



# Machine Learnig – Part 3

Nikita Kazeev<sup>123</sup>

<sup>1</sup>National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE) <sup>2</sup>Yandex <sup>3</sup>Yandex School of Data Analysis

> Who is (or in near future will) be doing a physics analysis?

- > Who is (or in near future will) be doing a physics analysis?
- > Who has fitted a classifier?

- > Who is (or in near future will) be doing a physics analysis?
- > Who has fitted a classifier?
- > Who has computed cross-validation error of a classifier?

- > Who is (or in near future will) be doing a physics analysis?
- > Who has fitted a classifier?
- > Who has computed cross-validation error of a classifier?
- > Who has trained a deep NN?

- > Who is (or in near future will) be doing a physics analysis?
- > Who has fitted a classifier?
- > Who has computed cross-validation error of a classifier?
- > Who has trained a deep NN?
- > Who has trained a convolutional NN?

- > Who is (or in near future will) be doing a physics analysis?
- > Who has fitted a classifier?
- > Who has computed cross-validation error of a classifier?
- > Who has trained a deep NN?
- > Who has trained a convolutional NN?
- > Who has trained a LSTM RNN?

> 8 hours is not nearly enough

- > 8 hours is not nearly enough
- > Just enough theory to understand what's going on

- > 8 hours is not nearly enough
- > Just enough theory to understand what's going on
- Just enough practice to use out-of-shelf state-of-the-art solutions (I really love those of-in-between words)

- > 8 hours is not nearly enough
- > Just enough theory to understand what's going on
- Just enough practice to use out-of-shelf state-of-the-art solutions (I really love those of-in-between words)
- > Encourage to attend our summer school

- > 8 hours is not nearly enough
- > Just enough theory to understand what's going on
- Just enough practice to use out-of-shelf state-of-the-art solutions (I really love those of-in-between words)
- > Encourage to attend our summer school
- > Compete at Kaggle

## **Environment setup**

## This lecture plan

- Naive boosting for regression
- Gradient boosting machine
- › XGBoost
- > Dealing with non-numeric data
- > Dealing with overfitting

I'm grateful to Alexei Artemov for his materials.

# Naive boosting for regression

$$\,\, > \,\, Consider \, a \, regression \, problem \, \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} (h(x_i) - y_i)^2 \rightarrow \, \min_h$$

- > Consider a regression problem  $\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{\ell}(h(x_i) y_i)^2 \rightarrow \min_h$
- > Search for solution in the form of weak learner composition  $a_N(x)=\sum_{n=1}^N h_n(x)$  with weak learners  $h_n\in\mathbb{H}$

- > Consider a regression problem  $\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{\ell}(h(x_i) y_i)^2 \rightarrow \min_{h}$
- > Search for solution in the form of weak learner composition  $a_N(x)=\sum_{n=1}^N h_n(x)$  with weak learners  $h_n\in\mathbb{H}$
- > The boosting approach: add weak learners greedily
  - 1. Start with a "trivial" weak learner  $h_0(x) = \frac{1}{\ell} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} y_i$

- > Consider a regression problem  $\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} (h(x_i) y_i)^2 \rightarrow \min_{h}$
- > Search for solution in the form of weak learner composition  $a_N(x)=\sum_{n=1}^N h_n(x)$  with weak learners  $h_n\in\mathbb{H}$
- > The boosting approach: add weak learners greedily
  - 1. Start with a "trivial" weak learner  $h_0(x) = \frac{1}{\ell} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} y_i$
  - 2. At step N, compute the residuals

$$s_i^{(N)} = y_i - \sum_{n=1}^{N-1} h_n(x_i) = y_i - a_{N-1}(x_i), \qquad i=1,\ldots,\ell$$

3. Learn the next weak algorithm using

$$a_N(x) := \underset{h \in \mathbb{H}}{arg\min} \, \frac{1}{2} {\textstyle \sum}_{i=1}^{\ell} (h(x_i) - s_i^{(N)})^2 \label{eq:anderson}$$

(this implementation may be found in, e.g., **scikit-learn**)













# Gradient boosting

 $\,\,$  > With  $a_{N-1}({\bf x})$  already built, how to find the next  $\gamma_N$  and  $h_N$  if

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} L(y_i, a_{N-1}(\textbf{x}_i) + \gamma h(\textbf{x}_i)) \rightarrow \min_{\gamma, h}$$

 $\,\,$  > With  $a_{N-1}(\textbf{x})$  already built, how to find the next  $\gamma_N$  and  $h_N$  if

