Classification

Sewoong Oh

CSE/STAT 416
University of Washington

Boolean Classification

Boolean classification

- **Supervised learning** is training a predictor from labelled examples:
- There are two types of supervised learning
  - 1. **Regression**: the output variable ***y*** to be predicted is **real valued** scalar or a vector
  - 2. **Classification**: the output variable ***y*** to be predicted is categorical
    - 2.1 **Boolean classification**: there are two classes
    - 2.2 **Multi-class classification**: multiple classes

- We study Boolean classification in this chapter
- We denote two classes by -1 and 1, often corresponding to {FALSE,TRUE}
- for a data point (x_i, y_i), the value $y_i \in \{-1, 1\}$ is called the **class** or **label**
- A **Boolean classifier** predicts label ***y*** given input ***x***

Classification



- in this example $x_i \in \mathbf{R}^2$
- Red points have label y_i=-1, blue points have label y_i=1
- We want a predictor that maps any ***x*** into prediction $\hat{y} \in \{-1, 1\}$

Example: nearest neighbor

- Trained on 100 samples



- given x, let $k = \arg\min_i \|x - x_i\|$, then predict $\hat{y} = y_k$
- Red region is the set of x for which prediction is -1
- Blue region is the set of x for which prediction is 1
- Zero training error, but overfitting

Simple approach: Linear classifier

linear model: $f(x) = w_0 + w_1 x[1] + w_2 x[2] + \cdots$

In training: find w that minimizes $\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}(f(x_i) - y_i)^2$

In prediction: $\hat{y} = \text{sign}(f(x_i))$



- This is the simplest form: L2 regression followed by sign()
- General recipe: (some type of) regression followed by sign()
- We can do significantly better by choosing the right loss

Example: sentiment analysis

List of positive words	List of negative words
great, awesome, good, amazing,…	bad, terrible, disgusting, sucks,…

x_i

Sushi was great, the food was awesome, but the service was terrible.

$$\hat{y}_i = \text{sign}(\text{number of positive words} - \text{number of negative words})$$

- If we have access to the list of positive and negative words, then we could count them to give a score f(x) and take the sign for estimating the sentiment in {positive,negative}

Example: sentiment analysis

- **Linear classifier**

Sushi was great, the food was awesome, but the service was terrible.

$$h_j(x) = \text{how many times the word appears}$$
$$w_j = \text{how positive is that word}$$

$$\hat{y}_i = \text{sign}(w_0 + w_1 h_1(x) + w_2 h_2(x) + \cdots)$$

Word	Weight
good	1.0
great	1.5
awesome	2.7
bad	-1.0
terrible	-2.1
awful	-3.3
restaurant, the, we, where, …	0.0
…	…

- Without manually constructed list, we can use ML to learn the sentiment of the words (parameters ***w***), and then compute a score f(x)

Confusion Matrix:
How should we measure performance in Boolean classification?

Two types of error

- When measuring performance of a predictor on Boolean classification
- each input data x_i has a label $y_i \in \{-1, 1\}$
- each corresponding prediction is $\hat{y}_i \in \{-1, 1\}$
- Only four possible combinations of $(\hat{y}_i, y_i)$:
  - **true positive** if $\hat{y}_i = 1$ and $y_i = 1$
  - **true negative** if $\hat{y}_i = -1$ and $y_i = -1$
  - **false negative** of **type II error** if $\hat{y}_i = -1$ and $y_i = 1$
  - **false positive** of **type I error** if $\hat{y}_i = 1$ and $y_i = -1$

$$C = \begin{bmatrix} \#\text{ true negatives} & \#\text{ false negatives} \\ \#\text{ false negatives} & \#\text{ true positives} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} C_{tn} & C_{fn} \\ C_{fp} & C_{tp} \end{bmatrix}$$

- Each outcome of a predictor means different things depending on the application: Screening for cancer…

Example: **linear classifier**



- Trained on 100 samples
- decision boundary

- 18% mis-classified in training data
- true positive C_{tp} =42, false positive C_{fp} =12,
- true negative C_{tn} =38, false negative C_{fn}=8

We can represent the performance with a confusion matrix

- Define the **confusion matrix**: (some people use the transpose of C)

$$\begin{bmatrix} C_{tn} & C_{fn} \\ C_{fp} & C_{tp} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 38 & 8 \\ 12 & 42 \end{bmatrix}$$

- $C_{tn} + C_{fn} + C_{fp} + C_{tp} = N$
- $N_n = C_{tn} + C_{fp}$ is the number of negative examples
- $N_p = C_{fn} + C_{tp}$ is the number of positive examples
- Diagonal entries give numbers of correct predictions
- Off-diagonal entries give numbers of incorrect predictions

