Applied Data Analysis (CS401)

Lecture 7
Learning from data: Supervised learning
29 Oct 2025

EPFL

Maria Brbić

Announcements

- Project milestone P2 due on **Wed Nov 5th**
- Friday's lab session: two parallel tracks:
  - Track 1: exercise on supervised learning (Exercise 6)
  - Track 2: project office hours (on Zoom)
    - Logistics: see Ed post
    - Do come and ask for feedback – everyone will win!

Feedback

Give us feedback on this lecture here:
https://go.epfl.ch/ada2025-lec7-feedback

- What did you (not) like about this lecture?
- What was (not) well explained?
- On what would you like more (fewer) details?
- …

Why ML as part of data science?

- ML can facilitate most steps of the data analysis cycle

- But stay critical: “Can I trust my ML model?”



Machine learning

- **Supervised:** We are given input/output pairs (X, y) (a.k.a. "samples") that are related via a function $y = f(X)$. We would like to "learn" f, and evaluate it on new data. Types:
  - Discrete y (class labels): **"classification"**
  - Continuous y: **"regression"** (e.g., linear regression)
- **Unsupervised:** Given only samples X of the data, we compute a function f such that $y = f(X)$ is a "simpler" representation.
  - Discrete y (cluster labels): **"clustering"**
  - Continuous y: **"dimensionality reduction"**

Machine learning: examples

- **Supervised (*lecture 7, i.e., today*):**
  - Is this image a cat, dog, or cow?
  - How would this user rate that restaurant?
  - Is this email spam?
  - Is this blob on a telescope image a supernova?
- **Unsupervised (*lecture 9*):**
  - Cluster handwritten digit data into 10 classes
  - What are the top 20 topics in Twitter right now?
  - Find the best 2D visualization of 1000-dimensional data

Machine learning: techniques

- **Supervised learning:**
  - k-NN (k nearest neighbors)
  - Tree-based models: decision trees, random forests
  - Linear + logistic regression
  - Naïve Bayes
  - Support vector machines
  - Supervised neural networks
  - etc.
- **Unsupervised learning:**
  - Clustering
  - Dimensionality reduction: topic modeling, matrix factorization (PCA, SVD, word2vec)
  - Hidden Markov models (HMM), etc.

Today
(particularly in light of bias/variance tradeoff)

Lecture 9

Intro to supervised learning: k nearest neighbors (k-NN)

k nearest neighbors (*k*-NN)

Given a query item:

Find *k* closest matches
in a labeled dataset ↓



k nearest neighbors (*k*-NN)

Given a query item:

Find k closest matches
in a labeled dataset ↓

Return the most
frequent label
among the *k*

k nearest neighbors (*k*-NN)

k = 3 votes for
“domestic cat”

Properties of *k*-NN

The data is the model

- No training needed.
- Conceptually simple algorithm.
- Accuracy generally improves with more data.
- Usually need data in memory, but can also be run from disk.

Minimal configuration:

- Only one parameter: k (number of neighbors)
- But two other choices are also important:
  - Similarity metric
  - Weighting of neighbors in voting (e.g. by similarity)

k-NN flavors

Classification:

- Model is y = f(X), y is from a discrete set (labels).
- Given X, compute y = majority vote of the k nearest neighbors.
- Can also use a weighted vote* of the neighbors.

Regression:

- Model is y = f(X), y is a real value.
- Given X, compute y = average value of the k nearest neighbors.
- Can also use a weighted average* of the neighbors.

* Weighting function is usually the similarity.

k-NN distance (opposite of similarity) measures

- **Euclidean Distance:** Simplest, fast to compute

$$d(x, y) = \|x - y\|$$

- **Cosine Distance:** Good for documents, images, etc.

$$d(x, y) = 1 - \frac{x \cdot y}{\|x\|\|y\|}$$

- **Jaccard Distance:** For set data:

$$d(X, Y) = 1 - \frac{|X \cap Y|}{|X \cup Y|}$$

- **Hamming Distance:** For string data:

$$d(x, y) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (x_i \neq y_i)$$

k-NN distance (opposite of similarity) measures

- **Manhattan Distance:** Coordinate-wise distance

$$d(x, y) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} |x_i - y_i|$$

- **Edit Distance:** for strings, especially genetic data.

```
stack.push(kNN)
```

Predicting from samples

- Most datasets are **samples** from a (maybe infinite) **population**.
- We are most interested in **models of the population**, but we only have access to a **sample** (blue points) from the population.

