

Introduction to Machine Learning

Computational Linguistics: Jordan Boyd-Graber University of Maryland NAIVE BAYES AND LOGISTIC REGRESSION

Slides adapted from Hinrich Schütze and Lauren Hannah

By the end of today ...

- You'll be able to frame many machine learning tasks as classification problems
- Apply logistic regression (given weights) to classify data
- Learn naïve bayes from data

Given:

 A universe X our examples can come from (e.g., English documents with a predefined vocabulary)

- A universe X our examples can come from (e.g., English documents with a predefined vocabulary)
 - Examples are represented in this space.

- A universe X our examples can come from (e.g., English documents with a predefined vocabulary)
 - Examples are represented in this space.
- A fixed set of labels $y \in \mathbb{C} = \{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_J\}$

- A universe X our examples can come from (e.g., English documents with a predefined vocabulary)
 - Examples are represented in this space.
- A fixed set of labels $y \in \mathbb{C} = \{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_J\}$
 - The classes are human-defined for the needs of an application (e.g., spam vs. ham).

- A universe X our examples can come from (e.g., English documents with a predefined vocabulary)
 - Examples are represented in this space.
- A fixed set of labels $y \in \mathbb{C} = \{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_J\}$
 - The classes are human-defined for the needs of an application (e.g., spam vs. ham).
- A training set *D* of labeled documents with each labeled document {(x₁, y₁)...(x_N, y_N)}

Given:

- A universe X our examples can come from (e.g., English documents with a predefined vocabulary)
 - Examples are represented in this space.
- A fixed set of labels $y \in \mathbb{C} = \{c_1, c_2, \dots, c_J\}$
 - The classes are human-defined for the needs of an application (e.g., spam vs. ham).
- A training set *D* of labeled documents with each labeled document $\{(x_1, y_1) \dots (x_N, y_N)\}$

We learn a classifier γ that maps documents to class probabilities:

$$\gamma:(x,y)\to [0,1]$$

such that $\sum_{y} \gamma(x, y) = 1$

Generative vs. Discriminative Models

Generative

Model joint probability p(x, y) including the data *x*.

Naïve Bayes

- Uses Bayes rule to reverse conditioning $p(x|y) \rightarrow p(y|x)$
- Naïve because it ignores joint probabilities within the data distribution

Discriminative

Model only conditional probability p(y|x), excluding the data *x*.

Logistic regression

- Logistic: A special mathematical function it uses
- Regression: Combines a weight vector with observations to create an answer
- General cookbook for building conditional probability distributions

- Suppose that I have two coins, C₁ and C₂
- Now suppose I pull a coin out of my pocket, flip it a bunch of times, record the coin and outcomes, and repeat many times:

```
C1: 0 1 1 1 1

C1: 1 1 0

C2: 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 1

C1: 0 1

C1: 1 1 0 1 1 1

C2: 0 0 1 1 0 1

C2: 1 0 0 0
```

- Suppose that I have two coins, C₁ and C₂
- Now suppose I pull a coin out of my pocket, flip it a bunch of times, record the coin and outcomes, and repeat many times:

```
C1 ·
    0 1 1 1 1
C1:
   1 1 0
C2: 1 0 0 0 0 0 1
C1:
   0 1
C1: 1 1 0
           1
                1
             .
C2: 0
      0 1 1
               1
             0
C2:
   1 \ 0 \ 0
           0
```

Now suppose I am given a new sequence, 0 0 1; which coin is it from?

This problem has particular challenges:

- different numbers of covariates for each observation
- number of covariates can be large

However, there is some structure:

- Easy to get $P(C_1)$, $P(C_2)$
- Also easy to get $P(X_i = 1 | C_1)$ and $P(X_i = 1 | C_2)$
- By conditional independence,

$$P(X = 0 \, 1 \, 0 \, | \, C_1) = P(X_1 = 0 \, | \, C_1) P(X_2 = 1 \, | \, C_1) P(X_2 = 0 \, | \, C_1)$$

• Can we use these to get $P(C_1 | X = 001)$?

This problem has particular challenges:

- different numbers of covariates for each observation
- number of covariates can be large

However, there is some structure:

- Easy to get $P(C_1) = 4/7$, $P(C_2) = 3/7$
- Also easy to get $P(X_i = 1 | C_1)$ and $P(X_i = 1 | C_2)$
- By conditional independence,

$$P(X = 0 \, 1 \, 0 \, | \, C_1) = P(X_1 = 0 \, | \, C_1) P(X_2 = 1 \, | \, C_1) P(X_2 = 0 \, | \, C_1)$$

• Can we use these to get $P(C_1 | X = 001)$?

This problem has particular challenges:

- different numbers of covariates for each observation
- number of covariates can be large

However, there is some structure:

- Easy to get $P(C_1) = 4/7$, $P(C_2) = 3/7$
- Also easy to get $P(X_i = 1 | C_1) = 12/16$ and $P(X_i = 1 | C_2) = 6/18$
- By conditional independence,

$$P(X = 0 \, 1 \, 0 \, | \, C_1) = P(X_1 = 0 \, | \, C_1) P(X_2 = 1 \, | \, C_1) P(X_2 = 0 \, | \, C_1)$$

• Can we use these to get $P(C_1 | X = 001)$?

