

Introduction to Machine Learning

Machine Learning: Jordan Boyd-Graber University of Maryland

Slides adapted from Hinrich Schütze and Lauren Hannah

By the end of today ...

- You'll be able to frame many machine learning tasks as classification problems
- Apply logistic regression (given weights) to classify data
- Learn naïve bayes from data

Given:

■ A universe X our examples can come from (e.g., English documents with a predefined vocabulary)

- A universe X our examples can come from (e.g., English documents with a predefined vocabulary)
 - Examples are represented in this space.

- A universe X our examples can come from (e.g., English documents with a predefined vocabulary)
 - Examples are represented in this space.
- A fixed set of labels $y \in \mathbb{C} = \{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_J\}$

- A universe X our examples can come from (e.g., English documents with a predefined vocabulary)
 - Examples are represented in this space.
- A fixed set of labels $y \in \mathbb{C} = \{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_J\}$
 - The classes are human-defined for the needs of an application (e.g., spam vs. ham).

- A universe X our examples can come from (e.g., English documents with a predefined vocabulary)
 - Examples are represented in this space.
- A fixed set of labels $y \in \mathbb{C} = \{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_J\}$
 - The classes are human-defined for the needs of an application (e.g., spam vs. ham).
- A training set D of labeled documents with each labeled document $\{(x_1, v_1)...(x_N, v_N)\}$

Given:

- A universe X our examples can come from (e.g., English documents with a predefined vocabulary)
 - Examples are represented in this space.
- A fixed set of labels $y \in \mathbb{C} = \{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_J\}$
 - The classes are human-defined for the needs of an application (e.g., spam vs. ham).
- A training set D of labeled documents with each labeled document $\{(x_1, v_1)...(x_N, v_N)\}$

We learn a classifier γ that maps documents to class probabilities:

$$\gamma:(x,y)\rightarrow [0,1]$$

such that $\sum_{v} \gamma(x, y) = 1$

Generative vs. Discriminative Models

Generative

Model joint probability p(x, y)including the data x.

Naïve Bayes

- Uses Bayes rule to reverse conditioning $p(x|y) \rightarrow p(y|x)$
- Naïve because it ignores joint probabilities within the data distribution

Discriminative

Model only conditional probability p(y|x), excluding the data x.

Logistic regression

- Logistic: A special mathematical function it uses
- Regression: Combines a weight vector with observations to create an answer
- General cookbook for building conditional probability distributions

- Suppose that I have two coins, C₁ and C₂
- Now suppose I pull a coin out of my pocket, flip it a bunch of times, record the coin and outcomes, and repeat many times:

```
0 1 1 1 1
C1:
   1 1 0
C2: 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1
C1:
   0 1
C1: 1 1 0 1
C2: 0 0 1 1 0
C2: 1 0 0
```

- Suppose that I have two coins, C₁ and C₂
- Now suppose I pull a coin out of my pocket, flip it a bunch of times, record the coin and outcomes, and repeat many times:

```
0 1 1 1 1
   1 1 0
C2: 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1
C.1:
   0 1
C2: 0
     0 1 1
C2:
   1 0 0
```

 Now suppose I am given a new sequence, 0 0 1; which coin is it from?

This problem has particular challenges:

- different numbers of covariates for each observation.
- number of covariates can be large

However, there is some structure:

- Easy to get P(C₁), P(C₂)
- Also easy to get $P(X_i = 1 \mid C_1)$ and $P(X_i = 1 \mid C_2)$
- By conditional independence,

$$P(X = 0 10 | C_1) = P(X_1 = 0 | C_1)P(X_2 = 1 | C_1)P(X_2 = 0 | C_1)$$

• Can we use these to get $P(C_1|X=001)$?

This problem has particular challenges:

- different numbers of covariates for each observation.
- number of covariates can be large

However, there is some structure:

- Easy to get $P(C_1) = 4/7$, $P(C_2) = 3/7$
- Also easy to get $P(X_i = 1 \mid C_1)$ and $P(X_i = 1 \mid C_2)$
- By conditional independence,

$$P(X = 0 10 | C_1) = P(X_1 = 0 | C_1)P(X_2 = 1 | C_1)P(X_2 = 0 | C_1)$$

• Can we use these to get $P(C_1|X=001)$?

This problem has particular challenges:

- different numbers of covariates for each observation.
- number of covariates can be large

However, there is some structure:

- Easy to get $P(C_1) = 4/7$, $P(C_2) = 3/7$
- Also easy to get $P(X_i = 1 \mid C_1) = 12/16$ and $P(X_i = 1 \mid C_2) = 6/18$
- By conditional independence,

$$P(X = 0 10 | C_1) = P(X_1 = 0 | C_1)P(X_2 = 1 | C_1)P(X_2 = 0 | C_1)$$

• Can we use these to get $P(C_1|X=001)$?

