

Experimentation

Jaime Arguello

INLS 613: Text Data Mining

jarguell@email.unc.edu

October 11, 2017

Outline

Parameter Tuning

Cross-Validation

Significance tests

Evaluation

- The goal of evaluation is to determine a model's performance on previously unseen data
 - Parameter-tuning
 - Comparing between alternative approaches
 - Feature-ablation studies

Parameter Tuning

motivation

- Supervised machine learning algorithms have lots of moving parts
- We can think of these parameters as “knobs” that need to be tweaked or tuned
- The goal is to set these parameter values such that we maximize performance
- We need to do this for both systems, not just the one we want to win!
- Can you think of some example parameters?


Parameter Tuning

- K-nearest Neighbor
 - ▶ Compute the similarity between a previously unseen instance and all the instances in the training set
 - ▶ Assign the majority class associated with its K nearest neighbors
- Parameter K determines the number of training set instances that are used in the voting
- Goals:
 - ▶ How do we set K?
 - ▶ What is the expected performance of the system with a good value of K?

Parameter Tuning

- How should we determine the value of K ?
- **Option -1:** roll the dice, close your eyes, and hope for the best
- **Option 0:** take a conservative guess (e.g., $K = 5$)?
- **Option 1:** try out a range of values (e.g., $K = 1, 5, 10, 20, 50, 100$) and set it to the value that maximizes performance based on a sensible metric?

Parameter Tuning




Why is this a bad idea?

Parameter Tuning

toy example

- **Objective:** distinguish between stars, squares, and circles



- **Parameters:** the relative importance between (1) size, (2) color, and (3) number of sides

Parameter Tuning

- The goal is to set parameter values such that we maximize performance
- What is the performance that we are really interested in?
- We care about performance on previously unseen data
- We care about generalization performance!
- Our training set may contain regularities that are not meaningful
- We care about those regularities that are meaningful for the overall population!

Parameter Tuning



Parameter Tuning

- Option 2:
 1. divide the data set into two sets
 - ▶ **training set:** a set used to find the best parameter values (e.g., 80%)
 - ▶ **test set:** a held-out set used to evaluate model performance (e.g., 20%)
 2. **train:** find the parameter value that maximize performance on the training set
 3. **test:** evaluate the model (with the best training-set parameter value) on the test set


Parameter Tuning



DATASET

Parameter Tuning

- Split the data into two sets.
- Find the parameter value that maximizes performance on the training set.
- Evaluate the system with that parameter value on the test set.




$K = 5$

$F = 0.50$

Parameter Tuning

- Split the data into two sets.
- Find the parameter value that maximizes performance on the training set.
- Evaluate the system with that parameter value on the test set.



$K = 5$

$F = 0.50$

Advantages and Disadvantages?

Single Train/Test Split

- Advantage

- ▶ the data used to find the optimal parameter value is not the same data used to test!
- ▶ we are testing generalization performance.

- Disadvantage

- ▶ we are putting all our eggs in one basket!
- ▶ out of pure coincidence, the training set may have regularities that don't generalize to the test set

Parameter Tuning

- Option 3: cross-validation
 1. divide the data into N sets of instances
 2. use the union of $N-1$ sets to find the best parameter values
 3. measure performance (using the best parameters) on the held-out set
 4. do steps 2-3 N times
 5. average performance across the N held-out sets
- This is called N -fold cross-validation (usually, $N=10$)


Cross-Validation



DATASET


Cross-Validation

- Split the data into $N = 5$ folds



Cross-Validation

- For each fold, find the parameter value that maximizes performance on the union of $N - 1$ folds and test (using this parameter value) on the held-out fold.




$K = 5$

$F = 0.50$


Cross-Validation

- For each fold, find the parameter value that maximizes performance on the union of $N - 1$ folds and test (using this parameter value) on the held-out fold.




Cross-Validation

- For each fold, find the parameter value that maximizes performance on the union of $N - 1$ folds and test (using this parameter value) on the held-out fold.




Cross-Validation

- For each fold, find the parameter value that maximizes performance on the union of $N - 1$ folds and test (using this parameter value) on the held-out fold.



Cross-Validation

- For each fold, find the parameter value that maximizes performance on the union of $N - 1$ folds and test (using this parameter value) on the held-out fold.



$K = 5$

$F = 0.50$

Cross-Validation

- Average the performance across held-out folds

1	$F = 0.50$
2	$F = 0.60$
3	$F = 0.70$
4	$F = 0.60$
5	$F = 0.50$
Average	$F = 0.58$

Cross-Validation

- Average the performance across held-out folds

1	$F = 0.50$
2	$F = 0.60$
3	$F = 0.70$
4	$F = 0.60$
5	$F = 0.50$
Average	$F = 0.58$

Advantages and Disadvantages?

