

Chapter VI: Classification

Knowledge Discovery in Databases

Luciano Melodia M.A.

Evolutionary Data Management, Friedrich-Alexander University Erlangen-Nürnberg

Summer semester 2021



Chapter VI: Classification

Classification: basic concepts.

Decision-tree induction.

Bayes classification methods.

Rule-based classification.

Model evaluation and selection.

Techniques to improve classification accuracy: ensemble methods.

Summary.

Supervised vs. Unsupervised Learning

Supervised learning (classification).

Supervision:

The **training data** (observations, measurements, etc.) are accompanied by **labels** indicating the **class** of the observations.

New data is classified based on a **model** created from the training data.

Unsupervised learning (clustering).

The class labels of training data are unknown.

Or rather, there are no training data.

Given a set of measurements, observations, etc., the goal is to find classes or clusters in the data.

See next chapter.

Prediction Problems: Classification vs. Numerical Prediction

Classification:

Predicts **categorical class labels** (discrete, nominal).

Constructs a model based on the training set and the values (class labels) in a classifying attribute and uses it in classifying new data.

Numerical prediction:

Models **continuous-valued functions**.

I.e. predicts missing or unknown (future) values.

Typical applications of classification:

Credit/loan approval: Will it be paid back?

Medical diagnosis: Is a tumor cancerous or benign?

Fraud detection: Is a transaction fraudulent or not?

Web-page categorization: Which category is it?

Classification – A Two-step Process

Model construction: describing a set of predetermined classes:

Each tuple/sample is assumed to belong to a predefined class, as determined by the **class-label attribute**.

The set of tuples used for model construction is the **training set**.

The **model** is represented as classification rules, decision trees, or mathematical formulae.

Model usage, for classifying future or unknown objects:

Estimate **accuracy** of the model:

The known label of **test samples** is compared with the result from the model.

Accuracy rate is the percentage of test-set samples that are correctly classified by the model.

Test set is independent of training set (otherwise overfitting).

If the accuracy is acceptable, **use the model** to classify data tuples whose class labels are not known.

Classification – A Two-step Process



Process (II): Using the Model in Prediction



Chapter VI: Classification

Classification: basic concepts.

Decision-tree induction.

Bayes classification methods.

Rule-based classification.

Model evaluation and selection.

Techniques to improve classification accuracy: ensemble methods.


Summary.

Decision-tree Induction: An Example

Training dataset: buys_computer.

The dataset follows an example of Quinlan's ID3 (playing tennis).

Resulting tree:



age	income	student	credit_rating	uter
≤ 30	high	no	fair	no
≤ 30	high	no	excellent	no
31 ... 40	high	no	fair	yes
> 40	medium	no	fair	yes
> 40	low	yes	fair	yes
> 40	low	yes	excellent	no
31 ... 40	low	yes	excellent	yes
≤ 30	medium	no	fair	no
≤ 30	low	no	fair	yes
> 40	medium	yes	fair	yes
≤ 30	medium	yes	excellent	yes
31 ... 40	medium	no	excellent	yes
31 ... 40	high	yes	fair	yes
> 40	medium	no	excellent	no

Algorithm for Decision-tree Induction

Basic algorithm (a greedy algorithm):

Tree is constructed in a **top-down recursive divide-and-conquer manner**.

Attributes are categorical.

If not: discretize in advance.

At start, all the training examples are at the root.

Examples are **partitioned recursively** based on selected attributes.

Test attributes are selected on the basis of a heuristic or statistical measure.

E.g., information gain – see on the next slide.

Conditions for stopping partitioning:

All samples for a given node belong to the same class.

There are no remaining attributes for further partitioning.

Majority voting is employed for classifying the leaf.

There are no samples left (i.e. partition for particular value is empty).

Attribute-selection Measure: Information Gain (ID3/C4.5)

Select the attribute with the highest information gain.

Let p_i be the probability that an arbitrary tuple in D belongs to class C_i , estimated by $\frac{|C_i|}{|D|}$, such that $1 \leq i \leq m$.

Expected information (entropy) needed to classify a tuple in D :

$$\text{Info}(D) = - \sum_{i=1}^m p_i \log_2(p_i). \quad (1)$$

Information needed (after using attribute A to split D into v partitions) to classify D :

$$\text{Info}_A(D) = \sum_{j=1}^v \left(\frac{|D_j|}{|D|} \text{Info}(D_j) \right). \quad (2)$$

Information gained by branching on A :

$$\text{Gain}(A) = \text{Info}(D) - \text{Info}_A(D). \quad (3)$$

Attribute Selection: Information Gain

Class P: buys_computer = "yes"

Class N: buys_computer = "no"

$$\text{Info}(D) = I(9, 5) = -\frac{9}{14} \log_2\left(\frac{9}{14}\right) - \frac{5}{14} \log_2\left(\frac{5}{14}\right) = 0.94$$

age	p	n	$I(p, n)$
≤ 30	2	3	0.971
31 ... 40	4	0	0
> 40	3	2	0.971

Similarly,

$$\text{Gain}(\text{income}) = 0.029,$$

$$\text{Gain}(\text{student}) = 0.090,$$

$$\text{Gain}(\text{credit_rating}) = 0.048.$$


$$\text{Info}_{\text{age}}(D) = \frac{5}{14} I(2, 3) + \frac{4}{14} I(4, 0) + \frac{5}{14} I(3, 2) = 0.694.$$

$\frac{5}{14} I(2, 3)$ means "age ≤ 30 " has 5 out of 14 samples, with 2 yes'es and 3 no's. Hence,

$$\text{Gain}(\text{age}) = \text{Info}(D) - \text{Info}_{\text{age}}(D) = 0.246.$$

age	income	student	credit_rating	buys_computer
≤ 30	high	no	fair	no
≤ 30	high	no	excellent	no
31 ... 40	high	no	fair	yes
> 40	medium	no	fair	yes
> 40	low	yes	fair	yes
> 40	low	yes	excellent	no
31 ... 40	low	yes	excellent	yes
≤ 30	medium	no	fair	no
≤ 30	low	no	fair	yes
> 40	medium	yes	fair	yes
≤ 30	medium	yes	excellent	yes
31 ... 40	medium	no	fair	yes
31 ... 40	high	yes	fair	yes
> 40	medium	no	excellent	no

Partitioning in the Example



Computing Information Gain for Continuous-valued Attributes

Let attribute A be a continuous-valued attribute.

Must determine the best split point for A.

Sort the values of A in increasing order.

Typically, the midpoint between each pair of adjacent values is considered as a possible split point.

$\frac{a_i + a_{i+1}}{2}$ is the midpoint between the values of a_i and a_{i+1} .

The point with the minimum expected information requirement for A is selected as the split point for A.

Split:

D_1 is the set of tuples in D satisfying $A \leq \text{split point}$,
and D_2 is the set of tuples in D satisfying $A > \text{split point}$.

So to say: Discretization as you go along.

For this particular purpose.

Gain Ratio for Attribute Selection (C4.5)

Information-gain measure is biased towards attributes with a large number of values. C4.5 (a successor of ID3) uses gain ratio to overcome the problem (normalization to information gain):

$$\text{SplitInfo}_A(D) = - \sum_{j=1}^v \frac{|D_j|}{|D|} \log_2 \left(\frac{|D_j|}{|D|} \right), \quad (4)$$

$$\text{GainRatio}(A) = \frac{\text{Gain}(A)}{\text{SplitInfo}_A(D)}. \quad (5)$$

Example:

$$\text{SplitInfo}_{\text{income}}(D) = -\frac{4}{14} \log_2 \left(\frac{4}{14} \right) - \frac{6}{14} \log_2 \left(\frac{6}{14} \right) - \frac{4}{14} \log_2 \left(\frac{4}{14} \right) = 1.557, \quad (6)$$

$$\text{GainRatio}(\text{income}) = \frac{0.029}{1.557} = 0.019. \quad (7)$$

The attribute with the maximum gain ratio is selected as the splitting attribute.

