# Summary

# Enrich Model Test on 2+3

Model: SVM

Feature: All features

## 3-way Results

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Train | Test | Precision | Recall | F-Measure |
| train2 | test1 | 0.833 | 0.842 | 0.835 |
|  | test2 | 0.835 | 0.806 | 0.817 |
|  | test3 | 0.716 | 0.71 | 0.713 |
|  | test4 | 0.841 | 0.82 | 0.828 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| train3 | test1 | 0.789 | 0.776 | 0.782 |
|  | test2 | 0.797 | 0.744 | 0.764 |
|  | test3 | 0.87 | 0.873 | 0.868 |
|  | test4 | 0.868 | 0.751 | 0.782 |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| train23 | test1 | 0.837 | 0.847 | 0.838 |
|  | test2 | 0.832 | 0.813 | 0.821 |
|  | test3 | 0.865 | 0.869 | 0.864 |
|  | test4 | 0.88 | 0.808 | 0.828 |

In the summary10.24.2013, I have shown that enrich model is better than others (test1,2,4 with train2; test3 with train3). Now, train23 is even better.

## Combined Results (Highlight ones are better than “bestbyothers”)

“3way\_enrich\_train2\_allmetrics”, “3way\_enrich\_train3\_allmetrics”, “3way\_enrich\_train22\_allmetrics” are models trained 2, 3, 2+3 respectively (using distribution of labels).

“3way\_actngram\_allmetrics”, “3way\_enrich3\_allmetrics” used actngram and all features respectively (without distributional lables)
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