## Learning I

## Linda Shapiro <br> CSE 455

## Learning

- AI/Vision systems are complex and may have many parameters.
- It is impractical and often impossible to encode all the knowledge a system needs.
- Different types of data may require very different parameters.
- Instead of trying to hard code all the knowledge, it makes sense to learn it.


## Learning from Observations

- Supervised Learning - learn a function from a set of training examples which are preclassified feature vectors.

| feature vector | class |
| :--- | :---: |
| (shape,color) |  |
| (square, red) | I |
| (square, blue) | I |
| (circle, red) | II |
| (circle blue) | II |
| (triangle, red) | I |
| (triangle, green) | I |
| (ellipse, blue) | II |
| (ellipse, red) | II |

Given a previously unseen feature vector, what is the rule that tells us if it is in class I or class II?
(circle, green)
(triangle, blue)

## Real Observations

## \%Training set of Calenouria and Dorenouria

 @DATA0,1,1,0,0,0,0,0,0,1,1,2,3,0,1,2,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,1,0,0,1,
$0,2,0,0,0,0,1,1,1,0,1,8,0,7,0,0,0,1,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,1,0,0$,
$3,3,4,0,2,1,0,1,1,1,0,0,0,0,1,0,0,1,1$, cal $0,1,0,0,0,1,0,0,0,4,1,2$
,2,0,1,0,0,0,0,0,1,0,0,3,0,2,0,0,1,1,0,0,1,0,0,0,1,0,1,6,1,8,2,0,0,
$0,0,1,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,1,1,0,0,1,2,0,5,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,1,3,0,0,0,0$,
$0, \mathrm{cal}$
0,0,1,0,1,0,0,1,0,1,0,0,1,0,3,0,1,0,0,2,0,0,0,0,1,3,0,0,0,0,0,0,1,0, 2,0,2,0,1,8,0,5,0,1,0,1,0,1,1,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,2,2,0,0,3,0,0,2,1,1, 5,0,0,0,2,1,3,2,0,1,0,0,cal 0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,2,0,0,1,2,0,1,1,0,0,0,1 ,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,0,1,0,0,0,1,0,0,3,0,0,4,1,8,0,0,0,1,0,0,0,0,0,1,0,1 ,0,1,0,0,0,0,0,0,4,2,0,2,1,1,2,1,1,0,0,0,0,2,0,0,2,2,cal

## Learning from Observations

- Unsupervised Learning - No classes are given. The idea is to find patterns in the data. This generally involves clustering.

- Reinforcement Learning - learn from feedback after a decision is made.


## Topics to Cover

- Inductive Learning
- decision trees
- ensembles
- neural nets
- kernel machines
- Unsupervised Learning
- K-Means Clustering
- Expectation Maximization (EM) algorithm


## Decision Trees

- Theory is well-understood.
- Often used in pattern recognition problems.
- Has the nice property that you can easily understand the decision rule it has learned.


## Decision Tree Hypothesis Space

If the features are continuous, internal nodes may test the value of a feature against a threshold.


## Classic ML example: decision tree for "Shall I play tennis today?"

## A Real Decision Tree (WEKA)

part23 < 0.5
part29 < 3.5
part34<0.5
part8 < 2.5
part2 < 0.5
part63 < 3.5
part20 < 1.5 : dor (53/12) [25/8]
part20 >= 1.5
part37 < 2.5 : cal (6/0) [5/2]
part37 >= 2.5 : dor (3/1) [2/0]
part63 >= 3.5 : dor (14/0) [3/0]
part2 $>=0.5$ : cal (21/8) [10/4]
part8 >= 2.5 : dor (14/0) [14/0]
part34 >= 0.5 : cal (38/12) [18/4]
part29 >= 3.5 : dor (32/0) [10/2]
part23 $>=0.5$
part29 < 7.5 : cal (66/8) [35/12]
part29 >= 7.5
part24 < 5.5 : dor (9/0) [4/0]
part24 >= 5.5 : cal (4/0) [4/0]

## Evaluation

| Correctly Classified Instances | 281 | $73.5602 \%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Incorrectly Classified Instances | 101 | $26.4398 \%$ |
| Kappa statistic | 0.4718 |  |
| Mean absolute error | 0.3493 |  |
| Root mean squared error | 0.4545 |  |
| Relative absolute error | $69.973 \%$ |  |
| Root relative squared error | $90.7886 \%$ |  |
| Total Number of Instances | 382 |  |

