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Machine Learning / 1. What is a Decision Tree?
Using a Decision Tree

The class of a given case $x \in X$ is predicted by

1. starting at the root node,
2. at each interior node

- evaluate the decision rule for $x$ and
- branch to the child node picked by the decision rule, (default: left = "true", right = "false")

3. once a leaf node is reached,

- predict the class assigned to that node as class of the case $x$.


Example:
$x$ : Petal.Length $=6$, Petal.Width $=1.6$

## Each branch of a decision tree can be formulated as a single conjunctive rule

if condition $(x)$ and condition $_{2}(x)$ and $\ldots$ and condition ${ }_{k}(x)$, then $y=$ class label at the leaf of the branch.

A decision tree is equivalent to a set of such rules, one for each branch.

## Decision Tree as Set of Rules



## set of rules:

Petal.Length $<2.45 \rightarrow$ class=setosa
Petal.Length $\geq 2.45$ and Petal.Width $<1.75$ and Petal.Length $<4.95 \rightarrow$ class=versicolor
Petal.Length $\geq 2.45$ and Petal.Width $<1.75$ and Petal.Length $\geq 4.95$ and Petal.Width $\geq 1.55 \rightarrow$ class=versicolor
Petal.Length $\geq 2.45$ and Petal.Width $<1.75$ and Petal.Length $\geq 4.95$ and Petal.Width $<1.55 \rightarrow$ class $=$ virginica
Petal.Length $\geq 2.45$ and Petal.Width $\geq 1.75 \rightarrow$ class=virginica

## Decision Tree as Set of Rules



## set of rules:

Petal.Length $<2.45$
$\rightarrow$ class=setosa
Petal.Length $\in$ [2.45, 4.95[ and Petal.Width $<1.75 \quad \rightarrow$ class=versicolor
Petal.Length $\geq 4.95$
Petal.Length $\geq 4.95$
Petal.Length $\geq 2.45$ and Petal.Width $\in[1.55,1.75[\rightarrow$ class=versicolor and Petal.Width $<1.55 \quad \rightarrow$ class $=$ virginica and Petal.Width $\geq 1.75 \quad \rightarrow$ class $=$ virginica

## Decision boundaries are rectangular.



A regression tree is a tree that

1. at each inner node has a decision rule that assigns instances uniquely to child nodes of the actual node, and
2. at each leaf node has a target value.

A probability tree is a tree that

1. at each inner node has a decision rule that assigns instances uniquely to child nodes of the actual node, and
2. at each leaf node has a class probability distribution.

## 1. What is a Decision Tree?

## 2. Splits

## 3. Regularization

## 4. Learning Decision Trees

## 5. Digression: Incomplete Data

## 6. Properties of Decision Trees

## 7. Pruning Decision Trees

An alternative Decision Tree?
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Simple Splits
To allow all kinds of decision rules at the interior nodes (also called splits) does not make much sense. The very idea of decision trees is that

- the splits at each node are rather simple and
- more complex structures are captured by chaining several simple decisions in a tree structure.

Therefore, the set of possible splits is kept small by opposing several types of restrictions on possible splits:

- by restricting the number of variables used per split (univariate vs. multivariate decision tree),
- by restricting the number of children per node (binary vs. n-ary decision tree),
- by allowing only some special types of splits (e.g., complete splits, interval splits, etc.).

2003

A split is called univariate if it uses only a single variable, otherwise multivariate.

Example:
"Petal.Width < 1.75 " is univariate,
"Petal.Width < 1.75 and Petal.Length $<4.95$ " is bivariate.

Multivariate splits that are mere conjunctions of univariate splits better would be represented in the tree structure.

But there are also multivariate splits than cannot be represented by a conjunction of univariate splits, e.g., "Petal.Width / Petal.Length < 1"

A split is called $n$-ary if it has $n$ children. (Binary is used for 2-ary, ternary for 3-ary.)

## Example:

"Petal.Length < 1.75" is binary,

is ternary.
All $n$-ary splits can be also represented as a tree of binary splits, e.g.,


2003

A univariate split on a nominal variable is called complete if each value is mapped to a child of its own, i.e., the mapping between values and children is bijective.


A complete split is $n$-ary
(where $n$ is the number of different values for the nominal variable).

A univariate split on an at least ordinal variable is called interval split if for each child all the values assigned to that child are an interval.

