## **Results**

No defaults (# of epochs, batch size, etc.) were changed from original code.

All optimizers from <a href="https://pytorch.org/docs/stable/optim.html#algorithms">https://pytorch.org/docs/stable/optim.html#algorithms</a>.

Optimizer	Accuracy	Loss	Recall	F1	AUC
<mark>Adam</mark>	<mark>.718</mark>	<mark>.639</mark>	<mark>.706</mark>	<mark>.612</mark>	<mark>.772</mark>
Adamax	.698	.643	.706	.603	.770
RMSprop	.769	.632	.687	.636	.766
SGD w/ Momentum	.638	.691	.606	.532	.649
Adadelta	.145	.693	.500	.127	.482
Adagrad	.690	.664	.678	.587	.743
<b>NAdam</b>	<mark>.770</mark>	.643	<mark>.689</mark>	<mark>.637</mark>	.770
RAdam	.650	.656	.698	.571	.766
Rprop	.692	.600	.706	.599	.771
ASGD	.540	.693	.559	.467	.582

Adam = Default optimizer used in paper

NAdam = Biggest improvement

## Adam vs NAdam Results

Optimizer	Accuracy	Loss	Recall	F1	AUC
<mark>Adam</mark>	<mark>.718</mark>	<mark>.639</mark>	<mark>.706</mark>	<mark>.612</mark>	<mark>.772</mark>
NAdam NAdam	<mark>.770</mark>	<mark>.643</mark>	.689	<mark>.637</mark>	.770
Difference	+6.99%	+.62%	-2.44%	+4%	26%

## **Summary:**

With NAdam improving the accuracy by almost 7% and F1 score increasing by 4%, it was enough to show a considerable improvement, despite the minor increase in loss (.62%) and minor decreases in recall (2.4%) and AUC (.26%).