Pattern Evaluation

- Association rule algorithms tend to produce too many rules
  - many of them are uninteresting or redundant
  - Redundant if {A,B,C} → {D} and {A,B} → {D} have same support & confidence
- Interestingness measures can be used to prune/rank the derived patterns
- In the original formulation of association rules, support & confidence are the only measures used

Application of Interestingness Measure



Computing Interestingness Measure

- Given a rule $X \rightarrow Y$, information needed to compute rule interestingness can be obtained from a contingency table

Contingency table for $X \rightarrow Y$

	Y	$\overline{Y}$	
X	f_{11}	f_{10}	f_{1+}
$\overline{X}$	f_{01}	f_{00}	f_{o+}
	f_{+1}	f_{+0}	$\|T\|$

f_{11}: support of X and Y
f_{10}: support of X and $\overline{Y}$
f_{01}: support of $\overline{X}$ and Y
f_{00}: support of X and $\overline{Y}$

Used to define various measures

- support, confidence, lift, Gini, J-measure, etc.

Drawback of Confidence

	Coffee	$\overline{\text{Coffee}}$	
Tea	15	5	20
$\overline{\text{Tea}}$	75	5	80
	90	10	100

Association Rule: Tea $\rightarrow$ Coffee

Confidence= P(Coffee|Tea) = 0.75

but P(Coffee) = 0.9

$\Rightarrow$ Although confidence is high, rule is misleading

$\Rightarrow$ P(Coffee|$\overline{\text{Tea}}$) = 0.9375

Statistical Independence

- Population of 1000 students
  - 600 students know how to swim (S)
  - 700 students know how to bike (B)
  - 420 students know how to swim and bike (S,B)

  - $P(S \wedge B) = 420/1000 = 0.42$
  - $P(S) \times P(B) = 0.6 \times 0.7 = 0.42$

  - $P(S \wedge B) = P(S) \times P(B)$ => Statistical independence
  - $P(S \wedge B) > P(S) \times P(B)$ => Positively correlated
  - $P(S \wedge B) < P(S) \times P(B)$ => Negatively correlated

Statistical-based Measures

- Measures that take into account statistical dependence

$$Lift = \frac{P(Y \mid X)}{P(Y)}$$

$$Interest = \frac{P(X,Y)}{P(X)P(Y)}$$

$$PS = P(X,Y) - P(X)P(Y)$$

$$\phi - coefficient = \frac{P(X,Y) - P(X)P(Y)}{\sqrt{P(X)[1-P(X)]P(Y)[1-P(Y)]}}$$

Example: Lift / Interest

	Coffee	$\overline{\text{Coffee}}$	
Tea	15	5	20
$\overline{\text{Tea}}$	75	5	80
	90	10	100

Association Rule: Tea $\rightarrow$ Coffee

Confidence= P(Coffee|Tea) = 0.75

but P(Coffee) = 0.9

$\Rightarrow$ Lift = 0.75/0.9= 0.8333 (< 1, therefore is negatively associated)

Drawback of Lift & Interest

	Y	$\overline{Y}$	
X	10	0	10
$\overline{X}$	0	90	90
	10	90	100

$$Lift = \frac{0.1}{(0.1)(0.1)} = 10$$

	Y	$\overline{Y}$	
X	90	0	90
$\overline{X}$	0	10	10
	90	10	100

$$Lift = \frac{0.9}{(0.9)(0.9)} = 1.11$$

Statistical independence:

If P(X,Y)=P(X)P(Y) => Lift = 1

There are lots of measures proposed in the literature

Some measures are good for certain applications, but not for others

What criteria should we use to determine whether a measure is good or bad?

What about Apriori-style support based pruning? How does it affect these measures?

