**Customer Churn Analysis Project Summary**

**Data Features and Preprocessing**

Key Features Used:

| **Category** | **Features** |
| --- | --- |
| **Customer Behavior** | Tenure, OrderCount, HourSpendOnApp, DaySinceLastOrder |
| **Satisfaction Indicators** | SatisfactionScore, Complain |
| **Economic Factors** | CashbackAmount, CouponUsed, OrderAmountHikeFromLastYear |
| **Logistics** | WarehouseToHome, CityTier |
| **Technical Engagement** | NumberOfDeviceRegistered, NumberOfAddress |

**Data Cleaning:**

* Converted columns to numeric formats
* Replaced zeros with Nan in CashbackAmount & CouponUsed, filled with missing values (medians for numeric, modes for categorical)
* Standardized features for modeling, removed zero-variance columns

**Prediction Models and Evaluation**

**Target Variable:** Binary customer churn (0/1)

**Regression Analysis:**

* Univariate & Multivariate Random Forest Regression (R² ≈ 0.3)

**Clustering Analysis**:

| **Clustering Method** | **Number of Clusters** | **Evaluation Metrics** | **Best Performing** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Agglomerative Clustering** | 3 | Silhouette Score, PCA Visualization, Churn Rate Differentiation | No |
| **K-Means Clustering** | 3 | Silhouette Score, PCA Visualization, Churn Rate Differentiation | No |
| **Mini-Batch K-Means** | 3 | Silhouette Score, PCA Visualization, Churn Rate Differentiation | No |
| **Mean Shift Clustering** | **7 (auto determined)** | **Silhouette Score: 0.299** | **Yes (Best Performing)** |

**Cluster-Wise Churn Rates**

| **Cluster** | **Number of Customers** | **Churn Rate** | **Remarks** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Cluster 2** | 41 | **31.71%** (High Risk) | **High Churn Segment** |
| **Cluster 0** | 5,505 | **16.89%** | Moderate Churn Rate |
| **Clusters 3, 4, 5** | 50 | **0%** | **Perfect Loyalty** |
| **Cluster 6** | 1 | **100%** | **Complete Churn** |
|  |  |  |  |

**Classification Analysis in a tabular format:**

| **Method** | **Accuracy** | **ROC AUC** | **F1 Score (Churned Class)** | **Cluster Feature Impact** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Logistic Regression** | 87.99% | 0.855 | 0.518 | Minimal Improvement |
| **K-Nearest Neighbors** | 87.92% | 0.889 | 0.536 | No Significant Change |
| **Decision Tree (Best Model)** | **94.2%** | 0.901 | **0.825** | **Improved Performance** |
| **Support Vector Machine** | 88.81% | 0.896 | 0.531 | Minimal Improvement |
| **Naive Bayes** | 83.78% | 0.800 | 0.526 | Decreased Performance |
| **Neural Network (Runner-up)** | **94.1%** | 0.971 (Best Discrimination) | **0.806** | **Improved Performance** |

**Evaluation Metrics Considered:**

* Accuracy, ROC AUC, F1 Score (for churn class)
* Cross-validation scores, confusion matrices, comparison with and without cluster features

**Conclusion & Key Takeaways**

1. Customer Segmentation: Mean Shift revealed natural churn patterns, outperforming arbitrary cluster sizes.
2. Classification Effectiveness: Decision Trees balanced accuracy & interpretability, making them ideal for business use.
3. Cluster Feature Impact: Improved classification performance, especially for Neural Networks, validating a two-stage approach.
4. Business Application:
   * Target retention efforts on high-risk Cluster 2 (31.7% churn)
   * Study zero-churn clusters to identify loyalty drivers
   * Implement segment-specific retention strategies
5. Methodology Insight: The strong performance of Mean Shift **underscores the importance of data-driven clustering over predefined counts.**