

ECEN 758 Data Mining & Analysis: Frequent Itemset Mining & Association Rules

Adapted from: Mining of Massive Datasets

Jure Leskovec, Anand Rajaraman, Jeff Ullman @ Stanford University

<http://www.mmds.org>



Association Rule Discovery

Supermarket shelf management – Market-basket model:

- **Goal:** Identify items that are bought together by sufficiently many customers
- **Approach:** Process the sales data collected with barcode scanners to find dependencies among items
- **A classic rule:**
 - If someone buys diaper and milk, then he/she is likely to buy beer
 - Don't be surprised if you find six-packs next to diapers!



The Market-Basket Model

- A large set of **items**
 - e.g., things sold in a supermarket
- A large set of **baskets**
- Each basket is a small subset of items
 - e.g., the things one customer buys on one day
- Want to discover **association rules**
 - People who bought $\{x,y,z\}$ tend to buy $\{v,w\}$
 - Amazon!

Input:

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

Output:

Rules Discovered:

$\{\text{Milk}\} \rightarrow \{\text{Coke}\}$

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

Applications

- **Items** = products;
- **Baskets** = sets of products someone bought in one trip to the store
- **Real market baskets:** Chain stores keep TBs of data about what customers buy together
 - Tells how typical customers navigate stores, lets them position tempting items
 - Suggests tie-in “tricks”, e.g., run sale on diapers and raise the price of beer
 - Need the rule to occur frequently, or no \$\$’s
- **Amazon’s people who bought X also bought Y**



Applications – (2)

- **Baskets** = sentences; **Items** = documents containing those sentences
 - Items that appear together too often could represent plagiarism
 - Notice items do not have to be “in” baskets
- **Baskets** = patients; **Items** = drugs & side-effects
 - Has been used to detect combinations of drugs that result in particular side-effects
 - **But requires extension:** Absence of an item needs to be observed as well as presence



More generally


- **A general many-to-many mapping (association) between two kinds of things**
 - But we ask about connections among “items”, not “baskets”
- **For example:**
 - Finding communities in graphs (e.g., Twitter)



Example:

- Finding communities in graphs (e.g., Twitter)
- **Baskets** = nodes; **Items** = outgoing neighbors
 - Searching for complete bipartite subgraphs $K_{s,t}$ of a big graph

- How?



- View each node i as a basket B_i of nodes i it points to
- $K_{s,t}$ = a set Y of size t that occurs in s buckets B_i
- Looking for $K_{s,t} \rightarrow$ set of support s and look at layer t – all frequent sets of size t

Outline

- **First: Define**

- Frequent itemsets
- Association rules:
 - Confidence, Support, Interestingness

- **Then: Algorithms for finding frequent itemsets**

- Finding frequent pairs
- A-Priori algorithm
- PCY algorithm + 2 refinements



Frequent Itemsets

- **Simplest question:** Find sets of items that appear together “frequently” in baskets
- **Support** for itemset I : Number of baskets containing all items in I
 - (Often expressed as a fraction of the total number of baskets)
- Given a **support threshold s** , then sets of items that appear in at least s baskets are called **frequent itemsets**

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

Support of
 $\{\text{Beer, Bread}\} = 2$

Example: Frequent Itemsets

- Items = {milk, coke, pepsi, beer, juice}
- Support threshold = 3 baskets

$B_1 = \{m, c, b\}$

$B_2 = \{m, p, j\}$

$B_3 = \{m, b\}$

$B_4 = \{c, j\}$


$B_5 = \{m, p, b\}$

$B_6 = \{m, c, b, j\}$

$B_7 = \{c, b, j\}$

$B_8 = \{b, c\}$

- Frequent itemsets: $\{m\}, \{c\}, \{b\}, \{j\},$
 $\{m, b\}, \{b, c\}, \{c, j\}.$



Association Rules

- **Association Rules:**

If-then rules about the contents of baskets

- $\{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k\} \rightarrow j$ means: “if a basket contains all of i_1, \dots, i_k then it is *likely* to contain j ”
- In practice there are many rules, want to find significant/interesting ones!
- **Confidence** of this association rule is the probability of j given $I = \{i_1, \dots, i_k\}$

$$\text{conf}(I \rightarrow j) = \frac{\text{support}(I \cup j)}{\text{support}(I)}$$

Interesting Association Rules

- **Not all high-confidence rules are interesting**

- The rule $X \rightarrow \textit{milk}$ may have high confidence for many itemsets X , because milk is just purchased very often (independent of X) and the confidence will be high

