

# Machine Learning Analysis on Contextual and Covariate Features in Satellite Image of Lagos, Nigeria



Data Science Capstone Spring 2022

By Jake Lieberfarb and Bradley Reardon

Supervisors: Professor Ryan Engstrom  
Professor Amir Jafari

# Table of Contents

Original Raw Image of Lagos, Nigeria



- 1) **Introduction (3-5)**
  - a) Problem statement
  - b) Data
  - c) Flow of Analysis
- 2) **Contextual Features (6-24)**
  - a) Extraction/Preprocessing
  - b) Feature Importance
  - c) Feature Ranking
  - d) Model Development
- 3) **Covariates (25-48)**
  - a) Extraction/Preprocessing
  - b) Feature Importance
  - c) Feature Ranking
  - d) Statistical Analysis
  - e) Model Development
- 4) **Conclusion (49-51)**
- 5) **Discussion (52-55)**

QR code to our github




# Problem Statement

## Background:

- According to the UN, more than 1 billion people are living in deprived areas
- Policy makers, government and global organizations are seeking detailed identification of deprived areas to enhance assignment of resources and track progress of development projects

**There were two questions the researchers hoped to address in this study:**

1. **Can feature importance methods derive any contextual or covariate features that are useful in identifying 'Deprive' and 'Built-up' areas?**
2. **Through the use of classical machine learning models and statistical analysis, are contextual and/or covariate features useful in identifying 'Deprived' and 'Built-up' areas?**




# The Data

Labeled Areas	Raw Satellite Image	Contextual Features	Covariate Features
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 47,560 labeled areas in Lagos</li><li>• Three labels: <b>Deprived</b>, <b>Built-up</b> and <b>Non-Built-up</b></li><li>• 100m<sup>2</sup> per label</li><li>• Highly imbalanced</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• GeoTiff file for Lagos</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• 144 contextual features</li><li>• GeoTiff file per each feature</li></ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Pixel based</li><li>• Format: GeoTiff file</li></ul>

# Flow of Analysis

- Contextual and Covariate features followed the same:
  - Preprocessing
  - Feature importance procedure
  - Model building method
  - Standardized and split on 60/20/20
  - Same hyperparameter features and cross validation
  - **Random state = 42**
  - **Alpha = 0.05**



# Contextual Features


# Table of Contents

- 1) **Introduction (3-5)**
  - a) Problem statement
  - b) Data
  - c) Flow of Analysis
- 2) **Contextual Features (6-24)**
  - a) Extraction/Preprocessing
  - b) Feature Importance
  - c) Feature Ranking
  - d) Model Development
- 3) **Covariates (25-48)**
  - a) Extraction/Preprocessing
  - b) Feature Importance
  - c) Feature Ranking
  - d) Statistical Analysis
  - e) Model Development
- 4) **Conclusion (49-51)**
- 5) **Discussion (52-55)**

Original Raw Image of Lagos, Nigeria



# Flow of Contextual Feature Importance Analysis




# Extracting Contextual Features (Terminology)

**Contextual features**-144 statistical measurements for each pixel taken from satellite imaging

- Contextual features were defined as the statistical quantification of edge patterns, pixel groups, gaps, textures, and the raw spectral signatures calculated over groups of pixels or neighborhoods.
- Examples:


**sfs\_sc31\_w\_mean**



**pantex\_sc7\_min**




# Extracting Contextual Features




# Preprocessing the Contextual Features (2/2)

- Removed 'Not-Built-up' from the dataset
  - New dataframe:
    - 15471 samples
    - 98.3% - 'Built-up'
    - 1.7% - 'Deprived'

Overview of Labeled Coordinates





Overview of Area Descriptions After Removing 'Not-Built-up' Areas



# Contextual Features Correlation Plot

Many of the variables had a strong correlation with each other as indicated by **dark red** and **light-yellow** areas

- Histogram showed strong negative and positive correlation
- Many features had low correlation with each other ( $\text{skew} = 0.579909$ )




