18 LEARNING FROM OBSERVATIONS

• An intelligent agent may have to learn, for instance, the following components:
  • A direct mapping from conditions on the current state to actions
  • A means to infer relevant properties of the world from the percept sequence
  • Information about the way the world evolves and about the results of possible actions the agent can take
  • Utility information indicating the desirably of world states
  • Action-value information indicating the desirably of actions
  • Goals that describe classes of states whose achievement maximizes the agent’s utility

• The type of feedback available for learning determines the nature of the learning problem that the agent faces
  • **Supervised learning** involves learning a function from examples of its inputs and outputs
  • **Unsupervised learning** involves learning patterns in the input when no specific output values are supplied
  • In **reinforcement learning** the agent must learn from reinforcement (reward, less exact feedback than in supervised learning)

• The representation of the learned information plays an important role in determining how the learning algorithm must work
18.2 Inductive Learning

- In deterministic supervised learning the aim is to recover the unknown function \( f \) given examples \((x, f(x))\), where \( x \) is the input (vector)
- In pure inductive inference (or induction) the result is a hypothesis \( h \), which is function that approximates \( f \)
- A good hypothesis will generalize well – will predict unseen instances correctly
- The hypothesis is chosen from a hypothesis space \( H \)
- For example, when both \( x \) and \( f(x) \) are real numbers, then \( H \) can be, e.g., the set of polynomials of degree at most \( k \):
  \[ 3x^2 + 2, \ x^{17} - 4x^3, \ldots \]

A consistent hypothesis agrees with all the data

- How do we choose from among multiple consistent hypotheses?
- Occam's (Ockham's) razor: prefer the simplest hypothesis consistent with the data
- How to define simplicity?

\[ f(x) \]

\[ x \]
The learning problem is called realizable if the hypothesis space contains the true function; otherwise it is unrealizable. On the other hand, in the name of better generalization ability it may be sensible to trade off exactness of fitting to simplicity of the hypothesis. In other words, it may be sensible to be content with a hypothesis fitting the data less perfectly as long as it is simple. The hypothesis space needs to be restricted so that finding a hypothesis that fits the data stays computationally efficient. Machine learning concentrates on learning relatively simple knowledge representations.

18.3 Learning Decision Trees

A decision tree takes as input an object or situation described by a set of attributes. It returns a decision — the predicted output value for the input. If the output values are discrete, then the decision tree classifies the inputs. Learning a continuous function is called regression. Each internal node in the tree corresponds to a test of the value of one of the properties, and the branches from the node are labeled with possible values of the test. Each leaf node in the tree specifies the value to be returned if the leaf is reached. To process an input, it is directed from the root of the tree through internal nodes to a leaf, which determines the output value.
A decision tree (of reasonable size) is an easy to comprehend way of representing knowledge

- Important in practice, heuristically learnable
- The previous decision tree corresponds to the goal predicate
  \textbf{WillWait} – whether to wait for a table in a restaurant
- Its goal predicate can be seen as an assertion of the form
  \[ \forall s: \text{WillWait}(s) \iff (P_1(s) \lor \ldots \lor P_n(s)), \]
  where each \(P_i(s)\) is a conjunction of tests corresponding to a path from the root of the tree to a leaf with a positive outcome
- An exponentially large decision tree can express any Boolean function
Typically, decision trees can represent many functions with much smaller trees. For some kinds of functions this, however, this is a real problem, e.g., xor and maj need exponentially large decision trees. Decision trees, like any other knowledge representation, are good for some kinds of functions and bad for others. Consider the set of all Boolean functions on $n$ attributes. How many different functions are in this set? The truth table has $2^n$ rows, so there are $2^{2^n}$ different functions. For example, when $n = 6 \Rightarrow 2^{2^6} > 18 \times 10^{18}$, we will need some ingenious algorithms to find consistent hypotheses in such a large space.