- **Interest** of an association rule $I \rightarrow j$:
difference between its confidence and the fraction of baskets that contain j

- Interesting rules are those with high positive or negative interest values (usually above 0.5)

$$\text{Interest}(I \rightarrow j) = \text{conf}(I \rightarrow j) - \text{Pr}[j]$$



Example: Confidence and Interest

$$B_1 = \{m, c, b\}$$

$$B_3 = \{m, b\}$$

$$B_5 = \{m, p, b\}$$

$$B_7 = \{c, b, j\}$$

$$B_2 = \{m, p, j\}$$

$$B_4 = \{c, j\}$$

$$B_6 = \{m, c, b, j\}$$

$$B_8 = \{b, c\}$$

- Association rule: $\{m, b\} \rightarrow c$

- **Confidence** = $2/4 = 0.5$

- **Interest** = $|0.5 - 5/8| = 1/8$

- Item c appears in $5/8$ of the baskets
 - Rule is not very interesting!



Finding Association Rules

- **Problem:**

- Find all association rules with support $\geq s$ and confidence $\geq c$
- **Note:** Support of an association rule is the support of the set of items on the left side

- **Hard part: Finding the frequent itemsets!**

- If $\{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k\} \rightarrow j$ has high support and confidence, then both $\{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k\}$ and $\{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_k, j\}$ will be “frequent”

$$\text{conf}(I \rightarrow j) = \frac{\text{support}(I \cup j)}{\text{support}(I)}$$



Mining Association Rules

- **Step 1: Find all frequent itemsets I**
 - (we will explain this next)
- **Step 2: Rule generation**
 - For every subset A of I , generate a rule $A \rightarrow I \setminus A$
 - ▣ Since I is frequent, A is also frequent
 - ▣ **Variant 1:** Single pass to compute the rule confidence
 - $\text{confidence}(A, B \rightarrow C, D) = \text{support}(A, B, C, D) / \text{support}(A, B)$
 - ▣ **Variant 2:**
 - **Observation:** If $A, B, C \rightarrow D$ is below confidence, so is $A, B \rightarrow C, D$
 - Can generate “bigger” rules from smaller ones!
 - **Output the rules above the confidence threshold**



Example

$$\mathbf{B}_1 = \{\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{c}, \mathbf{b}\}$$

$$B_2 = \{m, p, j\}$$

$$B_3 = \{m, c, b, n\}$$

$$B_4 = \{c, j\}$$

$$\mathbf{B}_5 = \{\mathbf{m}, \mathbf{p}, \mathbf{b}\}$$

$$B_6 = \{m, c, b, j\}$$

$$B_7 = \{c, b, j\}$$

$$\mathbf{B}_8 = \{\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{c}\}$$

- Support threshold $s = 3$, confidence $c = 0.75$

- 1) Frequent itemsets:

- **{b,m} {b,c} {c,m} {c,j} {m,c,b}**

- 2) Generate rules:

- ~~○ $b \rightarrow m: c=4/6$~~
- $m \rightarrow b: c=4/5$
- ...

Compacting the Output

- **To reduce the number of rules we can post-process them and only output:**

- **Maximal frequent itemsets:**

- No immediate superset is frequent

- Gives more pruning

or

- **Closed itemsets:**

- No immediate superset has the same count (> 0)

- Stores not only frequent information, but exact counts



Example: Maximal/Closed

	Support	Maximal(s=3)	Closed	
A	4	No	No	Frequent, but superset BC also frequent.
B	5	No	Yes	Frequent, and its only superset, ABC, not freq.
C	3	No	No	
AB	4	Yes	Yes	Superset BC has same count.
AC	2	No	No	
BC	3	Yes	Yes	Its only super- set, ABC, has smaller count.
ABC	2	No	Yes	

Finding Frequent Itemsets



TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY

Department of Electrical
& Computer Engineering



TEXAS A&M

Institute of
Data Science

Itemsets: Computation Model

- **Back to finding frequent itemsets**
- **Typically, data is kept in flat files rather than in a database system:**
 - Stored on disk
 - Stored basket-by-basket
 - Baskets are **small** but we have many baskets and many items
 - Expand baskets into pairs, triples, etc. as you read baskets
 - Use **k** nested loops to generate all sets of size **k**

Note: We want to find frequent itemsets. To find them, we have to count them. To count them, we have to generate them.