N-Fold Cross-Validation

- Advantage
 - ▶ multiple rounds of generalization performance.
- Disadvantage
 - ▶ ultimately, we'll tune parameters on the whole dataset and send our system into the world.
 - ▶ a model trained on 100% of the data should perform better than one trained on 80%.
 - ▶ thus, we may be underestimating the model's performance!

Leave-One-Out Cross-Validation



Leave-One-Out Cross-Validation

- Split the data into N folds of 1 instance each



Leave-One-Out Cross-Validation

- For each instance, find the parameter value that maximize performance on for the other instances and and test (using this parameter value) on the held-out instance.



Leave-One-Out Cross-Validation

- For each instance, find the parameter value that maximize performance on for the other instances and and test (using this parameter value) on the held-out instance.



Leave-One-Out Cross-Validation

- For each instance, find the parameter value that maximize performance on for the other instances and and test (using this parameter value) on the held-out instance.
- And so on ...
- Finally, average the performance for each held-out instance



Leave-One-Out Cross-Validation

- For each instance, find the parameter value that maximize performance on for the other instances and and test (using this parameter value) on the held-out instance.
- And so on ...
- Finally, average the performance for each held-out instance



Advantages and Disadvantages?

Leave-One-Out Cross-Validation

- Advantages
 - ▶ multiple rounds of generalization performance.
 - ▶ each training fold is as similar as possible to the one we will ultimately use to tune parameters before sending the system out into the world.
- Disadvantage
 - ▶ our estimate of generalization performance may still be artificially high
 - ▶ why?

Leave-One-Out Cross-Validation

- Advantages
 - ▶ multiple rounds of generalization performance.
 - ▶ each training fold is as similar as possible to the one we will ultimately use to tune parameters before sending the system out into the world.
- Disadvantage
 - ▶ our estimate of generalization performance may still be artificially high
 - ▶ we are likely to try lots of different things and pick the one with the best “generalization” performance
 - ▶ still indirectly over-training to the dataset (sigh...)

Experimentation

Jaime Arguello

INLS 613: Text Data Mining

jarguell@email.unc.edu

October 24, 2016

Outline

Parameter Tuning

Cross-Validation

Significance tests

Comparing Systems

	Fold	System A	System B
• Train and test both systems using 10-fold cross validation	1	0.2	0.5
	2	0.3	0.3
	3	0.1	0.1
• Use the same folds for both systems	4	0.4	0.4
	5	1	1
	6	0.8	0.9
• Compare the difference in average performance across held-out folds	7	0.3	0.1
	8	0.1	0.2
	9	0	0.5
	10	0.9	0.8
	Average	0.41	0.48
		Difference	0.07

Significance Tests

motivation

- Why would it be risky to conclude that **System B** is better **System A**?
- Put differently, what is it that we're trying to achieve?

Significance Tests

motivation

- **In theory:** that the average performance of **System B** is greater than the average performance of **System A** for all possible test sets.
- However, we don't have all test sets. We have a sample
- And, this sample may favor one system vs. the other!

Significance Tests

definition

- A **significance test** is a statistical tool that allows us to determine whether a difference in performance reflects a true pattern or just random chance

Significance Tests

ingredients

- **Test statistic:** a measure used to judge the two systems (e.g., the difference between their average F-measure)
- **Null hypothesis:** no “true” difference between the two systems
- **P-value:** take the value of the observed test statistic and compute the probability of observing a value that large (or larger) under the null hypothesis

Significance Tests

ingredients

- If the p-value is large, we cannot reject the null hypothesis
- That is, we cannot claim that one system is better than the other
- If the p-value is small ($p < 0.05$), we can reject the null hypothesis
- That is, the observed test-statistic is not due to random chance

Comparing Systems

- **P-value:** the probability of observing a difference **equal to or greater than 0.07** under the null hypothesis (i.e., the systems are actually equal).

Fold	System A	System B
1	0.2	0.5
2	0.3	0.3
3	0.1	0.1
4	0.4	0.4
5	1	1
6	0.8	0.9
7	0.3	0.1
8	0.1	0.2
9	0	0.5
10	0.9	0.8
Average	0.41	0.48
	Difference	0.07

Fisher's Randomization Test

procedure

- **Inputs:** `counter` = 0, `N` = 100,000

- Repeat `N` times:

Step 1: for each fold, flip a coin and if it lands 'heads', flip the result between System A and B

Step 2: see whether the test statistic is equal to or greater than the one observed and, if so, increment `counter`

- **Output:** `counter` / `N`

Fisher's Randomization Test

Fold	System A	System B
1	0.2	0.5
2	0.3	0.3
3	0.1	0.1
4	0.4	0.4
5	1	1
6	0.8	0.9
7	0.3	0.1
8	0.1	0.2
9	0	0.5
10	0.9	0.8
Average	0.41	0.48
	Difference	0.07

