اصول و روش‌های داده‌کاوی (Data Mining)

درس چهارم: روش های پایه در کاوش الگوهای مکرر

مدرس: سمیرا لویمی

گروه مهندسی کامپیوتر - دانشگاه شهید چمران اهواز

Data Mining:

Concepts and Techniques

(3rd ed.)

— Chapter 6 —

Jiawei Han, Micheline Kamber, and Jian Pei

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign &

Simon Fraser University

Chapter 6: Mining Frequent Patterns, Association and Correlations: Basic Concepts and Methods

- Basic Concepts
- Frequent Itemset Mining Methods
- Which Patterns Are Interesting?—Pattern Evaluation Methods
- Summary

What Is Frequent Pattern Analysis?

- Frequent pattern: a pattern (a set of items, subsequences, substructures, etc.) that occurs frequently in a data set
- First proposed by Agrawal, Imielinski, and Swami [AIS93] in the context of frequent itemsets and association rule mining
- Motivation: Finding inherent regularities in data
  - What products were often purchased together?— Cheese and Cheeses?!
  - What are the subsequent purchases after buying a PC?
  - What kinds of DNA are sensitive to this new drug?
  - Can we automatically classify web documents?
- Applications
  - Basket data analysis, cross-marketing, catalog design, sale campaign analysis, Web log (click stream) analysis, and DNA sequence analysis.

Why Is Freq. Pattern Mining Important?

- Freq. pattern: An intrinsic and important property of datasets
- Foundation for many essential data mining tasks
  - Association, correlation, and causality analysis
  - Sequential, structural (e.g., sub-graph) patterns
  - Pattern analysis in spatiotemporal, multimedia, time-series, and stream data
  - Classification: discriminative, frequent pattern analysis
  - Cluster analysis: frequent pattern-based clustering
  - Data warehousing: iceberg cube and cube-gradient
  - Semantic data compression: fascicles
  - Broad applications

Basic Concepts: Frequent Patterns

Tid	Items bought
10	Cheese, Nuts, Bread
20	Cheese, Coffee, Bread
30	Cheese, Bread, Eggs
40	Nuts, Eggs, Milk
50	Nuts, Coffee, Bread, Eggs, Milk



- itemset: A set of one or more items
- k-itemset $X = \{x_1, \ldots, x_k\}$
- *(absolute) support*, or, *support count* of X: Frequency or occurrence of an itemset X
- *(relative) support*, *s*, is the fraction of transactions that contains X (i.e., the probability that a transaction contains X)
- An itemset X is *frequent* if X's support is no less than a *minsup* threshold

Basic Concepts: Association Rules

Tid	Items bought
10	Cheese, Nuts, Bread
20	Cheese, Coffee, Bread
30	Cheese, Bread, Eggs
40	Nuts, Eggs, Milk
50	Nuts, Coffee, Bread, Eggs, Milk



{Cheese} ∪ {Bread} = {Cheese, Bread}

Note: Itemset: X ∪ Y, a subtle notation!

Find all the rules $X \rightarrow Y$ with minimum support and confidence

- **support**, s, probability that a transaction contains X ∪ Y
- **confidence**, c, conditional probability that a transaction having X also contains Y

Frequent itemsets: Let: minsup = 50%

- Freq. 1-itemsets: Cheese: 3, Nuts: 3, Bread: 4, Eggs: 3
- Freq. 2-itemsets: {Cheese, Bread}: 3

Association rules: Let: *minconf* = 50%

- *Cheese → Bread (60%, 100%)*
- *Bread → Cheese (60%, 75%)*

Q: Are these all rules?