Gini Index

Corrado Gini (1884 – 1965).

Italian statistician and sociologist.

Also called Gini coefficient.

Measures statistical dispersion.

Zero expresses perfect equality where all values belong to the same class.

One expresses maximal inequality among values.

Based on the Lorenz curve.

Plots the proportion of the total sum of values (y -axis) that is cumulatively assigned to the bottom $x\%$ of the population.


Line at 45 degrees thus represents perfect equality of value distribution.

Gini coefficient then is . . .

. . . the ratio of the area that lies between the line of equality and the Lorenz curve over the total area under the line of equality.

Gini Index (II)

Example: Distribution of incomes.



Gini Index (CART, IBM IntelligentMiner)

If a dataset D contains examples from n classes, Gini index $\text{gini}(D)$ is defined as:

$$\text{gini}(D) = 1 - \sum_{j=1}^n p_j^2, \quad (8)$$

where p_j is the relative frequency of class j in D .

If a dataset D is split on A into two subsets D_1 and D_2 , the Gini index $\text{gini}(D)$ is defined as

$$\text{gini}_A(D) = \frac{|D_1|}{|D|} \text{gini}(D_1) + \frac{|D_2|}{|D|} \text{gini}(D_2). \quad (9)$$

Reduction in impurity:

$$\Delta \text{gini}_A(D) = \text{gini}(D) - \text{gini}_A(D). \quad (10)$$

The attribute A provides the smallest $\text{gini}_A(D)$ (or the largest reduction in impurity) is chosen to split the node.

Need to enumerate all the possible splitting points for each attribute.

Computation of Gini Index (I)

Example:

D has 9 tuples in `buys_computer = "yes"` and 5 in `"no"`, thus

$$\text{gini}(D) = 1 - \left(\frac{9}{14}\right)^2 - \left(\frac{5}{14}\right)^2 = 0.459. \quad (11)$$

Suppose the attribute `income` partitions D into 10 in $D_1 : \{\text{low}, \text{medium}\}$ and 4 in $D_2 : \{\text{high}\}$:

$$\text{gini}(D|_{D[\text{income}] = \text{"medium"}, \text{"low"}}) \quad (12)$$

$$= \frac{10}{14} \text{gini}(D_1) + \frac{4}{14} \text{gini}(D_2) \quad (13)$$

$$= \frac{10}{14} \left(1 - \left(\frac{7}{10}\right)^2 - \left(\frac{3}{10}\right)^2 \right) + \frac{4}{14} \left(1 - \left(\frac{2}{4}\right)^2 - \left(\frac{2}{4}\right)^2 \right) = \quad (14)$$

$$= 0.443 = \text{gini}(D|_{D[\text{income}] = \text{"high"}}). \quad (15)$$

Computation of Gini Index (II)

Example (cont.):

$$\text{gini}(D|_{D[\text{income}] = \text{"low"}, \text{"high"}}) = 0.458,$$

$$\text{gini}(D|_{D[\text{income}] = \text{"medium"}, \text{"high"}}) = 0.450.$$

Thus, split on the {"low", "medium"} and {"high"}, since it has the lowest gini index.

All attributes are assumed continuous-valued.

May need other tools, E.g., clustering, to get the possible split values.

Can be modified for categorical attributes.

Computation of Gini Index (III)

The three measures, in general, return good results, but

Information gain:

Biased towards multi-valued attributes.

Gain ratio:

Tends to prefer unbalanced splits in which one partition is much smaller than the others.

Gini index:

Biased to multi-valued attributes.

Has difficulty when number of classes is large.

Tends to favor tests that result in equal-sized partitions and purity in both partitions.

Other Attribute-selection Measures

CHAID:

A popular decision-tree algorithm, measure based on χ^2 test for independence.

C-SEP:

Performs better than information gain and Gini index in certain cases.

G-statistic:

Has a close approximation to χ^2 distribution.

MDL (Minimal Description Length) principle:

I.e. the simplest solution is preferred.

The best tree is the one that requires the fewest number of bits to both (1) encode the tree and (2) encode the exceptions to the tree.

Multivariate splits:

Partitioning based on multiple variable combinations.

CART: finds multivariate splits based on a linear combination of attributes.

Which attribute-selection measure is the best?

Most give good results, none is significantly superior to others.

Overfitting and Tree Pruning

Overfitting: An induced tree may overfit the training data.

Too many branches, some may reflect anomalies due to noise or outliers.
Poor accuracy for unseen samples.

Two approaches to avoid overfitting:

Prepruning:

Halt tree construction early.
Do not split a node, if this would result in the goodness measure falling below a threshold.
Difficult to choose an appropriate threshold.

Postpruning:

Remove branches from a "fully grown" tree.
Get a sequence of progressively pruned trees.
Use a set of data different from the training data to decide which is the "best pruned tree."

Enhancements to Basic Decision-Tree Induction

Allow for continuous-valued attributes.

Dynamically define new discrete-valued attributes that partition the values of continuous-valued attributes into a discrete set of intervals.

Handle missing attribute values.

Assign the most common value of the attribute.

Assign probability to each of the possible values.

Attribute construction.

Create new attributes based on existing ones that are sparsely represented.

This reduces fragmentation, repetition, and replication.

Classification in Large Databases

Classification – a classical problem extensively studied by statisticians and machine-learning researchers.

Scalability:

Classifying datasets with millions of examples and hundreds of attributes with reasonable speed.

Why is decision-tree induction popular?

Relatively fast learning speed (compared to other classification methods).

Convertible to simple and easy-to-understand classification rules.

Can use SQL queries for accessing databases.

Classification accuracy comparable with other methods.

RainForest (Gehrke, Ramakrishnan & Ganti, VLDB'98).

Builds an AVC-list (attribute, value, class_label).

Scalability Framework for RainForest

Separates the scalability aspects from the criteria that determine the quality of the tree.

Builds an AVC-list:

AVC (Attribute, Value, Class_label).

AVC-set (of an attribute X):

Projection of training dataset onto the attribute X and class label where counts of individual class label are aggregated.

AVC-group (of a node n):

Set of AVC-sets of all predictor attributes at the node n .

RainForest: Training Set and its AVC-sets

age	income	student	credit_rating	buys_computer
≤ 30	high	no	fair	no
≤ 30	high	no	excellent	no
31 ... 40	high	no	fair	yes
> 40	medium	no	fair	yes
> 40	low	yes	fair	yes
> 40	low	yes	excellent	no
31 ... 40	low	yes	excellent	yes
≤ 30	medium	no	fair	no
≤ 30	low	yes	fair	yes
> 40	medium	yes	fair	yes
≤ 30	medium	yes	excellent	yes
31 ... 40	medium	no	excellent	yes
31 ... 40	high	yes	fair	yes
> 40	medium	no	excellent	no

AVC-set on age:

age	yes	no
≤ 30	2	3
31 ... 40	4	0
> 40	3	2

AVC-set on income:

income	yes	no
high	2	2
medium	4	2
low	3	1

RainForest: Training Set and its AVC-sets (II)

age	income	student	credit_rating	buys_computer
≤ 30	high	no	fair	no
≤ 30	high	no	excellent	no
31 ... 40	high	no	fair	yes
> 40	medium	no	fair	yes
> 40	low	yes	fair	yes
> 40	low	yes	excellent	no
31 ... 40	low	yes	excellent	yes
≤ 30	medium	no	fair	no
≤ 30	low	yes	fair	yes
> 40	medium	yes	fair	yes
≤ 30	medium	yes	excellent	yes
31 ... 40	medium	no	excellent	yes
31 ... 40	high	yes	fair	yes
> 40	medium	no	excellent	no

AVC-set on student:

student	yes	no
yes	6	1
no	3	4

AVC-set on credit_rating:

credit_rating	yes	no
fair	6	2
excellent	3	3

BOAT (Bootstrapped Optimistic Algorithm for Tree Construction)

Use a statistical technique called bootstrapping to create several smaller samples (subsets), each fitting in memory.

