

Course3 - Task2

Question1

For each method, did you experiment with adjusting the input values until you did not see an improvement in the error metrics?

DECISION TREE MODEL

Tune Length:

Tune length =15 has the best accuracy of 91% for the cp value 0.0015020027. As you can see even though cp value increase the accuracy doesn't improve.

```
> dTreeTuneLengthModel
CART

7919 samples
  6 predictor
  2 classes: '0', '1'

Pre-processing: centered (6), scaled (6)
Resampling: Cross-Validated (10 fold, repeated 3 times)
Summary of sample sizes: 7128, 7128, 7126, 7127, 7128, 7126, ...
Resampling results across tuning parameters:

cp      Accuracy  Kappa
0.0006675567 0.9117328 0.8125211
0.0007788162 0.9132486 0.8159582
0.0008344459 0.9132908 0.8160364
0.0010013351 0.9146374 0.8192057
0.0011682243 0.9148059 0.8194728
0.0012238540 0.9148059 0.8194728
0.0015020027 0.9156902 0.8213445
0.0050066756 0.9118593 0.8147250
0.0080106809 0.9090386 0.8094315
0.0126835781 0.9008734 0.7932340
0.0133511348 0.9006208 0.7926356
0.0503337784 0.8808849 0.7536127
0.0627503338 0.7724877 0.5376569
0.0857810414 0.7423041 0.4661881
0.1011348465 0.6574430 0.1510971

Accuracy was used to select the optimal model using the largest value.
The final value used for the model was cp = 0.001502003.
```

Tune Grid:

Tune Grid has the best accuracy of 90 % for the cp value 0.01. As you can see even though cp value increase the accuracy doesn't improve.

```
> dTreeTuneGridModel
CART

7919 samples
  6 predictor
  2 classes: '0', '1'

Pre-processing: centered (6), scaled (6)
Resampling: Cross-Validated (10 fold, repeated 3 times)
Summary of sample sizes: 7127, 7126, 7128, 7126, 7128, 7126, ...
Resampling results across tuning parameters:

cp      Accuracy  Kappa
0.00 0.9070194 0.8024513
0.01 0.9082389 0.8081655
0.02 0.9009563 0.7937074
0.03 0.9009563 0.7937074
0.04 0.9009563 0.7937074
0.05 0.8796634 0.7511356
0.06 0.7779149 0.5477896
0.07 0.7647030 0.5238701
0.08 0.7639033 0.5216815
0.09 0.7324165 0.4409831
0.10 0.6919702 0.2868719

Accuracy was used to select the optimal model using the largest value.
The final value used for the model was cp = 0.01.
```

C5.0 MODEL

Tune Length

Tune length has the best accuracy of 91 % for the Trials-30 ,winnow= true & model= tree. As you can see the accuracy doesn't improve even though the values are changing.

```
> c50TuneLengthModel
C5.0

7919 samples
6 predictor
2 classes: '0', '1'

No pre-processing
Resampling: Cross-Validated (10 fold, repeated 10 times)
Summary of sample sizes: 7127, 7128, 7127, 7128, 7126, 7127, ...
Resampling results across tuning parameters:

model winnow trials Accuracy Kappa
rules FALSE 1 0.9004959 0.7924936
rules FALSE 10 0.9169969 0.8229608
rules FALSE 20 0.9181961 0.8260610
rules FALSE 30 0.9180195 0.8258764
rules FALSE 40 0.9180069 0.8258658
rules FALSE 50 0.9181205 0.8261182
rules FALSE 60 0.9181079 0.8260977
rules FALSE 70 0.9181079 0.8260977
rules FALSE 80 0.9181079 0.8260977
rules FALSE 90 0.9181079 0.8260977
rules FALSE 100 0.9181079 0.8260977
rules TRUE 1 0.9014181 0.7945835
rules TRUE 10 0.9175152 0.8237146
rules TRUE 20 0.9183986 0.8262369
rules TRUE 30 0.9181333 0.8258508
rules TRUE 40 0.9182848 0.8261955
rules TRUE 50 0.9182848 0.8261955
rules TRUE 60 0.9182848 0.8261955
rules TRUE 70 0.9182848 0.8261955
rules TRUE 80 0.9182848 0.8261955
rules TRUE 90 0.9182848 0.8261955
rules TRUE 100 0.9182848 0.8261955
tree FALSE 1 0.8996880 0.7907210
tree FALSE 10 0.9177041 0.8252353
tree FALSE 20 0.9176538 0.8253323
tree FALSE 30 0.9173380 0.8247781
tree FALSE 40 0.9169843 0.8241164
tree FALSE 50 0.9169590 0.8240537
tree FALSE 60 0.9169338 0.8239954
tree FALSE 70 0.9169338 0.8239954
tree FALSE 80 0.9169338 0.8239954
tree FALSE 90 0.9169338 0.8239954
tree FALSE 100 0.9169338 0.8239954
tree TRUE 1 0.9010391 0.7937669
tree TRUE 10 0.9191314 0.8282457
tree TRUE 20 0.9189162 0.8281150
tree TRUE 30 0.9193202 0.8290543
tree TRUE 40 0.9191056 0.8286550
tree TRUE 50 0.9191687 0.8287896
tree TRUE 60 0.9191687 0.8287896
tree TRUE 70 0.9191687 0.8287896
tree TRUE 80 0.9191687 0.8287896
tree TRUE 90 0.9191687 0.8287896
tree TRUE 100 0.9191687 0.8287896

Accuracy was used to select the optimal model using the largest value.
The final values used for the model were trials = 30, model = tree and winnow = TRUE.
```

