Knn in sparklyr

Introduction

This model is an approximate version for knn model which is difficult to be implemented with large data set. In contrast to knn model that looks for the exact number of nearest neighbours, this model looks for neighbours with high probabilite. Spark provides two methods to find out the approximate neighbours that depend on the data type at hand, **Bucketed random projection** and **Minhash for jaccard distance**.

The first method projects the data in lower dimension hash in which similar hashes indicate that the associated points (or observations) are close to each other. The mathematical basis of this technique is the following formula.

$$h^{x,b}(\vec{v}) = \lfloor \frac{\vec{v}.\vec{x}}{w} \rfloor$$

Where h is the hashing function, \vec{v} is the feature vector, x is standard normal vector that has the same length, and w is the bin width of the hashing bins, and the symbol $\lfloor \rfloor$ to coerce the result to be integer value. The idea is simple, we take the dot product of each feature vector with noisy vector, then the resulted projections (which are random) will be grouped into buckets, these buckets are supposed to include similar points. This process can be repeated many times with different noisy vector at each time to fine the similarity.

For more detail click here

First we set the connection to spark.

```
library(sparklyr)
library(tidyverse)
sc<-spark_connect(master="local")
mydata<-spark_read_csv(sc,"titanic",path = "train.csv")</pre>
```

Then we remove some variables that we think they are useless.

```
newdata<- mydata%>%
  select(c(2,3,5,6,7,8,10,12))%>%
  mutate(Pclass =as.character(Pclass))%>%
  glimpse()
```

```
## Observations: ??
## Variables: 8
## Database: spark_connection
## $ Survived <int> 0, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0, 0, 1, 0, 1, 0, 1...
                                                     ## $ Pclass
## $ Sex
                                                     <chr> "male", "female", "female", "female", "male", "male
                                                     <dbl> 22, 38, 26, 35, 35, NaN, 54, 2, 27, 14, 4, 58, 20, 39, 14,...
## $ Age
## $ SibSp
                                                     <int> 1, 1, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0, 3, 0, 1, 1, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 4, 0, 1, 0...
## $ Parch
                                                     <int> 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 0, 1, 2, 0, 1, 0, 0, 5, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0, ...
## $ Fare
                                                     <dbl> 7.2500, 71.2833, 7.9250, 53.1000, 8.0500, 8.4583, 51.8625,...
## $ Embarked <chr> "S", "C", "S", "S", "S", "Q", "S", "S", "S", "C", "S", "S"...
```

May be the first thing we do in explaratory analysis is to check the missing values.

```
newdata%>%
  mutate_all(is.na)%>%
  mutate_all(as.numeric)%>%
  summarise_all(sum)
```

```
## Warning: Missing values are always removed in SQL.
## Use `SUM(x, na.rm = TRUE)` to silence this warning
## This warning is displayed only once per session.
## # Source: spark<?> [?? x 8]
## Survived Pclass Sex Age SibSp Parch Fare Embarked
## <dbl> = 4bl> <dbl> <dbl>
```

Since we have a large number of missing values it would be better to imput thes values rather then removing them. For the numeric variable **Age** we replace them by the median using the sparklyr function **ft_imputer**, and for categorical variable **Embarked** we use the most frequently label which is here **S** port.

```
newdata<-newdata%>%
  ft_imputer(input_cols = "Age",output_cols="Age",strategy="median")%>%
  na.replace(Embarked="S")
```

Now we split the data between training and testing set , then we add an id column to ach set in order to uniquelly identify each row.

```
data_surv<-newdata%>%
  filter(Survived==1)
data not<-newdata%>%
  filter(Survived==0)
partition_surv<-data_surv%>%
  sdf_random_split(training=0.8,test=0.2,seed = 123)
partition_not<-data_not%>%
  sdf_random_split(training=0.8,test=0.2,seed = 123)
train<-sdf bind rows(partition surv$training,partition not$training)
id<-sdf_len(sc,sdf_nrow(train))</pre>
train<-sdf_bind_cols(id,train)%>%
  compute("train")
test<-sdf_bind_rows(partition_surv$test,partition_not$test)
id<-sdf_len(sc,sdf_nrow(test))</pre>
test<-sdf bind cols(id,test)%>%
  compute("test")
```

Before fitting any model the data must be processed in a way that can be consumed by the model. For our model, such as the most machine learning models, requires numeric features, we convert thus categorical variables to integers using the function **ft_strin_indexer**, after that we convert them to dumy variables using the function **ft_one hot_encoder_estimator**, because the last function expects the inputs to be numeric.

