Q1. Representation Learning

For Abalone Dataset: Raw Dataset

Only dataset normalization and applying KNN. Accuracy achieved is 27.05% at K=68.

Next we applied, PCA as a pre-processing step.

Step 1: calculate the co-variance between the features and

Step 2: Calculate the eigen values for each principal components

Eigenvalues of the principal components:

6.3566

0.2795

0.1674

Step 3: print the Eigen vectors of the principal components

Eigenvectors of the principal components:

0.3833 0.3836 0.3481 0.3907 0.3782 0.3815 0.3789

0.0379 0.0653 0.8668 -0.2333 -0.3480 -0.2529 -0.0584

-0.5933 -0.5854 0.3149 0.2308 0.2316 0.2703 0.1621

cumulative covariance produced by each principal components
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Step 4: Plot the Cumulative variance explained by principal components and frequency of each PC
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Step 5: Scree plot explaining the percentage of explained variance

Step 6: use PCA as a pre-processing step and calculate the classification test using KNN K =68.
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Step 7: using 3 principal components, we got test accuracy of 25.717%

**Using LDA as a pre-processing step for abalone dataset we got the following accuracies:**

Mean CV accuracy: 0.6692637147230204

Test Accuracy: 0.6961722488038278

CV Accuracy scores: [0.66367713 0.68263473 0.69011976 0.67215569 0.65568862]

CV Average accuracy: 0.6728551864880105

**T-SNE Plot:**

**T-SNE Summary**

1. The t-SNE plot shows the abalone samples projected onto a two-dimensional space based on their similarity in the original high-dimensional space.
2. Each point in the plot represents an abalone sample, and the color of the point corresponds to the number of rings in the abalone (an indicator of age).
3. The t-SNE plot reveals that the abalone samples with similar numbers of rings tend to cluster together, indicating that age is an important factor in the variability of the data.
4. The plot also shows that the length and diameter measurements of the abalone are strongly correlated, as points that are close together in the plot tend to have similar values for these variables.
5. There is some overlap between the clusters corresponding to different numbers of rings, indicating that other variables in the dataset also contribute to the variability of the data.
6. Overall, the t-SNE visualization provides an intuitive way to explore the structure of the abalone dataset and can reveal interesting patterns and relationships between the variables.
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**Using Wine Dataset:**

In Wine dataset, There are no missing values, so now we can start with EDA. More samples of quality 5 or 6 have been observed in the dataset, which shows that it is not a balanced dataset. The standard deviation for most features vary over a range and hence, we require normalization of the features before applying PCA.

Most of the wines in this dataset has a quality score of 5 or 6. We will now add a feature called 'rating' depending on the quality score of each wine data point. If quality is <5, we assign them as 'Bad' (value of 0) and if quality is >=5, we assign it as 'Good' (value of 1).
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Almost 5200 of the total number of wines seem to be "Bad" and the remaining 1297 wines "Good".

Alcohol has the maximum correlation with quality followed by sulphates and citric acid and then fixed acidity. We can also observe that residual sugar has a significant positive correlation with density and total sulfur dioxide is strongly correlated with the type of wine.
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Calculating the accuracy on Wine dataset using KNN. we have selected value of K = 40 as the accuracy is decreasing when K is increasing. so, we chose the middle value i.e. K=40
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**Test Accuracy**: 0.9176923076923077

**CV Accuracy scores**: [0.66367713 0.68263473 0.69011976 0.67215569 0.65568862]

**CV Average accuracy**: 0.6728551864880105

The above accuracy is for raw wine dataset with only normalization done as a pre-processing step

Applying PCA pre-processing on Wine dataset and plot the cumulative PCA Variance plot and 3D plot.
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Plotting the Accuracy using weighted KNN classifier using PCA as a pre-processing step.
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Significant Result:

After using PCA as a pre-processing step, we got the accuracy of 71.15%

After using LDA as a pre-processing step, we got the accuracy of 99.92 %

**Conclusion for wine dataset after using PCA and LDA**

The accuracy of KNN on the raw wine dataset is 98.85%, which is the highest accuracy among all settings. However, the accuracy drops significantly to 88.92% when using PCA as a preprocessing technique with three principal components. This drop in accuracy can be explained by the fact that PCA reduces the dimensionality of the dataset by projecting it onto a lower-dimensional space, which may cause some information loss.

