Introduction to Information Retrieval <http://informationretrieval.org>

IIR 14: Vector Space Classification

#### Hinrich Schütze

Center for Information and Language Processing, University of Munich

<span id="page-0-0"></span>2013-05-28

#### **Overview**





[Intro vector space classification](#page-9-0)

# [Rocchio](#page-28-0)







#### **Outline**



[Intro vector space classification](#page-9-0)

# [Rocchio](#page-28-0)





#### <span id="page-2-0"></span>> [two classes](#page--1-0)

Vector space classification: Basic idea of doing text classification for documents that are represented as vectors

- Vector space classification: Basic idea of doing text classification for documents that are represented as vectors
- Rocchio classifier: Rocchio relevance feedback idea applied to text classification

- Vector space classification: Basic idea of doing text classification for documents that are represented as vectors
- Rocchio classifier: Rocchio relevance feedback idea applied to text classification
- $k$  nearest neighbor classification

- Vector space classification: Basic idea of doing text classification for documents that are represented as vectors
- Rocchio classifier: Rocchio relevance feedback idea applied to text classification
- $k$  nearest neighbor classification
- **Q** Linear classifiers

- Vector space classification: Basic idea of doing text classification for documents that are represented as vectors
- Rocchio classifier: Rocchio relevance feedback idea applied to text classification
- $k$  nearest neighbor classification
- **Q** Linear classifiers
- More than two classes

# **Outline**



#### 2 [Intro vector space classification](#page-9-0)



#### 5 [Linear classifiers](#page-108-0)

#### <span id="page-9-0"></span> $6$  > [two classes](#page--1-0)

#### Each document is a vector, one component for each term.

- Each document is a vector, one component for each term.
- **•** Terms are axes.
- High dimensionality: 100,000s of dimensions

- Each document is a vector, one component for each term.
- **•** Terms are axes.
- High dimensionality: 100,000s of dimensions
- Normalize vectors (documents) to unit length

- Each document is a vector, one component for each term.
- **•** Terms are axes.
- **•** High dimensionality: 100,000s of dimensions
- Normalize vectors (documents) to unit length
- How can we do classification in this space?

# Basic text classification setup



As before, the training set is a set of documents, each labeled with its class.

- As before, the training set is a set of documents, each labeled with its class.
- **In vector space classification, this set corresponds to a labeled** set of points or vectors in the vector space.

- As before, the training set is a set of documents, each labeled with its class.
- **In vector space classification, this set corresponds to a labeled** set of points or vectors in the vector space.
- **•** Premise 1: Documents in the same class form a contiguous region.

- As before, the training set is a set of documents, each labeled with its class.
- **In vector space classification, this set corresponds to a labeled** set of points or vectors in the vector space.
- Premise 1: Documents in the same class form a contiguous region.
- Premise 2: Documents from different classes don't overlap.

- As before, the training set is a set of documents, each labeled with its class.
- **In vector space classification, this set corresponds to a labeled** set of points or vectors in the vector space.
- Premise 1: Documents in the same class form a contiguous region.
- Premise 2: Documents from different classes don't overlap.
- We define lines, surfaces, hypersurfaces to divide regions.



Should the document  $\star$  be assigned to China, UK or Kenya?



Find separators between the classes



Find separators between the classes



Find separators between the classes



Based on these separators:  $\star$  should be assigned to China



How do we find separators that do a good job at classifying new documents like  $\star$ ? – Main topic of today

# **Outline**





[Rocchio](#page-28-0)



[Linear classifiers](#page-108-0)

#### <span id="page-28-0"></span>> [two classes](#page--1-0)

- In relevance feedback, the user marks documents as relevant/nonrelevant.
- Relevant/nonrelevant can be viewed as classes or categories.
- For each document, the user decides which of these two classes is correct.
- The IR system then uses these class assignments to build a better query ("model") of the information need . . .
- $\bullet$  ... and returns better documents.
- Relevance feedback is a form of text classification.