Item
Item
Item
Item
Item
Item
Item
Item
Item
Item
Item
Etc.

Items are positive integers, and boundaries between baskets are denoted by -1 .

Computation Model

- The true cost of mining disk-resident data is usually the **number of disk I/Os**
- In practice, association-rule algorithms read the data in *passes* – all baskets read in turn
- We measure the cost by the **number of passes** an algorithm makes over the data



Main-Memory Bottleneck

- **For many frequent-itemset algorithms, main-memory is the critical resource**
 - As we read baskets, we need to count something,
 - e.g., occurrences of pairs of items
 - The number of different things we can count is limited by main memory
 - Swapping counts in/out is a disaster (**why?**)



Finding Frequent Pairs

- The hardest problem often turns out to be finding the frequent **pairs** of items $\{i_1, i_2\}$
 - **Why?** Freq. pairs are common, freq. triples are rare
 - **Why?** Probability of being frequent drops exponentially with size; number of sets grows more slowly with size
- **Let's first concentrate on pairs, then extend to larger sets**
- **The approach:**
 - We always need to generate all the itemsets
 - But we would only like to count (keep track) of those itemsets that in the end turn out to be frequent



Naïve Algorithm

- **Naïve approach to finding frequent pairs**
- **Read file once, counting in main memory the occurrences of each pair:**
 - From each basket of n items, generate its $n(n-1)/2$ pairs by two nested loops
- **Fails if $(\#items)^2$ exceeds main memory**
 - **Remember:** $\#items$ can be 100K (Wal-Mart) or 10B (Web pages)
 - Suppose 10^5 items, counts are 4-byte integers
 - Number of pairs of items: $10^5(10^5-1)/2 = 5 \cdot 10^9$
 - Therefore, $2 \cdot 10^{10}$ (20 gigabytes) of memory needed



Counting Pairs in Memory

Two approaches:


- **Approach 1:** Count all pairs using a matrix
- **Approach 2:** Keep a table of triples $[i, j, c]$ = “the count of the pair of items $\{i, j\}$ is c .”
 - If integers and item ids are 4 bytes, we need approximately 12 bytes for pairs with count > 0
 - Plus some additional overhead for the hashtable

Note:


- **Approach 1** only requires 4 bytes per pair
- **Approach 2** uses 12 bytes per pair (but only for pairs with count > 0)



Comparing the 2 Approaches



Triangular Matrix



Triples

Comparing the two approaches

- **Approach 1: Triangular Matrix**

- n = total number items
- Count pair of items $\{i, j\}$ only if $i < j$
- Keep pair counts in lexicographic order:
 - $\{1,2\}, \{1,3\}, \dots, \{1,n\}, \{2,3\}, \{2,4\}, \dots, \{2,n\}, \{3,4\}, \dots$
- Pair $\{i, j\}$ is at position $(i-1)(n-i/2) + j-1$
- Total number of pairs $n(n-1)/2$; total bytes = $2n^2$
- **Triangular Matrix** requires 4 bytes per pair

- **Approach 2 uses 12 bytes per occurring pair (but only for pairs with count > 0)**

- Beats Approach 1 if less than **1/3** of possible pairs actually occur



Comparing the two approaches

- **Approach 1: Triangular Matrix**

- n = total number items
- Count pair of items $\{i, j\}$ only if $i < j$
- Keep pair counts in lexicographic order:
 - $\{1,2\}, \{1,3\}, \dots, \{1,n\}, \{2,3\}, \{2,4\}, \dots, \{2,n\}, \{3,4\}, \dots$
- Pair $\{i, j\}$ is at position $(i-1)(n-1)/2 + j - i$
- Total number of pairs $n(n-1)/2$; total bytes = $2n^2$
- **Triangular Matrix** requires 4 bytes per pair

Problem is if we have too many items so the pairs do not fit into memory.

- **Approach 2** uses 12 bytes per pair
(*but only for pairs with count > 0*)

Can we do better?

- Beats Approach 1 if less than $1/3$ of possible pairs actually occur

A-Priori Algorithm



TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY

Department of Electrical
& Computer Engineering




TEXAS A&M

Institute of
Data Science

A-Priori Algorithm – (1)

- A two-pass approach called *A-Priori* limits the need for main memory
- Key idea: *monotonicity*
 - If a set of items I appears at least s times, so does every subset J of I
- Contrapositive for pairs:
If item i does not appear in s baskets, then no pair including i can appear in s baskets
- So, how does A-Priori find freq. pairs?