Tune Grid:

Tune Grid has the best accuracy of 91 % for the Trials-30 & winnow= false. As you can see, the accuracy doesn't improve even though the values are changing.

```
> c50TuneGridModel
C5.0

7919 samples
6 predictor
2 classes: '0', '1'

No pre-processing
Resampling: Cross-Validated (10 fold, repeated 10 times)
Summary of sample sizes: 7127, 7127, 7127, 7128, 7127, 7126, ...
Resampling results across tuning parameters:

winnow trials Accuracy Kappa
FALSE 1 0.8941012 0.7795201
FALSE 5 0.9151155 0.8199188
FALSE 10 0.9173135 0.8244648
FALSE 15 0.9177682 0.8256858
FALSE 20 0.9177558 0.8257522
FALSE 25 0.9177429 0.8257937
FALSE 30 0.9183367 0.8270989
TRUE 1 0.8963242 0.7842569
TRUE 5 0.9176413 0.8253970
TRUE 10 0.9195487 0.8292036
TRUE 15 0.9194602 0.8292733
TRUE 20 0.9199527 0.8303323
TRUE 25 0.9196625 0.8299161
TRUE 30 0.9203822 0.8314175

Tuning parameter 'model' was held constant at a value of tree
Accuracy was used to select the optimal model using the largest value.
The final values used for the model were trials = 30, model = tree and winnow = TRUE.
```

GBM MODEL

Default

No tune parameters for the model. The best accuracy is 92% for interaction depth=30 & ntree=150.

```
> gbmDefaultModel
Stochastic Gradient Boosting

7919 samples
 6 predictor
 2 classes: '0', '1'

No pre-processing
Resampling: Cross-Validated (10 fold, repeated 10 times)
Summary of sample sizes: 7127, 7127, 7127, 7127, 7128, 7128, ...
Resampling results across tuning parameters:

  interaction.depth  n.trees  Accuracy  Kappa
1                50      0.7348797  0.4386138
2                100      0.7351829  0.4384784
3                150      0.7351069  0.4374349
4                50      0.8238299  0.6322036
5                100      0.8814625  0.7524828
6                150      0.9100383  0.8104705
7                50      0.8781924  0.7479431
8                100      0.9113645  0.8140227
9                150      0.9205834  0.8324992

Tuning parameter 'shrinkage' was held constant at a value of 0.1
Tuning parameter 'n.minobsinnode' was held constant at a value of 10
Accuracy was used to select the optimal model using the largest value.
The final values used for the model were n.trees = 150, interaction.depth = 3, shrinkage = 0.1 and n.minobsinnode = 10.
```