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} L(y_i, a_{N-1}(\textbf{x}_i) + \gamma h(\textbf{x}_i)) \rightarrow \min_{\gamma, h}$$

> Recall: functions decrease in the direction of negative gradient

 $\,\,$  > With  $a_{N-1}(\textbf{x})$  already built, how to find the next  $\gamma_N$  and  $h_N$  if

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} L(y_i, a_{N-1}(\textbf{x}_i) + \gamma h(\textbf{x}_i)) \rightarrow \min_{\gamma, h}$$

- > Recall: functions decrease in the direction of negative gradient
- > View L(y, z) as a function of z (=  $a_N(\mathbf{x}_i)$ ), execute gradient descent on z

 $\,\,$  > With  $a_{N-1}(\textbf{x})$  already built, how to find the next  $\gamma_N$  and  $h_N$  if

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} L(y_i, a_{N-1}(\textbf{x}_i) + \gamma h(\textbf{x}_i)) \rightarrow \min_{\gamma, h}$$

- > Recall: functions decrease in the direction of negative gradient
- > View L(y, z) as a function of  $z (= a_N(\mathbf{x}_i))$ , execute gradient descent on z

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} L(y_i,a_{N-1}(\boldsymbol{x}_i)+s_i) \rightarrow \min_{s_1,\dots,s_\ell}$$

 $\,\,$  > With  $a_{N-1}(\textbf{x})$  already built, how to find the next  $\gamma_N$  and  $h_N$  if

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} L(y_i, a_{N-1}(\textbf{x}_i) + \gamma h(\textbf{x}_i)) \rightarrow \min_{\gamma, h}$$

- > Recall: functions decrease in the direction of negative gradient
- > View L(y, z) as a function of  $z (= a_N(\mathbf{x}_i))$ , execute gradient descent on z

$$\begin{split} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} L(y_i,a_{N-1}(\textbf{x}_i)+s_i) &\to \min_{s_1,\dots,s_\ell} \\ & \text{> Choose } s_i = - \left. \frac{\partial L(y_i,z)}{\partial z} \right|_{z=a_{N-1}(\textbf{x}_i)} \text{, approximate } s_i\text{'s by } h_N(\textbf{x}_i) \end{split}$$

> Input:

- $\,\,\cdot\,\,$  Training set  $X^\ell=\{(\textbf{x}_i,y_i)\}_{i=1}^\ell$
- Number of boosting iterations N
- > Loss function Q(y, z) with its gradient  $\frac{\partial Q}{\partial z}$
- $\,\,$  A family  $\mathbb{H}=\{h(x)\}$  of weak learners and their associated learning procedures
- > Additional hyperparameters of weak learners (tree depth, etc.)
- > Initialize GBM  $h_0(\mathbf{x})$  using some simple rule (zero, most popular class, etc.)
- $\,\,$  > Execute boosting iterations t  $=1,\ldots,$  N (see next slide)
- $\,\,$  > Compose the final GBM learner:  $a_N(\textbf{x}) = \sum_{t=0}^N \gamma_i h_i(\textbf{x})$

At every iteration:

1. Compute pseudo-residuals: 
$$s_i = -\left.\frac{\partial Q(y_i,z)}{\partial z}\right|_{z=a_{N-1}(x_i)}, i = 1, \dots, \ell$$

At every iteration:

- 1. Compute pseudo-residuals:  $s_i = -\left.\frac{\partial Q(y_i,z)}{\partial z}\right|_{z=a_{N-1}(x_i)}, i = 1, \dots, \ell$
- 2. Learn  $h_N(\boldsymbol{x}_i)$  by regressing onto  $s_1,\ldots,s_\ell$ :

$$h_N(x) = \underset{h \in \mathbb{H}}{\text{arg min}} \sum_{i=1}^\ell \left(h(x_i) - s_i\right)^2$$

At every iteration:

- 1. Compute pseudo-residuals:  $s_i = -\left.\frac{\partial Q(y_i,z)}{\partial z}\right|_{z=a_{N-1}(x_i)}, i = 1, \dots, \ell$
- 2. Learn  $h_N(\textbf{x}_i)$  by regressing onto  $s_1, \ldots, s_\ell$ :

$$h_N(x) = \underset{h \in \mathbb{H}}{\text{arg min}} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \left(h(x_i) - s_i\right)^2$$

3. Find the optimal  $\gamma_{\rm N}$  using plain gradient descent:

$$\gamma_N = \mathop{\text{arg\,min}}_{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} Q(y_i, a_{N-1}(\textbf{x}_i) + \gamma h_N(\textbf{x}_i))$$