# Feature Importance: Methodology

<b>Feature Importance Method</b>	<b>Sklearn Function</b>	<b>Methodology</b>
<i>Mutual Information</i>	<i>SelectKBest, mutual_info_classif</i>	<i>nonparametric methods related to entropy estimation from k-nearest neighbors distances. Mutual information is closely related to entropy and provides results from the range of zero to 1.</i>
<i>Random Forest</i>	<i>feature_importances_</i>	<i>The mean and standard deviation of accumulation of the impurity decrease within each decision tree of the random forest</i>
<i>Logistic Regression</i>	<i>LogisticRegression</i>	<i>odds ratio for coefficients</i>
<i>Gradient Boosting</i>	<i>feature_importances_</i>	<i>rank features based on the total reduction of the criterion within each feature (Gini importance)</i>
<i>Adaboost</i>	<i>feature_importances_</i>	<i>rank features based on the total reduction of the criterion within each feature (Gini importance)</i>


# Feature Ranking: Mutual Information

- Feature importance conducted on validation set
- Most significant feature:
  - ‘fourier\_sc51\_variance’




# Feature Ranking: Random Forest

- Feature importance conducted on validation set
- Most significant feature:  
'gabor\_sc5\_filter\_12'




# Feature Ranking: Logistic Regression

- Feature importance conducted on Validation set
- Most significant feature:
  - ‘fourier\_sc31\_mean’




# Feature Ranking: Gradient Boosting

- Feature importance conducted on Validation set
- Most significant feature:
  - 'gabor\_sc7\_filter\_8'



# Feature Ranking: Adaptive Boosting

- Feature importance conducted on Validation set
- If feature was not significant, it was given value of zero
  - 5 features were important
- Most significant feature:
  - 'gabor\_sc7\_filter\_8



# Feature Ranking: Results

- No clear pattern was detected amongst Contextual Feature methods
  - Feature with rank 1: 'lbpm\_sc7\_max'

Model	Validation F1 for 'Deprived'
Random Forest	0.07
Logistic Regression	0.07
Gradient Boosting	0.00
Adaboost	0.00

# Feature Ranking: Comparing all Ranks

- Contextual features would have feature importance values for some models but have low values for others

Contextual_features	top_logistic_0_1	top_Random_Forest_0_1	top_Gradient_Boosting_0_1	top_Ada_Boosting_0_1	minfo_0_1	rank
lbpmp_sc7_max	7	22	18	4	39	1
hog_sc3_skew	10	26	6	5	73	2
gabor_sc5_filter_12	69	1	14	82	3	3
lac_sc7_lac	26	19	2	2	131	4
gabor_sc7_filter_8	91	38	1	1	53	5

# Model Development: Contextual - classes 0 & 1

- 5 model types tested:
  - Ensemble (9 MLP models)
  - Multilayer Perceptron
  - Random Forest
  - LogisticRegression
  - Gradient Boosting
- train/test/val split: 60/20/20
- GridsearchCV used for hyperparameter tuning
- Top 50 features in each feature reduction set tested
- Best performing model:
  - Ensemble model
  - Using all features available

Dataset	Model	Feature Set	Feature Count	Classes	F1 - Class 1 (Deprived)	F1 - Macro
contextual	Ensemble	All_Features	144	classes_0&1	0.35	0.67
contextual	Gradient_Boosting	ADA_Features	50	classes_0&1	0.09	0.54
contextual	Gradient_Boosting	All_Features	144	classes_0&1	0.09	0.54
contextual	Random_Forest	ADA_Features	50	classes_0&1	0.07	0.53
contextual	Gradient_Boosting	Gradient_Boosting_Features	50	classes_0&1	0.07	0.53
contextual	MLP	Gradient_Boosting_Features	50	classes_0&1	0.04	0.51
contextual	MLP	All_Features	144	classes_0&1	0.04	0.51
contextual	MLP	ADA_Features	50	classes_0&1	0.04	0.51
contextual	MLP	Logistic_Features	50	classes_0&1	0.04	0.51
contextual	Logistic_Regression	All_Features	144	classes_0&1	0.04	0.51
contextual	Logistic_Regression	ADA_Features	50	classes_0&1	0.04	0.51
contextual	Logistic_Regression	Logistic_Features	50	classes_0&1	0.04	0.51
contextual	Random_Forest	All_Features	144	classes_0&1	0.04	0.51
contextual	Random_Forest	Logistic_Features	50	classes_0&1	0.04	0.51
contextual	Logistic_Regression	Gradient_Boosting_Features	50	classes_0&1	0.04	0.08
contextual	Gradient_Boosting	Minfo_Features	50	classes_0&1	0.03	0.51
contextual	Gradient_Boosting	Logistic_Features	50	classes_0&1	0.03	0.51
contextual	MLP	Random_Forest_Features	50	classes_0&1	0.03	0.50
contextual	MLP	Minfo_Features	50	classes_0&1	0.00	0.50
contextual	Gradient_Boosting	Random_Forest_Features	50	classes_0&1	0.00	0.49
contextual	Logistic_Regression	Random_Forest_Features	50	classes_0&1	0.00	0.50
contextual	Logistic_Regression	Minfo_Features	50	classes_0&1	0.00	0.50
contextual	Random_Forest	Random_Forest_Features	50	classes_0&1	0.00	0.50
contextual	Random_Forest	Gradient_Boosting_Features	50	classes_0&1	0.00	0.50
contextual	Random_Forest	Minfo_Features	50	classes_0&1	0.00	0.50

