

CSCI-630 Project 2: Metal Part Sort

Thang Nguyen - Ishan Gulhane

November 20, 2015

1 Algorithms

Briefly discuss the similarities and differences between the two learning algorithms. Which type did you expect to perform better in the experiment, and why?

Similarities and differences:

2 Data

Provide separate plots for the training and test data sets. Show sample classes using colors and/or shapes. Comment on the distribution of classes in the data sets.

a) Training set




Figure 2.1: Training set

The training samples are distributed in separated region

b) Test set

It can be seen from figure 2.2 that in the testing set, all testing samples are linearly separated, so it is easy to reach correct classification.




Figure 2.2: Testing set

3 Results

3.1 MLP

i) Plots showing the test samples and classification regions produced by different numbers of training epochs




Figure 3.1: Epochs = 0




Figure 3.2: Epochs = 10




Figure 3.3: Epochs = 100




Figure 3.4: Epochs = 1000




Figure 3.5: Epochs = 10000

ii) Learning curve image(SSE vs Epoch) for the trained MLP




Figure 3.6: Learning curve

iii)A table showing the recognition rate and profit for each number of saved epochs for the MLP

Epochs	Recognition rate	Profit(cents)
0	20%	-60
10	20%	-60
100	65%	85
1000	100%	203
10000	100%	203

Table 3.1: Recognition rate and profit for each number of saved epochs for the MLP

3.2 Decision Trees

i) Plots showing the test samples and classification regions produced by each of the two decision trees.

ii) Plots showing how feature space is split by each decision tree.




Figure 3.7: Feature space splitted in normal tree




Figure 3.8: Feature space splitted in pruning tree

iii) A table providing the recognition rate and profit obtained by each decision tree, along with the tree metrics produced by trainDT.py.

Tree	Normal tree	Prunned tree
Recognition rate	95%	95%
Profits(cents)	199	199
No of nodes	19	17
No of internal nodes	9	8
No of leaf nodes	10	9
Max depth	4	4
Min depth	2	2
Average depth	3.5	3.333

Table 3.2: Recognition rate and profit for each number of saved epochs for the MLP

4 Discussion

a) Which versions of the classifiers performed best in terms of 1) accuracy and 2) profit? Did this meet your expectations? In both term of accuracy and profit, MLP seems perform better b) How do the hypotheses (i.e. class boundaries) and performance metrics differ between the different version of the MLP and decision trees, and why?

MLP: As can be seen from figure 3.1 and 3.2 for epoch = 0 and epoch = 10, respectively, MLP do not achieve enough weight accuracy, there is not much different in 4 nodes of output, thus all test sampels are clas-sified as scrap with no boundaries between classes. As epochs increase, the perceptron network achieve better weight for all layers, thus improve accuracy of the output. With epochs = 100, the network reach 65% recognition rate