## Example:

"Petal.Width < 1.75 " is an interval split,
"Petal.Width < 1.75 and Petal.Width $>=1.45$ " also is an interval split.
"Petal.Width < 1.75 or Petal.Width >= 2.4 " is not an interval split.

A decision tree is called univariate,
$n$-ary, with complete splits or with interval splits,
if all its splits have the corresponding property.

## Machine Learning / 2. Splits

Binary Univariate Interval Splits

There are partitions (sets of rules) that cannot be created by binary univariate splits.


There are partitions (sets of rules)
that cannot be created by binary univariate splits.


But all partitions can be refined
s.t. they can be created by binary univariate splits.
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Imagine, the tree structure is already given, thus the partition

$$
R_{j}, \quad j=1, \ldots, k
$$

of the predictor space is already given.

Then the remaining problem is to assign a predicted value

$$
\hat{y}_{j}, \quad j=1, \ldots k
$$

to each cell.

Fit criteria such as the smallest residual sum of squares can be decomposed in partial criteria for cases falling in each cell:

$$
\sum_{i=1}^{n}\left(y_{i}-\hat{y}\left(x_{i}\right)\right)^{2}=\sum_{j=1}^{k} \sum_{i=1, x_{i} \in R_{j}}^{n}\left(y_{i}-\hat{y}_{j}\right)^{2}
$$

and this sum is minimal if the partial sum for each cell is minimal.

This is the same as fitting a constant model to the points in each cell and thus the $\hat{y}_{j}$ with smallest RSS are just the means:

$$
\hat{y}_{j}:=\operatorname{average}\left\{y_{i} \mid i=1, \ldots, n ; x_{i} \in R_{j}\right\}
$$
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The same argument shows that
for a probability tree with given structure the class probabilities with maximum likelihood are just the relative frequencies of the classes of the points in that region:

$$
\hat{p}\left(Y=y \mid x \in R_{j}\right)=\frac{\left|\left\{i \mid i=1, \ldots, n ; x_{i} \in R_{j}, y_{i}=y\right\}\right|}{\left|\left\{i \mid i=1, \ldots, n ; x_{i} \in R_{j}\right\}\right|}
$$

And for a decision tree with given structure, that the class label with smallest misclassification rate is just the majority class label of the points in that region:

$$
\hat{y}\left(x \in R_{j}\right)=\operatorname{argmax}_{y}\left|\left\{i \mid i=1, \ldots, n ; x_{i} \in R_{j}, y_{i}=y\right\}\right|
$$

Even when possible splits are restricted, e.g., only binary univariate interval splits are allowed, then tree structures can be build that separate all cases in tiny cells that contain just a single point (if there are no points with same predictors).

For such a very fine-grained partition, the fit criteria would be optimal (RSS=0, misclassification rate $=0$, likelihood maximal).

Thus, decision trees need some sort of regularization to make sense.

2003

There are several simple regularization methods:
minimum number of points per cell:
require that each cell (i.e., each leaf node) covers a given minimum number of training points.

## maximum number of cells:

limit the maximum number of cells of the partition (i.e., leaf nodes).

## maximum depth:

limit the maximum depth of the tree.

The number of points per cell, the number of cells, etc. can be seen as a hyperparameter of the decision tree learning method.
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The decision tree learning problem could be described as follows: Given a dataset

$$
\left(x_{1}, y_{1}\right),\left(x_{2}, y_{2}\right), \ldots,\left(x_{n}, y_{n}\right)
$$

find a decision tree $\hat{y}: X \rightarrow Y$ that

- is binary, univariate, and with interval splits,
- contains at each leaf a given minimum number $m$ of examples,
- and has minimal misclassification rate

$$
\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} I\left(y_{i} \neq \hat{y}\left(x_{i}\right)\right)
$$

among all those trees.

Unfortunately, this problem is not feasible as there are too many tree structures / partitions to check and no suitable optimization algorithms to sift efficiently through them.

Therefore, a greedy search is conducted that

- builds the tree recursively starting from the root
- by selecting the locally optimal decision in each step. (or alternatively, even just some locally good decision).