Closed Patterns and Max-Patterns

- A long pattern contains a combinatorial number of sub-patterns, e.g., $\{a_1, \ldots, a_{100}\}$ contains

  In total: $\binom{100}{1} + \binom{100}{2} + \ldots + \binom{100}{100} = 2^{100} - 1$ sub-patterns!
- Solution: *Mine closed patterns and max-patterns instead*

Solution 1: Closed patterns: A pattern (itemset) X is closed if X is *frequent*, and there exists *no super-pattern* $Y \supset X$, *with the same support* as X

- Let Transaction DB TDB_1: T_1: $\{a_1, \ldots, a_{50}\}$; T_2: $\{a_1, \ldots, a_{100}\}$
- Suppose *minsup* = 1, How many closed patterns does TDB_1 contain?
  - Two: P_1: "$\{a_1, \ldots, a_{50}\}$: 2"; P_2: "$\{a_1, \ldots, a_{100}\}$: 1"

Solution 2: Max-patterns: A pattern X is a Max-pattern if X is frequent and there exists no frequent super-pattern $Y \supset X$

- Closed pattern is a lossless compression of freq. patterns
  - Reducing the # of patterns and rules

Closed Patterns and Max-Patterns

- Exercise. DB = {$<a_1, \ldots, a_{100}>$, $< a_1, \ldots, a_{50}>$}
  - Min_sup = 1.
- What is the set of closed itemset?
  - $<a_1, \ldots, a_{100}>$: 1
  - $< a_1, \ldots, a_{50}>$: 2
- What is the set of max-pattern?
  - $<a_1, \ldots, a_{100}>$: 1
- What is the set of all patterns?
  - !!

Computational Complexity of Frequent Itemset Mining

- How many itemsets are potentially to be generated in the worst case?
  - The number of frequent itemsets to be generated is senstive to the minsup threshold
  - When minsup is low, there exist potentially an exponential number of frequent itemsets
  - The worst case: M^N where M: # distinct items, and N: max length of transactions
- The worst case complexty vs. the expected probability
  - Ex. Suppose Walmart has 10^4 kinds of products
    - The chance to pick up one product 10^{-4}
    - The chance to pick up a particular set of 10 products: $\sim 10^{-40}$
    - What is the chance this particular set of 10 products to be frequent 10^3 times in 10^9 transactions?

Scalable Frequent Itemset Mining Methods

- Apriori: A Candidate Generation-and-Test Approach
- Improving the Efficiency of Apriori
- FPGrowth: A Frequent Pattern-Growth Approach
- ECLAT: Frequent Pattern Mining with Vertical Data Format

The Downward Closure Property and Scalable Mining Methods

- The downward closure (also called Apriori) property of frequent patterns
  - Any subset of a frequent itemset must be frequent
  - If **{Cheese, Bread, nuts}** is frequent, so is **{Cheese, Bread}**
  - i.e., every transaction having {Cheese, Bread, nuts} also contains {Cheese, Bread}
- Scalable mining methods: Three major approaches
  - Apriori (Agrawal & Srikant@VLDB'94)
  - Freq. pattern growth (FPgrowth—Han, Pei & Yin @SIGMOD'00)
  - Vertical data format approach (Charm—Zaki & Hsiao @SDM'02)

Apriori: A Candidate Generation & Test Approach

- Apriori pruning principle: If there is any itemset which is infrequent, its superset should not be generated/tested! (Agrawal & Srikant @VLDB'94, Mannila, et al. @ KDD' 94)
- Method:
  - Initially, scan DB once to get frequent 1-itemset
  - Generate length (k+1) candidate itemsets from length k frequent itemsets
  - Test the candidates against DB to find frequent (k+1)-itemsets
  - Terminate when no frequent or candidate set can be generated

The Apriori Algorithm—An Example

C_k: Candidate k-itemset
L_k : frequent k-itemset

Database TDB

Tid	Items
10	A, C, D
20	B, C, E
30	A, B, C, E
40	B, E

1st scan →

C_1

Itemset	sup
{A}	2
{B}	3
{C}	3
{D}	1
{E}	3

→ L_1

Itemset	sup
{A}	2
{B}	3
{C}	3
{E}	3

C_2

Itemset
{A, B}
{A, C}
{A, E}
{B, C}
{B, E}
{C, E}

← 2nd scan

C_2

Itemset	sup
{A, B}	1
{A, C}	2
{A, E}	1
{B, C}	2
{B, E}	3
{C, E}	2

← L_2

Itemset	sup
{A, C}	2
{B, C}	2
{B, E}	3
{C, E}	2

C_3

Itemset
{B, C, E}

3rd scan → L_3

Itemset	sup
{B, C, E}	2

The Apriori Algorithm (Pseudo-Code)

