PROJECT SPECIFICATION

Identify Fraud from Enron Email

Quality of Code

CRITERIA MEETS SPECIFICATIONS RESPONSES FROM SARAVANAN KANDAMY

Functionality

documented in the writeup and the writeup clearly specifies the final

Code reflects the description in the The code performs the functions that is documented in this report. answers to questions in the writeup. It will also clearly specify the analysis strategy used to achieve the i.e. code performs the functions intended performance i.e. precision>0.3 and recall >0.3.

analysis strategy.

Usability

can be checked easily using the intended performance. tester.py.

poi_id.py can be run to export the tester.py has been imported to poi_id.py using the import function dataset, list of features and to allow the former script to be called every time the latter script is algorithm, so that the final algorithm called. This eases the verification process to see if I have achieved

Understanding the Dataset and Question

CRITERIA

MEETS SPECIFICATIONS

RESPONSES FROM SARAVANAN KANDAMY

Data Exploration

dataset and uses characteristics to inform their include:

- total number of data points
- allocation across classes (POI/non- be sold in order to turn it liquid. POI)
- number of features used
- missing values? etc.

Student response addresses the Data exploration is used to understand the available features. I have most important characteristics of chosen the ones I deem most relevant in our investigation. In any these fraud cases, it involves money. I am concerned the means money can be siphoned out, usually in more than 1 method either in direct analysis. Important characteristics liquid form or otherwise i.e. salary in the direct, liquid form on monthly basis; bonus in the direct, liquid form on yearly basis; total **stock value** in the indirect, non-liquid form where the stocks have to

- total number of data points =146
- allocation across classes (POI/non-POI) =POI:18, Non-POI:128
- are there features with many number of features used =4[poi, salary, bonus, total_stock_value]
 - are there features with many missing values? Out of the 4 used features, bonus has the highest missing values (64/146) followed by salary (51), total_stock_value (20) and poi (0). In the total 21 available features, *loan advances* has the highest missing values followed (142/146)bν director fees (129),restricted_stock_deferred (128) and deferral_payments (107).

Outlier Investigation Student response explains how they are removed or otherwise handled.

identifies Outlier Investigation is important especially when it coming from outlier(s) in the financial data, and different sources for different classes as it can easily lead to bias/ mistakes. Outlier can be detected using several methods via: a) exploratory analysis. Using this method, I have removed TOTAL from data_dict, as salary \$26,704,229 is way far from average; b) manual checking. Using this method, I have removed i) THE TRAVEL AGENCY IN THE PARK from data dict, as it is not a name of a person ii) LOCKHART EUGENE E from data_dict, as no value is available for its 20 features except for **poi**. Now, total number of data points =143.

Optimize Feature Selection/Engineering

new

CRITERIA

MEETS SPECIFICATIONS

RESPONSES FROM SARAVANAN KANDAMY

Create features

At least one new feature is Added two new features: a) fraction_from_poi, which is defined as implemented. Justification for that the fraction of from_poi_to_this_person and to_messages; b) feature is provided in the written *fraction_to_poi*, which is defined as the fraction response. The effect of that feature from_this_person_to_poi and from_messages. This two new on final algorithm performance is features were added because of the hunch that POI would write and

The student is not required to used=6. include their new feature in their final feature set.

tested or its strength is compared to receive much more emails than non-POI. Keen to study if this feature other features in feature selection. could assist to identify more new POI. Now, number of features

Intelligently select features

Univariate or recursive feature Feature selection selection is deployed, or features are a) Manual selection by hand combinations of the number of features selected is importances (e.g. decision tree) or those are documented as well.

by hand (different Difficult to address bias ~ variance dilemma if done manually. features are Different combinations of features are attempted. There is no attempted, and the performance is intelligence in selecting the feature, the process: human intuition -> documented for each one). Features code up the feature -> visualise -> repeat. The performance is that are selected are reported and documented for each one. Using clf = DecisionTreeClassifier()

justified. For an algorithm that i) Features List= ['poi', 'salary', 'bonus', 'total_stock_value'] the feature Features Importance= [0.21513238, 0.47434166, 0.31052596]

feature scores (e.g. SelectKBest), ii) Features List= ['poi', 'salary', 'bonus', 'total_stock_value', 'fraction_from_poi', 'fraction_to_poi'] Features Importance= [0.11965812, 0.15306268, 0.49722959, 0.06410256, 0.16594705]

b) Univariate (SelectPercentile(), SelectKBest())

