

## Assignment 2 – Regression using Scikit-learn

### **Assessment weighting:**

This assignment is worth **15% of the total marks** for this module.

### **Due date:**

This assignment is due by **23:59 on Friday 28<sup>th</sup> November 2025**.

Extensions to the due date may be possible in certain circumstances (e.g., with a medical certificate), but only if an extension is requested **before** the due date.

**Please be aware that late submissions will not be accepted, except for cases with serious extenuating circumstances (e.g., illness).**

### **Submission instructions:**

Your report should be uploaded as a .pdf to the Turnitin link marked 'Submit Assignment 2 Report' provided on Canvas, with the naming convention CT4101\_A1\_lastname\_firstname.pdf. Your report should be a separate document from your code submission and not contained e.g. within a Jupyter Lab notebook / .ipynb or other type of file.

Your code should be neatly laid out and formatted and commented appropriately. Submitted code samples (including comments) should adhere to the conventions in the PEP 8 Style Guide for Python Code (<https://www.python.org/dev/peps/pep-0008/>).

Your code should be submitted to the link marked 'Submit Assignment 2 Code' provided on Canvas in a single .zip folder (**NOT** in a .rar, tar.gz, .7z etc.), with the naming convention CT4101\_A1\_lastname\_firstname\_code.zip. Code submissions can be in the form of a standard Python module or modules (file extension .py), or in the form of a Jupyter Lab notebook (file extension .ipynb).

Submissions via email will not be accepted under any circumstances, you should upload your work on Canvas only. Failure to adhere to these submission instructions may lead to penalties being applied.

### **Plagiarism and copying:**

Plagiarism is passing off the work of another person as one's own.

While you are allowed to collaborate with your classmates and review online and print resources for high-level problem solving and background research, you are each expected to complete this assignment **individually**. This means that every sentence in your report submission should be written by **you alone**. You may reuse or modify **short snippets** of code from the lecture notes or online resources for your code submission, but the overall application structure and all code comments should be your own original work. Please see the University of Galway Code of Practice for Dealing with Plagiarism for further information on plagiarism: <https://www.universityofgalway.ie/plagiarism/>

**Plagiarism is a serious academic offence and may lead to a loss of some or all marks and/or disciplinary proceedings if it is detected in any of your submissions. All submissions will be processed using automatic plagiarism detection software. Students who facilitate others to copy their work are also subject to plagiarism sanctions (including loss of marks), so you should not share your assignment solutions with classmates.**

You may find it helpful to consult online guidelines for help with referencing:  
<https://libguides.library.nuigalway.ie/c.php?g=681111&p=4858348>

**Assignment description (25 marks max.)**

The goal of this assignment is to learn the basics of using the scikit-learn package to develop machine learning (ML) models for a regression task. To complete this assignment, you must write a Python application (extension .py) or a Jupyter notebook (extension .ipynb) that trains two ML models for regression and explores the impact of different hyperparameter values on the error achieved by your models. You must also prepare a short .pdf report (5 pages max.) discussing your findings.

A dataset called **steel.csv** has been supplied on Canvas. This dataset has not been split into separate training and test sets – you are required to do this yourself (see below). The data is supplied in comma separated values format. Each row describes one instance in the dataset. The attributes are in columns in the following order: normalising\_temperature, tempering\_temperature, percent\_silicon, percent\_chromium, percent\_copper, percent\_nickel, percent\_sulphur, percent\_carbon, percent\_manganese, tensile\_strength. The goal of your regression models is to predict the value of the target attribute **tensile\_strength**.

You are required to select any two regression algorithms (*apart from ones based on linear regression*) from the scikit-learn package, and then apply them to this dataset to train predictive models. Please note that selection of linear regression models (e.g., scikit-learn classes **LinearRegression**, **Ridge** etc.) is **not allowed** as these models are very simple and generally do not have many hyperparameters to tune. Please note that it is not necessary to implement any ML algorithms yourself, you should use the algorithm implementations available in scikit-learn. A list of available scikit-learn regression implementations can be found at: [https://scikit-learn.org/stable/supervised\\_learning.html](https://scikit-learn.org/stable/supervised_learning.html) (N.B. this link includes both classification and regression models – be sure to choose **only regression** models).

Your models should be trained and evaluated using **10-fold cross validation** on the supplied dataset. You should choose one *domain independent* and one *domain specific* measure of error to evaluate your trained models. You should report average training and test set results over all folds for each model. You should present average results for each model using the default hyperparameter settings in scikit-learn, and results achieved when attempting to tune two of the available hyperparameters for each model. For each model, you may choose any two available hyperparameters to tune. You **may use** an automated hyperparameter tuning method (e.g., the scikit-learn **GridSearchCV** class) for this assignment if you wish.