C_k: Candidate itemset of size k
L_k : frequent itemset of size k

L_1 = {frequent items};
for (k = 1; L_k !=$\emptyset$; k++) **do begin**
    C_{k+1} = candidates generated from L_k;
    for each transaction t in database do
        increment the count of all candidates in C_{k+1} that are contained in t
    L_{k+1} = candidates in C_{k+1} with min_support
    end
return $\cup_k L_k$;

Implementation of Apriori

- How to generate candidates?
  - Step 1: self-joining L_k
  - Step 2: pruning
- Example of Candidate-generation
  - L_3={*abc, abd, acd, ace, bcd*}
  - Self-joining: L_3*L_3
    - *abcd* from *abc* and *abd*
    - *acde* from *acd* and *ace*
  - Pruning:
    - *acde* is removed because *ade* is not in L_3
  - C_4 = {*abcd*}



Further Improvement of the Apriori Method

- Major computational challenges
  - Multiple scans of transaction database
  - Huge number of candidates
  - Tedious workload of support counting for candidates
- Improving Apriori: general ideas
  - Reduce passes of transaction database scans
  - Shrink number of candidates
  - Facilitate support counting of candidates

Partition: Scan Database Only Twice

- Any itemset that is potentially frequent in DB must be frequent in at least one of the partitions of DB
  - Scan 1: partition database and find local frequent patterns
  - Scan 2: consolidate global frequent patterns
- A. Savasere, E. Omiecinski and S. Navathe, *VLDB'95*



$DB_1 + DB_2 + \cdots + DB_k = DB$

$sup_1(i) < \sigma DB_1$ $\quad sup_2(i) < \sigma DB_2$ $\quad sup_k(i) < \sigma DB_k$ $\quad sup(i) < \sigma DB$

Partitioning



Figure 6.6 Mining by partitioning the data.

ECLAT: Mining by Exploring Vertical Data Format

- Vertical format: $t(AB) = \{T_{11}, T_{25}, \ldots\}$
  - tid-list: list of trans.-ids containing an itemset
- Deriving frequent patterns based on vertical intersections
  - $t(X) = t(Y)$: X and Y always happen together
  - $t(X) \subset t(Y)$: transaction having X always has Y
- Using diffset to accelerate mining
  - Only keep track of differences of tids
  - $t(X) = \{T_1, T_2, T_3\}$, $t(XY) = \{T_1, T_3\}$
  - Diffset $(XY, X) = \{T_2\}$

A transaction DB in Horizontal Data Format

Tid	Itemset
10	a, c, d, e
20	a, b, e
30	b, c, e

The transaction DB in Vertical Data Format

Item	TidList
a	10, 20
b	20, 30
c	10, 30
d	10
e	10, 20, 30

CHARM: Mining by Exploring Vertical Data Format

- Vertical format: $t(AB) = \{T_{11}, T_{25}, \ldots\}$
  - tid-list: list of trans.-ids containing an itemset
- Deriving closed patterns based on vertical intersections
  - $t(X) = t(Y)$: X and Y always happen together
  - $t(X) \subset t(Y)$: transaction having X always has Y
- Using diffset to accelerate mining
  - Only keep track of differences of tids
  - $t(X) = \{T_1, T_2, T_3\}$, $t(XY) = \{T_1, T_3\}$
  - Diffset $(XY, X) = \{T_2\}$
- Eclat/MaxEclat (Zaki et al. @KDD'97), VIPER(P. Shenoy et al.@SIGMOD'00), CHARM (Zaki & Hsiao@SDM'02)

