Introduction to Machine Learning

Working Group "Computational Statistics" – Bernd Bischl et al.

Code demo for ROC

Data

We use the Breast Cancer data set from UCI database and try to predict the class of the cancer. This is an **unbalanced data set**, and we manipulate the data set further to make it even more unbalanced. The data looks like that:

```
library("dplyr")
library("mlbench")
library("mlr3")
library("mlr3learners")
library("mlr3viz")
data("BreastCancer")
target_label <- "Class"</pre>
# delete one column with missing values
bc <- BreastCancer[, -c(1, 7)]</pre>
table(BreastCancer$Class) / nrow(BreastCancer)
##
##
      benign malignant
##
       0.655
                 0.345
# transform all factors to numeric, dangerous simplification but ok here
# (don't tell the stats profs...!)
mut <- bc[, -9] %>%
 mutate_all(as.character) %>%
 mutate_all(as.numeric)
bc_data <- cbind(mut, bc[, target_label])</pre>
colnames(bc_data) <- c(colnames(mut), target_label)</pre>
# make it more unbalanced and remove 60% of the "malignant" class instances
bc_data <- bc_data %>%
 filter(
    # always keep non-malignant
    (Class != "malignant") |
      # randomly discard non-malignant with probability .6
      ((Class == "malignant") & (runif(nrow(bc_data)) < .4))</pre>
  )
head(bc_data)
```

```
Cl.thickness Cell.size Cell.shape Marg.adhesion Epith.c.size
##
## 1
                5
                          1
                                     1
                                                    1
                                                                 7
## 2
                5
                          4
                                     4
                                                    5
                3
                                                                 2
## 3
                          1
                                     1
                                                    1
               6
                          8
                                     8
                                                    1
                                                                 3
## 4
## 5
                4
                          1
                                     1
                                                    3
                                                                 2
                8
                                                                 7
## 6
                         10
                                    10
```

```
Bl.cromatin Normal.nucleoli Mitoses
                                            Class
## 1
              3
                              1
                                           benign
              3
                              2
                                           benign
## 2
## 3
              3
                              1
                                      1
                                           benign
              3
                              7
## 4
                                      1
                                           benign
## 5
              3
                              1
                                      1
                                           benign
## 6
              9
                              7
                                      1 malignant
table(bc_data[, target_label]) / sum(table(bc_data[, target_label]))
##
##
      benign malignant
##
      0.834
                0.166
```

We split the data again in train and test:

```
# Data split
set.seed(1337)
train_size <- 3 / 4
train_indices <- sample(
    x = seq(1, nrow(bc_data), by = 1),
    size = ceiling(train_size * nrow(bc_data)), replace = FALSE
)
bc_train <- bc_data[ train_indices, ]
bc_test <- bc_data[ -train_indices, ]

task <- TaskClassif$new(
    id = "bc_task", backend = bc_train,
    target = target_label
)</pre>
```

Models

We check the performance of three classifiers:

Logistic regression

```
# logreg
learner_logreg <- lrn("classif.log_reg", predict_type = "prob")</pre>
learner_logreg$train(task)
pred_logreg <- learner_logreg$predict_newdata(newdata = bc_test)</pre>
pred_logreg$score(list(msr("classif.ce"), msr("classif.auc")))
    classif.ce classif.auc
##
##
        0.0438
                    0.9939
pred_logreg$confusion
##
              truth
## response
               benign malignant
     benign
                  107
                              24
##
     malignant
                     1
```

k-NN

```
# knn
learner_knn <- lrn("classif.kknn", k = 5, predict_type = "prob")</pre>
learner_knn$train(task)
pred_knn <- learner_knn$predict_newdata(newdata = bc_test)</pre>
pred_knn$score(list(msr("classif.ce"), msr("classif.auc")))
    classif.ce classif.auc
##
         0.073
                      0.956
pred_knn$confusion
##
              truth
## response
               benign malignant
                   106
##
     benign
     malignant
                               21
##
                     2
```