At each node one tries all possible splits.
For an univariate binary tree with interval splits at the actual node let there still be the data

$$
\left(x_{1}, y_{1}\right),\left(x_{2}, y_{2}\right), \ldots,\left(x_{n}, y_{n}\right)
$$

Then check for each predictor variable $X$ with domain $\mathcal{X}$ :

## if $X$ is a nominal variable:

all $2^{m-1}-1$ possible splits in two subsets $X_{1} \cup \dot{\cup} X_{2}$.
E.g., for $\mathcal{X}=\{\mathrm{Hi}, \mathrm{Gö}, \mathrm{H}\}$ the splits

| $\{\mathrm{Hi}\}$ | vs. $\{\mathrm{Gö}, \mathrm{H}\}$ |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\{\mathrm{Hi}, \mathrm{Gö}\}$ | vs. $\{\mathrm{H}\}$ |
| $\{\mathrm{Hi}, \mathrm{H}\}$ | vs. $\{\mathrm{Gö}\}$ |

if $X$ is an ordinal or interval-scaled variable:
sort the $x_{i}$ as

$$
x_{1}^{\prime}<x_{2}^{\prime}<\ldots<x_{n^{\prime}}^{\prime}, \quad n^{\prime} \leq n
$$

and then test all $n^{\prime}-1$ possible splits at

$$
\frac{x_{i}^{\prime}+x_{i+1}^{\prime}}{2}, \quad i=1, \ldots, n^{\prime}-1
$$

E.g.,

$$
\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{8}\right)=(15,10,5,15,10,10,5,5), \quad n=8
$$

are sorted as

$$
x_{1}^{\prime}:=5<x_{2}^{\prime}:=10<x_{3}^{\prime}:=15, \quad n^{\prime}=3
$$

and then split at 7.5 and 12.5.
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All possible splits - often called candidate splits - are assessed by a quality criterion.

For all kinds of trees the original fit criterion can be used, i.e., for regression trees:
the residual sum of squares.

## for decision trees:

the misclassification rate.

## for probability trees:

the likelihood.
The split that gives the best improvement is choosen.

Artificial data about visitors of an online shop:

|  | referrer | num.visits | duration buyer |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: |
| 1 | search engine | several | 15 |
| 2 | yes |  |  |
| 2 | search engine | once | 10 yes |
| 3 | other | several | 5 |
| 4 | ad | once | 15 |
| 5 | yes |  |  |
| 6 | od | once | 10 no |
| 7 | other | once | 10 no |
| 8 | once | ad | once |

Build a decision tree that tries to predict if a visitor will buy.

Step 1 (root node): The root covers all 8 visitors.
There are the following splits:

|  |  | buyer |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| variable | values | yes | no | errors |
| referrer | $\{\mathrm{s}\}$ | 2 | 0 | 2 |
|  | $\{\mathrm{a}, \mathrm{o}\}$ | 2 | 4 |  |
| referrer | $\{\mathrm{s}, \mathrm{a}\}$ | 3 | 2 | 3 |
|  | $\{0\}$ | 1 | 2 |  |
| referrer | $\{\mathrm{s}, \mathrm{o}\}$ | 3 | 2 | 3 |
|  | $\{\mathrm{a}\}$ | 1 | 2 |  |
| num.visits | once | 2 | 4 | 2 |
|  | several | 2 | 0 |  |
| duration | $<7.5$ | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|  | $\geq 7.5$ | 3 | 2 |  |
| duration | $<12.5$ | 2 | 4 | 2 |
|  | $\geq 12.5$ | 2 | 0 |  |
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The splits

- referrer = search engine ?
- num.visits = once?
- duration < 12.5 ?
are locally optimal at the root.
We choose "duration < 12.5":



The right node is pure and thus a leaf.

Step 2 (node 2): The left node (called "node 2") covers the following cases:

|  | referrer | num.visits | duration buyer |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 2 | search engine | once | 10 yes |
| 3 | other | several | 5 yes |
| 5 | ad | once | 10 no |
| 6 | other | once | 10 no |
| 7 | other | once | 5 no |
| 8 | ad | once | 5 no |
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Machine Learning / 4. Learning Decision Trees

At node 2 are the following splits:

|  |  | buyer |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| variable | values | yes no | errors |
| referrer | \{s\} | 10 | 1 |
|  | $\{\mathrm{a}, \mathrm{o}\}$ | 14 |  |
| referrer | \{s, a\} | 12 | 2 |
|  | \{0, | 12 |  |
| referrer | \{s, o\} | 22 | 2 |
|  | \{a\} | 02 |  |
| num.visits | once | 14 | 1 |
|  | several | 10 |  |
| duration | <7.5 |  | 2 |
|  | $\geq 7.5$ | 12 |  |

Again, the splits

- referrer = search engine ?
- num.visits = once ?
are locally optimal at node 2.

We choose the split "referrer = search engine":


The left node is pure and thus a leaf.