#	Measure	Formula
1	ϕ-coefficient	$\frac{P(A,B)-P(A)P(B)}{\sqrt{P(A)P(B)(1-P(A))(1-P(B))}}$
2	Goodman-Kruskal's (λ)	$\frac{\sum_j \max_k P(A_j,B_k)+\sum_k \max_j P(A_j,B_k)-\max_j P(A_j)-\max_k P(B_k)}{2-\max_j P(A_j)-\max_k P(B_k)}$
3	Odds ratio (α)	$\frac{P(A,B)P(\overline{A},\overline{B})}{P(A,\overline{B})P(\overline{A},B)}$
4	Yule's Q	$\frac{P(A,B)P(\overline{AB})-P(A,\overline{B})P(\overline{A},B)}{P(A,B)P(\overline{AB})+P(A,\overline{B})P(\overline{A},B)} = \frac{\alpha-1}{\alpha+1}$
5	Yule's Y	$\frac{\sqrt{P(A,B)P(\overline{AB})}-\sqrt{P(A,\overline{B})P(\overline{A},B)}}{\sqrt{P(A,B)P(\overline{AB})}+\sqrt{P(A,\overline{B})P(\overline{A},B)}} = \frac{\sqrt{\alpha}-1}{\sqrt{\alpha}+1}$
6	Kappa (κ)	$\frac{P(A,B)+P(\overline{A},\overline{B})-P(A)P(B)-P(\overline{A})P(\overline{B})}{1-P(A)P(B)-P(\overline{A})P(\overline{B})}$
7	Mutual Information (M)	$\frac{\sum_i \sum_j P(A_i,B_j)\log\frac{P(A_i,B_j)}{P(A_i)P(B_j)}}{\min(-\sum_i P(A_i)\log P(A_i), -\sum_j P(B_j)\log P(B_j))}$
8	J-Measure (J)	$\max\Big(P(A,B)\log(\frac{P(B\|A)}{P(B)}) + P(A\overline{B})\log(\frac{P(\overline{B}\|A)}{P(\overline{B})}),$ $P(A,B)\log(\frac{P(A\|B)}{P(A)}) + P(\overline{A}B)\log(\frac{P(\overline{A}\|B)}{P(\overline{A})})\Big)$
9	Gini index (G)	$\max\Big(P(A)[P(B\|A)^2 + P(\overline{B}\|A)^2] + P(\overline{A})[P(B\|\overline{A})^2 + P(\overline{B}\|\overline{A})^2]$ $-P(B)^2 - P(\overline{B})^2,$ $P(B)[P(A\|B)^2 + P(\overline{A}\|B)^2] + P(\overline{B})[P(A\|\overline{B})^2 + P(\overline{A}\|\overline{B})^2]$ $-P(A)^2 - P(\overline{A})^2\Big)$
10	Support (s)	$P(A,B)$
11	Confidence (c)	$\max(P(B\|A), P(A\|B))$
12	Laplace (L)	$\max\left(\frac{NP(A,B)+1}{NP(A)+2}, \frac{NP(A,B)+1}{NP(B)+2}\right)$
13	Conviction (V)	$\max\left(\frac{P(A)P(\overline{B})}{P(A\overline{B})}, \frac{P(B)P(\overline{A})}{P(B\overline{A})}\right)$
14	Interest (I)	$\frac{P(A,B)}{P(A)P(B)}$
15	cosine (IS)	$\frac{P(A,B)}{\sqrt{P(A)P(B)}}$
16	Piatetsky-Shapiro's (PS)	$P(A,B) - P(A)P(B)$
17	Certainty factor (F)	$\max\left(\frac{P(B\|A)-P(B)}{1-P(B)}, \frac{P(A\|B)-P(A)}{1-P(A)}\right)$
18	Added Value (AV)	$\max(P(B\|A) - P(B), P(A\|B) - P(A))$
19	Collective strength (S)	$\frac{P(A,B)+P(\overline{AB})}{P(A)P(B)+P(\overline{A})P(\overline{B})} \times \frac{1-P(A)P(B)-P(\overline{A})P(\overline{B})}{1-P(A,B)-P(\overline{AB})}$
20	Jaccard (ζ)	$\frac{P(A,B)}{P(A)+P(B)-P(A,B)}$
21	Klosgen (K)	$\sqrt{P(A,B)}\max(P(B\|A) - P(B), P(A\|B) - P(A))$

Comparing Different Measures

10 examples of contingency tables:

Example	f_{11}	f_{10}	f_{01}	f_{00}
E1	8123	83	424	1370
E2	8330	2	622	1046
E3	9481	94	127	298
E4	3954	3080	5	2961
E5	2886	1363	1320	4431
E6	1500	2000	500	6000
E7	4000	2000	1000	3000
E8	4000	2000	2000	2000
E9	1720	7121	5	1154
E10	61	2483	4	7452

Rankings of contingency tables using various measures:

