Introduction

Wine is the most ordinarily utilized refreshment internationally and its qualities are viewed as significant in the public eye. The nature of the wine is consistently significant for its customers and essentially for makers in the present cutthroat market to raise income. Generally, wine quality used to be controlled by testing toward the finish of the creation; to arrive at that level, one as of now invests bunches of energy and cash. With the rise of ML techniques and their success in the past decade, there have been various efforts in determining wine quality by using the available data (Li et al., 2017; Shanmuganathan, 2016; Riul Jr et al., 2004). The different modelling techniques to improve the quality of food using AI show how AI is expanding sanitation and quality activities in food industry (Sahni et al., 2021). The new system which is developed works on Real Time with a merged function of RFID and GPS to sustain the detailed information about farmers and E-Rickshaw (Tyagi et al., 2021). On the off chance that the quality isn’t acceptable, the different strategy should be carried out all along, which is exorbitant. Each individual has their own assessment on taste, so distinguishing a quality dependent on an individual's taste is testing. With the improvement of innovation, the makers began to depend on different gadgets for testing being developed stages. In this way, they can have a superior thought regarding wine quality, which, obviously, sets aside heaps of cash and time. Likewise, this aided in gathering heaps of information with different boundaries, for example, the amount of various synthetic substances and temperature utilized during the creation and the nature of the wine delivered. The analysis of the basic parameters that determine the wine quality is very important. Human experts may introduce error while predicting the quality of wine while tasting because it is very subjective and depends on person’s choice. In addition to humanitarian efforts, ML can be an alternative to identify the most important parameters that control the wine quality. In this study, it is shown how ML can be used to identify the best parameter on which the wine quality depends and in turn predict wine quality.

Literature Review

Today, fluctuated purchasers appreciate wine to an ever increasing extent. The wine business is investigating new advances for both wine making and offering measures to back up this development (Cortez et al., 2009). Physicochemical and tangible tests are utilized for assessing wine accreditation (Ebeler et al., 1999). The segregation of wines is certainly not a simple cycle inferable from the intricacy and heterogeneity of its headspace. The arrangement of wines is vital in view of various reasons. These reasons are the financial worth of wine items, to ensure and guarantee the nature of wines, to disallow contaminated of wines and to control refreshment preparing (Preedy et al., 2016). This study shows the viability of group AI dependent on a democratic technique (Moritani and Takefuji, 2018). Three AI calculations were exclusively assessed utilizing the...
Experimental Setup

Initially the wine data is collected from Kaggle (Cortez et al. 2009). In this data there are 1599 records. Each record contains 11 different features of wine. The next step is to check for null values, duplicate values etc. After data cleaning, data visualization helps in clearly explaining each feature in wine dataset. Random forest classifier is used to identify patterns and relationships in features. Lastly we train and test the model. The algorithm for wine quality prediction is as follows:

Step 1: Import libraries (numpy and pandas)
Step 2: Load kaggle dataset
Step 3: Separate dataset into features and labels
Step 4: Split data for testing (20% and training 80%)
Step 5: Perform normalization
Step 6: Train decision tree classifier
Step 7: Check efficiency

Splitting the dataset into test and train data can vary. The train data is used to train the model for predicting wine quality. In every Machine Learning program, there are two things, features and labels. Features are the part of a dataset which are used to predict the label.

Materials and Methods

Figure 1 shows the block diagram of wine quality prediction using Artificial Intelligence, where X is the number of features, F is the machine learning model, f(XS) is the output prediction and XS is one of the input features. To build the machine leaning model, the data is split into training and testing data using train-test split ratio. The training data is fed to Random Forest Regressor. The first step is to import the python libraries. Load the wine data and add headers. Check for missing data in dataset. This is very important to get correct results. The last step is to find out the quality of wine.

To begin with, verify the dissemination of the quality variable in the dataset. Make sure that enough great quality wines are available in the dataset. Then, the relationships between the factors are checked. This permits improving comprehension of the connections between the factors in a speedy impression. Quickly, it is seen that there are a few factors that are emphatically connected to quality. Almost certainly, these factors are additionally the main highlights in the AI model. The primary thing to do is normalize the information Normalizing the information implies that it will change the information so its dissemination will have a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1. It’s essential to normalize the information to even out the scope of the information.

The UCI Machine Learning vault is utilized as a dataset for trial purposes. This dataset was utilized for research by (Cortez et al., 2009). It has two classes of wine information. One class contains data on red wines and the other contains information of white wines. To begin with, required libraries are imported for information examination. The detail of information in the dataset is displayed in Table 1.