Tune Length

Tune length has the best accuracy of 92 % for the Interaction depth=3, ntree= 250. As you can see, the accuracy doesn't improve even though the values are changing.

```
> gbmTuneLengthModel
Stochastic Gradient Boosting

7919 samples
 6 predictor
 2 classes: '0', '1'

No pre-processing
Resampling: Cross-Validated (10 fold, repeated 10 times)
Summary of sample sizes: 7128, 7128, 7127, 7128, 7127, 7126, ...
Resampling results across tuning parameters:

  interaction.depth  n.trees  Accuracy  Kappa
1                50      0.7343376  0.4381999
2                100      0.7346398  0.4373185
3                150      0.7347919  0.4370508
4                200      0.7350321  0.4369819
5                250      0.7353351  0.4371450
6                300      0.7360800  0.4384135
7                350      0.7359415  0.4378553
8                400      0.7360930  0.4379804
9                50      0.8214439  0.6275996
10               100      0.8811125  0.7518863
11               150      0.9096756  0.8097383
12               200      0.9162537  0.8231259
13               250      0.9199160  0.8306103
14               300      0.9221132  0.8351200
15               350      0.9230604  0.8371010
16               400      0.9232497  0.8374883
17               50      0.8758079  0.7431400
18               100      0.9104060  0.8120554
19               150      0.9208752  0.8329938
20               200      0.9237669  0.8388047
21               250      0.9240700  0.8393476
22               300      0.9252872  0.8375852
23               350      0.9226683  0.8362582
24               400      0.9221379  0.8350847
25               50      0.8944218  0.7809527
26               100      0.9201297  0.8317627
27               150      0.9230088  0.8373289
28               200      0.9233502  0.8378869
29               250      0.9226811  0.8363654
30               300      0.9218731  0.8345580
31               350      0.9215955  0.8339495
32               400      0.9210393  0.8326984
33               50      0.9216842  0.8348186
34               100      0.9237548  0.8387572
35               150      0.9258176  0.8387263
36               200      0.9232243  0.8372422
37               250      0.9221760  0.8350854
38               300      0.9211028  0.8327796
39               350      0.9204836  0.8314026
40               400      0.9201555  0.8306194
41               50      0.9239562  0.8392375
42               100      0.9240189  0.8391189
43               150      0.9230848  0.8370204
44               200      0.9215949  0.8337591
45               250      0.9209760  0.8324267
46               300      0.9203318  0.8310321
47               350      0.9190943  0.8283509
48               400      0.9186402  0.8273628
49               50      0.9240071  0.8392203
50               100      0.9238172  0.8386177
51               150      0.9220876  0.8348415
52               200      0.9210776  0.8326276
53               250      0.9197011  0.8296466
54               300      0.9191582  0.8285121
55               350      0.9181227  0.8262837
56               400      0.9180850  0.8261872
57               50      0.9236282  0.8383080
58               100      0.9229968  0.8367754
59               150      0.9215446  0.8336302
60               200      0.9202946  0.8309288
61               250      0.9192468  0.8287121
62               300      0.9185993  0.8272283
63               350      0.9177186  0.8254032
64               400      0.9176173  0.8251804

Tuning parameter 'shrinkage' was held constant at a value of 0.1
Tuning parameter 'n.minobsinnode' was held constant at a value of 10
Accuracy was used to select the optimal model using the largest value.
The final values used for the model were n.trees = 250, interaction.depth = 3, shrinkage = 0.1 and n.minobsinnode = 10.
```