A-Priori Algorithm – (2)

- **Pass 1:** Read baskets and count in main memory the occurrences of each **individual item**
 - Requires only memory proportional to #items
- **Items that appear $\geq s$ times are the frequent items**
- **Pass 2:** Read baskets again and count in main memory only those pairs where both elements are frequent (from Pass 1)
 - Requires memory proportional to square of **frequent** items only (for counts)
 - Plus a list of the frequent items (so you know what must be counted)




Main-Memory: Picture of A-Priori




Detail for A-Priori

- You can use the triangular matrix method with n = number of frequent items
 - May save space compared with storing triples
- **Trick:** re-number frequent items 1,2,... and keep a table relating new numbers to original item numbers



Frequent Triples, Etc.

- For each k , we construct two sets of k -tuples (sets of size k):
 - C_k = *candidate k -tuples* = those that might be frequent sets (support $\geq s$) based on information from the pass for $k-1$
 - L_k = the set of truly frequent k -tuples



Example

** Note here we generate new candidates by generating C_k from L_{k-1} and L_1 .
But that one can be more careful with candidate generation. For example, in C_3 we know $\{b,m,j\}$ cannot be frequent since $\{m,j\}$ is not frequent

- **Hypothetical steps of the A-Priori algorithm**

- $C_1 = \{ \{b\} \{c\} \{j\} \{m\} \{n\} \{p\} \}$
- Count the support of itemsets in C_1
- Prune non-frequent: $L_1 = \{ b, c, j, m \}$
- Generate $C_2 = \{ \{b,c\} \{b,j\} \{b,m\} \{c,j\} \{c,m\} \{j,m\} \}$
- Count the support of itemsets in C_2
- Prune non-frequent: $L_2 = \{ \{b,m\} \{b,c\} \{c,m\} \{c,j\} \}$
- Generate $C_3 = \{ \{b,c,m\} \{b,c,j\} \{b,m,j\} \{c,m,j\} \}$
- Count the support of itemsets in C_3
- Prune non-frequent: $L_3 = \{ \{b,c,m\} \}$

**



A-Priori for All Frequent Itemsets

- One pass for each k (itemset size)
- Needs room in main memory to count each candidate k -tuple
- For typical market-basket data and reasonable support (e.g., 1%), $k = 2$ requires the most memory
- **Many possible extensions:**
 - Association rules with intervals:
 - For example: Men over 65 have 2 cars
 - Association rules when items are in a taxonomy
 - Bread, Butter → FruitJam
 - BakedGoods, MilkProduct → PreservedGoods
 - Lower the support s as itemset gets bigger



PCY (Park-Chen-Yu) Algorithm



TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY

Department of Electrical
& Computer Engineering



TEXAS A&M

Institute of
Data Science

PCY (Park-Chen-Yu) Algorithm

- **Observation:**

In pass 1 of A-Priori, most memory is idle

- We store only individual item counts
- **Can we use the idle memory to reduce memory required in pass 2?**

- **Pass 1 of PCY:** In addition to item counts, maintain a hash table with as many buckets as fit in memory

- Keep a **count** for each bucket into which **pairs** of items are hashed
 - **For each bucket just keep the count, not the actual pairs that hash to the bucket!**



PCY Algorithm – First Pass

```
FOR (each basket) :  
    FOR (each item in the basket) :  
        add 1 to item's count;  
New in PCY { FOR (each pair of items) :  
                hash the pair to a bucket;  
                add 1 to the count for that bucket;
```

- **Few things to note:**

- Pairs of items need to be generated from the input file; they are not present in the file
- We are not just interested in the presence of a pair, but we need to see whether it is present at least s (support) times



Observations about Buckets

- **Observation:** If a bucket contains a **frequent pair**, then the bucket is surely **frequent**
- **However, even without any frequent pair, a bucket can still be frequent** 😞
 - So, we cannot use the hash to eliminate any member (pair) of a “frequent” bucket
- **But, for a bucket with total count less than s , none of its pairs can be frequent** 😊
 - Pairs that hash to this bucket can be eliminated as candidates
 - even if the pair consists of 2 frequent items
- **Pass 2: Only count pairs that hash to frequent buckets**



PCY Algorithm – Between Passes

- **Replace the buckets by a bit-vector:**
 - **1** means the bucket count exceeded the support s (call it a **frequent bucket**); **0** means it did not
- **4-byte integer counts are replaced by bits, so the bit-vector requires 1/32 of memory**
- **Also, decide which items are frequent and list them for the second pass**




