Practice problems for NNC with partial answers

1. Suppose there are two variables x1 and x2 from two populations. Draw possible scatter plots of data where you would expect NNC methods to work better than DA methods.

The important point here is that DA essentially would draw a straight line on a scatter plot to divide the data into the two predicted populations. Therefore, NNC may work better when a straight line like this does divide the data well, and observations from the same population are still somewhat close together.

1. This problem builds on the data simulation problem from the discriminant analysis homework.
	1. Simulate 100 observations each from two populations with the following distributions:

 and 

Set a seed number of 1181 before using the first distribution and a seed number of 1218 before using the second distribution. Plot the simulated data in a scatter plot where the plotting symbols correspond to the population. Based on this plot, how well do you think NNC will separate out the observations into the correct populations?

> library(mvtnorm)

> set.seed(1181)

> pop1<-rmvnorm(n = 100, mean = c(0,0), sigma = matrix(data = c(1, 0, 0, 1), nrow =

 2, ncol = 2))

> head(pop1)

 [,1] [,2]

[1,] -0.2962019 -1.02229182

[2,] -0.2277220 2.09802300

[3,] 1.8393558 0.29361539

[4,] -0.7641729 -1.16671752

[5,] -0.2279988 0.05907115

[6,] -0.5433259 0.61151723

> set.seed(1218)

> pop2<-rmvnorm(n = 100, mean = c(6,0), sigma = matrix(data = c(1, 0, 0, 1), nrow =

 2, ncol = 2))

> head(pop2)

 [,1] [,2]

[1,] 6.005221 -0.264053889

[2,] 6.013727 0.594869118

[3,] 7.351746 0.003988692

[4,] 8.637141 0.778251779

[5,] 6.447020 0.211541760

[6,] 6.298675 -0.635608118

> dev.new()

> par(pty = "s")

> plot(x = pop1[,1], y = pop1[,2], xlab = "Variable #1", ylab = "Variable #2", pch

 = 1, col = "blue", xlim = c(-5, 10), ylim = c(-5, 10), panel.first = grid())

> points(x = pop2[,1], y = pop2[,2], xlab = "Variable #1", ylab = "Variable #2",

 pch = 2, col = "red")

> legend(x = 0, y = 8, legend = c("Pop. #1", "Pop. #2"), col = c("blue", "red"),

 pch = c(1, 2), bty = "n")



The two groups of points are fairly well separated so I would expect NNC to find the correct populations.

* 1. Combine the two sets of data into one data frame and perform NNC with cross-validation on the non-standardized data and K = 1. Examine how well NNC differentiates between the two populations.

Both have 100% accuracy!

Because this is a simple data simulation where the variances are the same for the two populations, one does not need to standardize the data. Of course, you would not know the distributions in practice so standardizing would usually still be done.

* 1. Repeat a) and b) with the variable #1 mean for population #2 being decreased from 6 to 5, 4, 3, and 2. Describe trends you see as the mean decreases.
	2. For the mean of 4 case given in c), construct a scatter plot showing the observations with their original and classified populations. Discuss which observations are misclassified.

Here’s my plot for a mean of 4 (smaller symbols denote the original populations and larger symbols denote the classifications):



Notice the following:

* Where the two different samples overlap, we can see the misclassifications start to occur. For example, the circled area shows what can happen when K = 1 only!
* Unlike DA, we cannot plot a vertical line to show how the NNC method makes its classification decisions.
	1. Examine if difference choices for K improve the classification accuracy for the different mean cases.
	2. Compare your results to those obtained from the DA practice problems.

For K = 1 and mean = 2, DA has better accuracy. Remember that DA assumes normality and this is what we have for the data! Typically, one should expect parametric procedures to work better than nonparametric procedures when the underlying assumptions for the parametric procedure are satisfied.