almost same, but  $p = 2$  is little better
- We think this shows that using regular distance ( $p = 2$ ) works better for our data than other options

### 1.5 Overfitting Analysis

We see clear overfitting in our results, especially with  $k = 1$ :

For  $k = 1$ :

- Very small empirical errors ( $\approx 0.014$ - $0.015$ )
- Much bigger true errors ( $\approx 0.126$ - $0.136$ )
- Big differences between errors ( $\approx 0.111$ - $0.121$ )

When k gets bigger:

- Empirical errors get little bigger
- True errors get much smaller
- Differences between errors get smaller too

This pattern shows classic overfitting when  $k = 1$ . The model learns training data too well (small empirical error) but cannot work good on new data (big true error). Using bigger k helps fix this by taking average of more neighbors.

## 1.6 Why These Parameters Work Best

$k = 9$  with  $p = 2$  gives best results because:

- It uses enough neighbors to make predictions more stable
- It reduces overfitting (smallest difference between empirical and true errors)
- Euclidean distance ( $p = 2$ ) seems to work better for relationships between features than Manhattan ( $p = 1$ ) or maximum distance ( $p = \infty$ ).
- Euclidean distance represents how the human eye sees distances, which is good for our data
- The big  $k$  value ( $k = 9$ ) tells us there is probably lot of noise in data that needs to be averaged

## 1.7 Conclusion

Our analysis shows that  $k = 9$  and  $p = 2$  give best performance for this classification task. These parameters help balance between learning from data and not overfitting. The results also show importance of choosing right  $k$  value to avoid overfitting, especially avoiding  $k = 1$  which memorizes training data too much.