See on the subsequent slides.

Each subset is used to create a tree, resulting in several trees.

These trees are examined and used to construct a new tree T' .

It turns out that T' is very close to the tree that would be generated using the whole data set together.


Advantages:

Requires only two scans of DB.


An incremental algorithm:

Take insertions and deletions of training data and update the decision tree.


Presentation of Classification Results



Visualization of a Decision Tree in SGI/MineSet 3.0



Interactive Visual Mining by Perception-based Classification (PBC)



Chapter VI: Classification

Classification: basic concepts.

Decision-tree induction.

Bayes classification methods.

Rule-based classification.

Model evaluation and selection.

Techniques to improve classification accuracy: ensemble methods.

Summary.

Bayesian Classification: Why?

A statistical classifier:

Performs probabilistic prediction, i.e. predicts class-membership probabilities.

Foundation: Bayes' Theorem.

Performance:

A simple Bayesian classifier (naïve Bayesian classifier) has performance comparable with decision tree and selected neural-network classifiers.

Incremental:

Each training example can incrementally increase/decrease the probability that a hypothesis is correct – prior knowledge can be combined with observed data.

Standard:

Even when Bayesian methods are computationally intractable, they can provide a standard of optimal decision making against which other methods can be measured.

Bayes' Theorem: Basics

Let X be a data sample ("evidence").

The class label shall be unknown.

Let C_i be the hypothesis that X belongs to class i .

Classification is to determine $P(C_i|X)$:

Posteriori probability: the probability that the hypothesis holds given the observed data sample X .

$P(C_i)$:

Prior probability: the initial probability.

E.g., X will buy computer, regardless of age, income, . . .

$P(X)$:

Probability that sample data is observed.

$P(X|C_j)$:

Likelihood: the probability of observing the sample X given that the hypothesis holds.

E.g., given that X buys computer, the probability that X is 31 . . . 40, medium income.

Bayes' Theorem (II)

Given training data X , the posteriori probability $P(C_i|X)$ of a hypothesis C_i follows from the Bayes' Theorem:

$$P(C_i|X) = \frac{P(X|C_i)P(C_i)}{P(X)}. \quad (16)$$

Predicts that X belongs to C_i if the probability $P(C_i|X)$ is **the highest** among all the $P(C_k|X)$ for all k classes.

Practical difficulty:

Requires initial knowledge of many probabilities.

Significant computational cost.

Towards Naïve Bayesian Classifier

Let D be a training set of tuples and their associated class labels.

Each tuple is represented by an n -dimensional attribute $X = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$.

Suppose there are m classes C_1, C_2, \dots, C_m .

Classification is to derive the maximum posteriori probability.

i.e. the maximal $P(C_i|X)$.

This can be derived from Bayes' Theorem:

$$P(C_i|X) = \frac{P(X|C_i)P(C_i)}{P(X)}. \quad (17)$$

Since $P(X)$ is constant for all classes, we must maximize only:

$$P(X|C_i)P(C_i). \quad (18)$$

Derivation of Naïve Bayes Classifier

A simplifying assumption: attributes are conditionally independent.

I.e. no dependence relation between attributes (which is "naïve").

$$P(X|C_i) = \prod_{k=1}^n P(x_k|C_i) = P(x_1|C_i)P(x_2|C_i) \cdots P(x_n|C_i).$$

This greatly reduces the computation cost:

Only count the class distribution.

If A_k is categorical,

$P(x_k|C_i)$ is the number of tuples in C_i having value x_k for A_k
divided by $|C_{i,D}|$ (the number of tuples of C_i in D).

If A_k is continuous-valued,

$P(x_k|C_i)$ is usually computed based on Gaussian distribution with a mean μ and standard deviation σ :

$$G(x, \mu, \sigma) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma} e^{-\frac{(x-\mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}},$$

and $P(x_k|C_i) = G(x_k, \mu_{C_i}, \sigma_{C_i})$.

Naïve Bayesian Cellcolormake Dataset

Classes:

C_1 : buys_computer = "yes".

C_2 : buys_computer = "no".

Data sample:

$X = (\text{age} \leq 30,$
 $\text{income} = \text{"medium"},$
 $\text{student} = \text{"yes"},$
 $\text{credit_rating} = \text{"fair"}).$

age	income	student	credit_rating	buys_computer
≤ 30	high	no	fair	no
≤ 30	high	no	excellent	no
31 ... 40	high	no	fair	yes
> 40	medium	no	fair	yes
> 40	low	yes	fair	yes
> 40	low	yes	excellent	no
31 ... 40	low	yes	excellent	yes
≤ 30	medium	no	fair	no
> 40	medium	yes	fair	yes
≤ 30	medium	yes	excellent	yes
31 ... 40	medium	no	fair	yes
31 ... 40	high	yes	fair	yes
> 40	medium	no	excellent	no

Naïve Bayesian Classifier: An Example

$P(C_i)$:

$$P(\text{buys_computer} = \text{"yes"}) = \frac{9}{14} = 0.643.$$

$$P(\text{buys_computer} = \text{"no"}) = \frac{5}{14} = 0.357.$$

$X = (\text{age} \leq 30, \text{income} = \text{"medium"}, \text{student} = \text{"yes"}, \text{credit_rating} = \text{"fair"}).$

Compute $P(X|C_i)$ for each class:

$$P(\text{age} \leq 30 | \text{buys_computer} = \text{"yes"}) = \frac{2}{9} = 0.222.$$

$$P(\text{age} \leq 30 | \text{buys_computer} = \text{"no"}) = \frac{3}{5} = 0.6.$$

$$P(\text{income} = \text{"medium"} | \text{buys_computer} = \text{"yes"}) = \frac{4}{9} = 0.444.$$

$$P(\text{income} = \text{"medium"} | \text{buys_computer} = \text{"no"}) = \frac{2}{5} = 0.4.$$

$$P(\text{student} = \text{"yes"} | \text{buys_computer} = \text{"yes"}) = \frac{6}{9} = 0.667.$$

$$P(\text{student} = \text{"yes"} | \text{buys_computer} = \text{"no"}) = \frac{1}{5} = 0.2.$$

$$P(\text{credit_rating} = \text{"fair"} | \text{buys_computer} = \text{"yes"}) = \frac{6}{9} = 0.667.$$

$$P(\text{credit_rating} = \text{"fair"} | \text{buys_computer} = \text{"no"}) = \frac{2}{5} = 0.4.$$

Naïve Bayesian Classifier: An Example (II)

$P(C_i)$:

$$P(X|\text{buys_computer} = \text{"yes"}) = 0.222 \cdot 0.444 \cdot 0.667 \cdot 0.667 = 0.044.$$

$$P(X|\text{buys_computer} = \text{"no"}) = 0.6 \cdot 0.4 \cdot 0.2 \cdot 0.4 = 0.019.$$

$P(X|C_i) \cdot P(C_i)$:

$$P(X|\text{buys_computer} = \text{"yes"}) \cdot P(\text{buys_computer} = \text{"yes"}) = 0.028.$$

$$P(X|\text{buys_computer} = \text{"no"}) \cdot P(\text{buys_computer} = \text{"no"}) = 0.007.$$

Therefore, X belongs to class C_1 ($\text{buys_computer} = \text{"yes"}$).

