Lecture 7: Tree Based Methods

Applied Data Analysis and Visualization

Anastasia Giachanou, Ayoub Bagheri

What	When
Linear regression for data science	Week 4
Classification	Week 5
Interactive visualizations with R shiny	Week 6
Tree-based methods	Week 7
Introduction to text mining	Week 8
Network analysis	Week 9
EXAM	Week 10

Should I bike to the Univeristy?



Main points for today

- Tree-based methods: segment predictor space into a number of simple regions
- Using decision trees for prediction
- Improvement 1: Bagging
- Improvement 2: Random forests
- Approximate the test error using the Out of Bag (OOB) error
- Variable importance measures
- Conclusions

Decision Trees





















Features: x1: precipitation x2: temparature

labels y: 1: picnic 0: no picnic



- Internal nodes
- Two children that can be: - internal node



- Internal nodes
- Two children that can be:
 - internal node
 - leaves or terminal node



- Internal nodes
- Two children that can be:
 - internal node
 - leaves or terminal node
- Connections with branches

Build a decision tree

1.Divide the predictor space — that is, the set of possible values for X_1, X_2, \ldots, X_p — into J distinct and non-overlapping regions, R_1, R_2, \ldots, R_J .

2. For every observation that falls into the region R_{j} , we make the same prediction, which is simply the majority class of the outcome for the training observations in R_{i} .











Growing decision trees from data

- Recursive (binary) partitioning:
 - 1. Find the split that makes observations as similar as possible on the outcome within that split;
 - 2. Within each resulting group, do (1).
- Early stopping: add after (2):
- 'unless there are fewer than n_{min} observations in the group' (typically 10)

Growing decision trees from data

- Criteria for 'as similar as possible': reduction in classification error rate such as the **Gini impurity** or **entropy**
- Gini impurity: $G = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \hat{p}_{mk} (1 - \hat{p}_{mk}),$
- p_{mk} is the proportion of training observations in partition m with category k
- Small value: almost all values in the partition belong to one class
- Gini index is a measure of node *impurity*: small value indicates that a partition contains predominantly observations from a single class



Choosing Features

• Key Idea: good features partition the data into subsets that are either "all positive" or "all negative" (ideally)

Tree building: top-down and greedy

- Recursive (binary) partitioning is a top-down and greedy algorithm:
- **Top-down**: algorithm begins at the top of the tree and then successively splits the predictor space. Each split is indicated via two new branches further down on the tree.
- **Greedy**: at each step, the best split for that step is made, instead of looking ahead and picking a split that will result in the best tree in a future step.

- Decision trees can be used for regression as well!
- Instead of predicting class label in each 'box' (partition), we predict the outcome in each partition:
 - mean of the training observations in the partition to which the test observation belongs
- Cutpoints are selected such that splitting the predictor space into the regions leads to the greatest possible reduction in residual sums of squares (RSS).
- CART: classification and regression trees



Features: x1: precipitation x2: temparature

y:

- minutes of outdoor training





How to construct regions?

• The goal is to find boxes R1, . . . ,RJ that minimize the RSS

$$\sum_{j=1}^{J} \sum_{i \in R_j} (y_i - \hat{y}_{R_j})^2,$$

 Computationally infeasible to consider every possible partition of the feature space into J boxes

- Process described to grow trees most likely overfits the data → poor test performance
- Solution 1: build the tree until the decrease in classification error / RSS exceeds some threshold
- This strategy will result in smaller trees
- However, a seemingly worthless split early on in the tree might be followed by a very good split







Cost Complexity Pruning

• Grow a large tree and then prune it back

$$\sum_{m=1}^{|T|} \sum_{i: x_i \in R_m} (y_i - \hat{y}_{R_m})^2 + \alpha |T|$$

- |T| is the number of terminal nodes
- R_m is the rectancige that corresponds to the mth terminal node
- The tuning parameter *a* controls a trade-off between the subtree's complexity and its fit to the training data







Subtree 1

a = 10.000

Subtree 2 a = 15.000

Full tree a = 0

Cost Complexity Pruning

$$\sum_{m=1}^{|T|} \sum_{i: x_i \in R_m} (y_i - \hat{y}_{R_m})^2 + \alpha |T|$$

- α =0 \rightarrow subtree equals the original (long) tree
- As α increases, becomes more expensive to have a tree with many terminal nodes, resulting in a smaller subtree. Very similar to Lasso!
- Use K-fold cross-validation to choose α .

Linear Models VS Trees

- Which model is better?
- It depends on the problem



Which of the panel(s) below cannot be representative of a decision tree model using recursive binary splitting?



Summary

- Trees are very easy to explain and interpret
- Mirror human decision-making better than other the regression and classification approaches
- Trees can be displayed graphically (sometimes)
- ✓ Detects non-linear relationships

Do not have the same level of predictive accuracy than other approaches

They are **prone to overfitting**: a small change in data can cause a large change in the final tree

Bagging and Random Forests



10 minutes break



Bagging

Intuition behind bagging

When you fiddle with the observations just a little:

- 1. Some things vary a lot;
- 2. Some things stay pretty much the same.

Intuition:

- Overfitting is caused by (1);
- but (1) happens randomly, causing predictions to go up or down haphazardly;
- Therefore, (1) should be cancelled out by fiddling with the observations a little and averaging
- "Wisdom of the crowds"

Bagging

- *Bootstrap aggregation,* or bagging (Breiman 1994):
- A general-purpose procedure for reducing the variance of statistical learning methods. It is very useful and often applied in the context of decision trees
- Averaging a set of independent observations reduces variance. But what if we only have one training set?