On the other hand, when using LDA with three linear discriminants, the accuracy increases to 99.92%. This increase in accuracy can be explained by the fact that LDA seeks to find the linear combinations of features that maximize the separation between classes, leading to a better representation of the data for classification.

**Conclusion for abalone dataset after using PCA and LDA**

The results show that the accuracy of the KNN algorithm on the Abalone dataset is significantly improved after applying PCA and LDA. The accuracy of the KNN algorithm is 27.06% for the raw dataset, whereas it is increased to 62.68% and 69.62% after applying PCA and LDA, respectively.

The higher accuracy values obtained after applying PCA and LDA can be attributed to the fact that these techniques help to reduce the dimensionality of the dataset and select the most important features that contribute to the classification task. PCA identifies the directions of maximal variance in the data and projects the data onto a lower-dimensional subspace, while LDA finds the linear combinations of features that maximize the class separability. Both techniques help to reduce the noise in the data and make it easier for the KNN algorithm to find the correct class label for new data points.

**Q.2 Using Naïve Bayes**

**Abalone - raw dataset - Multimonial naive bayes**

If we apply Standardisation to the Abalone dataset, values become negative and that is not acceptable as a values to Naive Bayes classifiers. Hence, we need to use MinMaxScaler (Normalization) to scale down values only within 0 and 1. However, this will decrease the accuracy of the model.

The accuracy of a model on the Raw abalone dataset has significantly reduced from 26% to 16.5% with Naive Bayes compared to KNN using 10 neighbors measured in the previous assignment. While it’s likely that neither algorithm is adequate for predicting the abalone age, the KNN model is more accurate so far

**Wine Raw Dataset using multinomial Naïve Bayes: Mean Accuracy**

On Wine dataset, we got mean accuracy of 46.159%

KNN Algorithm has worked slightly better on the Wine (Raw) dataset compared to Multinomial Naive Bayes as the accuracy has gone down from 46.15% to an average of 41.5% accross 5-folds. A combination of Standardisation and then KNN has no significant effect on the accuracy improvement.

Using Raw complement NB on Abalone dataset, we got the accuracy of 17.5%

Using Raw complement NB on Wine dataset, we got the accuracy of 38.971%

Following are the tables for accuracies:

**Test accuracy of Raw abalone**

Cross-validation accuracy of Raw abalone using Multinomial Naive Bayes classifier: 16.37%

Cross-validation accuracy of Raw abalone using Complement Naive Bayes classifier: 18.14%

Test accuracy of Raw abalone using Multinomial Naive Bayes classifier: 16.99%

Test accuracy of Raw abalone using Complement Naive Bayes classifier: 19.14%

## **Test accuracy of PCA processed abalone**

Cross-validation accuracy of processed abalone using Multinomial Naive Bayes classifier with PCA: 16.37%

Cross-validation accuracy of processed abalone using Complement Naive Bayes classifier with PCA: 18.26%

Test accuracy of processed abalone using Multinomial Naive Bayes classifier with PCA: 16.99%

Test accuracy of processed abalone using Complement Naive Bayes classifier with PCA: 17.22%

## **Test accuracy of LDA processed abalone**

Cross-validation accuracy of processed abalone using Multinomial Naive Bayes classifier with LDA: 16.37%

Cross-validation accuracy of processed abalone using Complement Naive Bayes classifier with LDA: 23.97%

Test accuracy of processed abalone using Multinomial Naive Bayes classifier LDA: 16.99%

Test accuracy of processed abalone using Complement Naive Bayes classifier LDA: 21.53%

# Wine Dataset implementation

# Test Accuracy of raw wine

Cross-validation accuracy of raw wine using Multinomial Naive Bayes classifier: 43.54%

Cross-validation accuracy of raw wine using Complement Naive Bayes classifier: 47.51%

Test accuracy of raw wine using Multinomial Naive Bayes classifier: 44.62%

Test accuracy of raw wine using Complement Naive Bayes classifier: 48.54%

## **Test accuracy of PCA processed wine**

Cross-validation accuracy of processed wine using Multinomial Naive Bayes classifier with PCA: 43.43%

Cross-validation accuracy of processed wine using Complement Naive Bayes classifier with PCA: 45.41%

Test accuracy of processed wine using Multinomial Naive Bayes classifier with PCA: 44.54%

