

Introduction to Responsible Machine Learning*

Lecture 1: Interpretable Machine Learning Models

Patrick Hall

The George Washington University

May 31, 2020

*This material is shared under a [CC By 4.0 license](#) which allows for editing and redistribution, even for commercial purposes. However, any derivative work should attribute the author.

Contents

Class Overview

Introduction

Penalized GLM

Monotonic GBM

A Burgeoning Ecosystem

Acknowledgments

Grading and Policy

- Grading:
 - $\frac{1}{3}$ Participation
 - $\frac{1}{3}$ Project GitHub or Kaggle kernel
 - $\frac{1}{3}$ Public Kaggle leaderboard score
- Project:
 - Kaggle competition using techniques from class
 - Individual or group (no more than 4 members)
 - Select team members ASAP
- Syllabus
- Webex office hours: Thurs. 5-6 pm or by appointment
- Class resources: https://jphall663.github.io/GWU_rml/

Overview


- **Class 1:** Interpretable Models
- **Class 2:** Post-hoc Explanations
- **Class 3:** Fairness
- **Class 4:** Security
- **Class 5:** Model Debugging
- **Class 6:** Best Practices

Responsible Artificial Intelligence


“Responsible Artificial Intelligence is about human responsibility for the development of intelligent systems along fundamental human principles and values, to ensure human-flourishing and well-being in a sustainable world.”

— Virginia Dignum, ***Responsible Artificial Intelligence***

What About Machine Learning?




A Responsible Machine Learning Workflow



Source: *A Responsible Machine Learning Workflow.*

A Responsible ML Workflow: Interpretable Models



Source: *A Responsible Machine Learning Workflow*.

Interpretable ML Models

Doshi-Velez and Kim, 2017, define interpretable as, “the ability to explain or to present in understandable terms to a human.”

There are many types of interpretable ML models. Some might be directly interpretable to non-technical consumers. Some are only interpretable to highly-skilled data scientists. Interpretability is not an on-and-off switch.

Interpretable models are crucial for documentation, explanation of predictions to consumers, finding and fixing discrimination, and debugging other problems in ML modeling pipelines. Simply put, **it is very difficult to mitigate risks you don't understand.**

There is not necessarily a trade-off between accuracy and interpretability, especially for structured data.

Background

We will frequently refer to the following terms and definitions today:

- Notation
- Pearson correlation
 - Measurement of the linear relationship between two input X_j features; takes on values between -1 and +1, including 0.
- Shapley value
- Partial dependence and individual conditional expectation (ICE)
- Gradient boosting machine (GBM)

Background: Notation

Spaces

- Input features come from the set \mathcal{X} contained in a P -dimensional input space, $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^P$. An arbitrary, potentially unobserved, or future instance of \mathcal{X} is denoted \mathbf{x} , $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$.
- Labels corresponding to instances of \mathcal{X} come from the set \mathcal{Y} .
- Learned output responses come from the set $\hat{\mathcal{Y}}$.

Background: Notation

Datasets

- The input dataset \mathbf{X} is composed of observed instances of the set \mathcal{X} with a corresponding dataset of labels \mathbf{Y} , observed instances of the set \mathcal{Y} .
- Each i -th observation of \mathbf{X} is denoted as $\mathbf{x}^{(i)} = [x_0^{(i)}, x_1^{(i)}, \dots, x_{P-1}^{(i)}]$, with corresponding i -th labels in \mathbf{Y} , $y^{(i)}$, and corresponding predictions in $\hat{\mathbf{Y}}$, $\hat{y}^{(i)}$.
- \mathbf{X} and \mathbf{Y} consist of N tuples of observations: $[(\mathbf{x}^{(0)}, \mathbf{y}^{(0)}), (\mathbf{x}^{(1)}, \mathbf{y}^{(1)}), \dots, (\mathbf{x}^{(N-1)}, \mathbf{y}^{(N-1)})]$.
- Each j -th input column vector of \mathbf{X} is denoted as $X_j = [x_j^{(0)}, x_j^{(1)}, \dots, x_j^{(N-1)}]^T$.

Background: Notation

Models

- A type of machine learning (ML) model g , selected from a hypothesis set \mathcal{H} , is trained to represent an unknown signal-generating function f observed as \mathbf{X} with labels \mathbf{Y} using a training algorithm \mathcal{A} : $\mathbf{X}, \mathbf{Y} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{A}} g$, such that $g \approx f$.
- g generates learned output responses on the input dataset $g(\mathbf{X}) = \hat{\mathbf{Y}}$, and on the general input space $g(\mathcal{X}) = \hat{\mathcal{Y}}$.
- The model to be explained, tested for discrimination, or debugged is denoted as g .

Background: Shapley Value

Shapley explanations, including TreeSHAP and even certain implementations of LIME, are a class of additive, locally accurate feature contribution measures with long-standing theoretical support (Lundberg and Lee, 2017).