Fisher's Randomization Test


Fold	System A	System B	
1	0.5	0.2	
2	0.3	0.3	
3	0.1	0.1	
4	0.4	0.4	
5	1	1	
6	0.9	0.8	
7	0.3	0.1	
8	0.1	0.2	
9	0.5	0	
10	0.9	0.8	
Average	0.5	0.39	
	Difference	-0.11	at least 0.07?
iteration = 1 counter = 0			

Fisher's Randomization Test

Fold	System A	System B
1	0.2	0.5
2	0.3	0.3
3	0.1	0.1
4	0.4	0.4
5	1	1
6	0.8	0.9
7	0.1	0.3
8	0.2	0.1
9	0	0.5
10	0.08	0.9
Average	0.318	0.5
	Difference	0.182
iteration = 2 counter = 1		

at least 0.07?

Fisher's Randomization Test

Fold	System A	System B	
1	0.5	0.2	
2	0.3	0.3	
3	0.1	0.1	
4	0.4	0.4	
5	1	1	
6	0.9	0.8	
7	0.3	0.1	
8	0.1	0.2	
9	0.5	0	
10	0.9	0.8	
Average	0.5	0.39	
	Difference	-0.11	
iteration = 100,000		counter = 25,678	at least 0.07?

Fisher's Randomization Test

procedure

- **Inputs:** **counter** = 0, **N** = 100,000
- Repeat **N** times:
 - Step 1:** for each query, flip a coin and if it lands 'heads', flip the result between System A and B
 - Step 2:** see whether the test statistic is equal to or greater than the one observed and, if so, increment **counter**
- **Output:** **counter** / **N** = (25,678/100,00) = 0.25678

Fisher's Randomization Test

- Under the null hypothesis, the probability of observing a value of the test statistic of 0.07 or greater is about 0.26.
- Because $p > 0.05$, we cannot confidently say that the value of the test statistic is not due to random chance.
- A difference between the average F-measure values of 0.07 is not significant

Fisher's Randomization Test

procedure

- **Inputs:** **counter** = 0, **N** = 100,000

- Repeat **N** times:

Step 1: for each query, flip a coin and if it lands 'heads', flip the result between System A and B

Step 2: see whether the test statistic is equal to or greater than the one observed and, if so, increment **counter**

- **Output:** **counter** / **N** = (25,678/100,00) = 0.25678

This is a one-tailed test (**B** > **A**).

How can we modify it to be a two-tailed test (**B** != **A**)

Fisher's Randomization Test

procedure


- **P-value:** the probability of observing a difference *in the absolute value* **equal to or greater than 0.07** under the null hypothesis (i.e., the systems are actually equal).

Fold	System A	System B
1	0.2	0.5
2	0.3	0.3
3	0.1	0.1
4	0.4	0.4
5	1	1
6	0.8	0.9
7	0.3	0.1
8	0.1	0.2
9	0	0.5
10	0.9	0.8
Average	0.41	0.48
Difference		0.07

Bootstrap-Shift Test

motivation


- Our sample is a representative sample of all data



Bootstrap-Shift Test

motivation

- If we sample (with replacement) from our sample, we can generate a new representative sample of all data



Bootstrap-Shift Test procedure

- **Inputs:** Array $T = \{\}$, $N = 100,000$
- Repeat N times:
 - Step 1:** sample 10 folds (with replacement) from our set of 10 folds (called a subsample)
 - Step 2:** compute test statistic associated with new sample and add to T
- **Step 3:** compute average of numbers in T
- **Step 4:** reduce every number in T by average
- **Output:** % of numbers in T greater than or equal to the observed test statistic

Bootstrap-Shift Test procedure

- **Inputs:** Array $T = \{\}$, $N = 100,000$
- Repeat N times:
 - Step 1:** sample 10 folds (with replacement) from our set of 10 folds (called a subsample)
 - Step 2:** compute test statistic associated with new sample and add to T
- **Step 3:** compute average of numbers in T
- **Step 4:** reduce every number in T by average
- **Output:** % of numbers in T greater than or equal to the observed test statistic

Bootstrap-Shift Test

Fold	System A	System B
1	0.2	0.5
2	0.3	0.3
3	0.1	0.1
4	0.4	0.4
5	1	1
6	0.8	0.9
7	0.3	0.1
8	0.1	0.2
9	0	0.5
10	0.9	0.8
Average	0.41	0.48
	Difference	0.07


Bootstrap-Shift Test

Fold	System A	System B	sample
1	0.2	0.5	0
2	0.3	0.3	1
3	0.1	0.1	2
4	0.4	0.4	2
5	1	1	0
6	0.8	0.9	1
7	0.3	0.1	1
8	0.1	0.2	1
9	0	0.5	2
10	0.9	0.8	0

iteration = 1

Bootstrap-Shift Test

Fold	System A	System B
2	0.3	0.3
3	0.1	0.1
3	0.1	0.1
4	0.4	0.4
4	0.4	0.4
6	0.8	0.9
7	0.3	0.1
8	0.1	0.2
9	0	0.5
9	0	0.5
Average	0.25	0.35
	Difference	0.1



