Machine Learning

Lecture 2: k-Nearest Neighbors

Prof. Dr. Stephan Günnemann

Data Mining and Analytics
Technical University of Munich

15.10.2019

Reading material

Main reading

- "Machine Learning: A Probabilistic Perspective" by Murphy [ch. 1.4.1 - 1.4.3]

Extra reading

- "Bayesian Reasoning and Machine Learning" by Barber [ch. 14]

Slides adapted from previous versions by W. Koepp & D. Korhammer

Iris dataset



Iris dataset: 2 features

How do we intuitively label new samples by hand?
Look at the *surrounding* points. Do as your neighbor does.

1-NN algorithm

Given a training dataset $\mathcal{D} = \{(\boldsymbol{x}_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^N$
where $\boldsymbol{x}_i \in \mathbb{R}^D$ are features and $y_i \in \{1, \dots, C\}$ are class labels

To classify new observations:

- define a distance measure (e.g. Euclidean distance)
- compute the nearest neighbor for all new data points
- and label them with the label of their nearest neighbor

This works for both *classification* and *regression*.

1-NN



This corresponds to a Voronoi tesselation.
And results in poor generalization...

k-Nearest Neighbor classification

More *robust* against errors in the training set:

Look at multiple nearest neighbors and pick the majority label.

Let $\mathcal{N}_k(\boldsymbol{x})$ be the k nearest neighbors of a vector $\boldsymbol{x}$, then in classification tasks:

$$p(y = c \mid \boldsymbol{x}, k) = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_k(\boldsymbol{x})} \mathbb{I}(y_i = c),$$

$$\hat{y} = \arg\max_c p(y = c \mid \boldsymbol{x}, k)$$

with the *indicator variable* $\mathbb{I}(e)$ is defined as:

$$\mathbb{I}(e) = \begin{cases} 1 \text{ if } e \text{ is true} \\ 0 \text{ if } e \text{ is false.} \end{cases}$$

i.e., the vector will be labeled by the mode of its neighbors' labels.

k-Nearest Neighbor classification: weighted

Look at multiple nearest neighbors and pick the weighted majority label.
The weight is inversely proportional to the distance.

Let $\mathcal{N}_k(\boldsymbol{x})$ be the k nearest neighbors of a vector $\boldsymbol{x}$, then in classification tasks:

$$p(y = c \mid \boldsymbol{x}, k) = \frac{1}{Z} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_k(\boldsymbol{x})} \frac{1}{\mathrm{d}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{x}_i)} \mathbb{I}(y_i = c),$$

$$\hat{y} = \arg\max_c p(y = c \mid \boldsymbol{x}, k)$$

with $Z = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_k(x)} \frac{1}{\mathrm{d}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{x}_i)}$ the normalization constant and $\mathrm{d}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{x}_i)$ being a distance measure between $\boldsymbol{x}$ and $\boldsymbol{x}_i$.

k-Nearest-Neighbor regression

Regression is similar:

Let $\mathcal{N}_k(\boldsymbol{x})$ be the k nearest neighbors of a vector $\boldsymbol{x}$, then for regression:

$$\hat{y} = \frac{1}{Z} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_k(\boldsymbol{x})} \frac{1}{\mathrm{d}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{x}_i)} \, y_i,$$

with $Z = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_k(x)} \frac{1}{\mathrm{d}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{x}_i)}$ the normalization constant and $\mathrm{d}(\boldsymbol{x}, \boldsymbol{x}_i)$ being a distance measure between $\boldsymbol{x}$ and $\boldsymbol{x}_i$,

i.e., the vector will be labeled by a weighted mean of its neighbors' values.

Note: y_i is a real number here (rather then categorical label).

3-NN



So, how many neighbors are best?

1-NN



Compare the decision boundaries of 1-NN and 3-NN

Choosing k

Goal is generalization: pick k (called a *hyper-parameter*) that performs best[1] on unseen (future) data.

