

CAPSTONE PROJECT

MACHINE LEARNING ENGINEER NANODEGREE

SAMUEL BAAFI BOAKYE
SAMBETHSLIM@GMAIL.COM

JULY 2, 2018

PROJECT OVERVIEW

Most of the data we deal with from day to day is in the text form. It has become very imperative to find ways to extract information from language or text. Natural language processing is the field that is trying to apply machine learning and text feature extraction algorithms to be able to create translations from one language to another, sentiment analysis, speech recognition, question answering and many other applications yet to be discovered.

This project seeks to find similarities in questions from the Quora website. I was able to apply machine learning algorithm that could confidently determine a duplicate question from a non-duplicate question. An xgboost classifier algorithm was used and an Long short-term memory neural network was applied to see how it performs.

The dataset was obtained from the kaggle[1] with human generated labels. Although these labels are not 100% accurate as will be discussed later, it was assumed to be okay enough to create a model out of it.

As an avid user of the quora website and someone who has always been interested in working with text data I find it very unfortunate to find so many duplicated questions on the quora platform, which makes finding the right information very difficult. So I believe it's very important to find a way to solve this problem.

PROBLEM STATEMENT

Having duplicated questions can only make it difficult for users to find the answers they need. Some questions may have longer sentences, others may be shorter but could mean the same thing. Clearly to manually root out duplicated questions will be difficult. What Quora does to solve this problem is to use an ensemble machine learning algorithm called Random Forest which basically combines a number of Decision Trees

to build a stronger model. Questions are sentences and sentences are made up of words. Now how can you tell if question A is the same as question B? You may look at the length of the questions but some questions may be dissimilar in length but similar in meaning.


The plan of attack was as follows;

1. Get the right dataset from kaggle with real duplicated and unduplicated questions from Quora.
2. Preprocess the data by removing punctuations, white spaces, tokenization, normalization and removing stop words.
3. The next was to perform feature extraction by extracting some text metadata like question lengths and difference in lengths and also with the help of the `fuzzwuzzy[2]` library extraction some features like partial ratio, token set ratio and others.
4. Gain some insight into the data with new features to see how wrong or right the human generated labels are.
5. Gain another feature from the data using `word2vec` with the help of the Global Word Vectors Representation file[3] (`glove.6b.300d.txt`) and run its through some classifier algorithms and see how it performs.
6. Add more features using the Term Frequency - Inverse Document Frequency (TF_IDF) and run it through the same classifier algorithms and see how that performs too.
7. Lastly, the dataset will be run through a recurrent neural network, specifically an LSTM to see if it performs better there.

METRICS

Logarithmic loss, commonly known as log loss (similar to cross-entropy used in the neural network) measures performance of a classification model where the input predictions is a probability between 0 and 1. The aim of using a log loss metric is to have it reduced. Hence, a really good model has a log loss of 0. Compared to accuracy which takes the count of right predictions where the predictions equal the actual values, log loss takes into account the uncertainty of the prediction. For instance, accuracy has a yes and no nature so it predicts with certainty but log loss has doubts which makes it a

much better metric.



As can be seen above, when the model makes a prediction, if the prediction is wrong it is punished so as the predicted probability decreases, the log loss increases.

In binary classification ($M=2$), the formula equals:

$$-(y \log(p) + (1 - y) \log(1 - p))$$

For example, given a class label of 1 and a predicted probability of .25, using the formula above we can calculate the log loss:

$$-(1 \log(.25) + (1 - 1) \log(1 - .25))$$

$$-(\log(.25) + 0 \log(.75))$$

$$-\log(.25)$$

Similarly given a class label of 0 and a predicted probability of .25, we can calculate log loss as:

$$-(0 \log(.25) + (1 - 0) \log(1 - .25))$$

$$-(1 \log(.75))$$

$$-\log(.75)$$

ANALYSIS

DATA EXPLORATION

The dataset used has about 400000 rows with 6 columns. The 3 important columns in the dataset are question1, question2 and is_duplicate. question1 and question2 columns contain real questions extracted from the quora website. These questions are paired so the first row of questions in question1 and question2 are duplicates according to the is_duplicate label. The questions in the dataset contain some noise like unnecessary whitespaces. Since the is_duplicate column was human generated it's also likely to contain some noise but this project was run with the assumption that the human labelling of the dataset is 100% accurate. Some people who worked on this dataset took into consideration the columns quid1 and quid2 to run their model but I find that to be a little overreaching because I believe duplicates questions should be based of the content and meaning in the questions and not their ids.