For some observation $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$, Shapley explanations take the form:

$$\phi_j = \underbrace{\sum_{S \subseteq \mathcal{P} \setminus \{j\}} \frac{|S|!(\mathcal{P} - |S| - 1)!}{\mathcal{P}!}}_{\text{weighted average over all subsets in } \mathbf{X}} \underbrace{[(S \cup \{j\}) - g_{\mathbf{x}}(S)]}_{g \text{ "without" } x_j} \quad (1)$$

$$g(\mathbf{x}) = \phi_0 + \sum_{j=0}^{j=\mathcal{P}-1} \phi_j \mathbf{z}_j \quad (2)$$

Background: Partial Dependence and ICE

- Following Friedman, Hastie, and Tibshirani (2001) a single input feature, $X_j \in \mathbf{X}$, and its complement set, $\mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{P} \setminus \{j\}} \in \mathbf{X}$, where $X_j \cup \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{P} \setminus \{j\}} = \mathbf{X}$ is considered. $\text{PD}(X_j, g)$ for a given feature X_j is estimated as the average output of the learned function $g(\mathbf{X})$ when all the components of X_j are set to a constant $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $\mathbf{X}_{(-j)}$ is left unchanged.
- $\text{ICE}(x_j, \mathbf{x}, g)$ for a given instance \mathbf{x} and feature x_j is estimated as the output of $g(\mathbf{x})$ when x_j is set to a constant $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and all other features $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbf{X}_{(-j)}$ are left untouched. Partial dependence and ICE curves are usually plotted over some set of constants $x \in \mathcal{X}$ (Goldstein et al., 2015).

Background: Gradient Boosting Machine

$$g^{\text{GBM}}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{b=0}^{B-1} T_b(\mathbf{x}; \Theta) \quad (3)$$

A GBM is a sequential combination of decision trees, T_b , where T_0 is trained to predict y , but all subsequent T are trained to reduce the errors of T_{b-1} .

Anatomy of Elastic Net Regression

Generalized linear models (GLM) have the same basic functional form as more traditional linear models, e.g. ...

$$g^{\text{GLM}}(\mathbf{x}) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 x_0 + \beta_2 x_1 + \cdots + \beta_P x_{P-1} \quad (4)$$

... but are more robust to correlation, wide data, and outliers.


Anatomy of Elastic Net Regression: L1 and L2 Penalty

Iteratively reweighted least squares (IRLS) method with ridge (L_2) and LASSO (L_1) penalty terms:

$$\tilde{\beta} = \min_{\beta} \left\{ \underbrace{\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} (y_i - \beta_0 - \sum_{j=1}^{P-1} x_{ij} \beta_j)^2}_1 + \underbrace{\lambda}_2 \sum_{j=1}^{P-1} \left(\underbrace{\alpha}_3 \underbrace{\beta_j^2}_4 + (1 - \underbrace{\alpha}_3) \underbrace{|\beta_j|}_5 \right) \right\} \quad (5)$$

- 1: Least squares minimization
- 2: Controls magnitude of penalties
- 3: Tunes balance between L1 and L2
- 4: L_2 /Ridge penalty term
- 5: L_1 /LASSO penalty term

Graphical Illustration of Shrinkage/Regularization Method:



Monotonic GBM (Gill et al., 2020)

Monotonic GBM (MGBM) constrain typical GBM training to consider only tree splits that obey user-defined positive and negative monotone constraints, with respect to each input feature, X_j , and a target feature, y , independently. An MGBM remains an additive combination of B trees trained by gradient boosting, T_b , and each tree learns a set of splitting rules that respect monotone constraints, Θ_b^{mono} . A trained MGBM model, g^{MGBM} , takes the form:


$$g^{\text{MGBM}}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{b=0}^{B-1} T_b(\mathbf{x}; \Theta_b^{\text{mono}}) \quad (6)$$

Monotone Constraints for GBM (Gill et al., 2020)

1. For the first and highest split in T_b involving X_j , any $\theta_{b,j,0}$ resulting in $T(x_j; \theta_{b,j,0}) = \{w_{b,j,0,L}, w_{b,j,0,R}\}$ where $w_{b,j,0,L} > w_{b,j,0,R}$, is not considered.
2. For any subsequent left child node involving X_j , any $\theta_{b,j,k \geq 1}$ resulting in $T(x_j; \theta_{b,j,k \geq 1}) = \{w_{b,j,k \geq 1,L}, w_{b,j,k \geq 1,R}\}$ where $w_{b,j,k \geq 1,L} > w_{b,j,k \geq 1,R}$, is not considered.
3. Moreover, for any subsequent left child node involving X_j , $T(x_j; \theta_{b,j,k \geq 1}) = \{w_{b,j,k \geq 1,L}, w_{b,j,k \geq 1,R}\}$, $\{w_{b,j,k \geq 1,L}, w_{b,j,k \geq 1,R}\}$ are bound by the associated $\theta_{b,j,k-1}$ set of node weights, $\{w_{b,j,k-1,L}, w_{b,j,k-1,R}\}$, such that $\{w_{b,j,k \geq 1,L}, w_{b,j,k \geq 1,R}\} < \frac{w_{b,j,k-1,L} + w_{b,j,k-1,R}}{2}$.
4. (1) and (2) are also applied to all right child nodes, except that for right child nodes $w_{b,j,k,L} \leq w_{b,j,k,R}$ and $\{w_{b,j,k \geq 1,L}, w_{b,j,k \geq 1,R}\} \geq \frac{w_{b,j,k-1,L} + w_{b,j,k-1,R}}{2}$.

