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Introduction

Deciding whether a used car is worth the posted price when you see listings online can be difficult. Several factors, including mileage, make, model, year, etc. can influence the actual worth of a car. From the perspective of a seller, it is also a dilemma to price a used car appropriately. Based on existing data, the aim is to use machine learning algorithms to develop models for predicting used car prices.

Dataset and Pre-Processing

For this project, we are using the dataset on used car sales from all over the United States, available on Kaggle. The features available in this dataset are Mileage, Make, Model, Year, State and City.

- **Pruning:** A histogram of the dataset indicated many outliers, for example, cars with really low mileages that were unrepresentative of a "used" car. Therefore, we pruned our dataset to three standard deviations around the mean.

- **One-Hot Vectorization:** We converted the Make, Model and State into one-hot vectors. Since we had over 2000 unique cities in the dataset, we replaced the string representing the city with a boolean which was set if the population of the city was above a certain threshold i.e. a major city.

Methodology

We utilized several classic and state-of-the-art methods, including ensemble learning techniques, with a 90-10 split on test and training data. To reduce the time required for training, we used 500k examples from our dataset (of almost a million examples).

- **Linear Regression:** Quick to train and test as a baseline algorithm.
- **Gradient Boost:** To account for non-linear relationships, by splitting the data into 100 regions.
- **Random Forest:** To account for the large number of features in the dataset and compare a bagging technique with the Gradient Boost method.
- **XGBoost:** To improve performance compared to standard Gradient Boosting using regularization, second order gradients and added support for parallel compute.
- **KMeans + Linear Regression Ensemble:** In order to capitalize on the linear regression results using ensemble learning.
- **Light GBM:** To improve performance compared to Gradient Boosting with a leaf-wise-tree growth approach and improved speed compared to XGBoost.

Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Learning Algorithm</th>
<th>Test Data R² Score</th>
<th>Training Data R² Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Linear Regression</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gradient Boost</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random Forest</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light GBM</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XGBoost</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KMeans + LinReg</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compared to Linear Regression, most Decision-Tree based methods did not perform comparably well. This can be attributed to the apparent linearity of the dataset. It can also be attributed to the difficulty in tuning most gradient boost methods. The exception to this is the Random Forest method which marginally outperforms Linear Regression. However Random Forests tend to overfit the dataset. Building up from the relatively good performance of Linear Regression, the KMeans + Linear Regression Ensemble Learning Method (with K = 3) produced the best R2 Score on test data without high variance as it fits linear relationships categorically.

Future Work and References

We plan to utilize Deep Neural Networks to improve our prediction performance while avoiding overfitting. In addition to this, we shall tune Decision-Tree parameters like the number of trees, depth, etc. and sub-sample datapoints.