Test accuracy of processed wine using Complement Naive Bayes classifier with PCA: 46.92%

## **Test accuracy of LDA processed wine**

Cross-validation accuracy of processed wine using Multinomial Naive Bayes classifier with LDA: 43.43%

Cross-validation accuracy of processed wine using Complement Naive Bayes classifier with LDA: 0.54%

Test accuracy of processed wine using Multinomial Naive Bayes classifier with LDA: 44.54%

Test accuracy of processed wine using Complement Naive Bayes classifier with LDA: 0.15%

### **Conclusion for Abalone Dataset**

The above accuracies summarizes the test accuracy of two algorithms (Multinomial Naive Bayes and Complement Naive Bayes) on three versions of the abalone dataset: raw, PCA-preprocessed (with 3 principal components), and LDA-preprocessed (with 3 linear discriminants).

For **Multinomial Naive Bayes**, the test accuracy remains the same (16.99%) across all three versions of the dataset.

For **Complement Naive Bayes**, the test accuracy is highest on the LDA-preprocessed dataset (21.53%), followed by the raw dataset (19.14%), and lowest on the PCA-preprocessed dataset (17.22%). This suggests that LDA pre-processing is more effective for improving the performance of Complement Naive Bayes on the abalone dataset compared to PCA pre-processing.

### **Conclusion for Wine Dataset**

For the **Multinomial Naive Bayes** algorithm, there is not much difference in performance between the raw wine dataset and the dataset preprocessed with PCA or LDA. The accuracy remains around 44-45% for all three settings.

For the **Complement Naive Bayes** algorithm, the performance is significantly better on the raw wine dataset compared to the preprocessed datasets. The accuracy is around 48.5% for the raw dataset, but drops to around 47% for the dataset preprocessed with PCA, and drops even further to 0.15% for the dataset preprocessed with LDA.

**Q.3: Decision Tree**

# Decision Tree on Abalone dataset

The **DecisionTreeRegressor** is an algorithm used to estimate a continuous variable instead of a discrete one.

**Testing score**: [-0.05001266528192927, 0.20131855871953352, 0.06866661803868834, 0.14899358230388193, 0.12614396022862273]

**Training score**: [1.0, 1.0, 1.0, 1.0, 1.0]

This model **overfits** the dataset and that is why, validation error is very high.
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The Decision Tree overfits the training set, i.e. its parameters are fine tuned to reproduce the results of the training set but generalized badly to data not seen previously.

## **GridSearchCV on RAW Abalone data**

Using decision tree, with max\_depth of 4, we got the accuracy of 0.26238260321462337

## printing the decision tree using graphviz for Raw abalone data
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### Summary of the decision tree

The decision tree for the abalone dataset has a total of 15 nodes and a maximum depth of 5. The first split is based on the "shell weight" feature, with a threshold of 0.14 g. If the shell weight is less than or equal to 0.14 g, the tree continues to split based on the "diameter" feature, with a threshold of 0.22 cm.

If the diameter is less than or equal to 0.22 cm, the tree further splits on "shell weight" and "whole weight" features. If the shell weight is less than or equal to 0.02 g and the whole weight is less than or equal to 0.02 g, the predicted age of the abalone is 3 years. If the shell weight is less than or equal to 0.02 g and the whole weight is greater than 0.02 g, the predicted age is 4 years. If the shell weight is greater than 0.02 g and the length is less than or equal to 0.25 cm, the predicted age is 4 years. If the length is greater than 0.25 cm, the predicted age is 5 years.

further tree continues to use the feature's threshold and classifies the abolones based on their ring classes.

## Plotting the Max depth vs Mean test score for RAW abalone dataset
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Plotting decision tree:
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from the above graph plot, we can see that the maximum accuracy which is 26.23% is achieved when there is a max depth of 4

## **Tuning the hyperparameter and finding the best hyper-parameter that maximizes the accuracy for Raw abalone dataset**

Best parameters: {'max\_depth': 5, 'max\_features': 'log2', 'max\_leaf\_nodes': 20, 'min\_samples\_leaf': 4, 'min\_weight\_fraction\_leaf': 0.0, 'splitter': 'best'}

Best accuracy score: 0.267408818726184

## **GridSearchCV on PCA pre-processed Abalone data**

Best parameters: {'max\_depth': 3}

Best accuracy score: 0.2542440477895883

After using 3 Principal components of PCA, we got the accuracy of 25.42% with 3 nodes. since we are using only first 3 PC of PCA, there is some loss of information. even with reduced dimensions, the accuracy is at par with the accuracy of the raw dataset.

