

# Data And Information Quality Project

- **PROJECT ID:** 21
- **PROJECT NUMBER:** 1
- **ASSIGNED DATASET:** USERS
- **STUDENT:** PASQUALE CASTIGLIONE 10657816
- **ASSIGNED TASK:** CLUSTERING

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>SETUP CHOICES</b>	<b>3</b>
1.1	Chosen ML algorithms . . . . .	3
1.2	Chosen ML performance evaluation metrics . . . . .	3
1.3	Imputation techniques selected . . . . .	3
1.3.1	Simple Imputation . . . . .	3
1.3.2	Advanced Imputation . . . . .	3
<b>2</b>	<b>PIPELINE IMPLEMENTATION</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1	Description of the steps you performed . . . . .	3
<b>3</b>	<b>RESULTS</b>	<b>4</b>
3.1	Description of the main results obtained . . . . .	4
3.1.1	Simple Imputation . . . . .	4
3.1.2	Advanced Imputation . . . . .	4
3.2	ML performance comparison between the imputation/outlier detection techniques you have implemented . . . . .	4

## **1 SETUP CHOICES**

### **1.1 Chosen ML algorithms**

### **1.2 Chosen ML performance evaluation metrics**

### **1.3 Imputation techniques selected**

#### **1.3.1 Simple Imputation**

The simple imputation was performed by propagating valid data to the missing value.

#### **1.3.2 Advanced Imputation**

The advanced technique used to impute missing value was *KNN*. In order to apply this method, data were firstly encoded as one-hot numeric arrays. This method turned out to be pretty robust to shuffling.

## **2 PIPELINE IMPLEMENTATION**

### **2.1 Description of the steps you performed**

### 3 RESULTS

#### 3.1 Description of the main results obtained

##### 3.1.1 Simple Imputation

	CT	CU	LT	TC
<b>50%</b>	0.92	0.91	0.9	1.00
<b>60%</b>	0.92	0.93	0.93	1.00
<b>70%</b>	0.94	0.97	0.93	0.99
<b>80%</b>	0.96	0.95	0.97	1.00
<b>90%</b>	0.97	0.99	0.99	1.00

Table 1: Simple Imputation

	CT	CU	LT	TC
<b>50%</b>	0.69	0.81	0.67	0.61
<b>60%</b>	0.71	0.83	0.76	0.69
<b>70%</b>	0.83	0.90	0.81	0.78
<b>80%</b>	0.89	0.93	0.87	0.83
<b>90%</b>	0.91	0.98	0.94	0.91

Table 2: Simple Imputation Shuffled

##### 3.1.2 Advanced Imputation

	CT	CU	LT	TC
<b>50%</b>	0.76	0.90	0.79	0.80
<b>60%</b>	0.84	0.92	0.85	0.87
<b>70%</b>	0.88	0.96	0.92	0.91
<b>80%</b>	0.94	0.97	0.95	0.94
<b>90%</b>	0.97	1.00	0.99	0.98

Table 3: KNN Imputation

	CT	CU	LT	TC
<b>50%</b>	0.79	0.91	0.78	0.78
<b>60%</b>	0.83	0.91	0.86	0.83
<b>70%</b>	0.88	0.94	0.91	0.91
<b>80%</b>	0.96	0.96	0.94	0.95
<b>90%</b>	0.98	0.99	0.99	1.00

Table 4: KNN Imputation Shuffled

#### 3.2 ML performance comparison between the imputation/outlier detection techniques you have implemented