

Introduction to Machine Learning

Computational Linguistics: Jordan Boyd-Graber University of Maryland NAÏVE 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:

 \blacksquare 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.

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

- \blacksquare 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 $y \in \mathbb{C} = \{c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_J\}$
	- \Box 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 $y \in \mathbb{C} = \{c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_J\}$
	- \Box 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 $\{(x_1, y_1) \dots (x_N, y_N)\}$

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 $y \in \mathbb{C} = \{c_1, c_2, \ldots, c_J\}$
	- \Box 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 $\sum_{\substack{y}} \gamma(x, y) = 1$

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, C_1 and C_2
- 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 0C2: 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, C_1 and C_2
- 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 0C2: 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
```
Now suppose I am given a new sequence, $0 \quad 0 \quad 1$; 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,

$$
P(X = 010 | C_1) = P(X_1 = 0 | C_1)P(X_2 = 1 | C_1)P(X_2 = 0 | C_1)
$$

 \blacksquare 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,

$$
P(X = 010 | C_1) = P(X_1 = 0 | C_1)P(X_2 = 1 | C_1)P(X_2 = 0 | C_1)
$$

 \blacksquare 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,

$$
P(X = 010 | C_1) = P(X_1 = 0 | C_1)P(X_2 = 1 | C_1)P(X_2 = 0 | C_1)
$$

 \blacksquare 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,

P(*apple* |*green*,*round*,*size* = 2) $=\frac{P(green, round, size=2| apple)P(apole)}{\sum_{n=1}^{n} P(mose, round, size=2| Earth)P(gue)}$ P *fruits ^P*(*green*,*round*,*size* = ²|*fruit j*)*P*(*fruit j*) ∝*P*(*green*|*round*,*size* = 2,*apple*)*P*(*round* |*size* = 2,*apple*) × *P*(*size* = 2|*apple*)*P*(*apple*)

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,

$$
P(\text{green}|\text{round}, \text{size}=2, \text{apple}) = P(\text{green}|\text{apple})
$$
\n
$$
P(\text{round}|\text{green}, \text{size}=2, \text{apple}) = P(\text{round}|\text{apple})
$$
\n
$$
P(\text{size}=2|\text{green}, \text{round}, \text{apple}) = P(\text{size}=2|\text{apple})
$$

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

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

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

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 $P(w_n = "buy'']y = SPAM)$.

Maximum likelihood (ML) estimate of the probability is:

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

 \blacksquare 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:

$$
\hat{P}(\text{ "bagel"} | \text{ SPAM}) = \frac{T_{\text{SPAM, "bagel"}}}{\sum_{w' \in V} T_{\text{SPAM},w'}} = 0
$$

- $\blacksquare \rightarrow \mathsf{We}$ will get $P(\text{SPAM}|\boldsymbol{d}) = 0$ for any document that contains bagel!
- 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:

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

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

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

 \bullet α _{*i*} is called a smoothing factor, a pseudocount, etc.

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

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

- \bullet α _{*i*} is called a smoothing factor, a pseudocount, etc.
- When $\alpha_i = 1$ 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):

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

- \bullet α _{*i*} is called a smoothing factor, a pseudocount, etc.
- When $\alpha_i = 1$ 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** $\{\alpha_1,\ldots,\alpha_N\}$ **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*(*wⁱ* |*c*) as a measure of how much evidence *^wⁱ* 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 :

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

■ We write \hat{P} for *P* since these values are estimates from the training set.

Naïve Bayes conditional independence assumption

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

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

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; ln is logarithm base *e*.

$$
lg x = a \Longleftrightarrow 2^a = x \qquad ln x = a \Longleftrightarrow e^a = x \tag{4}
$$

- 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:

$$
c_{\text{ map}} = \arg\max_{c_j \in \mathbb{C}} \left[\hat{P}(c_j) \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n_d} \hat{P}(w_i | c_j) \right]
$$

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

Implementation Detail: Taking the log

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

$$
lg x = a \Longleftrightarrow 2^a = x \qquad ln x = a \Longleftrightarrow e^a = x \tag{4}
$$

- 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:

$$
c_{\text{ map}} = \arg\max_{c_j \in \mathbb{C}} \left[\hat{P}(c_j) \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n_d} \hat{P}(w_i | c_j) \right]
$$

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

Implementation Detail: Taking the log

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

$$
lg x = a \Longleftrightarrow 2^a = x \qquad ln x = a \Longleftrightarrow e^a = x \tag{4}
$$

- 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:

$$
c_{\text{ map}} = \arg\max_{c_j \in \mathbb{C}} \left[\hat{P}(c_j) \prod_{1 \leq i \leq n_d} \hat{P}(w_i | c_j) \right]
$$

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