$T = \{0.10\}$

iteration = 1

Bootstrap-Shift Test

Fold	System A	System B	sample
1	0.2	0.5	0
2	0.3	0.3	0
3	0.1	0.1	3
4	0.4	0.4	2
5	1	1	0
6	0.8	0.9	1
7	0.3	0.1	1
8	0.1	0.2	1
9	0	0.5	1
10	0.9	0.8	1

T = {**0.10**}

iteration = 2

Bootstrap-Shift Test

Fold	System A	System B
3	0.1	0.1
3	0.1	0.1
3	0.1	0.1
4	0.4	0.4
4	0.4	0.4
6	0.8	0.9
7	0.3	0.1
8	0.1	0.2
9	0	0.5
10	0.9	0.8
Average	0.32	0.36
	Difference	0.04

iteration = 2

T = {**0.10**,
0.04}

Bootstrap-Shift Test

Fold	System A	System B
1	0.2	0.5
1	0.2	0.5
4	0.4	0.4
4	0.4	0.4
4	0.4	0.4
6	0.8	0.9
7	0.3	0.1
8	0.1	0.2
8	0.1	0.2
10	0.9	0.8
Average	0.38	0.44

Difference 00000000

iteration = 100,000

$T = \{0.10, 0.04, \dots, 0.06\}$

Bootstrap-Shift Test procedure

- **Inputs:** Array $T = \{\}$, $N = 100,000$
- Repeat N times:
 - Step 1:** sample 10 folds (with replacement) from our set of 10 folds (called a subsample)
 - Step 2:** compute test statistic associated with new sample and add to T
- **Step 3:** compute average of numbers in T
- **Step 4:** reduce every number in T by average
- **Output:** % of numbers in T greater than or equal to the observed test statistic

Bootstrap-Shift Test procedure

- For the purpose of this example, let's assume $N = 10$.

$T = \{0.10,$
 $0.04,$
 $0.21,$
 $0.20,$
 $0.13,$
 $0.09,$
 $0.22,$
 $0.07,$
 $0.03,$
 $0.11\}$

Step 3



Step 4

$T' = \{-0.02,$
 $-0.08,$
 $0.09,$
 $0.08,$
 $0.01,$
 $-0.03,$
 $0.10,$
 $-0.05,$
 $-0.09,$
 $-0.01\}$

Average = 0.12

Bootstrap-Shift Test procedure

- For the purpose of this example, let's assume $N = 10$.


$T = \{0.10,$
 $0.04,$
 $0.21,$
 $0.20,$
 $0.13,$
 $0.09,$
 $0.22,$
 $0.07,$
 $0.03,$
 $0.11\}$

This is a one-tailed
test. How can we
modify it to be a
two-tailed test?

Step 3



Step 4



$T' = \{-0.02,$
 $-0.08,$
 $0.09,$
 $0.08,$
 $0.01,$
 $-0.03,$
 $0.10,$
 $-0.05,$
 $-0.09,$
 $-0.01\}$

Average = 0.12

Bootstrap-Shift Test procedure

- **Inputs:** Array $T = \{\}$, $N = 100,000$
- Repeat N times:
 - Step 1:** sample 10 folds (with replacement) from our set of 10 folds (called a subsample)
 - Step 2:** compute test statistic associated with new sample and add to T
 - **Step 3:** compute average of numbers in T
 - **Step 4:** reduce every number in T by average
- **Output:** % of numbers in T greater than or equal to the observed test statistic

Bootstrap-Shift Test procedure

- **Output:** $(3/10) = 0.30$

$T = \{0.10,$
 $0.04,$
 $0.21,$
 $0.20,$
 $0.13,$
 $0.09,$
 $0.22,$
 $0.07,$
 $0.03,$
 $0.11\}$

Step 3



Step 4

$T' = \{-0.02,$
 $-0.08,$
 $0.09,$
 $0.08,$
 $0.01,$
 $-0.03,$
 $0.10,$
 $-0.05,$
 $-0.09,$
 $-0.01\}$

Average = 0.12

Significance Tests

summary

- Significance tests help us determine whether the outcome of an experiment signals a “true” trend
- The null hypothesis is that the observed outcome is due to random chance (sample bias, error, etc.)
- There are many types of tests
- **Parametric tests:** assume a particular distribution for the test statistic under the null hypothesis
- **Non-parametric tests:** make no assumptions about the test statistic distribution under the null hypothesis
- The **randomization** and **bootstrap-shift** tests make no assumptions, are robust, and easy to understand