```
In [ ]: Name="Muhammad Omer Farooq Bhatti"
ID = "st122498"
```

Multinomial Naive Classification

The Gaussian assumption just described is by no means the only simple assumption that could be used to specify the generative distribution for each label. Another useful example is multinomial naive bayes, where the features are assumed to be generated from a simple multinomial distribution. The multinomial distribution describes the probability of observing counts among a number of categories, and thus multinomial naive bayes is most appropriate for features that represent counts or count rates.

The idea is precisely the same as before, except that instead of modeling the data distribution with the best-fit Gaussian, we model the data distribution with a best-fit multinomial distribution.

One place where multinomial naive Bayes is often used is in **text classification**, where the features w are related to word counts or frequencies within the documents to be classified and y will be our class. The formation is as follows:

$$P(y|w) = rac{P(w|y)P(y)}{P(w)}$$

Implementation steps:

- 1. Prepare your data
 - ullet ${f X}$ and ${f y}$ in the right shape
 - \blacksquare **X** -> (m,n)
 - **y** → (m,)
 - Note that theta is not needed. Why?
 - train-test split
 - feature scale
 - clean out any missing data
 - (optional) feature engineering
- 2. Using the train documents, calculate the **likelihoods** of each word. Following multinomial distribution, for a given word w_i , we count how many of w_i belong in class k, we then divide this by the count of all the words that belong to k. This gives us the conditional probability for a word w given k:

$$P(w_i \in train \mid y = k) = rac{count(w_i \in train, k)}{\sum_{i=1}^n count(w_i \in train, k)}$$

where

n stands for number of unique vocabulary (i.e., features) and m stands for number of documents (i.e., samples).

Example:

	docID	words in doc	China?
Training set	1	Chinese Beijing Chinese	Yes
	2	Chinese Chinese Shanghai	Yes
	3	Chinese Macao	Yes
	4	Tokyo Japan Chinese	No
Test set	5	Chinese Chinese Tokyo Japan	?

1. Since nothing in this world has zero probability, similarly, even we never see a particular word in some class should not gaurantee a zero probability, thus we can perform **Laplace smoothing** to account for any words with zero count. Also zero probability is not good when we do a product of probabilities.

$$P(w_i \in train \mid y = k) = rac{count(w_i \in train, k) + 1}{\sum_{i=1}^n count(w_i \in train, k) + n}$$

1. Find **priors** P(y) where is simply number of documents belonging to that class divided by all documents

$$P(y=k) = rac{\Sigma_{i=1}^m \mathbb{1}(y=k)}{m}$$

1. Once we get the **likelihoods** from the train data. If given some test data, we simply use this likelihood to calculate the total likelihood of the test document. Similarly, since we have more than one word in the test document, we need to make a product of all likelihood of each word in the test document.

$$P(w \in test \mid y = k) = \prod_{i=1}^n P(w_i \in test \mid y = k)^{ ext{freq of } w_i \in test}$$

Then we can multiply $P(y)P(w \in test \mid y)$ for each class which will give us $P(y \mid x)$ (**posteriors**)

$$P(y \mid x) = P(y = k) \prod_{i=1}^n P(w_i \in test \mid y = k)^{ ext{freq of } w_i \in test}$$

- 1. Instead of probabilities, we gonna use log (base e) probabilities which have several benefits:
 - Speed Log probabilities become addition, which is faster than multiplication
 - Stability Probabilities can be too small where some significant digits can be lost during calculations. Log probabilities can prevent such underflow. If you don't believe me, try perform $\log_e(0.0000001)$
 - **Simplicity** Many distributions have exponential form. Taking log cancels out the exp. The reason we can apply log is because log is a monotically increasing function, thus will not alter the result
 - **Dot product** After log, addition can often expressed as dot product of matrix, simplifying the code implementation Now that you are convinced,

$$P(y=k)\prod_{i=1}^n p(w_i \in test \mid y=k)^{ ext{freq of } w_i \in test}$$

becomes

$$\log \ P(y=k) + (ext{freq of} \ w_i \in test) * \sum_{i=1}^n \log \ p(w_i \in test \mid y=k)$$

- Note 1: Log of multiplication becomes addition
- Note 2: Exponent of log becomes multiplicative scalar

Thus, in implementation we can expressed as

np.log(priors) + X_test @ np.log(likelihoods.T)

When to Use Naive Bayes

Usually only as baseline! Because naive Bayesian classifiers make such stringent assumptions about data, they will **generally NOT perform as well as a more complicated model.** That said, they have several advantages:

- They are extremely fast for both training and prediction
- They provide straightforward probabilistic prediction
- They are often very easily interpretable
- They have very few (if any) tunable parameters

Naive Bayes classifiers tend to perform well only when your data is clearly separable or has high dimension.