# Best Model: Contextual - classes 0 & 1

BEST PERFORMING CONTEXTUAL MODEL ON ALL CLASSES

<i>Dataset</i>	<i>Model</i>	<i>Feature Set</i>	<i>Feature Count</i>	<i>Classes</i>	<i>F1-Deprived</i>	<i>F1-Macro</i>
<i>covariate</i>	<i>Ensemble</i>	<i>All</i>	<i>144</i>	<i>classes 0&amp;1</i>	<i>0.35</i>	<i>0.67</i>

a. Ensemble model consisted of nine (9) MLP models

## Models Parameters

- Hidden layer sizes: (100, 100, 100)
- Activation: tanh
- Solver: adam
- Alpha: 0.0001
- Learning Rate: invscaling

CONTEXTUAL CONFUSION MATRIX - CLASSES 0 & 1

<i>True</i>	<i>Built-up</i>	<i>3033</i>	<i>9</i>
	<i>Deprived</i>	<i>39</i>	<i>13</i>
	<i>Built-up</i>	<i>Deprived</i>	
		<i>Predicted</i>	

(Confusion Matrix for the best performing model trained on the contextual features dataset containing only instances of the built-up (0) and deprived (1) classes.)

# Model Testing: Contextual - all classes

- 5 model types tested:
  - Ensemble (9 MLP models)
  - Multilayer Perceptron
  - Random Forest
  - LogisticRegression
  - Gradient Boosting
- train/test/val split: 60/20/20
- GridsearchCV used for hyperparameter tuning
- Top 50 features in each feature reduction set tested
- Best performing model:
  - Ensemble model
  - Using all features available

Dataset	Model	Feature Set	Feature Count	Classes	F1 - Class 1 (Deprived)	F1 - Macro
contextual	Ensemble	All_Features	144	all_classes	0.25	0.70
contextual	MLP	All_Features	144	all_classes	0.21	0.67
contextual	Gradient_Boosting	Minfo_Features	50	all_classes	0.18	0.67
contextual	MLP	ADA_Features	50	all_classes	0.10	0.64
contextual	MLP	Logistic_Features	50	all_classes	0.09	0.63
contextual	Random_Forest	ADA_Features	50	all_classes	0.08	0.63
contextual	Gradient_Boosting	ADA_Features	50	all_classes	0.07	0.62
contextual	Gradient_Boosting	All_Features	144	all_classes	0.07	0.63
contextual	Gradient_Boosting	Gradient_Boosting_Features	50	all_classes	0.06	0.61
contextual	Random_Forest	All_Features	144	all_classes	0.04	0.62
contextual	Gradient_Boosting	Logistic_Features	50	all_classes	0.03	0.61
contextual	Logistic_Regression	Random_Forest_Features	50	all_classes	0.00	0.33
contextual	Logistic_Regression	Minfo_Features	50	all_classes	0.00	0.10
contextual	Logistic_Regression	Gradient_Boosting_Features	50	all_classes	0.00	0.32
contextual	MLP	Random_Forest_Features	50	all_classes	0.00	0.38
contextual	MLP	Gradient_Boosting_Features	50	all_classes	0.00	0.44
contextual	MLP	Minfo_Features	50	all_classes	0.00	0.38
contextual	Gradient_Boosting	Random_Forest_Features	50	all_classes	0.00	0.57
contextual	Logistic_Regression	All_Features	144	all_classes	0.00	0.60
contextual	Logistic_Regression	ADA_Features	50	all_classes	0.00	0.59
contextual	Logistic_Regression	Logistic_Features	50	all_classes	0.00	0.59
contextual	Random_Forest	Random_Forest_Features	50	all_classes	0.00	0.44
contextual	Random_Forest	Gradient_Boosting_Features	50	all_classes	0.00	0.42
contextual	Random_Forest	Logistic_Features	50	all_classes	0.00	0.60
contextual	Random_Forest	Minfo_Features	50	all_classes	0.00	0.55