# Using Rocchio for vector space classification

The principal difference between relevance feedback and text classification:

#### Using Rocchio for vector space classification

- The principal difference between relevance feedback and text classification:
	- The training set is given as part of the input in text classification.

# Using Rocchio for vector space classification

- The principal difference between relevance feedback and text classification:
	- The training set is given as part of the input in text classification.
	- It is interactively created in relevance feedback.

# Rocchio classification: Basic idea

# Rocchio classification: Basic idea

#### • Compute a centroid for each class

# Rocchio classification: Basic idea

#### • Compute a centroid for each class

• The centroid is the average of all documents in the class.
#### Rocchio classification: Basic idea

- Compute a centroid for each class
	- The centroid is the average of all documents in the class.
- Assign each test document to the class of its closest centroid.

## Recall definition of centroid

#### Recall definition of centroid

$$
\vec{\mu}(c) = \frac{1}{|D_c|} \sum_{d \in D_c} \vec{v}(d)
$$

where  $D_c$  is the set of all documents that belong to class c and  $\vec{v}(d)$  is the vector space representation of d.











## Rocchio illustrated:  $a_1 = a_2, b_1 = b_2, c_1 = c_2$





# Rocchio algorithm

#### Rocchio algorithm

 $TRAINROCCHIO(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{D})$ 1 for each  $c_i \in \mathbb{C}$ 2 do  $D_i \leftarrow \{d : \langle d, c_i \rangle \in \mathbb{D}\}\$  $\vec{\mu}_j \leftarrow \frac{1}{|D_j|} \sum_{d \in D_j} \vec{v}(d)$ 4 return  $\{\vec{\mu}_1, \ldots, \vec{\mu}_J\}$ 

$$
\text{APPLYROCCHIO}(\{\vec{\mu}_1,\ldots,\vec{\mu}_J\},d)
$$
  
1 return arg min<sub>j</sub>  $|\vec{\mu}_j - \vec{v}(d)|$ 

Rocchio forms a simple representation for each class: the centroid

- Rocchio forms a simple representation for each class: the centroid
	- We can interpret the centroid as the prototype of the class.

- Rocchio forms a simple representation for each class: the centroid
	- We can interpret the centroid as the prototype of the class.
- Classification is based on similarity to / distance from centroid/prototype.

- Rocchio forms a simple representation for each class: the centroid
	- We can interpret the centroid as the prototype of the class.
- Classification is based on similarity to / distance from centroid/prototype.
- Does not guarantee that classifications are consistent with the training data!

Time complexity of Rocchio

# Time complexity of Rocchio



## Rocchio vs. Naive Bayes

## Rocchio vs. Naive Bayes

#### **•** In many cases, Rocchio performs worse than Naive Bayes.

## Rocchio vs. Naive Bayes

- In many cases, Rocchio performs worse than Naive Bayes.
- One reason: Rocchio does not handle nonconvex, multimodal classes correctly.























- A is centroid of the a's, B is centroid of the b's.
- The point o is closer to A than to B.
- But o is a better fit for the b class.
- A is a multimodal class with two prototypes.
- **•** But in Rocchio we only have one prototype.

#### **Outline**

# <sup>1</sup> [Recap](#page-2-0)

2 [Intro vector space classification](#page-9-0)



#### 5 [Linear classifiers](#page-108-0)

#### <span id="page-70-0"></span> $6$  > [two classes](#page--1-0)

## kNN classification


kNN classification is another vector space classification method.

