

My model can be separated into 2 parts.

For the first part, I use the principles of linear programming to marp the positis in the first quadrant shot two shtegers from $\{0,1\}$. For the positis in area 0 and 0 are $(x_1-x_2)\cdot(x_1+x_2-2)>0$, so the outputs of the first hidden layer is both 1. For the positis in 0 and 0, $(x_1-x_2)\cdot(x_1+x_2-2)<0$. (3) the output of the first hidden layer are 0 and 1 for each node.

The second part can be described as an XNOR (exclusive NOR) gate. I just modified the weights and bias of a normal standard XOR gate such that the output will be 1 if the two inputs are the same and sie versu.

I just plunged some specific points to verify the model, but the procedure is difficult to precent in this report, so I omit it.

2. Xk = (xk, xk, ..., xd).

2. Wy of Vp.

Yk = (yk, yk, ..., yk).

(i)
$$X = (X_1, X_1, ..., X_d)$$
 $a_1 = \{(X_1, X_1, ..., X_d), a_1\} = \{(X_1, X_1), a_2\} = \{(X_1, X_1), a_2\} = \{(X_1, X_1), a_3\} = \{(X_1, X_1), a_4\} = \{(X_1, X_1), a_4\}$

Machine Learning HW4

PART 2

(i). I just ignore the warnings relating to GPU.

Epoch 1/10

1875/1875 - 2s - loss: 1.4529 - accuracy: 0.7020 - val_loss: 0.8840 - val_accuracy: 0.8346 Epoch 2/10

1875/1875 - 1s - loss: 0.7178 - accuracy: 0.8446 - val_loss: 0.5740 - val_accuracy: 0.8698 Epoch 3/10

1875/1875 - 1s - loss: 0.5334 - accuracy: 0.8706 - val_loss: 0.4657 - val_accuracy: 0.8862 Epoch 4/10

1875/1875 - 1s - loss: 0.4552 - accuracy: 0.8826 - val_loss: 0.4108 - val_accuracy: 0.8940 Epoch 5/10

1875/1875 - 1s - loss: 0.3626 - accuracy: 0.8987 - val_loss: 0.3398 - val_accuracy: 0.9057 Epoch 8/10

1875/1875 - 1s - loss: 0.3472 - accuracy: 0.9029 - val_loss: 0.3258 - val_accuracy: 0.9090 Epoch 9/10

1875/1875 - 1s - loss: 0.3245 - accuracy: 0.9079 - val_loss : 0.3069 - $val_accuracy$: 0.9129 Test Accuracy on the test set: 0.913

(ii). The results are shown below. The accuracy is improved after changing the activate function.

Epoch 1/10

 1875/1875 - 1
s - loss: 0.2917 - accuracy: 0.9181 - val_loss: 0.2648 - val_accuracy: 0.9260 Epoch
 4/10

1875/1875 - 1s - loss: 0.2617 - accuracy: 0.9271 - val_loss: 0.2429 - val_accuracy: 0.9324 Epoch 5/10

1875/1875 - 1s - loss: 0.2391 - accuracy: 0.9327 - val_loss: 0.2224 - val_accuracy: 0.9371 Epoch 6/10

1875/1875 - 1s - loss: 0.2054 - accuracy: 0.9430 - val_loss: 0.1958 - val_accuracy: 0.9456 Epoch 8/10

1875/1875 - 1s - loss: 0.1924 - accuracy: 0.9464 - val loss: 0.1844 - val accuracy: 0.9486

Epoch 9/10

1875/1875 - 1s - loss: 0.1809 - accuracy: 0.9497 - val_loss: 0.1740 - val_accuracy: 0.9517 Epoch 10/10

1875/1875 - 1s - loss: 0.1711 - accuracy: 0.9523 - val_loss : 0.1652 - $val_accuracy$: 0.9540 Test Accuracy on the test set: 0.954

(iii). The accuracy does change.

Epoch 1/10

1875/1875 - 2s - loss: 0.2704 - accuracy: 0.9227 - val_loss: 0.1469 - val_accuracy: 0.9571 Epoch 2/10

 1875/1875 - 1
s - loss: 0.0658 - accuracy: 0.9801 - val_loss: 0.0764 - val_accuracy: 0.9768 Epoch
 5/10

1875/1875 - 1s - loss: 0.0508 - accuracy: 0.9844 - val_loss: 0.0823 - val_accuracy: 0.9752 Epoch 6/10

1875/1875 - 1s - loss: 0.0202 - accuracy: 0.9941 - val_loss: 0.0768 - val_accuracy: 0.9794 Test Accuracy on the test set: 0.979

The accuracy becomes even better, so 'adam' is the better optimizer.

(iv). The accuracy slightly changes, but makes no difference.

Epoch 1/10

1875/1875 - 1s - loss: 0.1141 - accuracy: 0.9666 - val_loss: 0.0961 - val_accuracy: 0.9699 Epoch 3/10

1875/1875 - 1s - loss: 0.0593 - accuracy: 0.9822 - val_loss: 0.0835 - val_accuracy: 0.9746 Epoch 5/10

1875/1875 - 1s - loss: 0.0450 - accuracy: $0.9862 - val_loss$: $0.0755 - val_accuracy$: 0.9762 Epoch 6/10

```
1875/1875 - 1s - loss: 0.0288 - accuracy: 0.9911 - val_loss: 0.0827 - val_accuracy: 0.9757 Epoch 8/10
```

1875/1875 - 1s - loss: 0.0245 - accuracy: 0.9923 - val_loss: 0.0698 - val_accuracy: 0.9803 Epoch 9/10

1875/1875 - 1s - loss : 0.0163 - accuracy : 0.9948 - val_loss : 0.0777 - $val_accuracy$: 0.9795 Test Accuracy on the test set: 0.979

(v). The accuracy even decreased a little bit.