The right node (called "node 5") allows further splits.

Step 3 (node 5): The right node (called "node 5") covers the following cases:

|  | referrer | num.visits | duration |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| 3 | buyer |  |  |
| 5 | ad | several | 5 yes |
| 6 | once | 10 no |  |
| 7 | other | once | 10 |
| other | once | 5 no |  |
| 8 | ad | once | 5 no |

It allows the following splits:

|  |  | buyer |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |
| variable | values | yes | no | errors |
| referrer | $\{a\}$ | 0 | 2 | 1 |
|  | $\{0\}$ | 1 | 2 |  |
| num.visits | once | 1 | 0 | 0 |
|  | several | 0 | 4 |  |
| duration | $<7.5$ | 1 | 2 | 1 |
|  | $\geq 7.5$ | 0 | 2 |  |

## Example / Node 5 Split

The split "num.visits = once" is locally optimal.


## Both child nodes are pure thus leaf nodes.

The algorithm stops.
(1) expand-decision-tree(node $T$, training data $X$ ):
(2) if stopping-criterion $(X)$
(3) $\quad T$.class $=\operatorname{argmax}_{y^{\prime}}\left|\left\{(x, y) \in X \mid y=y^{\prime}\right\}\right|$
(4) return
5) fi
(6) $s:=\operatorname{argmax}_{\text {split } s}$ quality-criterion $(s)$
(7) if $s$ does not improve
(8) $\quad$.class $=\operatorname{argmax}_{y^{\prime}}\left|\left\{(x, y) \in X \mid y=y^{\prime}\right\}\right|$
(9) return
(10) fi
(11) T.split $:=s$
(12) for $z \in \operatorname{Im}(s)$ do
(13) create new node $T^{\prime}$
(14) $\quad T$.child $[z]:=T^{\prime}$
(15) expand-decision-tree $\left(T^{\prime},\{(x, y) \in X \mid s(x)=z\}\right)$
(16) OC

## stopping-criterion( $X$ ):

e.g., all cases in $X$ belong to the same class, all cases in $X$ have the same predictor values (for all variables), there are less than the minimum number of cases per node to split.

## split $s$ :

all possible splits, e.g., all binary univariate interval splits.

## quality-criterion(s):

e.g., misclassification rate in $X$ after the split (i.e., if in each child node suggested by the split the majority class is predicted).
$s$ does not improve:
e.g., if the misclassification rate is the same as in the actual node (without the split $s$ ).
all the possible outcomes of the split,
e.g., $\{0,1\}$ for a binary split.
$T$. child $(z):=T^{\prime}:$
keep an array that maps all the possible outcomes of the split to the corresponding child node.

Although it is possible to use misclassification rate as quality criterion, it usually is not a good idea.

Imagine a dataset with a binary target variable (zero/one) and 400 cases per class (400/400).
Assume there are two splits:


Both have 200 errors / misclassification rate 0.25 .

But the right split may be preferred as it contains a pure node.

The effects of a split on training data can be described by a contingency table $\left.\left(C_{j, k}\right)_{j \in J, k \in K}\right)$, i.e., a matrix

- with rows indexed by the different child nodes $j \in J$,
- with columns indexed by the different target classes $k \in K$,
- and cells $C_{j, k}$ containing the number of points in class $k$ that the split assigns to child $j$ :

$$
C_{j, k}:=\mid\{(x, y) \in X \mid s(x)=j \text { and } y=k\}
$$
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Let

$$
P_{n}:=\left\{\left(p_{1}, p_{2}, \ldots, p_{n}\right) \in[0,1]^{n} \mid \sum_{i} p_{i}=1\right\}
$$

be the set of multinomial probability distributions on the values $1, \ldots, n$.

An entropy function $q: P_{n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{0}^{+}$has the properties

- $q$ is maximal for uniform $p=\left(\frac{1}{n}, \frac{1}{n}, \ldots, \frac{1}{n}\right)$.
- $q$ is 0 iff $p$ is deterministic
(one of the $p_{i}=1$ and all the others equal 0 ).


