



Big Data Analytics SOEN 691

Dr. Tristan Glatard Winter 2020 Team ID 12

NBA Playoff Prediction

YING RAO

ELIE DOSH

PROJECT REPO

HTTPS://GITHUB.COM/SKIERWING/SOEN691_PROJECT_ED_YR.GIT

Introduction

☐ The goal of the project is to predict if an NBA Team will make it to the playoff or NOT

According to oddsshark.com

















Los Angeles Lakers Milwaukee Bucks Los Angeles Clippers Houston Rockets Toronto Raptors Boston Celtics Miami Heat

Still, bettors and basketball fans are holding out hope the season will return soon as sportsbooks are still offering **NBA** futures for the 2019-20 **championship** and have the Los Angeles Lakers as the **betting** favorite.

...

Upcoming Events.

NBA - Championship 2019/20

| San Antonio | | +6000 |
|-------------|---|--------|
| Toronto | | +1000 |
| Utah | B | +4000 |
| Washington | | +50000 |
| | | |

26 more rows • Mar 18, 2020

Data preparation and analysis

- Manually gather data from basketball-reference.com
 - ☐ Between Seasons 1980-2018
- Analyzing the data:
 - □ Number of teams changed over the years 23, 27,29 and lately 30
 - ☐ Seasons 1980-1983 12 Teams 1984-2018 16 Teams to playoff
 - ☐ Each team plays different number of minutes in total
 - ☐ Used the Minutes Played field as common denominator for all Classifiers
- ☐ Using Spark framework and the Dataframe Library to generate the dataset

| Points_Per_minute | 3Points_Per_minute | 2Points_Per_minute | FThrow_Per_minute | | | |
|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|--|--|--|
| Rebound_Per_minute | Assists_Per_minute | Steals_Per_minute | Blocks_Per_minute | | | |
| TurnOvers_Per_minute | | | | | | |
| Playoff | | | | | | |

Machine Learning Libraries



Small Dataset

1074 records & 9 Classifiers



Decision to use Gaussian Naïve Bayes & SVM supervised learning models



Implemented "scikit-learn" library (Sklearn)



Used K-fold technique for training and testing

```
df = spark.read.csv(filename, header=True, mode="DROPMALFORMED", encoding='utf-8')
df = df.select("id", "year", "team", "3P", "2P", "FT", "TRB", "AST", "STL", "BLK", "TOV", "PTS", "MP", "Playoff")
df = df.withColumn("Points_Per_minute",col("PTS")/col("MP"))
df = df.withColumn("3Points Per minute",col("3P")/col("MP"))
df = df.withColumn("2Points_Per_minute",col("2P")/col("MP"))
df = df.withColumn("FThrow_Per_minute",col("FT")/col("MP"))
df = df.withColumn("Rebound_Per_minute",col("TRB")/col("MP"))
df = df.withColumn("Assists Per minute",col("AST")/col("MP"))
df = df.withColumn("Steals_Per_minute",col("STL")/col("MP"))
df = df.withColumn("Blocks Per minute",col("BLK")/col("MP"))
df = df.withColumn("TurnOvers_Per_minute",col("TOV")/col("MP"))
data_classifiers = df.select("id", "Playoff", "Points_Per_minute", "3Points_Per_minute", "2Points_Per_minute", "FThrow_Per_minute",
"Rebound_Per_minute", "Assists_Per_minute", "Steals_Per_minute", "Blocks_Per_minute", "TurnOvers_Per_minute")
return data classifiers#.collect()
```

□ Data loading and pre-processing: Spark dataframe

```
data = np.array(ld.collect()).astype(np.float64)
X = data[:,2:]
y = data[:,1]
ns = 5
kf = KFold(n_splits=ns, random_state=None, shuffle=False)
count=0
for train index, test index in kf.split(X):
    count+=1
    print("############### K-FOLD Round "+str(count)+" ############################"
    X_train, X_test = X[train_index], X[test_index]
   y_train, y_test = y[train_index], y[test_index]
    print("########## Algorithm 1: Support Vector Machines #################
    run_SVM(X_train, X_test, y_train, y_test)
    print("########### Algorithm 2: Gaussian Naive Bayes ###########")
    run GNB(X train, X test, y train, y test)
```

- Split Data using K-fold: sklearn.model_selection
 - ☐ K-fold is a good cross-validation method that tackles overfitting or underfitting

```
def run_GNB(X_train,X_test,y_train,y_test):
    start time = time.time()
    gnb = GaussianNB()
    gnb.fit(X train, y train)
    print("---Training Time %s seconds ---" % (time.time() - start time))
    start_time = time.time()
                                              def run_SVM(X_train,X_test,y_train,y_test):
    predictions = gnb.predict(X test)
                                                  # Training the SVM model using X train and Y train
                                                  start time = time.time()
                                                  svm = SVC(kernel='rbf',C=100,gamma=10)
                                                  svm.fit(X train, y train)
                                                  print("---Training Time %s seconds ---" % (time.time() - start_time))
                                                  # Classification of X test using the SVM model
                                                  start time = time.time()
                                                  predictions = svm.predict(X_test)
```

