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### Problems faced:

1. Feeding highly-dimensional feature vectors representing genome samples to any machine learning algorithm is expensive both in terms of space and time complexity.
2. Selecting the correct machine learning model, given that **Random Forest** is known to produce an accuracy of **66%** when applied here.
3. Avoiding **overfitting**: Because of limited sample space, there is a fine line between supposedly correct results and “overfitting”
4. Using the **fragment ambiguity graph** to figure out which transcripts are unique to certain individuals (enabling their use as identifiers of the population that they represent), and sifting out which transcripts are expressed across individuals.

### Solutions:

1. To solve problem 1: We used the following **dimensionality reduction** techniques:
   1. **PCA** - us to **369** principal components and hence there was a lot of information loss in variants.
   2. **Tree based feature selection model (Scikit-learn)** - This uses tree based estimators to measure feature importances which can be used to eliminate irrelevant features. With this, we could reduce the feature vector to a size of **828** features. Accuracy achieved =
2. To solve problem 2: **Machine learning model selection**-

**Deep learning model** - Used a **2-layer** **fully connected neural network**. The first layer had **1024 neurons** followed by **16 neurons** in the second layer. Initially, the resultant accuracy was **40%**. However, after inspection we found out that this poor outcome was a result of non-standardized data. Thus, we used **Z-score standardization** (**Scikit-learn**) to center and scale each feature independently. Subsequently, we achieved an accuracy of <>.

1. Since we used a deep learning model, we discovered that longer epoch execution resulted in the deep learning model was memorizing the training data (During the training the accuracy > **95%**, which fell to <> across <> number of experiments). We applied **Stratified Shuffle Split** with **number of splits = 3** to add a validation step during training. This led to a test accuracy of **83.8%** and a train accuracy of **88.4%**.
2. We are yet to incorporate this information into our framework and this will constitute our **future direction** of work.