

---

# **Data Mining**

## **Association Analysis: Basic Concepts and Algorithms**

# Association Rule Mining

- Given a set of transactions, find rules that will predict the occurrence of an item based on the occurrences of other items in the transaction

## Market-Basket transactions

<i>TID</i>	<i>Items</i>
1	Bread, Milk
2	Bread, Diaper, Beer, Eggs
3	Milk, Diaper, Beer, Coke
4	Bread, Milk, Diaper, Beer
5	Bread, Milk, Diaper, Coke

## Example of Association Rules

$\{\text{Diaper}\} \rightarrow \{\text{Beer}\},$   
 $\{\text{Milk, Bread}\} \rightarrow \{\text{Eggs, Coke}\},$   
 $\{\text{Beer, Bread}\} \rightarrow \{\text{Milk}\},$

Implication means co-occurrence,  
not causality!

# Definition: Frequent Itemset

## □ Itemset

- A collection of one or more items
  - ◆ Example: {Milk, Bread, Diaper}
- k-itemset
  - ◆ An itemset that contains k items

## □ Support count ( $\sigma$ )

- Frequency of occurrence of an itemset
- E.g.  $\sigma(\{\text{Milk, Bread, Diaper}\}) = 2$

## □ Support

- Fraction of transactions that contain an itemset
- E.g.  $s(\{\text{Milk, Bread, Diaper}\}) = 2/5$

## □ Frequent Itemset

- An itemset whose support is greater than or equal to a *minsup* threshold

<i>TID</i>	<i>Items</i>
1	Bread, Milk
2	Bread, Diaper, Beer, Eggs
3	Milk, Diaper, Beer, Coke
4	Bread, Milk, Diaper, Beer
5	Bread, Milk, Diaper, Coke

# Definition: Association Rule

## □ Association Rule

- An implication expression of the form  $X \rightarrow Y$ , where  $X$  and  $Y$  are itemsets
- Example:  
 $\{\text{Milk, Diaper}\} \rightarrow \{\text{Beer}\}$

## □ Rule Evaluation Metrics

- Support (s)
  - ◆ Fraction of transactions that contain both  $X$  and  $Y$
- Confidence (c)
  - ◆ Measures how often items in  $Y$  appear in transactions that contain  $X$

<i>TID</i>	<i>Items</i>
1	Bread, Milk
2	Bread, Diaper, Beer, Eggs
3	Milk, Diaper, Beer, Coke
4	Bread, Milk, Diaper, Beer
5	Bread, Milk, Diaper, Coke

Example:

$\{\text{Milk, Diaper}\} \Rightarrow \text{Beer}$

$$s = \frac{\sigma(\text{Milk, Diaper, Beer})}{|T|} = \frac{2}{5} = 0.4$$

$$c = \frac{\sigma(\text{Milk, Diaper, Beer})}{\sigma(\text{Milk, Diaper})} = \frac{2}{3} = 0.67$$

# Association Rule Mining Task

---

- Given a set of transactions  $T$ , the goal of association rule mining is to find all rules having
    - support  $\geq \textit{minsup}$  threshold
    - confidence  $\geq \textit{minconf}$  threshold
  
  - Brute-force approach:
    - List all possible association rules
    - Compute the support and confidence for each rule
    - Prune rules that fail the *minsup* and *minconf* thresholds
- ⇒ **Computationally prohibitive!**

# Mining Association Rules

<i>TID</i>	<i>Items</i>
1	Bread, Milk
2	Bread, Diaper, Beer, Eggs
3	Milk, Diaper, Beer, Coke
4	Bread, Milk, Diaper, Beer
5	Bread, Milk, Diaper, Coke

## Example of Rules:

$\{\text{Milk, Diaper}\} \rightarrow \{\text{Beer}\}$  ( $s=0.4, c=0.67$ )  
 $\{\text{Milk, Beer}\} \rightarrow \{\text{Diaper}\}$  ( $s=0.4, c=1.0$ )  
 $\{\text{Diaper, Beer}\} \rightarrow \{\text{Milk}\}$  ( $s=0.4, c=0.67$ )  
 $\{\text{Beer}\} \rightarrow \{\text{Milk, Diaper}\}$  ( $s=0.4, c=0.67$ )  
 $\{\text{Diaper}\} \rightarrow \{\text{Milk, Beer}\}$  ( $s=0.4, c=0.5$ )  
 $\{\text{Milk}\} \rightarrow \{\text{Diaper, Beer}\}$  ( $s=0.4, c=0.5$ )