## Entropy for Contingency Tables

2003
For a contingency table $C_{j, k}$ we use the following abbreviations:

$$
\begin{array}{rr}
C_{j, .}:=\sum_{k \in K} C_{j, k} & \text { sum of row } j \\
C_{., k}:=\sum_{j \in J} C_{j, k} & \text { sum of column } k \\
C_{\text {., }}:=\sum_{j \in J} \sum_{k \in K} C_{j, k} & \text { sum of matrix }
\end{array}
$$

and define the following entropies:
row entropy:

$$
H_{J}(C):=H\left(C_{j,,} \mid j \in J\right)
$$

## column entropy:

$$
H_{K}(C):=H\left(C_{., k} \mid k \in K\right)
$$

## conditional column entropy:

$$
H_{K \mid J}(C):=\sum_{j \in J} \frac{C_{j_{.}}}{C_{\mathrm{o}}, \cdot} H\left(C_{j, k} \mid k \in K\right)
$$
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Suitable split quality criteria are
entropy gain:

$$
H G(C):=H_{K}(C)-H_{K \mid J}(C)
$$

entropy gain ratio:

$$
H G(C):=\frac{H_{K}(C)-H_{K \mid J}(C)}{H_{J}(C)}
$$

Shannon entropy gain is also called information gain:

$$
\mathrm{IG}(C):=-\sum_{k} \frac{C_{., k}}{C_{., .}} \log _{2} \frac{C_{., k}}{C_{., .}}+\sum_{j} \frac{C_{j, .}}{C_{.,}} \sum_{k} \frac{C_{j, k}}{C_{j, .}} \log _{2} \frac{C_{j, k}}{C_{j, .}}
$$

Quadratic entropy gain is also called Gini index:

$$
\operatorname{Gini}(C):=-\sum_{k}\left(\frac{C_{., k}}{C_{\mathrm{r}, \cdot}}\right)^{2}+\sum_{j} \frac{C_{j_{.,}}}{C_{\mathrm{C}, \cdot}} \sum_{k}\left(\frac{C_{j, k}}{C_{j, .}}\right)^{2}
$$



Both have 200 errors / misclassification rate 0.25 .

But the right split may be preferred as it contains a pure node.

$$
\begin{array}{rr}
\text { Gini-Impurity } \\
=\frac{1}{2}\left(\left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^{2}+\left(\frac{1}{4}\right)^{2}\right)+\frac{1}{2}\left(\left(\frac{3}{4}\right)^{2}+\left(\frac{1}{4}\right)^{2}\right) \\
=0.625 & =\frac{3}{4}\left(\left(\frac{1}{3}\right)^{2}+\left(\frac{2}{3}\right)^{2}\right)+\frac{1}{4}\left(1^{2}+0^{2}\right) \\
& \approx 0.667
\end{array}
$$

## 1. What is a Decision Tree?
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If for some cases a variable is not observed, i.e., the value of the variable is not known, we say
the case is incomplete and
has a missing value w.r.t. that variable.

Variables with missing values cannot be used directly in models.

| case | $F$ | $L$ | $B$ | $D$ | $H$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 10 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 |

Complete data.

| case | $F$ | $L$ | $B$ | $D$ | $H$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | . | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | . | 1 | 1 |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | 0 | . | 0 | . | 1 |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 10 | 1 | 1 | . | 1 | 1 |

Incomplete data. Missing values are marked by a dot.
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Machine Learning / 5. Digression: Incomplete Data
Missing value indicators

For each variable $v$, we can interpret its missing of values as new random variable $M_{v}$,

$$
M_{v}:= \begin{cases}1, & \text { if } v_{\mathrm{obs}}=., \\ 0, & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

called missing value indicator of $v$.

| case | F | $M_{F}$ | L | $M_{L}$ | B | $M_{B}$ | D | $M_{D}$ | H | $M_{H}$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | . | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | . | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | 0 | 0 | . | 1 | 0 | 0 | . | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| 10 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | . | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 |

Incomplete data and missing value indicators.

A variable $v$ is called missing completely at random (MCAR), if the probability of a missing value is (unconditionally) independent of the (true, unobserved) value of $v$, i.e, if

$$
I\left(M_{v}, v_{\text {true }}\right)
$$

(MCAR is also called missing unconditionally at random).

Example: think of an apparatus measuring the velocity $v$ of wind that has a loose contact $c$. When the contact is closed, the measurement is recorded, otherwise it is skipped. If the contact $c$ being closed does not depend on the velocity $v$ of wind, $v$ is MCAR.