=== Detailed Accuracy By Class ===

|  | TP Rate | FP Rate | Precision | Recall | F-Measure | ROC Area | Class |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0.77 | 0.297 | 0.713 | 0.77 | 0.74 | 0.747 | cal |  |
|  | 0.703 | 0.23 | 0.761 | 0.703 | 0.731 | 0.747 | dor |
| Wg Avg. | 0.736 | 0.263 | 0.737 | 0.736 | 0.735 | 0.747 |  |

=== Confusion Matrix ===
a b <-- classified as
144 43| a = cal
58137 | b=dor

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Precision }=T P /(T P+F P) \\
& \text { Recall }=T P /(T P+F N) \\
& \text { F-Measure }=2 \times \text { Precision } \times \text { Recall } \\
& \quad \text { Precision }+ \text { Recall }
\end{aligned}
$$

## Properties of Decision Trees

- They divide the decision space into axis parallel rectangles and label each rectangle as one of the $k$ classes.
- They can represent Boolean functions.
- They are variable size and deterministic.
- They can represent discrete or continuous parameters.
- They can be learned from training data.


## Learning Algorithm for Decision Trees

## Growtree(S) /* Binary version */

if ( $\mathrm{y}==0$ for all $(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y})$ in S ) return newleaf(0) else if ( $y==1$ for all ( $x, y$ ) in $S$ ) return newleaf(1) else
choose best attribute $\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{j}}$
$\mathrm{S}_{0}=(\mathrm{x}, \mathrm{y})$ with $\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{j}}=0$
$S_{1}=(x, y)$ with $x_{j}=1$
return new node $\left(\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{j}}\right.$, Growtree $\left(\mathrm{S}_{0}\right)$, Growtree $\left(\mathrm{S}_{1}\right)$ ) end

How do we choose the best attribute?
What should that attribute do for us?

## Shall I play tennis today? Which attribute should be selected?



## Criterion for attribute selection

- Which is the best attribute?
- The one that will result in the smallest tree
- Heuristic: choose the attribute that produces the "purest" nodes
- Need a good measure of purity!
- Maximal when?
- Minimal when?


## Information Gain

Which test is more informative?

## Split over whether

 Balance exceeds 50KSplit over whether
applicant is employed


Unemployed Employed

## Information Gain

## Impurity/Entropy (informal)

- Measures the level of impurity in a group of examples



## Impurity

## Very impure group



Less impure


Minimum impurity


## Entropy: a common way to measure impurity

- Entropy $=\sum_{i}-p_{i} \log _{2} p_{i}$
$p_{i}$ is the probability of class $i$


Compute it as the proportion of class $i$ in the set.
16/30 are green circles; 14/30 are pink crosses
$\log _{2}(16 / 30)=-.9 ; \quad \log _{2}(14 / 30)=-1.1$
Entropy $=-(16 / 30)(-.9)-(14 / 30)(-1.1)=.99$

- Entropy comes from information theory. The higher the entropy the more the information content.
What does that mean for learning from examples?


## 2-Class Cases:

- What is the entropy of a group in which all examples belong to the same class?
- entropy =-1 $\log _{2} 1=0$
not a good training set for learning

Minimum impurity


Maximum impurity


## Information Gain

- We want to determine which attribute in a given set of training feature vectors is most useful for discriminating between the classes to be learned.
- Information gain tells us how important a given attribute of the feature vectors is.
- We will use it to decide the ordering of attributes in the nodes of a decision tree.