- □ Data modeling and classification: scikit-learn
 - □library: sklearn.naive_bayes GaussianNB and sklearn.svm SVC

```
# Performance measure
# use the classification report in order to extract the average F1 measure
print(classification_report(y_test, predictions, target_names=target_names))
# displaying the classification performances through the confusion matrix as well.
cm = confusion_matrix(y_test, predictions)
print(cm)
```

- Performance evaluation: F1 score, confusion matrix
 - □ library: sklearn.metrics classification_report and sklearn.metrics confusion_matrix

Observation

- ☐Base on our chosen dataset and classifiers
- Naïve Bayes algorithm was quicker during execution
- SVM algorithm is better at predicting the Playoff
 - \square Average Weighted Precision : [SVM=0.734] > [GNB=0.694]
 - \square Average Weighted Recall: [SVM=0.704] > [GNB=0.622]
 - □ Average Weighted F1-Score : [SVM=0.698] > [GNB=0.574]
- Results

| SVM | | | | | | | | GNB | | | | | | | | |
|------------------|-------------|-----------|------------|------------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|----------|
| Round 1 | | | | | | | | Round 1 | | | | | | | | |
| ▼ | Precision 💌 | Recall 💌 | F1-score ▼ | Support | | | | | Precision 💌 | Recall 💌 | F1-score | Support | | | | |
| PlayOff 0 | 0.58 | 0.83 | 0.68 | 78 | | | | PlayOff 0 | 0.92 | 0.15 | 0.26 | 78 | | | | |
| PlayOff1 | 0.87 | 0.66 | 0.75 | 137 | | Playoff/0 | Playoff/1 | PlayOff1 | 0.67 | 0.99 | 0.80 | 137 | | Playoff/0 | Playoff/1 | |
| | | | | | Playoff/0 | 65 | 13 | | 2 | | | | Playoff/0 | 12 | 66 | |
| Micro Average | 0.72 | 0.72 | 0.72 | 215 | Playoff/1 | 47 | 90 | Micro Average | 0.69 | 0.69 | 0.69 | 215 | Playoff/1 | 1 | 136 | |
| Macro Average | 0.73 | 0.75 | 0.72 | 215 | | | | Macro Average | 0.80 | 0.57 | 0.53 | 215 | | | | |
| Weighted Average | 0.77 | 0.72 | 0.73 | 215 | | | | Weighted Average | 0.76 | 0.69 | 0.61 | 215 | | | ult | - ~ |
| Round 2 | | | | | | | | Round 2 | | | | | K | PS | | S |
| | Precision 💌 | Recall 💌 | F1-score ▼ | Support ▼ | | | | | Precision 💌 | Recall ▼ | F1-score 💌 | Support 💌 | | | CIL | <u> </u> |
| PlayOff 0 | 0.80 | 0.49 | 0.61 | 90 | | | | PlayOff 0 | 0.67 | 0.42 | 0.52 | 90 | | | | |
| PlayOff1 | 0.71 | 0.91 | 0.80 | 125 | | | | Play0ff1 | 0.67 | 0.85 | 0.75 | 115 | | | | |
| | | | | | | Playoff/0 | Playoff/1 | | | | | | | Playoff/0 | Playoff/1 | |
| Micro Average | 0.73 | 0.73 | 0.73 | 215 | Playoff/0 | 44 | 46 | Micro Average | 0.67 | 0.67 | 0.67 | 215 | Playoff/0 | 38 | 52 | |
| Macro Average | 0.76 | 0.70 | 0.70 | 215 | Playoff/1 | 11 | 114 | Macro Average | 0.67 | 0.64 | 0.63 | 215 | Playoff/1 | 19 | 106 | |
| Weighted Average | 0.75 | 0.73 | 0.72 | 215 | | | | Weighted Average | 0.67 | 0.67 | 0.65 | 215 | | | | |
| Round 3 | | | | | | | | Round 3 | 0.01 | | | 2.0 | | | | |
| | Precision 🔻 | Recall 🔻 | F1-score ▼ | Support▼ | | | | | Precision 🔻 | Recall ▼ | F1-score | Support 🔻 | | | | |
| PlayOff 0 | 0.65 | 0.87 | 0.74 | 97 | | | | PlayOff 0 | 0.49 | 0.95 | 0.65 | 97 | | | | |
