Decision Trees

- Decision tree representation
- ID3 learning algorithm
- Entropy, Information gain
- Overfitting

Another Example Problem

Positive Examples

Negative Examples

A Decision Tree

Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Door</th>
<th>Tire</th>
<th>Classification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Minivan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Blackwall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Whitewall</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Decision Trees

- Each internal node tests an attribute
- Each branch corresponds to an attribute value
- Each leaf node assigns a classification

How would you represent:

\[ \neg A \lor \neg B \lor \neg C \lor \neg D \lor \neg E \]

When to Consider Decision Trees

- Instances describable by attribute-value pairs
- Target function is discrete valued
- Disjunctive hypothesis may be required
- Possibly noisy training data

Examples

- Equipment or medical diagnosis
- Credit risk analysis
- Modeling calendar scheduling preferences

Top-Down Induction of Decision Trees

Main loop:
1. A = the “best” decision attribute for next node
2. Assign A as decision attribute for node
3. For each value of A, create descendant of node
4. Divide training examples among child nodes
5. If training examples perfectly classified, STOP
   Else iterate over new leaf nodes

Which attribute is best?

- \[ [29+35] \]
- \[ [21+33] \]
- \[ [18+33] \]
- \[ [11+2] \]
Entropy

$S =$ sample of training examples
$p_+ =$ proportion of positive examples in $S$
$p_- =$ proportion of negative examples in $S$
Entropy measures the impurity of $S$

$\text{Entropy}(S) = - p_+ \log_2 p_+ - p_- \log_2 p_-$

Information Gain

$\text{Gain}(S, A) =$ expected reduction in entropy due to sorting on $A$

Gain($S,A$) = $\text{Entropy}(S) - \sum_{v \in \text{Values}(A)} \frac{|S_v|}{|S|} \text{Entropy}(S_v)$

Selecting Root Attribute

Gain($S, \text{Color}$) = 0.029

Gain($S, \text{Type}$) = 0.200

Best attribute: $\text{Type}$ (Gain = 0.200)

Car Examples
Selecting Next Attribute

Gain(S, Color) = \(0.971 - \frac{1}{5} \times 0.0 - \frac{2}{5} \times 1.0 = 0.171\)

Gain(S, Doors) = \(0.971 - \frac{3}{5} \times 0.0 - \frac{2}{5} \times 0.0 = 0.971\)

Gain(S, Tires) = \(0.971 - \frac{2}{5} \times 1.0 - \frac{3}{5} \times 0.918 = 0.020\)

Gain(S, Color) = \(0.918 - \frac{2}{6} \times 1.0 - \frac{1}{6} \times 0.0 - \frac{3}{6} \times 0.918 = 0.126\)

Gain(S, Doors) = \(0.918 - \frac{4}{6} \times 0.811 - \frac{2}{6} \times 1.0 = 0.044\)

Gain(S, Tires) = \(0.918 - \frac{2}{6} \times 0.0 - \frac{4}{6} \times 0.0 = 0.918\)

Resulting Tree

Hypothesis Space Search by ID3

Hypothesis Space Search by ID3

• Hypothesis space is complete!
  – Target function is in there (but will we find it?)
• Outputs a single hypothesis (which one?)
  – Cannot play 20 questions
• No back tracing
  – Local minima possible
• Statistically-based search choices
  – Robust to noisy data
• Inductive bias: approximately “prefer shortest tree”

Inductive Bias in ID3

Note \(H\) is the power set of instances \(X\)

Unbiased?

Not really…
• Preference for short trees, and for those with high information gain attributes near the root
• Bias is a preference for some hypotheses, rather than a restriction of hypothesis space \(H\)
• Occam’s razor: prefer the shortest hypothesis that fits the data

Occam’s Razor

Why prefer short hypotheses?

