10-701: Introduction to Machine Learning Lecture 3 –KNNs

Henry Chai 1/24/24

#### Front Matter

- Announcements:
	- · HW1 released 1/24 (toda
	- · Recitations will be held on place as lecture
		- HW1 recitation this Fr
	- · Office hours will start 1/2
- Recommended Readings:
	- Mitchell, Section 8.1 8.2
	- · Daumé III, Chapter 3: Geo

Recall: Decision Tree Prediction - Pseudocode

def  $predict(x')$ :

- walk from root node to a leaf node while(true):
	- if current node is internal (non-leaf):
		- check the associated attribute,  $x_d$
		- go down branch according to  $x_d'$
	- if current node is a leaf node:
		- return label stored at that leaf

Recall: Decision Tree Learning - Pseudocode

def  $train(D)$ : store root = tree recurse( $D$ ) def tree\_recurse $(D')$ :  $q = new node()$ base case – if (SOME CONDITION): recursion – else: find best attribute to split on,  $x_d$ q.split =  $x_d$ for v in  $V(x_d)$ , all possible values of  $x_d$ :  $\mathcal{D}_{v} = \left\{ (x^{(n)}, y^{(n)}) \in \mathcal{D}' \mid x_{d}^{(n)} = v \right\}$ q.children( $v$ ) = tree recurse( $\mathcal{D}_v$ ) return q Recall: Decision Tree Learning - Pseudocode

def train $(D)$ : store root = tree recurse( $D$ ) def tree\_recurse $(D')$ :  $q = new node()$ base case - if  $(D'$  is empty OR all labels in  $\mathcal{D}'$  are the same OR all features in  $\mathcal{D}'$  are identical OR some other stopping criterion): q.label = majority\_vote( $\mathcal{D}'$ )

recursion – else:

How is **Henry** Getting to Work?





**Decision** Trees: Inductive Bias

- The **inductive bias** of a machine learning algorithm is the principal by which it generalizes to unseen examples
- What is the inductive bias of the ID3 algorithm i.e., decision tree learning with mutual information maximization as the splitting criterion?
	- Try to find the **shortest** tree that achieves
	- **zero training error** with

**high mutual information** features at the top

 Occam's razor: try to find the "simplest" (e.g., smallest decision tree) classifier that explains the training dataset

**Decision** Trees: Pros & Cons

#### • Pros

- · Interpretable
- Efficient (computational cost and storage)
- Can be used for classification and regression tasks
- Compatible with categorical and real-valued features

Cons

Real -Valued Features: Example  $x =$  Outside Temperature (°F)



Real -Valued Features: Example  $x =$  Outside Temperature (°F)



Real -Valued Features: Example  $x =$  Outside Temperature (°F)



Real-Valued Features: Example  $x =$ Outside Temperature (℉)



**Decision** Trees: Pros & Cons

#### • Pros

- Interpretable
- Efficient (computational cost and storage)
- Can be used for classification and regression tasks
- Compatible with categorical and real-valued features
- Cons
	- Learned greedily: each split only considers the immediate impact on the splitting criterion
		- Not guaranteed to find the smallest (fewest number of splits) tree that achieves a training error rate of 0.
	- Liable to overfit!

### **Overfitting**

- Overfitting occurs when the classifier (or model)…
	- **· is too complex**
	- $\cdot$  fits noise or "outliers" in the training dataset as opposed to the actual pattern of interest
	- doesn't have enough inductive bias pushing it to generalize (e.g., memorizer)
- Underfitting occurs when the classifier (or model)…
	- is too simple
	- can't capture the actual pattern of interest in the training dataset
	- has too much inductive bias (e.g., majority vote)

### Different Kinds of Error

- Training error rate =  $err(h, D_{train})$
- Test error rate =  $err(h, D_{test})$
- True error rate =  $err(h)$ 
	- = the error rate of  $h$  on all possible examples
	- In machine learning, this is the quantity that we care about but, in most cases, it is unknowable.

Overfitting occurs when  $err(h) > err(h, D_{train})$ •  $err(h) - err(h, D_{train})$  can be thought of as a measure of overfitting







This tree only misclassifies one training data point!

### Overfitting in Decision Trees



**Combatting** Overfitting in Decision Trees

- Intuition: deeper trees are "more complicated" and thus more liable to overfit
- · Heuristics:
	- $\cdot$  Do not split leaves past a fixed depth,  $\delta$
	- $\cdot$  Do not split leaves with fewer than  $c$  data points
	- Do not split leaves where the maximal information gain is less than  $\tau$
- Take a majority vote in impure leaves

**Combatting** Overfitting in Decision Trees

- Reduced Error Pruning:
	- 1. Learn a decision tree
	- 2. Evaluate each split using a "validation" dataset by comparing the validation error rate with and without that split
	- 3. Greedily remove the split that most decreases the validation error rate
		- Break ties in favor of smaller trees
	- 4. Stop if no split is removed









$x_1$	$x_2$	$x_3$	$x_4$	$y$	
Rain	During	Backpack	Tired	Bus	
2 $val$	Rain	After	Both	NotTired	Bus
2 $val$	No Rain	Before	Backpack	NotTired	Bus
2 $err(h - s_1, D_{val})$	No Rain	During	Lunchbox	Tired	Dirive
No Rain	After	Lunchbox	Tired	Dirive	



$x_1$	$x_2$	$x_3$	$x_4$	$y$	
Rain	During	Backpack	Tired	Bus	
$D_{val}$	Rain	After	Both	NotTired	Bus
$err(h - s_1, D_{val}) = 0.4$	No Rain	During	Lunchbox	Tired	Dirive
No Rain	After	Lunchbox	Tired	Dirive	

