DHP: Reduce the Number of Candidates

- A *k*-itemset whose corresponding hashing bucket count is below the threshold cannot be frequent
  - Candidates: a, b, c, d, e
  - Hash entries
    - {ab, ad, ae}
    - {bd, be, de}
    - …
  - Frequent 1-itemset: a, b, d, e
  - ab is not a candidate 2-itemset if the sum of count of {ab, ad, ae} is below support threshold
- J. Park, M. Chen, and P. Yu. An effective hash-based algorithm for mining association rules. *SIGMOD'95*

count	itemsets
35	{ab, ad, ae}
88	{bd, be, de}
. . .	. . .
102	{yz, qs, wt}

Hash Table

Pattern-Growth Approach: Mining Frequent Patterns Without Candidate Generation

- Bottlenecks of the Apriori approach
  - repeatedly scan the whole database and check a large set of candidates pattern matching.
  - generates a huge number of candidates.
- The FPGrowth Approach (J. Han, J. Pei, and Y. Yin, SIGMOD' 00)
  - Depth-first search
  - Avoid explicit candidate generation
- Major philosophy: Grow long patterns from short ones using local frequent items only
  - "abc" is a frequent pattern
  - Get all transactions having "abc", i.e., project DB on abc: DB|abc
  - "d" is a local frequent item in DB|abc → abcd is a frequent pattern

Construct FP-tree from a Transaction Database

TID	*Items bought*	*(ordered) frequent items*
100	**{*f, a, c, d, g, i, m, p*}**	**{*f, c, a, m, p*}**
200	**{*a, b, c, f, l, m, o*}**	**{*f, c, a, b, m*}**
300	**{*b, f, h, j, o, w*}**	**{*f, b*}**
400	**{*b, c, k, s, p*}**	**{*c, b, p*}**
500	**{*a, f, c, e, l, p, m, n*}**	**{*f, c, a, m, p*}**

***min_support* = 3**

1. Scan DB once, find frequent 1-itemset (single item pattern)
2. Sort frequent items in frequency descending order, f-list
3. Scan DB again, construct FP-tree

Header Table

Item	*frequency*	*head*
f	4	
c	4	
a	3	
b	3	
m	3	
p	3	



F-list = f-c-a-b-m-p

Partition Patterns and Databases

- Frequent patterns can be partitioned into subsets according to f-list
  - F-list = f-c-a-b-m-p
  - Patterns containing p
  - Patterns having m but no p
  - …
  - Patterns having c but no a nor b, m, p
  - Pattern f
- Completeness and non-redundency

Find Patterns Having P From P-conditional Database

- Starting at the frequent item header table in the FP-tree
- Traverse the FP-tree by following the link of each frequent item *p*
- Accumulate all of *transformed prefix paths* of item *p* to form *p*'s conditional pattern base



***Conditional* pattern bases**

item	***cond. pattern base***
c	***f:3***
a	***fc:3***
b	***fca:1, f:1, c:1***
m	***fca:2, fcab:1***
p	***fcam:2, cb:1***

From Conditional Pattern-bases to Conditional FP-trees

- For each pattern-base
  - Accumulate the count for each item in the base
  - Construct the FP-tree for the frequent items of the pattern base



m-conditional **pattern base:**

fca:2, fcab:1

➔

{}
|
f:3
|
c:3
|
a:3

m-conditional **FP-tree**

➔

All frequent patterns relate to *m*

m,

fm, cm, am,

fcm, fam, cam,

fcam

Recursion: Mining Each Conditional FP-tree

{}
|
f:3
|
c:3
|
a:3

m-conditional **FP-tree**

Cond. pattern base of "am": (fc:3)

{}
|
f:3
|
c:3

am-conditional **FP-tree**

Cond. pattern base of "cm": (f:3)

{}
|
f:3

cm-conditional **FP-tree**

Cond. pattern base of "cam": (f:3)

{}
|
f:3

cam-conditional **FP-tree**

A Special Case: Single Prefix Path in FP-tree

- Suppose a (conditional) FP-tree T has a shared single prefix-path P
- Mining can be decomposed into two parts
  - Reduction of the single prefix path into one node
  - Concatenation of the mining results of the two parts





Benefits of the FP-tree Structure

- Completeness
  - Preserve complete information for frequent pattern mining
  - Never break a long pattern of any transaction
- Compactness
  - Reduce irrelevant info—infrequent items are gone
  - Items in frequency descending order: the more frequently occurring, the more likely to be shared
  - Never be larger than the original database (not count node-links and the *count* field)