## Calculating Information Gain

Information Gain = entropy(parent) - [average entropy(children)]
parent $-\left(\frac{14}{30} \cdot \log \frac{14}{30}\right)-\left(\frac{16}{30} \cdot \log \frac{16}{30}\right)=0.99 \epsilon \begin{aligned} & \text { enild } \\ & \text { entropy }\end{aligned}-\left(\frac{13}{17} \cdot \log \frac{13}{17}\right)-\left(\frac{4}{17} \cdot \log \frac{4}{17}\right)=0.787$
Entire population (30 instances)

child
17 instances
(Weighted) Average Entropy of Children $=$ $\left(\frac{17}{30} \cdot 0.787\right)+\left(\frac{13}{30} \cdot 0.391\right)=0.615$
| nformation Gain $=0.996-0.615=0.38$ for this split

## Entropy-Based Automatic Decision Tree Construction

$\left.\begin{array}{|c|}\hline \text { Training Set } S \\ \mathrm{x}_{1}=\left(\mathrm{f}_{11}, \mathrm{f}_{12}, \ldots \mathrm{f}_{1 \mathrm{~m}}\right) \\ \mathrm{x}_{2}=\left(\mathrm{f}_{21}, \mathrm{f}_{22},\right. \\ \mathrm{f}_{2 \mathrm{~m}}\end{array}\right)$

Node 1<br>What feature<br>should be used?



What values?

Quinlan suggested information gain in his ID3 system and later the gain ratio, both based on entropy.

# Using Information Gain to Construct a Decision Tree <br> (1) 

Construct child nodes for each value of $A$. Set $S^{\prime}$

Choose the attribute A with highest information gain for the full training set at the root of the tree. Each has an associated subset of vectors in which A has a particular value.

## Simple Example

Training Set: 3 features and 2 classes

| X | Y | Z | C |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | ---: |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | I |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | I |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | II |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | II |

How would you distinguish class I from class II?

| X | Y | Z | C |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | I |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | I |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | II |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | II |

Eparent= 1
Split on attribute $X$
If $X$ is the best attribute,


GAIN $=1-(3 / 4)(.9184)-(1 / 4)(0)=.3112$

| X | Y | Z | C |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | I |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | I |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | II |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | II |

## Eparent= 1

Split on attribute Y


| X | Y | Z | C |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | 1 | 1 | I |
| 1 | 1 | 0 | I |
| 0 | 0 | 1 | II |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | II |

Eparent= 1
Split on attribute Z


| (class) <br> character | area | height | width | number <br> \#holes | $\begin{aligned} & \text { number } \\ & \text { \#strokes } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} (c x, c y) \\ \text { center } \end{gathered}$ | best <br> axis | least inertia |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 'A, | medium | high | 3/4 | 1 | 3 | 1/2,2/3 | 90 | medium |
| 'B' | medium | high | 3/4 | 2 | 1 | 1/3,1/2 | 90 | large |
| '8' | medium | high | 2/3 | 2 | 0 | 1/2,1/2 | 90 | medium |
| '0' | medium | high | 2/3 | 1 | 0 | 1/2,1/2 | 90 | large |
| '1, | lob | high | 1/4 | 0 | 1 | 1/2,1/2 | 90 | lor |
| 'W, | high | high | 1 | 0 | 4 | 1/2,2/3 | 90 | large |
| ' X ' | high | high | 3/4 | 0 | 2 | 1/2,1/2 | ? | large |
| '*' | medium | lob | 1/2 | 0 | 0 | 1/2,1/2 | ? | large |
| '-' | log | log | 2/3 | 0 | 1 | 1/2,1/2 | 0 | 10\% |
| '/' | log | high | 2/3 | 0 | 1 | 1/2,1/2 | 60 | 10\% |

# Portion of a fake training set for character recognition 

## Decision tree for this training set.

## What would be different about a real training set?





## Many-Valued Features

- Your features might have a large number of discrete values.
Example: pixels in an image have ( $\mathrm{R}, \mathrm{G}, \mathrm{B}$ ) which are each integers between 0 and 255.
- Your features might have continuous values.
Example: from pixel values, we compute gradient magnitude, a continuous feature


## One Solution to Both

- We often group the values into bins



## Training and Testing

- Divide data into a training set and a separate testing set.
- Construct the decision tree using the training set only.
- Test the decision tree on the training set to see how it's doing.
- Test the decision tree on the testing set to report its real performance.


## Measuring Performance

- Given a test set of labeled feature vectors
e.g. (square,red) I
- Run each feature vector through the decision tree
- Suppose the decision tree says it belongs to class $X$ and the real label is $Y$
- If $(X=Y)$ that's a correct classification
- If $(X<>Y)$ that's an error


## Measuring Performance

- In a 2-class problem, where the classes are positive or negative (ie. for cancer)
- \# true positives
- \# true negatives
- \# false positives
- \# false negatives
- Accuracy $=$ \#correct $/ \#$ total $=(T P+T N) /(T P+T N+F P+F N)$
- Precision = TP / (TP + FP)

How many of the ones you said were cancer really were cancer?