The reason for high dimension is because new dimensions usually add more information, thus data become more separable. Thus, if you have really large dataset, try Naive Bayes and it may surprise you!

TfidVectorizer

Recall that in Naive Multinomial Classification, we want our features to be represented as frequency. Here, we shall go beyond one more step, i.e., after counting the number of words, we shall perform a normalization process called TF-IDF which focuses on **cutting very frequent words which tend to be less meaningful information like "the", "a", "is".**

Here is how it works underhood:

The formula is

$$TF-IDF = TF * IDF$$

where TF is

$$\text{TF}_t = \frac{\text{Count of words t in that document}}{\text{Total count of words in that document}}$$

Thus TF =

	ist word	Ziid Wold	Jid Wold
doc1	3/4 = 0.75	0	1/4 = 0.25
doc2	2/3 = 0.66	1/3 = 0.33	0
doc3	3/10 = 0.33	2/10 = 0.20	5/10 = 0.5

2nd word 3rd word

and

$$ext{IDF} = \log \left(rac{ ext{Number of documents}}{ ext{Number of documents containing that word}}
ight) + 1$$

Note: We plus one so that super frequent words will not be ignored entirely

Thus IDF =

IDF

	IDF		
1st word	log 3/3 + 1 = 1		
2nd word	log 3/2 + 1 = 1.4055		
3rd word	log 3/2 + 1 = 1.4055		

Notice that terms (i.e., 1st word) that appear frequently across documents will get low score. By multiplying this IDF term with the frequency, it will scale the importance down.

Thus TF * IDF =

	1st word	2nd word	3rd word
doc1	0.75 * 1 = 0.75	0 * 1.4055 = 0	0.25 * 1.4055 = 0.3514
doc2	0.66 * 1 = 0.66	0.33 * 1.4055 = 0.4685	0 * 1.4055 = 0
doc3	0.33 * 1 = 0.33	0.20 * 1.4055 = 0.2811	0.5 * 1.4055 = 0.7027

We need to further normalize each word using this formula (since each document has unequaled number of words):

$$norm(t_i) = rac{t_i}{\sqrt{t_1^2 + t_2^2 + \ldots + t_n^2}}$$

Thus, normalized factor for each document is

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{doc1} = \sqrt{0.75^2 + 0^2 + 0.3514^2} = 0.8282 \\ & \text{doc2} = \sqrt{0.66^2 + 0.4685^2 + 0^2} = 0.8094 \\ & \text{doc3} = \sqrt{0.33^2 + 0.281^2 + 0.7027^2} = 0.8256 \end{aligned}$$

Thus, normalized(TF * IDF) =

	1st word	2nd word	3rd word
doc1	0.75 / 0.8282 = 0.9056	0	0.3514 / 0.8282 = 0.4243
doc2	0.66 / 0.8094 = 0.8154	0.4685 / 0.8094 = 0.5788	0
doc3	0.33 / 0.8256 = 0.3997	0.2811 / 0.8256 = 0.3405	0.7027 / 0.8256 = 0.8511