Featureless

.. a fairly stupid learner that simply predicts the majority of the two classes for each observation.

```
# learner that uses simple majority vote for classification
learner_stupid <- lrn("classif.featureless",
   method = "mode", predict_type = "prob"
)
learner_stupid$train(task)
pred_stupid <- learner_stupid$predict_newdata(newdata = bc_test)
pred_stupid$score(list(msr("classif.ce"), msr("classif.auc")))

## classif.ce classif.auc
## 0.212 0.500</pre>
```

pred_stupid\$confusion

```
## truth
## response benign malignant
## benign 108 29
## malignant 0 0
```

By looking at the confusion matrices we see that the problem is now, that even the stupid approach yields a reasonable mmce performance. Thus, we need additional measure: Let's compare the logistic regression and the stupid learner in terms of sensitivity¹ and specificity² (check if you can compute these values by hand):

ROC Curve Evaluation

¹Also called *true positive rate* or *recall*.

 $^{^2 {\}rm Also}$ called true negative rate

```
pred_logreg$confusion
##
               truth
## response
                benign malignant
##
     benign
                    107
##
     malignant
                      1
                                24
pred_logreg$score(list(msr("classif.sensitivity"), msr("classif.specificity")))
## classif.sensitivity classif.specificity
##
                  0.991
                                         0.828
pred_stupid$confusion
##
               truth
## response
                benign malignant
##
                   108
                                29
     benign
                                 0
##
     malignant
                      0
pred_stupid$score(list(msr("classif.sensitivity"), msr("classif.specificity")))
## classif.sensitivity classif.specificity
A specificity of 0 means that all ill persons would be told they are healthy, which is certainly not what the
test is intended for. On the other hand can we do better with the logistic regression in terms of those
measures? Remember with our classification methods we try to estimate the posterior probabilities. Until
now in the case of two classes we classified the observation as the first class if its posterior probability is
greater or equal to 50% and otherwise as the second class. So what happens if we move this threshold?
pred_logreg$set_threshold(0.01)
pred_logreg$confusion
##
               truth
## response
                benign malignant
##
     benign
                    108
                                20
                                 9
     malignant
                      0
##
pred_logreg$score(list(msr("classif.sensitivity"), msr("classif.specificity")))
## classif.sensitivity classif.specificity
##
                    1.00
pred_logreg$set_threshold(0.7)
pred_logreg$confusion
##
               truth
## response
                benign malignant
##
     benign
                    106
                                 5
##
     malignant
                      2
                                24
```

```
pred_logreg$score(list(msr("classif.sensitivity"), msr("classif.specificity")))
## classif.sensitivity classif.specificity
## 0.981 0.828
```

```
We see that in our case with a higher threshold value the specificity improves and the sensitivity degrades
and vice versa. We can investigate this relationship with ROC curves. Compare the ROC curves:
task <- TaskClassif$new(</pre>
  id = "bc_all_task", backend = bc_data,
  target = target_label
learners <- list(learner_logreg, learner_knn, learner_stupid)</pre>
design <- benchmark_grid(</pre>
 tasks = task,
 learners = learners,
 resamplings = rsmp("cv", folds = 3)
bmr <- benchmark(design)</pre>
        [10:41:02.326] Benchmark with 9 resampling iterations
## INFO [10:41:02.363] Applying learner 'classif.log_reg' on task 'bc_all_task' (iter 1/3)
## INFO [10:41:02.401] Applying learner 'classif.log_reg' on task 'bc_all_task' (iter 2/3)
## INFO [10:41:02.425] Applying learner 'classif.log_reg' on task 'bc_all_task' (iter 3/3)
## INFO [10:41:02.450] Applying learner 'classif.kknn' on task 'bc_all_task' (iter 1/3)
        [10:41:02.483] Applying learner 'classif.kknn' on task 'bc_all_task' (iter 2/3)
## INFO
## INFO [10:41:02.517] Applying learner 'classif.kknn' on task 'bc_all_task' (iter 3/3)
## INFO [10:41:02.552] Applying learner 'classif.featureless' on task 'bc_all_task' (iter 1/3)
        [10:41:02.586] Applying learner 'classif.featureless' on task 'bc_all_task' (iter 2/3)
## INFO
         [10:41:02.600] Applying learner 'classif.featureless' on task 'bc_all_task' (iter 3/3)
## INFO
         [10:41:02.627] Finished benchmark
## INFO
```

```
autoplot(bmr, type = "roc")
```

