Data Mining-HW1

P76061425 林聖軒

主程式: assoc_analysis.py

執行參數:

Result compare:

Dataset: data.ntrans 1 (IBM Quest Data)

Number of transactions:1000

Minimum Support = 3 , Minimum Confidence = 0.5

執行時間:

Apriori Algorithm:

real 1m50.782s

FP-Growth:

real 0m5.904s

Minimum Support = 4, Minimum Confidence = 0.5

執行時間:

Apriori Algorithm:

real 0m13.639s

FP-Growth:

real 0m1.349s

Minimum Support = 5, **Minimum Confidence = 0.5**

執行時間:

Apriori Algorithm:

real 0m0.947s

FP-Growth:

real 0m0.610s

Kaggle DataSet (bonus):

Dataset: kaggle data.csv

Number of transactions:9684

Minimum Support = 5, Minimum Confidence = 0.5

執行時間:

Apriori Algorithm:

shengxuan@gpuserval-System-Product-Name:~/DM/DM_HWl\$ time py assoc_analysis.py -p apr -msp 5 -msc 0.5 -f kaggle_data.csv -ftp k∎

real 1m15.463s

FP-Growth:

shengxuan@gpuserval-System-Product-Name:~/DM/DM_HWl\$ time py assoc_analysis.py -p fpg -msp 5 -msc 0.5 -f kaggle_data.csv -ftp k

real 0m0.564s

上面幾個例子可以很明顯的看到,FP-Growth 演算法的執行時間較少,效率明顯高於 Apriori Algorithm,而 minimum support 越低則需要越長的時間來找 association rule。

程式驗證:

與 weka 結果相同

```
Associator output
=== Run information ===
        weka.associations.FPGrowth -P 2 -I -1 -N 10 -T 0 -C 0.5 -D 0.05 -U 1.0 -M 0.4 -S
Scheme:
Relation:
        fp_test_datal
Instances:
Attributes:
        b
=== Associator model (full training set) ===
FPGrowth found 14 rules
6. [e=1]: 3 ==> [c=1]: 2 <conf:(0.67)> lift:(0.89) lev:(-0.06) conv:(0.38)
13. [b=1]: 3 ==> [e=1, c=1]: 2 <conf:(0.67)> lift:(1.33) lev:(0.13) conv:(0.75)
14. [e=1, b=1]: 3 ==> [c=1]: 2 <conf:(0.67)> lift:(0.89) lev:(-0.06) conv:(0.38)
```