## Observations:

- All the above rules are binary partitions of the same itemset:  
 $\{\text{Milk, Diaper, Beer}\}$
- Rules originating from the same itemset have identical support but can have different confidence
- Thus, we may decouple the support and confidence requirements

# Mining Association Rules

---

- Two-step approach:

- 1. Frequent Itemset Generation


- Generate all itemsets whose support  $\geq$  minsup

- 2. Rule Generation

- Generate high confidence rules from each frequent itemset, where each rule is a binary partitioning of a frequent itemset

- Frequent itemset generation is still computationally expensive

# Frequent Itemset Generation




**Given  $d$  items, there are  $2^d$  possible candidate itemsets**



# Frequent Itemset Generation

## □ Brute-force approach:


- Each itemset in the lattice is a **candidate** frequent itemset
- Count the support of each candidate by scanning the database



- Match each transaction against every candidate
- Complexity  $\sim O(NMw) \Rightarrow$  **Expensive since  $M = 2^d$  !!!**

# Computational Complexity

- Given  $d$  unique items:
  - Total number of itemsets =  $2^d$
  - Total number of possible association rules:



$$R = \sum_{k=1}^{d-1} \left[ \binom{d}{k} \times \sum_{j=1}^{d-k} \binom{d-k}{j} \right]$$
$$= 3^d - 2^{d+1} + 1$$

**If  $d=6$ ,  $R = 602$  rules**

# Frequent Itemset Generation Strategies

---

- Reduce the **number of candidates** (M)
  - Complete search:  $M=2^d$
  - Use pruning techniques to reduce M
- Reduce the **number of transactions** (N)
  - Reduce size of N as the size of itemset increases
  - Used by DHP and vertical-based mining algorithms
- Reduce the **number of comparisons** (NM)
  - Use efficient data structures to store the candidates or transactions
  - No need to match every candidate against every transaction

# Reducing Number of Candidates

---

## □ Apriori principle:


- If an itemset is frequent, then all of its subsets must also be frequent

## □ Apriori principle holds due to the following property of the support measure:

$$\forall X, Y : (X \subseteq Y) \Rightarrow s(X) \geq s(Y)$$

- Support of an itemset never exceeds the support of its subsets
- This is known as the **anti-monotone** property of support

# Illustrating Apriori Principle



# Illustrating Apriori Principle

Item	Count
Bread	4
Coke	2
Milk	4
Beer	3
Diaper	4
Eggs	1

Items (1-itemsets)



Itemset	Count
{Bread,Milk}	3
{Bread,Beer}	2
{Bread,Diaper}	3
{Milk,Beer}	2
{Milk,Diaper}	3
{Beer,Diaper}	3

Pairs (2-itemsets)

(No need to generate candidates involving Coke or Eggs)

Minimum Support = 3

If every subset is considered,  
 ${}^6C_1 + {}^6C_2 + {}^6C_3 = 41$   
With support-based pruning,  
 $6 + 6 + 1 = 13$



Triplets (3-itemsets)

Itemset	Count
{Bread,Milk,Diaper}	3



# Apriori Algorithm

---


## □ Method:

- Let  $k=1$
- Generate frequent itemsets of length 1
- Repeat until no new frequent itemsets are identified
  - ◆ Generate length  $(k+1)$  candidate itemsets from length  $k$  frequent itemsets
  - ◆ Prune candidate itemsets containing subsets of length  $k$  that are infrequent
  - ◆ Count the support of each candidate by scanning the DB
  - ◆ Eliminate candidates that are infrequent, leaving only those that are frequent

# Reducing Number of Comparisons

## □ Candidate counting:

- Scan the database of transactions to determine the support of each candidate itemset
- To reduce the number of comparisons, store the candidates in a hash structure
  - ◆ Instead of matching each transaction against every candidate, match it against candidates contained in the hashed buckets







# Generate Hash Tree

Suppose you have 15 candidate itemsets of length 3:


{1 4 5}, {1 2 4}, {4 5 7}, {1 2 5}, {4 5 8}, {1 5 9}, {1 3 6}, {2 3 4}, {5 6 7}, {3 4 5},  
{3 5 6}, {3 5 7}, {6 8 9}, {3 6 7}, {3 6 8}

You need:


- Hash function
- Max leaf size: max number of itemsets stored in a leaf node (if number of candidate itemsets exceeds max leaf size, split the node)




# Association Rule Discovery: Hash tree



# Association Rule Discovery: Hash tree




# Association Rule Discovery: Hash tree




# Subset Operation


Given a transaction  $t$ , what are the possible subsets of size 3?