PCY Algorithm – Pass 2

- **Count all pairs $\{i, j\}$ that meet the conditions for being a candidate pair:**
 1. Both i and j are frequent items
 2. The pair $\{i, j\}$ hashes to a bucket whose bit in the bit vector is **1** (i.e., a frequent bucket)
- **Both conditions are necessary for the pair to have a chance of being frequent**



Main-Memory: Picture of PCY



Main-Memory Details

- **Buckets require a few bytes each:**
 - **Note:** we do not have to count past s
 - #buckets is $O(\text{main-memory size})$
- **On second pass, a table of (item, item, count) triples is essential (we cannot use triangular matrix approach, why?)**
 - Thus, hash table must eliminate approx. 2/3 of the candidate pairs for PCY to beat A-Priori




Refinement: Multistage Algorithm

- **Limit the number of candidates to be counted**
 - **Remember:** Memory is the bottleneck
 - Still need to generate all the itemsets but we only want to count/keep track of the ones that are frequent
- **Key idea: After Pass 1 of PCY, rehash only those pairs that qualify for Pass 2 of PCY**
 - i and j are frequent, and
 - $\{i, j\}$ hashes to a frequent bucket from **Pass 1**
- **On middle pass, fewer pairs contribute to buckets, so fewer *false positives***
- **Requires 3 passes over the data**



Main-Memory: Multistage



Multistage – Pass 3

- **Count only those pairs $\{i, j\}$ that satisfy these candidate pair conditions:**
 1. Both i and j are frequent items
 2. Using the first hash function, the pair hashes to a bucket whose bit in the first bit-vector is **1**
 3. Using the second hash function, the pair hashes to a bucket whose bit in the second bit-vector is **1**



Important Points

1. The two hash functions have to be independent

2. We need to check both hashes on the third pass

- If not, we would end up counting pairs of frequent items that hashed first to an infrequent bucket but happened to hash second to a frequent bucket




Refinement: Multihash

- **Key idea:** Use several independent hash tables on the first pass
- **Risk:** Halving the number of buckets doubles the average count
 - We have to be sure most buckets will still not reach count s
- If so, we can get a benefit like multistage, but in only 2 passes



Main-Memory: Multihash



PCY: Extensions

- Either **multistage** or **multihash** can use more than two hash functions
- In **multistage**, there is a point of diminishing returns, since the bit-vectors eventually consume all of main memory
- For **multihash**, the bit-vectors occupy exactly what one PCY bitmap does, but too many hash functions makes all counts $\geq s$



Frequent Itemsets in ≤ 2 Passes



TEXAS A&M UNIVERSITY

Department of Electrical
& Computer Engineering



TEXAS A&M

Institute of
Data Science


Frequent Itemsets in ≤ 2 Passes

- **A-Priori, PCY, etc., take k passes to find frequent itemsets of size k**
- **Can we use fewer passes?**
- **Use 2 or fewer passes for all sizes,**
but may miss some frequent itemsets
 - Random sampling
 - SON (Savasere, Omiecinski, and Navathe)
 - Toivonen (see textbook)



Random Sampling (1)

- **Take a random sample of the market baskets**
- **Run a-priori or one of its improvements in main memory**
 - So we don't pay for disk I/O each time we increase the size of itemsets
 - Reduce support threshold proportionally to match the sample size



Random Sampling (2)

- **Optionally, verify that the candidate pairs are truly frequent in the entire data set by a second pass (avoid false positives)**
- **But you don't catch sets frequent in the whole but not in the sample**
 - Smaller threshold, e.g., $s/125$, helps catch more truly frequent itemsets
 - But requires more space



SON Algorithm – (1)

- **Repeatedly read small subsets of the baskets into main memory and run an in-memory algorithm to find all frequent itemsets**
 - Note: we are not sampling, but processing the entire file in memory-sized chunks
- **An itemset becomes a candidate if it is found to be frequent in *any* one or more subsets of the baskets.**



SON Algorithm – (2)

- On a second pass, count all the candidate itemsets and determine which are frequent in the entire set
- **Key “monotonicity” idea:** an itemset cannot be frequent in the entire set of baskets unless it is frequent in at least one subset.



SON – Distributed Version

- **SON lends itself to distributed data mining**
- **Baskets distributed among many nodes**
 - Compute frequent itemsets at each node
 - Distribute candidates to all nodes
 - Accumulate the counts of all candidates