Note

. My numbers are not evactly the same due to float precisions

- 1) Learn about TFidVectorizer and replace CountVectorizer with TFIDVectorizer (I have provided the explanation below.) 2) Put Multinomial Naive Classification into a class that can transform the data, fit the model and do prediction.
 - In the class, allow users to choose whether to use CountVectorizer or TFIDVectorizer to transform the data.

```
import numpy as np
import matplotlib.pyplot as plt
from sklearn.datasets import fetch_20newsgroups
from sklearn.feature_extraction.text import TfidfVectorizer
from sklearn.metrics import confusion_matrix
from sklearn.preprocessing import label_binarize
from sklearn.metrics import average_precision_score, classification_report
from sklearn.feature_extraction.text import CountVectorizer
import seaborn as sns
```

```
class multinomial NB:
            def __init__(self):
                self.trainData=[]
                self.testData=[]
                self.vectorizer=[]
                self.X train=[]
                self.X test=[]
                self.y train=[]
                self.y test=[]
                self.k=[]
                self.likelihoods=[]
                self.priors=[]
                self.method=[]
            def fit(self, train, test, method='count'):
                self.trainData=train
                self.testData=test
                self.y_train = self.trainData.target
                self.y_test = self.testData.target
                self.method=method
                if self.method=='count':
                    self.count_transform()
                elif self.method=='tfidf':
                    self.tfidf transform()
                else:
                    raise ValueError("Invalid method given as argument: ", self.method)
                self.m, self.n = self.X_train.shape
                classes = np.unique(self.y_train) #list of class
                self.k = len(classes) #number of class
                self.priors = np.zeros(self.k) #prior for each classes
                self.likelihoods = np.zeros((self.k, self.n)) #likehood for each class of each feature
                for idx, label in enumerate(classes):
                    X train by class = self.X train[self.y train==label]
                    self.priors[idx] = self.prior(X train by class, self.m)
                    self.likelihoods[idx, :] = self.likelihood(X train by class)
            def predict(self, X test= None):
                if X test is None:
                    X test = self.X test
                yhat = np.log(self.priors) + X_test @ np.log(self.likelihoods.T)
                yhat = np.argmax(yhat, axis=1)
                return yhat
            def count transform(self):
                #transform our X to frequency data
                self.vectorizer = CountVectorizer()
                self.X_train = self.vectorizer.fit_transform(self.trainData.data)
                self.X test = self.vectorizer.transform(self.testData.data)
                self.X test = self.X test.toarray() #vectorizer gives us a sparse matrix; convert back to dense mat
            def tfidf transform(self):
                #transform our X to tf-idf data
                self.vectorizer = TfidfVectorizer()
                self.X_train = self.vectorizer.fit_transform(self.trainData.data)
                self.X_test = self.vectorizer.transform(self.testData.data)
                self.X_test = self.X_test.toarray() #vectorizer gives us a sparse matrix; convert back to dense mat
            def likelihood(self, X_class, laplace=1):
                return ((X_class.sum(axis=0)) + laplace) / (np.sum(X_class.sum(axis=0) + laplace))
            def prior(self, X class, m):
                return X_class.shape[0] / m
data = fetch 20newsgroups()
        data.target names
        categories = ['talk.religion.misc', 'soc.religion.christian',
                      'sci.space', 'comp.graphics']
        train = fetch 20newsgroups(subset='train', categories=categories)
        test = fetch 20newsgroups(subset='test', categories=categories)
        print(train.data[0]) #first 300 words
        print("Target: ", train.target[0]) #start with 1, soc.religion.christian
       From: jono@mac-ak-24.rtsg.mot.com (Jon Ogden)
       Subject: Re: Losing your temper is not a Christian trait
       Organization: Motorola LPA Development
       Lines: 26
       In article <Apr.23.02.55.47.1993.3138@geneva.rutgers.edu>, jcj@tellabs.com
        (jcj) wrote:
       > I'd like to remind people of the withering of the fig tree and Jesus
       > driving the money changers et. al. out of the temple. I think those
```

```
Yes, and what about Paul saying:
        26 Be ye angry, and \sin not: let not the \sup go down upon your wrath:
        (Ephesians 4:26).
        Obviously then, we can be angry w/o sinning.
        Jon
        _____
        Jon Ogden - jono@mac-ak-24.rtsg.mot.com
        Motorola Cellular - Advanced Products Division
        Voice: 708-632-2521 Data: 708-632-6086
        They drew a circle and shut him out.
        Heretic, Rebel, a thing to flout.
        But Love and I had the wit to win;
        We drew a circle and took him in.
In [46]:
         def compute_metrics(y_test, yhat):
            n_classes = len(np.unique(y_test))
            print("Accuracy: ", np.sum(yhat == y_test)/len(y_test))
            print("=======Average precision score======")
            y_test_binarized = label_binarize(y_test, classes=[0, 1, 2, 3])
            yhat_binarized = label_binarize(yhat, classes=[0, 1, 2, 3])
             for i in range(n classes):
                class_score = average_precision_score(y_test_binarized[:, i], yhat_binarized[:, i])
                print(f"Class {i} score: ", class_score)
            print("======Classification report======")
            print("Report: ", classification_report(y_test, yhat))
             #use confusion matrix
            mat = confusion matrix(y test, yhat)
             sns.heatmap(mat.T, annot=True, fmt="d",
                      xticklabels=train.target names, yticklabels=train.target names)
            plt.xlabel('true')
            plt.ylabel('predicted')
In [57]:
         #Instantiating our model class into an object
         model = multinomial_NB()
         #Using Count Vectorizer
         model.fit(train, test, method='count')
         yhat = model.predict()
         print("Y_predicted from Counts: ", yhat)
         compute_metrics(model.y_test, yhat)
        Y_predicted from Counts: [3 0 1 ... 1 2 1]
        Accuracy: 0.9168994413407822
        ======Average precision score======
        Class 0 score: 0.9152047938418233
        Class 1 score: 0.9069918620723723
        Class 2 score: 0.8429395016564877
        Class 3 score: 0.7277310085946386
        ======Classification report======
        Report:
                             precision recall f1-score support
                     0.95
                                  0.95 0.95
                  0
                                                        389
                          0.94
                                    0.96
                                             0.95
                                                        394
                  2
                          0.87
                                   0.95
                                             0.91
                                                        398
                   3
                          0.92
                                   0.74
                                             0.82
                                                        251
                                             0.92
                                                      1432
           accuracy
                                   0.90
                                                       1432
          macro avg
                          0.92
                                             0.91
                          0.92
                                   0.92
                                             0.92
                                                      1432
        weighted avg
```