The Frequent Pattern Growth Mining Method

- Idea: Frequent pattern growth
  - Recursively grow frequent patterns by pattern and database partition
- Method
  - For each frequent item, construct its conditional pattern-base, and then its conditional FP-tree
  - Repeat the process on each newly created conditional FP-tree
  - Until the resulting FP-tree is empty, or it contains only one path—single path will generate all the combinations of its sub-paths, each of which is a frequent pattern

Performance of FPGrowth in Large Datasets



FP-Growth vs. Apriori

Advantages of the Pattern Growth Approach

- Divide-and-conquer:
  - Decompose both the mining task and DB according to the frequent patterns obtained so far
  - Lead to focused search of smaller databases
- Other factors
  - No candidate generation, no candidate test
  - Compressed database: FP-tree structure
  - No repeated scan of entire database
  - Basic ops: counting local freq items and building sub FP-tree, no pattern search and matching
- A good open-source implementation and refinement of FPGrowth
  - FPGrowth+ (Grahne and J. Zhu, FIMI'03)

MaxMiner: Mining Max-Patterns

Tid	Items
10	A, B, C, D, E
20	B, C, D, E,
30	A, C, D, F

- 1st scan: find frequent items
  - A, B, C, D, E
- 2nd scan: find support for
  - AB, AC, AD, AE, ABCDE
  - BC, BD, BE, BCDE
  - CD, CE, CDE, DE

Potential max-patterns

- Since BCDE is a max-pattern, no need to check BCD, BDE, CDE in later scan
- R. Bayardo. Efficiently mining long patterns from databases. *SIGMOD'98*

Chapter 5: Mining Frequent Patterns, Association and Correlations: Basic Concepts and Methods

- Basic Concepts
- Frequent Itemset Mining Methods
- Which Patterns Are Interesting?—Pattern Evaluation Methods
- Summary

Pattern Evaluation

How to Judge if a Rule/Pattern Is Interesting?

- Pattern-mining will generate a large set of patterns/rules
  - Not all the generated patterns/rules are interesting
- Interestingness measures: Objective vs. Subjective
  - Objective interestingness measures:
    - Support, confidence, correlation, …
  - Subjective interestingness measures: One man's trash could be another man's treasure

Which Patterns Are Interesting?

Limitation of the Support-Confidence Framework

- Are *s* and *c* interesting in association rules: "A ⇒ B" [s, c]? Be careful!
- Example: Suppose one school may have the following statistics on # of students who may play basketball and/or eat cereal:

2-way contingency table

	play-basketball	not play-basketball	sum (row)
eat-cereal	400	350	750
not eat-cereal	200	50	250
sum(col.)	600	400	1000

- Association rule mining may generate the following:
  - *play-basketball* ⇒ *eat-cereal* [40%, 66.7%] (higher s & c)
- But this strong association rule is misleading: The overall % of students eating cereal is 75% > 66.7%, a more telling rule:
  - ¬ *play-basketball* ⇒ *eat-cereal* [35%, 87.5%] (high s & c)

Interestingness Measure: Correlations (Lift)

$$A \Rightarrow B \; [support,\; confidence,\; correlation].$$

- Measure of dependent/correlated events: Lift

$$lift(B,C) = \frac{c(B \rightarrow C)}{s(C)} = \frac{s(B \cup C)}{s(B) \times s(C)}$$

- Lift(B, C) may tell how B and C are correlated
  - Lift(B, C) = 1: B and C are independent
  - > 1: positively correlated
  - < 1: negatively correlated
- In our example,

$$lift(B,C) = \frac{400/1000}{600/1000 \times 750/1000} = 0.89$$

$$lift(B,\neg C) = \frac{200/1000}{600/1000 \times 250/1000} = 1.33$$

- Thus:
  - B and C are negatively correlated since lift(B, C) < 1;
  - B and ¬C are positively correlated since lift(B, ¬C) > 1

Lift is more telling than s & c

	B	¬B	$\sum_{row}$
C	400	350	750
¬C	200	50	250
$\sum_{col.}$	600	400	1000

Interestingness Measure : χ^2

	B	¬B	Σ_{row}
C	400 (450)	350 (300)	750
¬C	200 (150)	50 (100)	250
Σ_{col}	600	400	1000

