Last lecture...

How can we predict **binary** or **categorical** variables?

\[ f(\text{data}) \xrightarrow{?} \text{labels} \]

\{0,1\}, \{True, False\}

\{1, \ldots, N\}
Last lecture...

Will I **purchase** this product?  
(yes)

Will I **click on** this ad?  
(no)
Last lecture...

What animal appears in this image?

(mandarin duck)
Last lecture...

What are the categories of the item being described?
(book, fiction, philosophical fiction)

From Booklist
Houellebecq's deeply philosophical novel is about an alienated young man searching for happiness in the computer age. Bored with the world and too weary to try to adapt to the foibles of friends and coworkers, he retreats into himself, descending into depression while attempting to analyze the passions of the people around him. Houellebecq uses his nameless narrator as a vehicle for extended exploration into the meanings and manifestations of love and desire in human interactions. Ironically, as the narrator attempts to define love in increasingly abstract terms, he becomes less and less capable of experiencing that which he is so desperate to understand. Intelligent and well written, the short novel is a thought-provoking inspection of a generation's confusion about all things sexual. Houellebecq captures precisely the cynical disillusionment of disaffected youth. Bonnie Johnston -- This text refers to an out of print or unavailable edition of this title.
Last lecture...

- **Naïve Bayes**
  - Probabilistic model (fits $p(label|data)$)
  - Makes a conditional independence assumption of the form $(feature_i \perp feature_j|label)$ allowing us to define the model by computing $p(feature_i|label)$ for each feature
  - Simple to compute just by counting

- **Logistic Regression**
  - Fixes the “double counting” problem present in naïve Bayes

- **SVMs**
  - Non-probabilistic: optimizes the classification error rather than the likelihood
The classifiers we saw last week all attempt to make decisions by associating weights (theta) with features (x) and classifying according to

$$y_i = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } X_i \cdot \theta > 0 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

The difference between the three is then simply how they’re trained
Last lecture...
1) Naïve Bayes

\[
p(label|features) = \frac{p(label)p(features|label)}{p(features)}
\]

due to our conditional independence assumption:

\[
p(label|features) = \frac{p(label)\prod_i p(feature_i|label)}{p(features)}
\]
2) logistic regression

sigmoid function:  \( \sigma(t) = \frac{1}{1+e^{-t}} \)
3) Support Vector Machines

Try to optimize the **misclassification error** rather than maximize a probability.
Pros/cons

• **Naïve Bayes**
  ++ Easiest to implement, most efficient to “train”
  ++ If we have a process that generates feature that *are* independent given the label, it’s a very sensible idea
  -- Otherwise it suffers from a “double-counting” issue

• **Logistic Regression**
  ++ Fixes the “double counting” problem present in naïve Bayes
  -- More expensive to train

• **SVMs**
  ++ Non-probabilistic: optimizes the classification error rather than the likelihood
  -- More expensive to train
Today

1. A different type of classifier, based on measuring the distance between labeled/unlabeled instances
2. How to evaluate whether our classifiers are good or not
3. Another case study – building a classifier to predict which products will be copurchased
Nearest-neighbour classification

One more (even simpler) classifier

positive examples

negative examples

(training set)
Nearest-neighbour classification

Given a new point, just find the nearest labeled point, and assign it the same label.
Nearest-neighbour classification

Given a new point, just find the nearest labeled point, and assign it the same label

\[
\text{label}(X) = \text{label}(\arg \min_{Z \in \text{train}} d(X, Z))
\]

Nearest training point
Label of nearest training point

We’ll look more at this type of classifier in the case-study later tonight
CSE 190 – Lecture 4
Data Mining and Predictive Analytics

Evaluating classifiers
Which of these classifiers is best?
Which of these classifiers is best?

The solution which minimizes the #errors may not be the best one.
Which of these classifiers is best?

1. **When data are highly imbalanced**
   If there are far fewer positive examples than negative examples we may want to assign additional weight to negative instances (or vice versa)

   e.g. will I purchase a product? If I purchase 0.00001% of products, then a classifier which just predicts “no” everywhere is 99.99999% accurate, but not very useful
Which of these classifiers is best?

2. When mistakes are more costly in one direction

False positives are nuisances but false negatives are disastrous (or vice versa)

e.g. which of these bags contains a weapon?
Which of these classifiers is best?

3. When we only care about the “most confident” predictions

e.g. does a relevant result appear among the first page of results?
Evaluating classifiers

decision boundary

negative  positive
TP (true positive): Labeled as positive, predicted as positive.
Evaluating classifiers

TN (true negative): Labeled as negative, predicted as negative
Evaluating classifiers

FP (false positive): Labeled as negative, predicted as positive
FN (false negative): Labeled as positive, predicted as negative.
### Evaluating Classifiers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Label</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>true</td>
<td>false</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prediction true</td>
<td>true positive</td>
<td>false positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prediction false</td>
<td>false negative</td>
<td>true negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Classification accuracy  
= correct predictions / #predictions

Error rate  
= incorrect predictions / #predictions
## Evaluating classifiers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prediction</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>true</td>
<td>true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>false</td>
<td>false</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>true positive</th>
<th>false positive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>false negative</td>
<td>true negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**True positive rate (TPR)**

\[
\text{TPR} = \frac{\text{true positives}}{\#\text{labeled positive}}
\]

**True negative rate (TNR)**

\[
\text{TNR} = \frac{\text{true negatives}}{\#\text{labeled negative}}
\]
Evaluating classifiers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prediction</th>
<th>Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>true</td>
<td>true positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>false</td>
<td>false negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Balanced Error Rate (BER) = \( \frac{1}{2} \) (FPR + FNR)

= \( \frac{1}{2} \) for a random/naïve classifier, 0 for a perfect classifier
Evaluating classifiers

How to optimize a balanced error measure:

$$L_\theta(y|X) = \prod_{y_i=1} p_\theta(y_i|X_i) \prod_{y_i=0} (1 - p_\theta(y_i|X_i))$$
Evaluating classifiers – ranking

The classifiers we’ve seen can associate **scores** with each prediction.

