**1**.

-------**EXPERIMENT 1**-------

tank: 0.75

plant: 0.88

perplace: 0.815

smsspam: 0.3471223021582734

-------**EXPERIMENT 2**-------

tank: 0.475

plant: 0.8275

perplace: 0.52

smsspam: 0.3147482014388489

-------**EXPERIMENT 3**-------

tank: 0.805

plant: 0.89

perplace: 0.8475

smsspam: 0.3471223021582734

-------**EXPERIMENT 4**-------

tank: 0.775

plant: 0.8475

perplace: 0.7475

smsspam: 0.3471223021582734

-------**EXPERIMENT 5**-------

tank: 0.76

plant: 0.91

perplace: 0.85

smsspam: 0.3471223021582734

-------**EXPERIMENT 6**-------

tank: 0.805

plant: 0.885

perplace: 0.82

smsspam: 0.3471223021582734

-------**EXPERIMENT 7**-------

tank: 0.8875

plant: 0.88

perplace: 0.8075

smsspam: 0.9676258992805755

-------**EXPERIMENT 8**-------

tank: 0.825

plant: 0.91

perplace: 0.6425

smsspam: 0.947841726618705

-------**EXPERIMENT 9**-------

tank: 0.8975

plant: 0.9025

perplace: 0.85

smsspam: 0.9676258992805755

-------**EXPERIMENT 10**-------

tank: 0.93

plant: 0.915

perplace: 0.7525

smsspam: 0.9676258992805755

-------**EXPERIMENT 11**-------

tank: 0.9025

plant: 0.9225

perplace: 0.85

smsspam: 0.9676258992805755

-------**EXPERIMENT 12**-------

tank: 0.875

plant: 0.8825

perplace: 0.8525

smsspam: 0.9676258992805755

**2**. In part 2, I implemented my own weighting scheme (“ertman\_weighting”) inspired from stepped weighting. However, my approach considers more than just the words that are a distance 3 from the target and refines the weights. Here are the weights for these words.

Adjacent words: 11

2 away: 10

3 away: 8

4 away: 5

5 away: 1

**3**.

**4**.

Stop words: good for plant and tank slightly, hurt sms by 2% and perplace by up to 8%.