# Subset Operation Using Hash Tree



# Subset Operation Using Hash Tree







# Factors Affecting Complexity

---

- Choice of minimum support threshold
  - lowering support threshold results in more frequent itemsets
  - this may increase number of candidates and max length of frequent itemsets
- Dimensionality (number of items) of the data set
  - more space is needed to store support count of each item
  - if number of frequent items also increases, both computation and I/O costs may also increase
- Size of database
  - since Apriori makes multiple passes, run time of algorithm may increase with number of transactions
- Average transaction width
  - transaction width increases with denser data sets
  - This may increase max length of frequent itemsets and traversals of hash tree (number of subsets in a transaction increases with its width)

# Compact Representation of Frequent Itemsets

- Some itemsets are redundant because they have identical support as their supersets


TID	A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	A6	A7	A8	A9	A10	B1	B2	B3	B4	B5	B6	B7	B8	B9	B10	C1	C2	C3	C4	C5	C6	C7	C8	C9	C10
1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
3	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
4	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
5	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
9	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
10	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
11	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
12	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
13	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
14	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
15	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1

- Number of frequent itemsets =  $3 \times \sum_{k=1}^{10} \binom{10}{k}$

- Need a compact representation

# Maximal Frequent Itemset

An itemset is maximal frequent if none of its immediate supersets is frequent



# Closed Itemset

- An itemset is closed if none of its immediate supersets has the same support as the itemset


TID	Items
1	{A,B}
2	{B,C,D}
3	{A,B,C,D}
4	{A,B,D}
5	{A,B,C,D}

Itemset	Support
{A}	4
{B}	5
{C}	3
{D}	4
{A,B}	4
{A,C}	2
{A,D}	3
{B,C}	3
{B,D}	4
{C,D}	3

Itemset	Support
{A,B,C}	2
{A,B,D}	3
{A,C,D}	2
{B,C,D}	3
{A,B,C,D}	2


# Maximal vs Closed Itemsets

TID	Items
1	ABC
2	ABCD
3	BCE
4	ACDE
5	DE




# Maximal vs Closed Frequent Itemsets

Minimum support = 2



# Maximal vs Closed Itemsets


---




# Alternative Methods for Frequent Itemset Generation

## □ Traversal of Itemset Lattice


- General-to-specific vs Specific-to-general



(a) General-to-specific



(b) Specific-to-general




(c) Bidirectional




# Alternative Methods for Frequent Itemset Generation

## □ Traversal of Itemset Lattice

### — Equivalent Classes



(a) Prefix tree




(b) Suffix tree


# Alternative Methods for Frequent Itemset Generation

## □ Traversal of Itemset Lattice

- Breadth-first vs Depth-first



(a) Breadth first



(b) Depth first

# Alternative Methods for Frequent Itemset Generation

## □ Representation of Database

- horizontal vs vertical data layout

Horizontal  
Data Layout

TID	Items
1	A,B,E
2	B,C,D
3	C,E
4	A,C,D
5	A,B,C,D
6	A,E
7	A,B
8	A,B,C
9	A,C,D
10	B

Vertical Data Layout

A	B	C	D	E
1	1	2	2	1
4	2	3	4	3
5	5	4	5	6
6	7	8	9	
7	8	9		
8	10			
9				

# ECLAT

- For each item, store a list of transaction ids (tids)

Horizontal  
Data Layout

TID	Items
1	A,B,E
2	B,C,D
3	C,E
4	A,C,D
5	A,B,C,D
6	A,E
7	A,B
8	A,B,C
9	A,C,D
10	B

Vertical Data Layout


A	B	C	D	E
1	1	2	2	1
4	2	3	4	3
5	5	4	5	6
6	7	8	9	
7	8	9		
8	10			
9				



**TID-list**

# ECLAT

- Determine support of any k-itemset by intersecting tid-lists of two of its (k-1) subsets.