- Recall = TP / (TP + FN)

How many of the ones who had cancer did you call cancer?

## More Measures

- F-Measure $=2 *($ Precision * Recall) / (Precision + Recall)

Gives us a single number to represent both precision and recall.

In medicine:

- Sensitivity = TP / (TP + FN) = Recall

The sensitivity of a test is the proportion of people who have a disease who test positive for it.

- Specificity $=$ TN / (TN + FP)

The specificity of a test is the number of people who DON'T have a disease who test negative for it.

## Measuring Performance

- For multi-class problems, we often look at the confusion matrix.
assigned class

$C(i, j)=$ number of times (or percentage) class $i$ is given label j .


## Overfitting

- Suppose the classifier $h$ has error (1accuracy) of error ${ }_{\text {train }}$ (h)
- And there is an alternate classifier (hypothesis) h' that has error ${ }_{\text {train }}$ (h')
- What if error ${ }_{\text {train }}(\mathrm{h})<$ error $_{\text {train }}\left(\mathrm{h}^{\prime}\right)$
- But error ${ }_{D}(h)>$ error $_{D}(h$ ') for full set D
- Then we say h overfits the training data


## What happens as the decision tree gets bigger and bigger?

## Overfitting in Decision Tree Learning



Error on training data goes down, on testing data goes up

## Reduced Error Pruning

- Split data into training and validation sets
- Do until further pruning is harmful

1. Evaluate impact on validation set of pruning each possible node (and its subtree)
2. Greedily remove the one that most improves validation set accuracy

- Then you need an additional independent testing set.


## Effect of Reduced-Error Pruning



The tree is pruned back to the red line where it gives more accurate results on the test data.

- The WEKA example with Calenouria and Dorenouria I showed you used the REPTree classifier with 21 nodes.
- The classic decision tree for the same data had 65 nodes.
- Performance was similar for our test set.
- Performance increased using a random forest of 10 trees, each constructed with 7 random features.


## Decision Trees: Summary

- Representation=decision trees
- Bias=preference for small decision trees
- Search algorithm=none
- Heuristic function=information gain or information content or others
- Overfitting and pruning
- Advantage is simplicity and easy conversion to rules.


## Ensembles

- An ensemble is a set of classifiers whose combined results give the final decision.



## MODEL* ENSEMBLES

- Basic Idea
- Instead of learning one model
- Learn several and combine them
- Often this improves accuracy by a lot
- Many Methods
- Bagging
- Boosting
- Stacking
*A model is the learned decision rule. It can be as simple as a hyperplane in n-space (ie. a line in 2D or plane in 3D) or in the form of a decision tree or other modern classifier.


## Bagging

- Generate bootstrap replicates of the training set by sampling with replacement
- Learn one model on each replicate
- Combine by uniform voting



## Boosting

- Maintain a vector of weights for samples
- Initialize with uniform weights
- Loop
- Apply learner to weighted samples
- Increase weights of misclassified ones
- Combine models by weighted voting


## Idea of Boosting



## Boosting In More Detail (Pedro Domingos' Algorithm)

1. Set all E weights to 1, and learn H 1 .
2. Repeat $m$ times: increase the weights of misclassified Es, and learn $\mathrm{H} 2, \ldots \mathrm{Hm}$.
3. H1..Hm have "weighted majority" vote when classifying each test Weight $(\mathrm{H})=$ accuracy of H on the training data

## ADABoost

- ADABoost boosts the accuracy of the original learning algorithm.
- If the original learning algorithm does slightly better than 50\% accuracy, ADABoost with a large enough number of classifiers is guaranteed to classify the training data perfectly.