# Best Model: Contextual - all classes

BEST PERFORMING CONTEXTUAL MODEL ON ALL CLASSES

<i>Dataset</i>	<i>Model</i>	<i>Feature Set</i>	<i>Feature Count</i>	<i>Classes</i>	<i>F1-Deprived</i>	<i>F1-Macro</i>
<i>covariate</i>	<i>Ensemble</i>	<i>All</i>	144	<i>all classes</i>	0.25	0.70

a. Ensemble model consisted of nine (9) MLP models

CONTEXTUAL CONFUSION MATRIX - ALL CLASSES

<i>True</i>	<i>Built-up</i>	2729	6	325
	<i>Deprived</i>	25	8	16
	<i>Non-built-up</i>	267	1	6138
	<i>Built-up</i>	<i>Deprived</i>	<i>Non-built-up</i>	
		<i>Predicted</i>		

(Confusion Matrix for the best performing model trained on the full contextual features dataset containing all instances of the Built-up (0), Deprived (1), and Non-built-up (2) classes )

## Models Parameters

- Hidden layer sizes: (100, 100, 100)
- Activation: tanh
- Solver: adam
- Alpha: 0.0001
- Learning Rate: invscaling

# Covariate Features


# Table of Contents

- 1) **Introduction (3-5)**
  - a) Problem statement
  - b) Data
  - c) Flow of Analysis
- 2) **Contextual Features (6-24)**
  - a) Extraction/Preprocessing
  - b) Feature Importance
  - c) Feature Ranking
  - d) Model Development
- 3) **Covariates (25-48)**
  - a) Extraction/Preprocessing
  - b) Feature Importance
  - c) Feature Ranking
  - d) Statistical Analysis
  - e) Model Development
- 4) **Conclusion (49-51)**
- 5) **Discussion (52-55)**

Original Raw Image of Lagos, Nigeria



# Flow of Covariate Feature Importance Analysis




# Extracting Covariate Features (Terminology)

Covariate features- 61 total:


- Features stored in a single geoTiff file
- 55 continuous variables
- 6 categorical variables

## Covariate Features




Covariate Feature	Count
Facilities & Services	8
Housing(HO)	1
Infrastructure	5
Physical Hazards & Assets	23
Population Counts	2
SES(HH)	14
Social Hazards and Assets	5
Unplanned Urbanization	3

# Extracting Covariate Features



# Preprocessing the Covariate Features


- Removed 1987 nan values
  - 1876 from 'Not-Built-up'
  - 1 from 'Built-up'
  - Removed 'ph\_gdmhz\_2005'
    - Contained nan values
- Removed 'Not-Built-up' from the dataset
  - **New dataframe:**
    - 15470 samples
    - 98.3% - 'Built-up'
    - 1.7% - 'Deprived'



# Covariate Features Correlation Plot

Many of the variables had a strong correlation with each other as indicated by **dark red** and **light-yellow** areas

- Histogram showed strong negative and positive correlation
- Many features had low correlation with each other (**skew = 0.017183**)




# Feature Importance: Methodology

<b>Feature Importance Method</b>	<b>Sklearn Function</b>	<b>Methodology</b>
<i>Mutual Information</i>	<i>SelectKBest, mutual_info_classif</i>	<i>nonparametric methods related to entropy estimation from k-nearest neighbors distances. Mutual information is closely related to entropy and provides results from the range of zero to 1.</i>
<i>Random Forest</i>	<i>feature_importances_</i>	<i>The mean and standard deviation of accumulation of the impurity decrease within each decision tree of the random forest</i>
<i>Logistic Regression</i>	<i>LogisticRegression</i>	<i>odds ratio for coefficients</i>
<i>Gradient Boosting</i>	<i>feature_importances_</i>	<i>rank features based on the total reduction of the criterion within each feature (Gini importance)</i>
<i>Adaboost</i>	<i>feature_importances_</i>	<i>rank features based on the total reduction of the criterion within each feature (Gini importance)</i>


# Feature Ranking: Mutual Information

- Feature importance conducted on validation set
- Most significant feature:
  - 'ph\_climate\_risk\_2020'