Top-down induction of decision trees

The input to the algorithm is a training set, which consists of examples $(X, y)$, where $X$ is a vector of input attribute values and $y$ is the single output value (class value) attached to them. We could simply construct a consistent decision tree that has one path from the root to a leaf for each example. Then we would be able to classify all training examples correctly, but the tree would not be able to generalize at all. Applying Occam’s razor, we should find the smallest decision tree that is consistent with the examples. Unfortunately, for any reasonable definition of “smallest,” finding the smallest tree is an intractable problem.
Successful decision tree learning algorithms are based on simple heuristics and do a good of finding a smallish tree. The basic idea is to test the most important attribute first. Because the aim is to classify instances, “most important” attribute is the one that makes the most difference to the classification of an example. Actual decision tree construction happens with a recursive algorithm:

- First the most important attribute is chosen to the root of the tree,
- the training data is divided according to the values of the chosen attribute, and
- (sub)tree construction continues using the same idea

```c
Tree growConsTree( Attrs A, Exs S )
{
    if ( all examples in S have class C )
        return an one-leaf tree labeled by C;
    else {
        select an attribute α from A;
        partition S into S₁, ..., Sₖ by the value of α;
        for ( i = 1; I <= k; i++ )
            Tᵢ = growConsTree( A\{-α}, Sᵢ );
        return a tree T that has α in its root and
        Tᵢ as its i-th subtree; }
}
```
Choosing attribute tests

- The idea is to pick the attribute that goes as far as possible toward providing an exact classification of the examples
- A perfect attribute divides the examples into sets that contain only instances of one class
- A really useless attribute leaves the example sets with roughly the same proportion of instances of all classes as the original set
- To measure the usefulness of attributes we can use, for instance, the expected amount of information provided by the attribute – i.e., its Shannon entropy
- Information theory measures information content in bits
- One bit of information is enough to answer a yes/no question about which one has no idea, such as the flip of a fair coin
In general, if the possible answers \( v_i \) have probabilities \( P(v_i) \), then the entropy \( H \) of the actual answer is

\[
H(P(v_1), \ldots, P(v_n)) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} - P(v_i) \log_2 P(v_i)
\]

For example, \( H(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}) = 2(-\frac{1}{2} \log_2(\frac{1}{2})) = 1 \text{ bit} \)

In choosing attribute tests, we want to calculate the change of the value distribution \( P(C) \) of the class attribute \( C \), if the training set \( S \) is divided into subsets according to the value of attribute \( a \)

\[
\text{Gain}_S(P(C) | a) = \sum_{S_i} (|S_i|/|S|) \cdot H_{S_i}(P(C))
\]

where

\[
\text{Gain}_S(P(C) | a) = \sum_{S_i} (|S_i|/|S|) \cdot H_{S_i}(P(C))
\]

Let the training set \( S \) contain 14 apples and 6 pears

Hence,

\[
H_S(P(C)) = H(0.7, 0.3) \approx 0.7 \times 0.515 + 0.3 \times 1.737 \approx 0.881
\]

Suppose that attribute \( a \) divides the data s.t.

\[
S_1 = \{ 7 \text{ apples, 3 pears} \},
S_2 = \{ 7 \text{ apples} \}, \text{ and}
S_3 = \{ 3 \text{ pears} \}
\]

then

\[
\text{Gain}_S(P(C) | a) = \sum_{S_i} (|S_i|/|S|) \cdot H_{S_i}(P(C))
\]

\[
\approx (10/20) \times H(0.7, 0.3) + 0 + 0
\]

\[
\approx \frac{1}{2} \times 0.881 \approx 0.441
\]
Assessing performance of learning algorithms

- Divide the set of examples into disjoint training set and test set
- Apply the training algorithm to the training set, generating a hypothesis $h$
- Measure the percentage of examples in the test set that are correctly classified by $h$
- Repeat the above-mentioned steps for different sizes of training sets and different randomly selected training sets of each size
- The result of this procedure is a set of data that can be processed to give the average prediction quality as a function of the size of the training set
- Plotting this function on a graph gives the learning curve

An alternative (better) approach to testing is cross-validation

Noise and overfitting

- If there are two or more examples with the same description (in terms of attributes) but different classifications, then no consistent decision tree exists
- The solution is to have each leaf node report either
  - The majority classification for its set of examples, if a deterministic hypothesis is required, or
  - the estimated probabilities of each classification using the relative frequencies
- It is quite possible, and in fact likely, that even when vital information is missing, the learning algorithm will find a consistent decision tree
- This is because the algorithm can use irrelevant attributes, if any, to make spurious distinctions among the examples
Consider trying to predict the roll of a die on the basis of
- The day and
- The month in which the die was rolled, and
- Which is color of the die,
then as long as no two examples have identical descriptions, the
learning algorithm will find an exact hypothesis
- Such a hypothesis will be totally spurious
- The more attributes there are, the more likely it is that an exact
  hypothesis will be found
- The correct tree to return would be a single leaf node with
  probabilities close to 1/6 for each roll
- This problem is an example of overfitting, a very general
  phenomenon afflicting every kind of learning algorithm and target
  function, not only random concepts