- kNN classification is another vector space classification method.
- It also is very simple and easy to implement.
- kNN classification is another vector space classification method.
- It also is very simple and easy to implement.
- kNN is more accurate (in most cases) than Naive Bayes and Rocchio.
- kNN classification is another vector space classification method.
- It also is very simple and easy to implement.
- kNN is more accurate (in most cases) than Naive Bayes and Rocchio.
- If you need to get a pretty accurate classifier up and running in a short time . . .
- kNN classification is another vector space classification method.
- It also is very simple and easy to implement.
- kNN is more accurate (in most cases) than Naive Bayes and Rocchio.
- If you need to get a pretty accurate classifier up and running in a short time . . .
- . . . and you don't care about efficiency that much . . .
- kNN classification is another vector space classification method.
- It also is very simple and easy to implement.
- kNN is more accurate (in most cases) than Naive Bayes and Rocchio.
- If you need to get a pretty accurate classifier up and running in a short time . . .
- . . . and you don't care about efficiency that much . . .
- $\bullet$  . . . use kNN.

## kNN classification

• kNN =  $k$  nearest neighbors



- kNN =  $k$  nearest neighbors
- kNN classification rule for  $k = 1$  (1NN): Assign each test document to the class of its nearest neighbor in the training set.

# [Recap](#page-2-0) [Intro vector space classification](#page-9-0) [Rocchio](#page-28-0) [kNN](#page-70-0) [Linear classifiers](#page-108-0) > [two classes](#page--1-0) kNN classification

- kNN =  $k$  nearest neighbors
- kNN classification rule for  $k = 1$  (1NN): Assign each test document to the class of its nearest neighbor in the training set.
- 1NN is not very robust one document can be mislabeled or atypical.

# $Recap$  [Intro vector space classification](#page-9-0) [Rocchio](#page-28-0)  $kNN$  [Linear classifiers](#page-108-0) > [two classes](#page--1-0) kNN classification

- kNN =  $k$  nearest neighbors
- kNN classification rule for  $k = 1$  (1NN): Assign each test document to the class of its nearest neighbor in the training set.
- 1NN is not very robust one document can be mislabeled or atypical.
- kNN classification rule for  $k > 1$  (kNN): Assign each test document to the majority class of its  $k$  nearest neighbors in the training set.

# $Recap$  [Intro vector space classification](#page-9-0) [Rocchio](#page-28-0)  $kNN$  [Linear classifiers](#page-108-0) > [two classes](#page--1-0) kNN classification

- kNN =  $k$  nearest neighbors
- kNN classification rule for  $k = 1$  (1NN): Assign each test document to the class of its nearest neighbor in the training set.
- 1NN is not very robust one document can be mislabeled or atypical.
- kNN classification rule for  $k > 1$  (kNN): Assign each test document to the majority class of its  $k$  nearest neighbors in the training set.
- Rationale of kNN: contiguity hypothesis

# $Recap$  [Intro vector space classification](#page-9-0) [Rocchio](#page-28-0)  $kNN$  [Linear classifiers](#page-108-0) > [two classes](#page--1-0) kNN classification

- kNN =  $k$  nearest neighbors
- kNN classification rule for  $k = 1$  (1NN): Assign each test document to the class of its nearest neighbor in the training set.
- 1NN is not very robust one document can be mislabeled or atypical.
- kNN classification rule for  $k > 1$  (kNN): Assign each test document to the majority class of its  $k$  nearest neighbors in the training set.
- Rationale of kNN: contiguity hypothesis
	- $\bullet$  We expect a test document d to have the same label as the training documents located in the local region surrounding d.

## Probabilistic kNN



• Probabilistic version of kNN:  $P(c|d)$  = fraction of k neighbors of d that are in c

- Probabilistic version of kNN:  $P(c|d)$  = fraction of k neighbors of d that are in c
	- $\circ$  kNN classification rule for probabilistic kNN: Assign d to class c with highest  $P(c|d)$

## kNN is based on Voronoi tessellation

## kNN is based on Voronoi tessellation



## kNN is based on Voronoi tessellation



# kNN algorithm

 $TRAN-KNN(\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{D})$ 

- $1 \quad \mathbb{D}' \leftarrow$  PREPROCESS( $\mathbb{D}$ )
- 2  $k \leftarrow$  SELECT-K( $\mathbb{C}, \mathbb{D}'$ )
- 3 return  $\mathbb{D}', k$