- 3 traversal approaches:
  - top-down, bottom-up and hybrid
- Advantage: very fast support counting
- Disadvantage: intermediate tid-lists may become too large for memory

# Rule Generation

- Given a frequent itemset  $L$ , find all non-empty subsets  $f \subset L$  such that  $f \rightarrow L - f$  satisfies the minimum confidence requirement

- If  $\{A,B,C,D\}$  is a frequent itemset, candidate rules:

$ABC \rightarrow D,$	$ABD \rightarrow C,$	$ACD \rightarrow B,$	$BCD \rightarrow A,$
$A \rightarrow BCD,$	$B \rightarrow ACD,$	$C \rightarrow ABD,$	$D \rightarrow ABC$
$AB \rightarrow CD,$	$AC \rightarrow BD,$	$AD \rightarrow BC,$	$BC \rightarrow AD,$
$BD \rightarrow AC,$	$CD \rightarrow AB,$		

- If  $|L| = k$ , then there are  $2^k - 2$  candidate association rules (ignoring  $L \rightarrow \emptyset$  and  $\emptyset \rightarrow L$ )

# Rule Generation

---

## □ How to efficiently generate rules from frequent itemsets?

- In general, confidence does not have an anti-monotone property

$c(ABC \rightarrow D)$  can be larger or smaller than  $c(AB \rightarrow D)$


- But confidence of rules generated from the same itemset has an anti-monotone property
- e.g.,  $L = \{A, B, C, D\}$ :

$$c(ABC \rightarrow D) \geq c(AB \rightarrow CD) \geq c(A \rightarrow BCD)$$

- ◆ Confidence is anti-monotone w.r.t. number of items on the RHS of the rule

# Rule Generation for Apriori Algorithm


## Lattice of rules





# Rule Generation for Apriori Algorithm


- Candidate rule is generated by merging two rules that share the same prefix in the rule consequent
- $\text{join}(\text{CD} \Rightarrow \text{AB}, \text{BD} \Rightarrow \text{AC})$  would produce the candidate rule  $\text{D} \Rightarrow \text{ABC}$
- Prune rule  $\text{D} \Rightarrow \text{ABC}$  if its subset  $\text{AD} \Rightarrow \text{BC}$  does not have high confidence



# Effect of Support Distribution

- Many real data sets have skewed support distribution

**Support  
distribution of  
a retail data set**



# Effect of Support Distribution

---

- How to set the appropriate *minsup* threshold?
  - If *minsup* is set too high, we could miss itemsets involving interesting rare items (e.g., expensive products)
  - If *minsup* is set too low, it is computationally expensive and the number of itemsets is very large
- Using a single minimum support threshold may not be effective


# Multiple Minimum Support

---

- How to apply multiple minimum supports?
  - $MS(i)$ : minimum support for item  $i$
  - e.g.:  $MS(\text{Milk})=5\%$ ,  $MS(\text{Coke}) = 3\%$ ,  
 $MS(\text{Broccoli})=0.1\%$ ,  $MS(\text{Salmon})=0.5\%$
  - $MS(\{\text{Milk}, \text{Broccoli}\}) = \min (MS(\text{Milk}), MS(\text{Broccoli}))$   
 $= 0.1\%$
  - Challenge: Support is no longer anti-monotone
    - ◆ Suppose:  $\text{Support}(\text{Milk}, \text{Coke}) = 1.5\%$  and  
 $\text{Support}(\text{Milk}, \text{Coke}, \text{Broccoli}) = 0.5\%$
    - ◆  $\{\text{Milk}, \text{Coke}\}$  is infrequent but  $\{\text{Milk}, \text{Coke}, \text{Broccoli}\}$  is frequent


# Multiple Minimum Support

Item	MS(I)	Sup(I)
A	0.10%	0.25%
B	0.20%	0.26%
C	0.30%	0.29%
D	0.50%	0.05%
E	3%	4.20%



# Multiple Minimum Support

Item	MS(I)	Sup(I)
A	0.10%	0.25%
B	0.20%	0.26%
C	0.30%	0.29%
D	0.50%	0.05%
E	3%	4.20%