For a dataset consisting of pairs (X, y):

- features X, label y,

we aim to find the true model f:

- $y = f(X)$.

We train on a training sample D and denote the fitted model as f_D



Bias and variance

- Given a random training sample D, obtain model f_D
- For a new data point (X, y), prediction is $f_D(X)$
- (Squared) error = $\mathrm{E}[(f_D(X) - y)^2]$ (E is expectation over D!)
- Fact: error can be decomposed into two parts (derivation)
  - $\text{Error}^2 = \text{Bias}^2 + \text{Variance}$
  - $\text{Bias} = \mathrm{E}[f_D(X) - y]$
  - $\text{Variance} = \mathrm{E}[(f_D(X) - \mathrm{E}[f_D(X)])^2]$

Bias and variance

Our data-generated model $f_D(X)$ is a **statistical estimate** of the true function $f(X)$.

Because of this, its subject to bias and variance:

Bias: if we train models $f_D(X)$ on many training sets D, bias is the expected difference between their predictions and the true y's.

i.e. $$Bias = \mathrm{E}[f_D(X) - y]$$

E[] is taken over points X and datasets D

Variance: if we train models $f_D(X)$ on many training sets D, variance is the variance of the estimates:

$$Variance = \mathrm{E}\left[\left(f_D(X) - \bar{f}(X)\right)^2\right]$$

Where $\bar{f}(X) = \mathrm{E}[f_D(X)]$ is the average prediction on X.

Consider a fixed testing point (X, y) not seen during training



"Full" bias/variance: average this picture over all testing points (X, y)

Bias/variance tradeoff

Since $\text{Error}^2 = \text{Bias}^2 + \text{Variance}$, there is a tradeoff, usually modulated via model complexity:

Complex models (many parameters) usually have lower bias, but higher variance.

Simple models (few parameters) have higher bias, but lower variance.



Bias/variance tradeoff

Example: A linear model can only fit a straight line. A high-degree polynomial can fit a complex curve. But the polynomial will fit the individual training sample, rather than the full population. Its shape can vary from sample to sample, so it has high variance.





Bias/variance tradeoff

The total expected error is

$$Bias^2 + Variance$$

Because of the bias-variance trade-off, we want to **balance** these two contributions.

If $Variance$ strongly dominates, it means there is too much variation between models. This is called **over-fitting**.

If $Bias$ strongly dominates, then the models are not fitting the data well enough. This is called **under-fitting**.



```
kNN = stack.pop()
```

Choosing *k* for *k* nearest neighbors

We have a bias/variance tradeoff:

- Small $k \rightarrow$?
- Large $k \rightarrow$?

THINK FOR A MINUTE:

When *k* increases,
how do bias and variance change?

(Feel free to discuss with your neighbor.)



Choosing *k*



- Small $k \rightarrow$ low bias, high variance
- Large $k \rightarrow$ high bias, low variance
- Assume the real data follows the blue curve, with zero-mean additive noise. Red points are a data sample.



Choosing *k*



- **Small *k*** ⟶ low bias, high variance
- Large *k* ⟶ high bias, low variance



Choosing *k*



- **Small *k*** ⟶ low bias, high variance
- Large *k* ⟶ high bias, low variance



Choosing *k*



- Small *k* → low bias, high variance
- **Large *k*** → high bias, low variance

Bias = average of this offset



Choosing *k*

- Small *k* → low bias, high variance
- **Large *k*** → high bias, low variance





Choosing *k* in practice

Use leave-one-out (LOO) cross-validation:

- **Split:** Break data into train and test subsets, e.g. 80–20 % random split.
- **Predict:** For each point in the training set, predict using the *k* nearest neighbors from the set of all *other* points in training set. Measure the LOO error rate (classification) or squared error (regression).
- **Tune:** Try different values of *k*, and use the one that gives minimum leave-one-out error.
- **Evaluate:** Measure error on the test set to quantify performance.

Commercial break

American Diabetes Association®

Data is our candy.