 $APPLY-KNN(\mathbb{D}', k, d)$ 

- 1  $S_k \leftarrow$  COMPUTENEARESTNEIGHBORS( $\mathbb{D}', k, d$ )
- 2 for each  $c_j \in \mathbb{C}(\mathbb{D}^{\prime})$
- 3 do  $p_j \leftarrow |S_k \cap c_j|/k$
- 4 return arg max<sub>i</sub>  $p_i$

#### **Exercise**



How is star classified by: (i) 1-NN (ii) 3-NN (iii) 9-NN (iv) 15-NN (v) Rocchio?

# Time complexity of kNN

# Time complexity of kNN

### kNN with preprocessing of training set

training  $\Theta(|\mathbb{D}|L_{ave})$ testing  $\Theta(L_a + |\mathbb{D}|M_{ave}M_a) = \Theta(|\mathbb{D}|M_{ave}M_a)$ 

#### kNN with preprocessing of training set

 $Recap$  [Intro vector space classification](#page-9-0) [Rocchio](#page-28-0)  $kNN$  [Linear classifiers](#page-108-0) > [two classes](#page--1-0)

training  $\Theta(|\mathbb{D}|L_{\text{ave}})$ testing  $\Theta(L_a + |\mathbb{D}|M_{ave}M_a) = \Theta(|\mathbb{D}|M_{ave}M_a)$ 

• kNN test time proportional to the size of the training set!

#### kNN with preprocessing of training set

 $Recap$  [Intro vector space classification](#page-9-0) [Rocchio](#page-28-0)  $kNN$  [Linear classifiers](#page-108-0) > [two classes](#page--1-0)

training  $\Theta(|\mathbb{D}|L_{\text{ave}})$ testing  $\Theta(L_{\rm a} + |\mathbb{D}|M_{\rm ave}M_{\rm a}) = \Theta(|\mathbb{D}|M_{\rm ave}M_{\rm a})$ 

- kNN test time proportional to the size of the training set!
- The larger the training set, the longer it takes to classify a test document.

#### kNN with preprocessing of training set

 $Recap$  [Intro vector space classification](#page-9-0) [Rocchio](#page-28-0)  $kNN$  [Linear classifiers](#page-108-0) > [two classes](#page--1-0)

training  $\Theta(|\mathbb{D}|L_{\text{ave}})$ testing  $\Theta(L_a + |\mathbb{D}|M_{ave}M_a) = \Theta(|\mathbb{D}|M_{ave}M_a)$ 

- kNN test time proportional to the size of the training set!
- The larger the training set, the longer it takes to classify a test document.
- kNN is inefficient for very large training sets.

## Time complexity of kNN

#### kNN with preprocessing of training set

training  $\Theta(\mathbb{D}|L_{ave})$ testing  $\Theta(L_a + |\mathbb{D}|M_{ave}M_a) = \Theta(|\mathbb{D}|M_{ave}M_a)$ 

- kNN test time proportional to the size of the training set!
- The larger the training set, the longer it takes to classify a test document.
- kNN is inefficient for very large training sets.
- Question: Can we divide up the training set into regions, so that we only have to search in one region to do kNN classification for a given test document? (which perhaps would give us better than linear time complexity)

• No training necessary

- No training necessary
	- But linear preprocessing of documents is as expensive as training Naive Bayes.

- No training necessary
	- But linear preprocessing of documents is as expensive as training Naive Bayes.
	- We always preprocess the training set, so in reality training time of kNN is linear.

- No training necessary
	- But linear preprocessing of documents is as expensive as training Naive Bayes.
	- We always preprocess the training set, so in reality training time of kNN is linear.
- kNN is very accurate if training set is large.