i) selector = SelectPercentile(f_classif, percentile=10) Features List= ['poi', 'salary', 'bonus', 'total_stock_value'] Selector Scores= [11.18466395, 15.04137673, 16.4183221]

selector = SelectKBest(f classif, k=2) Features List= ['poi', 'salary', 'bonus', 'total stock value'] Selector Scores= [11.18466395, 15.04137673, 16.4183221]

ii) selector = SelectPercentile(f_classif, percentile=10) Features List= ['poi', 'salary', 'bonus', 'total stock value', 'fraction_from_poi', 'fraction_to_poi'] Selector Scores= [11.1719400, 10.1229852, 19.5434702, 0.0120766361, 4.09931158]

selector = SelectKBest(f_classif, k=2) Features List= ['poi', 'salary', 'bonus', 'total stock value', 'fraction_from_poi', 'fraction_to_poi'] Selector Scores= [11.1719400, 10.1229852, 19.5434702, 0.0120766361, 4.09931158]

c) Recursive

i) selector = RFE(clf, 2, step=1) Features List= ['poi', 'salary', 'bonus', 'total_stock_value'] Selector Scores n features = 2

Selector Scores support_= [True True False] Selector Scores ranking_= [1 1 2]

ii) selector = RFE(clf, 2, step=1)

Features List= ['poi', 'salary', 'bonus', 'total stock value', 'fraction from poi', 'fraction to poi'] Selector Scores n features = 2 Selector Scores support_= [False False True False True]

Selector Scores ranking_= [3 2 1 4 1]

Properly features scale

feature scaling is deployed.

If algorithm calls for scaled features, The algorithms that are affected by feature rescaling are Support Vector Machine with RBF (supervised learning) and k-means clustering (unsupervised learning). As we used Support Vector

Found no difference in Precision and Accuracy.

data = featureFormat(my_dataset, features_list, sort_keys = True) from sklearn.preprocessing import MinMaxScaler

Machine algorithm, we will rescale it using MinMax rescaler.

scaler = MinMaxScaler()

data = scaler.fit_transform(data)

labels, features = targetFeatureSplit(data)

clf = SVC(kernel='rbf', C=10.0)

Before MinMax rescaling:

Accuracy: 0.85757 Precision: 0.54286 Recall:

0.01900 F1: 0.03671 F2: 0.02354

Total predictions: 14000 True positives: 38 False

positives: 32 False negatives: 1962 True negatives: 11968

After MinMax rescaling:

Accuracy: 0.85757 Precision: 0.54286 Recall:

0.01900 F1: 0.03671 F2: 0.02354

Total predictions: 14000 True positives: 38 False

positives: 32 False negatives: 1962 True negatives: 11968

Pick and Tune an Algorithm

CRITERIA **MEETS SPECIFICATIONS** RESPONSES FROM SARAVANAN KANDAMY

Pick an algorithm

attempted and their performance is compared, with the best performing one used in the final analysis.

At least two different algorithms are The problem involves supervised learning with non-ordered, labelled data. Hence chosen to evaluate with: NaiveBayes, Support Vector Machine, Decision Tree, K-Nearest Neighbour, AdaBoost, and Random Forest algorithms. The performance in compared using Precision, Recall, Accuracy, and F1 Score metrics.

Discuss parameter tuning and importance

to perform parameter tuning and why it is important.

Response addresses what it means The goal of machine learning is to enable a system that can build models automatically from data without requiring much human intervention. However, one of the difficulties of learning algorithms, such as Support Vector Machine, Decision Trees and K Nearest Neighbour, require one to set its parameters before using it. Choosing the right parameters is important as it leads to an optimal model balancing bias-variance dilemma. In an initial learning phase (a.k.a. initial parameter tuning phase), training data are used to adjust the classification parameters where the model is tuned to achieve high quality results. Hence, parameter tuning for an algorithm or machine learning technique can be defined as an optimisation process leading to the algorithm to perform the best.