#	ϕ	λ	α	Q	Y	κ	M	J	G	s	c	L	V	I	IS	PS	F	AV	S	ζ	K
E1	1	1	3	3	3	1	2	2	1	3	5	5	4	6	2	2	4	6	1	2	5
E2	2	2	1	1	1	2	1	3	2	2	1	1	1	8	3	5	1	8	2	3	6
E3	3	3	4	4	4	3	3	8	7	1	4	4	6	10	1	8	6	10	3	1	10
E4	4	7	2	2	2	5	4	1	3	6	2	2	2	4	4	1	2	3	4	5	1
E5	5	4	8	8	8	4	7	5	4	7	9	9	9	3	6	3	9	4	5	6	3
E6	6	6	7	7	7	7	6	4	6	9	8	8	7	2	8	6	7	2	7	8	2
E7	7	5	9	9	9	6	8	6	5	4	7	7	8	5	5	4	8	5	6	4	4
E8	8	9	10	10	10	8	10	10	8	4	10	10	10	9	7	7	10	9	8	7	9
E9	9	9	5	5	5	9	9	7	9	8	3	3	3	7	9	9	3	7	9	9	8
E10	10	8	6	6	6	10	5	9	10	10	6	6	5	1	10	10	5	1	10	10	7

Properties of A Good Measure

- Piatetsky-Shapiro:
  3 properties a good measure M must satisfy:
  - M(A,B) = 0 if A and B are statistically independent
  - M(A,B) increases monotonically with P(A,B) when P(A) and P(B) remain unchanged
  - M(A,B) decreases monotonically with P(A) [or P(B)] when P(A,B) and P(B) [or P(A)] remain unchanged

Property under Variable Permutation

	B	$\overline{\mathbf{B}}$
A	p	q
$\overline{\mathbf{A}}$	r	s

	A	$\overline{\mathbf{A}}$
B	p	r
$\overline{\mathbf{B}}$	q	s

Does M(A,B) = M(B,A)?

Symmetric measures:

- support, lift, collective strength, cosine, Jaccard, etc

Asymmetric measures:

- confidence, conviction, Laplace, J-measure, etc

Property under Row/Column Scaling

Grade-Gender Example (Mosteller, 1968):

	Male	Female	
High	2	3	5
Low	1	4	5
	3	7	10

	Male	Female	
High	4	30	34
Low	2	40	42
	6	70	76

2x 10x

Mosteller:

Underlying association should be independent of the relative number of male and female students in the samples

Property under Inversion Operation

	A	B	C	D	E	F
Transaction 1	1	0	0	1	0	0
■	0	0	1	1	1	0
	0	0	1	1	1	0
■	0	0	1	1	1	0
■	0	1	1	0	1	1
	0	0	1	1	1	0
■	0	0	1	1	1	0
■	0	0	1	1	1	0
	0	0	1	1	1	0
Transaction N	1	0	0	1	0	0

(a) (b) (c)

Example: ϕ-Coefficient

- ϕ-coefficient is analogous to correlation coefficient for continuous variables

	Y	$\overline{Y}$	
X	60	10	70
$\overline{X}$	10	20	30
	70	30	100

	Y	$\overline{Y}$	
X	20	10	30
$\overline{X}$	10	60	70
	30	70	100

$$\phi = \frac{0.6 - 0.7 \times 0.7}{\sqrt{0.7 \times 0.3 \times 0.7 \times 0.3}} = 0.5238$$

$$\phi = \frac{0.2 - 0.3 \times 0.3}{\sqrt{0.7 \times 0.3 \times 0.7 \times 0.3}} = 0.5238$$

ϕ Coefficient is the same for both tables

Property under Null Addition

	B	$\overline{\textbf{B}}$
A	p	q
$\overline{\textbf{A}}$	r	s

⇒

	B	$\overline{\textbf{B}}$
A	p	q
$\overline{\textbf{A}}$	r	s + k

Invariant measures:

- support, cosine, Jaccard, etc

Non-invariant measures:

