

# Machine Learning and Real World Data

## Sentiment Classification

Is a standard task in NLP.

### Definitions

- A **type** is a unique word.
- A **token** is an instance of a type.
- A **tokeniser** split text into tokens.

---

## Naive Bayes Classification

**Machine learning** is a program that adapts its behaviour after being exposed to new data: without explicit programming, and implicitly from the data alone.

### Definitions

- **Features** are observable properties of the data.
- **Classes** are labels associated with the data (e.g. positive/negative)
- **Classification** is a function that maps features to classes.

The classifier is given a set of features  $O$  and classes  $c_1, \dots, c_n \in C$ , and gives  $P(c_i|O)$  for each  $c_i$ .

- $O = \{w_1, w_2, \dots, w_n\}$  are the words in the review.
- $C = \{\text{pos}, \text{neg}\}$

Choose the  $P(c_i|O)$  with the highest probability

$$\begin{aligned}c_{NB} &= \operatorname{argmax}_{c \in C} P(c|O) \\&= \operatorname{argmax}_{c \in C} \frac{P(O|c)P(c)}{P(O)} \\&= \operatorname{argmax}_{c \in C} P(O|c)P(c)\end{aligned}$$

As  $P(O)$  is a constant and does not affect  $\operatorname{argmax}$ .

$$P(O|c) = P(w_1|c) \times P(w_2|c) \times \dots \times P(w_n|c)$$

$$\begin{aligned}c_{NB} &= \operatorname{argmax}_{c \in C} P(c) \prod_{i=1}^n P(w_i|c) \\&= \operatorname{argmax}_{c \in C} \left( \log P(c) + \sum_{i=1}^n \log P(w_i|c) \right)\end{aligned}$$

Summing results in less floating point precision errors than multiplying.

In training, collect information needed to calculate  $P(c)$  and  $P(w_i|c)$

$$\begin{aligned}P(c) &= \frac{N_c}{N_{\text{total}}} \\P(w_i|c) &= \frac{\text{count}(w_i \text{ in } c)}{\sum_{w \in V} \text{count}(w \text{ in } c)}\end{aligned}$$

**Laplace smoothing** prevents  $P(w_i|c)$  from being zero by adding 1 to the count of each type.

$$P(w_i|c) = \frac{\text{count}(w_i \text{ in } c) + 1}{\sum_{w \in V} (\text{count}(w \text{ in } c) + 1)}$$

$$= \frac{\text{count}(w_i \text{ in } c) + 1}{\sum_{w \in V} \text{count}(w \text{ in } c) + |V|}$$

Name	Description
Zipf's law	$f_w \approx \frac{k}{(r_w + \beta)^\alpha}$ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <math>f_w</math> is the frequency of the word</li> <li>• <math>r_w</math> is the frequency rank of the word</li> <li>• <math>k, \alpha</math> and <math>\beta</math> are language dependent constants</li> </ul> <p>Note: <math>\beta</math> is the rank shift.</p>
Heap's law	$u_n = kn^\beta$ <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <math>u_n</math> is the number of types (vocabulary size)</li> <li>• <math>n</math> is the number of tokens</li> <li>• <math>\beta</math> and <math>k</math> are language dependent constants</li> </ul>

In Naive Bayes Classification, only seen types receive a probability estimate. Adding 1 redistributes some probability mass mass to unseen types.

### Significance Testing

- The **null hypothesis**: the two result sets comes from the same distribution.
- Rejecting the null hypothesis means the observed results is unlikely to have happened by chance.

Choose a **significance level**  $\alpha$ , reject the null hypothesis if the probability of observing the event under the null hypothesis is less than  $\alpha$ .

In a **binomial distribution**  $B(N, q)$

$$P(X = k) = \binom{N}{k} q^k (1 - q)^{N-k}$$

$$P(X \leq k) = \sum_{i=0}^k \binom{N}{i} q^i (1 - q)^{N-i}$$

A **two-tailed test** tests if the two systems performs equally well: the  $\alpha$  in each tail is halved.

	Actual = same	Actual = different
Predicted = same	Correct	Type II error: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Use a more powerful test (e.g. permutation test rather than sign test)</li> <li>• Use more data</li> </ul>
Predicted = different	Type I error	Correct

Significance testing cannot show two distributions are the same.

### Note

For testing sentiment classifiers, ignoring ties will lead to the null hypothesis being incorrectly rejected. Add 0.5 to the count of positive and negative results in case of ties.

---

### Overtraining

Overtraining is where more training makes the classifier perform worse on unseen data.

Am I overtraining?

- If you are using large amounts of new test data, not overtraining.
- If incrementally improving the classifier on the same small test data, overtraining.

Overtraining is caused by finding characteristic features of each class that are hard to generalise.

### N-fold cross-validation

1. Split data into  $N$  equal folds.
2. For each fold  $X$ , train on other folds, test on fold  $X$  only.
3. Average all the accuracy for the final accuracy.

It is good if each splits performs equally well, calculate the variance:

$$\text{var} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_i^n (x_i - \mu)^2$$

Consider the  $N$  experiments as one overall experiment.

Cross validation	Description
Stratified cross-validation	Each split mirrors the distribution of classes in the overall data.
Jack-knitting	Each individual data point is a split.
Dependency-sensitive cross-validation	Fold in a way that known characteristics of a data are isolated (e.g. one split per genre)

Cross-validation does not solve the problem of overtraining.

Instead, a **validation corpus** (a separate set of data not used for training or testing) can be used to

- Tweak parameters before training
  - Check if training is making the system perform worse on the validation corpus (is it overtraining?)
-