Tune Grid

Tune Grid has the best accuracy of 92 % for the interaction depth=5 & ntrees=100. As you can see, the accuracy doesn't improve even though the values are changing.

```
> glmTuneGridModel
Stochastic Gradient Boosting

7919 samples
 6 predictor
 2 classes: '0', '1'

No pre-processing
Resampling: Cross-Validated (10 fold, repeated 10 times)
Summary of sample sizes: 7128, 7128, 7128, 7127, 7127, 7126, ...
Resampling results across tuning parameters:

interaction.depth n.trees Accuracy Kappa
1 50 0.7349906 0.4391465
1 100 0.7351291 0.4384359
1 150 0.7353568 0.4382218
1 200 0.7359251 0.4388694
1 250 0.7363672 0.4393277
1 300 0.7364429 0.4391969
1 350 0.7364809 0.4389498
1 400 0.7365093 0.4389693
1 450 0.7367838 0.4392691
1 500 0.7366954 0.4390924
1 550 0.7366321 0.4387952
1 600 0.7366073 0.4387340
1 650 0.7369102 0.4392120
1 700 0.7368723 0.4391341
1 750 0.7368343 0.4389537
1 800 0.7369732 0.4392171
1 850 0.7367583 0.4388156
1 900 0.7370867 0.4393731
1 950 0.7370617 0.4392942
1 1000 0.7367458 0.4386274
1 1050 0.7365816 0.4382031
1 1100 0.7363416 0.4377749
1 1150 0.7366447 0.4382282
1 1200 0.7366825 0.4382581
1 1250 0.7367075 0.4382016
1 1300 0.7367457 0.4383285
1 1350 0.7362152 0.4371457
1 1400 0.7364046 0.4376219
1 1450 0.7364608 0.4377194
1 1500 0.7365437 0.4378349
5 50 0.9216183 0.8347295
5 100 0.9250287 0.8414182
5 150 0.9238035 0.8387062
5 200 0.9232476 0.8374077
5 250 0.9218837 0.8344906
5 300 0.9209621 0.8324817
5 350 0.9203184 0.8310919
5 400 0.9189037 0.8280620
5 450 0.9184492 0.8270844
5 500 0.9180450 0.8261647
5 550 0.9175149 0.8250145
```

```
5 600 0.9173258 0.8245908
5 650 0.9166434 0.8231667
5 700 0.9164286 0.8226384
5 750 0.9161887 0.8221772
5 800 0.9157973 0.8213274
5 850 0.9154944 0.8206888
5 900 0.9152039 0.8200834
5 950 0.9151536 0.8199337
5 1000 0.9152038 0.8200526
5 1050 0.9145222 0.8186218
5 1100 0.9139285 0.8173603
5 1150 0.9137517 0.8169223
5 1200 0.9136252 0.8166711
5 1250 0.9135241 0.8164907
5 1300 0.9133220 0.8160407
5 1350 0.9131071 0.8156019
5 1400 0.9128295 0.8150024
5 1450 0.9125014 0.8143163
5 1500 0.9125772 0.8144631
9 50 0.9239302 0.8388501
9 100 0.9225412 0.8357001
9 150 0.9212276 0.8328888
9 200 0.9201664 0.8305771
9 250 0.9186768 0.8273922
9 300 0.9181966 0.8263291
9 350 0.9171993 0.8242203
9 400 0.9168207 0.8234038
9 450 0.9160122 0.8216588
9 500 0.9162520 0.8221754
9 550 0.9150301 0.8195964
9 600 0.9148371 0.8191962
9 650 0.9144078 0.8182506
9 700 0.9141934 0.8178197
9 750 0.9138020 0.8169671
9 800 0.9134609 0.8162571
9 850 0.9132713 0.8158535
9 900 0.9129937 0.8152973
9 950 0.9126780 0.8146211
9 1000 0.9124254 0.8141229
9 1050 0.9125304 0.8144685
9 1100 0.9121474 0.8134994
9 1150 0.9121474 0.8135248
9 1200 0.9120338 0.8132701
9 1250 0.9118823 0.8129406
9 1300 0.9119709 0.8130774
9 1350 0.9116676 0.8124728
9 1400 0.9115667 0.8122866
9 1450 0.9110618 0.8111903
9 1500 0.9111375 0.8113578

Tuning parameter 'shrinkage' was held constant at a value of 0.1
Tuning parameter 'n.minobsinnode' was held constant at a value of 20
Accuracy was used to select the optimal model using the largest value.
The final values used for the model were n.trees = 100, interaction.depth = 5, shrinkage = 0.1 and n.minobsinnode = 20.
```

