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\textbf{ABSTRACT}

Sickness behaviour is characterised by a lethargic state during which the animal reduces its activity, sleeps more and at times when normally awake, reduces its feed and water intake, and interacts less with its environment. Subtle modifications in behaviour can materialise just before clinical signs of a disease. Recent sensor developments enable continuous monitoring of animal behaviour, but the shift to abnormal animal activity remains difficult to detect. We explored the use of Machine Learning (ML) to detect abnormal behaviour from continuous monitoring. We submitted 14 cows (Bos taurus) to Sub-Acute Ruminal Acidosis (SARA), a disease known to induce changes in behaviour. Another 14 control cows were not submitted to SARA. We used a ruminal bolus to monitor pH and detect when a cow experienced SARA. We used a positioning system to infer an animal’s activity based on its position in relation to specific elements in the barn (feeder, resting area, and alleys). We tested several ML algorithms: K Nearest Neighbours for Regression (KNNR); Decision Tree for Regression (DTR); MultiLayer Perceptron (MLP); Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM); and an algorithm where activity is assumed to be similar from one day to the next. First, we developed ML models to predict activity on a given day from the previous 24 h, considering all cows together. Then, we calculated the error between observed and predicted values for a given cow. Finally, we compared the error to a threshold chosen to optimise the distinction between normal and abnormal values. KNNR performed best, detecting 83% of SARA cases (true-positives), but it also produced 66% of false-positives, which limits its use in practice. In conclusion, ML can help detect anomalies in behaviour. Further improvements could probably be obtained by applying ML on very large datasets at animal rather than group level.

\section{1. Introduction}

When animals get infected, it can cause a range of behavioural modifications leading to a lethargic state during which the animal reduces its activity, sleeps more and at times when it is normally awake, reduces its feed and water intake, and interacts less with conspecifics or with humans (Hart, 1988; Dantzer & Kelley, 2007; Byrd & Lay, 2018). This sickness behaviour is observed in many species, including humans. It is induced by cytokines released at the onset of infection that act on the brain. Sickness behaviour is thought to reduce energy expenditure to sustain the high metabolic cost of the fever response and thus facilitate recovery from infection (Hart, 1988; Dantzer & Kelley, 2007). Alternatively, sickness behaviour could help reduce the spread of diseases among groups of animals (Shakhar & Shakhar, 2015), but this hypothesis has not yet been confirmed (Lopes et al., 2018).

Sickness behaviour can start before actual clinical symptoms of disease. For instance, cows are less reactive to their environment and change activity less often a few hours before fever due to Escherichia coli-induced mastitis (De Boyer Des Roches et al., 2017). In addition, the circadian rhythm of cattle activity can be less marked from as early as two days before clinical symptoms are detected by caretakers (Veissier et al., 1989b; Veissier et al., 2017). There is therefore scope to use such behaviours as early signs of a disease in order to detect and remedy health disorders very early on, and thus reduce medicine intakes and improve animal welfare.

Up to recently, it was difficult to routinely detect such behavioural changes because they require long periods of closely observing the animals. Today, there are readily-available sensors and Precision Livestock Farming (PLF) tools that offer the possibility to continuously monitor animal behaviour. Accelerometers can record gross activities...
such as walking, eating, lying down, positioning systems can connect an animal positions to specific resources and thus infer its putative activity, and image analysis can provide further input (González et al., 2015; Andriamandroso et al., 2017; Barwick et al., 2018). As argued by Dawkins et al. (2012), the issue is not about collecting data but how to process it. More specifically, to detect early signs of diseases through behavioural modifications, we need to be able to predict normal behaviour and to estimate deviations from this norm. Modelling behaviour should be of great help for this purpose.

Machine Learning (ML) can greatly help the study of behaviour (Valletta et al., 2017). ML consists in learning a model that corresponds to the performance of the data with no a priori hypotheses. The model can then help to classify data into groups according to a given criterion. Examples of the use of ML in behavioural studies include tracking mice to analyse their social behaviour, assigning eggs to individual female pheasants in mixed clutches, identifying social networks in jackdaws, counting wildebeest from aerial photos, or detecting oestrus from vaginal temperature and conductivity (Hong et al., 2015; Valletta et al., 2017; Higaki et al., 2018). So far, to our knowledge, ML has not been used to predict future behaviour.