Tune algorithm tuned with at least 3 settings the following are true:

- GridSearchCV used parameter tuning
- Several parameters tuned
- Parameter tuning incorporated into algorithm selection (i.e. and one algorithm, best

At least one important parameter In Support Vector Machine two parameters are investigated with at least 4 settings: kernel (linear, rbf, poly, sigmoid), C (1, 10, 100, 1000, investigated systematically, or any of 10000, 100000, 1000000). In Decision Tree and Random Forest, two parameters are investigated: criterion (gini, entropy), min_samples_split (2, 10, 20, 25, 30, 40, 50). In K-Nearest Neighbour for three parameters are investigated with at least 2 settings: n_neighbors (2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8), algorithm (auto, brute, ball_tree, kd_tree), weights (uniform, distance). In AdaBoost three parameters are investigated with at least 2 settings: n estimators (20, 30, 40, 50, 60, 70, 80), algorithm ('SAMME.R', 'SAMME'), parameters tuned for more than learning_rate (0.80, 0.85, 0.90, 0.95, 1.0).

algorithm-tune selected for final analysis).

combination Implemented NaiveBayes, Support Vector Machine, Decision Tree, K-Nearest Neighbour, AdaBoost, and Random Forest algorithms. The best algorithm-tune combination will be selected for final analysis. Did not implement GridSearchCV which generates candidates from a grid of parameter values as we have used list with multiple options for the same purpose.

Validate and Evaluate

CRITERIA

MEETS SPECIFICATIONS

RESPONSES FROM SARAVANAN KANDAMY

Usage of **Evaluation Metrics**

evaluate context of the project task.

At least two appropriate metrics are Accuracy, Precision, Recall, and F1 are used as performance algorithm evaluation metrics for the evaluated machine learning algorithms. In performance (e.g. precision and the context of the project task, Accuracy is the ratio of correctly recall), and the student articulates predicted observation to the total observations, mathematically what those metrics measure in defined as the ratio of sum of true positives and true negatives, to total predictions. Precision also known as positive predictive value is the ratio of correctly predicted positive observations to the total predicted positive observations, mathematically defined as the ratio of true positives to, the sum of true positives and false positives. Recall is also known as sensitivity, mathematically defined as the ratio of true positives with, the sum of true positives and false negatives. F1 is the weighted average of Precision and Recall, mathematically defined as twice the ratio of precision times recall with, sum of Precision and Recall.

Discuss validation and its importance

is and why it is important.

Response addresses what validation Validation is an important process where data is separated for training and testing purposes. In training phase, training dataset are used to learn the best approach for prediction and in test phase, the performance of the model(s) can be calculated using the test dataset. K-Fold cross validation is an example of validation algorithm. Validation allow us to avoid overfitting, where the training can be stopped when the error in a test dataset starts growing (before convergence). Plus in the validation process, we can estimate the performance of independent test data before using it for actual implementation.

Validation Strategy

through the use of cross validation, noting the specific type of validation performed.

Performance of the final algorithm In this project, the train test split is used as a strategy to split the selected is assessed by splitting the data in 70:30 ratio. The identified 30% test dataset is used later to data into training and testing sets or predict using the model obtained from 70% training dataset.

Algorithm Performance

are both at least 0.3.

When tester.py is used to evaluate tester.py is used to evaluate the NaiveBayes, Support Vector performance, precision and recall Machine, Decision Tree, K-Nearest Neighbour, AdaBoost, and Random Forest algorithms with various combination of parameter values. Apart from Precision and Recall, Accuracy and F1 are evaluated. The results are shown in decreasing order below, where Precision and Recall are both above 0.3,

#SVC(kernel='poly', C=1000000.0)

Accuracy: 0.84279, Precision: 0.44942, Recall: 0.44650, F1: 0.44796

#SVC(kernel='rbf', C=1000000.0)

Accuracy: 0.83293, Precision: 0.41823, Recall: 0.43350, F1: 0.42573

#SVC(kernel='rbf', C=100000.0)

Accuracy: 0.82800, Precision: 0.38356, Recall: 0.33600, F1: 0.35821 #KNeighborsClassifier(n_neighbors=2, algorithm='kd_tree', weights

='distance')

Accuracy: 0.81800, Precision: 0.35173, Recall: 0.32500, F1: 0.33784 #KNeighborsClassifier(n_neighbors=2, algorithm='brute', weights ='distance')

Accuracy: 0.81800, Precision: 0.35173, Recall: 0.32500, F1: 0.33784 #KNeighborsClassifier(n_neighbors=2, algorithm='auto', weights ='distance')

Accuracy: 0.81800, Precision: 0.35173, Recall: 0.32500, F1: 0.33784 #DecisionTreeClassifier(criterion='entropy', min_samples_split=2) Accuracy: 0.80814, Precision: 0.33268, Recall: 0.34100, F1: 0.33679

Hence, **Support Vector Machine using poly kernel with C=1,000,000** is the best machine learning algorithm for our data in this project. It achieves Accuracy of 84.3%, Precision of 44.9%, Recall of 44.7% and F1 score of 0.44796.