| PlayOff 1 | 0.85 | 0.62 | 0.72 | 118 | | | | PlayOff 1 | 0.83 | 0.20 | 0.33 | 118 | | | | |
| | | | | | | Playoff/0 | Playoff/1 | | | | | | | Playoff/0 | Playoff/1 | |
| Micro Average | 0.73 | 0.73 | 0.73 | 215 | Playoff/0 | 84 | 13 | Micro Average | 0.54 | 0.54 | 0.54 | 215 | Playoff/0 | 92 | 5 | |
| Macro Average | 0.75 | 0.74 | 0.73 | 215 | Playoff/1 | 45 | 73 | Macro Average | 0.66 | 0.58 | 0.49 | 215 | Playoff/1 | 94 | 24 | |
| Weighted Average | 0.76 | 0.73 | 0.73 | 215 | ,, . | 40 | | Weighted Average | 0.68 | 0.54 | 0.47 | 215 | ,, . | | | |
| Round 4 | 0.70 | 0.70 | 0.75 | 213 | | | | Round 4 | 0.00 | 0.54 | 0.47 | 210 | | | | |
| Rouliu 4 | Precision 💌 | Recall 🔻 | F1-score ▼ | Support ▼ | | | | Round 4 | Precision 🔻 | Recall 🔻 | F1-score ▼ | Support ▼ | | | | |
| PlayOff 0 | 0.65 | 0.73 | 0.69 | 100 | | | | PlayOff 0 | 0.51 | 0.96 | 0.66 | 100 | | | | |
| PlayOff 1 | 0.74 | 0.66 | 0.70 | 115 | | | | PlayOff1 | 0.85 | 0.19 | 0.31 | 115 | | | | |
| Ptayonii | 0.74 | 0.00 | 0.70 | 113 | | Playoff/0 | Playoff/1 | Ptayonii | 0.65 | 0.17 | 0.51 | 113 | | Playoff/0 | Playoff/1 | |
| Micro Average | 0.49 | 0.49 | 0.49 | 215 | Dlavett/0 | | | Micro Average | 0.55 | O EE | 0.55 | 215 | Diavett/0 | | | |
| Micro Average | 0.69 | 0.69 | 0.69 | 215 215 | Playoff/0 | 73 39 | 27 76 | Micro Average | 0.55 0.68 | 0.55 0.58 | 0.55 0.49 | 215 215 | Playoff/0 | 65 47 | 90 | |
| Macro Average | | | | | Playoff/1 | 37 | 76 | Macro Average | | | | | Playoff/1 | 47 | 90 | |
| Weighted Average | 0.70 | 0.69 | 0.69 | 215 | | | | Weighted Average | 0.69 | 0.55 | 0.48 | 215 | | | | |
| Round 5 | Dunasiai | Descrit . | Et avenue | Curr | | | | Round 5 | Donataio | Decett 1 | F1 | Cumment | | | | |
| | Precision ▼ | Recall ▼ | F1-score ▼ | | | | | DI - 2W 2 | Precision 🔻 | Recall ▼ | F1-score ▼ | Support ▼ | | | | |
| PlayOff 0 | 0.77 | 0.37 | 0.50 | 101 | | | | PlayOff 0 | 0.63 | 0.71 | 0.67 | 101 | | | | |
| Play0ff1 | 0.61 | 0.90 | 0.73 | 113 | | | | Play0ff1 | 0.71 | 0.62 | 0.66 | 113 | | | | |
| | | | | | | Playoff/0 | Playoff/1 | | 1 | | | | | Playoff/0 | Playoff/1 | |
| Micro Average | 0.65 | 0.65 | 0.65 | 214 | Playoff/0 | 37 | 64 | Micro Average | 0.66 | 0.66 | 0.66 | 214 | Playoff/0 | 65 | 13 | |
| Macro Average | 0.69 | 0.63 | 0.61 | 214 | Playoff/1 | 11 | 102 | Macro Average | 0.67 | 0.67 | 0.66 | 214 | Playoff/1 | 47 | 90 | |
| Weighted Average | 0.69 | 0.65 | 0.62 | 214 | | | | Weighted Average | 0.67 | 0.66 | 0.66 | 214 | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Conclusion

- ☐Given our dataset
 - ☐ Gaussian Naïve Bayes performed the worst
 - □ SVM is Decent for playoffs prediction [~70%]





Thank You

Questions?

References

- ☐ Google
- □ https://www.basketball-reference.com/leagues/
- https://scikit-learn.org/stable/
- https://muthu.co/understanding-the-classification-report-in-sklearn/
- https://scikit-learn.org/stable/modules/generated/sklearn.metrics.precision_recall_fscore_support.html
- https://scikit-learn.org/stable/modules/generated/sklearn.model_selection.KFold.html