#### Pruning Decision Trees



#### Key Takeaways

- Decision tree prediction algorithm
- Decision tree learning algorithm via recursion
- Inductive bias of decision trees
- Overfitting vs. Underfitting
- How to combat overfitting in decision trees

### Real-valued Features



#### Fisher Iris Dataset

Fisher (1936) used 150 meas from 3 different species: Iris (1), Iris versicolor (2) collecte



#### Fisher Iris Dataset

Fisher (1936) used 150 meas from 3 different species: Iris (1), Iris versicolor (2) collecte



### Fisher Iris Dataset





The Free Encyclopedia

Main page **Contents** 

**Featured content Current events** 

**Random article** 

**Article Talk** 

#### Duck test

From Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia

For the use of "the duck test" within the Wikiped

The duck test is a form of abductive reasoning. Thi

If it looks like a duck, swims like a duck, and

### The Duck Test

The Duck Test for Machine **Learning** 

- Classify a point as the label of the "most similar" training point
- · Idea: given real-valued features, we can use a distance metric to determine how similar two data points are
- A common choice is Euclidean distance:

$$
d(x, x') = ||x - x'||_2 = \sqrt{\sum_{d=1}^{D} (x_d - x'_d)^2}
$$

An alternative is the Manhattan distance:

$$
d(x, x') = ||x - x'||_1 = \sum_{d=1}^{D} |x_d - x'_d|
$$

Nearest Neighbor Model

- Classify a point as the label of the "most similar" training point
- Given a training dataset  $\mathcal{D}_{train} = \{ (\mathbf{x}^{(n)}, y^{(n)}) \}$  $n=1$  $\overline{N}$ Let  $\hat{\iota}(\boldsymbol{x}') = \operatorname{argmin}$  $i \in \{1,...,N\}$  $d\big(\pmb{\chi}^{(i)}, \pmb{\chi}^\prime$

• Then the nearest neighbor classifier can be written as  $h(x') = y$  $\hat{\imath} (\vec{x}')$ 

### **Nearest** Neighbor: Example



### **Nearest** Neighbor: Example



### Nearest Neighbor: Example



The Nearest Neighbor Model

Requires no training!

- Always has zero training error!
	- *A data point is always its own nearest neighbor*

 $\ddot{\bullet}$ 

Always has zero training error…

### Generalization of Nearest Neighbor (Cover and Hart, 1967)

- Claim: under certain condition probability, the true error rate model  $\leq 2$   $*$  the Bayes error
- Proof:
	- Assume a binary classifica
	- · Assume data points are d some probability distribut
	- $\cdot$  Assume labels are *stochas*
	- Assume  $\pi(\pmb{x})$  is continuous

 $\chi^{(1)(X)}$ 

 $\Rightarrow \pi$ 

 $A$ s  $N$ 

### Generalization of Nearest Neighbor (Cover and Hart, 1967)

- Claim: under certain condition probability, the true error rate model  $\leq 2$  \* the Bayes error
- Proof (cont.):  $err(h) = P(h(x))$  $=$   $P(h(x') = c$  $\int$ ,  $\int$  $\ddot{\phantom{0}}$  $1 - 1$  $\frac{1}{1}$   $\overline{1}$   $\overline{2}$   $\overline{$

 $\leq$  7

### **Generalization** of Nearest **Neighbor** (Cover and Hart, 1967)

- Claim: under certain condition probability, the true error rate model  $\leq 2$  \* the Bayes error
- · Interpretation: "In this sense, classification information in a contained in the nearest neigh

### But why limit ourselves to just one neighbor?

- Claim: under certain condition probability, the true error rate model  $\leq 2$  \* the Bayes error
- · Interpretation: "In this sense, classification information in a contained in the nearest neigh

-Nearest **Neighbors**  $(kNN)$ 

- Classify a point as the most common label among the labels of the  $k$  nearest training points
- $\cdot$  Tie-breaking (in case of even  $k$  and/or more than 2 classes) - look of the next nearest meighbor  $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$  $\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$  $\mu_{\alpha}$  and  $\mu_{\alpha}$ Henry Chai - 1/24/24 **53**



3-Class classification ( $k = 2$ , weights = 'uniform')



 $3 - Class classification (k = 3, weights = 'uniform')$ 



3-Class classification ( $k = 5$ , weights = 'uniform')



3-Class classification ( $k = 10$ , weights = 'uniform')



3-Class classification ( $k = 20$ , weights = 'uniform')



3-Class classification ( $k = 30$ , weights = 'uniform')





3-Class classification ( $k = 100$ , weights = 'uniform')



3-Class classification ( $k = 120$ , weights = 'uniform')



3-Class classification ( $k = 150$ , weights = 'uniform')  $5.0 4.5 4.0 \bullet$  $3.5 3.0 2.5 2.0 1.5 1.0$  $\overline{5}$ 6  $\overline{7}$  $\,8\,$  $\overline{4}$ 

#### $kNN$ : Inductive Bias

- $\cdot$  What is the inductive bias of a  $kNN$  model that uses the Euclidean distance metric?
- Similar points should have similar labels and *all features are equivalently important for determining similarity*



#### Setting  $k$

- $\cdot$  When  $k = 1$ :
	- many, complicated decision boundaries
	- may *overfit*
- $\cdot$  When  $k = N$ :
	- no decision boundaries; always predicts the most common label in the training data
	- may *underfit*
- $\cdot$  k controls the complexity of the hypothesis set  $\Longrightarrow$  k affects how well the learned hypothesis will generalize