Ensure that you acknowledge all your sources of information using appropriate references when writing the report. All of the report should be written **in your own words** – do not copy text directly from online or print sources as this will lead to mark deductions for plagiarism.

The required sections in the report (5 pages max., excluding appendices) are described below:

1. **Description of algorithms:** Clearly describe each of your chosen scikit-learn algorithm implementations in turn, paying special attention to discussing the two hyperparameters that you have chosen to tune for each algorithm. You should write a maximum of 1 page per algorithm.
2. **Model training and evaluation:** For each of your chosen algorithms, you should discuss the results achieved with the default settings, and also discuss the results you achieved after trying out a selection of different values for the two selected hyperparameters. You should summarise the results of your evaluation using cross validation in an appropriate format (e.g., in graphs or tables). You should write a maximum of 1 page per algorithm.
3. **Conclusion:** Briefly sum up your key findings, including e.g., which model performed best, whether overfitting or underfitting was evident, whether the achieved accuracy of one of the models is more sensitive to hyperparameter values than the other, and your recommended hyperparameter values for each algorithm. You should write a maximum of 1 page for this section.
4. **Appendix:** you may include additional information (e.g., additional results) in an appendix if you wish.

*The marking rubric for this assignment is below. Please read it carefully.*

## **Grading Rubric – CT4101 Assignment 1 (Classification with Scikit-learn)**

**Total: 50 marks (15% of module grade)**

### **1. Description of Algorithms (2 × 10 marks = 20 marks)**

For **each** selected algorithm (excluding linear regression models):

- **10** – Exceptional: Clear, concise, and accurate explanation of the algorithm and its mechanics; detailed analysis of the two chosen hyperparameters and their expected influence; shows deep understanding.
- **8–9** – Very good: Strong explanation with only minor omissions or inaccuracies.
- **6–7** – Average: Covers key points but limited depth or clarity, especially on hyperparameters.
- **4–5** – Passable: Superficial discussion; hyperparameters mentioned but not well explained.
- **1–3** – Incomplete: Major gaps in description; lacks accuracy or detail.
- **0** – Section missing.

### **2. Model Training and Evaluation (2 × 10 marks = 20 marks)**

For **each** chosen algorithm:

- **10** – Exceptional: Comprehensive evaluation of default vs. tuned hyperparameters; clear, correct reporting of CV analysis; results well presented in graphs/tables; insightful discussion of trends.
- **8–9** – Very good: Strong coverage, with some minor issues in reporting or analysis.
- **6–7** – Average: Reports results but with limited critical analysis or clarity in presentation.
- **4–5** – Passable: Minimal discussion of results; poor organisation or weak accuracy reporting.
- **1–3** – Incomplete: Very limited or inaccurate reporting.
- **0** – Section missing.

### **3. Conclusion (5 marks)**

- **5** – Exceptional: Concise synthesis of findings; identifies best-performing model; discusses hyperparameter sensitivity; well-justified recommendations.
- **4** – Very good: Covers most aspects with solid reasoning.
- **3** – Average: Some findings summarised, but limited depth.
- **2** – Passable: Minimal summary without strong conclusions.
- **1** – Incomplete: Vague or unclear.
- **0** – Section missing.

#### 4. Professional Practices: Referencing + GitHub + Track Changes (5 marks total)

##### a. Referencing (up to 2 marks)

- **2** – Excellent references that are correctly cited throughout the text. High quality sources of information chosen.
- **1** – Adequate referencing with some flaws in citation style or the quality of references.
- **0** – Little to no supporting sources provided in the report.

##### b. GitHub Version Control (up to 2 marks)

- **2** – Frequent, meaningful commits with descriptive messages; evidence of iterative development; well-structured repo.
- **1** – Regular commits with good messages; some progression is evident.
- **0** – No GitHub repo or single / inadequate final upload provided.

##### c. Tracking Changes in MS Word (up to 1 mark)

- **1** – Version history enabled in MS Word by saving on OneDrive or SharePoint in Microsoft 365 Include a written update log keeping track of your progress at the end of the report.
- **0** – No trace of the updating process.

---

#### Weighting Overview

- Algorithms Description: **20 marks**
- Training and Evaluation: **20 marks**
- Conclusion: **5 marks**
- Referencing + GitHub + Tracking Changes: **5 marks**

**= 50 marks total**

**Note:** Failure to submit a sufficient Progress Journal on Canvas at the halfway point will result in a **20% penalty**.

---