## ADABoost Weight Updating (from Fig 18.34 text)

/* First find the sum of the weights of the misclassified samples */
for $\mathrm{j}=1$ to N do /* go through training samples */ if $\mathrm{h}[\mathrm{m}]\left(\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{j}}\right)<>\mathrm{y}_{\mathrm{j}}$ then error <- error $+\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{j}}$
/* Now use the ratio of error to 1-error to change the weights of the correctly classified samples */ for $\mathrm{j}=1$ to N do

$$
\text { if } h[m]\left(x_{j}\right)=y_{j} \text { then } w[j]<-w[j] \text { * error/(1-error) }
$$

## Example

- Start with 4 samples of equal weight .25 .
- Suppose 1 is misclassified. So error $=.25$.
- The ratio comes out $.25 / .75=.33$
- The correctly classified samples get weight of $.25^{*} .33=.0825$
. 2500
. 0825
.0825
.0825
What's wrong? What should we do?
We want them to add up to 1, not . 4975 .
Answer: To normalize, divide each one by their sum (.4975).


## Sample Application: Insect Recognition



Using circular regions of interest selected by an interest operator, train a classifier to recognize the different classes of insects.

## Boosting Comparison

- ADTree classifier only (alternating decision tree)
- Correctly Classified Instances $268 \quad 70.1571$ \%
- Incorrectly Classified Instances 114 29.8429 \%
- Mean absolute error 0.3855
- Relative absolute error 77.2229 \%

| Classified as $->$ | Hesperperla | Doroneuria |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Real <br> Hesperperlas | 167 | 28 |
| Real <br> Doroneuria | 51 | 136 |

## Boosting Comparison

## AdaboostM1 with ADTree classifier

- Correctly Classified Instances

303
79
79.3194 \%

- Incorrectly Classified Instances
- Mean absolute error
- Relative absolute error
0.2277
45.6144 \%

| Classified as -> | Hesperperla | Doroneuria |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Real <br> Hesperperlas | 167 | 28 |
| Real <br> Doroneuria | 51 | 136 |

## Boosting Comparison

- RepTree classifier only (reduced error pruning)
- Correctly Classified Instances

| 294 | $75.3846 \%$ |
| :---: | ---: |
| 96 | $24.6154 \%$ |
| 0.3012 |  |
| $60.606 \%$ |  |


| Classified as -> | Hesperperla | Doroneuria |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Real <br> Hesperperlas | 169 | 41 |
| Real <br> Doroneuria | 55 | 125 |

## Boosting Comparison

## AdaboostM1 with RepTree classifier

- Correctly Classified Instances
324
66
0.1978
$39.7848 \%$

| Classified as -> | Hesperperla | Doroneuria |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Real <br> Hesperperlas | 180 | 30 |
| Real <br> Doroneuria | 36 | 144 |

## References

- AdaboostM1: Yoav Freund and Robert E. Schapire (1996). "Experiments with a new boosting algorithm". Proc International Conference on Machine Learning, pages 148156, Morgan Kaufmann, San Francisco.
- ADTree: Freund, Y., Mason, L.: "The alternating decision tree learning algorithm". Proceeding of the Sixteenth International Conference on Machine Learning, Bled, Slovenia, (1999) 124133.


## Stacking

- Apply multiple base learners (e.g.: decision trees, naive Bayes, neural nets)
- Meta-learner: Inputs $=$ Base learner predictions
- Training by leave-one-out cross-validation: Meta-L. inputs $=$ Predictions on left-out examples



## Random Forests

- Tree bagging creates decision trees using the bagging technique. The whole set of such trees (each trained on a random sample) is called a decision forest. The final prediction takes the average (or majority vote).
- Random forests differ in that they use a modified tree learning algorithm that selects, at each candidate split, a random subset of the features.


## Back to Stone Flies

Random forest of 10 trees, each constructed while considering 7 random features. Out of bag error: 0.2487 . Time taken to build model: 0.14 seconds

| Correctly Classified Instances | 292 |
| :--- | :---: |
| Incorrectly Classified Instances | 90 |
| Kappa statistic | 0.5272 |
| Mean absolute error | 0.344 |
| Root mean squared error | 0.4069 |
| Relative absolute error | $68.9062 \%$ |
| Root relative squared error | $81.2679 \%$ |
| Total Number of Instances | 382 |

76.4398 \% (81.4 with AdaBoost) 23.5602 \%

Kappa statistic
Mean absolute error
0.344
0.4069
68.9062 \%
81.2679 \%

382