Summary: have *P*(*data*|*class*), want *P*(*class*|*data*)

Solution: Bayes' rule!

$$P(class | data) = \frac{P(data | class)P(class)}{P(data)}$$
$$= \frac{P(data | class)P(class)}{\sum_{class=1}^{C} P(data | class)P(class)}$$

To compute, we need to estimate P(data | class), P(class) for all classes

This works because the coin flips are independent given the coin parameter. What about this case:

- want to identify the type of fruit given a set of features: color, shape and size
- color: red, green, yellow or orange (discrete)
- shape: round, oval or long+skinny (discrete)
- size: diameter in inches (continuous)



Conditioned on type of fruit, these features are not necessarily independent:



Given category "apple," the color "green" has a higher probability given "size < 2":

P(green | size < 2, apple) > P(green | apple)

Using chain rule,

$$\begin{split} P(apple | green, round, size = 2) \\ &= \frac{P(green, round, size = 2 | apple)P(apple)}{\sum_{fruits} P(green, round, size = 2 | fruit j)P(fruit j)} \\ &\propto P(green | round, size = 2, apple)P(round | size = 2, apple) \\ &\times P(size = 2 | apple)P(apple) \end{split}$$

But computing conditional probabilities is hard! There are many combinations of (*color*, *shape*, *size*) for each fruit.

Idea: assume conditional independence for all features given class,

$$P(green | round, size = 2, apple) = P(green | apple)$$

 $P(round | green, size = 2, apple) = P(round | apple)$
 $P(size = 2 | green, round, apple) = P(size = 2 | apple)$

• Suppose we want to estimate $P(w_n = "buy" | y = SPAM)$.

• Suppose we want to estimate $P(w_n = "buy"|y = SPAM)$.

buy	buy	nigeria	opportunity	viagra
nigeria	opportunity	viagra	fly	money
fly	buy	nigeria	fly	buy
money	buy	fly	nigeria	viagra

• Suppose we want to estimate $P(w_n = "buy"|y = SPAM)$.

buy	buy	nigeria	opportunity	viagra
nigeria	opportunity	viagra	fly	money
fly	buy	nigeria	fly	buy
money	buy	fly	nigeria	viagra

Maximum likelihood (ML) estimate of the probability is:

$$\hat{\beta}_i = \frac{n_i}{\sum_k n_k} \tag{1}$$

• Suppose we want to estimate $P(w_n = "buy"|y = SPAM)$.

buy	buy	nigeria	opportunity	viagra
nigeria	opportunity	viagra	fly	money
fly	buy	nigeria	fly	buy
money	buy	fly	nigeria	viagra

Maximum likelihood (ML) estimate of the probability is:

$$\hat{\beta}_i = \frac{n_i}{\sum_k n_k} \tag{1}$$

Is this reasonable?

The problem with maximum likelihood estimates: Zeros (cont)

 If there were no occurrences of "bagel" in documents in class SPAM, we'd get a zero estimate:

$$\hat{P}(\text{``bagel''}| \text{SPAM}) = \frac{T \text{SPAM}, \text{``bagel''}}{\sum_{w' \in V} T \text{SPAM}, w'} = 0$$

- \rightarrow We will get P(SPAM|d) = 0 for any document that contains bage!!
- Zero probabilities cannot be conditioned away.

- For many applications, we often have a prior notion of what our probability distributions are going to look like (for example, non-zero, sparse, uniform, etc.).
- This estimate of a probability distribution is called the maximum a posteriori (MAP) estimate:

$$\beta_{MAP} = \operatorname{argmax}_{\beta} f(x|\beta) g(\beta)$$
 (2)

 For a multinomial distribution (i.e. a discrete distribution, like over words):

$$\beta_i = \frac{n_i + \alpha_i}{\sum_k n_k + \alpha_k} \tag{3}$$

• α_i is called a smoothing factor, a pseudocount, etc.

 For a multinomial distribution (i.e. a discrete distribution, like over words):

$$\beta_i = \frac{n_i + \alpha_i}{\sum_k n_k + \alpha_k} \tag{3}$$

- *α_i* is called a smoothing factor, a pseudocount, etc.
- When α_i = 1 for all *i*, it's called "Laplace smoothing" and corresponds to a uniform prior over all multinomial distributions (just do this).

 For a multinomial distribution (i.e. a discrete distribution, like over words):

$$\beta_i = \frac{n_i + \alpha_i}{\sum_k n_k + \alpha_k} \tag{3}$$

- α_i is called a smoothing factor, a pseudocount, etc.
- When α_i = 1 for all *i*, it's called "Laplace smoothing" and corresponds to a uniform prior over all multinomial distributions (just do this).
- To geek out, the set {α₁,..., α_N} parameterizes a Dirichlet distribution, which is itself a distribution over distributions and is the conjugate prior of the Multinomial (don't need to know this).