Avoiding the Zero-probability Problem

Naïve Bayesian prediction requires each conditional probability to be non-zero.

Otherwise, the predicted probability will be zero.

$$P(X|C_i) = \prod_{k=1}^n P(x_k|C_i). \quad (19)$$

Example:

Suppose a dataset with 1000 tuples, income = "low" (0), income = "medium" (990), and income = "high" (10).

Use Laplacian correction (or Laplacian estimator):

Add 1 to each case:

$$P(\text{income} = \text{"low"}) = \frac{1}{1003}.$$

$$P(\text{income} = \text{"medium"}) = \frac{991}{1003}.$$

$$P(\text{income} = \text{"high"}) = \frac{11}{1003}.$$

The "corrected" probability estimates are close to their "uncorrected" counterparts.

Naïve Bayesian Classifier: Comments

Advantages:

- Easy to implement.

- Good results obtained in most of the cases.

Disadvantages:

- Assumption: class conditional independence, therefore loss of accuracy.

- Practically, **dependencies** exist among variables.

 - E.g., hospital patients:

 - Profile: age, family history, etc.

 - Symptoms: fever, cough, etc.

 - Disease: lung cancer, diabetes, etc.

 - Cannot be modeled by naïve Bayesian classifier.

How to deal with these dependencies?

- Bayesian belief networks (see textbook).

Chapter VI: Classification

Classification: basic concepts.

Decision-tree induction.

Bayes classification methods.

Rule-based classification.

Model evaluation and selection.

Techniques to improve classification accuracy: ensemble methods.

Summary.

Using IF-THEN Rules for Classification

Represent the knowledge in the form of **IF-THEN rules**.

E.g., if age ≤ 30 AND student = "yes" THEN buys_computer = "yes".
Readable.

Rule **antecedent/precondition** vs. rule **consequent**.

Assessment of a rule R : coverage and accuracy.

$n_{\text{covers}} = \#$ of tuples covered by R (antecedent if true).

$n_{\text{correct}} = \#$ of tuples correctly classified by R .

$\text{coverage}(R) = \frac{n_{\text{covers}}}{|D|}$ with D training data set.

$\text{accuracy}(R) = \frac{n_{\text{correct}}}{n_{\text{covers}}}.$

Using IF-THEN Rules for Classification (II)

If more than one rule are triggered, need **conflict resolution**.

Size ordering:

Assign the highest priority to the triggered rule that has the "toughest" requirement (i.e., the most attribute tests).

Class-based ordering:

Decreasing order of prevalence or misclassification cost per class.

Rule-based ordering (decision list):

Rules are organized into one long priority list, according to some measure of rule quality, or by experts.

Rule Extraction from a Decision Tree

Rules are **easier to understand** than large trees.


Rule can be created for **each path from the root to a leaf**.

The leaf holds the class prediction.

Each attribute-value pair along the path forms a conjunction:

Example:

IF age \leq 30 AND student = "no"
THEN buys_computer = "no".
IF age \leq 30 AND student = "yes"
THEN buys_computer = "yes".
IF age 31 ... 40 THEN
buys_computer = "yes".



Rule Induction: Sequential Covering Method

Sequential covering algorithm:

Extracts rules directly from training data.

Typical sequential covering algorithms:

FOIL, AQ, CN2, RIPPER.

Rules are learned **sequentially**.

Each rule for a given class C_i will cover many tuples of C_i , but none (or few) of the tuples of other classes.

Steps:

Rules are learned one at a time.

Each time a rule is learned, the tuples covered by the rule are removed.

The process repeats on the remaining tuples unless termination condition, e.g., when no more training examples left or when the quality of a rule returned is below a user-specified threshold.

Compare with decision-tree induction:


That was learning a set of rules simultaneously.

Sequential Covering Algorithm

While (enough target tuples left):

generate a rule;

remove positive target tuples satisfying this rule;



Sequential Covering Algorithm (II)

To generate a rule:


while(true:)

 find the best predicate p (attribute = value);

if FOIL_Gain(p) > threshold

then add p to current rule;

else break;



Sequential Covering Algorithm (III)

Start with the most general rule possible:

Condition = empty.

Add new attributes by adopting a greedy depth-first strategy.

Pick the one that improves the rule quality most.

Current rule R : IF condition THEN class = c .

New rule R' : IF condition' THEN class = c ,
 pos/neg are # of positive/negative tuples covered by R .

Rule-quality measures.

Must consider both coverage and accuracy.

FOIL_Gain (from FOIL - First-Order Inductive Learner):

$$\text{FOIL_Gain} = pos' \left(\log_2 \frac{pos'}{pos' + neg'} - \log_2 \frac{pos}{pos + neg} \right). \quad (20)$$

Favors rules that have high accuracy and cover many positive tuples.

Rule Pruning

Danger of **overfitting**.

Removing a conjunct (attribute test),

if pruned version of rule has greater quality,
assessed on an independent set of test tuples (called "pruning set").

FOIL uses:

$$\text{FOIL_Prune}(R) = \frac{\text{pos} - \text{neg}}{\text{pos} + \text{neg}}. \quad (21)$$

If FOIL_Prune is higher for the pruned version of R , prune R .

Chapter VI: Classification

Classification: basic concepts.

Decision-tree induction.

Bayes classification methods.

Rule-based classification.

Model evaluation and selection.

Techniques to improve classification accuracy: ensemble methods.

Summary.

Model Evaluation and Selection

Evaluation metrics:

How can we measure accuracy?

Other metrics to consider?

Use test set of class-labeled tuples instead of training set when assessing accuracy.

Methods for estimating a classifier's accuracy:

Holdout method, random subsampling.

Cross-validation.

Bootstrap.

Comparing classifiers:

Confidence intervals.

Cost-benefit analysis and ROC curves.

Model Evaluation and Selection (II)

Confusion Matrix:

Actual class/predicted class:	C_1	$\neg C_1$
C_1	True positives (TP)	False negatives (FN)
$\neg C_1$	False positives (FP)	True negatives (TN)

Example:

Actual class/predicted class:	buys_computer = yes	buys_computer = no	Total
buys_computer = yes	6954	46	7000
buys_computer = no	412	2588	3000
Total	7366	2634	10000

Given M classes, an entry $C_{ij}^{(m)}$ in an $M \times M$ confusion matrix indicates # of tuples in class i that were labeled by the classifier as class j .

May have extra rows/columns to provide totals.

Classifier-evaluation Metrics: Accuracy, Error Rate, Sensitivity and Specificity

A/P	C	$\neg C$	
C	TP	FN	P
$\neg C$	FP	TN	N
	P'	N'	All

Classifier accuracy, or recognition rate:

Percentage of test set tuples that are correctly classified.

$$\text{Accuracy} = \frac{TP+TN}{All}.$$

Error rate:

1 - accuracy, or

$$\text{Error rate} = \frac{FP+FN}{All}.$$

Class-imbalance problem:

One class may be rare e.g., fraud, or HIV-positive.

