## **K-NN on validation set**

Distance Metric	k=1	k=3	k=5
Hamming	36.36363636363637	38.59090909090909	37.31818181818182
Euclidean	56.31818181818182	57.40909090909091	55.0
Cosine similarity using TF-IDF vectors	81.0909090909091	83.22727272727273	<mark>83.5</mark>

# Naive Bayes on validation set

Smoothing factor,α	Accuracy (%)
0.0001	90.68181818181819
0.001	91.545454545455
0.01	92.227272727273
0.025	92.227272727273
0.05	92.227272727273
0.065	92.31818181818181
0.075	92.272727272727
0.1	92.181818181819
0.5	91.90909090909
1	91.454545454545
10	85.545454545455
100	79.59090909091

## **Comparing K-NN and Naïve Bayes on test set:**

Iteration	K-NN (TF-IDF for K=5)	Naïve Bayes ( $\alpha = 0.065$ )
1	89.09090909091	91.818181818181
2	88.181818181819	95.454545454545
3	84.545454545455	96.36363636363636
4	81.818181818181	90.0
5	87.272727272727	95.454545454545
6	88.181818181819	92.727272727273
7	87.272727272727	95.454545454545
8	87.2727272727	91.818181818181
9	81.818181818181	91.818181818181
10	82.727272727273	91.818181818181
11	83.636363636364	93.636363636364
12	85.454545454545	95.454545454545
13	76.363636363636	89.09090909091
14	80.90909090909	90.90909090909
15	80.0	90.90909090909
16	77.272727272727	89.09090909091
17	80.0	90.90909090909
18	79.09090909091	92.727272727273
19	76.363636363636	90.90909090909
20	79.09090909091	88.181818181819
21	80.0	84.545454545455
22	87.272727272727	97.272727272727
23	85.454545454545	93.636363636364
	81.818181818181	94.545454545455
24	82.727272727273	
25		90.90909090909
26	84.545454545455	89.09090909091
27	82.727272727273	88.181818181819
28	78.181818181819	90.0
29	81.818181818181	89.09090909091
30	80.90909090909	94.545454545455
31	84.545454545455	90.0
32	80.90909090909	92.727272727273
33	85.454545454545	92.727272727273
34	82.727272727273	94.545454545455
35	81.818181818181	89.09090909091
36	80.0	91.818181818181
37	80.90909090909	89.09090909091
38	79.09090909091	91.818181818181
39	87.272727272727	96.363636363636
40	89.09090909091	96.363636363636
41	77.272727272727	89.09090909091
42	88.181818181819	96.363636363636
43	80.0	90.0
44	83.636363636364	90.0
45	81.818181818181	92.727272727273
46	85.454545454545	93.636363636364
47	82.727272727273	90.90909090909
48	80.0	89.09090909091
49	82.727272727273	88.181818181819
50	82.727272727273	95.454545454545

### **Summary of test set accuracies:**

K-NN on test set:(using Cosine similarity on TF-IDF vector and k=5)

Min: 76.363636363636 Max: 89.0909090909091 Mean: 82.76363636363637 Std Dev: 3.4013123378829406

Naive Bayes on test set:(using 0.065 as the smoothing factor)

Min: 84.545454545455 Max: 97.272727272727 Mean: 91.927272727272 Std Dev: 2.785084238380596

### **Result of t statistics:**

If the p-value is smaller than the threshold, then we reject the null hypothesis of equal averages. Small p-values are associated with large t-statistics. Following result was calculated by **stats.ttest\_rel** (**test\_set\_accuracies\_knn**, **test\_set\_accuracies\_nb**) from **scipy** library. Relative t-test was used because we wanted to compare on each test set pairwise (KNN and Naïve Bayes).

*T* statistic= -23.120636250963607, pvalue= 5.1705019279572745e-28

T\_statistic value (as it is negative) tells us Naïve Bayes is better than K-NN. This p-value is smaller than 0.005. So we reject the null hypothesis of equal averages at significance level of 0.005. Same goes for significance levels of 0.01 and 0.05. Such a small P-value also states that Naïve Bayes is consistently better than K-NN.

#### **Summary:**

#### Performance:

Naïve Bayes is better than K-NN looking at the averages of the accuracies run on 50 iterations of test set. Naïve Bayes takes probability of all the words of test set in training space into account. K-NN is really bad at prediction in hamming and Euclidean distance measures. It increases significantly in cosine similarity with TF-IDF weights.

#### Running time:

Naïve Bayes took around 2s on validation set whereas KNN took almost ~50s. Naïve Bayes is faster because KNN needs more real time computation than Naïve Bayes.