ROC

ROC has the best accuracy of 92 % for the interaction depth=9 & ntrees=50. As you can see, the accuracy doesn't improve even though the values are changing.

```
> glmROCModel
Stochastic Gradient Boosting

7919 samples
 6 predictor
 2 classes: 'X0', 'X1'

No pre-processing
Resampling: Cross-Validated (10 fold, repeated 10 times)
Summary of sample sizes: 7127, 7127, 7126, 7127, 7127, 7128, ...
Resampling results across tuning parameters:

interaction.depth n.trees Accuracy Kappa
1 50 0.7353325 0.4401118
1 100 0.7355978 0.4387712
1 150 0.7362922 0.4397234
1 200 0.7363302 0.4393393
1 250 0.7365195 0.4393540
1 300 0.7367343 0.4392591
1 350 0.7369742 0.4396124
1 400 0.7370500 0.4395790
1 450 0.7369617 0.4392976
1 500 0.7367597 0.4387875
1 550 0.7366713 0.4385686
1 600 0.7366716 0.4384779
1 650 0.7367598 0.4385631
1 700 0.7366837 0.4384048
1 750 0.7365830 0.4382143
1 800 0.7366714 0.4384023
1 850 0.7365196 0.4378728
1 900 0.7367219 0.4384142
1 950 0.7366587 0.4380964
1 1000 0.7366965 0.4380412
1 1050 0.7364821 0.4376162
1 1100 0.7364810 0.4376619
1 1150 0.7363557 0.4373537
1 1200 0.7366083 0.4378196
1 1250 0.7361534 0.4368876
1 1300 0.7359388 0.4364184
1 1350 0.7359264 0.4362850
1 1400 0.7357369 0.4359183
1 1450 0.7357621 0.4358912
1 1500 0.7362410 0.4369198
5 50 0.9217950 0.8350872
5 100 0.9243964 0.8401480
5 150 0.9239041 0.8389370
5 200 0.9232601 0.8374892
5 250 0.9220984 0.8349632
5 300 0.9205449 0.8316701
5 350 0.9201406 0.8307198
5 400 0.9193250 0.8300856
5 450 0.9192567 0.8287618
5 500 0.9184863 0.8270488
5 550 0.9178045 0.8256263
```

```
5 600 0.9174510 0.8248518
5 650 0.9168324 0.8235407
5 700 0.9161125 0.8220001
5 750 0.9158474 0.8214236
5 800 0.9153551 0.8203336
5 850 0.9151276 0.8198394
5 900 0.9147615 0.8190640
5 950 0.9143195 0.8180953
5 1000 0.9143196 0.8180965
5 1050 0.9144078 0.8182897
5 1100 0.9138016 0.8169884
5 1150 0.9140796 0.8175793
5 1200 0.9139404 0.8173033
5 1250 0.9139279 0.8172646
5 1300 0.9138900 0.8172100
5 1350 0.9138522 0.8171062
5 1400 0.9134106 0.8161650
5 1450 0.9130187 0.8153408
5 1500 0.9128202 0.8149550
9 50 0.9245221 0.8400976
9 100 0.9230447 0.8368150
9 150 0.9213530 0.8331325
9 200 0.9198121 0.8297959
9 250 0.9190544 0.8282151
9 300 0.9186877 0.8273789
9 350 0.9177158 0.8253083
9 400 0.9171600 0.8241201
9 450 0.9165937 0.8226699
9 500 0.9164276 0.8225389
9 550 0.9156446 0.8208873
9 600 0.9151774 0.8198789
9 650 0.9149627 0.8193954
9 700 0.9146471 0.8187675
9 750 0.9145209 0.8184589
9 800 0.9140663 0.8175149
9 850 0.9138387 0.8170671
9 900 0.9131823 0.8156741
9 950 0.9131949 0.8157007
9 1000 0.9130561 0.8153466
9 1050 0.9127277 0.8146900
9 1100 0.9126648 0.8145942
9 1150 0.9121092 0.8133817
9 1200 0.9119451 0.8130575
9 1250 0.9120208 0.8132051
9 1300 0.9120964 0.8133736
9 1350 0.9120207 0.8131983
9 1400 0.9120211 0.8132655
9 1450 0.9119831 0.8131308
9 1500 0.9118186 0.8128115

Tuning parameter 'shrinkage' was held constant at a value of 0.1
Tuning parameter 'n.minobsinnode' was held constant at a value of 20
Accuracy was used to select the optimal model using the largest value.
The final values used for the model were n.trees = 50, interaction.depth = 9, shrinkage = 0.1 and n.minobsinnode = 20.
```

RANDOM FOREST MODEL

Tune Length

Tune length has the best accuracy of 92 % for mtry=2. As you can see, even though mtry value increases, the accuracy doesn't improve .

```
> rfTuneLengthModel
Random Forest

7919 samples
  6 predictor
  2 classes: '0', '1'

No pre-processing
Resampling: Cross-Validated (10 fold, repeated 3 times)
Summary of sample sizes: 7127, 7126, 7127, 7126, 7128, ...
Resampling results across tuning parameters:
```

mtry	Accuracy	Kappa
2	0.9215836	0.8339370
3	0.9207412	0.8318668
4	0.9187636	0.8274740
5	0.9163634	0.8223327
6	0.9140485	0.8174408

Accuracy was used to select the optimal model using the largest value.
The final value used for the model was mtry = 2.