Significant majority of the negative class and minority of the positive class

Sensitivity: True-positive recognition rate. $\text{Sensitivity} = \frac{TP}{P}.$

Specificity: False-negative recognition rate. $\text{Specificity} = \frac{TN}{N}.$

Classifier-evaluation Metrics: Precision, Recall, and F-measures

Precision:

Exactness – the % of tuples that are actually positive in those that the classifier labeled as positive: $\frac{TP}{TP+FP}$.

Recall:

Completeness – the % of tuples that the classifier labeled as positive in all positive tuples: $\frac{TP}{TP+FN}$.
Perfect score is 1.0.

Inverse relationship between precision and recall.

F-measure (F_1 or F -score):

Gives equal weight to precision and recall: $F = \frac{2 \cdot \text{precision} \cdot \text{recall}}{\text{precision} + \text{recall}}$.

F_β weighted measure of precision and recall:

Assigns β times as much weight to recall as to precision: $F_\beta = \frac{(1+\beta^2) \cdot \text{precision} \cdot \text{recall}}{\beta^2 \cdot \text{precision} + \text{recall}}$.

Classifier-evaluation Metrics: Precision, Recall, and F-measures (II)

Actual class/predicted class	cancer = yes	cancer = no	Total	Recognition (%)
cancer = yes	90	210	300	30.00 (sensitivity)
cancer = no	140	9560	9700	98.56 (specificity)
Total	230	9770	10000	96.40 (accuracy)

$$\text{Precision} = \frac{90}{230} = 39.13\%.$$

$$\text{Recall} = \frac{90}{300} = 30.00\%.$$

$$F_1\text{-measure} = \frac{2 \cdot 0.3913 \cdot 0.3}{0.3913 + 0.3} = 33.96\%.$$

Classifier-evaluation Metrics: Holdout & Cross-validation Methods

Holdout method.

Given data is randomly partitioned into two independent sets:

Training set (E.g., $2/3$) for model construction.

Test set (E.g., $1/3$) for accuracy estimation.

Random sampling: a variation of holdout.

Repeat holdout k times, accuracy = avg. of the accuracies obtained.

Cross-validation (k -fold, where $k = 10$ is most popular).

Randomly partition the data into k mutually exclusive subsets, each approximately equal size.

At i -th iteration, use D_i as test set and the others as training set.

Leave-one-out: k folds, where $k = \#$ of tuples; for small-sized data.

Stratified cross-validation: Folds are stratified so that class distribution in each fold is approx. the same as that in the initial data.

Evaluating Classifier Accuracy: Bootstrap

Bootstrap.

Works well with small data sets.

Samples the given training tuples uniformly with replacement.

I.e. each time a tuple is selected, it is equally likely
to be selected again and re-added to the training set.

Several bootstrap methods, and a common one is .632 bootstrap.

Data set with d tuples sampled d times, with replacement,
resulting in a training set of d samples.

The data tuples that did not make it into the training set end up forming the test set.

About 63.2% of the original data end up in the bootstrap, and the remaining 36.8% form
the test set (since $(1 - \frac{1}{d})^d \approx e^{-1} = 0.368$).

Repeat the sampling procedure k times; overall accuracy of the model:

$$\text{Acc}(M) = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k 0.632 \cdot \text{Acc}(M_i)_{\text{test_set}} + 0.368 \cdot \text{Acc}(M_i)_{\text{train_set}}. \quad (22)$$

Evaluating Classifier Accuracy: Bootstrap (II)

Suppose we have 2 classifiers, M_1 and M_2 , which one is better?

Use 10-fold cross-validation to obtain $\overline{\text{err}}(M_1)$ and $\overline{\text{err}}(M_2)$.

Recall: error rate is $1 - \text{accuracy}(M)$.

Mean error rates:

Just estimates of error on the true population of future data cases.

What if the difference between the 2 error rates is just attributed to chance?

Use a test of statistical significance.

Obtain confidence limits for our error estimates.

Evaluating Classifier Accuracy: Null Hypothesis

Perform 10-fold cross-validation.

10 times.

Assume samples follow a t -distribution with $k - 1$ degrees of freedom.

Here, $k = 10$.

Use t -test

Student's t -test.

Null hypothesis:

M_1 and M_2 are the same.

If we can reject the null hypothesis, then

Conclude that difference between M_1 and M_2 is statistically significant.

Obtain confidence limits for our error estimates.

Estimating Confidence Intervals: t -Test

If only one test set available: pairwise comparison:

For i -th round of 10-fold cross-validation, the same cross partitioning is used to obtain $\text{err}(M_1)_i$ and $\text{err}(M_2)_i$.

Average over 10 rounds to get $\overline{\text{err}}(M_1)$ and $\overline{\text{err}}(M_2)$.

t -test computes t -statistic with $k - 1$ degrees of freedom:

$$t = \frac{\overline{\text{err}}(M_1) - \overline{\text{err}}(M_2)}{\sqrt{\frac{\text{var}(M_1 - M_2)}{k}}}, \quad (23)$$

where

$$\text{var}(M_1 - M_2) = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k [\text{err}(M_1)_i - \text{err}(M_2)_i - (\overline{\text{err}}(M_1) - \overline{\text{err}}(M_2))]^2. \quad (24)$$

If two test sets available: use nonpaired t -test:

$$\text{var}(M_1 - M_2) = \sqrt{\frac{\text{var}(M_1)}{k_1} + \frac{\text{var}(M_2)}{k_2}}, \quad (25)$$

where k_1 & k_2 are # of cross-validation samples used for M_1 & M_2 , respectively.

Estimating Confidence Intervals: Table for t -Distribution

Symmetrical.

Significance level:

E.g., $\text{sig} = 0.05$ or 5% means M_1 & M_2 are significantly different for 95% of population.

Confidence limit: $z = \frac{\text{sig}}{2}$.