Summary: have P(data|class), want P(class|data)

Solution: Bayes' rule!

$$P(class | data) = \frac{P(data | class)P(class)}{P(data)}$$

$$= \frac{P(data | class)P(class)}{\sum_{class=1}^{C} P(data | class)P(class)}$$

To compute, we need to estimate P(data | class), P(class) for all classes

This works because the coin flips are independent given the coin parameter. What about this case:

- want to identify the type of fruit given a set of features: color, shape and size
- color: red, green, yellow or orange (discrete)
- shape: round, oval or long+skinny (discrete)
- size: diameter in inches (continuous)



Conditioned on type of fruit, these features are not necessarily independent:



Given category "apple," the color "green" has a higher probability given "size < 2":

P(green | size < 2, apple) > P(green | apple)

Using chain rule,

$$P(apple | green, round, size = 2)$$

$$= \frac{P(green, round, size = 2 | apple)P(apple)}{\sum_{fruits} P(green, round, size = 2 | fruitj)P(fruitj)}$$

$$\propto P(green | round, size = 2, apple)P(round | size = 2, apple)$$

$$\times P(size = 2 | apple)P(apple)$$

But computing conditional probabilities is hard! There are many combinations of (color, shape, size) for each fruit.

Idea: assume conditional independence for all features given class,

$$P(green | round, size = 2, apple) = P(green | apple)$$

$$P(round | green, size = 2, apple) = P(round | apple)$$

$$P(size = 2 | green, round, apple) = P(size = 2 | apple)$$

• Suppose we want to estimate $P(w_n = "buy" | y = SPAM)$.

• Suppose we want to estimate $P(w_n = "buy" | y = SPAM)$.

buy	buy	nigeria	opportunity	viagra
nigeria	opportunity	viagra	fly	money
fly	buy	nigeria	fly	buy
money	buy	fly	nigeria	viagra

• Suppose we want to estimate $P(w_n = \text{"buy"}|y = \text{SPAM})$.

buy	buy	nigeria	opportunity	viagra
nigeria	opportunity	viagra	fly	money
fly	buy	nigeria	fly	buy
money	buy	fly	nigeria	viagra

Maximum likelihood (ML) estimate of the probability is:

$$\hat{\beta}_i = \frac{n_i}{\sum_k n_k} \tag{1}$$

• Suppose we want to estimate $P(w_n = \text{"buy"}|y = \text{SPAM})$.

buy	buy	nigeria	opportunity	viagra
nigeria	opportunity	viagra	fly	money
fly	buy	nigeria	fly	buy
money	buy	fly	nigeria	viagra

Maximum likelihood (ML) estimate of the probability is:

$$\hat{\beta}_i = \frac{n_i}{\sum_k n_k} \tag{1}$$

Is this reasonable?

The problem with maximum likelihood estimates: Zeros (cont)

If there were no occurrences of "bagel" in documents in class SPAM, we'd get a zero estimate:

$$\hat{P}(\text{"bagel"}|\text{SPAM}) = \frac{T \text{SPAM, "bagel"}}{\sum_{w' \in V} T \text{SPAM,} w'} = 0$$

- \rightarrow We will get P(SPAM|d) = 0 for any document that contains bage!!
- Zero probabilities cannot be conditioned away.

- For many applications, we often have a prior notion of what our probability distributions are going to look like (for example, non-zero, sparse, uniform, etc.).
- This estimate of a probability distribution is called the maximum a posteriori (MAP) estimate:

$$\beta_{\mathsf{MAP}} = \operatorname{argmax}_{\beta} f(x|\beta)g(\beta)$$
 (2)

 For a multinomial distribution (i.e. a discrete distribution, like over words):

$$\beta_i = \frac{n_i + \alpha_i}{\sum_k n_k + \alpha_k} \tag{3}$$

• α_i is called a smoothing factor, a pseudocount, etc.

 For a multinomial distribution (i.e. a discrete distribution, like over words):

$$\beta_i = \frac{n_i + \alpha_i}{\sum_k n_k + \alpha_k} \tag{3}$$

- α_i is called a smoothing factor, a pseudocount, etc.
- When $\alpha_i = 1$ for all i, it's called "Laplace smoothing" and corresponds to a uniform prior over all multinomial distributions (just do this).

 For a multinomial distribution (i.e. a discrete distribution, like over words):

$$\beta_i = \frac{n_i + \alpha_i}{\sum_k n_k + \alpha_k} \tag{3}$$

- α_i is called a smoothing factor, a pseudocount, etc.
- When $\alpha_i = 1$ for all i, it's called "Laplace smoothing" and corresponds to a uniform prior over all multinomial distributions (just do this).
- To geek out, the set $\{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_N\}$ parameterizes a Dirichlet distribution, which is itself a distribution over distributions and is the conjugate prior of the Multinomial (don't need to know this).