# Multiple Minimum Support (Liu 1999)

---

- Order the items according to their minimum support (in ascending order)
  - e.g.:     $MS(\text{Milk})=5\%$ ,                       $MS(\text{Coke}) = 3\%$ ,  
              $MS(\text{Broccoli})=0.1\%$ ,         $MS(\text{Salmon})=0.5\%$
  - Ordering: Broccoli, Salmon, Coke, Milk
  
- Need to modify Apriori such that:
  - $L_1$  : set of frequent items
  - $F_1$  : set of items whose support is  $\geq MS(1)$   
             where  $MS(1)$  is  $\min_i( MS(i) )$
  - $C_2$  : candidate itemsets of size 2 is generated from  $F_1$   
             instead of  $L_1$

# Multiple Minimum Support (Liu 1999)

---

## □ Modifications to Apriori:

- In traditional Apriori,
  - ◆ A candidate  $(k+1)$ -itemset is generated by merging two frequent itemsets of size  $k$
  - ◆ The candidate is pruned if it contains any infrequent subsets of size  $k$
- Pruning step has to be modified:
  - ◆ Prune only if subset contains the first item
  - ◆ e.g.: Candidate={Broccoli, Coke, Milk} (ordered according to minimum support)
  - ◆ {Broccoli, Coke} and {Broccoli, Milk} are frequent but {Coke, Milk} is infrequent
    - Candidate is not pruned because {Coke, Milk} does not contain the first item, i.e., Broccoli.




# Pattern Evaluation

---

- Association rule algorithms tend to produce too many rules
  - many of them are uninteresting or redundant
  - Redundant if  $\{A,B,C\} \rightarrow \{D\}$  and  $\{A,B\} \rightarrow \{D\}$  have same support & confidence
- Interestingness measures can be used to prune/rank the derived patterns
- In the original formulation of association rules, support & confidence are the only measures used

# Application of Interestingness Measure



# Computing Interestingness Measure

- Given a rule  $X \rightarrow Y$ , information needed to compute rule interestingness can be obtained from a contingency table

Contingency table for  $X \rightarrow Y$

	Y	$\overline{Y}$	
X	$f_{11}$	$f_{10}$	$f_{1+}$
$\overline{X}$	$f_{01}$	$f_{00}$	$f_{0+}$
	$f_{+1}$	$f_{+0}$	$ T $

$f_{11}$ : support of X and Y

$f_{10}$ : support of  $\underline{X}$  and  $\overline{Y}$

$f_{01}$ : support of  $\overline{X}$  and  $\underline{Y}$

$f_{00}$ : support of  $\overline{X}$  and  $\overline{Y}$

Used to define various measures

- support, confidence, lift, Gini, J-measure, etc.

# Drawback of Confidence

	Coffee	<u>Coffee</u>	
Tea	15	5	20
<u>Tea</u>	75	5	80
	90	10	100

Association Rule: Tea  $\rightarrow$  Coffee

Confidence =  $P(\text{Coffee}|\text{Tea}) = 0.75$

but  $P(\text{Coffee}) = 0.9$

$\Rightarrow$  Although confidence is high, rule is misleading

$\Rightarrow P(\text{Coffee}|\overline{\text{Tea}}) = 0.9375$

# Statistical Independence

---

- Population of 1000 students
  - 600 students know how to swim (S)
  - 700 students know how to bike (B)
  - 420 students know how to swim and bike (S,B)
  
  - $P(S \cap B) = 420/1000 = 0.42$
  - $P(S) \times P(B) = 0.6 \times 0.7 = 0.42$
  
  - $P(S \cap B) = P(S) \times P(B) \Rightarrow$  Statistical independence
  - $P(S \cap B) > P(S) \times P(B) \Rightarrow$  Positively correlated
  - $P(S \cap B) < P(S) \times P(B) \Rightarrow$  Negatively correlated

# Statistical-based Measures

---

- Measures that take into account statistical dependence

$$\textit{Lift} = \frac{P(Y | X)}{P(Y)}$$

$$\textit{Interest} = \frac{P(X, Y)}{P(X)P(Y)}$$

$$PS = P(X, Y) - P(X)P(Y)$$

$$\phi - \textit{coefficient} = \frac{P(X, Y) - P(X)P(Y)}{\sqrt{P(X)[1 - P(X)]P(Y)[1 - P(Y)]}}$$