Some Boolean classification measures

- **Confusion matrix** $\begin{bmatrix} C_{tn} & C_{fn} \\ C_{fp} & C_{tp} \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 38 & 8 \\ 12 & 42 \end{bmatrix}$
- The basic error measures are:
  - **False positive rate** is C_{fp}/N (e.g. False discovery rate)
  - **False negative rate** is C_{fn}/N (e.g. medical diagnosis)
  - **Error rate** is $(C_{fn} + C_{fp})/N$
  - **Accuracy** is $(C_{tn} + C_{tp})/N$
- High accuracy does not always mean good classifier
  - For example, 99% population does not have cancer, and predicting always no cancer achieves accuracy 99%

$$C = \begin{bmatrix} 99 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

- Error measures also used:
  - **True positive rate** or **sensitivity** or **recall** is C_{tp}/N_p (e.g. 84%, 0%)
  - **False alarm rate** is C_{fp}/N_n (e.g. 24%, 0%)
  - **Specificity** or **true negative rate** is C_{tn}/N_n (e.g. 76%, 100%)
  - **Precision** is $C_{tp}/(C_{tp} + C_{fp})$ (e.g. 77%, 0%)

Neyman-Pearson error

- **Neyman-Pearson error** over a data set is

$$\kappa C_{fn}/N + C_{fp}/N$$

- A scalarization of our two objectives,
  minimizing false positive and minimizing false negative rates

- A positive real values ***k*** is how much more false negative irritates us than false positives
- When ***k***=1, the Neyman-Pearson error is the **error rate**

- A common and flexible measure of error
- Baseline for designing a loss function for training
  - Similar to how MSE performance metric is a baseline for designing loss for regression problems

Commonly used loss functions for Classification

Recall linear regression

linear model: $f(x) = w_0 + w_1 x[1] + w_2 x[2] + \cdots$

We choose square quality metric: $\text{MSE}(w) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (f(x_i) - y_i)^2$

In training: find w that minimizes $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} (f(x_i) - y_i)^2$



Can we do the same for classification?

linear model: $f(x) = w_0 + w_1 x[1] + w_2 x[2] + \cdots$

We choose k-Neyman-Pearson: $\text{Loss}(w) =$

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\Big\{\kappa \underbrace{\mathbb{I}(\text{sign}(f(x_i)) = -1 \text{ and } y_i = 1)}_{\text{false negative}} + \underbrace{\mathbb{I}(\text{sign}(f(x_i)) = 1 \text{ and } y_i = -1)}_{\text{false positive}}\Big\}$$



Linear (Boolean) classifier

- You train a **linear model** of the form

$$f(x) \;=\; w_0 + w_1 h_2(x) + w_2 h_x(x) + \cdots$$

- Prediction is

$$\hat{y} \;=\; \mathrm{sign}\big(\, f(x) \,\big)$$

- Ideally, we would like to find the weights ***w***, that minimizes **error rate** or more generally **Neyman-Pearson error**

$$\frac{\kappa C_{fn} + C_{fp}}{N} \;=$$

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N}\Big\{\kappa\, \underbrace{\mathbb{I}(\mathrm{sign}(f(x_i)) = -1 \text{ and } y_i = 1)}_{\text{false negative}} + \underbrace{\mathbb{I}(\mathrm{sign}(f(x_i)) = 1 \text{ and } y_i = -1)}_{\text{false positive}}\Big\}$$

Notations

- So far we used the notation

$$f(x) \;=\; w_0 + w_1 h_2(x) + w_2 h_x(x) + \cdots$$

  for the **continuous** linear model, and

$$\hat{y} \;=\; \text{sign}\big(\, f(x)\,\big)$$

  for the **discrete** prediction

- From now on, we will also use $\hat{y}$ to denote the continuous valued model:

$$\hat{y} \;=\; f(x) \;=\; w_0 + w_1 h_2(x) + w_2 h_x(x) + \cdots$$

  to not introduce additional notation
- It should be clear from context which one we mean by $\hat{y}$

Training a linear classifier

- Given a linear model

$$\hat{y} \;=\; f(x) \;=\; w_0 + w_1 h_1(x) + w_2 h_2(x) + \cdots$$

- Neayman-Pearson error cannot be directly optimized (more on this later)

- Instead, in training classifiers, we minimize a loss of the form

$$\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \ell(\underbrace{\qquad\qquad}_{f(x_i)=w^T x_i = w_0 + w_1 x_1[1] + \cdots} \hat{y}_i \qquad\qquad , y_i)$$

- And find parameters ***w,*** that minimize this loss function

- The choice of $\ell(\hat{y}, y)$ depends on the application
- One can add regularization: $\lambda\, r(w)$



- Recipe for training classifiers
  - 1. Train a continuous valued model, as if regression but with special choices of the loss
  - 2. For prediction take sign(f(x))
  - 3. The score f(x) tells us how confident we are in the prediction