Here we explored ML to predict cow behaviours in order to detect anomalies potentially reflecting a health disorder. We used a Real-Time Locating System (RTLS) to continuously record the position of cows in a barn. As the various in-barn activities of a cow are associated with in-barn locations, we inferred the activity of each cow according to its position in relation to resources such as feeders and the resting area. We submitted cows to a Sub-Acute Ruminal Acidosis (SARA) as a model of a disease that induces behavioural changes (Commun et al., 2012; Silberberg et al., 2017). We analysed the activity as a time series and predicted behaviour from one day to the next. A deviation from the prediction reveals abnormal behaviour, and could thus signal a health disorder.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Ethical note

The experiment was conducted at the INRAE ‘Herbipôle’ experimental facility (https://doi.org/10.15454/1.5572318050509348E12, UE 1414, Marcenat, France), which has French Ministry of Agriculture approval to carry out experiments on live animals (EEA accreditation #C15-114-01). All scientists and technicians involved in the experiment have received initial training for experiments on live animals and are regularly retrained to maintain and refresh their capacities, in line with French regulations governing experiments on animals. The protocol was submitted to and approved by the regional ethics committee (approval: APAFIS366). All these measures are aligned with the framework of the EU Directive 2010/63 for the protection of animals used for scientific purposes. In addition, cow health was checked closely every day by caretakers using direct observations and data from sensors (see below).

2.2. Animals and husbandry

A total of 28 Holstein-breed dairy cows aged 3–7 years were monitored for 9 weeks from 3 months after the start of lactation. The cows were housed in a 11.7 × 21.4 m pen equipped with as many feeding places and resting cubicles as cows (Fig. 1B). They were fed forage (hay and wrapped hay) and starch-containing concentrates. The cows were divided into two treatments (n = 14 in each treatment). In the first treatment (controls), the cows were fed a diet with 75% forage and 25% concentrates (corresponding to 10.5% starch in the diet) during the entire observation period. In the second treatment, after 4 weeks of control diet, the proportion of concentrates was progressively increased to reach 46% in 10 days (31.5% starch) and the cows were maintained on this diet for 2 weeks before resuming the control diet for 3 weeks.

Table 1 summarises the characteristics of the two diets. This treatment was designed to induce a SARA, which is characterised by a low pH in the rumen (Villot et al., 2018).

2.3. Observation

Cow activities were captured and collected using an RTLS system (CowView, GEA Farm Technologies, Bönen, Germany). The system consists of a locating sensor fixed on top of each cow collar that emits a signal in the ultra-wideband area that is captured by antennas fixed in the barn ceiling (Fig. 1). The position of the cow is determined by triangulation every second. If the cow is found in a cubicle, she is considered to be resting, if she is found near a trough, she is considered to be eating, and if she is found in the alley, she is considered to be walking (if she is moving) or standing (if not moving). For the purposes of this experiment, we merged walking with standing, as direct observations proved that the device did not precisely distinguish these two activities.

As in Veissier et al. (2017), we performed a factorial correspondence analysis with hours of the day as observations and proportion of cows in each activity as variables. We used the weights of activities on the first component to build a new summary variable called activity level. These weights are: −0.34 for resting, +0.29 for being in alleys, and +0.52 for eating. A high value obtained for a cow at a given time (i.e. a specific hour on a specific day) means that she is fairly active; a low value means she is fairly inactive. We then exploited the time series composed of the activity level of each cow per hour. Fig. 2 provides an example of variations in activity level during a day.

We monitored the ruminal pH of each cow every 15 min during the entire experiment using a specific pH sensor in the cow rumen (Farm bolus; eCow, Exeter, UK). Following the method proposed by Villot et al. (2018), we normalised the ruminal pH values of each cow to take into account inter-individual variability, sensor drift and sensor noise. We considered that a cow was under SARA when the time she spent with a normalised ruminal pH (NpH) decreased by at least 0.3 for more than 50 min/d and the daily standard deviation in NpH was above 0.2 or the daily NpH range was above 0.8.

Every day, the caretakers observed the cows and noted any apparent disorders (laziness, low ingestion, diarrhoea, respiratory disorder, colic, injury, isolation, apathy, and oestrus) as well as any potential disturbances in the barn due to e.g. electric failure or a fire alarm.