TABLE B: t -DISTRIBUTION CRITICAL VALUES

df	Tail probability p											
	.25	.20	.15	.10	.05	.025	.02	.01	.005	.0025	.001	.0005
1	1.000	1.376	1.963	3.078	6.314	12.71	15.89	31.82	63.66	127.3	318.3	636.6
2	.816	1.061	1.386	1.886	2.920	4.303	4.849	6.965	9.925	14.09	22.33	31.60
3	.765	.978	1.250	1.638	2.353	3.182	3.482	4.541	5.841	7.453	10.21	12.92
4	.741	.941	1.190	1.533	2.132	2.776	2.999	3.747	4.604	5.598	7.173	8.610
5	.727	.920	1.156	1.476	2.015	2.571	2.757	3.365	4.032	4.773	5.893	6.869
6	.718	.906	1.134	1.440	1.943	2.447	2.612	3.143	3.707	4.317	5.208	5.959
7	.711	.896	1.119	1.415	1.895	2.365	2.517	2.998	3.499	4.029	4.785	5.408
8	.706	.889	1.108	1.397	1.860	2.306	2.449	2.896	3.355	3.833	4.501	5.041
9	.703	.883	1.100	1.383	1.833	2.262	2.398	2.821	3.250	3.690	4.297	4.781
10	.700	.879	1.093	1.372	1.812	2.228	2.359	2.764	3.169	3.581	4.144	4.587
11	.697	.876	1.088	1.363	1.796	2.201	2.328	2.718	3.106	3.497	4.025	4.437
12	.695	.873	1.083	1.356	1.782	2.179	2.303	2.681	3.055	3.428	3.930	4.318
13	.694	.870	1.079	1.350	1.771	2.160	2.282	2.650	3.012	3.372	3.852	4.221
14	.692	.868	1.076	1.345	1.761	2.145	2.264	2.624	2.977	3.326	3.787	4.140
15	.691	.866	1.074	1.341	1.753	2.131	2.249	2.602	2.947	3.286	3.733	4.073
16	.690	.865	1.071	1.337	1.746	2.120	2.235	2.583	2.921	3.252	3.686	4.015
17	.689	.863	1.069	1.333	1.740	2.110	2.224	2.567	2.898	3.222	3.646	3.965
18	.688	.862	1.067	1.330	1.734	2.101	2.214	2.552	2.878	3.197	3.611	3.922
19	.688	.861	1.066	1.328	1.729	2.093	2.205	2.539	2.861	3.174	3.579	3.883
20	.687	.860	1.064	1.325	1.725	2.086	2.197	2.528	2.845	3.153	3.552	3.850
21	.686	.859	1.063	1.323	1.721	2.080	2.189	2.518	2.831	3.135	3.527	3.819
22	.686	.858	1.061	1.321	1.717	2.074	2.183	2.508	2.819	3.119	3.505	3.792
23	.685	.858	1.060	1.319	1.714	2.069	2.177	2.500	2.807	3.104	3.485	3.768
24	.685	.857	1.059	1.318	1.711	2.064	2.172	2.492	2.797	3.091	3.467	3.745
25	.684	.856	1.058	1.316	1.708	2.060	2.167	2.485	2.787	3.078	3.450	3.725
26	.684	.856	1.058	1.315	1.706	2.056	2.162	2.479	2.779	3.067	3.435	3.707
27	.684	.855	1.057	1.314	1.703	2.052	2.158	2.473	2.771	3.057	3.421	3.690
28	.683	.855	1.056	1.313	1.701	2.048	2.154	2.467	2.763	3.047	3.408	3.674
29	.683	.854	1.055	1.311	1.699	2.045	2.150	2.462	2.756	3.038	3.396	3.659
30	.683	.854	1.055	1.310	1.697	2.042	2.147	2.457	2.750	3.030	3.385	3.646
40	.681	.851	1.050	1.303	1.684	2.021	2.123	2.423	2.704	2.971	3.307	3.551
50	.679	.849	1.047	1.299	1.676	2.009	2.109	2.403	2.678	2.937	3.261	3.496
60	.679	.848	1.045	1.296	1.671	2.000	2.099	2.390	2.660	2.915	3.232	3.460
80	.678	.846	1.043	1.292	1.664	1.990	2.088	2.374	2.639	2.887	3.195	3.416
100	.677	.845	1.042	1.290	1.660	1.984	2.081	2.364	2.626	2.871	3.174	3.390
1000	.675	.842	1.037	1.282	1.646	1.962	2.056	2.330	2.581	2.813	3.098	3.300
∞	.674	.841	1.036	1.282	1.645	1.960	2.054	2.326	2.576	2.807	3.091	3.291

Confidence level C

Estimating Confidence Intervals: Statistical Significance

Are M_1 and M_2 significantly different?

Compute t . Select significance level (E.g., $\text{sig} = 5\%$).

Consult table for t -distribution:

t -distribution is symmetrical:

Typically upper % points of distribution shown.

Find critical value c corresponding to $k - 1$ degrees of freedom (here, 9)
and for confidence limit $z = \frac{\text{sig}}{2}$ (here, 0.025).

\implies Here, critical value $c = 2.262$

If $t > c$ or $t < -c$, then t value lies in rejection region:

Reject null hypothesis that mean error rates of M_1 and M_2 are equal.

Conclude: **statistically significant difference** between M_1 and M_2 .

Otherwise, conclude that any difference is chance.

Model Selection: ROC-Curves

ROC (Receiver Operating Characteristics) curves:


For visual comparison of classification models.
Originated from signal-detection theory.
Shows the trade-off between the true-positive rate and the false-positive rate.

The area under the ROC curve is a **measure of the accuracy** of the model.

Rank the test tuples in decreasing order:

The one that is most likely to belong to the positive class appears at the top of the list.

The closer to the diagonal line (i.e. the closer the area is to 0.5), the less accurate is the model.



Vertical axis represents TP.

Horizontal axis repr. the FP.

The plot also shows a diagonal line.

A model with perfect accuracy will have an area of 1.0.

Issues after Model Selection

Accuracy.

Classifier accuracy: predicting class label.

Speed.

Time to construct the model (training time).

Time to use the model (classification/prediction time).

Robustness.

Handling noise and missing values.

Scalability.

Efficiency in disk-resident databases.

Interpretability.

Understanding and insight provided by the model.

Other measures.

E.g., goodness of rules, such as decision-tree size or compactness of classification rules.

Chapter VI: Classification

Classification: basic concepts.

Decision-tree induction.

Bayes classification methods.

Rule-based classification.

Model evaluation and selection.

Techniques to improve classification accuracy: ensemble methods.

Summary.

Ensemble Methods: Increasing the Accuracy

Ensemble methods:

Use a combination of models to increase accuracy.
Combine a series of k learned models, M_1, M_2, \dots, M_k , with the aim of creating an improved model M^* .

Popular ensemble methods:

Bagging:

Averaging the prediction over a collection of classifiers.

Boosting:

Weighted vote with a collection of classifiers.

Ensemble:

Combining a set of heterogeneous classifiers.

Bagging: Bootstrap Aggregation

Analogy:

Diagnosis based on multiple doctors' majority vote.

Training:

Given a set D of d tuples, at each iteration i , a training set D_i of d tuples is sampled with replacement from D (i.e., bootstrap).

A classifier model M_i is learned for each training set D_i .

Classification: classify an unknown sample X .

Each classifier M_i returns its class prediction.

The bagged classifier M^* counts the votes and assigns the class with the most votes to X .

Prediction:

Can be applied to the prediction of continuous values by taking the average value of each prediction for a given test tuple.

Accuracy:

Often significantly better than a single classifier derived from D .

For noisy data: not considerably worse, more robust.

Proved improved accuracy in prediction.

Boosting

Analogy:

Consult several doctors, based on a combination of weighted diagnoses – weight assigned based on the previous diagnosis accuracy

How boosting works:

Weights are assigned to each training tuple.

A series of k classifiers is iteratively learned.

After a classifier M_i is learned, the weights are updated to allow the subsequent classifier, M_{i+1} to pay more attention to the training tuples that were misclassified by M_i .

The final M^* combines the votes of each individual classifier, where the weight of each classifier's vote is a function of its accuracy.

Boosting algorithm can be extended for numeric prediction.

Each classifier M_i returns its class prediction.

The bagged classifier M^* counts the votes and assigns the class with the most votes to X .

AdaBoost ("Adaptive Boosting" (Freund and Schapire, 1997))

Given a set of d class-labeled tuples: $(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_d, y_d)$.

Initially, all the weights of tuples are set the same: $\frac{1}{d}$.

Generate k classifiers in k rounds. At round i ,

Tuples from D are sampled (with replacement) to form a training set D_i of the same size.

Each tuple's chance of being selected is based on its weight.

A classification model M_i is derived from D_i .

Its error rate is calculated using D_i as a test set.

If a tuple is misclassified, its weight is increased, otherwise it is decreased.

Error rate: $\text{err}(x_j)$ is the misclassification error of tuple x_j . Classifier M_i error rate is the sum of the weights of the misclassified tuples:

$$\text{error}(M_i) = \sum_{j=1}^d w_j \cdot \text{err}(x_j). \quad (26)$$

The weight of classifier M_i 's vote is: $\log \frac{1 - \text{error}(M_i)}{\text{error}(M_i)}.$

Random Forest (Breiman, 2001)

Random forest:

Each classifier in the ensemble is a decision-tree classifier and is generated using a random selection of attributes at each node to determine the split.