- No training necessary
	- But linear preprocessing of documents is as expensive as training Naive Bayes.
	- We always preprocess the training set, so in reality training time of kNN is linear.
- kNN is very accurate if training set is large.
- Optimality result: asymptotically zero error if Bayes rate is zero.

- No training necessary
	- But linear preprocessing of documents is as expensive as training Naive Bayes.
	- We always preprocess the training set, so in reality training time of kNN is linear.
- kNN is very accurate if training set is large.
- Optimality result: asymptotically zero error if Bayes rate is zero.
- **•** But kNN can be very inaccurate if training set is small.
# **Outline**









#### <span id="page-108-0"></span>> [two classes](#page--1-0)

# Linear classifiers

# Linear classifiers

#### **·** Definition:



- **O** Definition:
	- A linear classifier computes a linear combination or weighted sum  $\sum_i w_i x_i$  of the feature values.



- **O** Definition:
	- A linear classifier computes a linear combination or weighted sum  $\sum_i w_i x_i$  of the feature values.
	- Classification decision:  $\sum_i w_i x_i > \theta$ ?
- **O** Definition:
	- A linear classifier computes a linear combination or weighted sum  $\sum_i w_i x_i$  of the feature values.
	- Classification decision:  $\sum_i w_i x_i > \theta$ ?
	- $\bullet$  ... where  $\theta$  (the threshold) is a parameter.
- **O** Definition:
	- A linear classifier computes a linear combination or weighted sum  $\sum_i w_i x_i$  of the feature values.
	- Classification decision:  $\sum_i w_i x_i > \theta$ ?
	- $\bullet$  ... where  $\theta$  (the threshold) is a parameter.
- (First, we only consider binary classifiers.)
- **O** Definition:
	- A linear classifier computes a linear combination or weighted sum  $\sum_i w_i x_i$  of the feature values.
	- Classification decision:  $\sum_i w_i x_i > \theta$ ?
	- $\bullet$  ... where  $\theta$  (the threshold) is a parameter.
- (First, we only consider binary classifiers.)
- Geometrically, this corresponds to a line (2D), a plane (3D) or a hyperplane (higher dimensionalities), the separator.
- **O** Definition:
	- A linear classifier computes a linear combination or weighted sum  $\sum_i w_i x_i$  of the feature values.
	- Classification decision:  $\sum_i w_i x_i > \theta$ ?
	- $\bullet$  ... where  $\theta$  (the threshold) is a parameter.
- (First, we only consider binary classifiers.)
- Geometrically, this corresponds to a line (2D), a plane (3D) or a hyperplane (higher dimensionalities), the separator.
- We find this separator based on training set.
- **O** Definition:
	- A linear classifier computes a linear combination or weighted sum  $\sum_i w_i x_i$  of the feature values.
	- Classification decision:  $\sum_i w_i x_i > \theta$ ?
	- $\bullet$  ... where  $\theta$  (the threshold) is a parameter.
- (First, we only consider binary classifiers.)
- Geometrically, this corresponds to a line (2D), a plane (3D) or a hyperplane (higher dimensionalities), the separator.
- We find this separator based on training set.
- Methods for finding separator: Perceptron, Rocchio, Naive Bayes – as we will explain on the next slides
- - **O** Definition:
		- A linear classifier computes a linear combination or weighted sum  $\sum_i w_i x_i$  of the feature values.
		- Classification decision:  $\sum_i w_i x_i > \theta$ ?
		- $\bullet$  ... where  $\theta$  (the threshold) is a parameter.
	- (First, we only consider binary classifiers.)
	- Geometrically, this corresponds to a line (2D), a plane (3D) or a hyperplane (higher dimensionalities), the separator.
	- We find this separator based on training set.
	- Methods for finding separator: Perceptron, Rocchio, Naive Bayes – as we will explain on the next slides
	- Assumption: The classes are linearly separable.