Table 1 shows few rows and 12 unique credits of wine in the dataset. The last section gives the nature of the wine. The quality characteristic takes estimates between 1 to 10, 1 method inferior quality wine and 10 are for acceptable quality wine. The dataset may contain some missing qualities. The examination of information in the dataset is done to check for missing qualities. The yield has shown that the information is legitimate and no missing qualities in the dataset. The python library is utilized for execution. To comprehend the informational collection appropriately more extra data is needed for itemized examination. After starting examination and point by point study, it is seen that all wines in the dataset with quality value more than 7 will be of good quality, wine with quality values between the range of 5 and 6 are of average quality and qualities fewer than 5 are of bad quality. This data will be exceptionally helpful for the dynamic process. The quality of wine information is displayed in Table 2. Table 3 shows the statistics of wine data. The total number of records is 1599.

Figure 2 shows graph of quality v/s total number of data in dataset. It is clearly seen that most wines fall under mid-range quality.

There are fewer wines of top caliber and enormous tasting and not very many wines that are of inferior quality. Further investigation of the information is fundamental for additional assessment of value.
Table 1: Different features of wine dataset

| Sr.no. | Fixed acidity | Volatile acidity | Citric acid | Residual sugar | Chlorides | Free sulfur dioxide | Total sulfur dioxide | density | pH | Sulphates | Alcohol | Quality |
|--------|---------------|------------------|------------|----------------|-----------|---------------------|---------------------|--------|----|-----------|---------|---------|
| 0      | 7.4           | 0.70             | 0.00       | 0.00           | 7.4       | 0.70                | 11.0                | 34.0   | 0.9978 | 3.51      | 0.56    | 9.4     | 5       |
| 1      | 7.8           | 0.88             | 0.00       | 2.6            | 7.8       | 0.098               | 25.0                | 67.0   | 0.9968 | 3.20      | 0.68    | 9.8     | 5       |
| 2      | 7.8           | 0.76             | 0.04       | 15.0           | 7.8       | 0.092               | 54.0                | 0.9970 | 3.26   | 0.65      | 9.8     | 5       |
| 3      | 11.2          | 0.28             | 0.56       | 1.9            | 11.2      | 0.075               | 17.0                | 0.9980 | 3.16   | 0.58      | 9.8     | 6       |
| 4      | 7.4           | 0.70             | 0.00       | 11.0           | 7.4       | 0.076               | 11.0                | 34.0   | 0.9978 | 3.51      | 0.56    | 9.4     | 5       |
|        |               |                  |            |                |           |                     |                     |        |       |           |         |         |         |
|        |               |                  |            |                |           |                     |                     |        |       |           |         |         |         |
|        |               |                  |            |                |           |                     |                     |        |       |           |         |         |         |

Table 2: Quality of wines

| Quality values | Total number |
|----------------|--------------|
| >7             | 217          |
| between 5 and 6| 1319         |
| <5             | 63           |
| % of wine with >7 | 13.57%    |

Table 3: Statistics of wine data

|               | Fixed acidity | Volatile acidity | Citric acid | Residual sugar | Chlorides | Free sulfur dioxide | Total sulfur dioxide | Density | pH | Sulphates | Alcohol | Quality |
|---------------|---------------|------------------|------------|----------------|-----------|---------------------|---------------------|--------|----|-----------|---------|---------|
| Count         | 1599.0        | 1599.0           | 1599.0     | 1599.0         | 1599.0    | 1599.0              | 1599.0              | 1599.0 |    | 1599.0    | 1599.0  |         |
| Mean          | 8.0           | 1.0              | 0.0        | 3.0            | 0.0       | 16.0                | 1.0                 | 3.0    |    | 1.0       | 10.0    | 6.0     |
| Std           | 2.0           | 0.0              | 0.0        | 1.0            | 0.0       | 10.0                | 0.0                 | 0.0    |    | 0.0       | 8.0     | 3.0     |
| Min           | 5.0           | 0.0              | 0.0        | 1.0            | 0.0       | 1.0                 | 1.0                 | 3.0    |    | 0.0       | 8.0     | 3.0     |
| 25%           | 7.0           | 0.0              | 0.0        | 0.0            | 0.0       | 7.0                 | 1.0                 | 3.0    |    | 1.0       | 10.0    | 5.0     |
| 50%           | 8.0           | 1.0              | 0.0        | 2.0            | 0.0       | 14.0                | 1.0                 | 3.0    |    | 1.0       | 10.0    | 6.0     |
| 75%           | 9.0           | 1.0              | 0.0        | 3.0            | 0.0       | 21.0                | 1.0                 | 3.0    |    | 1.0       | 11.0    | 6.0     |
| Max           | 16.0          | 2.0              | 1.0        | 16.0           | 1.0       | 72.0                | 1.0                 | 4.0    |    | 2.0       | 15.0    | 8.0     |