# Example: Lift/Interest

	Coffee	<u>Coffee</u>	
Tea	15	5	20
<u>Tea</u>	75	5	80
	90	10	100

Association Rule: Tea  $\rightarrow$  Coffee

Confidence =  $P(\text{Coffee}|\text{Tea}) = 0.75$

but  $P(\text{Coffee}) = 0.9$

$\Rightarrow \text{Lift} = 0.75/0.9 = 0.8333 (< 1, \text{ therefore is negatively associated})$

# Drawback of Lift & Interest

	Y	$\bar{Y}$	
X	10	0	10
$\bar{X}$	0	90	90
	10	90	100

$$Lift = \frac{0.1}{(0.1)(0.1)} = 10$$

	Y	$\bar{Y}$	
X	90	0	90
$\bar{X}$	0	10	10
	90	10	100

$$Lift = \frac{0.9}{(0.9)(0.9)} = 1.11$$

**Statistical independence:**

**If  $P(X,Y)=P(X)P(Y) \Rightarrow Lift = 1$**



There are lots of measures proposed in the literature

Some measures are good for certain applications, but not for others

What criteria should we use to determine whether a measure is good or bad?

What about Apriori-style support based pruning? How does it affect these measures?

#	Measure	Formula
1	$\phi$ -coefficient	$\frac{P(A,B) - P(A)P(B)}{\sqrt{P(A)P(B)(1-P(A))(1-P(B))}}$
2	Goodman-Kruskal's ( $\lambda$ )	$\frac{\sum_j \max_k P(A_j, B_k) + \sum_k \max_j P(A_j, B_k) - \max_j P(A_j) - \max_k P(B_k)}{2 - \max_j P(A_j) - \max_k P(B_k)}$
3	Odds ratio ( $\alpha$ )	$\frac{P(A,B)P(\bar{A},\bar{B})}{P(A,\bar{B})P(\bar{A},B)}$
4	Yule's $Q$	$\frac{P(A,B)P(\bar{A}\bar{B}) - P(A,\bar{B})P(\bar{A},B)}{P(A,B)P(\bar{A}\bar{B}) + P(A,\bar{B})P(\bar{A},B)} = \frac{\alpha - 1}{\alpha + 1}$
5	Yule's $Y$	$\frac{\sqrt{P(A,B)P(\bar{A}\bar{B})} - \sqrt{P(A,\bar{B})P(\bar{A},B)}}{\sqrt{P(A,B)P(\bar{A}\bar{B})} + \sqrt{P(A,\bar{B})P(\bar{A},B)}} = \frac{\sqrt{\alpha} - 1}{\sqrt{\alpha} + 1}$
6	Kappa ( $\kappa$ )	$\frac{P(A,B) + P(\bar{A},\bar{B}) - P(A)P(B) - P(\bar{A})P(\bar{B})}{1 - P(A)P(B) - P(\bar{A})P(\bar{B})}$
7	Mutual Information ( $M$ )	$\frac{\sum_i \sum_j P(A_i, B_j) \log \frac{P(A_i, B_j)}{P(A_i)P(B_j)}}{\min(-\sum_i P(A_i) \log P(A_i), -\sum_j P(B_j) \log P(B_j))}$
8	J-Measure ( $J$ )	$\max \left( P(A, B) \log \left( \frac{P(B A)}{P(B)} \right) + P(\bar{A}\bar{B}) \log \left( \frac{P(\bar{B} \bar{A})}{P(\bar{B})} \right), \right. \\ \left. P(A, B) \log \left( \frac{P(A B)}{P(A)} \right) + P(\bar{A}\bar{B}) \log \left( \frac{P(\bar{A} \bar{B})}{P(\bar{A})} \right) \right)$
9	Gini index ( $G$ )	$\max \left( P(A)[P(B A)^2 + P(\bar{B} A)^2] + P(\bar{A})[P(B \bar{A})^2 + P(\bar{B} \bar{A})^2] \right. \\ \left. - P(B)^2 - P(\bar{B})^2, \right. \\ \left. P(B)[P(A B)^2 + P(\bar{A} B)^2] + P(\bar{B})[P(A \bar{B})^2 + P(\bar{A} \bar{B})^2] \right. \\ \left. - P(A)^2 - P(\bar{A})^2 \right)$
10	Support ( $s$ )	$P(A, B)$
11	Confidence ( $c$ )	$\max(P(B A), P(A B))$
12	Laplace ( $L$ )	$\max \left( \frac{NP(A,B)+1}{NP(A)+2}, \frac{NP(A,B)+1}{NP(B)+2} \right)$
13	Conviction ( $V$ )	$\max \left( \frac{P(A)P(\bar{B})}{P(\bar{A}B)}, \frac{P(B)P(\bar{A})}{P(\bar{B}A)} \right)$
14	Interest ( $I$ )	$\frac{P(A,B)}{P(A)P(B)}$
15	cosine ( $IS$ )	$\frac{P(A,B)}{\sqrt{P(A)P(B)}}$
16	Piatetsky-Shapiro's ( $PS$ )	$P(A, B) - P(A)P(B)$
17	Certainty factor ( $F$ )	$\max \left( \frac{P(B A) - P(B)}{1 - P(B)}, \frac{P(A B) - P(A)}{1 - P(A)} \right)$
18	Added Value ( $AV$ )	$\max(P(B A) - P(B), P(A B) - P(A))$
19	Collective strength ( $S$ )	$\frac{P(A,B) + P(\bar{A}\bar{B})}{P(A)P(B) + P(\bar{A})P(\bar{B})} \times \frac{1 - P(A)P(B) - P(\bar{A})P(\bar{B})}{1 - P(A,B) - P(\bar{A}\bar{B})}$
20	Jaccard ( $\zeta$ )	$\frac{P(A,B)}{P(A) + P(B) - P(A,B)}$
21	Klosgen ( $K$ )	$\sqrt{P(A, B)} \max(P(B A) - P(B), P(A B) - P(A))$

