

## Comparison of Null-Invariant Measures

- Not all null-invariant measures are created equal
- Which one is better?
  - $\square$   $D_4 D_6$  differentiate the null-invariant measures
  - Kulc (Kulczynski 1927) holds firm and is in balance of both directional implications

#### 2-variable contingency table

	milk	$\neg milk$	$\Sigma_{row}$
coffee	mc	$\neg mc$	c
$\neg coffee$	$m \neg c$	$\neg m \neg c$	$\neg c$
$\Sigma_{col}$	m	$\neg m$	Σ

All 5 are null-invariant

Data set	mc	$\neg mc$	$m \neg c$	$\neg m \neg c$	AllConf	Jaccard	Cosine	Kulc	MaxConf
$D_1$	10,000	1,000	1,000	100,000	0.91	0.83	0.91	0.91	0.91
$D_2$	10,000	1,000	1,000	100	0.91	0.83	0.91	0.91	0.91
$D_3$	100	1,000	1,000	100,000	0.09	0.05	0.09	0.09	0.09
$D_4$	1,000	1,000	1,000	100,000	0.5	0.33	0.5	0.5	0.5
$D_5$	1,000	100	10,000	100,000	0.09	0.09	0.29	0.5	0.91
$D_6$	1,000	10	100,000	100,000	0.01	0.01	0.10	0.5	0.99

Subtle: They disagree on those cases

## **Analysis of DBLP Coauthor Relationships**

Recent DB conferences, removing balanced associations, low sup, etc.

ID	Author $A$	Author $B$	$s(A \cup B)$	s(A)	s(B)	Jaccard	Cosine	Kulc
1	Hans-Peter Kriegel	Martin Ester	28	146	54	0.163(2)	0.315(7)	0.355(9)
2	Michael Carey	Miron Livny	26	104	58	0.191(1)	0.335(4)	0.349 (10)
3	Hans-Peter Kriegel	Joerg Sander	24	146	36	0.152(3)	0.331(5)	0.416 (8)
4	Christos Faloutsos	Spiros Papadimitriou	20	162	26	0.119(7)	0.308(10)	0.446(7)
5	Hans-Peter Kriegel	Martin Pfeifle	18	146	18	0.123(6)	0.351(2)	0.562(2)
6	Hector Garcia-Molina	Wilburt Labio	16	144	18	0.110(9)	0.314(8)	0.500(4)
7	Divyakant Agrawal	Wang Hsiung	<b>1</b> 6	120	16	$\bigcirc 0.133 (5)$	0.365(1)	0.567(1)
8	Elke Rundensteiner	Murali Mani	16	104	20	0.148(4)	0.351(3)	0.477(6)
9	Divyakant Agrawal	Oliver Po	$\triangleleft$ 12	120	12	0.100(10)	0.316 (6)	0.550(3)
10	Gerhard Weikum	Martin Theobald	12	106	14	0.111 (8)	0.312 (9)	0.485(5)
			•			•		

Advisor-advisee relation: Kulc: high, Jaccard: low,

cosine: middle

- Which pairs of authors are strongly related?
  - ☐ Use Kulc to find Advisor-advisee, close collaborators

# Imbalance Ratio with Kulczynski Measure

□ IR (Imbalance Ratio): measure the imbalance of two itemsets A and B in rule implications: |e(A) - e(B)|

$$IR(A,B) = \frac{|s(A)-s(B)|}{s(A)+s(B)-s(A\cup B)}$$

- □ Kulczynski and Imbalance Ratio (IR) together present a clear picture for all the three datasets D<sub>4</sub> through D<sub>6</sub>
  - $\square$  D<sub>4</sub> is neutral & balanced; D<sub>5</sub> is neutral but imbalanced
  - D<sub>6</sub> is neutral but very imbalanced

Data set	mc	$\neg mc$	$m \neg c$	eg m  eg c	Jaccard	Cosine	Kulc	IR
$D_1$	10,000	1,000	1,000	100,000	0.83	0.91	0.91	0
$D_2$	10,000	1,000	1,000	100	0.83	0.91	0.91	0
$D_3$	100	1,000	1,000	100,000	0.05	0.09	0.09	0
$D_4$	1,000	1,000	1,000	100,000	0.33	$\bigcirc 0.5$	0.5	0
$D_5$	1,000	100	10,000	100,000	0.09	$\bigcirc 0.29$	0.5	0.89
$D_6$	1,000	10	100,000	100,000	0.01	0.10	0.5	0.99

#### Recommended Readings

- C. C. Aggarwal and P. S. Yu. A New Framework for Itemset Generation. PODS'98
- S. Brin, R. Motwani, and C. Silverstein. Beyond market basket: Generalizing association rules to correlations. SIGMOD'97
- M. Klemettinen, H. Mannila, P. Ronkainen, H. Toivonen, and A. I. Verkamo. Finding interesting rules from large sets of discovered association rules. CIKM'94
- E. Omiecinski. Alternative Interest Measures for Mining Associations. TKDE'03
- P.-N. Tan, V. Kumar, and J. Srivastava. Selecting the Right Interestingness Measure for Association Patterns. KDD'02
- T. Wu, Y. Chen and J. Han, Re-Examination of Interestingness Measures in Pattern Mining: A Unified Framework, Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery, 21(3):371-397, 2010