2.4. Machine learning

The data we used are time series as the values correlate with time. Following a classification approach, a ML model can be built to classify the data from a time series into normal vs. abnormal. For instance, Rajpurkar et al. (2017) used a neural network to classify electrocardiograms into normal heart activity vs. several types of arrhythmia. Using this approach assumes that the patterns of all possible anomalies are known. This was not the case in our study: although cows’ activity follows a circadian rhythm as in other animals (Buijs et al., 2016), each cow has its own rhythm of activity during the day and may react differently to a particular disorder. This implies that we cannot detect a specific pattern of anomaly among the time series. However, we can attempt to predict future values of the series and detect the anomalies by comparing the observed values against predicted values. Such an approach was proposed by Malhotra et al. (2015), then applied by Chauhan and Vig (2015) to detect anomalies in electrocardiograms. The framework proposed by Malhotra et al. (2015) is organized in three steps: (1) ML prediction, (2) Prediction error computing, and (3) Statistical analysis (Fig. 3). In Step 1, the ML algorithm predicts the future values of a given time-window. In Step 2, the error between predicted and observed values is calculated. If there is no anomaly in the window, the system is able to accurately predict the future values. In Step 3, the error between predicted and observed values is compared to a given
threshold, chosen to optimise the distinction between normal and abnormal values. An anomaly is detected in the time window if the error is statistically higher than the threshold. We applied this framework to detect anomalies in cow activity.

Here, we used 24-h time-windows, because the circadian rhythm is a strong determinant of activity (Buijs et al., 2016). We thus considered 24 h of activity represented by the vector:

\[ x = < x_{1}, \ldots, x_{24} > , x \in \mathbb{R}^{24} \]

and predicted the activity of the future hours as:

\[ y^p = < x^p_{1}, x^p_{2}, \ldots, x^p_{24+p} > , y^p \in \mathbb{R}^{l} \]

where:

- \( x_{1}, \ldots, x_{24} \) is the activity level of a cow over the 24 h of a given day
- \( x^p_{1}, x^p_{2}, \ldots, x^p_{24+p} \) is the activity level predicted for the next day
- \( l \) is the number of future hours for which cow activity is predicted (from 1 to 12 in our study).

We used the same 24-h sample to train the models whatever the number of hours to be predicted, taking into account only the maximum number of hours to be predicted (here 12, so the sample includes a time windows of 24 observed +12 h predicted). The sample available from the dataset gets smaller with increasing number of hours to be predicted. Beyond 12 h to be predicted, the models were unstable and the quality of the results decreased. We thus decided to limit the prediction to 12 h from the previous 24 h. Using floating 24-h time-windows, we were nevertheless able to predict 24 h of activity.

In Step 1 of the framework borrowed from Malhotra et al. (2015), we tested several widely-used ML algorithms to predict the activity of the future hours (\( y^p \)):

- K Nearest Neighbours for Regression (KNNR), which is a lazy algorithm that gives a prediction based on the average of the \( k \) nearest
observations from the dataset (Cover & Hart, 1967). To do so, we screened the dataset to find the k 24 consecutive hours with the minimum Euclidian distance from the observed vector \( x \). We tested \( k = 1, 10 \) and 20;

- Decision Tree for Regression (DTR), which takes a decision (the prediction) from a particular structure called a decision tree (Quinlan, 1986). Each node of the tree corresponds to a rule, i.e. a condition test on the data. Each possible result of that test leads to a branch, then possibly to a new node with a new rule. The algorithm starts by the first node of the tree, called root, then follows a path through all branches and finishes by a leaf that gives the best prediction;

- MultiLayer Perceptron (MLP), which is a basic neural network architecture (Rumelhart et al., 1986) composed of artificial neurons organized in layers. Each neuron from a layer is connected to all neurons from the following layer. A connection consists of a signal that is transmitted from one neuron to another, like synapses in the brain. A neuron collects all signals from the previous layer and applies a non-linear function, the result of which is sent to the following neurons.

- Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM), which is a neural network architecture designed for time series (Hochreiter & Schmidhuber, 1997) that takes into account former values in the series. It is the original algorithm used by Malhotra et al. (2015);

- H-24, which is a homemade basic algorithm assuming a stable rhythm on consecutive days \( h \), that is the activity on Hour 25 equals that on Hour 1, that activity on Hour 26 equals that on Hour 25 equals.

