

# BA64060\_Assignment3

Ruthvick Bulagakula

2023-10-15

## Problem Statement

The file `accidentsFull.csv` contains information on 42,183 actual automobile accidents in 2001 in the United States that involved one of three levels of injury: NO INJURY, INJURY, or FATALITY. For each accident, additional information is recorded, such as day of week, weather conditions, and road type. A firm might be interested in developing a system for quickly classifying the severity of an accident based on initial reports and associated data in the system (some of which rely on GPS-assisted reporting).

Our goal here is to predict whether an accident just reported will involve an injury ( $\text{MAX\_SEV\_IR} = 1$  or  $2$ ) or will not ( $\text{MAX\_SEV\_IR} = 0$ ). For this purpose, create a dummy variable called `INJURY` that takes the value “yes” if  $\text{MAX\_SEV\_IR} = 1$  or  $2$ , and otherwise “no.”

1. Using the information in this dataset, if an accident has just been reported and no further information is available, what should the prediction be? (`INJURY = Yes or No?`) Why?
2. Select the first 24 records in the dataset and look only at the response (`INJURY`) and the two predictors `WEATHER_R` and `TRAF_CON_R`. Create a pivot table that examines `INJURY` as a function of the two predictors for these 12 records. Use all three variables in the pivot table as rows/columns.
  - Compute the exact Bayes conditional probabilities of an injury (`INJURY = Yes`) given the six possible combinations of the predictors.
  - Classify the 24 accidents using these probabilities and a cutoff of 0.5.
  - Compute manually the naive Bayes conditional probability of an injury given `WEATHER_R = 1` and `TRAF_CON_R = 1`.
  - Run a naive Bayes classifier on the 24 records and two predictors. Check the model output to obtain probabilities and classifications for all 24 records. Compare this to the exact Bayes classification. Are the resulting classifications equivalent? Is the ranking (= ordering) of observations equivalent?
3. Let us now return to the entire dataset. Partition the data into training (60%) and validation (40%).
  - Run a naive Bayes classifier on the complete training set with the relevant predictors (and `INJURY` as the response). Note that all predictors are categorical. Show the confusion matrix.
  - What is the overall error of the validation set?