Decision trees

Decision trees: example

age	income	student	credit_rating	buys_computer
<=30	high	no	fair	no
<=30	high	no	excellent	no
31…40	high	no	fair	yes
>40	medium	no	fair	yes
>40	low	yes	fair	yes
>40	low	yes	excellent	no
31…40	low	yes	excellent	yes
<=30	medium	no	fair	no
<=30	low	yes	fair	yes
>40	medium	yes	fair	yes
<=30	medium	yes	excellent	yes
31…40	medium	no	excellent	yes
31…40	high	yes	fair	yes
>40	medium	no	excellent	no



Decision trees



Model: Flow-chart-like tree structure

- Nodes are tests on a single attribute
- Branches are attribute values of parent node
- Leaves are marked with class labels

Goal: Find decision tree that maximizes classification accuracy on given dataset

Optimization:

- NP-hard
- Heuristic: greedy top-down tree construction + pruning

Decision tree induction



Tree construction (top-down divide-and-conquer strategy)

- At the beginning, all training samples belong to the root
- Examples are partitioned recursively based on selected “most discriminative” attributes (partitioning data into most homogeneous subsets)
- Discriminative power based on information gain (in ID3 and C4.5 algorithms) or Gini impurity (in CART algorithm)

Partitioning stops if

- All samples belong to the same class → assign the class label to the leaf
- There are no attributes left → majority voting to assign the class label to the leaf

Decision tree induction

age	income	student	credit_rating	buys_computer
<=30	high	no	fair	no
<=30	high	no	excellent	no
31…40	high	no	fair	yes
>40	medium	no	fair	yes
>40	low	yes	fair	yes
>40	low	yes	excellent	no
31…40	low	yes	excellent	yes
<=30	medium	no	fair	no
<=30	low	yes	fair	yes
>40	medium	yes	fair	yes
<=30	medium	yes	excellent	yes
31…40	medium	no	excellent	yes
31…40	high	yes	fair	yes
>40	medium	no	excellent	no



Decision tree induction

age	income	student	credit_rating	buys_computer
<=30	high	no	fair	no
<=30	high	no	excellent	no
31…40	high	no	fair	yes
>40	medium	no	fair	yes
>40	low	yes	fair	yes
>40	low	yes	excellent	no
31…40	low	yes	excellent	yes
<=30	medium	no	fair	no
<=30	low	yes	fair	yes
>40	medium	yes	fair	yes
<=30	medium	yes	excellent	yes
31…40	medium	no	excellent	yes
31…40	high	yes	fair	yes
>40	medium	no	excellent	no



Decision tree induction

age	income	student	credit_rating	buys_computer
<=30	high	no	fair	no
<=30	high	no	excellent	no
31…40	high	no	fair	yes
>40	medium	no	fair	yes
>40	low	yes	fair	yes
>40	low	yes	excellent	no
31…40	low	yes	excellent	yes
<=30	medium	no	fair	no
<=30	low	yes	fair	yes
>40	medium	yes	fair	yes
<=30	medium	yes	excellent	yes
31…40	medium	no	excellent	yes
31…40	high	yes	fair	yes
>40	medium	no	excellent	no



Attribute selection

For a given branch in the tree, the set of samples *S* to be classified has *P* positive and *N* negative samples

The amount of entropy in the set S is

$$H(P,\ N) = -\frac{P}{P+N}\log_2\frac{P}{P+N} - \frac{N}{P+N}\log_2\frac{N}{P+N}$$



Note that:

- If $P = 0$ or $N = 0$: $H(P, N) = 0 \rightarrow$ no uncertainty
- If $P = N$: $H(P, N) = 1 \rightarrow$ maximum uncertainty

Attribute selection

$H_S = H(9, 5) = 0.94$

age	income	student	credit_rating	buys_computer
<=30	high	no	fair	no
<=30	high	no	excellent	no
31…40	high	no	fair	yes
>40	medium	no	fair	yes
>40	low	yes	fair	yes
>40	low	yes	excellent	no
31…40	low	yes	excellent	yes
<=30	medium	no	fair	no
<=30	low	yes	fair	yes
>40	medium	yes	fair	yes
<=30	medium	yes	excellent	yes
31…40	medium	no	excellent	yes
31…40	high	yes	fair	yes
>40	medium	no	excellent	no

Age **[<=30]** H(2, 3) = 0.97

Age **[31…40]** H(4, 0) = 0

Age **[>40]** H(3, 2) = 0.97

Income **[high]** H(2, 2) = 1

Income **[med]** H(4, 2) = 0.92

Income **[low]** H(3, 1) = 0.81

Student **[yes]** H(6, 1) = 0.59

Student **[no]** H(3, 4) = 0.98

Rating **[fair]** H(6, 2) = 0.81

Rating **[exc]** H(3, 3) = 1

Attribute selection

age	income	student	credit_rating	buys_computer
<=30	high	no	fair	no
<=30	high	no	excellent	no
31…40	high	no	fair	yes
>40	medium	no	fair	yes
>40	low	yes	fair	yes
>40	low	yes	excellent	no
31…40	low	yes	excellent	yes
<=30	medium	no	fair	no
<=30	low	yes	fair	yes
>40	medium	yes	fair	yes
<=30	medium	yes	excellent	yes
31…40	medium	no	excellent	yes
31…40	high	yes	fair	yes
>40	medium	no	excellent	no