In Step 2, we calculated error vectors. For each 24-h time-window \( x \), we have \( l (l \in [1,12]) \) predicted values and \( l \) observed values (vectors \( y^p \) and \( y^o \)). For error computing, we calculated the prediction error vector:

\[
e = y^o - y^p = < x_{25}^p - x_{25}^o, \ldots, x_{26}^p - x_{26}^o >
\]

with \( e \in \mathbb{R}^l \)

For the statistical analysis in step 3, we assumed that all computed error vectors follow a multivariate normal distribution \( \mathcal{N} (\mu, \Sigma) \), with \( \mu = 0^l \) and \( \Sigma \) the covariance matrix computed by the maximum likelihood estimation method.

A threshold \( \tau \) was calculated to define a limit of acceptance, i.e. to distinguish a normal vs. abnormal activity. It was computed in a way to maximise the difference between True Positive Rate (TPR, see below) and the False Positive Rate (FPR, see below). If the density of an error vector was below the threshold, we classified the corresponding 24-h time-window as normal. If the error vector density was above the threshold, we considered the corresponding 24-hour time-window as abnormal.

### 2.5. Dataset

We split our dataset into normal vs. abnormal cow*days. To extract the normal cow*days, we removed the cow*days when a disorder was detected on a cow by the caretakers or via the ruminal pH sensor and the days when a disturbance was recorded affecting the whole barn (e.g., an electricity failure or fire alarm). We also removed two cow*days before a disorder was detected on a cow and seven days after in order to avoid pre-clinical stages or the disorder recovery phase. To extract the abnormal cow*days due to SARA, we kept the cow*days on which cows were detected under SARA due to abnormal ruminal pH and the following cow*day, based on the fact that ruminal pH correlates with behavioural symptoms of SARA, i.e. an animal is sick when pH goes down and recovers quickly when pH resumes normal values (Villot et al., 2018). As this study is focused on SARA, we did not use the remaining cow*days, which were days when a disturbance occurred in the barn or days considered abnormal due to another cow disorder (disease or oestrus). We obtained 196 normal cow*days and 265 cow*days when cows were under SARA.

Then we used:

- 70% of the normal cow*days to build the ML models to learn the normal patterns of a cow activity. Algorithms based on a neural network architecture (MLP and LSTM) need to separate training and validation, so we used 80% of the sub-dataset for training and 20% for validation;

- 10% of the normal cow*days and 50% of the SARA cow*days to find the parameters of the multivariate Gaussian error distribution and optimise the threshold \( \tau \) to distinguish normal vs. abnormal days. We used different percentages for normal and SARA cow*days to obtain a similar number of days in the two conditions;

- 20% of the normal cow*days and 50% of the SARA cow*days to compare the performances of the ML models.

All normal and SARA cow*days were chosen at random from the initial dataset.

### 2.6. Training and comparison of ML models

The training of a MLP and LSTM models is stochastic, i.e. each execution of the training process can bring a different result. We trained the models 10 times to cover for variations in models produced by each training. The results given in this paper are the average of the results from the 10 executions.

We calculated the TPR and FPR obtained with each ML model, with:

- TPR, the proportion of 24-h time-windows labelled as abnormal and detected as abnormal in all 24-h time-windows labelled as abnormal,

- FPR, the proportion of 24-h time-windows labelled as normal and detected as abnormal in all 24-h time-windows labelled as normal.

We also recorded the time needed to perform all three steps of the Malhotra method and the time needed to detect anomalies for each ML model.
ruminal pH. When sheep are submitted to short but repeated episodes of activity and detect significant variations in the activity rhythm considered as normal is the same for all cows. By contrast, each cow may have its own rhythm of activity. Building models at individual level could probably increase the precision in the distinction between normal vs. abnormal activity, but would require larger datasets. Here we observed 28 cows for 9 weeks, whereas to obtain the same precision in results at cow level, we would need 28*9 weeks, i.e. nearly 5 years of observation, before being able to detect anomalies in the next years, which is clearly not compatible with the objective of routinely detecting diseases in a herd.