Table 1: Different features of wine dataset
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Fig. 1: Block diagram of wine quality prediction using artificial intelligence
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Fig. 2: Quality v/s total number

Python pandas portray technique is utilized to get accommodating measurements, like mean, middle and standard deviation of attributes in the information.

Some helpful measurements that are used:

1. Mean (Average): Here every one of the qualities for a given component are added, by then segment it by the quantity of tests
2. Median: Arrange all the example esteems in mathematical request, in a rundown. The center number in this rundown will be the median
3. Mode: The value that happens the most in a rundown of samples
4. Range: The difference between the most noteworthy worth and the least qualities in a list
5. Standard Deviation: First ascertain the mean, at that point take away each number in the rundown with the mean and square the outcome. At that point ascertain the mean of those squared contrasts; lastly compute its square root

Presently, the accompanying stage is to think about the features in our enlightening assortment in more detail. The idea of wine depends on a ton of compound properties that impact its taste, smell and flavor. In spite of the way that winemaking is seen as workmanship, it’s in actuality wonderful sensible taking a gander at the circumstance impartially. Wines contain fluctuating degrees of organic acids, alcohol, sugars, salts from mineral and organic acids, pigments, phenolic compounds, nitrogenous substances, gums, pectins, volatile aromatic compounds, mucilage, salts, vitamins and sulfur dioxide.
Results

In this section, the connections between highlights are investigated. Presently that some area information about wine is known, it's an ideal opportunity to investigate more. The dataset which is used contains a lot of highlights, for example, liquor levels, measure of remaining sugar and pH esteem.

A portion of these highlights may be subject to different highlights, some may not. Some of them may influence our quality appraisals as well. In information science or Artificial Intelligence, it's very critical to consider the highlights that make up the information and notice if there are any co-relations between them.

Physiochemical Parameters

The physiochemical parameters incorporate the assessment of sugar content, pH, acidity content and the alcoholic substance.

pH vs. Fixed Acidity: Here the connection amongst pH and fixed acidity is investigated. For this make information outline containing pH and fixed acidity columns to break down the relationship. The seaborn library is utilized to instate the joint framework with the information outline. Ultimately, show the outcomes as regression plot and appropriation plot in a similar grid. This is displayed in Fig. 3.

Figure 3 it is observed that pH change with changing fixed acidity levels. The increase in fixed acidity levels, there is decrease in pH levels. Figure 2 it is also observed that when pH level is low there is high acidity in the wine.

Volatile Acidity vs Quality

Figure 4 shows the relation between quality and volatile acidity. When wine has less volatile acidity value that means the wine is of very good quality. Maintaining less volatile acidity is very important as it affects the taste and aroma of wine. If volatile acidity is more, then the wine will have low quality.

Alcohol vs. Quality

Figure 5 shows the graph of quality v/s alcohol content. Alcohol content is very important is wine. Figure 4 it is observed that if alcohol content in wine is more, than the wine is of very good quality. Alcohol content in wine also affects the taste, flavor harmony and the body of wine. Wines of high alcohol content are from warm climate.

Discussion

The result of the wine prediction is also tested with human experts and shown in Table 4. It is observed that the accuracy of automated wine quality prediction is more than 90% accurate and also it is in agreement with human expert 90%. To test it more rigorously, more test data will be generated by producing different varieties of homemade local fruit and flower wines.
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![Fig. 5: Quality v/s alcohol](image3)

| Table 4: Test results |
|----------------------|
| Number of wine sample data | Automated prediction | Remark (between manual and auto system) |
| 1599 | 90% | In agreement 90% |
Conclusion

It is believed that many people commonly like wines with high liquor content and are excessively repetitive and eager. Great is normally connected with low degrees of unpredictable causticity. This implies that unpredictable acridity is an indication of a spoiler and can cause an upsetting scent. From this examination, it is presumed that when the wine has less unstable causticity esteem, it implies the wine is of excellent quality. Additionally, when the liquor content in wine is more, the wine is of generally excellent quality. The accuracy of the automated wine quality prediction is more than 90%.
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