The following are the field of the dataset:


- id : the row ids
- quid1 : corresponding to the question id in the question1 column (integer)
- quid2 : corresponding to the question id in the question2 column (integer)
- question1 : real questions from quora (string)
- question2 : real questions from quora (string)
- is_duplicate : binary values of 0s and 1s with 1 being that the question pairs are duplicates. (binary integers)

	id	qid1	qid2	question1	question2	is_duplicate
0	0	1	2	What is the step by step guide to invest in sh...	What is the step by step guide to invest in sh...	0
1	1	3	4	What is the story of Kohinoor (Koh-i-Noor) Dia...	What would happen if the Indian government sto...	0
2	2	5	6	How can I increase the speed of my internet co...	How can Internet speed be increased by hacking...	0
3	3	7	8	Why am I mentally very lonely? How can I solve...	Find the remainder when 23^{24} i...	0
4	4	9	10	Which one dissolve in water quickly sugar, salt...	Which fish would survive in salt water?	0

Sample view of the quora_question_pairs dataset

EXPLORATORY VISUALIZATION

From the table below it can be seen that lots for the questions are non-duplicates (255027) and few are duplicates (149263). The percentage of duplicated question pairs is about 36.9%.



Non-duplicates in blue and Duplicates in orange.

TEXT PREPROCESSING

Text preprocessing techniques were applied to the questions to prepare them for feature extraction. Five text preprocessing techniques were created and applied.

1. Noise was removed. In relation to the dataset, unnecessary whitespaces were considered as noise so they were removed.
2. Contractions were also replaced with their full words. For instance, when the function finds a word like 'didn't', it will be transformed to 'did not'.
3. Afterwards the questions were tokenized which means each question was separated into smaller components and transformed into a list of words.
4. At the normalization stage, a number of techniques were created and applied;
 - a. Words were lemmatized. Lemmatization is to convert words to their base dictionary form. For instance the word 'better' becomes 'good'.
 - b. Non-ascii characters were removed
 - c. Numbers in their symbolic forms were replaced with text.
 - d. All words were also converted to lowercase and punctuations removed.

5. The last process was to remove stop words from tokenized text.

Before the feature extraction stage the unwanted columns were removed from the dataset. The id, quid1 and quid2 columns were removed from the dataset as they were seen to be less significant.

FEATURE EXTRACTION/ENGINEERING

14 features were extracted from the preprocessed dataset. These are the features;


- Length of questions, to find the number of words in each question
- Difference in questions length, when question1 is subtracted from question2
- Common words, to find the intersection between questions with similar words
- Length of the characters in each question
- Fuzzywuzzy[2] features which checks string similarity in various ways
 - Ratio
 - Partial ratio
 - Token sort ratio
 - Token set ratio
 - Qratio
 - Wratio
 - Partial token sort ratio
 - Partial token set ratio

VISUALIZING EXTRACTED FEATURES

Here, I wanted to check the accuracy of human labels against the accuracy of extracted features to see what they think of a duplicated question.


To begin, some assumptions were made.

- Let's say similar question pairs have a difference in length below or equal to 5. So assuming the assumption is correct, we should have a lot of question pairs with difference in length below or equal to 5 labelled as duplicates.




Over 20000 question pairs labelled wrongly according to the assumption

- Let's assume similar question pairs have a partial ratio above the 75th percentile.



Over 80000 question pairs labelled correctly according to the assumption.


- Lets also assume similar question pairs have a token set ratio above the 75th percentile.



Over 60000 question pairs labelled wrongly according to the assumption.

WORD2VEC FEATURE EXTRACTION

There is a lot ambiguity in human language so in order for the computer to be able to understand words, the context and meaning of the words needs to be looked at. Words often have synonyms, multiple meanings and antonyms and can have different meaning with respect to the context in which they appear. Word to vectors technique comes into play as we need to represent the words in a way that makes sense to the computer. Here, words are placed in a plane of vectors. Words that normally appear in the same context appear close to each other on the vector plane.



An Intuitive Understanding of Word Embeddings: From Count Vectors to Word2Vec (Analytics Vidhya)

GloVe[3] which stands for Global Vectors for Word Representation is an unsupervised learning algorithm created by some Stanford researchers, has files with vector representations for words that was used to generate a word2vec feature. The file with 6B token, 400000 vocabularies and 300d vectors was used in generating the next feature which is the word similarity feature. This feature was obtained by checking each word in a question against each word in the paired question with similar question pairs having a score closer to one and vice versa.