Cattle behaviour generally follows a well-marked circadian rhythm (Veissier et al., 1989a; Veissier et al., 2001; Nikkah, 2014). Cattle are generally active during the day and rest at night. In addition, when kept indoors, dairy cattle display peaks of activity at the time food is delivered and around milking. Here we considered 24-h time-windows as introduced and around milking. Here we considered 24-h time-windows for the definition of abnormal rhythms, but would require larger datasets. Here we observed 28 cows for 9 weeks, whereas to obtain the same precision in results at cow level, we would need 28*9 weeks, i.e. nearly 5 years of observations, before being able to detect anomalies in the next years, which is clearly not compatible with the objective of routinely detecting diseases in a herd. The lack of specificity may come from the fact that the rhythm of activity is highly variable from one day to another, making it difficult to identify an abnormal rhythm among variations of the rhythm. Indeed, we obtained the worst performances with an algorithm that assumes a stable rhythm from one day to another (named H-24). More recent methods of ML, such as Residual Networks used by Yadav and Bist to identify flies activity (2019) should be investigated to try to improve the specificity of our detection. Furthermore, we applied the various ML algorithms to describe rhythm of activity at group level, i.e. where the rhythm considered as normal is the same for all cows. By contrast, each cow may have its own rhythm of activity. Building models at individual level could probably increase the precision in the distinction between normal vs. abnormal activity, but would require larger datasets. Here we observed 28 cows for 9 weeks, whereas to obtain the same precision in results at cow level, we would need 28*9 weeks, i.e. nearly 5 years of observations, before being able to detect anomalies in the next years, which is clearly not compatible with the objective of routinely detecting diseases in a herd.

Cattle behaviour generally follows a well-marked circadian rhythm (Veissier et al., 1989a; Veissier et al., 2001; Nikkah, 2014). Cattle are generally active during the day and rest at night. In addition, when kept indoors, dairy cattle display peaks of activity at the time food is delivered and around milking. Here we considered 24-h time-windows but we did not look at specific periodic components of the circadian rhythm. Extracting such components could improve the accuracy of the modelling of the 24 h time-windows and may allow models to be built at animal level rather than group level.

This study used SARA, a metabolic disease, as disease model. SARA may not affect animal behaviour as much as other diseases that induce inflammation, fever, or pain (e.g. in cattle, Borderas et al., 2009; De Boyer Des Roches et al., 2017). Further exploration of behavioural changes under such diseases is necessary in order to make further progress in using ML to detect sickness behaviour early. This would

Table 2
Performances of the algorithms tested. The algorithms were: K-Nearest Neighbours for Regression (KNNR) applied to 1, 10 and 20 neighbours; Decision Tree for Regression (DTR); MultiLayer Perceptron (MLP); Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM); and an algorithm called H-24 where activity is assumed similar to the day before. For each algorithm, the activity of the cows was predicted from 1 to 12 h. Performances are expressed as True Positive Rate (TPR) and False Positive Rate (FPR).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Algorithm</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KNNR1</td>
<td>TPR</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DTR</td>
<td>TPR</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLP</td>
<td>TPR</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSTM</td>
<td>TPR</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-24</td>
<td>TPR</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Number of hours for which we predict the cows’ activity.
necessitate inducing either an infectious disease or at least inflammation via e.g. LPS injection, or monitoring all diseases occurring spontaneously in a herd over a large period.

Finally, the time needed to build the models was fairly quick, with the longest being 84 s for KNNR with 1 neighbour and 12 h of the prediction. Detection was also quick, at 35–39 s for KNNR and just 1 s for the other algorithms. These times are compatible with a use of ML in real-farm practice, allowing fast detection of anomalies. However, the sample used in our study was relatively small (28 cows). The time to build the models may be far longer in large herds when a KNNR algorithm is used, because for each 24-h window analysed, the algorithm has to look for the nearest neighbour among all data. The practicality of KNNR algorithms thus needs checking on large herds.

In conclusion, Machine Learning helps analyse the activity rhythm of animals. It is possible to detect anomalies in the activity rhythm that are possibly related to health disorders (in our study, an experimentally-induced episode of SARA). However, the current method lacks specificity for detecting health disorders. Investigations should be pursued on larger datasets, possibly from routine observation of diseases and other artefacts in the animal’s life, with modelling applied at animal level and taking into account the circadian nature of the activity rhythm.
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Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Algorithm</th>
<th>Detection time (s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KNNR1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNNR10</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNNR20</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSTM</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLP</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-24</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Detection time (s) | 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Algorithm</th>
<th>Detection time (s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KNNR1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNNR10</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNNR20</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSTM</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLP</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H-24</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Detection time (s) | 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Algorithm</th>
<th>Detection time (s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KNNR1</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNNR10</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNNR20</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSTM</td>
<td>1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MLP</td>
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