Unfortunately, no access to future data, so split the dataset $\mathcal{D}$:



Hyper-parameter tuning procedure

- Learn the model using the training set
- Evaluate performance with different k on the *validation set* picking the best k
- Report final performance on the test set.[2]

[1] In terms of some predefined metric, i.e. accuracy
[2] Good data science practices: See slides on Decision Trees

Using validation set to choose k



We choose $k = 7$.

Measuring classification performance

How can we assess the performance of a (binary) classification algorithm?

$\Rightarrow$ Confusion table

Predicted	True condition $y=1$	True condition $y=0$
$y=1$	TP	FP
$y=0$	FN	TN

TP = true prositive, TN = true negative } correct predictions

FP = false prositive, FN = false negative } wrong predictions



Measuring classification performance

Accuracy: $\text{acc} = \frac{TP+TN}{TP+TN+FP+FN}$

Precision: $\text{prec} = \frac{TP}{TP+FP}$

Sensitivty/Recall: $\text{rec} = \frac{TP}{TP+FN}$

Specificity: $\text{tnr} = \frac{TN}{FP+TN}$

False Negative Rate: $\text{fnr} = \frac{FN}{TP+FN}$

False Positive Rate: $\text{fpr} = \frac{FP}{FP+TN}$

F1 Score: $f1 = \frac{2 \cdot \text{prec} \cdot \text{rec}}{\text{prec} + \text{rec}}$

$\Rightarrow$ Trade-off between precision and recall: increasing one (most often) leads to decreasing the other

General note: Be careful when you have imbalanced classes!

Distance measures

- K-NN can be used with various distance measures $\rightarrow$ highly flexible
- Euclidean distance (L_2 norm): $\sqrt{\sum_i (u_i - v_i)^2}$
- L_1 norm: $\sum_i |u_i - v_i|$
- L_∞ norm: $\max_i |u_i - v_i|$
- Angle:

$$\cos\alpha = \frac{\boldsymbol{u}^T\boldsymbol{v}}{\|\boldsymbol{u}\|\|\boldsymbol{v}\|}$$



- *Mahalanobis distance* ($\boldsymbol{\Sigma}$ is *positive (semi) definite* and *symmetric*):

$$\sqrt{(\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{v})^T\boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1}(\boldsymbol{u}-\boldsymbol{v})}$$

- Hamming distance, Edit distance, ...

Scaling issues



The same old example but one of our features is in the order of meters, the other in the order of centimeters. $(k = 1)$

Circumventing scaling issues

- Data *standardization*
  Scale each feature to zero mean and unit variance.

$$x_{i,\text{std}} = \frac{x_i - \mu_i}{\sigma_i}$$

  (This is a standard procedure in machine learning. Many models are sensitive to differences in scale.)
- Use the Mahalanobis distance.

$$\text{mahalanobis}(\boldsymbol{x}_1, \boldsymbol{x}_2) = \sqrt{(\boldsymbol{x}_1 - \boldsymbol{x}_2)^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma}^{-1} (\boldsymbol{x}_1 - \boldsymbol{x}_2)}$$

$\boldsymbol{\Sigma} = \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_1^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sigma_n^2 \end{bmatrix}$ is equal to Euclidean distance on normalized data

The curse of dimensionality

Given a discrete one-dimensional input space $x \in \{1, 2, \ldots, 10\}$

For $N = 20$ uniformly distributed samples the data covers 100% of the input space.

Add a second dimension (now $\boldsymbol{x} \in \{1, \ldots, 10\}^2$) and your data only covers 18% of the input space.

Once you add a third dimension you only cover 2%.



The curse of dimensionality

- The nearest neighbor will now be pretty far away..
- N has to grow exponentially with the number of features. Consider this when using k-NN on high-dimensional data.



Practical considerations

Expensive: memory and naive inference are both $O(N)$:

we need to store the entire training data and compare with all training instances to find the nearest neighbor

Solution: use tree-based search structures (e.g. k-d tree) for efficient (approximate) NN [3]



[3] At the expense of an additional computation performed only once

What we learned

- k-NN Algorithm
- Train-validation-test split
- Measuring classification performance
- Distance metrics
- Curse of dimensionality