Observed value

Expected value:600*750/1000

- Another measure to test correlated events: χ^2

$$\chi^2 = \sum \frac{(Observed - Expected)^2}{Expected}$$

- General rules:
  - $\chi^2 = 0$: independent
  - $\chi^2 > 0$: correlated, either positive or negative, so it needs additional test
- Now,

$$\chi^2 = \frac{(400-450)^2}{450} + \frac{(350-300)^2}{300} + \frac{(200-150)^2}{150} + \frac{(50-100)^2}{100} = 55.56$$

- χ^2 shows B and C are negatively correlated since the expected value is 450 but the observed is only 400
- χ^2 is also more telling than the support-confidence framework

Are *lift* and χ^2 Good Measures of Correlation?

- Null Transactions: transactions that contain neither B nor C
  - Let's examine the dataset D
  - BC (100) is much rarer than B¬C (1000) and ¬BC (1000), but there are many ¬B¬C (100000)
  - Unlikely B & C will happen together!
- But, Lift(B, C) = 8.44 >> 1 (Lift shows B and C are strongly positively correlated!)
- χ^2 = 670: Observed(BC) >> expected value (11.85) [B and C are positively correlated]
  - Too many null transactions may "spoil the soup"!

	B	¬B	$\sum_{row}$
C	100	1000	1100
¬C	1000	100000	101000
$\sum_{col.}$	1100	101000	102100

Null transactions

Contingency table with expected values added

	B	¬B	$\sum_{row}$
C	100 (11.85)	1000	1100
¬C	1000 (988.15)	100000	101000
$\sum_{col.}$	1100	101000	102100

Pattern Evaluation Measures

$$all\_conf(A,B) = \frac{sup(A \cup B)}{max\{sup(A), sup(B)\}} = min\{P(A|B), P(B|A)\},$$

$$max\_conf(A, B) = max\{P(A \mid B), P(B \mid A)\}.$$

$$Kulc(A, B) = \frac{1}{2}(P(A|B) + P(B|A)).$$

$$cosine(A, B) = \frac{P(A \cup B)}{\sqrt{P(A) \times P(B)}} = \frac{sup(A \cup B)}{\sqrt{sup(A) \times sup(B)}}$$
$$= \sqrt{P(A|B) \times P(B|A)}.$$

Interestingness Measures & Null-Invariant

- Null invariance: Value does not change with the # of null-transactions
- A few interestingness measures: Some are null invariant

Measure	Definition	Range	Null-Invariant
$\chi^2(A,B)$	$\sum_{i,j=0,1} \frac{(e(a_i b_j) - o(a_i b_j))^2}{e(a_i b_j)}$	$[0, \infty]$	No
$Lift(A,B)$	$\frac{s(A \cup B)}{s(A) \times s(B)}$	$[0, \infty]$	No
$AllConf(A,B)$	$\frac{s(A \cup B)}{max\{s(A), s(B)\}}$	$[0, 1]$	Yes
$Jaccard(A,B)$	$\frac{s(A \cup B)}{s(A) + s(B) - s(A \cup B)}$	$[0, 1]$	Yes
$Cosine(A,B)$	$\frac{s(A \cup B)}{\sqrt{s(A) \times s(B)}}$	$[0, 1]$	Yes
$Kulczynski(A,B)$	$\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{s(A \cup B)}{s(A)} + \frac{s(A \cup B)}{s(B)}\right)$	$[0, 1]$	Yes
$MaxConf(A,B)$	$max\{\frac{s(A)}{s(A \cup B)}, \frac{s(B)}{s(A \cup B)}\}$	$[0, 1]$	Yes

χ^2 and lift are not null-invariant

Jaccard, consine, AllConf, MaxConf, and Kulczynski are null-invariant measures

T. Wu, Y. Chen, and J. Han, *Association Mining in Large Databases: A Re-Examination of Its Measures*, PKDD 2007.

Which is the best in assessing the discovered pattern relationships?