Loss function for Boolean classification

- We need to design loss function $\ell(\hat{y}, y)$

- Note that $w^T x = w_0 + w_1 x[1] + w_2 x[2] + \cdots$
  - prediction $\hat{y} = w^T x$ can take any values
  - but y can only take $+1$ or -1

- So in order to specify $\ell(\hat{y}, y)$,
  we only need to give two functions (of scalar $\hat{y}$)
  - $\ell(\hat{y}, -1)$ is how much $\hat{y}$ irritates us when $y = -1$
  - $\ell(\hat{y}, 1)$ is how much $\hat{y}$ irritates us when $y = 1$

- typically, one chooses those two functions to be symmetric, but appropriately scaled to reflect that false negatives irritates us factor ***k*** more than false positives:

$$\ell(\hat{y}, 1) = \kappa\, \ell(-\hat{y}, -1)$$

Neyman-Pearson loss

$$\sum_i \ell(f(x_i), y_i)$$

$$\tilde{\ell}(y_i \cdot f(x_i))$$

- Neayman-Pearson loss is

$$\ell(\hat{y}, -1) = \begin{cases} 1 & \hat{y} \geq 0 \\ 0 & \hat{y} < 0 \end{cases} \qquad \ell(\hat{y}, 1) = \begin{cases} 0 & \hat{y} \geq 0 \\ \kappa & \hat{y} < 0 \end{cases}$$

- Neayman-Pearson loss computed on the training data is (training) Neayman-Pearson error





Problem with Neyman-Pearson loss

- Neyman-Pearson loss is not differentiable, or even continuous (And certainly not convex)
- Its gradient is zero or does not exist
- Gradient based optimizer does not know how to improve the model

Ideas of proxy loss

- We get better results using proxy losses that
    - approximate, or captures the flavor of, the Neyman-Pearson loss
    - Is more easily optimized (e.g. convex or non-zero derivatives)

- concretely, we want **proxy loss function**
    - with $\ell(\hat{y}, -1)$ small when $\hat{y} < 0$ and larger when $\hat{y} > 0$
    - with $\ell(\hat{y}, 1)$ small when $\hat{y} > 0$ and larger when $\hat{y} < 0$
    - Which has other nice characteristics, e.g., differentiable or convex

Sigmoid loss

- Differentiable approximation of Neyman-Pearson loss
- But not convex in $\hat{y}$
- The two losses sum to one, if ***k***=1
- Softer (or smoothed) version of the N-P loss

$$\frac{1}{1+e^{-\hat{y}}} + \frac{1}{1+e^{\hat{y}}} = \frac{e^{\hat{y}}}{e^{\hat{y}}+1} + \frac{1}{1+e^{\hat{y}}} = 1$$





Logistic loss

- Differentiable and convex in $\hat{y}$
- approximation of Neyman-Pearson

$$\ell(\hat{y}, -1) = \log(1 + e^{\hat{y}})$$



$$\ell(\hat{y}, 1) = \kappa \log(1 + e^{-\hat{y}})$$



Hinge loss

- Non-differentiable but convex approximation of Neyman-Pearson loss

$$\ell(\hat{y}, -1) = [1 + \hat{y}]^+ \qquad \ell(\hat{y}, 1) = \kappa[1 - \hat{y}]^+$$



true y

true y

where $[x]^+ = \max\{0, x\}$

Square loss

- Not only is it convex, square loss is easy to minimize (has a closed form solution)

$$\ell(\hat{y}, -1) = (1 + \hat{y})^2$$



$$\ell(\hat{y}, 1) = \kappa(1 - \hat{y})^2$$

Commonly used Boolean classifiers

Squared loss classifier

- Uses **sum of squares loss** (a.k.a. L2 loss, Mean Squared Error (MSE), Residual Sum of Squares (RSS))

$$\text{minimize}_w \; \mathcal{L}(w) \; = \; \frac{1}{N}\Big(\sum_{i:y_i=-1} (1+\hat{y}_i)^2 + \kappa \sum_{i:y_i=1} (1-\hat{y}_i)^2 \Big)$$

  together with a choice of your regularizer

- This is particularly easy to optimize, if the regularizer is also L2 regularizer

Logistic regression

- Uses **logistic loss**

$$\text{minimize}_w \; \mathcal{L}(w) \; = \; \frac{1}{N}\Big(\sum_{i:y_i=-1} \log(1+e^{\hat{y}_i}) + \kappa \sum_{i:y_i=1} \log(1+e^{-\hat{y}_i}) \Big)$$

  with a choice of a regularizer

- Is a convex optimization if the regularizer is convex, and the minimizer can be found efficiently

Support vector machine (SVM)