Machine Learning / 5. Digression: Incomplete Data
Types of missingness / MCAR / Imputation

If a variable is MCAR, for each value the probability of missing is the same, and, e.g., the sample mean of $v_{\text {obs }}$ is an unbiased estimator for the expectation of $v_{\text {true }}$; here

$$
\begin{aligned}
\hat{\mu}\left(v_{\text {obs }}\right) & =\frac{1}{10}(2 \cdot 1+4 \cdot 3+2 \cdot 3+2 \cdot 4) \\
& =\frac{1}{15}(3 \cdot 1+6 \cdot 3+3 \cdot 3+3 \cdot 4)=\hat{\mu}\left(v_{\text {true }}\right)
\end{aligned}
$$

Replacing the missing values by the sample mean is called imputing.
Afterwards, the data is complete and can be used by all models.

| case | $v_{\text {true }}$ | $v_{\text {observed }}$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1 | . |
| 2 | 2 | 2 |
| 3 | 2 | . |
| 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 5 | 3 | 3 |
| 6 | 2 | 2 |
| 7 | 1 | 1 |
| 8 | 4 | . |
| 9 | 3 | 3 |
| 10 | 2 | . |
| 11 | 1 | 1 |
| 12 | 3 | . |
| 13 | 4 | 4 |
| 14 | 2 | 2 |
| 15 | 2 | 2 |

Data with a variable $v$ MCAR. Missing values are stroken through.

## Types of missingness / MAR

| case |  |  | $i^{2}$ | case |  |  | $\frac{e^{2}}{2}$ | case |  | No | h |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1 |  | 0 | 10 | B | . | 1 | 14 | B |  | 2 |
| 2 | 2 | 2 | 0 | 11 | 4 | 4 | 1 | 15 | 4 | 4 | 2 |
| 3 | B | . | 0 | 12 | 4 | . | 1 | 16 | 4 |  | 2 |
| 4 | 3 | 3 | 0 | 13 | 3 | 3 | 1 | 17 | 5 | 5 | 2 |
| 5 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 18 | B |  | 2 |
| 6 | 3 | 3 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 19 | 5 |  | 2 |
| 7 | 1 | 1 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 20 | 3 | 3 | 2 |
| 8 | 2 | . | 0 |  |  |  |  | 21 | 4 |  | 2 |
| 9 | 2 | 2 | 0 |  |  |  |  | 22 | 5 | . | 2 |

Figure 28: Data with a variable $v$ MAR (conditionally on $h$ ).
then $v$ is missing at random (conditionally on $h$ ).

A variable $v$ is called missing at random (MAR), if the probability of a missing value is conditionally independent of the (true, unobserved) value of $v$, i.e, if

$$
I\left(M_{v}, v_{\text {true }} \mid W\right)
$$

for some set of variables $W \subseteq V \backslash\{v\}$ (MAR is also called missing conditionally at random).

Example: think of an apparatus measuring the velocity $v$ of wind. If we measure wind velocities at three different heights $h=0,1,2$ and say the apparatus has problems with height not recording
$1 / 3$ of cases at height 0 , $1 / 2$ of cases at height 1 ,
$2 / 3$ of cases at height 2 ,
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Machine Learning / 5. Digression: Incomplete Data
Types of missingness / MAR
If $v$ depends on variables in $W$, then, e.g., the sample mean is not an unbiased estimator, but the weighted mean w.r.t. $W$ has to be used; here:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sum_{h=0}^{2} \hat{\mu}(v \mid H=h) p(H=h) \\
&= 2 \cdot \frac{9}{22}+3.5 \cdot \frac{4}{22}+4 \cdot \frac{9}{22} \\
& \neq \frac{1}{11} \sum_{\substack{i=1, \ldots, 22 \\
v_{i} \neq .}} v_{i} \\
&= 2 \cdot \frac{6}{11}+3.5 \cdot \frac{2}{11}+4 \cdot \frac{3}{11}
\end{aligned}
$$



Figure 28: Data with a variable $v$ MAR (conditionally on $h$ ).
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A variable $v$ is called missing systematically (or not at random), if the probability of a missing value does depend on its (unobserved, true) value.

Example: if the apparatus has problems measuring high velocities and say, e.g., misses
$1 / 3$ of all measurements of $v=1$, $1 / 2$ of all measurements of $v=2$,
$2 / 3$ of all measurements of $v=3$,
i.e., the probability of a missing value does depend on the velocity, $v$ is missing systematically.

| case | N | No |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $\Lambda$ |  |
| 2 | 1 | 1 |
| 3 | 2 |  |
| 4 | B | . |
| 5 | 3 | 3 |
| 6 | 2 | 2 |
| 7 | 1 | 1 |
| 8 | 2 | . |
| 9 | B |  |
| 10 | 2 | 2 |

Figure 29: Data with a variable $v$ missing systematically.

