Package 'mltest'

October 13, 2022

October 13, 2022	
Title Classification Eval	uation Metrics
Version 1.0.1	
_	evaluation metrics based on confusion matrix.
License GPL-2	
Encoding UTF-8	
LazyData true	
RoxygenNote 6.1.0	
NeedsCompilation no	
Author G. Dudnik [aut,	cre, cph]
Maintainer G. Dudnik	<gl.dudnik@gmail.com></gl.dudnik@gmail.com>
Repository CRAN	
Date/Publication 2018-	11-16 17:00:03 UTC
R topics docume	ented:
ml_test	multi-class classifier evaluation metrics based on a confusion matrix (contingency table)
(balanced.accuracy measure, F-score), F negative rate (FNR),	ss classification evaluation metrics: balanced.accuracy , balanced accuracy), diagnostic odds ratio (DOR), error rate (error.rate), F.beta (F0.5 , F1 (F-12) with where beta is 0.5, 1 and 2 respectively), false positive rate (FPR), false false omission rate ((FOR)), false discovery rate (FDR), geometric mean (geo-ard , positive likelihood ratio (p+, LR(+) or simply L), negative likelihood ratio

ml_test

(p-, LR(-) or simply **lambda**), Matthews corellation coefficient (**MCC**), markedness (**MK**), negative predictive value (**NPV**), optimization precision **OP**, **precision**, **recall** (sensitivity), **specificity** and finally **Youden**'s index. The function calculates the aforementioned metrics from a confusion matrix (contingency matrix) where *TP*, *TN*, *FP FN* are abbreviations for *true positives*, *true negatives*, *false positives* and *false negatives* respectively.

Usage

```
ml_test(predicted, true, output.as.table = FALSE)
```

Arguments

predicted class labels predicted by the classifier model (a set of classes convertible into

type factor with levels representing labels)

true class labels (a set of classes convertible into type factor of the same length

and with the same levels as predicted)

output.as.table

the function returns all metrics except for accuracy and error.rate in a tabular

format if this argument is set to TRUE

Value

the function returns a list of following metrics:

accuracy calculated as: (TP+TN) / (TP+FP+TN+FN) (doesn't show up when output.as.table

= TRUE

balanced.accuracy

calculated as: (TP / (TP+FN)+TN / (TN+FP)) / 2 = (recall+specificity) / 2

DOR $calculated \ as: TP*TN / (FP*FN) = L / lambda$

error.rate calculated as: (FP+FN) / (TP+TN+FP+FN) = 1-accuracy (doesn't show up

when output.as.table = TRUE)

F0.5 *calculated as:* 1.25*(recall*precision/(0.25*precision+recall))

F1 calculated as: 2*(precision*recall / (precision+recall))
F2 calculated as: 5*(precision*recall / (4*precision+recall))

FDR calculated as: 1-precision

FNR calculated as: 1-recall **FOR** calculated as: 1-NPV

FPR calculated as: 1-specificity

geometric.mean

calculated as: (recall*specificity)^0.5

Jaccard calculated as: TP / (TP+FP+FN)

L calculated as: recall / (1-specificity)

lambda calculated as: (1-recall) / (specificity)

MCC calculated as: (TP*TN-FP*FN)/(((TP+FP)*(TP+FN)*(TN+FP)*(TN+FN))^0.5)

ml_test 3

MK calculated as: precision + NPV - 1
NPV calculated as: TN / (TN+FN)

OP calculated as: accuracy - |recall-specificity| / (recall+specificity)

precisioncalculated as: TP / (TP+FP)recallcalculated as: TP / (TP+FN)specificitycalculated as: TN / (TN+FP)Youdencalculated as: recall+specificity-1

Author(s)

G. Dudnik

References

- 1. Sasaki Y. (2007). The truth of the F-measure.:1–5. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/268185911_The_truth_of_the_F-measure.
- 2. Powers DMW. (2011). Evaluation: from Precision, Recall and F-measure to ROC, Informedness, Markedness & Correlation. Arch Geschwulstforsch. 2(1):37–63. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/313610493_Evaluation_From_precision_recall_and_fmeasure_to_roc_informedness_markedness_and_correlation.
- 3. Bekkar M, Djemaa HK, Alitouche TA. (2013). Evaluation Measures for Models Assessment over Imbalanced Data Sets. J Inf Eng Appl. 3(10):27–38. https://www.iiste.org/ Journals/index.php/JIEA/article/view/7633.
- 4. Jeni LA, Cohn JF, De La Torre F. (2013). Facing Imbalanced Data Recommendations for the Use of Performance Metrics. Conference on Affective Computing and Intelligent Interaction. IEEE. p. 245–51. http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/6681438/.
- 5. López V, Fernández A, García S, Palade V, Herrera F. (2013). An insight into classification with imbalanced data: Empirical results and current trends on using data intrinsic characteristics. Inf Sci. 250:113–41. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ins.2013.07.007.
- 6. Tharwat A. (2018). Classification assessment methods. Appl Comput Informatics . https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S2210832718301546.

Examples

```
library(mltest)

# class labels ("cat, "dog" and "rat") predicted by the classifier model
predicted_labels <- as.factor(c("dog", "cat", "dog", "rat", "rat"))

# true labels (test set)
true_labels <- as.factor(c("dog", "cat", "dog", "rat", "dog"))

classifier_metrics <- ml_test(predicted_labels, true_labels, output.as.table = FALSE)

# overall classification accuracy
accuracy <- classifier_metrics$accuracy</pre>
```

4 ml_test

```
# F1-measures for classes "cat", "dog" and "rat"
F1 <- classifier_metrics$F1

# tabular view of the metrics (except for 'accuracy' and 'error.rate')
classifier_metrics <- ml_test(predicted_labels, true_labels, output.as.table = TRUE)</pre>
```

Index

```
* utilities
    ml_test, 1
ml_test, 1
```