# Feature Ranking: Random Forest

- Feature importance conducted on validation set
- Most significant feature:  
‘uu\_bld\_den\_2020’




# Feature Ranking: Logistic Regression

- Feature importance conducted on Validation set
- Most significant feature:
  - ‘ses\_odef\_2018’




# Feature Ranking: Gradient Boosting

- Feature importance conducted on Validation set
- Most significant feature:
  - 'uu\_bld\_den\_2020'



# Feature Ranking: Adaptive Boosting

- Feature importance conducted on Validation set
- If feature was not significant, it was given value of zero
  - 25 features were important
- Most significant feature:
  - 'uu\_bld\_den\_2020'



# Feature Ranking: Results

- No clear pattern was detected amongst covariate feature methods
  - Feature with rank 1: 'uu\_bld\_den\_2020'


Model	Validation F1 for 'Deprived'
Random Forest	0.91
Logistic Regression	0.87
Gradient Boosting	0.81
Adaboost	0.79

# Feature Ranking: Comparing all Ranks

- Covariate features would have feature importance values for some models but have low values for others
- Top performing feature: 'uu\_bld\_den\_2020'


Covariate_features	top_logistic_0_1	top_Random_Forest_0_1	top_Gradient_Boosting_0_1	top_Ada_Boosting_0_1	minfo_0_1	rank
uu_bld_den_2020	24	1	1	1	4	1
ses_odef_2018	1	13	3	2	14	2
uu_bld_count_2020	25	2	2	35	7	3
ses_impr_water_src_2016	2	9	24	15	21	4
ses_dpt3_2018	18	17	13	14	17	5
ph_dist_aq_veg_2015	13	5	27	7	35	6

# Flow of Covariate Feature Statistical Analysis



# Quantitative Statistical Analysis


- Results: Determined that top 21 covariate features were statistically significant in determining 'Deprived' and 'Built-up' areas
- Hypothesis testing:
  - Kolmogorov-Smirnov test on Normality (ANOVA assumption 1)
  - Levene test for equality of variances (ANOVA assumption 2)
  - Kruskal-Wallis H test
    - 'Built-up' and 'Deprived' did not come from same distribution
    - Mean rank utilized for testing ([link](#))
    - Non-parametric rank based testing
- Box plot:
  - Quantiles for 'Deprived' and 'Built-up' do not overlap (visual indication of Difference between groups)




# Categorical Statistical Analysis

- Determined that 1 out of 5 variables was statistically independent from being able to classify 'Deprived' and 'Built-up'
  - 'fs\_electric\_dist\_2020'
- Hypothesis testing:
  - Chi Square test of Independence


Chi-Square Test Results		
Categorical Covariate Features	P-value	Number of categories
fs_electric_dist_2020	0.7381	2
ph_hzd_index_2011	0.00	6
ph_land_c1_2019	0.00	11
ph_land_c2_2020	0.00	8
sh_pol_relev_ethnic_gr_2019	0.00	2
uu_urb_bldg_2018	0.00	3



# Logistic model



# Random Forest model



# Model Testing: Covariate - classes 0 & 1

- 4 model types tested:
  - Multilayer Perceptron
  - Random Forest
  - LogisticRegression
  - Gradient Boosting
- train/test/val split: 60/20/20
- GridsearchCV used for hyperparameter tuning
- Top 50 features in each feature reduction set tested
- Best performing model:
  - MLP
  - Using all features available

