## **Boston Housing Prediction Results**

| Row | Prediction Model        | Feature Selection Method     | Feature removed                | Normalization<br>Method | Train Test Method  | Test Size | Train Score | Test Score           | Train & Test Score<br>(Weighted AVG) | Model Rank |
|-----|-------------------------|------------------------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|-----------|-------------|----------------------|--------------------------------------|------------|
| 1   | Linear Regression       | -                            | -                              | -                       | 70% Train_30% Test | 30%       | 87%         | <del>-72</del> 2%    | -156%                                | 15         |
| 2   | Linear Regression       | -                            | -                              | Standard Scalar         | 70% Train_30% Test | 30%       | 87%         | <del>-72</del> 2%    | <b>-15</b> 6%                        | 15         |
| 3   | Linear Regression       | -                            | -                              | -                       | Train_Test_Split   | 30%       | 76%         | 67%                  | 73%                                  | 7          |
| 4   | Linear Regression       | -                            | -                              | Standard Scalar         | Train_Test_Split   | 30%       | 76%         | 67%                  | 73%                                  | 7          |
| 5   | Linear Regression       | Correlations (>0.7 or <-0.7) | 'INDUS', 'DIS', 'NOX', 'TAX'   | 1                       | 70% Train_30% Test | 30%       | 85%         | <mark>-25</mark> 7%  | - <mark>1</mark> 8%                  | 13         |
| 6   | Linear Regression       | Correlations (>0.7 or <-0.7) | 'INDUS', 'DIS', 'NOX', 'TAX'   | Standard Scalar         | 70% Train_30% Test | 30%       | 85%         | <mark>-25</mark> 7%  | - <mark>1</mark> 8%                  | 13         |
| 7   | Linear Regression       | Correlations (>0.7 or <-0.7) | 'INDUS', 'DIS', 'NOX', 'TAX'   | 1                       | Train_Test_Split   | 30%       | 73%         | 62%                  | 70%                                  | 10         |
| 8   | Linear Regression       | Correlations (>0.7 or <-0.7) | 'INDUS', 'DIS', 'NOX', 'TAX'   | Standard Scalar         | Train_Test_Split   | 30%       | 73%         | 62%                  | 70%                                  | 10         |
| 9   | Linear Regression       | Chi2                         | 'NOX', 'RM', 'PTRATIO', 'CHAS' | 1                       | 70% Train_30% Test | 30%       | 60%         | <b>-11</b> 18%       | - <mark>29</mark> 3%                 | 17         |
| 10  | Linear Regression       | Chi2                         | 'NOX', 'RM', 'PTRATIO', 'CHAS' | -                       | Train_Test_Split   | 30%       | 67%         | 58%                  | 64%                                  | 12         |
| 11  | Random Forest Regressor | Chi2                         | 'NOX', 'RM', 'PTRATIO', 'CHAS' | Standard Scalar         | Train_Test_Split   | 30%       | 98%         | 72%                  | 90%                                  | 3          |
| 12  | Random Forest Regressor | Chi2                         | 'NOX', 'RM', 'PTRATIO', 'CHAS' | -                       | Train_Test_Split   | 30%       | 98%         | 71%                  | 90%                                  | 4          |
| 13  | Random Forest Regressor | Correlations (>0.7 or <-0.7) | 'INDUS', 'DIS', 'NOX', 'TAX'   | -                       | Train_Test_Split   | 30%       | 98%         | 76%                  | 91%                                  | 2          |
| 14  | Random Forest Regressor | -                            | -                              | Standard Scalar         | Train_Test_Split   | 30%       | 98%         | 84%                  | 94%                                  | 1          |
| 15  | Random Forest Regressor | -                            | -                              | Standard Scalar         | 70% Train_30% Test | 30%       | 99%         | 24%                  | 77%                                  | 6          |
| 16  | Plynomial (Degree 2)    | Chi2                         | 'NOX', 'RM', 'PTRATIO', 'CHAS' | Standard Scalar         | Train_Test_Split   | 30%       | 80%         | 53%                  | 72%                                  | 9          |
| 17  | Plynomial (Degree 2)    | Correlations (>0.7 or <-0.7) | 'INDUS', 'DIS', 'NOX', 'TAX'   | Standard Scalar         | Train_Test_Split   | 30%       | 89%         | 51%                  | 78%                                  | 5          |
| 18  | Plynomial (Degree 3)    | Correlations (>0.7 or <-0.7) | 'INDUS', 'DIS', 'NOX', 'TAX'   | Standard Scalar         | Train_Test_Split   | 30%       | 96%         | <mark>-78</mark> 22% | <mark>-22</mark> 79%                 | 18         |
| 19  |                         |                              |                                |                         |                    |           |             |                      |                                      |            |
| 20  |                         |                              |                                |                         |                    |           |             |                      |                                      |            |

## Description:

- 1- One of the most important reasons for the difference between the scores of the models is the training and testing method (Rows: 1, 3 or 14, 15).
- 2- Normalization of the available samples makes very little difference in the final results (Rows: 1, 2).
- 3 In a specified model, assuming the stability of other conditions, the removal of features in various methods, contrary to expectations, reduces the performance of the prediction model! (Rows: 3, 7, 10).
- 4 Increasing the degree in the polynomial method increases the consistency of the training part, but at the same time greatly reduces the test result. In a way, it can be said that Increasing the degree will result model suffers from overfit (Rows: 17, 18).