Tune Grid

Tune Grid has the best accuracy of 92 % for mtry=2. As you can see, even though mtry value increases, the accuracy doesn't improve .

```
> rfTuneGridModel
Random Forest

7919 samples
  6 predictor
  2 classes: '0', '1'

No pre-processing
Resampling: Cross-Validated (10 fold, repeated 3 times)
Summary of sample sizes: 7127, 7127, 7126, 7126, 7127, 7128, ...
Resampling results across tuning parameters:
```

mtry	Accuracy	Kappa
1	0.8685015	0.7120302
2	0.9220861	0.8350195
3	0.9211186	0.8326470
4	0.9200246	0.8302171
5	0.9179201	0.8256654
6	0.9153939	0.8201895

Accuracy was used to select the optimal model using the largest value.
The final value used for the model was mtry = 2.

Question 2

Did you include a brief explanation of your rationale for selecting the training model you did?

Because it's a classification problem, I chose the below Algorithms to help find the best models.

- Decision Tree Algorithm
- Stochastic Gradient Boosting Algorithm
- C5.0 Algorithm
- Random Forest Algorithm

Question 3

Did you provide a simple chart that displays which brand Blackwell customers prefer?

Best Decision Tree Model -

Confusion Matrix

```
> cmTreeTuneLength
Confusion Matrix and Statistics

      Reference
Prediction 0  1
0    568  59
1     60  903

      Accuracy : 0.9252
      95% CI : (0.9111, 0.9376)
      No Information Rate : 0.605
      P-Value [Acc > NIR] : <2e-16

      Kappa : 0.8434

      Mcnemar's Test P-Value : 1

      Sensitivity : 0.9045
      Specificity : 0.9387
      Pos Pred Value : 0.9059
      Neg Pred Value : 0.9377
      Prevalence : 0.3950
      Detection Rate : 0.3572
      Detection Prevalence : 0.3943
      Balanced Accuracy : 0.9216

      'Positive' Class : 0
```

Best C50 Model - Confusion Matrix

```
> cmC50TuneLength
Confusion Matrix and Statistics

      Reference
Prediction 0  1
0    572  42
1     56  920

      Accuracy : 0.9384
      95% CI : (0.9254, 0.9497)
      No Information Rate : 0.605
      P-Value [Acc > NIR] : <2e-16

      Kappa : 0.8705

      Mcnemar's Test P-Value : 0.1891

      Sensitivity : 0.9108
      Specificity : 0.9563
      Pos Pred Value : 0.9316
      Neg Pred Value : 0.9426
      Prevalence : 0.3950
      Detection Rate : 0.3597
      Detection Prevalence : 0.3862
      Balanced Accuracy : 0.9336

      'Positive' Class : 0
```

Best GBM Mode - Confusion Matrix

```
> cmGBMTuneLength
Confusion Matrix and Statistics

      Reference
Prediction 0  1
0      578  59
1       50 903

      Accuracy : 0.9314
      95% CI : (0.9179, 0.9434)
      No Information Rate : 0.605
      P-Value [Acc > NIR] : <2e-16

      Kappa : 0.8569

      Mcnemar's Test P-Value : 0.4435

      Sensitivity : 0.9204
      Specificity : 0.9387
      Pos Pred Value : 0.9074
      Neg Pred Value : 0.9475
      Prevalence : 0.3950
      Detection Rate : 0.3635
      Detection Prevalence : 0.4006
      Balanced Accuracy : 0.9295

      'Positive' Class : 0
```

Best Random Forest Model

```
> cmRFTuneGrid
Confusion Matrix and Statistics

      Reference
Prediction 0  1
0       628  0
1        0 962

      Accuracy : 1
      95% CI : (0.9977, 1)
      No Information Rate : 0.605
      P-Value [Acc > NIR] : < 2.2e-16

      Kappa : 1

      Mcnemar's Test P-Value : NA

      Sensitivity : 1.000
      Specificity : 1.000
      Pos Pred Value : 1.000
      Neg Pred Value : 1.000
      Prevalence : 0.395
      Detection Rate : 0.395
      Detection Prevalence : 0.395
      Balanced Accuracy : 1.000

      'Positive' Class : 0
```

Conclusion

If you check the above the confusion matrices for all the models, the fraction of Brand-1 (SONY) is more compared to Brand-0 (ACER). Hence we can say that SONY is preferred more compared to ACER. Also the Prediction accuracy on the Incomplete

Survey data points to the same inference where in Sony is preferred compared to ACER.

Did you include the logs of the results of each classifier run? - PFA