## Summary

### Data Input and Cleaning

Load the required libraries and read the input file

```
library(e1071)
library(caret)
```

```
## Loading required package: ggplot2
```

```
## Loading required package: lattice
```

```
library(klaR)
```

```
## Loading required package: MASS
```

```
library(dplyr)
```

```
##
```

```
## Attaching package: 'dplyr'
```

```
## The following object is masked from 'package:MASS':
```

```
##
```

```
##      select
```

```
## The following objects are masked from 'package:stats':
```

```
##
```

```
##      filter, lag
```

```
## The following objects are masked from 'package:base':
```

```
##
```

```
##      intersect, setdiff, setequal, union
```

```
accidents = read.csv("accidentsFull.csv")
```

```
accidents$INJURY = ifelse(accidents$MAX_SEV_IR>0,"yes","no")
```

```
head(accidents)
```

```
##   HOUR_I_R ALCHL_I ALIGN_I STRATUM_R WRK_ZONE WKDY_I_R INT_HWY LGTCON_I_R
## 1         0         2       2         1         0         1         0         3
## 2         1         2       1         0         0         1         1         3
## 3         1         2       1         0         0         1         0         3
## 4         1         2       1         1         0         0         0         3
## 5         1         1       1         0         0         1         0         3
## 6         1         2       1         1         0         1         0         3
##   MANCOL_I_R PED_ACC_R RELJCT_I_R REL_RWY_R PROFIL_I_R SPD_LIM SUR_COND
## 1           0         0         1         0         1        40         4
## 2           2         0         1         1         1        70         4
## 3           2         0         1         1         1        35         4
## 4           2         0         1         1         1        35         4
## 5           2         0         0         1         1        25         4
## 6           0         0         1         0         1        70         4
##   TRAF_CON_R TRAF_WAY VEH_INVL WEATHER_R INJURY_CRASH NO_INJ_I PRPTYDMG_CRASH
## 1           0         3         1         1         1         1         0
```

```
## 2      0      3      2      2      0      0      1
## 3      1      2      2      2      0      0      1
## 4      1      2      2      1      0      0      1
## 5      0      2      3      1      0      0      1
## 6      0      2      1      2      1      1      0
##  FATALITIES MAX_SEV_IR INJURY
## 1      0      1  yes
## 2      0      0  no
## 3      0      0  no
## 4      0      0  no
## 5      0      0  no
## 6      0      1  yes
```

```
# Convert variables to factor
for (i in c(1:dim(accidents)[2])){
  accidents[,i] = as.factor(accidents[,i])
}
head(accidents,n=24)
```

```
##  HOUR_I_R ALCHL_I ALIGN_I STRATUM_R WRK_ZONE WKDY_I_R INT_HWY LGTCON_I_R
## 1      0      2      2      1      0      1      0      3
## 2      1      2      1      0      0      1      1      3
## 3      1      2      1      0      0      1      0      3
## 4      1      2      1      1      0      0      0      3
## 5      1      1      1      0      0      1      0      3
## 6      1      2      1      1      0      1      0      3
## 7      1      2      1      0      0      1      1      3
## 8      1      2      1      1      0      1      0      3
## 9      1      2      1      1      0      1      0      3
## 10     0      2      1      0      0      0      0      3
## 11     1      2      1      0      0      1      0      3
## 12     1      2      1      1      0      1      0      3
## 13     1      2      1      1      0      1      0      3
## 14     1      2      2      0      0      1      0      3
## 15     1      2      2      1      0      1      0      3
## 16     1      2      2      1      0      1      0      3
## 17     1      2      1      1      0      1      0      3
## 18     1      2      1      1      0      0      0      3
## 19     1      2      1      1      0      1      0      3
## 20     1      2      1      0      0      1      0      3
## 21     1      2      1      1      0      1      0      3
## 22     1      2      2      0      0      1      0      3
## 23     1      2      1      0      0      1      0      3
## 24     1      2      1      1      0      1      9      3
##  MANCOL_I_R PED_ACC_R RELJCT_I_R REL_RWY_R PROFIL_I_R SPD_LIM SUR_COND
## 1      0      0      1      0      1      40      4
## 2      2      0      1      1      1      70      4
## 3      2      0      1      1      1      35      4
## 4      2      0      1      1      1      35      4
## 5      2      0      0      1      1      25      4
## 6      0      0      1      0      1      70      4
## 7      0      0      0      0      1      70      4
## 8      0      0      0      0      1      35      4
## 9      0      0      1      0      1      30      4
```

## 10	0	0	1	0	1	25	4
## 11	0	0	0	0	1	55	4
## 12	2	0	0	1	1	40	4
## 13	1	0	0	1	1	40	4
## 14	0	0	0	0	1	25	4
## 15	0	0	0	0	1	35	4
## 16	0	0	0	0	1	45	4
## 17	0	0	0	0	1	20	4
## 18	0	0	0	0	1	50	4
## 19	0	0	0	0	1	55	4
## 20	0	0	1	1	1	55	4
## 21	0	0	1	0	0	45	4
## 22	0	0	1	0	0	65	4
## 23	0	0	0	0	0	65	4
## 24	2	0	1	1	0	55	4
##	TRAF_CON_R	TRAF_WAY	VEH_INVL	WEATHER_R	INJURY_CRASH	NO_INJ_I	PRPTYDMG_CRASH
## 1	0	3	1	1	1	1	0
## 2	0	3	2	2	0	0	1
## 3	1	2	2	2	0	0	1
## 4	1	2	2	1	0	0	1
## 5	0	2	3	1	0	0	1
## 6	0	2	1	2	1	1	0
## 7	0	2	1	2	0	0	1
## 8	0	1	1	1	1	1	0
## 9	0	1	1	2	0	0	1
## 10	0	1	1	2	0	0	1
## 11	0	1	1	2	0	0	1
## 12	2	1	2	1	0	0	1
## 13	0	1	4	1	1	2	0
## 14	0	1	1	1	0	0	1
## 15	0	1	1	1	1	1	0
## 16	0	1	1	1	1	1	0
## 17	0	1	1	2	0	0	1
## 18	0	1	1	2	0	0	1
## 19	0	1	1	2	0	0	1
## 20	0	1	1	2	0	0	1
## 21	0	3	1	1	1	1	0
## 22	0	3	1	1	0	0	1
## 23	2	2	1	2	1	2	0
## 24	0	2	2	2	1	1	0
##	FATALITIES	MAX_SEV_IR	INJURY				
## 1	0	1	yes				
## 2	0	0	no				
## 3	0	0	no				
## 4	0	0	no				
## 5	0	0	no				
## 6	0	1	yes				
## 7	0	0	no				
## 8	0	1	yes				
## 9	0	0	no				
## 10	0	0	no				
## 11	0	0	no				
## 12	0	0	no				
## 13	0	1	yes				

```
## 14      0      0      no
## 15      0      1      yes
## 16      0      1      yes
## 17      0      0      no
## 18      0      0      no
## 19      0      0      no
## 20      0      0      no
## 21      0      1      yes
## 22      0      0      no
## 23      0      1      yes
## 24      0      1      yes
```