Decision tree pruning

- A simple approach to deal with overfitting is to prune the decision
tree
- Pruning works by preventing recursive splitting on attributes that
  are not clearly relevant

- Suppose we split a set of examples using an irrelevant attribute
- Generally, we would expect the resulting subsets to have roughly
  the same proportions of each class as the original set
- In this case, the information gain will be close to zero

- How large a gain should we require in order to split on a
  particular attribute?
A statistical **significance test** begins by assuming that there is no underlying pattern (the so-called **null hypothesis**) and then analyzes the actual data to calculate the extent to which they deviate from a perfect absence of pattern.

- If the degree of deviation is statistically unlikely (usually taken to mean a 5% probability or less), then that is considered to be good evidence for the presence of a significant pattern in the data.
- The probabilities are calculated from standard distributions of the amount of deviation one would expect to see in random sampling.
- Null hypothesis: the attribute at hand is irrelevant and, hence, its information gain for an infinitely large sample is zero.
- We need to calculate the probability that, under the null hypothesis, a sample of size \(v\) would exhibit the observed deviation from the expected distribution of examples.

Let the numbers positive and negative examples in each subset be \(p_i\) and \(n_i\), respectively.

- Their expected values, assuming true irrelevance, are
  \[
  p'_i = p \cdot (p_i + n_i) / (p + n)
  \]
  \[
  n'_i = n \cdot (p_i + n_i) / (p + n)
  \]

  where \(p\) and \(n\) are the total numbers of positive and negative examples in the training set.

- A convenient measure for the total deviation is given by
  \[
  D = \sum_{i=1}^{v} (p_i - p'_i)^2 / p'_i + (n_i - n'_i)^2 / n'_i
  \]

- Under the null hypothesis, the value of \(D\) is distributed according to the \(\chi^2\) (chi-squared) distribution with \((v-1)\) degrees of freedom.
- The probability that the attribute is really irrelevant can be calculated with the help of standard \(\chi^2\) tables.
The above method is known as $\chi^2$ (pre-)pruning.

Pruning allows the training examples to contain noise and it also reduces the size of the decision trees and makes them more comprehensible.

More common than pre-pruning are post-pruning methods in which:

- One first constructs a decision tree that is as consistent as possible with the training data and
- Then removes those subtrees that have likely been added due to the noise.

In cross-validation the known data is divided in $k$ parts, each of which is used as a test set in its turn for a decision tree that has been grown on the other $k-1$ subsets.

Thus one can approximate how well each hypothesis will predict unseen data.

In practice decision tree learning has to answer also the following questions:

- Missing attribute values: while learning and in classifying instances.
- Multivalued discrete attributes: value subsetting or penalizing against too many values.
- Numerical attributes: split point selection for interval division.
- Continuous-valued output attributes.

Decision trees are used widely and many good implementations are available (even for free).

Decision trees fulfill understandability, contrary to neural networks, which is a legal requirement for financial decisions.
18.4 Ensemble Learning

- Select a whole collection, or ensemble, of hypotheses and combine their prediction
- For example, we might generate a hundred different decision trees from the same training set and have them vote on the best classification for a new instance
- If an ensemble contains 5 hypotheses and we combine their predictions using simple majority voting, then misclassifying an instance requires that at least three of the five hypotheses have to misclassify it
- In general, we hope that the misclassification of three hypotheses is less likely than a misclassification by a single hypothesis
Conclusion

- AI is a very broad research field, also methodologically
- We could have had a totally different course based on the same textbook
- Important research innovations are achieved daily
- Probabilistic approach has passed the logical one

- High-visibility demonstrations of the possibilities of the methods are received with accelerating speed
- Also less publicized everyday applications of AI keep increasing

- The interaction of a physical agent with its working environment and humans still needs further steps