During classification, each tree votes and the most popular class is returned.

Two methods to construct random forests:

Forest-RI (random input selection):

Randomly select, at each node, F attributes as candidates for the split at the node. The CART methodology is used to grow the trees to maximum size.

Creates new attributes (or features) that are a linear combination of the existing attributes (reduces the correlation between individual classifiers).

Comparable in accuracy to AdaBoost, but more robust to errors and outliers.

Insensitive to the number of attributes selected for consideration at each split, and faster than bagging or boosting.

Classification of Class-imbalanced Data Sets

Class-imbalance problem:

Rare positive example but numerous negative ones.

E.g., medical diagnosis, fraud, oil-spill, fault, etc.

Traditional methods assume a balanced distribution of classes and equal error costs: not suitable for class-imbalanced data.

Typical methods for imbalanced data in 2-class classification:

Oversampling:

Re-sampling of data from positive class.

Undersampling:

Randomly eliminate tuples from negative class.

Threshold-moving:

Moves the decision threshold, t , so that the rare-class tuples are easier to classify, and hence, less chance of costly false-negative errors

Ensemble techniques:

Ensemble multiple classifiers introduced above.

Still difficult on multi-class tasks.

Chapter VI: Classification

Classification: basic concepts.

Decision-tree induction.

Bayes classification methods.

Rule-based classification.

Model evaluation and selection.

Techniques to improve classification accuracy: ensemble methods.

Summary.

Summary

Classification.

A form of data analysis that extracts models describing important data classes.

Effective and scalable methods developed for:

Decision-tree induction, naive Bayesian classification, rule-based classification, and many other classification methods.

Evaluation metrics:

Accuracy, sensitivity, specificity, precision, recall, F -measure, and F_{β} -measure.

Stratified k -fold cross-validation.

Recommended for accuracy estimation.

Significance tests and ROC curves.

Useful for model selection.

Summary (II)

Ensemble methods.

Bagging and boosting can be used to increase overall accuracy by learning and combining a series of individual models.

Numerous comparisons of the different classification methods.

Matter remains a research topic.

No single method has been found to be superior over all others for all data sets.

Issues such as accuracy, training time, robustness, scalability, and interpretability must be considered and can involve trade-offs, further complicating the quest for an overall superior method.

Reference: Books on Classification

- E. Alpaydin: Introduction to Machine Learning. 2nd ed., MIT Press, 2011.
- L. Breiman, J. Friedman, R. Olshen, and C. Stone: Classification and Regression Trees. Wadsworth International Group, 1984.
- C. M. Bishop: Pattern Recognition and Machine Learning. Springer, 2006.
- R. O. Duda, P. E. Hart, and D. G. Stork. Pattern Classification. 2nd ed., John Wiley, 2001.
- T. Hastie, R. Tibshirani, and J. Friedman: The Elements of Statistical Learning: Data Mining, Inference, and Prediction. Springer-Verlag, 2001.
- H. Liu and H. Motoda (eds.): Feature Extraction, Construction, and Selection: A Data Mining Perspective. Kluwer Academic, 1998.
- T. M. Mitchell: Machine Learning. McGraw Hill, 1997.
- S. Marsland: Machine Learning: An Algorithmic Perspective. Chapman & Hall/CRC, 2009.
- J. R. Quinlan: C4.5: Programs for Machine Learning. Morgan Kaufmann, 1993.
- J. W. Shavlik and T. G. Dietterich. Readings in Machine Learning. Morgan Kaufmann, 1990.

Reference: Books on Classification (II)

P. Tan, M. Steinbach, and V. Kumar: Introduction to Data Mining. Addison Wesley, 2005.

S. M. Weiss and C. A. Kulikowski: Computer Systems that Learn: Classification and Prediction Methods from Statistics, Neural Nets, Machine Learning, and Expert Systems. Morgan Kaufman, 1991.

S. M. Weiss and N. Indurkha: Predictive Data Mining. Morgan Kaufmann, 1997.

I. H. Witten and E. Frank: Data Mining: Practical Machine Learning Tools and Techniques. 2nd ed., Morgan Kaufmann, 2005

Reference: Decision Trees

- M. Ankerst, C. Elsen, M. Ester, and H.-P. Kriegel: Visual classification: An interactive approach to decision tree construction. KDD'99.
- C. Apte and S. Weiss: Data mining with decision trees and decision rules. Future Generation Computer Systems 13, 1997.
- C. E. Brodley and P. E. Utgoff: Multivariate decision trees. Machine Learning 19:45-77, 1995.
- P. K. Chan and S. J. Stolfo: Learning arbiter and combiner trees from partitioned data for scaling machine learning. KDD'95.
- U. M. Fayyad: Branching on attribute values in decision tree generation. AAAI'94.
- M. Mehta, R. Agrawal, and J. Rissanen: SLIQ: A fast scalable classifier for data mining. EDBT'96.
- J. Gehrke, R. Ramakrishnan, and V. Ganti: Rainforest: A framework for fast decision tree construction of large datasets. VLDB'98.
- J. Gehrke, V. Gant, R. Ramakrishnan, and W.-Y. Loh: BOAT – Optimistic Decision Tree Construction. SIGMOD'99

Reference: Decision Trees (II)

S. K. Murthy: Automatic Construction of Decision Trees from Data: A Multi-Disciplinary Survey. Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery 2(4):345-389, 1998.

J. R. Quinlan: Induction of decision trees. Machine Learning 1:81-106, 1986.

J. R. Quinlan and R. L. Rivest: Inferring decision trees using the minimum description length principle. Information and Computation 80:227-248, Mar. 1989.

S. K. Murthy. Automatic construction of decision trees from data: A multi-disciplinary survey. Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery 2:345-389, 1998.

R. Rastogi and K. Shim: Public: A decision tree classifier that integrates building and pruning. VLDB'98.

J. Shafer, R. Agrawal, and M. Mehta: SPRINT: A scalable parallel classifier for data mining. VLDB'96.

Y.-S. Shih: Families of splitting criteria for classification trees. Statistics and Computing 9:309-315, 1999.

Reference: Neural Networks

C. M. Bishop: Neural Networks for Pattern Recognition. Oxford University Press, 1995.

Y. Chauvin and D. Rumelhart: Backpropagation: Theory, Architectures, and Applications. Lawrence Erlbaum, 1995

J. W. Shavlik, R. J. Mooney, and G. G. Towell: Symbolic and neural learning algorithms: An experimental comparison. Machine Learning 6:111-144, 1991.

S. Haykin: Neural Networks and Learning Machines. Prentice Hall, Saddle River, NJ, 2008.

J. Hertz, A. Krogh, and R. G. Palmer: Introduction to the Theory of Neural Computation. Addison Wesley, 1991.

R. Hecht-Nielsen: Neurocomputing. Addison Wesley, 1990.

B. D. Ripley: Pattern Recognition and Neural Networks. Cambridge University Press, 1996.

Reference: Support Vector Machines

C. J. C. Burges: A Tutorial on Support Vector Machines for Pattern Recognition. Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery 2(2):121-168, 1998.

N. Cristianini and J. Shawe-Taylor: An Introduction to Support Vector Machines and Other Kernel-Based Learning Methods. Cambridge Univ. Press, 2000.

H. Drucker, C. J. C. Burges, L. Kaufman, A. Smola, and V. N. Vapnik: Support vector regression machines. NIPS, 1997.

J. C. Platt: Fast training of support vector machines using sequential minimal optimization. In B. Schoelkopf, C. J. C. Burges, and A. Smola (eds.). Advances in Kernel Methods|Support Vector Learning, pages 185-208. MIT Press, 1998.