TF-IDF FEATURE EXTRACTION

This feature was added later to improve accuracy of the model. The tf-idf is a numerical statistic that shows how important a word is to a text in a corpus. It is very effective to retrieve important information in a text. The tf-idf value increases proportionally to the number of times a word appears in the document and is offset by the frequency of the word in the corpus, which helps to adjust for the fact that some words appear more frequently in general. This means it is not affected by stop words in the text.

$$w_{i,j} = tf_{i,j} \times \log \left(\frac{N}{df_i} \right)$$

$tf_{i,j}$ = number of occurrences of i in j

df_i = number of documents containing i

N = total number of documents

Formulae to calculate the tf-idf of a text in a corpus

20 features were generated with the tf-idf vectorizer which was dimensionally reduced with the truncated singular value decomposition so the output can be used in the model.

BENCHMARK

The initial benchmark was based on a model[4] with this ("Spacy + TD-IDF + Siamese") structure with an accuracy of 0.78. Although I was more focused on attaining a log loss value below 0.4 with a model structure in the form Word2vec + TD-IDF and an LSTM recurrent neural network. So I wanted to see how my model structure will perform against the benchmark model structure with the same GloVe text file used.

METHODOLOGY & RESULTS

MODEL CREATION WITH METADATA + WORD2VEC FEATURES

The dataset was split into a train set and a validation set of 70% and 30% respectively. Log loss was used as the scorer function with a lesser value being better. Three algorithms were chosen to find the best one that works well with the processed data. Logistic regression algorithm, the random forest ensemble method and the xgboost algorithm which is known to perform very well in Kaggle datasets.

A pipeline was created that runs each model with scaled values of the train datasets with the corresponding labels. The models were trained in 10 folds and their mean score computed as their log loss values. Random forest performed poorly unsurprisingly because of the fact that it does not work well sparse datasets. Logistic regression algorithm did better but xgboost classifier came out on top with a log loss close to the benchmark model.

LR - Logistic Regression	RF - Random Forest	XG - XGBClassifier
ScaledLR: 0.532948		
ScaledRF: 0.978139		
ScaledXG: 0.491490		

The better model was selected and further tuned to gain a better log loss value. The xgboost classifier was tuned with the max_depth hyperparameter in a range from 3 to 9

and min_child_weight hyperparameter in a range from 1 to 5. Using the same scoring and 10 folds of the dataset these were the results:

Best: 0.467980 using {'max_depth': 8, 'min_child_weight': 1}

MODEL CREATION WITH METADATA + WORD2VEC + TF-IDF FEATURES

What if the model accuracy could be improved by adding more features. Tf-idf vectors with 20 features were added to the metadata and word2vec features and run through a pipeline with the same scoring and same number of folds. The three models were run and these were the results:

LR - Logistic Regression	RF - Random Forest	XG - XGBClassifier
ScaledLR: 0.520244 (0.002672)		
ScaledRF: 0.782523 (0.017344)		
ScaledXG: 0.480573 (0.002681)		

Clearly it can be seen there has been some improvement in all the models. Random forest still not performing well but has improved by much. Logistic Regression did not improve by much. Here again, the xgboost classifier has performs better than the rest. It has also improved a little. The best model was further tuned to gain better accuracy with the same configuration as talked about above. Here are the results;

Best: 0.447165 using {'max_depth': 8, 'min_child_weight': 1}

There was a lot of improvement, clearly reinforcing the importance of hyperparameter tuning. A lot can be done to improve the model. Maybe increasing the max_depth could give better results or adding more features to the processed data.

RECURRENT NEURAL NETWORK (LONG SHORT-TERM MEMORY (LSTM))

Some benefits of using a recurrent neural network is that it's very good for predicting sequential data. The objective of this study is to solve a problem which involves sequential data, which it a good model for the problem. There a number of recurrent neural networks and the one incorporated into this project is the LSTM which solves the recurrent neural network problem of the vanishing gradient. This is the structure of the LSTM implemented in this project.