For models build in sparklyr, the inputs variables should be stacked into one column vector on each other, this can be easily done by using the function **ft_vector_assembler**. However, this step does not prevent us to apply some other transformation even the features are in one column. For instance, to run efficiently our model we can transform the variables such that they have the same scale, to do so we can either use standardization (sa we do here) or normalization method.

Now it is a good practice to save this preocessed set into the spark memory under an object name using the function **compute**

```
ft_string_indexer(input_col = "Sex",output_col="Sex_indexed")%>%
 ft_string_indexer(input_col = "Embarked",output_col="Embarked_indexed")%>%
 ft_string_indexer(input_col = "Pclass",output_col="Pclass_indexed")%>%
 ft_one_hot_encoder_estimator(
    input_cols = c("Pclass_indexed", "Sex_indexed", "Embarked_indexed"),
   output_cols=c("Pc_encod", "Sex_encod", "Emb_encod")
 ft_vector_assembler(input_cols = c("Pc_encod", "Sex_encod", "Age", "SibSp",
                                    "Parch", "Fare", "Emb_encod"),
                     output col="features")%>%
 ft_standard_scaler(input_col = "features",output_col="scaled",
                    with_mean=TRUE)%>%
 select(id,Survived,scaled)%>%
 compute("trained")
glimpse(trained)
## Observations: ??
## Variables: 3
## Database: spark_connection
             <int> 6, 7, 12, 13, 14, 25, 27, 31, 49, 55, 58, 60, 63, 64, 65, ...
## $ id
## $ scaled
            <1ist> [<-1.1143190, 1.7700801, -1.3830544, -0.9020825, 1.385871...</pre>
The same transformations above will be applied to the testing set test
tested<-test%>%
 ft_string_indexer(input_col = "Sex",output_col="Sex_indexed")%>%
 ft string indexer(input col = "Embarked", output col="Embarked indexed")%%
 ft string indexer(input col = "Pclass",output col="Pclass indexed")%>%
 ft_one_hot_encoder_estimator(
    input_cols = c("Pclass_indexed", "Sex_indexed", "Embarked_indexed"),
   output_cols=c("Pc_encod", "Sex_encod", "Emb_encod")
 )%>%
 ft_vector_assembler(input_cols = c("Pc_encod", "Sex_encod", "Age", "SibSp",
                                    "Parch", "Fare", "Emb_encod"),
                     output_col="features")%>%
 ft_standard_scaler(input_col = "features",output_col="scaled",
                    with mean=TRUE)%>%
 select(id,Survived,scaled)%>%
 compute("tested")
```

Now we are ready to project the data on the lower dimension hash using the function **ft_bucketed_random_projection_lsh**

Now we fit this model to the training data **trained**

trained<- train%>%

```
model_lsh<-ml_fit(lsh_vector,trained)</pre>
```

Prediction

At the prediction stage this model of classification give us to alternatives for how we define the nearest neighbours:

- define a threshold value from which we decide if two observations are considered as nearest neighbours or not, small value leads to take small number of neighbours. in sparklyr we can achive that using the function ml_approx_similarity_join and we specify the the threshold value for the minimum distance.
- prespecify the number of the nearest neighbours without regardeless of the distance between observations.

 This second alternative can be achieved using ml approx nearest neighbors.

each of which has its advantages and drawbacks depending on the problem at hand, for instance in medecine if you are more interested to check the similarities among patients at some level then the first option would be your choice but you may not be able to predict new cases that are not similar to any of the training cases constrained by this threshold value. In contrast, if your goal is to predict all your new cases then you would opt for the second option, but with the cost of including neighbours that are far a way constrained by the fixed number of neighbours.