Bagging

- We can mimic having multiple training sets by bootstrapping:
- Generate *B* different bootstrapped training data sets.
- Train a decision tree on each of the b^{th} bootstrapped training set to get a prediction for each observation x: $\hat{f}^{*b}(x)$
- For regression trees, we average all predictions to obtain: $\hat{f}_{bag}(x) = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^{B} \hat{f}^{*b}(x)$.
- For classification trees, we take the majority vote
- Do not need to prune: grow large trees in each bootstrapped sample, and variance is decreased by averaging

Training data	
(X1, y1)	there are your rows, e.g., patient 1
(X2, y2)	
(ХЗ,уЗ)	
(X4,y4)	
(X5,y5)	→ e.g., patient 5

	Training data		
	(X1, y1)	there are your rows, e.g., patient 1	
	(X2, y2)		
	(X3,y3)		
	(X4,y4)		
	(X5,y5)	 e.g., patient 5 	
Bootstrap sample 1	Bootstrap sample 2	Bootstrap sample 3	
(X1, y1)	(X2, y2)	(X4,y4)	
(X2, y2)	(X1, y1)	(X2, y2)	
(X5,y5)	(X3,y3)	(X3,y3)	
(X4,y4)	(X1, y1)	(X4,y4)	
(X5,y5)	(X2, y2)	(X1, y1)	







Random Forests

Random Forests

- In bootstrapping, the samples taken are independent.
- But the predictions from trees grown on the bootstrapped samples are not independent!
- They share the same features and can therefore create similarly overfitting decision rules
- "Wisdom of crowds who peek at each other's answers"
- This phenomenon is called "tree correlation" (Breiman 2001)

Random Forests

 Random forests try to remove the tree correlation by feature sampling: randomly sampling both rows (bootstrapping) and columns

Random forest: feature sampling

- Decorrelation obtained by:
 - When building a tree, instead of using all variables when making a split, take a random selection of *m* predictors as candidates to base the split on
 - At each split, take a fresh selection of *m* predictors
- *m* is typically set to \sqrt{p}
- Similar to bagging, the collection of trees (= forest) is built on bootstrapped training samples
- Hence, bagging is a special case of a random forest with m = p.

p1	p2	р3	р4	У



Bootstrap sample 1	p1
(X1, y1)	
(X2, y2)	
(Х5,у5)	
(X4,y4)	
(X5,y5)	





Take one bootstrapped sample
 Build a decision tree:

- To find the best predictor, consider randomly 2 predictors to choose from



e.g., To find the root of the tree consider only p2, p3





Take one bootstrapped sample
 Build a decision tree:

- To find the best predictor, consider randomly 2 predictors to choose from



"Out-of-bag" error estimation

- When we do bagging and random forest, there is a very simple way to estimate the test error:
 - In both methods, we take multiple bootstrapped samples of the training data. On average, each tree uses about 2/3 of the observations
 - The remaining 1/3 of observations left out are referred to as the out-ofbag(OOB) observations
- If we want to calculate the error for a particular observation, we can predict the response using each of the trees in which it was OOB. This will give *B/3* predictions for this observation, which we average. When we do this for all observations, we get the OOB error.
- Very close to leave-one-out cross-validation







Class A

. . .



out of bag sample



Correclty classified as class A



We can measure how accurate our random forest is by the proportion of out-of-the-bag samples that were correctly classified
The proportion that was incorrectly classified is the Out-Of-Bag error

bagging vs random forest



- The dashed line indicates the test error resulting from a single classification tree.

- The test error (black and orange) is shown as a function of B, the number of bootstrapped training sets used.

- The green and blue traces show the OOB error, which in this case is — by chance — considerably lower.

Variable importance measure

- In both bagging and random forest, it can be difficult to interpret the resulting model:
 - When we build a large number of trees, it is no longer possible to (graphically) represent the resulting statistical learning procedure using a single tree
 - How to find out which predictor(s) are most important in predicting a correct outcome?
- Variable importance measures
- Larger value indicates a more important predictor

Impurity-based feature importance (MDI)

- How "important" is variable x_i to the prediction?
- Recall that trees (classification or regression) are grown by minimizing "impurity" (e.g. Gini)
- IDEA: Record the total amount that impurity is decreased due to splits over x_i, averaged over all B trees (MDI)
- Advantage:
 - Obtained for free with estimation
- Disadvantages:
 - importance of features used to overfit inflated
 - importance of numerical features inflated

Permutation-based feature importance

- IDEA: randomly shuffle one column, and observe how much worse it makes the model
- Advantage: Doesn't have the problems of MDI
- Disadvantages:
 - Can take a while, results vary
 - Ignores correlations among predictors (e.g. perfectly correlated features are all "unimportant")



Quiz time!





@ Copy participation link

Summary

- Decision trees are simple and useful for interpretation
- However, prone to overfitting. Solutions: pruning, bagging and random forests
- Bagging: fit multiple trees to bootstrapped samples of the data, combine to yield a single consensus prediction
- Random Forest: fit trees to bootstrapped samples from the data AND sample predictors. Combine all trees to yield a consensus prediction

Summary

- When using bagging and random forests we can approximate the test error using the Out of Bag (OOB) estimate of the error
- Which predictor is most influential on the outcome can be inferred from variable importance measures
- Random forests often show top-tier performance out of the box, but the resulting model is difficult to interpret

Practical on Thursday.

Preparation: make sure to have finished the homework section

Next week: Introduction to text mining (ONLINE)

Link for the MS teams on BB; join before Sunday ③

Have a nice day!