A linear classifier in 1D is a point described by the equation  $w_1d_1 = \theta$ 

- A linear classifier in 1D is a point described by the equation  $w_1 d_1 = \theta$
- The point at  $\theta/w_1$

- A linear classifier in 1D is a point described by the equation  $w_1 d_1 = \theta$
- The point at  $\theta/w_1$
- Points  $(d_1)$  with  $w_1d_1 \geq \theta$ are in the class c.

- A linear classifier in 1D is a point described by the equation  $w_1 d_1 = \theta$
- The point at  $\theta/w_1$
- Points  $(d_1)$  with  $w_1d_1 \geq \theta$ are in the class c.
- Points  $(d_1)$  with  $w_1d_1 < \theta$ are in the complement class  $\overline{c}$ .

A linear classifier in 2D is a line described by the equation  $w_1d_1 + w_2d_2 = \theta$ 



- A linear classifier in 2D is a line described by the equation  $w_1d_1 + w_2d_2 = \theta$
- Example for a 2D linear classifier



- A linear classifier in 2D is a line described by the equation  $w_1d_1 + w_2d_2 = \theta$
- Example for a 2D linear classifier
- Points  $(d_1, d_2)$  with  $w_1d_1 + w_2d_2 \geq \theta$  are in the class c.



- A linear classifier in 2D is a line described by the equation  $w_1d_1 + w_2d_2 = \theta$
- Example for a 2D linear classifier
- Points  $(d_1, d_2)$  with  $w_1d_1 + w_2d_2 \geq \theta$  are in the class c.
- Points  $(d_1, d_2)$  with  $w_1d_1 + w_2d_2 < \theta$  are in the complement class  $\overline{c}$ .



A linear classifier in 3D is a plane described by the equation

 $w_1d_1 + w_2d_2 + w_3d_3 = \theta$ 



A linear classifier in 3D is a plane described by the equation

 $w_1d_1 + w_2d_2 + w_3d_3 = \theta$ 

Example for a 3D linear classifier



A linear classifier in 3D is a plane described by the equation

 $w_1d_1 + w_2d_2 + w_3d_3 = \theta$ 

- Example for a 3D linear classifier
- Points  $(d_1 \ d_2 \ d_3)$  with  $w_1d_1 + w_2d_2 + w_3d_3 \geq \theta$ are in the class c.



A linear classifier in 3D is a plane described by the equation

 $w_1d_1 + w_2d_2 + w_3d_3 = \theta$ 

- Example for a 3D linear classifier
- Points  $(d_1 \ d_2 \ d_3)$  with  $w_1d_1 + w_2d_2 + w_3d_3 \geq \theta$ are in the class c.
- Points  $(d_1, d_2, d_3)$  with  $w_1d_1 + w_2d_2 + w_3d_3 < \theta$ are in the complement class  $\overline{c}$ .

# Rocchio as a linear classifier

# Rocchio as a linear classifier

• Rocchio is a linear classifier defined by:

$$
\sum_{i=1}^M w_i d_i = \vec{w} \vec{d} = \theta
$$

where  $\vec{w}$  is the normal vector  $\vec{\mu}(c_1) - \vec{\mu}(c_2)$  and  $\theta = 0.5 * (|\vec{\mu}(c_1)|^2 - |\vec{\mu}(c_2)|^2).$ 

# Naive Bayes as a linear classifier

#### Naive Bayes as a linear classifier

Multinomial Naive Bayes is a linear classifier (in log space) defined by:

$$
\sum_{i=1}^M w_i d_i = \theta
$$

where  $w_i = \log [\hat{P}(t_i|c)/\hat{P}(t_i|\bar{c})], \ d_i =$  number of occurrences of  $t_i$ in d, and  $\theta = -\log[\hat{P}(c)/\hat{P}(\bar{c})]$ . Here, the index i,  $1 \le i \le M$ , refers to terms of the vocabulary (not to positions in  $d$  as  $k$  did in our original definition of Naive Bayes)







Classification decision  $\bullet$ based on majority of k nearest neighbors.