## Questions

1. Using the information in this dataset, if an accident has just been reported and no further information is available, what should the prediction be? (INJURY = Yes or No?) Why?

Answer: If there is no information available whether accident will result in INJURY(Yes or No), then we calculate probability of INJURY = YES and, NO and compare both which ever has highest value we can consider that as outcome of the accident.

Example code,

```
yes = accidents %>% filter(accidents$INJURY=="yes") %>% summarise(count= n())
p_yes = yes / nrow(accidents)
p_yes$count
```

```
## [1] 0.5087832
```

```
no = accidents %>% filter(accidents$INJURY=="no") %>% summarise(count= n())
p_no = no / nrow(accidents)
p_no$count
```

```
## [1] 0.4912168
```

As you can see probability for yes is 0.5087832 and probability for no is 0.4912168. So, we can consider outcome of the accident as INJURY = Yes.

2. Select the first 24 records in the dataset and look only at the response (INJURY) and the two predictors WEATHER\_R and TRAF\_CON\_R. Create a pivot table that examines INJURY as a function of the two predictors for these 12 records. Use all three variables in the pivot table as rows/columns.
  - Compute the exact Bayes conditional probabilities of an injury (INJURY = Yes) given the six possible combinations of the predictors.
  - Classify the 24 accidents using these probabilities and a cutoff of 0.5.
  - Compute manually the naive Bayes conditional probability of an injury given WEATHER\_R = 1 and TRAF\_CON\_R = 1.
  - Run a naive Bayes classifier on the 24 records and two predictors. Check the model output to obtain probabilities and classifications for all 24 records. Compare this to the exact Bayes classification. Are the resulting classifications equivalent? Is the ranking (= ordering) of observations equivalent?

```
accidents24 = accidents[1:24,c("INJURY","WEATHER_R","TRAF_CON_R")]
```

```
dt1 = ftable(accidents24)
dt1
```

```
##              TRAF_CON_R 0 1 2
## INJURY WEATHER_R
## no      1              3 1 1
##          2              9 1 0
## yes     1              6 0 0
##          2              2 0 1
```

```
dt2 = ftable(accidents24[,-1]) # print table only for conditions
dt2
```

```
##          TRAF_CON_R 0 1 2
## WEATHER_R
## 1              9 1 1
## 2             11 1 1
```

2. Select the first 24 records in the dataset and look only at the response (INJURY) and the two predictors WEATHER\_R and TRAF\_CON\_R. Create a pivot table that examines INJURY as a function of the two predictors for these 12 records. Use all three variables in the pivot table as rows/columns.

- Compute the exact Bayes conditional probabilities of an injury (INJURY = Yes) given the six possible combinations of the predictors.

```
# Injury = yes
p1 = dt1[3,1] / dt2[1,1] # Injury, Weather=1 and Traf=0
p2 = dt1[4,1] / dt2[2,1] # Injury, Weather=2, Traf=0
p3 = dt1[3,2] / dt2[1,2] # Injury, W=1, T=1
p4 = dt1[4,2] / dt2[2,2] # I, W=2, T=1
p5 = dt1[3,3] / dt2[1,3] # I, W=1, T=2
p6 = dt1[4,3] / dt2[2,3] # I, W=2, T=2
```

```
# Injury = no
n1 = dt1[1,1] / dt2[1,1] # Weather=1 and Traf=0
n2 = dt1[2,1] / dt2[2,1] # Weather=2, Traf=0
n3 = dt1[1,2] / dt2[1,2] # W=1, T=1
n4 = dt1[2,2] / dt2[2,2] # W=2, T=1
n5 = dt1[1,3] / dt2[1,3] # W=1, T=2
n6 = dt1[2,3] / dt2[2,3] # W=2, T=2
print(c(p1,p2,p3,p4,p5,p6))
```

```
## [1] 0.6666667 0.1818182 0.0000000 0.0000000 0.0000000 1.0000000
```

```
print(c(n1,n2,n3,n4,n5,n6))
```

```
## [1] 0.3333333 0.8181818 1.0000000 1.0000000 1.0000000 0.0000000
```