Note: In fact we can overcome the drawbacks of each method using the hyperparameters. To get predictions of all the new cases we can increase the distance threshold (but be very careful if you have any single outlier) using the first method. And we can reduce the threshold for the nearest neighbours number to get meaningful similarities (but we may lose accuracy).

the similarity based on distance

To show the neighbours of each point we use the function **ml_approx_similarity_join** but this requires that the data has an **id** column, this is thus the reason why we have created this id before.

```
## # A tibble: 25,319 x 3
##
        id_a id_b dist_col
       <int> <int>
                        <dbl>
##
##
    1
           6
                  6
                        0
           7
##
    2
                  7
                        0
##
    3
          13
                 22
                        0.553
##
    4
          13
                 13
                        0
##
    5
          14
                  8
                        0.536
##
    6
          14
                 26
                        0.760
##
    7
          27
                 27
                        0
##
    8
          31
                 30
                        0.137
    9
##
          31
                 45
                        0.683
## 10
          49
                 48
                        0.542
          with 25,309 more rows
```

This function joined the data **trained** with itself to get the similar observations. The threshold determine the value from which we consider two observations as similar. let's for instance pick up some similar observations and check out how they are similar.

```
train%>%
filter(id %in% c(31,45,9,20))
```

```
## # Source: spark<?> [?? x 9]
##
        id Survived Pclass Sex
                                      Age SibSp Parch Fare Embarked
              <int> <chr> <chr>
##
                                    <dbl> <int> <int> <dbl> <chr>
     <int>
## 1
        31
                   1 1
                            female
                                       30
                                               0
                                                        93.5 S
## 2
        20
                   1 1
                            female
                                       26
                                               0
                                                     0
                                                        78.8 S
## 3
        45
                   1 1
                            female
                                       38
                                               0
                                                     0
                                                        80
                                                             S
                                                        78.0 S
## 4
         9
                   1 1
                            female
                                       21
                                               0
                                                     0
```

As we see these passengers are all survived females in the same class without children or parents or siblings embarked from the same ports, their ages are more or less close to each other. Since they are embarked from the same port it is highly likely to be friends.

```
## # Source: spark<?> [?? x 3]
       id_a id_b distCol
##
##
       <int> <int>
                      <dbl>
                86
##
    1
         85
                      0.482
    2
          85
                23
                      0.581
##
##
    3
         90
                26
                      0.597
##
    4
          93
                88
                      0.555
##
    5
         93
                86
                      0.808
##
    6
          93
                89
                      0.679
##
    7
          93
                27
                      0.650
##
    8
          99
                26
                      0.570
    9
                24
                      0.982
##
         99
## 10
        100
                29
                      0.761
## # ... with more rows
```

we can now shoose a particular person, say id_b=88, and then find his similar persons in the training set. By using the majority vote we decide if that person is survived or not.

```
m<-88
ids_train<-hashed%>%
  filter(id_b==m)%>%
  pull(id_a)
df1<-train%>%
  filter(id %in% ids_train)
df2<-test%>%
  filter(id==m)
df<-sdf_bind_rows(df1,df2)
df</pre>
```

```
## # Source: spark<?> [?? x 9]
##
         id Survived Pclass Sex
                                      Age SibSp Parch Fare Embarked
               <int> <chr>
                             <chr> <dbl> <int> <int> <dbl> <chr>
##
      <int>
                                       28
                                               0
                                                     0
                                                        30.5 S
##
    1
         85
                    1 1
                             male
                                               0
                                                     0
                                                        35.5 S
##
    2
         87
                    1 1
                             male
                                       28
##
    3
         90
                    1 1
                             male
                                       34
                                               0
                                                     0
                                                        26.6 S
```

```
##
         93
                    1 1
                              male
                                        36
                                                         26.3 S
##
    5
        272
                    0 1
                              male
                                        28
                                                0
                                                      0
                                                         25.9 S
                                                         26.6 S
##
    6
        274
                    0 1
                              male
                                        28
                                                0
                                                      0
                                                         47.1 S
##
    7
        281
                    0 1
                                        28
                                                0
                                                      0
                              male
##
    8
        282
                    0 1
                              male
                                        28
                                                0
                                                      0
                                                         52
                                                               S
    9
                                        28
                                                0
                                                      0
                                                         26.6 S
##
         81
                    1 1
                              male
## 10
        273
                    0 1
                                                         26
                              male
                                        28
                                                               S
## # ... with more rows
df%>%
  filter(id!=88)%>%
  select(Survived)%>%
  collect()%>%
  table()
## .
## 0 1
## 13 9
```

Using the majority vote this person will be classified as not survived since the non survived persons number (13) is larger than survived persons number (9), and hence this person is correctly classified.