Note that $g^{\text{MGBM}}(\mathbf{x})$ is an addition of each full T_b prediction, with the application of a monotonic logit or softmax link function for classification problems. Moreover, each tree's root node corresponds to some constant node weight that by definition obeys monotonicity constraints, $T(x_j^\alpha; \theta_{b,0}) = T(x_j^\beta; \theta_{b,0}) = w_{b,0}$.

Partial Dependence and ICE:



A Burgeoning Ecosystem of Interpretable Machine Learning Models

- Generalized additive model (GAM) (Friedman, Hastie, and Tibshirani, 2001)
- GA2M / Explainable boosting machine (EBM) (Lou et al., 2013)
- Explainable Neural Network (XNN) (Vaughan et al., 2018)
- Rudin group:
 - *This looks like that deep learning* (Chen et al., 2019)
 - Scalable Bayesian rule list (Yang, Rudin, and Seltzer, 2017)
 - Optimal sparse decision tree (Hu, Rudin, and Seltzer, 2019)
 - Supersparse linear integer models (Ustun and Rudin, 2016)
 - and more ...
- RuleFit (Friedman and Popescu, 2008)

Acknowledgments

Thanks to Lisa Song for her continued assistance in developing these course materials.

References

- Chen, Chaofan et al. (2019). "This Looks Like That: Deep Learning for Interpretable Image Recognition." In: *Proceedings of Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*. URL: <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1806.10574.pdf>.
- Doshi-Velez, Finale and Been Kim (2017). "Towards a Rigorous Science of Interpretable Machine Learning." In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1702.08608*. URL: <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1702.08608.pdf>.
- Friedman, Jerome, Trevor Hastie, and Robert Tibshirani (2001). ***The Elements of Statistical Learning***. URL: https://web.stanford.edu/~hastie/ElemStatLearn/printings/ESLII_print12.pdf. New York: Springer.
- Friedman, Jerome H., Bogdan E. Popescu, et al. (2008). "Predictive Learning Via Rule Ensembles." In: *The Annals of Applied Statistics* 2.3. URL: https://projecteuclid.org/download/pdfview_1/euclid.aoas/1223908046, pp. 916–954.
- Gill, Navdeep et al. (2020). "A Responsible Machine Learning Workflow with Focus on Interpretable Models, Post-hoc Explanation, and Discrimination Testing." In: *Information* 11.3. URL: <https://www.mdpi.com/2078-2489/11/3/137>, p. 137.
- Goldstein, Alex et al. (2015). "Peeking Inside the Black Box: Visualizing Statistical Learning with Plots of Individual Conditional Expectation." In: *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* 24.1. URL: <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1309.6392.pdf>.

References

- Hu, Xiyang, Cynthia Rudin, and Margo Seltzer (2019). "Optimal Sparse Decision Trees." In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.12847*. URL: <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1904.12847.pdf>.
- Lou, Yin et al. (2013). "Accurate Intelligible Models with Pairwise Interactions." In: *Proceedings of the 19th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. URL: <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.352.7682&rep=rep1&type=pdf>. ACM, pp. 623–631.
- Lundberg, Scott M. and Su-In Lee (2017). "A Unified Approach to Interpreting Model Predictions." In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 30*. Ed. by I. Guyon et al. URL: <http://papers.nips.cc/paper/7062-a-unified-approach-to-interpreting-model-predictions.pdf>. Curran Associates, Inc., pp. 4765–4774.
- Ustun, Berk and Cynthia Rudin (2016). "Supersparse Linear Integer Models for Optimized Medical Scoring Systems." In: *Machine Learning* 102.3. URL: <https://users.cs.duke.edu/~cynthia/docs/UstunTrRuAAAI13.pdf>, pp. 349–391.
- Vaughan, Joel et al. (2018). "Explainable Neural Networks Based on Additive Index Models." In: *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.01933*. URL: <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1806.01933.pdf>.
- Yang, Hongyu, Cynthia Rudin, and Margo Seltzer (2017). "Scalable Bayesian Rule Lists." In: *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)*. URL: <https://arxiv.org/pdf/1602.08610.pdf>.