At every iteration:

- 1. Compute pseudo-residuals:  $s_i = -\frac{\partial Q(y_i,z)}{\partial z}\Big|_{z=a_{N-1}(x_i)}, i = 1, \dots, \ell$
- 2. Learn  $h_N(\textbf{x}_i)$  by regressing onto  $s_1, \ldots, s_\ell$ :

$$h_N(x) = \underset{h \in \mathbb{H}}{\text{arg min}} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \left(h(x_i) - s_i\right)^2$$

3. Find the optimal  $\gamma_{\rm N}$  using plain gradient descent:

$$\gamma_{\mathsf{N}} = \underset{\gamma \in \mathbb{R}}{\operatorname{arg\,min}} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} Q(\mathsf{y}_i, \mathsf{a}_{\mathsf{N}-1}(\mathbf{x}_i) + \gamma \mathsf{h}_{\mathsf{N}}(\mathbf{x}_i))$$

4. Update the GBM by  $a_N(\mathbf{x}_i) \leftarrow a_{N-1}(\mathbf{x}) + \gamma_N h_N(\mathbf{x})$
→ Consider a training set for a X<sup>300</sup> = {(**x**<sub>i</sub>, y<sub>i</sub>)}<sup>300</sup><sub>i=1</sub> where x<sub>i</sub> ∈ [-5, 5], y<sub>i</sub> = cos(x<sub>i</sub>) +  $\varepsilon_i$ ,  $\varepsilon_i \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1/5)$ 



- > Pick N = 3 boosting iterations
- $\,\,$   $\,$  Gradient of the quadratic loss  $\frac{\partial Q(y_i,z)}{\partial z}=(y-z)$  is just redisuals
- > Pick decision trees as weak learners  $h_i(\mathbf{x})$
- > Set 2 as the maximum depth for decision trees

















# GBM: an interactive demo

http://arogozhnikov.github.io/2016/06/24/gradient\_boosting\_explained.html



## GBM: an interactive demo

http://arogozhnikov.github.io/2016/07/05/gradient\_boosting\_playground.html

#### Dataset to classify:



Prediction:



Decision functions of first 30 trees





1. Approximate the descent direction constructed using second order derivatives

$$\sum_{i=1}^\ell \left( -s_i h(\textbf{x}_i) + \frac{1}{2} t_i h^2(\textbf{x}_i) \right) \rightarrow \min_h, \qquad t_i = \left. \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} L(y_i,z) \right|_{a_{N-1}(\textbf{x}_i)}$$

1. Approximate the descent direction constructed using second order derivatives

$$\sum_{i=1}^\ell \left( -s_i h(\textbf{x}_i) + \frac{1}{2} t_i h^2(\textbf{x}_i) \right) \rightarrow \min_h, \qquad t_i = \left. \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z^2} L(y_i,z) \right|_{a_{N-1}(\textbf{x}_i)}$$

2. Penalize large leaf counts J and large leaf coefficient norm  $\|b\|_2^2 = \sum_{j=1}^J b_j^2$ 

$$\sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \left( -s_i h(x_i) + \frac{1}{2} t_i h^2(x_i) \right) + \gamma J + \frac{\lambda}{2} \sum_{j=1}^{J} b_j^2 \rightarrow \min_h$$
 where  $b(\textbf{x}) = \sum_{j=1}^{J} b_j [\textbf{x} \in R_j]$ 

3. Choose split  $[\mathbf{x}_j < t]$  at node R to maximize

$$Q = H(R) - H(R_{\ell}) - H(R_r) \rightarrow max,$$

where the impurity criterion

$$\mathsf{H}(\mathsf{R}) = -\frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{(\mathsf{t}_i,\mathsf{s}_i)\in\mathsf{R}} \mathsf{s}_j \right)^2 \middle/ \left( \sum_{(\mathsf{t}_i,\mathsf{s}_i)\in\mathsf{R}} \mathsf{t}_j + \lambda \right) + \gamma$$

3. Choose split  $[\mathbf{x}_j < t]$  at node R to maximize

$$Q = H(R) - H(R_{\ell}) - H(R_r) \rightarrow max,$$

where the impurity criterion

$$\mathsf{H}(\mathsf{R}) = -\frac{1}{2} \left( \sum_{(t_i,s_i) \in \mathsf{R}} \mathsf{s}_j \right)^2 \middle/ \left( \sum_{(t_i,s_i) \in \mathsf{R}} \mathsf{t}_j + \lambda \right) + \gamma$$