Argument in favor:
• Fewer short hypotheses than long hypotheses
• Short hyp. that fits data unlikely to be coincidence
• Long hyp. that fits data more likely to be coincidence

Argument opposed:
• There are many ways to define small sets of hypotheses
  – e.g., all trees with a prime number of nodes that use attributes beginning with “Z”
• What is so special about small sets based on size of hypothesis?
Overfitting in Decision Trees

Consider adding a noisy training example: 
<Green, SUV, 2, Blackwall> +
What happens to decision tree below?

Overfitting

Consider error of hypothesis over
• training data: error\_train(h)
• entredistribution D of data: error\_D(h)
Hypothesis h \in H overfits the training data if there is an alternative hypothesis h' \in H such that

error\_train(h) < error\_train(h')

and

error\_D(h) > error\_D(h')

Avoiding Overfitting

How can we avoid overfitting?
• stop growing when data split not statistically significant
• grow full tree, the post-prune

How to select “best” tree:
• Measure performance over training data
• Measure performance over separate validation set (examples from the training set that are put aside)
• MDL: minimize

size(tree) + size(misclassification(tree))

Reduced-Error Pruning

Split data into training and validation set
Do until further pruning is harmful:
1. Evaluate impact on validation set of pruning each possible node (plus those below it)
2. Greedily remove the one that most improves validation set accuracy

• Produces smallest version of most accurate subtree
• What if data is limited?
Rule Post-Pruning
1. Convert tree to equivalent set of rules
2. Prune each rule independently of others
3. Sort final rules into desired sequence for use

Perhaps most frequently used method (e.g., C4.5)

Converting a Tree to Rules
IF (Type=Car) AND (Doors=2) THEN +
IF (Type=SUV) AND (Tires=Whitewall) THEN +
IF (Type=Minivan) THEN -
… (what else?)

Continuous Valued Attributes
Create one (or more) corresponding discrete attributes based on continuous
– (EngineSize = 325) = true or false
– (EngineSize <= 330) = t or f (330 is “split” point)

How to pick best “split” point?
1. Sort continuous data
2. Look at points where class differs between two values
3. Pick the split point with the best gain

EngineSize : 285 290 295 310 330 330 345 360
Class: - - + + - + + +

Attributes with Many Values
Problem:
• If attribute has many values, Gain will select it
• Imagine if cars had PurchaseDate feature - likely all would be different
One approach: use GainRatio instead

\[
GainRatio(S, A) = \frac{Gain(S, A)}{SplitInformation(S, A)}
\]

\[
SplitInformation(S, A) = \sum_{i} \frac{|S_i|}{|S|} \log \frac{|S|}{|S_i|}
\]
where \(S_i\) is subset of \(S\) for which \(A\) has value \(v_i\)

Attributes with Costs
Consider
• medical diagnosis, BloodTest has cost $150
• robotics, Width_from_1ft has cost 23 second

How to learn consistent tree with low expected cost?
Approaches: replace gain by

Tan and Schlimmer (1990)

Nunez (1988)

\[
\frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\text{cost}(A) + 1}{\text{cost}(A)} \right)
\]

Unknown Attribute Values
What if some examples missing values of \(A\)?

“?” in C4.5 data sets
Use training example anyway, sort through tree
– If node \(n\) tests \(A\), assign most common value of \(A\) among other examples sorted to node \(n\)
– assign most common value of \(A\) among other examples with same target value
– assign probability \(p_i\) to each possible value \(v_i\) of \(A\)
  * assign fraction \(p_i\) of example to each descendant in tree

Classify new examples in same fashion
Decision Tree Summary

- simple (easily understood), powerful (accurate)
- highly expressive (complete hypothesis space)
- bias: restrictive
  - search based on information gain (defined using entropy)
  - favors short hypotheses, high gain attributes near root
- issues:
  - overfitting
    - avoiding: stopping early, pruning
    - pruning: how to judge, what to prune (tree, rules, etc.)
- issues (cont):
  - attribute issues
    - continuous valued attributes
    - attributes with lots of values
    - attributes with costs
    - unknown values
- effective for discrete valued target functions
- handles noise

Decision Tree Summary (cont)