Null Invariance: An Important Property

- Why is null invariance crucial for the analysis of massive transaction data?
  - Many transactions may contain neither milk nor coffee!

milk vs. coffee contingency table

	$milk$	$\neg milk$	Σ_{row}
$coffee$	mc	$\neg mc$	c
$\neg coffee$	$m\neg c$	$\neg m\neg c$	$\neg c$
Σ_{col}	m	$\neg m$	Σ

- Lift and χ^2 are not null-invariant: not good to evaluate data that contain too many or too few null transactions!
- Many measures are not null-invariant!

Null-transactions w.r.t. m and c

Data set	mc	$\neg mc$	$m\neg c$	$\neg m\neg c$	χ^2	$Lift$
D_1	10,000	1,000	1,000	100,000	90557	9.26
D_2	10,000	1,000	1,000	100	0	1
D_3	100	1,000	1,000	100,000	670	8.44
D_4	1,000	1,000	1,000	100,000	24740	25.75
D_5	1,000	100	10,000	100,000	8173	9.18
D_6	1,000	10	100,000	100,000	965	1.97

2 × 2 Contingency Table for Two Items

	milk	$\overline{milk}$	Σ_{row}
coffee	mc	$\overline{m}c$	c
$\overline{coffee}$	$m\overline{c}$	$\overline{mc}$	$\overline{c}$
Σ_{col}	m	$\overline{m}$	Σ

Comparison of Six Pattern Evaluation Measures Using Contingency Tables for a Variety of Data Sets

Data Set	mc	$\overline{m}c$	$m\overline{c}$	$\overline{mc}$	χ^2	*lift*	*all_conf.*	*max_conf.*	*Kulc.*	*cosine*
D_1	10,000	1000	1000	100,000	90557	9.26	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91
D_2	10,000	1000	1000	100	0	1	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91
D_3	100	1000	1000	100,000	670	8.44	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09
D_4	1000	1000	1000	100,000	24740	25.75	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5
D_5	1000	100	10,000	100,000	8173	9.18	0.09	0.91	0.5	0.29
D_6	1000	10	100,000	100,000	965	1.97	0.01	0.99	0.5	0.10

Which Null-Invariant Measure Is Better?

- IR (Imbalance Ratio): measure the imbalance of two itemsets A and B in rule implications

$$IR(A,B) = \frac{|sup(A) - sup(B)|}{sup(A) + sup(B) - sup(A \cup B)}$$

- Kulczynski and Imbalance Ratio (IR) together present a clear picture for all the three datasets D_4 through D_6
  - D_4 is balanced & neutral
  - D_5 is imbalanced & neutral
  - D_6 is very imbalanced & neutral

$Data$	mc	$\overline{m}c$	$m\overline{c}$	$\overline{mc}$	$all\_conf.$	$max\_conf.$	$Kulc.$	$cosine$	IR
D_1	10,000	1,000	1,000	100,000	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.0
D_2	10,000	1,000	1,000	100	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.91	0.0
D_3	100	1,000	1,000	100,000	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.0
D_4	1,000	1,000	1,000	100,000	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.0
D_5	1,000	100	10,000	100,000	0.09	0.91	0.5	0.29	0.89
D_6	1,000	10	100,000	100,000	0.01	0.99	0.5	0.10	0.99

Summary

- Basic concepts: association rules, support-confident framework, closed and max-patterns
- Scalable frequent pattern mining methods
  - Apriori (Candidate generation & test)
  - Projection-based (FPgrowth, CLOSET+, ...)
  - Vertical format approach (ECLAT, CHARM, ...)
- Which patterns are interesting?
  - Pattern evaluation methods

Ref: Basic Concepts of Frequent Pattern Mining

- (Association Rules) R. Agrawal, T. Imielinski, and A. Swami. Mining association rules between sets of items in large databases. SIGMOD'93
- (Max-pattern) R. J. Bayardo. Efficiently mining long patterns from databases. SIGMOD'98
- (Closed-pattern) N. Pasquier, Y. Bastide, R. Taouil, and L. Lakhal. Discovering frequent closed itemsets for association rules. ICDT'99
- (Sequential pattern) R. Agrawal and R. Srikant. Mining sequential patterns. ICDE'95