Dataset	Model	Feature Set	Feature Count	Classes	F1 - Class 1 (Deprived)	F1 - Macro
covariate	MLP	All_Features	60	classes_0&1	0.96	0.98
covariate	MLP	Gradient_Boosting_Features	50	classes_0&1	0.96	0.98
covariate	MLP	Logistic_Features	50	classes_0&1	0.94	0.97
covariate	Random_Forest	ADA_Features	50	classes_0&1	0.94	0.97
covariate	MLP	ADA_Features	50	classes_0&1	0.94	0.97
covariate	MLP	Minfo_Features	50	classes_0&1	0.93	0.96
covariate	Logistic_Regression	ADA_Features	50	classes_0&1	0.92	0.96
covariate	Random_Forest	Minfo_Features	50	classes_0&1	0.92	0.96
covariate	Random_Forest	All_Features	60	classes_0&1	0.92	0.96
covariate	Random_Forest	Gradient_Boosting_Features	50	classes_0&1	0.92	0.96
covariate	Random_Forest	Logistic_Features	50	classes_0&1	0.91	0.95
covariate	Logistic_Regression	Gradient_Boosting_Features	50	classes_0&1	0.90	0.95
covariate	Logistic_Regression	Minfo_Features	50	classes_0&1	0.90	0.95
covariate	Logistic_Regression	All_Features	60	classes_0&1	0.89	0.95
covariate	Gradient_Boosting	ADA_Features	50	classes_0&1	0.89	0.94
covariate	Gradient_Boosting	All_Features	60	classes_0&1	0.89	0.94
covariate	Gradient_Boosting	Gradient_Boosting_Features	50	classes_0&1	0.88	0.94
covariate	Gradient_Boosting	Minfo_Features	50	classes_0&1	0.86	0.93
covariate	Gradient_Boosting	Logistic_Features	50	classes_0&1	0.85	0.92
covariate	Logistic_Regression	Logistic_Features	50	classes_0&1	0.82	0.91

# Best Model: Covariate - classes 0 & 1

BEST PERFORMING COVARIATE MODEL ON CLASSES 0 & 1

<i>Dataset</i>	<i>Model</i>	<i>Feature Set</i>	<i>Feature Count</i>	<i>Classes</i>	<i>F1-Deprived</i>	<i>F1-Macro</i>
<i>covariate</i>	<i>MLP</i>	<i>All</i>	<i>144</i>	<i>classes 0&amp;1</i>	<i>0.96</i>	<i>0.98</i>

COVARIATE CONFUSION MATRIX - CLASSES 0 & 1

<i>True</i>	<i>Built-up</i>	<i>3040</i>	<i>3</i>
	<i>Deprived</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>50</i>
	<i>Built-up</i>	<i>Deprived</i>	
<i>Predicted</i>			

(Confusion Matrix for the best performing model trained on the covariate features dataset containing only instances of the built-up (0) and deprived (1) classes.)

## Model Parameters

- Hidden layer sizes: (100, 100, 100)
- Activation: tanh
- Solver: adam
- Alpha: 0.0001
- Learning Rate: invscaling

# Model Testing: Covariate - all classes

- 4 model types tested:
  - Multilayer Perceptron
  - Random Forest
  - LogisticRegression
  - Gradient Boosting
- train/test/val split: 60/20/20
- GridsearchCV used for hyperparameter tuning
- Top 50 features in each feature reduction set tested
- Best performing model:
  - Random Forest
  - Top 50 Mutual information features

Dataset	Model	Feature Set	Feature Count	Classes	F1 - Class 1 (Deprived)	F1 - Macro
covariate	Random_Forest	Minfo_Features	50	all_classes	0.94	0.98
covariate	Random_Forest	All_Features	60	all_classes	0.91	0.97
covariate	Random_Forest	Gradient_Boosting_Features	50	all_classes	0.91	0.97
covariate	Random_Forest	Logistic_Features	50	all_classes	0.91	0.96
covariate	Random_Forest	ADA_Features	50	all_classes	0.90	0.96
covariate	MLP	Gradient_Boosting_Features	50	all_classes	0.90	0.96
covariate	MLP	ADA_Features	50	all_classes	0.89	0.96
covariate	MLP	Logistic_Features	50	all_classes	0.89	0.96
covariate	MLP	All_Features	60	all_classes	0.88	0.96
covariate	MLP	Minfo_Features	50	all_classes	0.88	0.96
covariate	Logistic_Regression	Logistic_Features	50	all_classes	0.80	0.92
covariate	Logistic_Regression	All_Features	60	all_classes	0.78	0.91
covariate	Logistic_Regression	Gradient_Boosting_Features	50	all_classes	0.78	0.91
covariate	Gradient_Boosting	ADA_Features	50	all_classes	0.78	0.92
covariate	Gradient_Boosting	Logistic_Features	50	all_classes	0.78	0.92
covariate	Logistic_Regression	ADA_Features	50	all_classes	0.78	0.91
covariate	Logistic_Regression	Minfo_Features	50	all_classes	0.78	0.90
covariate	Gradient_Boosting	Gradient_Boosting_Features	50	all_classes	0.74	0.91
covariate	Gradient_Boosting	All_Features	60	all_classes	0.73	0.90
covariate	Gradient_Boosting	Minfo_Features	50	all_classes	0.71	0.90