$= H(9, 5) = 0.94$

$H_{Age} = p([<=30]) \cdot H(2, 3) + p([31...40]) \cdot H(4, 0) + p([>40]) \cdot H(3, 2) =$

$= 5/14 \cdot 0.97 + 4/14 \cdot 0 + 5/14 \cdot 0.97 = 0.69$

$H_{Income} = p([high]) \cdot H(2, 2) + p([med]) \cdot H(4, 2) + p([low]) \cdot H(3, 1) =$

$= 4/14 \cdot 1 + 6/14 \cdot 0.92 + 4/14 \cdot 0.81 = 0.91$

$H_{Student} = p([yes]) \cdot H(6, 1) + p([no]) \cdot H(3, 4) = 7/14 \cdot 0.59 + 7/14 \cdot 0.98 = 0.78$

$H_{Rating} = p([fair]) \cdot H(6, 2) + p([exc]) \cdot H(3, 3) = 8/14 \cdot 0.81 + 6/14 \cdot 1 = 0.89$

Attribute selection

Attribute *A* partitions *S* into S_1, S_2, ... S_v

Entropy of attribute *A* is $$H(A) = \sum_{i=1}^{v} \frac{P_i + N_i}{P + N} H(P_i, N_i)$$

The *information gain* obtained by splitting *S* using *A* is

$$Gain(A) = H(P, N) - H(A)$$

Gain(Age) = 0.94 – 0.69 = 0.25 ← split on age

Gain(Income) = 0.94 – 0.91 = 0.03

Gain(Student) = 0.94 – 0.78 = 0.16

Gain(Rating) = 0.94 – 0.89 = 0.05

Pruning



The construction phase does not filter out noise ⟶ **overfitting**

Many possible pruning strategies

- Stop partitioning a node when the corresponding number of samples assigned to a leaf goes below a threshold
- Bottom-up cross validation: Build the full tree and replace nodes with leaves labeled with the majority class if classification accuracy on a **validation set (not seen during training!)** does not get worse this way

Comments

Decision trees are an example of a classification algorithm

- Many other out there (k-NN, naive Bayes, SVM, neural networks, logistic regression, random forests ...)

Maybe not the best one ...

- Sensitive to small perturbation in the data (high variance)
- Tend to overfit
- Non-incremental: Need to be re-trained from scratch if new training data becomes available

Decision tree models

- As tree depth increases, how do bias and variance change? (Hint: think about k-NN)





POLLING TIME

- Scan QR code or go to https://go.epfl.ch/ada2025-lec7-poll

Decision tree models

- As tree depth increases, bias decreases and variance generally increases. Why? (Hint: think about k-NN)



Bias decreases with tree depth

Variance increases with tree depth



Ensemble methods

Are, metaphorically, like **"democratic" machine learning algorithms**:

- Take a collection of simple or *weak* learners
- Combine their results to make a single, better learner

Types:

- **Bagging:** train learners in parallel on different samples of the data, then combine by voting (for discrete output) or by averaging (for continuous output).
- **Boosting:** train learner again, but after filtering/weighting samples based on output of previous train/test runs.
- **Stacking:** combine outputs from various models using a second-stage learner (e.g., linear regression).

Random forests

Grow *K* trees on datasets sampled from the original dataset (size *N*) with replacement (bootstrap samples), *p* = number of features.

- Draw *K* bootstrap samples of size *N*
- Grow each decision tree by selecting a random set of *m* out of *p* features at each node and choosing the best feature to split on.
- At testing time, aggregate the predictions of the trees (most popular vote, or average) to produce the final class (example of bagging).

Typically *m* might be e.g. sqrt(*p*), but can be smaller.

Random forests

Principles: we want to take a vote between different learners so we don't want the models to be too similar. The following two criteria ensure diversity in the individual trees:

- Draw *K* bootstrap samples of size *N*:
  - Each tree is trained on different data.
- Grow a decision tree by selecting a random set of *m* out of *p* features at each node, and choosing the best feature to split on.
  - Corresponding nodes in different trees (usually) can't use the same feature to split on.