![Diagram showing decision boundary and scores]

- Furthest from decision boundary in negative direction = lowest score/least confident.
- Furthest from decision boundary in positive direction = highest score/most confident.
The classifiers we’ve seen can associate **scores** with each prediction

- In ranking settings, the actual labels assigned to the points (i.e., which side of the decision boundary they lie on) **don’t matter**
- All that matters is that positively labeled points tend to be at **higher ranks** than negative ones
Evaluating classifiers – ranking

The classifiers we’ve seen can associate **scores** with each prediction

- For naïve Bayes, the “score” is the ratio between an item having a positive or negative class
- For logistic regression, the “score” is just the probability associated with the label being 1
- For Support Vector Machines, the score is the distance of the item from the decision boundary (together with the sign indicating what side it’s on)
The classifiers we’ve seen can associate **scores** with each prediction

e.g.

\[ y = [1, -1, 1, 1, 1, -1, 1, 1, -1, 1] \]

*Confidence* = [1.3, -0.2, -0.1, -0.4, 1.4, 0.1, 0.8, 0.6, -0.8, 1.0]

Sort **both** according to confidence:
The classifiers we’ve seen can associate **scores** with each prediction

Labels sorted by confidence:

\[ [1, 1, 1, 1, 1, -1, 1, -1, 1, -1] \]

Suppose we have a fixed budget (say, six) of items that we can return (e.g. we have space for six results in an interface)

- Total number of **relevant** items =
- Number of items we returned =
- Number of **relevant items** we returned =
Evaluating classifiers – ranking

The classifiers we’ve seen can associate scores with each prediction

$$\text{precision} = \frac{|\text{relevant documents} \cap \text{retrieved documents}|}{|\text{retrieved documents}|}$$

“fraction of retrieved documents that are relevant”

$$\text{recall} = \frac{|\text{relevant documents} \cap \text{retrieved documents}|}{|\text{relevant documents}|}$$

“fraction of relevant documents that were retrieved”
Evaluating classifiers – ranking

The classifiers we’ve seen can associate **scores** with each prediction

\[ \text{precision@}k = \text{precision when we have a budget of } k \text{ retrieved documents} \]

e.g.

- Total number of **relevant** items = 7
- Number of items we returned = 6
- Number of **relevant items** we returned = 5

\[ \text{precision@6} = \]
Evaluating classifiers – ranking

The classifiers we’ve seen can associate \textbf{scores} with each prediction

\[ F_1 = 2 \cdot \frac{\text{precision} \cdot \text{recall}}{\text{precision} + \text{recall}} \]

(harmonic mean of precision and recall)

\[ F_\beta = (1 + \beta^2) \cdot \frac{\text{precision} \cdot \text{recall}}{\beta^2 \cdot \text{precision} + \text{recall}} \]

(weighted, in case precision is more important (low beta), or recall is more important (high beta))
How does our classifier behave as we “increase the budget” of the number retrieved items?

- For budgets of size 1 to N, compute the precision and recall
- Plot the precision against the recall
**Summary**

1. **When data are highly imbalanced**

   If there are far fewer positive examples than negative examples we may want to assign additional weight to negative instances (or vice versa)

   e.g. will I purchase a product? If I purchase 0.00001% of products, then a classifier which just predicts “no” everywhere is 99.99999% accurate, but not very useful

   - Compute the true positive rate and true negative rate, and the F_1 score
2. When mistakes are more costly in one direction

False positives are nuisances but false negatives are disastrous (or vice versa)

Compute “weighted” error measures that trade-off the precision and the recall, like the $F_{\beta}$ score

e.g. which of these bags contains a weapon?
3. When we only care about the “most confident” predictions, e.g. does a relevant result appear among the first page of results?

Compute the precision@k, and plot the signature of precision versus recall.
So far: Regression

How can we use features such as product properties and user demographics to make predictions about real-valued outcomes (e.g. star ratings)?

How can we prevent our models from overfitting by favouring simpler models over more complex ones?

How can we assess our decision to optimize a particular error measure, like the MSE?
So far: Classification

Next we adapted these ideas to **binary** or **multiclass** outputs.

What animal is in this image?  Will I **purchase** this product?  Will I **click on** this ad?

Combining features using naïve Bayes models

Logistic regression

Support vector machines
So far: supervised learning

Given **labeled training data** of the form

\[
\{(\text{data}_1, \text{label}_1), \ldots, (\text{data}_n, \text{label}_n)\}
\]

Infer the function

\[ f(\text{data}) \xrightarrow{?} \text{labels} \]
We’ve looked at two types of prediction algorithms:

Regression:
\[ y_i = X_i \cdot \theta \]

Classification:
\[ y_i = \begin{cases} 
1 & \text{if } X_i \cdot \theta > 0 \\
0 & \text{otherwise}
\end{cases} \]
Further reading:

• “Cheat sheet” of performance evaluation measures:

• Andrew Zisserman’s SVM slides, focused on computer vision:
  http://www.robots.ox.ac.uk/~az/lectures/ml/lect2.pdf