# Properties of A Good Measure

---

## □ Piatetsky-Shapiro:

3 properties a good measure  $M$  must satisfy:

- $M(A,B) = 0$  if  $A$  and  $B$  are statistically independent
- $M(A,B)$  increase monotonically with  $P(A,B)$  when  $P(A)$  and  $P(B)$  remain unchanged
- $M(A,B)$  decreases monotonically with  $P(A)$  [or  $P(B)$ ] when  $P(A,B)$  and  $P(B)$  [or  $P(A)$ ] remain unchanged

# Comparing Different Measures

10 examples of  
contingency tables:


Example	$f_{11}$	$f_{10}$	$f_{01}$	$f_{00}$
E1	8123	83	424	1370
E2	8330	2	622	1046
E3	9481	94	127	298
E4	3954	3080	5	2961
E5	2886	1363	1320	4431
E6	1500	2000	500	6000
E7	4000	2000	1000	3000
E8	4000	2000	2000	2000
E9	1720	7121	5	1154
E10	61	2483	4	7452

Rankings of contingency tables  
using various measures:

#	$\phi$	$\lambda$	$\alpha$	$Q$	$Y$	$\kappa$	$M$	$J$	$G$	$s$	$c$	$L$	$V$	$I$	$IS$	$PS$	$F$	$AV$	$S$	$\zeta$	$K$
E1	1	1	3	3	3	1	2	2	1	3	5	5	4	6	2	2	4	6	1	2	5
E2	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	3	2	2	1	1	1	8	3	5	1	8	2	3	6
E3	3	3	4	4	4	3	3	8	7	1	4	4	6	10	1	8	6	10	3	1	10
E4	4	7	2	2	2	5	4	1	3	6	2	2	2	4	4	1	2	3	4	5	1
E5	5	4	8	8	8	4	7	5	4	7	9	9	9	3	6	3	9	4	5	6	3
E6	6	6	7	7	7	7	6	4	6	9	8	8	7	2	8	6	7	2	7	8	2
E7	7	5	9	9	9	6	8	6	5	4	7	7	8	5	5	4	8	5	6	4	4
E8	8	9	10	10	10	8	10	10	8	4	10	10	10	9	7	7	10	9	8	7	9
E9	9	9	5	5	5	9	9	7	9	8	3	3	3	7	9	9	3	7	9	9	8
E10	10	8	6	6	6	10	5	9	10	10	6	6	5	1	10	10	5	1	10	10	7

# Property under Variable Permutation

	<b>B</b>	$\overline{\text{B}}$
<b>A</b>	p	q
$\overline{\text{A}}$	r	s



	<b>A</b>	$\overline{\text{A}}$
<b>B</b>	p	r
$\overline{\text{B}}$	q	s

Does  $M(\text{A}, \text{B}) = M(\text{B}, \text{A})$ ?