- correlation, Gini, mutual information, odds ratio, etc

Different Measures have Different Properties

Symbol	Measure	Range	P1	P2	P3	O1	O2	O3	O3'	O4
Φ	Correlation	-1 … 0 … 1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
λ	Lambda	0 … 1	Yes	No	No	Yes	No	No*	Yes	No
α	Odds ratio	0 … 1 … ∞	Yes*	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes*	Yes	No
Q	Yule's Q	-1 … 0 … 1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Y	Yule's Y	-1 … 0 … 1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
κ	Cohen's	-1 … 0 … 1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	Yes	No
M	Mutual Information	0 … 1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No*	Yes	No
J	J-Measure	0 … 1	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
G	Gini Index	0 … 1	Yes	No	No	No	No	No*	Yes	No
s	Support	0 … 1	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No
c	Confidence	0 … 1	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
L	Laplace	0 … 1	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	No	No	No
V	Conviction	0.5 … 1 … ∞	No	Yes	No	Yes**	No	No	Yes	No
I	Interest	0 … 1 … ∞	Yes*	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No
IS	IS (cosine)	0 .. 1	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
PS	Piatetsky-Shapiro's	-0.25 … 0 … 0.25	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	Yes	No
F	Certainty factor	-1 … 0 … 1	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes	No
AV	Added value	0.5 … 1 … 1	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No
S	Collective strength	0 … 1 … ∞	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes*	Yes	No
ζ	Jaccard	0 .. 1	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	Yes
K	Klosgen's	$\left(\sqrt{\frac{2}{\sqrt{3}}-1}\right)\left(2-\sqrt{3}-\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\right)\ldots 0 \ldots \frac{2}{3\sqrt{3}}$	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No

Support-based Pruning

- Most of the association rule mining algorithms use support measure to prune rules and itemsets
- Study effect of support pruning on correlation of itemsets
  - Generate 10000 random contingency tables
  - Compute support and pairwise correlation for each table
  - Apply support-based pruning and examine the tables that are removed

Effect of Support-based Pruning



Effect of Support-based Pruning





Support-based pruning eliminates mostly negatively correlated itemsets



Effect of Support-based Pruning

- Investigate how support-based pruning affects other measures

- Steps:
  - Generate 10000 contingency tables
  - Rank each table according to the different measures
  - Compute the pair-wise correlation between the measures

Effect of Support-based Pruning

- Without Support Pruning (All Pairs)



Scatter Plot between Correlation & Jaccard Measure

- Red cells indicate correlation between the pair of measures > 0.85
- 40.14% pairs have correlation > 0.85

Effect of Support-based Pruning

- 0.5% ≤ support ≤ 50%





Scatter Plot between Correlation & Jaccard Measure:

- 61.45% pairs have correlation > 0.85

Effect of Support-based Pruning

- 0.5% ≤ support ≤ 30%





Scatter Plot between Correlation & Jaccard Measure

- 76.42% pairs have correlation > 0.85

Subjective Interestingness Measure

- Objective measure:
  - Rank patterns based on statistics computed from data
  - e.g., 21 measures of association (support, confidence, Laplace, Gini, mutual information, Jaccard, etc).
- Subjective measure:
  - Rank patterns according to user's interpretation
    - A pattern is subjectively interesting if it contradicts the expectation of a user (Silberschatz & Tuzhilin)
    - A pattern is subjectively interesting if it is actionable (Silberschatz & Tuzhilin)

Interestingness via Unexpectedness

- Need to model expectation of users (domain knowledge)



+ Pattern expected to be frequent

\- Pattern expected to be infrequent

Pattern found to be frequent

Pattern found to be infrequent

+ - Expected Patterns

\- + Unexpected Patterns

- Need to combine expectation of users with evidence from data (i.e., extracted patterns)

Simpson's Paradox

- Hidden influences can produce misleading results
  - C(EM=Y | HDTV=Y) = 55%
  - C(EM=Y | HDTV=N) = 45%
  - Conclude HDTV -> EM?

Buy HDTV	Buy Exercise Machine		
	Yes	No	
Yes	99	81	180
No	54	66	120
Totals	153	147	300

Simpson's Paradox

College Students
C(EM=Y | HDTV=Y) = 10%
C(EM=Y | HDTV=N) = 11.8%
Conclude HDTV -> not EM

Working Adults
C(EM=Y | HDTV=Y) = 57.7%
C(EM=Y | HDTV=N) = 58.1%
Conclude HDTV -> not EM

Customer Group	Buy HDTV	Buy Exercise Machine		Total
		Yes	No	
College Students	Yes	1	9	10
	No	4	30	34
Working Adults	Yes	98	72	170
	No	50	36	86