Random forests

- **Very popular in practice,** probably the most popular classifier for dense data (up to a few thousand features)
- **Easy to implement** (simply train many normal decision trees)
- **Easy to parallelize**

- **Needs many passes over the data** – at least the max depth of the trees (<< boosted trees though, cf. next slide)

Boosted decision trees

- A more recent alternative to random forests (RF) [good intro here]
- In contrast to RF, whose trees are trained **independently** by bagging, BDT trees are trained **sequentially** by **boosting**: Each tree is trained to predict ("correct") residual errors of previous trees (→ bias reduction).
- **Final prediction:** sum of predictions made by individual trees.
- Both RF and boosted trees can produce very high-quality models. Superiority of one method or the other is dataset-dependent.
- Resource requirements are very different as well, so it's actually non-trivial to compare the methods.

Random forests vs. boosted trees



- The “geometry” of the methods is very different:
- Random forests use 10’s of deep, large trees:



Random forests vs. boosted trees



- The “geometry” of the methods is very different:
- Boosted decision trees use 1000’s of shallow, small trees:



Random forests vs. boosted trees



- RF training embarrassingly parallel, can be very fast
- Evaluation of trees (runtime) also much faster for RFs



For your personal perusal:

“A visual introduction to machine learning”

http://www.r2d3.us/visual-intro-to-machine-learning-part-1/

Linear and logistic regression

Linear regression

- Your good friend from lecture 5 on regression analysis
- Goal: find the “best” line (linear function $y = f(X)$) to explain the data



How to model binary events?

- E.g., X: student features; y: did student pass ADA?
- Desired output: $f(X)$ = probability of passing ADA, given feats X
- Problem with linear regression:
  $f(X)$ can be below 0 or above 1



Logistic regression



- Trick: don't deal with probabilities, which range from 0 to 1, but with log odds, which range from $-\infty$ to $+\infty$
- Probability y ⇔ odds $y/(1-y)$ ⇔ log odds $\log[y/(1-y)]$
- Model log odds as a linear function of X

Logistic regression

- Model log odds as a linear function of X
- $\beta^T X = \log[y/(1-y)]$
- Solve for y: $y = 1 / (1 + \exp(-\beta^T X))$ "sigmoid"
- Finding best model β via maximum likelihood.
  - Don't use square loss as in linear regression (where y is assumed to be generated from Normal distribution)
  - Use cross-entropy loss instead (y assumed to be generated from Bernoulli distribution, i.e., biased coin)



Overfitting



- The more features the better?
  - **No!**
  - More features mean less bias, but more variance
  - Overfitting
- Carefully selected features can improve model accuracy
  - E.g., keep features that correlate with the label *y*
  - Forward/backward feature selection
  - Regularization (e.g., penalize norm of weight vector)
- More on such practical aspects: next lecture (“applied ML”)

Feedback

Give us feedback on this lecture here:
https://go.epfl.ch/ada2025-lec7-feedback

- What did you (not) like about this lecture?
- What was (not) well explained?
- On what would you like more (fewer) details?
- …

Criteria

Predictive performance (accuracy, AUC/ROC, precision, recall, F1-score, etc.)

Speed and scalability

- Time to build the model
- Time to use the model
- In memory vs. on disk processing
- Communication cost

Robustness

- Handling noise, outliers, missing values

Interpretability

- Understanding the model and its decisions (black box vs. white box)

Compactness of the model

- Mobile and embedded devices

k-NN and the curse of dimensionality

The curse of dimensionality refers to “weird” phenomena that occur in high dimensions (100s to millions) that do not occur in low-dimensional (e.g. 3-dimensional) space.

In particular data in high dimensions are much sparser (less dense) than data in low dimensions.

For k-NN, this means there are fewer points that are very close in feature space (very similar) to the point X whose y we want to predict.

k-NN and the curse of dimensionality

From this perspective, it's surprising that kNN works at all in high dimensions.

Luckily real data are not like random points in a high-dimensional cube. Instead they live in **dense clusters** and near **much lower-dimensional surfaces**.

Also, points can be very "similar" even if their Euclidean distance is large. E.g. documents with the same few dominant words are likely to be on the same topic (--> use different distance)

k-NN and the curse of dimensionality

Example: Consider a collection of uniformly random points in the unit cube. In one dimension, the average squared Euclidean distance between any two points is:

$$\int_0^1 \int_0^1 (x-y)^2 dx\, dy = \frac{1}{6}$$

In N dimensions, we add up the squared differences for all N coordinates (because the coordinates are independent in a uniform random cube), giving:

$$d^2 = \mathrm{E}[\|x-y\|^2] = \frac{N}{6}$$

So the euclidean distance scales as $\sqrt{N}$