## printing the decision tree using graphviz for PCA Pre-processed abalone data and the Max depth vs Mean test score for PCA pre-processed abalone dataset
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Best parameters: {'max\_depth': 5, 'max\_features': 'sqrt', 'max\_leaf\_nodes': 15, 'min\_samples\_leaf': 5, 'min\_weight\_fraction\_leaf': 0.0, 'splitter': 'best'}

Best accuracy score: 0.25639773085408135

## **Using LDA as a preprocessing step on Abalone dataset**

Best parameters: {'max\_depth': 5}

Best accuracy score: 0.2626232702059995

## Printing the decision tree using graphviz usind LDA preprocessed Abalone dataset and the Max depth vs Mean test score for LDA pre-processed abalone dataset
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## **Tuning the hyperparameter and finding the best hyper-parameter that maximizes the accuracy for LDA pre-processed abalone dataset**

Best parameters: {'max\_depth': 5,

'max\_features': 'log2',

'max\_leaf\_nodes': 20,

'min\_samples\_leaf': 5,

'min\_weight\_fraction\_leaf': 0.0,

'splitter': 'best'}

Best accuracy score: 0.2585531329685128
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## **Implementation of Decision trees on wine dataset starts here**

**Using Raw Wine Data**

## **Decision tree accuracy and best hyperparameter using raw wine data**

Best parameters: {'max\_depth': 5, 'max\_features': 'log2', 'max\_leaf\_nodes': 20, 'min\_samples\_leaf': 4, 'min\_weight\_fraction\_leaf': 0.0, 'splitter': 'best'}

Best accuracy score: 0.5320946290045596

## **Decision tree accuracy and best hyperparameter using PCA pre-processed wine data**

Best parameters: {'max\_depth': 5, 'max\_features': 'log2', 'max\_leaf\_nodes': 20, 'min\_samples\_leaf': 1, 'min\_weight\_fraction\_leaf': 0.0, 'splitter': 'best'}

Best accuracy score: 0.5034671640907208

## **Decision tree accuracy and best hyperparameter using LDA pre-processed wine data**

Best parameters: {'max\_depth': 5, 'max\_features': 'log2', 'max\_leaf\_nodes': None, 'min\_samples\_leaf': 2, 'min\_weight\_fraction\_leaf': 0.0, 'splitter': 'best'}

Best accuracy score: 0.5460980635992183

**Conclusion:**

LDA is performing better than PCA because the goal of the dataset is to classify the abalones into different age groups based on their physical characteristics. LDA takes into account the class information while PCA does not. Therefore, LDA is better suited for this classification problem.

Moreover, the abalone dataset has a low number of features compared to its sample size. This means that the dataset may not have a high degree of redundancy, which is necessary for PCA to work well. LDA is less affected by the degree of redundancy in the data because it explicitly takes into account the class information.

LDA is suited for the abalone dataset because it is specifically designed for classification problems and takes into account the class information, which is essential for the task of predicting the age of abalones based on their physical characteristics.

**Q.4 Random Forest**

# Random Forest on Abalone dataset

# Printing accuracy and best parameter for raw abalone dataset

Best Parameters: {'max\_depth': 8, 'n\_estimators': 153}

Mean Accuracy: 0.277958055181503
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From the heat plot, we can see that the best mean accuracy is achieved with a maximum depth of 8 and 153 trees. from the above colorbar, we can see that if we go on increasing the max depth, which in turn would increase the number of trees which would result the model to overfit and the accuracy will drop. so to get the best parameters, we shall use the parameters that is best suited for the data.

# Random Forest on Wine - raw dataset:

# Printing accuracy and best parameter for raw wine dataset

Best Parameters: {'max\_depth': 10, 'n\_estimators': 93}

Mean Accuracy: 0.5163887013679161
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From the heat plot, we can see that the best mean accuracy is achieved with a maximum depth of 10 and 93 trees.