For INJURY = Yes:

- Probability of Injury given Weather = 1 and Traffic Condition = 0: 0.6666667
- Probability of Injury given Weather = 2 and Traffic Condition = 0: 0.1818182
- Probability of Injury given Weather = 1 and Traffic Condition = 1: 0.0000000
- Probability of Injury given Weather = 2 and Traffic Condition = 1: 0.0000000
- Probability of Injury given Weather = 1 and Traffic Condition = 2: 0.0000000
- Probability of Injury given Weather = 2 and Traffic Condition = 2: 1.0000000 For INJURY = No:
- Probability of No Injury given Weather = 1 and Traffic Condition = 0: 0.3333333
- Probability of No Injury given Weather = 2 and Traffic Condition = 0: 0.8181818
- Probability of No Injury given Weather = 1 and Traffic Condition = 1: 1.0000000
- Probability of No Injury given Weather = 2 and Traffic Condition = 1: 1.0000000
- Probability of No Injury given Weather = 1 and Traffic Condition = 2: 1.0000000
- Probability of No Injury given Weather = 2 and Traffic Condition = 2: 0.0000000

2. Let us now compute

- Classify the 24 accidents using these probabilities and a cutoff of 0.5.

```
classification_results <- character(24)

for (i in 1:24) {
  if (accidents24$WEATHER_R[i] == "1") {
    if (accidents24$TRAF_CON_R[i] == "0") {
      classification_results[i] = ifelse(p1 > 0.5, "Yes", "No")
    } else if (accidents24$TRAF_CON_R[i] == "1") {
      classification_results[i] = ifelse(p3 > 0.5, "Yes", "No")
    } else {
      classification_results[i] = ifelse(p5 > 0.5, "Yes", "No")
    }
  } else {
    if (accidents24$TRAF_CON_R[i] == "0") {
      classification_results[i] = ifelse(p2 > 0.5, "Yes", "No")
    } else if (accidents24$TRAF_CON_R[i] == "1") {
      classification_results[i] = ifelse(p4 > 0.5, "Yes", "No")
    } else {
      classification_results[i] = ifelse(p6 > 0.5, "Yes", "No")
    }
  }
}

cat("Classification Results based on Exact Bayes classifier:\n", classification_results)
```

```
## Classification Results based on Exact Bayes classifier:
```

```
## Yes No No No Yes No No Yes No No No No Yes Yes Yes Yes No No No No Yes Yes Yes No
```

- Compute manually the naive Bayes conditional probability of an injury given WEATHER\_R = 1 and TRAF\_CON\_R = 1.

Manually:

```
wt_data = accidents24[accidents24$WEATHER_R == "1" & accidents24$TRAF_CON_R == "1", ]
probability_injury_yes = sum(wt_data$INJURY == "yes") / nrow(wt_data)
cat("The result of this code is that the predicted probability of injury (INJURY = Yes) for the given c
```

```
## The result of this code is that the predicted probability of injury (INJURY = Yes) for the given com
```

Using NaiveBayes function:

```
new_data = data.frame(WEATHER_R = "1", TRAF_CON_R = "1")
nb = naiveBayes(INJURY ~ WEATHER_R + TRAF_CON_R, data = accidents24)
prediction = predict(nb, newdata = new_data, type = "raw")
probability_injury_yes = prediction[, "yes"]
cat("The result of this code is that the predicted probability of injury (INJURY = Yes) for the given c
```

```
## The result of this code is that the predicted probability of injury (INJURY = Yes) for the given com
```

2.

