Approach Used

1. Data Augmentation:

- Synonym Replacement: Introduced variation by replacing words with their synonyms from WordNet.
- Balancing Data: Used augmentation to ensure an equal number of positive, negative, and neutral labels.

2. Text Preprocessing:

- Converted text to lowercase.
- Removed special characters and extra spaces.
- o Encoded sentiment labels using LabelEncoder.

3. Feature Engineering:

 Applied TF-IDF vectorization (max_features=10,000) to convert text into numerical features.

4. Model Training & Evaluation:

- Split the dataset into 80% training and 20% testing.
- o Trained a Logistic Regression model for classification.
- Evaluated using accuracy, precision, recall, and F1-score.

Challenges Faced

- **Data Imbalance:** The dataset had an uneven distribution of labels, addressed through data augmentation.
- **Synonym Replacement Limitations:** Some synonyms from WordNet **did not fit the financial context**, potentially affecting accuracy.
- **Feature Representation:** TF-IDF is effective but does not capture deep semantic relationships.

Model Performance & Improvements

1. Performance Metrics:

Accuracy: 86.46%

Class-wise F1-Scores:

Neutral: 93%Positive: 84%Negative: 82%

2. **Observations:**

- The model performs well for neutral sentiments, but positive and negative sentiment classification could be improved.
- Precision and recall for negative sentiment (82%) indicate room for enhancement.

3. Possible Improvements:

 Use Word Embeddings: Implement Word2Vec or FinBERT for better financial context understanding.

- **Fine-tune Logistic Regression:** Adjust **regularization (C parameter)** for better performance.
- Experiment with Deep Learning Models: LSTMs or transformers like FinBERT may improve sentiment classification.