The similarity based on the number of nearest neighbours

Using the same above steps but here with the function ml_approx_nearest_neighbors

```
id_input <- tested %>%
  filter(id==1)%>%
    pull(scaled) %>%
  unlist()
id_input
```

```
## [1] -1.0807606 1.7510638 -1.2607203 -0.9955360 -0.4719918 1.0315978 4.0387936 ## [8] 0.5297556 -0.4190325
```

These are the values of all the standardized vectors in the column scaled.

```
knn<-ml_approx_nearest_neighbors(
  model_lsh,
  trained,
  key = id_input,
  dist_col = 'dist_col',
  num_nearest_neighbors = 7
)
knn</pre>
```

```
## # Source: spark<?> [?? x 5]
##
        id Survived scaled
                               hash
                                           dist_col
##
     <int>
              <int> <list>
                               t>
                                              <dbl>
## 1
        27
                  1 <dbl [9]> <list [5]>
                                               1.86
## 2
        53
                  1 <dbl [9]> <list [5]>
                                               2.16
                  1 <dbl [9]> <list [5]>
                                               2.31
## 3
        11
       264
                  0 <dbl [9]> <list [5]>
                                               2.43
## 4
## 5
       283
                  0 <dbl [9]> <list [5]>
                                               2.66
## 6
                  1 <dbl [9]> <list [5]>
                                               2.66
        1
                  1 <dbl [9]> <list [5]>
                                               2.83
## 7
        55
```

```
n<-sdf_nrow(knn)</pre>
pred<-knn%>%select(Survived)%>%
  summarise(p=sum(Survived)/n)
pred
## # Source: spark<?> [?? x 1]
##
##
     <dbl>
## 1 0.714
To get the accuracy we use the following for loop, then we collect the result into R.
mypred<-numeric(0)</pre>
for (i in 1:sdf_nrow(tested)) {
  id_input <- tested %>%
  filter(id==i)%>%
    pull(scaled) %>%
  unlist()
knn<-ml_approx_nearest_neighbors(
  model_lsh,
  trained,
  key = id_input,
  dist_col = 'dist_col',
  num_nearest_neighbors = 7
n<-sdf_nrow(knn)</pre>
pred<-knn%>%select(Survived)%>%
  summarise(p=sum(Survived)/n)%>%
  collect()
mypred<-rbind(mypred,pred)</pre>
mypred
## # A tibble: 200 x 1
##
           p
      <dbl>
##
##
   1 0.714
## 2 1
## 3 1
## 4 0.857
## 5 1
## 6 1
## 7 1
## 8 1
## 9 1
## 10 1
## # ... with 190 more rows
Now we convert the probabilities into class labels then we cebind this data frame with the testing data, after
```

that we use the function **confusionmatrix** from **caret** package.

```
tested_R<-tested%>%
  select(Survived)%>%
  collect()
new<-cbind(mypred,tested_R)%>%
```

```
mutate(predicted=ifelse(p>0.5,"1","0"))
caret::confusionMatrix(as.factor(new$Survived),as.factor(new$predicted))
```

```
## Confusion Matrix and Statistics
##
##
             Reference
## Prediction 0 1
##
            0 80 41
            1 49 30
##
##
##
                  Accuracy: 0.55
##
                    95% CI: (0.4782, 0.6202)
##
       No Information Rate: 0.645
       P-Value [Acc > NIR] : 0.9977
##
##
##
                     Kappa: 0.0416
##
##
    Mcnemar's Test P-Value: 0.4606
##
##
               Sensitivity: 0.6202
##
               Specificity: 0.4225
##
            Pos Pred Value : 0.6612
##
            Neg Pred Value: 0.3797
##
                Prevalence: 0.6450
            Detection Rate: 0.4000
##
      Detection Prevalence : 0.6050
##
##
         Balanced Accuracy: 0.5213
##
##
          'Positive' Class : 0
##
```

The accuracy rate is smaller than the No information rate value 0.625 if we would have predicted all the cases as class label 0. this may due to the uncorrect number chosen for the nearest neighbours or the model is not suitable for this data.