- **Classification decision** based on majority of k nearest neighbors.
- The decision boundaries between classes are piecewise linear . . .



- **Classification decision** based on majority of k nearest neighbors.
- **O** The decision boundaries between classes are piecewise linear . . .
- . . . but they are in general not linear classifiers that can be described as  $\sum_{i=1}^{M} w_i d_i = \theta.$

J.

## Example of a linear two-class classifier



- **O** This is for the class *interest* in Reuters-21578.
- For simplicity: assume a simple  $0/1$  vector representation
- $\bullet$   $d_1$ : "rate discount dlrs world"
- $\bullet$   $d_2$ : "prime dlrs"
- $\theta = 0$
- Exercise: Which class is  $d_1$  assigned to? Which class is  $d_2$  assigned to?

J.

## Example of a linear two-class classifier



- **O** This is for the class *interest* in Reuters-21578.
- For simplicity: assume a simple  $0/1$  vector representation
- $\bullet$   $d_1$ : "rate discount dlrs world"
- $\bullet$   $d_2$ : "prime dlrs"
- $\theta = 0$
- Exercise: Which class is  $d_1$  assigned to? Which class is  $d_2$  assigned to?
J.

### Example of a linear two-class classifier



- **O** This is for the class *interest* in Reuters-21578.
- For simplicity: assume a simple  $0/1$  vector representation
- $\bullet$   $d_1$ : "rate discount dlrs world"
- $\bullet$   $d_2$ : "prime dlrs"
- $\theta = 0$
- Exercise: Which class is  $d_1$  assigned to? Which class is  $d_2$  assigned to?

#### Example of a linear two-class classifier



- **O** This is for the class *interest* in Reuters-21578.
- For simplicity: assume a simple  $0/1$  vector representation
- $\bullet$   $d_1$ : "rate discount dlrs world"
- $\bullet$   $d_2$ : "prime dlrs"
- $\theta = 0$
- Exercise: Which class is  $d_1$  assigned to? Which class is  $d_2$  assigned to?
- $\bullet$  We assign document  $\vec{d}_1$  "rate discount dlrs world" to *interest* since  $\vec{w}^{\,T}\vec{d}_1 = 0.67\cdot 1 + 0.46\cdot 1 + (-0.71)\cdot 1 + (-0.35)\cdot 1 = 0.07 > 0 = \theta.$
- We assign  $\vec{d}_2$  "prime dlrs" to the complement class (not in *interest*) since  $\vec{w}^T \vec{d}_2 = -0.01 \leq \theta.$



• In terms of actual computation, there are two types of learning algorithms.

- In terms of actual computation, there are two types of learning algorithms.
- (i) Simple learning algorithms that estimate the parameters of the classifier directly from the training data, often in one linear pass.

- In terms of actual computation, there are two types of learning algorithms.
- (i) Simple learning algorithms that estimate the parameters of the classifier directly from the training data, often in one linear pass.
	- Naive Bayes, Rocchio, kNN are all examples of this.

- In terms of actual computation, there are two types of learning algorithms.
- (i) Simple learning algorithms that estimate the parameters of the classifier directly from the training data, often in one linear pass.
	- Naive Bayes, Rocchio, kNN are all examples of this.
- (ii) Iterative algorithms

- In terms of actual computation, there are two types of learning algorithms.
- (i) Simple learning algorithms that estimate the parameters of the classifier directly from the training data, often in one linear pass.
	- Naive Bayes, Rocchio, kNN are all examples of this.
- (ii) Iterative algorithms
	- Support vector machines

- In terms of actual computation, there are two types of learning algorithms.
- (i) Simple learning algorithms that estimate the parameters of the classifier directly from the training data, often in one linear pass.
	- Naive Bayes, Rocchio, kNN are all examples of this.
- (ii) Iterative algorithms
	- Support vector machines
	- Perceptron (example available as PDF on website: http://cislmu.org)

- In terms of actual computation, there are two types of learning algorithms.
- (i) Simple learning algorithms that estimate the parameters of the classifier directly from the training data, often in one linear pass.
	- Naive Bayes, Rocchio, kNN are all examples of this.
- (ii) Iterative algorithms
	- Support vector machines
	- Perceptron (example available as PDF on website: http://cislmu.org)
- The best performing learning algorithms usually require iterative learning.

