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Research Background & Related Work

- Many efforts have done to select rules with single objective index such as recall, precision, and so forth.
- At least 40 objective interestingness measures are developed and investigated to express a human evaluation criterion.

- Ohsaki et al. investigated the relationship between each index and criterion of an expert. However, no single objective index can express the human criterion exactly. [Ohsaki04].
- Applicable domain of these interestingness measures have been never generalized.
Research Issues

- A novel rule evaluation support method with rule evaluation models (REMs).
  - The system obtains a dataset to combine multiple objective indices and evaluations from a human expert.

- Detailed issues of our rule evaluation support method
  - To construct more accurate REMs to support human experts more exactly
  - To construct a valid REM with smaller training dataset
  - To construct a reasonable REMs to given human evaluation
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Overview of the rule evaluation support with REMs

1. IF-THEN Rules from a mining scheme
2. Evaluating each rules with background knowledge
3. Calculating objective rule evaluation index values

- Large number of Rules
- Human Expert
- Subjective criteria

- Learning a Model with a training dataset
- Choosing valuable rules with predicting evaluation labels based on rule evaluation index values of the given rules

- IF... THEN...
- IF... THEN...
- IF... THEN...
- IF... THEN...
- IF... THEN...

- Rule Evaluation Model
- Predicting
- Rules interested in an expert

- Mining scheme
- Construct a test dataset
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Comparisons of learning algorithms

- Comparison on an actual datamining result
  - To evaluate the availability on solid evaluations from a domain expert

- Comparison on rule sets of benchmark datasets with artificial class distributions
  - To evaluate the availability on evaluations without any particular human criterion

Evaluation viewpoints for these comparisons:
- Accuracies to the whole dataset and Leave-One-Out validation, and their recalls and precisions of each class label
- Estimating minimum size of training subset to construct valid REMs with learning curves
- Looking at elements of REMs from an actual data mining result
Objective Rule Evaluation indices calculated on a validation dataset for each classification rule

The 39 objective indices [Ohsaki 04]

- Based on probability (26 indices)
  - Coverage, Prevalence, Precision, Recall, Support, Accuracy, Specificity, Lift, Leverage, Added Value, Relative Risk, Jaccard, Certainty Factor, Odds ratio, Yule’s Q, Yule’s Y, Kappa, Koelesgen’s Interestingness, Brin’s Interestingness, Brin’s Conviction, GOI, Credibility, KSI, Laplace Correction, Collective Strength

- Based on test statistics (3 indices)
  - Chi-Square (with only True/Positive, with a whole confusion matrix), Gini Gain

- Based on information theory (6 indices)
  - Mutual Information, J-Measure, YLI1, YLI2, YZI, K-Measure

- Based on number of instances (3 indices)
  - coefficient, PSI, Cosine Similarity

- Based on similarity between rules on a validation dataset (2 indices)
  - GBI, Peculiarity
Learning algorithms for comparisons

- **Decision Tree**: J4.8 (an Java implementation of C4.5)
- **Neural Network**: BPNN (with back-propagation)
  - Parameters of BP: learning rate=0.3, momentum=0.2
  - Each unit corresponds to each class label in output layer
- **Classification Via Linear Regression**: CLR
  - Linear regression expressions: “1-the other” for each class label
  - Explanatory variable selection: greedy search with AIC
- **SVM**: Sequential Minimal Optimization [Platt98]
  - SVM for multiple class: learning “1-the other” expressions for each class label
  - Kernel function setting: polynomial kernel
- **OneR**
  1. Sorting with single objective index
  2. Setting thresholds based on class labels
  3. Constructs a rule set with the objective index
The Flow of the comparison with the meningitis datamining result [Hatazawa 00]

meningitis datasets having 140 inst. 6 Q 3 kinds of diagnostic problems

The 39 objective indices obtain attributes of the training dataset

Evaluations from a medical expert are added as class labels

Model Construction

Evaluation on:
- Performance
- Estimating minimum training subset
- Contents of REMs

| Sample of the data set |
|------------------------|
| |||

| 39 objective rule evaluation indices |
|--------------------------------------|
| |||

2006/10/24
Performance Comparison of the five algorithms
(All of rules =244 , 'I' =48(19.7%), 'NI' =187(76.6%), 'NU' =9(3.7%))

|               |               |               |               |               |               |               |               |
|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|
|               |               |               |               |               |               |               |
|               |               |               |               |               |               |               |
|               |               |               |               |               |               |               |
|               |               |               |               |               |               |               |

1. J4.8 and BPNN achieve higher than 85.7% of acc. with more than 77.5% reliability.
(BPNN tend to be over fitting, looking at it’s LOO acc., recalls and precisions)
2. To predict very minor class ‘NU’, a proper learning algorithm will be needed.
Leaning curves on achieve rates

(achieve rate = (acc. of each sub-sample / acc. of whole sample) *100)

All of algorithms can construct REMs having more than 86% of acc., just using 10% of training dataset.
Contents of Rule Evaluation Models
(Statistics of 10,000 bootstrap iterations)

These models include not only indices which express correctness of rules, but also other kinds of indices such as Peculiarity and GBI.
Datasets from rule sets learned with the ten UCI benchmark data
(To make sure the availability of our method without any human criteria)

| Rule Set | Rule 1 | Rule 2 | Rule 3 | Rule 4 | Rule 5 | Rule 6 | Rule 7 | Rule 8 | Rule 9 | Rule 10 |
|----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|---------|
| OOFBM    | VEJPMPHZ | VUPT   | BMBODFTDBMF | SFBTUDBODFS | SFBTUX | PMJD   | SFEJUB | 8BWFGPSN | FUUFS |        |
|          |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |         |

*All of rule sets are obtained by bagged PART with Weka [Witten 00]*
Performances of REMs on the training datasets with three kinds of class distributions

- Performances of algorithms are suffered from probabilistic class distribution especially in larger datasets.
- Hyper-plain type learner (SVM and CLR) could not work well, because of the probabilistic class distributions.
Estimation of minimum training subset to construct valid REMs (from learning curve analysis)

| Distribution | 20% | 10% | 5% | 3% | 1% |
|--------------|-----|-----|----|----|----|
| Data Set 1   |     |     |    |    |    |
| Data Set 2   |     |     |    |    |    |
| Data Set 3   |     |     |    |    |    |
| Data Set 4   |     |     |    |    |    |
| Data Set 5   |     |     |    |    |    |

- In Dist. I and II, almost learner succeeded in learning valid REMs with less than 20% of each data set.
- It is more difficult to construct valid REMs with smaller training subset on 'Distribution III', which has unbalanced class distribution.
- If we construct REMs without particular human criterion, we should prepare small (<100) dataset with balanced class distribution.
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Conclusion

Summary
- Comparing learning algorithms to construct rule evaluation models for supporting a post-processing of data mining exactly
  - Our method can construct valid rule evaluation models with the 39 objective rule evaluation indices at least the five learning algorithms.
  - The algorithms have been able to construct valid rule evaluation models with 10% of training subset with evaluations based on solid expert’s criterion.

Future works
- Introducing algorithm selection
  - for attribute construction and attribute selection algorithm
  - for learning algorithm
- Applying this method to other data from other domains