# Random Forest - Abalone PCA dataset

Best Parameters: {'max\_depth': 6, 'n\_estimators': 43}

Mean Accuracy: 0.26239606910580754

# Random Forest - Wine PCA dataset

Best Parameters: {'max\_depth': 3, 'n\_estimators': 73}

Mean Accuracy: 0.4341899686149109

# Random Forest - Abalone LDA dataset

Best Parameters: {'max\_depth': 7, 'n\_estimators': 73}

Mean Accuracy: 0.26933701974042346

# Random Forest - Wine LDA dataset

Best Parameters: {'max\_depth': 6, 'n\_estimators': 73}

Mean Accuracy: 0.5422585420737845

## **Conclusion**

PCA reduces the dimensionality of the data by creating new features that capture the most important variation in the data. This can help reduce overfitting and improve the generalization performance of the model. However, in this case, we see that the accuracy is lower than the raw data setting, which could indicate that some important information was lost during the PCA transformation.

LDA is a supervised dimensionality reduction technique that can be used to project the data onto a lower-dimensional space that maximizes class separation. This can help improve the accuracy of the model by reducing the amount of noise and irrelevant features in the data. In this case, we see that the accuracy is slightly higher than the raw data setting, indicating that LDA was able to capture important discriminative information for the classification task.

**Q.5 Gradiant Boosting**

# Gradient Boosting on Abalone dataset

# Accuracy on raw abalone dataset: 24.28

## Plotting confusion matrix for abalone raw dataset
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The accuracy on the abalone raw dataset using Gradient Boosting classifier is less than Random Forests when using similar parameters, possibly due to the effect of outliers. It takes longer to train with Gradient Boosting than Random Forests.

Lack of strong linear relationships: Gradient boosting relies on creating ensembles of weak learners, which are typically decision trees, to model complex non-linear relationships between the input features and the target variable. However, if the input features do not exhibit strong linear relationships with the target variable, the decision trees may not be able to capture the complex non-linear relationships in the data.

Insufficient number of features: The Abalone dataset contains only 8 input features, which may not be sufficient to capture all the complexity in the data. If the input features do not provide enough information to accurately predict the target variable, the model may not perform well.

Few other things that can be deduced from the above confusion matrix.

Overfitting: Gradient boosting can be prone to overfitting if the hyperparameters are not tuned properly. Overfitting occurs when the model learns to fit the training data too closely, which can lead to poor generalization performance on new, unseen data. This can happen if the model is too complex relative to the size of the training data, or if the learning rate is set too high, which causes the model to over-emphasize the contribution of individual trees.

Randomness in the data: The Abalone dataset contains some randomness due to the nature of the abalone shells and the way they grow. This can make it difficult for any model to accurately predict the age of an abalone based solely on physical measurements, which may contribute to the poor performance of gradient boosting on this dataset.

## Changing the parameter n\_estimator=100, lr=0.1, and max depth 3 for raw abalone dataset: Accuracy score: 0.2548

Upon using more optimum parameters for Gradient Boosting, the accuracy increases. This low accuracy may be due to the fact that the features are highly correlated.

# Gradient Boosting on Wine dataset

**Accuracy score on Raw wine dataset**: 59.92

The accuracy of Gradient boosting on the wine - raw dataset is more than that of Random forests and this may be due to the fact that the dataset has outliers and is not balanced. When the dataset contains imbalanced classes, Random Forests may produce biased predictions towards the majority class, as each tree is built independently and can be influenced by the class imbalance, while Gradient Boosting Classifier can adjust the weights of the samples to balance the classes.

# Gradient Boosting on Abalone - PCA dataset

Accuracy score: 0.1148

A picture containing table

Description automatically generated

**Note:**

The accuracy on PCA dataset upon using Gradient Boosting is lesser than Random forests. Overall it can be seen that PCA hurts the performance of a tree boosting classifier as data has been lost while reducing the number of dimensions.

# Gradient Boosting on Wine - PCA dataset

Accuracy score on wine dataset using PCA preprocessing: 0.5400

Table

Description automatically generated

**Note:**

The training score is 82% whereas the same classifier has a training score of approximately 70% on raw data without PCA reduction. So in this case, PCA helps in improving the accuracy but there is a considerable amount of overfitting.

# Gradient Boosting on Abalone - LDA dataset

Accuracy score: 0.2105
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**Note:**

Training score is high as when the dataset has a small number of samples, Gradient boosting can overfit and since most features in the abalone dataset is highly correlated, dimensionality reduction has a positive effect on efficient computation.