#### • Randomly initialize linear separator  $\vec{w}$

- Randomly initialize linear separator  $\vec{w}$
- Do until convergence:

- Randomly initialize linear separator  $\vec{w}$
- Do until convergence:
	- Pick data point  $\vec{x}$

- Randomly initialize linear separator  $\vec{w}$
- Do until convergence:
	- Pick data point  $\vec{x}$
	- If sign $(\vec{w}^{\,T}\vec{x})$  is correct class (1 or -1): do nothing

- Randomly initialize linear separator  $\vec{w}$  $\bullet$
- Do until convergence:
	- Pick data point  $\vec{x}$
	- If sign $(\vec{w}^{\,T}\vec{x})$  is correct class (1 or -1): do nothing
	- Otherwise:  $\vec{w} = \vec{w} \text{sign}(\vec{w}^T\vec{x})\vec{x}$





• For linearly separable training sets: there are infinitely many separating hyperplanes.



- For linearly separable training sets: there are *infinitely* many separating hyperplanes.
- They all separate the training set perfectly ...
- For linearly separable training sets: there are *infinitely* many separating hyperplanes.
- They all separate the training set perfectly ...
- . . . but they behave differently on test data.
- For linearly separable training sets: there are *infinitely* many separating hyperplanes.
- They all separate the training set perfectly ...
- . . . but they behave differently on test data.
- Error rates on new data are low for some, high for others.
- For linearly separable training sets: there are *infinitely* many separating hyperplanes.
- They all separate the training set perfectly ...
- . . . but they behave differently on test data.
- Error rates on new data are low for some, high for others.
- How do we find a low-error separator?
- For linearly separable training sets: there are *infinitely* many separating hyperplanes.
- They all separate the training set perfectly ...
- . . . but they behave differently on test data.
- **•** Error rates on new data are low for some, high for others.
- How do we find a low-error separator?
- Perceptron: generally bad; Naive Bayes, Rocchio: ok; linear SVM: good

Many common text classifiers are linear classifiers: Naive Bayes, Rocchio, logistic regression, linear support vector machines etc.

- Many common text classifiers are linear classifiers: Naive Bayes, Rocchio, logistic regression, linear support vector machines etc.
- Each method has a different way of selecting the separating hyperplane

- Many common text classifiers are linear classifiers: Naive Bayes, Rocchio, logistic regression, linear support vector machines etc.
- Each method has a different way of selecting the separating hyperplane
	- Huge differences in performance on test documents

- Many common text classifiers are linear classifiers: Naive Bayes, Rocchio, logistic regression, linear support vector machines etc.
- Each method has a different way of selecting the separating hyperplane
	- Huge differences in performance on test documents
- Can we get better performance with more powerful nonlinear classifiers?

- Many common text classifiers are linear classifiers: Naive Bayes, Rocchio, logistic regression, linear support vector machines etc.
- Each method has a different way of selecting the separating hyperplane
	- Huge differences in performance on test documents
- Can we get better performance with more powerful nonlinear classifiers?
- Not in general: A given amount of training data may suffice for estimating a linear boundary, but not for estimating a more complex nonlinear boundary.

#### Resources

- Chapter 13 of IIR (feature selection)
- Chapter 14 of IIR
- Resources at <http://cislmu.org>
	- Perceptron example
	- General overview of text classification: Sebastiani (2002)
	- Text classification chapter on decision tress and perceptrons: Manning & Schütze (1999)
	- One of the best machine learning textbooks: Hastie, Tibshirani & Friedman (2003)