4. The stopping rule: declare the node a leaf if even the best split gives negative Q

# **Categorical features**

#### **Categorical features**



#### One-hot encoding

# $[\text{proton, pion, kaon}] \rightarrow [[1, 0, 0], [0, 1, 0], [0, 0, 1]]$

#### One-hot encoding

# $[\text{proton, pion, kaon}] \rightarrow [[1, 0, 0], [0, 1, 0], [0, 0, 1]]$

# > Doesn't scale well with the number of categories

# CTR (aka click-through ratio)

For each pair

(target\_class, categori-

cal\_feature\_value):

 $ctr_i = \frac{countInClass + prior}{totalCount + 1}$ 

- countInClass number of objects in the i-th class with the current categorical feature value
- > prior algorithm parameter
- > totalCount total number of objects with the current categorical feature value

### CTR example

fruit	target	ctr
apple	0	0.625
orange	0	0.25
apple	1	0.625
apple	1	0.625

prior = 0.5

Nikita Kazeev

#### **Classes** counter

For each pair

(target\_class, categori-

cal\_feature\_value):

 $\text{count}_{\text{i}} = \frac{\text{curCount} + \text{prior}}{\text{totalCount} + 1}$ 

- > curCount number of objects with the current categorical feature value
- prior algorithm parameter
- > totalCount total number of objects

#### Counters example

fruit	target	ctr	counter
apple	0	0.625	0.7
orange	0	0.25	0.3
apple	1	0.625	0.7
apple	1	0.625	0.7

prior = 0.5

### Meet CatBoost



- > Gradient boosting on decision trees
- Categorical features handling (even more advanced than discussed!)
- A novel dynamic boosting scheme ( <u>submitted to NIPS</u>) [I'm a coauthor]
- > Released into open source by Yandex
- > Used in the LHCb PID



# GBM: regulization via shrinkage

- > For too simple weak learners, the negative gradient is approximated badly  $\implies$  random walk in space of samples
- > For too complex weak learners, a few boosting steps may be enough for overfitting
- > Shrinkage: make shorter steps using a learning rate  $\eta \in (0, 1]$

$$a_N(\boldsymbol{x}_i) \gets a_{N-1}(\boldsymbol{x}) + \eta \gamma_N h_N(\boldsymbol{x})$$

(effectively distrust gradient direction estimated via weak learners)

# GBM: shrinkage





Figure: High shrinkage

Figure: Low shrinkage













# Gradients bias in gradient boosting

 Each subsequent tree is fit to the gradient between the current predictions on train and the true labels

# Gradients bias in gradient boosting

- Each subsequent tree is fit to the gradient between the current predictions on train and the true labels
- The gradient is estimated using the model fitted on the very dataset used for training

# Gradients bias in gradient boosting

- Each subsequent tree is fit to the gradient between the current predictions on train and the true labels
- The gradient is estimated using the model fitted on the very dataset used for training
- > The gradients are likely to be overfitted

# Dynamic boosting



> Order data randomly

# Dynamic boosting



- > Order data randomly
- > For each element maintain prediction based on the previous model elements

# Summary [theory]

- Boosting: a general meta-algorithm aimed at composing a strong hypothesis from multiple weak hypotheses
- Boosting can be applied for arbitrary losses, arbitrary problems (regression, classification) and over arbitrary weak learners
- > The Gradient Boosting Machine: a general approach to boosting adding weak learners that approximate gradient of the loss function
- > AdaBoost: gradient boosting with an exponential loss function resulting in reweighting training instances when adding weak learners
- XGBoost: gradient boosting with second order optimization, penalized loss and particular choice of impurity criterion

# Summary [practice]

[Disclaimer] Objectively comparing algorithms is hard, but judging from competitions & industry cases...
## Summary [practice]

[Disclaimer] Objectively comparing algorithms is hard, but judging from competitions & industry cases...

- > As of 2017 Gradient Boosting and Deep Learning rule
  - > If you're using something else, think

## Summary [practice]

[Disclaimer] Objectively comparing algorithms is hard, but judging from competitions & industry cases...

- > As of 2017 Gradient Boosting and Deep Learning rule
  - > If you're using something else, think
- > There are more-or-less equal implementations in H2O, LightGBM, XGBoost
- You're also invited to try the new catboost [the recommendation is biased, gradients – not so much...]

## Contacts

Nikita Kazeev Researcher



kazeevn@yandex-team.ru

