Boolean Learning Example

Let's consider a concrete example with a finite number of the hypothesis set to further elaborate the main concept on the size of the hypothesis set, the probability structure of the data, and the influence of the size of the training set.

Let us consider a Boolean target function (i.e., $\mathcal{Y} = \{0, 1\}$) over a four-bit vector representation of input space $\{0000, 0001, \dots, 0111, 1000, 1001, \dots, 1111\}$.

Q: For this example, what is the dimension of the input space \mathcal{X} ?

A: 4

Q: For this example, how big is the entire input space \mathcal{X} ?

A: $2^4 = 16$

Q: For this example, how big is the entire Boolean hypothesis set \mathcal{H} ?

A: $2^{2^4} = 65,536$

In general, the target function f is **unknown**. However, to illustrate the concept and identify the learning performance, let us *define* the target function f which just <u>checks if the number of zeros in the binary representation exceeds the number of ones</u>. If so, then the function outputs 1 and 0 otherwise

Programming Tip: The string specification above uses Python's advanced string formatting minilanguage. In this case, the specification says to convert the integer into a fixed-width, four-character (04b) binary representation.

Learning is only feasible in a *probabilistic* sense. To this end, we **assume** that the training set represents a random sampling (**in-sample** data) from a greater population (**out-of-sample** data) that would be consistent with the population that g would ultimately predict upon.

Remark: In other words, we are assuming a stable probability structure for both the in-sample and out-of-sample data. This is a major assumption and makes learning feasible!

Now, presented with a training set consisting of some input/output pairs, our goal is to find g that best matches f on the **training** samples in the dataset \mathcal{D} . In other words, minimize errors over the training set $(E_{in}(g))$ where the subscript indicates in-sample data.

We will now show that we can indeed **predict** something useful outside \mathcal{D} using only \mathcal{D} .

Let us assume a very simple probabilistic distribution in which we have the first eight elements from the input space \mathcal{X} are <u>twice</u> as likely as the last eight. The following code is a function that generates elements from \mathcal{X} according to this distribution.

```
def get_sample(n=1):
    if n==1:
        return
'{0:04b}'.format(np.random.choice(list(range(8))*2+list(range(8,16))))
```

```
else:
   return [get sample(1) for in range(n)]
```

Programming Tip: The function that returns random samples uses the np.random.choice function from Numpy which takes samples (with replacement) from the given iterable. Because we want the first eight numbers to be twice as frequent as the rest, we simply repeat them in the iterable using range (8) *2. Recall that multiplying a Python list by an integer duplicates the entire list by that integer. It does not do element-wise multiplication as with Numpy arrays.

```
list(range(8))*2+list(range(8,16))
[0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 0, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15]
```

If we wanted the first eight to be 10 times more frequent, then we would use range (8) *10, for example. This is a simple but powerful technique that requires very little code. Note that np.random.choice also permits an explicit way to specify more complicated distributions.

The next block applies the function definition f to the sampled data to generate the training set consisting of 5 elements.

```
np.random.seed(12) # for reproduction
train=df.loc[get_sample(5),'f'] # 5-element training set
train.index.unique().shape # how many unique elements?
(4,)
```

Notice that even though there are 5 elements, there is redundancy because these are drawn according to an underlying probability.

```
df['g']=df.loc[train.index.unique(),'f']
  df.g
0000
        NaN
0001
        NaN
0010
        1.0
0011
        0.0
0100
        NaN
0101
        NaN
        0.0
0110
0111
        NaN
        NaN
1000
1001
        0.0
1010
        NaN
1011
        NaN
        NaN
1100
1101
        NaN
1110
        NaN
1111
        NaN
Name: g, dtype: float64
```

Note that there are NaN symbols for which the training set had no values. We now do a *bold guess*: we will fill NaN with 0.0 to define our final hypothesis g.

```
df['g'] = df['g'].fillna(0) #final specification of g
```

We can now address the performance of g with 5 training data elements. Let's pretend we have deployed this and generated 150 test data.

```
np.random.seed(30) # for reproduction
test= df.loc[get_sample(150),'f']
(df.loc[test.index,'g'] != test).mean()
0.28
```

The result shows an error rate of 0.28, given the probability mechanism that is generating the data. The following Pandas compares the overlap between the training and test sets in the context of all possible data. The NaN values show the rows where the test data had items absent in the training data. Recall that we made a bold guess to set zero for these items. As shown, sometimes this works in its favor, and sometimes not.

Programming Tip: The pd.concat function concatenates the two Series objects in the list. The axis=1 means joining the two objects along the columns where each newly created column is named according to the given keys. The level=0 in the groupby for each Series object means group along the index. Because the index corresponds to the 4-bit elements, this accounts for repetition in the elements. The mean aggregation function computes the values of the function for each 4-bit element. Because all functions in each respective group have the same value, the mean just picks out that value because the average of a list of constants is that constant.

| | test | train |
|------|------|-------|
| 0000 | 1 | NaN |
| 0001 | 1 | NaN |
| 0010 | 1 | 1.0 |
| 0011 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 0100 | 1 | NaN |
| 0101 | 0 | NaN |
| 0110 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 0111 | 0 | NaN |
| 1000 | 1 | NaN |
| 1001 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 1010 | 0 | NaN |
| 1011 | 0 | NaN |
| 1100 | 0 | NaN |
| 1101 | 0 | NaN |
| 1110 | 0 | NaN |
| 1111 | 0 | NaN |

Influence of Size of Training Data

We can now play around to see the influence of the size of training data. For example, if we keep everything the same and increase the size of training data to 12, we will have another final hypothesis g with a better prediction.

```
np.random.seed(12) # for reproduction
train=df.loc[get_sample(12),'f']
del df['g']
df['g']=df.loc[train.index.unique(),'f']
df.g.fillna(0,inplace=True) #final specification of g
np.random.seed(12) # for reproduction
test= df.loc[get_sample(50),'f']
(df.loc[test.index,'g'] != df.loc[test.index,'f']).mean() # error rate
```

And Pandas

0.126666666666668

| | test | train |
|------|------|-------|
| 0000 | 1 | NaN |
| 0001 | 1 | NaN |
| 0010 | 1 | 1.0 |
| 0011 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 0100 | 1 | 1.0 |
| 0101 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 0110 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 0111 | 0 | NaN |
| 1000 | 1 | 1.0 |
| 1001 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 1010 | 0 | NaN |
| 1011 | 0 | NaN |
| 1100 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 1101 | 0 | NaN |
| 1110 | 0 | 0.0 |
| 1111 | 0 | NaN |

The above Python code Boolean_Learning.ipynb can be downloaded from the course website.

Important Takeaways from the Learning Example

- Learning is only feasible in a *probabilistic* way. We don't insist on using any particular probability distribution or knowing what distribution is used. However, whatever distribution we use for generating the samples, we must also use it when we evaluate how well g approximates the *unknown* target function f.
- The hypothesis g is not fixed before generating the data because which hypothesis is selected to be g depends on the data.
- We can **predict** something useful outside the training set \mathcal{D} using only \mathcal{D} . The bigger the training set, the less likely real-world data will fall outside of it, and the better g will perform.