- Run a naive Bayes classifier on the 24 records and two predictors. Check the model output to obtain probabilities and classifications for all 24 records. Compare this to the exact Bayes classification. Are the resulting classifications equivalent? Is the ranking (= ordering) of observations equivalent?

```
nb = naiveBayes(INJURY ~ TRAF_CON_R + WEATHER_R,
                data = accidents24)

nbt = predict(nb, newdata = accidents24)

cutoff = 0.5

exact_bayes_classifications = ifelse(c(p1, p2, p3, p4, p5, p6) > cutoff, "yes", "no")

comparison_result = data.frame(
  "Exact_Bayes_Classification" = exact_bayes_classifications,
  "Naive_Bayes_Probability" = nbt
)

equivalent_classifications = exact_bayes_classifications == nbt

equivalent_ranking = order(-as.numeric(c(p1, p2, p3, p4, p5, p6))) == order(-as.numeric(nbt))

comparison_result
```



	Exact_Bayes_Classification	Naive_Bayes_Probability
## 1	yes	yes
## 2	no	no
## 3	no	no
## 4	no	no
## 5	no	yes
## 6	yes	no
## 7	yes	no
## 8	no	yes
## 9	no	no
## 10	no	no
## 11	no	no
## 12	yes	yes
## 13	yes	yes
## 14	no	yes
## 15	no	yes
## 16	no	yes
## 17	no	no
## 18	yes	no
## 19	yes	no
## 20	no	no
## 21	no	yes
## 22	no	yes
## 23	no	no
## 24	yes	no

```
cat("Are the resulting classifications equivalent? ", all(equivalent_classifications), "\n")
```

```
## Are the resulting classifications equivalent? FALSE
```

```
cat("Is the ranking of observations equivalent? ", all(equivalent_ranking), "\n")
```

```
## Is the ranking of observations equivalent? FALSE
```

The exact Bayes and Naive Bayes classifications do not match for all 24 records, and the ranking of observations based on probabilities is also not equivalent between the two methods. This suggests that the Naive Bayes classifier may make different predictions compared to exact Bayes in this specific dataset and feature set.

3. Let us now return to the entire dataset. Partition the data into training (60%) and validation (40%).

- Run a naive Bayes classifier on the complete training set with the relevant predictors (and INJURY as the response). Note that all predictors are categorical. Show the confusion matrix.
- What is the overall error of the validation set?

```
set.seed(1)
```

```
accidents_new = read.csv("accidentsFull.csv")
```

```
accidents_new$INJURY = ifelse(accidents_new$MAX_SEV_IR>0,1,0)
```

```

for (i in c(1:dim(accidents_new)[2])){
  accidents[,i] = as.factor(accidents_new[,i])
}

train.split = sample(row.names(accidents_new), 0.6*dim(accidents_new)[1])

valid.split = setdiff(row.names(accidents_new), train.split)

training_data = accidents_new[train.split,]

validation_data = accidents_new[valid.split,]

nb_model = naiveBayes(INJURY ~ ., data = training_data)

nb_predictions = predict(nb_model, validation_data)

confusion_matrix = confusionMatrix(nb_predictions, as.factor(validation_data$INJURY))

print(confusion_matrix)

```

```

## Confusion Matrix and Statistics
##
##              Reference
## Prediction    0      1
##              0 8219  205
##              1   0 8450
##
##              Accuracy : 0.9879
##              95% CI : (0.9861, 0.9894)
##              No Information Rate : 0.5129
##              P-Value [Acc > NIR] : < 2.2e-16
##
##              Kappa : 0.9757
##
##  Mcnemar's Test P-Value : < 2.2e-16
##
##              Sensitivity : 1.0000
##              Specificity : 0.9763
##              Pos Pred Value : 0.9757
##              Neg Pred Value : 1.0000
##              Prevalence : 0.4871
##              Detection Rate : 0.4871
##              Detection Prevalence : 0.4992
##              Balanced Accuracy : 0.9882
##
##              'Positive' Class : 0
##

```

```
overall_error_rate = 1 - confusion_matrix$overall["Accuracy"]  
  
cat("overall error of the validation set is", overall_error_rate)
```

```
## overall error of the validation set is 0.01214887
```

The confusion matrix indicates that the models overall performance on the validation set is very good with a high accuracy, sensitivity, and specificity. The overall error rate of the validation set is approximately 1.21%, which means that the models predictions are accurate for the vast majority of cases in the validation set.