Ref: Apriori and Its Improvements

- R. Agrawal and R. Srikant. Fast algorithms for mining association rules. VLDB'94
- H. Mannila, H. Toivonen, and A. I. Verkamo. Efficient algorithms for discovering association rules. KDD'94
- A. Savasere, E. Omiecinski, and S. Navathe. An efficient algorithm for mining association rules in large databases. VLDB'95
- J. S. Park, M. S. Chen, and P. S. Yu. An effective hash-based algorithm for mining association rules. SIGMOD'95
- H. Toivonen. Sampling large databases for association rules. VLDB'96
- S. Brin, R. Motwani, J. D. Ullman, and S. Tsur. Dynamic itemset counting and implication rules for market basket analysis. SIGMOD'97
- S. Sarawagi, S. Thomas, and R. Agrawal. Integrating association rule mining with relational database systems: Alternatives and implications. SIGMOD'98

Ref: Depth-First, Projection-Based FP Mining

- R. Agarwal, C. Aggarwal, and V. V. V. Prasad. A tree projection algorithm for generation of frequent itemsets. J. Parallel and Distributed Computing, 2002.
- G. Grahne and J. Zhu, Efficiently Using Prefix-Trees in Mining Frequent Itemsets, Proc. FIMI'03
- B. Goethals and M. Zaki. An introduction to workshop on frequent itemset mining implementations. *Proc. ICDM'03 Int. Workshop on Frequent Itemset Mining Implementations (FIMI'03),* Melbourne, FL, Nov. 2003
- J. Han, J. Pei, and Y. Yin. Mining frequent patterns without candidate generation*.* SIGMOD' 00
- J. Liu, Y. Pan, K. Wang, and J. Han. Mining Frequent Item Sets by Opportunistic Projection. KDD'02
- J. Han, J. Wang, Y. Lu, and P. Tzvetkov. Mining Top-K Frequent Closed Patterns without Minimum Support. ICDM'02
- J. Wang, J. Han, and J. Pei. CLOSET+: Searching for the Best Strategies for Mining Frequent Closed Itemsets. KDD'03

Ref: Vertical Format and Row Enumeration Methods

- M. J. Zaki, S. Parthasarathy, M. Ogihara, and W. Li. Parallel algorithm for discovery of association rules. DAMI:97.
- M. J. Zaki and C. J. Hsiao. CHARM: An Efficient Algorithm for Closed Itemset Mining, SDM'02.
- C. Bucila, J. Gehrke, D. Kifer, and W. White. DualMiner: A Dual-Pruning Algorithm for Itemsets with Constraints. KDD'02.
- F. Pan, G. Cong, A. K. H. Tung, J. Yang, and M. Zaki , CARPENTER: Finding Closed Patterns in Long Biological Datasets. KDD'03.
- H. Liu, J. Han, D. Xin, and Z. Shao, Mining Interesting Patterns from Very High Dimensional Data: A Top-Down Row Enumeration Approach, SDM'06.

Ref: Mining Correlations and Interesting Rules

- S. Brin, R. Motwani, and C. Silverstein. Beyond market basket: Generalizing association rules to correlations. SIGMOD'97.
- M. Klemettinen, H. Mannila, P. Ronkainen, H. Toivonen, and A. I. Verkamo. Finding interesting rules from large sets of discovered association rules. CIKM'94.
- R. J. Hilderman and H. J. Hamilton. *Knowledge Discovery and Measures of Interest*. Kluwer Academic, 2001.
- C. Silverstein, S. Brin, R. Motwani, and J. Ullman. Scalable techniques for mining causal structures. VLDB'98.
- P.-N. Tan, V. Kumar, and J. Srivastava. Selecting the Right Interestingness Measure for Association Patterns. KDD'02.
- E. Omiecinski. Alternative Interest Measures for Mining Associations. TKDE'03.
- T. Wu, Y. Chen, and J. Han, “Re-Examination of Interestingness Measures in Pattern Mining: A Unified Framework", Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery, 21(3):371-397, 2010