> were two instances of Christ showing anger (as part of His human side).

```
comp.graphics - 371 11 5 5 - 350 - 300 - 250
```

```
In [64]:
          #Using TFIDF Vectorizer
          model.fit(train, test, method='tfidf')
          yhat = model.predict()
          print("Y_predicted from TF-IDF: ",yhat)
          compute_metrics(model.y_test, yhat)
         Y_predicted from TF-IDF: [2 0 1 ... 1 2 1]
         Accuracy: 0.8016759776536313
         ======Average precision score======
         Class 0 score: 0.888341920518241
         Class 1 score: 0.8744630809734135
         Class 2 score: 0.6122064043881043
         Class 3 score: 0.332994836297269
         ======Classification report======
         Report:
                                 precision recall f1-score
                      0
                              0.97
                                         0.88
                                                    0.92
                                                                 389
                     1
                              0.92
                                         0.92
                                                     0.92
                                                                 394
                      2
                              0.62
                                         0.98
                                                     0.76
                                                                 398
                              1.00
                                         0.19
                                                     0.32
                                                                 251
             accuracy
                                                     0.80
                                                                1432
                                                                1432
            macro avg
                              0.88
                                         0.75
                                                     0.73
                              0.86
                                          0.80
                                                     0.77
                                                                1432
         weighted avg
                                                                       - 350
                               344
                comp.graphics
                                                                      - 300
                                                                      - 250
                               13
                                                            12
                    sci.space
                                         364
          predicted
                                                                      - 200
                                                                      - 150
                                32
                                         24
                                                  392
            soc.religion.christian
                                                                       - 100
                                                             48
                                                                       50
              talk.religion.misc ·
                                comp.graphics
                                                   soc.religion.christian
                                                             talk.religion.misc
```

```
In [69]:
         some_string = ["elon musk is building a rocket",
                         "God is good",
                         "GUI of this program is very good"]
         transformed = model.vectorizer.transform(some_string)
         #print(transformed.shape)
         prediction = model.predict(transformed)
         print(prediction)
         print(train.target_names[prediction[0]])
         print(train.target names[prediction[1]])
         print(train.target_names[prediction[2]])
         [1 2 0]
         sci.space
         soc.religion.christian
        comp.graphics
 In [ ]:
```

true