- Uses **hinge loss**

$$\text{minimize}_w \, \mathcal{L}(w) \; = \; \frac{1}{N}\Big(\sum_{i:y_i=-1} [1+\hat{y}_i]^+ + \kappa \sum_{i:y_i=1} [1-\hat{y}_i]^+ \Big)$$

with sum of squares regularizer

where $[x]^+ \; = \; \max\{0, x\}$

- It is a convex minimization

Support vector machine (SVM)

$$\ell(\hat{y}, 1) = \kappa[1 - \hat{y}]^+$$



$$\ell(\hat{y}, -1) = [1 + \hat{y}]^+$$



- Linear model is trained on the hinge loss shown on the left with ***k***=1
- Resulting prediction is shown below



- As we predict with $\text{sign}(\hat{y})$, the decision boundary is at

$$\hat{y} = w_0 + w_1 x[1] + w_2 x[2] = 0$$

- Dotted lines show the points where $\hat{y} = w_0 + w_1 x[1] + w_2 x[2] = \pm 1$
- What is the training error?

Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC)

Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC)

- Always abbreviated as **ROC,** comes from WWII
- Explores the tradeoff between false negative and false positive rates

- Typical recipe for evaluating performance of a classifier
  - 1. Construct a classifier for many values of ***k***
    - For each ***k***, select the regularization hyper-parameter via cross-validation, that minimizes Neyman-Pearson loss on test data set
  - 2. Plot the computed pair (false negative rate, false positive rate) on a 2-D plot.

- Connecting all the dots gives you **ROC curve** (when viewed upside-down)

Example: ROC curve



- SVM with various k
- Left hand plot shows training error pairs (C_{fn}/N ,C_{fp}/N)
- Right hand plot shows minimum error classifier (i.e. k=1)

Example

$$\ell(\hat{y}, -1) = [1 + \hat{y}]^+$$



$$\ell(\hat{y}, 1) = \kappa[1 - \hat{y}]^+$$



$\kappa = 0.4$



$\kappa = 4$



Probabilistic interpretation of logistic regression

- When $\kappa = 1$, we get the following losses for each data point x



$$(\underbrace{\frac{1}{1+e^{-w^T x}}}_{\ell(\hat{y},-1)}, \underbrace{\frac{1}{1+e^{w^T x}}}_{\ell(\hat{y},1)})$$

when using **sigmoid loss** that is trained with a linear model

- They are
  - Non-negative
  - sum to one, and
  - they measure how likely it is that the point ***x*** has label +1 (or -1) respectively
- One can view it as an estimation of the probability

$$(\mathbb{P}(y_i = +1|x), \mathbb{P}(y_i = -1|x))$$

-

Probabilistic interpretation of logistic regression

- Then taking the sign of the linear predictor to make final decision is simply taking a label that is more likely:

$$\hat{\hat{y}} = \text{sign}(w^T x) \quad \Longleftrightarrow \quad \hat{\hat{y}} = \begin{cases} +1 & \frac{1}{1+e^{-w^T x}} > \frac{1}{1+e^{w^T x}} \\ -1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

- and **logistic regression** can be interpreted as **Maximum Likelihood Estimator** under the probabilistic model with sigmoid function:

- $$(\underbrace{\frac{1}{1+e^{-w^T x}}}_{\mathbb{P}(y_i=+1|x_i)}, \underbrace{\frac{1}{1+e^{w^T x}}}_{\mathbb{P}(y_i=-1|x_i)})$$

Maximum Likelihood Estimator (MLE)

- model: $\underbrace{\frac{1}{1+e^{-w^T x}}}_{\mathbb{P}(y_i=+1|x_i)}, \underbrace{\frac{1}{1+e^{w^T x}}}_{\mathbb{P}(y_i=-1|x_i)}$

- log-likelihood on a data point (xi,yi):

$$\text{log-likelihood} = \log\Big(\mathbb{P}(y_i|x_i)\Big) = \begin{cases} \log\left(\frac{1}{1+e^{-w^T x_i}}\right) & \text{if } y_i = +1 \\ \log\left(\frac{1}{1+e^{w^T x_i}}\right) & \text{if } y_i = -1 \end{cases}$$

- Maximum Likelihood Estimator is the one that maximizes the sum of all likelihoods on training data points

$$\text{maximize}_w \sum_{i:y_i=-1} \log\left(\frac{1}{1+e^{\hat{y}_i}}\right) + \sum_{i:y_i=1} \log\left(\frac{1}{1+e^{-\hat{y}_i}}\right)$$

- Notice that this is exactly the **logistic regression** without any regularizers and with ***k***=1

$$\text{minimize}_w\ \mathcal{L}(w) \ = \ \frac{1}{N}\Big(\sum_{i:y_i=-1} \log(1+e^{\hat{y}_i}) + \kappa \sum_{i:y_i=1} \log(1+e^{-\hat{y}_i}) \Big)$$


P(x|