B. Schoelkopf, P. L. Bartlett, A. Smola, and R. Williamson: Shrinking the tube: A new support vector regression algorithm. NIPS, 1999.

H. Yu, J. Yang, and J. Han: Classifying large data sets using SVM with hierarchical clusters. KDD'03.

Reference: Pattern-based Classification

H. Cheng, X. Yan, J. Han, and C.-W. Hsu: Discriminative Frequent Pattern Analysis for Effective Classification. ICDE'07.

H. Cheng, X. Yan, J. Han, and P. S. Yu: Direct Discriminative Pattern Mining for Effective Classification. ICDE'08.

G. Cong, K.-L. Tan, A. K. H. Tung, and X. Xu: Mining top-k covering rule groups for gene expression data. SIGMOD'05.

G. Dong and J. Li: Efficient mining of emerging patterns: Discovering trends and differences. KDD'99.

H. S. Kim, S. Kim, T. Weninger, J. Han, and T. Abdelzaher: NDPMine: Efficiently mining discriminative numerical features for pattern-based classification. ECMLPKDD'10.

W. Li, J. Han, and J. Pei: CMAR: Accurate and Efficient Classification Based on Multiple Class-Association Rules. ICDM'01.

B. Liu, W. Hsu, and Y. Ma: Integrating classification and association rule mining. KDD'98.

J. Wang and G. Karypis: HARMONY: Efficiently mining the best rules for classification. SDM'05.

Reference: Rule Induction

P. Clark and T. Niblett: The CN2 induction algorithm. Machine Learning 3:261-283, 1989.

W. Cohen: Fast effective rule induction. ICML'95

S. L. Crawford: Extensions to the CART algorithm. Int. J. Man-Machine Studies 31:197-217, Aug. 1989.

J. R. Quinlan and R. M. Cameron-Jones: FOIL: A midterm report. ECML'93

P. Smyth and R. M. Goodman: An information theoretic approach to rule induction. IEEE Trans. Knowledge and Data Engineering 4:301-316, 1992.

X. Yin and J. Han. CPAR: Classification based on predictive association rules. SDM'03.

Reference: k -NN & Case-based Reasoning

- A. Aamodt and E. Plazas: Case-based reasoning: Foundational issues, methodological variations, and system approaches. AI Comm. 7:39-52, 1994.
- T. Cover and P. Hart: Nearest neighbor pattern classification. IEEE Trans. Information Theory 13:21-27, 1967.
- B. V. Dasarathy. Nearest Neighbor (NN) Norms: NN Pattern Classification Techniques. IEEE Computer Society Press, 1991.
- J. L. Kolodner: Case-Based Reasoning. Morgan Kaufmann, 1993.
- A. Veloso, W. Meira, and M. Zaki: Lazy associative classification. ICDM'06.

Reference: Bayesian Method & Statistical Models

A. J. Dobson: An Introduction to Generalized Linear Models. Chapman & Hall, 1990.

D. Heckerman, D. Geiger, and D. M. Chickering: Learning Bayesian networks: The combination of knowledge and statistical data. Machine Learning, 1995.

G. Cooper and E. Herskovits: A Bayesian method for the induction of probabilistic networks from data. Machine Learning 9:309-347, 1992.

A. Darwiche: Bayesian networks. Comm. ACM 53:80-90, 2010.

A. P. Dempster, N. M. Laird, and D. B. Rubin: Maximum likelihood from incomplete data via the EM algorithm. J. Royal Statistical Society, Series B, 39:1-38, 1977.

D. Heckerman, D. Geiger, and D. M. Chickering: Learning Bayesian networks: The combination of knowledge and statistical data. Machine Learning 20:197-243, 1995.

F. V. Jensen: An Introduction to Bayesian Networks. Springer Verlag, 1996.

D. Koller and N. Friedman: Probabilistic Graphical Models: Principles and Techniques. The MIT Press, 2009.

Reference: Bayesian Method & Statistical Models (II)

J. Pearl: Probabilistic Reasoning in Intelligent Systems. Morgan Kauffman, 1988.

S. Russell, J. Binder, D. Koller, and K. Kanazawa: Local learning in probabilistic networks with hidden variables. IJCAI'95.

V. N. Vapnik: Statistical Learning Theory. John Wiley & Sons, 1998.

Reference: Semi-supervised & Multi-class Learning

O. Chapelle, B. Schoelkopf, and A. Zien: Semi-supervised Learning. MIT Press, 2006.

T. G. Dietterich and G. Bakiri: Solving multiclass learning problems via error-correcting output codes.

J. Artificial Intelligence Research 2:263-286, 1995.

W. Dai, Q. Yang, G. Xue, and Y. Yu: Boosting for transfer learning. ICML'07.

S. J. Pan and Q. Yang: A survey on transfer learning. IEEE Trans. on Knowledge and Data Engineering 22:1345-1359, 2010.

B. Settles: Active learning literature survey. CS Tech. Rep. 1648, Univ. Wisconsin-Madison, 2010.

X. Zhu: Semi-supervised learning literature survey. CS Tech. Rep. 1530, Univ. Wisconsin-Madison, 2005.

Reference: Genetic Algorithms & Rough/Fuzzy Sets

D. Goldberg: Genetic Algorithms in Search, Optimization, and Machine Learning. Addison-Wesley, 1989.

S. A. Harp, T. Samad, and A. Guha: Designing application-specific neural networks using the genetic algorithm. NIPS, 1990.

Z. Michalewicz: Genetic Algorithms + Data Structures = Evolution Programs. Springer Verlag, 1992.

M. Mitchell: An Introduction to Genetic Algorithms. MIT Press, 1996.

Z. Pawlak: Rough Sets, Theoretical Aspects of Reasoning about Data. Kluwer Academic, 1991.

S. Pal and A. Skowron (eds.): Fuzzy Sets, Rough Sets and Decision Making Processes. New York, 1998.

R. R. Yager and L. A. Zadeh: Fuzzy Sets, Neural Networks and Soft Computing. Van Nostrand Reinhold, 1994.

Reference: Model Evaluation, Ensemble Methods

- L. Breiman: Bagging predictors. Machine Learning 24:123-140, 1996.
- L. Breiman: Random forests. Machine Learning 45:5-32, 2001.
- C. Elkan: The foundations of cost-sensitive learning. IJCAI'01.
- B. Efron and R. Tibshirani: An Introduction to the Bootstrap. Chapman & Hall, 1993.
- J. Friedman and E. P. Bogdan: Predictive learning via rule ensembles. Ann. Applied Statistics 2:916-954, 2008.
- T.-S. Lim, W.-Y. Loh, and Y.-S. Shih: A comparison of prediction accuracy, complexity, and training time of thirty-three old and new classification algorithms. Machine Learning, 2000.
- J. Magidson: The Chaid approach to segmentation modeling: Chi-squared automatic interaction detection. In R. P. Bagozzi (ed.). Advanced Methods of Marketing Research, Blackwell Business, 1994.
- J. R. Quinlan: Bagging, boosting, and C4.5. AAAI'96.

Reference: Model Evaluation, Ensemble Methods (II)

G. Seni and J. F. Elder: Ensemble Methods in Data Mining: Improving Accuracy Through Combining Predictions. Morgan and Claypool, 2010.

Y. Freund and R. E. Schapire: A decision-theoretic generalization of on-line learning and an application to boosting. J. Computer and System Sciences, 1997.

Thank you for your attention.
Any questions about the sixth chapter?

Ask them now, or again, drop me a line:
✉ luciano.melodia@fau.de.