DATA PREPARATION FOR LSTM

Text data from the dataset were tokenized with the text tokenization utility class from keras which vectorized the text corpus by giving each word in the corpus a unique index or integer. Next, each question in a column was converted into a sequence with a common padding of 40. Padding is done so each input to be fed into the neural network has equal length. It is assumed 40 is a good size and none of the tokenized questions has a length more than 40 and because the text corpus has different lengths, padding becomes very useful here.

Since, an embedding layer will be used in the neural network, an extract of the word embeddings from the GloVe text data was used. 400000 word vectors were extracted and used to create an embedding matrix of shape (x, y), where x is the total number of unique words tokenized from the text corpus and y is 300.

LSTM MODEL

Input tensors with shape of (40,) because of the padding length of the text data was fitted into an embedding layer with an input dimension of length of word_index (i.e. the total number of unique words tokenized from the text corpus) + 1 including values from 0 with an output dimension of 300 because the GloVe text data has a dimension of 300, using weights from the embedding matrix created. The embedding layer has a parameter called, trainable which was set to false because I did not want to update the weights on the learned words. The embedding layer was fitted into a time distributed dense layer with units of 300 and a relu activation function. The time distributed dense layer was seeded into a lambda layer to return the sum of the inputs horizontally across columns.

This structure was used for both tokenized text corpus from from the dataset of columns question1 and question2.

Another structure was created with a similar input and embedding layer but this time the embedding layer was not modeled with the embedding matrix. A dropout layer was added to the input to drop out 30% of the input to prevent overfitting during training. This was seeded into an LSTM layer with 300 units, a dropout of 30%, a recurrent dropout of 30% and the return_sequence parameter set to true so the full sequence length will be returned. Lastly, the LSTM layer was passed through a lambda layer similar as the one above.

This structure was used for both tokenized text corpus from from the dataset of columns question1 and question2. So in total, 2 pairs of models were created. These 4 models were concatenated to return a single tensor from the concatenation of all inputs. The concatenation output were normalized with a BatchNormalization layer. The model is then inputted into a dense layer of 300 units, a parametric rectified linear unit (PReLU) layer which is an advanced activation layer to help improve the accuracy of the model.

This is further run through a dropout layer of 30% and a batchnormalization layer applied again. This same structure goes on for two more times and seeded into an output layer.

The output layer is a dense layer of 1 unit and run through an a sigmoid activation layer which squash the model predictions to either 0 or 1. This was the model and implementation of an LSTM recurrent neural network.

LSTM MODEL RESULTS

A binary crossentropy loss similar to the log loss, the adam optimizer and an accuracy metrics was used to compile the model. The input data and target data were fit with a batch size of 384 with 15 epochs with a validation sample of 1%.

These were the results;

```
363648/363861 [=====>.] - ETA: 0s - loss: 0.1688 -  
acc: 0.9289  
Epoch 00014: val_acc improved from 0.81889 to 0.82050, saving model to weight.h5  
363861/363861 [=====] - 334s 919us/step - loss:  
0.1688 - acc: 0.9289 - val_loss: 0.5807 - val_acc: 0.8205
```

Here a loss of 0.1688 and a validation loss of 0.5807. There may be some overfitting here. This model can be improved by adding a convolution layer and adjusting the dropout rates.

CONCLUSION

In this project, I have shown how to work on the quora duplicate questions problem with two approaches. One approach was to use machine learning algorithms like logistic regression, an ensemble method and xgboost. To be able able to use these algorithms, a preprocessed dataset was used and the xgboost classifier came out as the better model. The improvement with this approach is either to increase the max_depth parameter for the xgboost to get a better accuracy or to extract more important features from the dataset. The second approach was to use a recurrent neural network, an LSTM to be specific to solve the problem. The text data had to be tokenized and padded to be of same length. This was then run into the LSTM architecture and the results were not as good as the first approach. To improve the LSTM model, more layers will have to be added, maybe a convolutional model could be added and tweaking the dropout rates could also improve the model and prevent overfitting.

REFERENCES

[1] <https://www.kaggle.com/c/quora-question-pairs>

[2] <http://chairnerd.seatgeek.com/fuzzywuzzy-fuzzy-string-matching-in-python/>

[3] <https://nlp.stanford.edu/projects/glove/>

[4] <https://github.com/bradleypallen/keras-quora-question-pairs/blob/master/>

<http://www.erogol.com/duplicate-question-detection-deep-learning/>

<https://machinelearningmastery.com/use-word-embedding-layers-deep-learning-keras/>

https://github.com/abhishekrthakur/is_that_a_duplicate_quora_question