Epoch 1/10

 1875/1875 - 1
s - loss: 0.2392 - accuracy: 0.9301 - val_loss: 0.1349 - val_accuracy: 0.9578 Epoch
 2/10

1875/1875 - 2s - loss: 0.1003 - accuracy: 0.9701 - $val_loss: 0.0912$ - $val_accuracy: 0.9714$ Epoch <math display="inline">3/10

1875/1875 - 1s - loss: 0.0373 - accuracy: 0.9879 - val_loss: 0.0902 - val_accuracy: 0.9741 Epoch 7/10

1875/1875 - 2s - loss: 0.0294 - accuracy: 0.9902 - val_loss: 0.0857 - val_accuracy: 0.9755 Epoch 8/10

1875/1875 - 1s - loss: 0.0250 - accuracy: 0.9918 - val_loss: 0.0862 - val_accuracy: 0.9765 Epoch 9/10

1875/1875 - 2s - loss: 0.0225 - accuracy: 0.9923 - val_loss : 0.0875 - $val_accuracy$: 0.9759 Epoch <math display="inline">10/10

1875/1875 - 1s - loss: 0.0207 - accuracy: 0.9928 - val_loss: 0.0889 - val_accuracy: 0.9771 Test Accuracy on the test set: 0.977

(vi). The accuracy becomes much higher.

Epoch 1/10

1875/1875 - 6s - loss: 0.0618 - accuracy: 0.9818 - val_loss: 0.0572 - val_accuracy: 0.9818 Epoch 3/10

1875/1875 - 6s - loss: 0.0423 - accuracy: 0.9866 - val_loss: 0.0555 - val_accuracy: 0.9813 Epoch 4/10

```
1875/1875 - 6s - loss: 0.0164 - accuracy: 0.9951 - val_loss: 0.0463 - val_accuracy: 0.9860 Epoch 7/10
```

 1875/1875 - 6
s - loss: 0.0116 - accuracy: 0.9963 - val_loss: 0.0468 - val_accuracy: 0.9865 Epoch 8/10

1875/1875 - 6s - loss: 0.0060 - accuracy: 0.9980 - val_loss: 0.0524 - val_accuracy: 0.9870 Test Accuracy on the test set: 0.987

(vii). The accuracy and the description of the model are as follows. I use the model.summary() function to help report the structure of this neural network.

Epoch 1/10

469/469 - 8s - loss: 0.1713 - accuracy: 0.9474 - val_loss: 0.0517 - val_accuracy: 0.9839 Epoch 2/10

469/469 - 7s - loss: 0.0500 - accuracy: 0.9844 - val_loss: 0.0409 - val_accuracy: 0.9874 Epoch 3/10

469/469 - 7s - loss: 0.0257 - accuracy: 0.9920 - val_loss: 0.0315 - val_accuracy: 0.9898 Epoch 5/10

469/469 - 7s - loss: 0.0200 - accuracy: 0.9934 - val_loss: 0.0269 - val_accuracy: 0.9921 Epoch 6/10

469/469 - 7s - loss: 0.0159 - accuracy: 0.9948 - val_loss: 0.0283 - val_accuracy: 0.9906 Epoch 7/10

469/469 - 7s - loss: 0.0139 - accuracy: 0.9953 - val_loss: 0.0303 - val_accuracy: 0.9906 Epoch 8/10

469/469 - 8s - loss: 0.0129 - accuracy: 0.9957 - val_loss: 0.0283 - val_accuracy: 0.9911 Epoch 9/10

469/469 - 8s - loss: 0.0101 - accuracy: 0.9966 - val_loss: 0.0254 - val_accuracy: 0.9920 Epoch 10/10

469/469 - 8s - $loss:\ 0.0085$ - accuracy: 0.9972 - $val_loss:\ 0.0280$ - $val_accuracy:\ 0.9923$ Test Accuracy on the test set: 0.992

Model: "sequential"

Layer (type)	Output Shape	Param #	
conv2d (Conv2D)	(None, 25, 25, 32)	544	
max_pooling2d (MaxPoolin	ng2D) (None, 12, 12, 32)	0	
conv2d_1 (Conv2D)	(None, 9, 9, 64)	32832	

max_pooling2d_1 (MaxPooling2 (None, 4, 4, 64)		0
dropout (Dropout)	(None, 4, 4, 64)	0
flatten (Flatten)	(None, 1024)	0
dense (Dense)	(None, 800)	820000
dense_1 (Dense)	(None, 10)	8010

Total params: 861,386 Trainable params: 861,386 Non-trainable params: 0

Some details:

conv2d: Convolution layer with 32 4 by 4 filters, the activation is relu.

max_pooling2d: Max pooling layer with 2 by 2 pooling window.

conv2d 1: Convolution layer with 64 4 by 4 filters, the activation is relu.

max pooling2d 1: Max pooling layer with 2 by 2 pooling window.

dropout: I drop out 10% of the data.

flatten

dense: First hidden layer with 800 hidden nodes with the relu activation function.

dense_1: The output layer with 10 classes output with the sigmoid activation function.