

Rare Patterns vs. Negative Patterns

- Rare patterns
 - Very low support but interesting (e.g., buying Rolex watches)
 - How to mine them? Setting individualized, group-based min-support thresholds for different groups of items
- Negative patterns
 - Negatively correlated: Unlikely to happen together
 - Ex.: Since it is unlikely that the same customer buys both a Ford Expedition (an SUV car) and a Ford Fusion (a hybrid car), buying a Ford Expedition and buying a Ford Fusion are likely negatively correlated patterns
 - How to define negative patterns?

Defining Negative Correlated Patterns

- A support-based definition
 - If itemsets A and B are both frequent but rarely occur together, i.e., sup(A U B) << sup (A) × sup(B)</p>
 - Then A and B are negatively correlated

Does this remind you the definition of lift?

- Is this a good definition for large transaction datasets?
- Ex.: Suppose a store sold two needle packages A and B 100 times each, but only one transaction contained both A and B
 - ☐ When there are in total 200 transactions, we have
 - \Box s(A U B) = 0.005, s(A) × s(B) = 0.25, s(A U B) << s(A) × s(B)
 - But when there are 10⁵ transactions, we have
 - \Box s(A U B) = 1/10⁵, s(A) × s(B) = 1/10³ × 1/10³, s(A U B) > s(A) × s(B)
 - What is the problem?—Null transactions: The support-based definition is not null-invariant!

Defining Negative Correlation: Need Null-Invariance in Definition

- A good definition on negative correlation should take care of the nullinvariance problem
 - Whether two itemsets A and B are negatively correlated should not be influenced by the number of null-transactions
- A Kulczynski measure-based definition
 - If itemsets A and B are frequent but (P(A|B) + P(B|A))/2 < ε, where ε is a negative pattern threshold, then A and B are negatively correlated</p>
- For the same needle package problem:
 - No matter there are in total 200 or 10⁵ transactions
 - □ If $\epsilon = 0.02$, we have $(P(A|B) + P(B|A))/2 = (0.01 + 0.01)/2 < \epsilon$