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### **A) Problem Description**

In this assignment, we aim to use machine learning techniques to predict whether a tumor in breast cancer patients is malignant (M) or benign (B). The dataset consists of 569 instances, each with 30 attributes that represent various cellular features, such as texture, smoothness, compactness, and concavity, among others. The target variable is a binary classification indicating whether the tumor is benign or malignant.

The goal of this project is to build and evaluate machine learning models that can classify the instances accurately. The primary evaluation metrics include **accuracy**, **precision**, **recall**, and **F1-score**. The challenge lies in the large feature space (30 attributes), the complexity of the relationship between features and the target, and the need for computationally efficient solutions.

This task will involve: 1. Training the model on a portion of the data, while ensuring a consistent train-test split ratio. 2. Optimizing model parameters to improve validation accuracy. 3. Evaluating performance in terms of **accuracy**, **precision**, **recall &** **F1-score**,

### **B) Methods Description**

#### **Model Building & Training Process**

* **Dataset Split**: The dataset will be split into training and testing sets, ensuring that no data instance used for training is included in the test set. The split ratio is 4:1 (training to testing).
* **Model Selection**: We will use two machine learning models:
  + **Decision Tree (DT)**: A decision tree will be used as one of the models due to its interpretability and ability to handle complex relationships in the data.
  + **k-Nearest Neighbors (kNN)**: This model is chosen because it is simple and effective for classification problems with a large number of features.
* **Model Training**: Both models will be trained on the selected training set using standard training algorithms.
* **Parameter Optimization**:
  + **Grid Search**: Grid search will be employed to find the optimal hyperparameters for both models, such as the maximum depth for the decision tree and the number of neighbors for kNN.

#### **Model Evaluation & Validation**

* **Performance Metrics**: After training, the models will be evaluated using the following metrics:
  + **Accuracy**: Percentage of correctly predicted instances.
  + **Precision**: Proportion of true positives among predicted positives.
  + **Recall**: Proportion of true positives among actual positives.
  + **F1 Score**: Harmonic mean of precision and recall.

### **C) Results & Conclusions**

#### **Model Performance**

After implementing the models and performing grid search and evolutionary algorithm optimization, we obtained the following results for both **Decision Tree** and **k-Nearest Neighbors** models:

* **Decision Tree**:
  + Accuracy: [Insert Accuracy]
  + Precision: [Insert Precision]
  + Recall: [Insert Recall]
  + F1-Score: [Insert F1-Score]
  + ROC-AUC: [Insert ROC-AUC]
* **k-Nearest Neighbors**:
  + Accuracy: [Insert Accuracy]
  + Precision: [Insert Precision]
  + Recall: [Insert Recall]
  + F1-Score: [Insert F1-Score]
  + ROC-AUC: [Insert ROC-AUC]

#### **Optimization Results**

After performing **Grid Search** for both models, we found that **[model name]** performed best after optimizing the following hyperparameters: - [Model 1] Optimized Parameters: [Insert Hyperparameters] - [Model 2] Optimized Parameters: [Insert Hyperparameters]

The optimized models showed a [Insert percentage] increase in validation accuracy compared to the initial models.

##### **Figure 1: Model Performance Comparison**

Insert a plot comparing the performance of both models (before and after optimization) using evaluation metrics like accuracy, F1-score, and ROC-AUC. This can be a bar chart or line plot that illustrates the improvement in performance post-optimization.

#### **Conclusions**

Based on the results, the **[chosen model]** performed best after optimization. The evolutionary algorithm provided a significant improvement in validation accuracy, showcasing its effectiveness in parameter optimization. Both models demonstrated satisfactory performance for the cancer diagnosis task, but further tuning and feature engineering could potentially improve these results. In particular, the **ROC-AUC** score revealed the model’s good ability to distinguish between malignant and benign instances.

Further work could involve experimenting with other machine learning models, such as **Support Vector Machines (SVM)** or **Random Forests**, and incorporating additional techniques like **feature selection** to reduce the dimensionality of the problem.

### **Note on Figures/Diagrams**

* **Figure 1**: Compare the performance metrics of both models (e.g., accuracy, F1 score, ROC-AUC) using a bar chart.
* **Figure 2**: Show the temporal progress of the best fitness (validation accuracy) in the evolutionary algorithm optimization process. This can be a line plot over several generations.