Symmetric measures:

- support, lift, collective strength, cosine, Jaccard, etc

Asymmetric measures:

- confidence, conviction, Laplace, J-measure, etc

# Property under Row/Column Scaling

Grade-Gender Example (Mosteller, 1968):

	Male	Female	
High	2	3	5
Low	1	4	5
	3	7	10

	Male	Female	
High	4	30	34
Low	2	40	42
	6	70	76

↓  
2x

↓  
10x

Mosteller:

Underlying association should be independent of the relative number of male and female students in the samples

# Different Measures have Different Properties

Symbol	Measure	Range	P1	P2	P3	O1	O2	O3	O3'	O4
$\Phi$	Correlation	-1 ... 0 ... 1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
$\lambda$	Lambda	0 ... 1	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No*	Yes	No
$\alpha$	Odds ratio	0 ... 1 ... $\infty$	Yes*	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes*	Yes	No
Q	Yule's Q	-1 ... 0 ... 1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Y	Yule's Y	-1 ... 0 ... 1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
$\kappa$	Cohen's	-1 ... 0 ... 1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
M	Mutual Information	0 ... 1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No*	Yes	No
J	J-Measure	0 ... 1	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
G	Gini Index	0 ... 1	Yes	No	No	No	No	No*	Yes	No
s	Support	0 ... 1	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No
c	Confidence	0 ... 1	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
L	Laplace	0 ... 1	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No
V	Conviction	0.5 ... 1 ... $\infty$	No	Yes	No	Yes**	No	No	Yes	No
I	Interest	0 ... 1 ... $\infty$	Yes*	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
IS	IS (cosine)	0 .. 1	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
PS	Platetsky-Shapiro's	-0.25 ... 0 ... 0.25	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
F	Certainty factor	-1 ... 0 ... 1	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No
AV	Added value	0.5 ... 1 ... 1	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
S	Collective strength	0 ... 1 ... $\infty$	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes*	Yes	No
$\zeta$	Jaccard	0 .. 1	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
K	Klosgen's	$\left(\sqrt{\frac{2}{\sqrt{3}}}-1\right)\left(2-\sqrt{3}-\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\right) \dots 0 \dots \frac{2}{3\sqrt{3}}$	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No

# Subjective Interestingness Measure

---

## □ Objective measure:


- Rank patterns based on statistics computed from data
- e.g., 21 measures of association (support, confidence, Laplace, Gini, mutual information, Jaccard, etc).

## □ Subjective measure:

- Rank patterns according to user's interpretation
  - ◆ A pattern is subjectively interesting if it contradicts the expectation of a user (Silberschatz & Tuzhilin)
  - ◆ A pattern is subjectively interesting if it is actionable (Silberschatz & Tuzhilin)

# Interestingness via Unexpectedness

- Need to model expectation of users (domain knowledge)



- +** Pattern expected to be frequent
- Pattern expected to be infrequent
- Pattern found to be frequent
- Pattern found to be infrequent
- ⊕** **⊖** Expected Patterns
- ⊖** **⊕** Unexpected Patterns

- Need to combine expectation of users with evidence from data (i.e., extracted patterns)



# Interestingness via Unexpectedness

- Web Data (Cooley et al 2001)
  - Domain knowledge in the form of site structure
  - Given an itemset  $F = \{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_k\}$  ( $X_i$  : Web pages)
    - ◆  $L$ : number of links connecting the pages
    - ◆  $lfactor = L / (k \times k - 1)$
    - ◆  $cfactor = 1$  (if graph is connected), 0 (disconnected graph)
  - Structure evidence =  $cfactor \times lfactor$
  - Usage evidence = 
$$\frac{P(X_1 \cap X_2 \cap \dots \cap X_k)}{P(X_1 \cup X_2 \cup \dots \cup X_k)}$$
  - Use Dempster-Shafer theory to combine domain knowledge and evidence from data