# Best Model: Covariate - all classes

BEST PERFORMING COVARIATE MODEL ON ALL CLASSES

<i>Dataset</i>	<i>Model</i>	<i>Feature Set</i>	<i>Feature Count</i>	<i>Classes</i>	<i>F1-Deprived</i>	<i>F1-Macro</i>
<i>covariate</i>	<i>RF</i>	<i>Minfo</i>	<i>144</i>	<i>all classes</i>	0.94	0.98

COVARIATE CONFUSION MATRIX - ALL CLASSES

<i>True</i>	<i>Built-up</i>	3059	0	11
	<i>Deprived</i>	2	46	4
	<i>Non-built-up</i>	18	0	5975
		<i>Built-up</i>	<i>Deprived</i>	<i>Non-built-up</i>
<i>Predicted</i>				

(Confusion Matrix for the best performing model trained on the full covariate features dataset containing all instances of the Built-up (0), Deprived (1), and Non-built-up (2) classes )

# Conclusion

# Table of Contents

- 1) **Introduction (3-5)**
  - a) Problem statement
  - b) Data
  - c) Flow of Analysis
- 2) **Contextual Features (6-24)**
  - a) Extraction/Preprocessing
  - b) Feature Importance
  - c) Feature Ranking
  - d) Model Development
- 3) **Covariates (25-48)**
  - a) Extraction/Preprocessing
  - b) Feature Importance
  - c) Feature Ranking
  - d) Statistical Analysis
  - e) Model Development
- 4) Conclusion (49-51)**
- 5) **Discussion (53-55)**

Original Raw Image of Lagos, Nigeria



# Conclusion: Problem Statement

There were two questions the researchers hoped to address in this study:

1. Can feature importance methods derive any contextual or covariate features that are useful in identifying 'Deprived' and 'Built-up' areas?
  - a. Feature importance methods based on Mutual information, Random Forest, Gradient Boosting, Logistic regression, and Adaptive boosting were able to identify the ranks of Contextual and Covariate features
    - i. Top Covariate feature: 'uu\_bld\_den\_2020'
  - b. Proved statistically that top 21 Covariate features were significant
2. Through the use of classical machine learning models and statistical analysis, are contextual and/or covariate features useful in identifying 'Deprived' and 'Built-up' areas?
  - a. Covariate features were useful
  - b. Contextual features were not useful

BEST PERFORMING MODELS

<i>Dataset</i>	<i>Model</i>	<i>Feature Set</i>	<i>Feature Count</i>	<i>Classes</i>	<i>F1-Deprived</i>	<i>F1-Macro</i>
<i>covariate</i>	<i>MLP</i>	<i>All</i>	<i>60</i>	<i>classes 0&amp;1</i>	<i>0.96</i>	<i>0.98</i>
<i>covariate</i>	<i>RF</i>	<i>Minfo</i>	<i>50</i>	<i>all classes</i>	<i>0.94</i>	<i>0.98</i>
<i>contextual</i>	<i>GB</i>	<i>All</i>	<i>144</i>	<i>classes 0&amp;1</i>	<i>0.35</i>	<i>0.67</i>
<i>contextual</i>	<i>MLP</i>	<i>All</i>	<i>144</i>	<i>all classes</i>	<i>0.25</i>	<i>0.70</i>

- A. MLP: Multilayer Perceptron  
B. RF: Random Forest  
C. GB: Gradient Boosting

# Discussion

# Table of Contents

- 1) **Introduction (3-5)**
  - a) Problem statement
  - b) Data
  - c) Flow of Analysis
- 2) **Contextual Features (6-25)**
  - a) Extraction/Preprocessing
  - b) Feature Importance
  - c) Feature Ranking
  - d) Model Development
- 3) **Covariates (26-49)**
  - a) Extraction/Preprocessing
  - b) Feature Importance
  - c) Feature Ranking
  - d) Statistical Analysis
  - e) Model Development
- 4) **Conclusion (50-52)**
- 5) **Discussion (53-55)**

Original Raw Image of Lagos, Nigeria



# Discussion

- Add more 'Deprived' areas to analysis to address class imbalance
- Attempt different processing steps for extracting the contextual features
  - Taking max, min, or median values
- Attempt to ensemble contextual and covariate features together
- Investigate outliers/ apply transformations within 'Deprived' and 'Built-up' covariate features to further confirm statistical analysis

# Questions?