Again, the sample mean is not unbiased; expectation can only be estimated if we have background knowledge about the probabilities of a missing value dependend on its true value.

Machine Learning / 5. Digression: Incomplete Data
Types of missingness / hidden variables

A variable $v$ is called hidden, if the probability of a missing value is 1 , i.e., it is missing in all cases.

Example: say we want to measure intelligence $I$ of probands but cannot do this directly. We measure their level of education $E$ and their income $C$ instead. Then $I$ is hidden.

| case | $I_{\text {true }}$ | $I_{\text {obs }}$ | $E$ | $C$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 1 | . | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | 2 | . | 1 | 2 |
| 3 | 2 | . | 2 | 1 |
| 4 | 2 | . | 2 | 2 |
| 5 | 1 | . | 0 | 2 |
| 6 | 2 | . | 2 | 0 |
| 7 | 1 | . | 1 | 2 |
| 8 | 0 | . | 2 | 1 |
| 9 | 1 | . | 2 | 2 |
| 10 | 2 | . | 2 | 1 |

Figure 30: Data with a hidden variable $I$.


Figure 32: Suggested dependency of variables $I, E$, and $C$.
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Figure 34: Types of missingness.

MAR/MCAR terminology stems from Little and Rubin 1987.
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Machine Learning / 5. Digression: Incomplete Data

The simplest scheme to learn from incomplete data $D$, e.g., the vertex potentials $\left(p_{v}\right)_{v \in V}$ of a Bayesian network, is complete case analysis (also called casewise deletion): use only complete cases

$$
D_{\text {compl }}:=\{d \in D \mid d \text { is complete }\}
$$

| case | $F$ | $L$ | $B$ | $D$ | $H$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | . | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | . | 1 | 1 |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | 0 | . | 0 | . | 1 |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 10 | 1 | 1 | . | 1 | 1 |

Figure 35: Incomplete data and data used in complete case analysis (highlighted).

If $D$ is MCAR, estimations based on the subsample $D_{\text {compl }}$ are unbiased for $D_{\text {true }}$.

But for higher-dimensional data (i.e., with a larger number of variables), complete cases might become rare.

Let each variable have a probability for missing values of 0.05 , then for 20 variables the probability of a case to be complete is

$$
(1-0.05)^{20} \approx 0.36
$$

for 50 variables it is $\approx 0.08$, i.e., most cases are deleted.

Machine Learning / 5. Digression: Incomplete Data

A higher case rate can be achieved by available case analysis. If a quantity has to be estimated based on a subset $W \subseteq V$ of variables, e.g., the vertext potential $p_{v}$ of a specific vertex $v \in V$ of a Bayesian network ( $W=$ fam $(v)$ ), use only complete cases of $\left.D\right|_{W}$

$$
\left(\left.D\right|_{W}\right)_{\text {compl }}=\left\{\left.d \in D\right|_{W} \mid d \text { is complete }\right\}
$$

| case | F | L | B | D | $H$ |
| ---: | :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- | :--- |
| 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 2 | . | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 3 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | . | 1 | 1 |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 7 | 0 | . | 0 | . | 1 |
| 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 9 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| 10 | 1 | 1 | . | 1 | 1 |

Figure 36: Incomplete data and data used in available case analysis for estimating the potential $p_{L}(L \mid F)$ (highlighted).

If $D$ is MCAR, estimations based on the subsample $\left(D_{W}\right)_{\text {compl }}$ are unbiased for $\left(D_{W}\right)_{\text {true }}$.

1. What is a Decision Tree?

## 2. Splits

## 3. Regularization

## 4. Learning Decision Trees

5. Digression: Incomplete Data

## 6. Properties of Decision Trees

## 7. Pruning Decision Trees

Decision trees can handle missing values intrinsically, i.e., without imputation, by using surrogate splits.

For this, one stores not only the best split (called primary split), but also several other splits

- on variables different from the one used in the primary split
- but that result in a similar assingment of training cases to child nodes as the primary split,
called surrogate splits.

If a case with a missing variable used in a primary split has to be predicted, a surrogate split is used instead.

2003

Predict buying behavior of the following customer:

|  | referrer | num.visits duration buyer |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 9 | search engine once | ? |
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Missing Values / Surrogate Splits / Example
The primary split at node 1 is
duration < 12.5
sending only cases 1 and 4 to the right.