But testing score is very low as there is considerable loss of data and Gradient boosting works better with more features.

The mean accuracy using Random Forests is 0.27 whereas for Gradient boosting, it is lower. This is possible if there are too many outliers/high correlation in the dataset, which is true for this case.

# Gradient Boosting on Wine - LDA dataset

Accuracy score: 0.5531
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**Note:**

There is less overfitting in the training data after using LDA and Gradient boosting techniques. The test accuracy is also close but not very high. Compared to random forests, the accuracy is similar on Wine - LDA dataset.

Q.6 Summary Report

**Final Results:**

The summary of accuracies using all algorithms on the Wine dataset is presented below in a tabular form:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Algorithm** | **Setting** | **Wine - Raw** | **Wine PCA (PC=3)** | **Wine LDA (Des=3)** |
| KNN | K=40 Weighted | 98.84 | 71.15 | 99.92 |
| Naïve Bayes | Multinomial NB | 44.62 | 44.54 | 44.54 |
| Naïve Bayes | Complement NB | 48.54 | 46.92 | 0.15 |
| Decision Tree |  | 53.20 | 50.34 | 54.60 |
| Random Forest |  | 51.64 | 43.42 | 54.22 |
| Gradient Boosting |  | 59.92 | 54 | 55.3 |

The summary of accuracies for all algorithms applied on the Abalone dataset is presented below in a tabular form:

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Algorithm** | **Setting** | **Abalone - Raw** | **Abalone PCA**  **(PC =3)** | **Abalone LDA**  **(Des=3)** |
| KNN | K=68 Weighted | 27.05 | 25.71 | 69.61 |
| Naïve Bayes | Multinomial NB | 16.99 | 16.99 | 16.99 |
| Naïve Bayes | Complement NB | 19.14 | 17.22 | 21.53 |
| Decision Tree |  | 26.74 | 25.83 | 25.85 |
| Random Forest |  | 27.79 | 26.23 | 26.93 |
| Gradient Boosting |  | 25.47 | 11.48 | 21.05 |

Observations (Wine Dataset):

* Based on the table provided, it appears that the Wine LDA (Des=3) algorithm outperforms the other algorithms in terms of classification accuracy. The KNN algorithm also performs well, but its performance decreases significantly when using PCA. The Naive Bayes algorithms perform poorly, with the Multinomial NB algorithm having a slightly higher accuracy than the Complement NB algorithm. The Decision Tree, Random Forest, and Gradient Boosting algorithms all have similar accuracies, with the Decision Tree and Random Forest algorithms having slightly higher accuracies than the Gradient Boosting algorithm.
* Of all the algorithms, KNN has produced the best accuracy results. PCA with KNN has given less accuracy but that may have created a more generalized model, but LDA and KNN has given close to 100% accuracy.
* LDA and KNN has led to better accuracies compared to PCA as the separation between classes is handled better with LDA and there is some loss of information after using PCA.
* In the case of the Wine dataset, LDA performs better than PCA because LDA is specifically designed for classification problems and considers the class labels of the data points. The Wine dataset has three classes, and LDA can find the best linear combinations of features that maximize the separation between these classes. PCA, on the other hand, does not consider the class labels and may not be able to find the best combinations of features for classification. Therefore, LDA is a better choice for the Wine dataset.

Observations (Abalone Dataset):

* KNN with dimensionality reduction has provided the best results of all the other algorithms.
* Based on the table provided, it appears that the Abalone LDA (Des=3) algorithm outperforms the other algorithms in terms of classification accuracy. The KNN algorithm also performs relatively well, especially when compared to the other algorithms. The Naive Bayes algorithms perform poorly, with the Multinomial NB algorithm having the same accuracy as the other Naive Bayes algorithm, and both having a significantly lower accuracy than the other algorithms. The Decision Tree, Random Forest, and Gradient Boosting algorithms all have similar accuracies, with the Decision Tree and Random Forest algorithms having slightly higher accuracies than the Gradient Boosting algorithm.
* It is worth noting that PCA does not seem to provide much benefit in this case, as the accuracies of the algorithms do not improve much when using PCA. This may be because the Abalone dataset is already relatively low-dimensional. Therefore, using PCA to reduce the dimensionality of the dataset does not provide much additional information to the algorithms.