The Naïve Bayes classifier

- The Naïve Bayes classifier is a probabilistic classifier.
- We compute the probability of a document d being in a class c as follows:

$$P(c|d) \propto P(c) \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n_d} P(w_i|c)$$

The Naïve Bayes classifier

- The Naïve Bayes classifier is a probabilistic classifier.
- We compute the probability of a document d being in a class c as follows:

$$P(c|d) \propto P(c) \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n_d} P(w_i|c)$$

The Naïve Bayes classifier

- The Naïve Bayes classifier is a probabilistic classifier.
- We compute the probability of a document d being in a class c as follows:

$$P(c|d) \propto P(c) \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n_d} P(w_i|c)$$

- n_d is the length of the document. (number of tokens)
- $P(w_i|c)$ is the conditional probability of term w_i occurring in a document of class c
- $P(w_i|c)$ as a measure of how much evidence w_i contributes that c is the correct class.
- P(c) is the prior probability of c.
- If a document's terms do not provide clear evidence for one class vs. another, we choose the c with higher P(c).

Maximum a posteriori class

- Our goal is to find the "best" class.
- The best class in Naïve Bayes classification is the most likely or maximum a posteriori (MAP) class c map:

$$c_{\mathsf{map}} = \arg\max_{c_j \in \mathbb{C}} \hat{P}(c_j|d) = \arg\max_{c_j \in \mathbb{C}} \hat{P}(c_j) \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n_d} \hat{P}(w_i|c_j)$$

• We write \hat{P} for P since these values are *estimates* from the training set.

Naïve Bayes conditional independence assumption

To reduce the number of parameters to a manageable size, recall the *Naïve* Bayes conditional independence assumption:

$$P(d|c_j) = P(\langle w_1, \ldots, w_{n_d} \rangle | c_j) = \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n_d} P(X_i = w_i | c_j)$$

We assume that the probability of observing the conjunction of attributes is equal to the product of the individual probabilities $P(X_i = w_i | c_i)$.

Our estimates for these priors and conditional probabilities: $\hat{P}(c_i) = \frac{N_c + 1}{N_c + |C_i|}$

and
$$\hat{P}(w|c) = \frac{T_{cw}+1}{(\sum_{w'\in V} T_{cw'})+|V|}$$

Implementation Detail: Taking the log

- Multiplying lots of small probabilities can result in floating point underflow.
- From last time lg is logarithm base 2; In is logarithm base e.

$$\lg x = a \Leftrightarrow 2^a = x \qquad \ln x = a \Leftrightarrow e^a = x \tag{4}$$

- Since $\lg(xy) = \lg(x) + \lg(y)$, we can sum log probabilities instead of multiplying probabilities.
- Since Ig is a monotonic function, the class with the highest score does not change.
- So what we usually compute in practice is:

$$c_{\text{map}} = \arg \max_{c_j \in \mathbb{C}} \left[\hat{P}(c_j) \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n_d} \hat{P}(w_i | c_j) \right]$$
$$\arg \max_{c_j \in \mathbb{C}} \left[\ln \hat{P}(c_j) + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq n_d} \ln \hat{P}(w_i | c_j) \right]$$

Implementation Detail: Taking the log

- Multiplying lots of small probabilities can result in floating point underflow.
- From last time lg is logarithm base 2; In is logarithm base e.

$$\lg x = a \Leftrightarrow 2^a = x \qquad \ln x = a \Leftrightarrow e^a = x \tag{4}$$

- Since $\lg(xy) = \lg(x) + \lg(y)$, we can sum log probabilities instead of multiplying probabilities.
- Since Ig is a monotonic function, the class with the highest score does not change.
- So what we usually compute in practice is:

$$c_{\text{map}} = \arg \max_{c_j \in \mathbb{C}} \left[\hat{P}(c_j) \prod_{1 \le i \le n_d} \hat{P}(w_i | c_j) \right]$$
$$\arg \max_{c_j \in \mathbb{C}} \left[\ln \hat{P}(c_j) + \sum_{1 \le i \le n_d} \ln \hat{P}(w_i | c_j) \right]$$

Implementation Detail: Taking the log

- Multiplying lots of small probabilities can result in floating point underflow.
- From last time lg is logarithm base 2; In is logarithm base e.

$$\lg x = a \Leftrightarrow 2^a = x \qquad \ln x = a \Leftrightarrow e^a = x \tag{4}$$

- Since $\lg(xy) = \lg(x) + \lg(y)$, we can sum log probabilities instead of multiplying probabilities.
- Since Ig is a monotonic function, the class with the highest score does not change.
- So what we usually compute in practice is:

$$c_{\text{map}} = \arg \max_{c_j \in \mathbb{C}} \left[\hat{P}(c_j) \prod_{1 \le i \le n_d} \hat{P}(w_i | c_j) \right]$$
$$\arg \max_{c_j \in \mathbb{C}} \left[\ln \hat{P}(c_j) + \sum_{1 \le i \le n_d} \ln \hat{P}(w_i | c_j) \right]$$