A surrogate split mimicks this split as closely as possible, i.e., is the best split for the surrogate target "duration < 12.5".

|  | referrer | num.visits | duration | buyer |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | :--- |
| 1 | surrogate target |  |  |  |
| 2 | search engine | several | 15 yes | true |
| 3 | other | sevgine | once | 10 |
| 4 | ad | 5 yes | false |  |
| 5 | ad | once | 15 yes | true |
| 6 | other | once | 10 no | false |
| 7 | once | 10 no | false |  |
| 8 | ad | once | 5 no | false |

2003

At node 1 are the following surrogate splits:

|  |  | surrogate target |  |  |  | gini |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| variable | values | true | false | errors | impurity |  |
| referrer | $\{s\}$ | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0.667 |  |
|  | $\{a, o\}$ | 5 | 1 |  |  |  |
| referrer | $\{\mathrm{s}, \mathrm{a}\}$ | 3 | 2 | 2 | 0.7 |  |
|  | $\{0\}$ | 3 | 0 |  |  |  |
| referrer | $\{\mathrm{s}, \mathrm{o}\}$ | 3 | 1 | 2 | 0.625 |  |
|  | $\{a\}$ | 3 | 1 |  |  |  |
| num.visits | once | 5 | 1 | 2 | 0.667 |  |
|  | several | 1 | 1 |  |  |  |

In principle, referrer $\in\{\mathbf{s}, \mathrm{a}\}$ is the best surrogate split. But as the majority class in both rows is "true", a missing value always is sent down to the left.

Decision trees often are used to visually explain models.

Nevertheless, usually there are many candidates for the primary split with very similar values of the quality criterion. So the choice of the primary split shown in the tree is somewhat arbitrary: the split may change, if the data changes a bit. The tree is said to be instable.

Machine Learning / 6. Properties of Decision Trees
Instability / Example / Iris (50/50)
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## 1. What is a Decision Tree?

## 2. Splits

## 3. Regularization

## 4. Learning Decision Trees

5. Digression: Incomplete Data

## 6. Properties of Decision Trees

## 7. Pruning Decision Trees

If a decision tree has been overgrown, i.e., overfits, it can be regularized by selecting the best subtree (pruning).

Let nodes $(\hat{y})$ denote the set of nodes a decision tree $\hat{y}$.
A subset $\mathcal{T} \subseteq \operatorname{nodes}(\hat{y})$ of its nodes is called a subtree, if it is closed under parents (i.e., it contains for each node $T \in \mathcal{T}$ also its parent node).

A subtree $\mathcal{T}$ can be interpreted as decision tree, if for leaf nodes $T \in \mathcal{T}$ that have been interior nodes in the original tree $\hat{y}$, the split is replaced by a prediction:

$$
\text { T.class }:=\operatorname{argmax}_{y^{\prime}}\left|\left\{(x, y) \in X \mid y=y^{\prime}\right\}\right|
$$

where $X$ denotes the subset of the training data that is passed down to node $T$.

## Cost Complexity Criterion: (minimize)

$$
\operatorname{CCC}(\hat{y}):=\operatorname{RSS}(\hat{y})+\lambda \cdot|\operatorname{nodes}(\hat{y})|
$$

where
$\hat{y}$ is a regression tree,
$\lambda \geq 0$ the complexity parameter / regularization parameter, and nodes $(\hat{y})$ denotes the set of nodes of tree $\hat{y}$.
$\lambda$ is a hyperparameter that needs to be estimated by cross-validation.

Note: many texts on decision trees use the symbol $\alpha$ instead of $\lambda$ to denote the regularization parameter.

## Machine Learning / 7. Pruning Decision Trees

## Popular Decision Tree Configurations

| name | ChAID | CART | ID3 | C4.5 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| author | Kass 1980 | Breiman et al. 1984 | Quinlan 1986 | Quinlan 1993 |
| selection <br> measure | $\chi^{2}$ | Gini index, <br> twoing index | information gain | information gain ratio |
| splits | all | binary nominal, <br> binary quantitative, <br> binary bivariate quantitative | complete | complete, <br> binary nominal, <br> binary quantitative |
| stopping <br> criterion | $\chi^{2}$ independence <br> test | minimum number <br> of cases/node | $\chi^{2}$ independence <br> test | lower bound on <br> selection measure |
| pruning <br> technique | none | error complexity pruning | pessimistic error pruning | pessimistic error pruning, <br> error based pruning |