The Naïve Bayes classifier

- The Naïve Bayes classifier is a probabilistic classifier.
- We compute the probability of a document *d* being in a class *c* as follows:

$$P(c|d) \propto P(c) \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n_d} P(w_i|c)$$

The Naïve Bayes classifier

- The Naïve Bayes classifier is a probabilistic classifier.
- We compute the probability of a document *d* being in a class *c* as follows:

$$P(c|d) \propto P(c) \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n_d} P(w_i|c)$$

The Naïve Bayes classifier

- The Naïve Bayes classifier is a probabilistic classifier.
- We compute the probability of a document *d* being in a class *c* as follows:

$$P(c|d) \propto P(c) \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n_d} P(w_i|c)$$

- *n_d* is the length of the document. (number of tokens)
- P(w_i|c) is the conditional probability of term w_i occurring in a document of class c
- *P*(*w_i*|*c*) as a measure of how much evidence *w_i* contributes that *c* is the correct class.
- P(c) is the prior probability of c.
- If a document's terms do not provide clear evidence for one class vs. another, we choose the *c* with higher *P*(*c*).

Maximum a posteriori class

- Our goal is to find the "best" class.
- The best class in Naïve Bayes classification is the most likely or maximum a posteriori (MAP) class c map :

$$c_{\text{map}} = \arg\max_{c_j \in \mathbb{C}} \hat{P}(c_j | d) = \arg\max_{c_j \in \mathbb{C}} \hat{P}(c_j) \prod_{1 \le i \le n_d} \hat{P}(w_i | c_j)$$

• We write \hat{P} for *P* since these values are <u>estimates</u> from the training set.

Naïve Bayes conditional independence assumption

To reduce the number of parameters to a manageable size, recall the <u>Naïve</u> Bayes conditional independence assumption:

$$P(d|c_j) = P(\langle w_1, \ldots, w_{n_d} \rangle | c_j) = \prod_{1 \le i \le n_d} P(X_i = w_i | c_j)$$

We assume that the probability of observing the conjunction of attributes is equal to the product of the individual probabilities $P(X_i = w_i | c_j)$. Our estimates for these priors and conditional probabilities: $\hat{P}(c_j) = \frac{N_c + 1}{N + |C|}$ and $\hat{P}(w|c) = \frac{T_{cw} + 1}{(\sum_{w' \in V} T_{cw'}) + |V|}$

Implementation Detail: Taking the log

- Multiplying lots of small probabilities can result in floating point underflow.
- From last time lg is logarithm base 2; In is logarithm base e.

$$\lg x = a \Leftrightarrow 2^a = x \qquad \ln x = a \Leftrightarrow e^a = x \qquad (4)$$

- Since lg(xy) = lg(x) + lg(y), we can sum log probabilities instead of multiplying probabilities.
- Since Ig is a monotonic function, the class with the highest score does not change.
- So what we usually compute in practice is:

$$c_{\max} = \arg\max_{c_j \in \mathbb{C}} \left[\hat{P}(c_j) \prod_{1 \le i \le n_d} \hat{P}(w_i | c_j) \right]$$
$$\arg\max_{c_j \in \mathbb{C}} \left[\ln \hat{P}(c_j) + \sum_{1 \le i \le n_d} \ln \hat{P}(w_i | c_j) \right]$$

Implementation Detail: Taking the log

- Multiplying lots of small probabilities can result in floating point underflow.
- From last time lg is logarithm base 2; In is logarithm base e.

$$\lg x = a \Leftrightarrow 2^a = x \qquad \ln x = a \Leftrightarrow e^a = x \qquad (4)$$

- Since lg(xy) = lg(x) + lg(y), we can sum log probabilities instead of multiplying probabilities.
- Since Ig is a monotonic function, the class with the highest score does not change.
- So what we usually compute in practice is:

$$c_{\max} = \arg\max_{c_j \in \mathbb{C}} \left[\hat{P}(c_j) \prod_{1 \le i \le n_d} \hat{P}(w_i | c_j) \right]$$
$$\arg\max_{c_j \in \mathbb{C}} \left[\ln \hat{P}(c_j) + \sum_{1 \le i \le n_d} \ln \hat{P}(w_i | c_j) \right]$$

Implementation Detail: Taking the log

- Multiplying lots of small probabilities can result in floating point underflow.
- From last time lg is logarithm base 2; In is logarithm base e.

$$\lg x = a \Leftrightarrow 2^a = x \qquad \ln x = a \Leftrightarrow e^a = x \qquad (4)$$

- Since lg(xy) = lg(x) + lg(y), we can sum log probabilities instead of multiplying probabilities.
- Since Ig is a monotonic function, the class with the highest score does not change.
- So what we usually compute in practice is:

$$c_{\max} = \arg\max_{c_j \in \mathbb{C}} \left[\hat{P}(c_j) \prod_{1 \le i \le n_d} \hat{P}(w_i | c_j) \right]$$
$$\arg\max_{c_j \in \mathbb{C}} \left[\ln \hat{P}(c_j) + \sum_{1 \le i \le n_d} \ln \hat{P}(w_i | c_j) \right]$$