STATS 507 Data Analysis in Python

Lecture 23: scikit-learn

scikit-learn

Open-source Python machine learning library Built atop numpy, scipy and matplotlib

Makes many common ML/stats models easily available API supports simple model fitting, prediction, cross-validation, etc.

Installation:

pip install scikit-learn (or conda install scikit-learn) ...or install from source (still not recommended)

Example: classifiers in scikit-learn

from sklearn import datasets $digits = datasets.load_digits()$ digits.target[42]

sklearn includes a number of built-in data sets, among which is a version of the famous MNIST digits data set. We'll see more of this when we discuss TensorFlow.

plt.imshow(np.reshape(digits.data[42], (8,8)), cmap='binary')

<matplotlib.image.AxesImage at 0x109815748>

0 1 $\overline{2}$ 3 4 5 6 7

digits.data is an array, entries of which are 64-dimensional vectors, which correspond to images. To display them, we have to reshape them to 8-by-8. The cmap argument specifies a color map. See <https://matplotlib.org/users/colormaps.html>

Example: classifiers in scikit-learn SVC is a support vector machine

```
from sklearn import sym
 clf = svm.SVC(gamma=0.001, C=100.)
  clf.fit(digits.data[:-1], digits.target[:-1])
3
```
(SVM) classifier, one of many classifiers that sklearn provides. It requires two hyperparameters (more on these soon, but for now just treat them as magic).

```
SVC(C=100.0, cache size=200, class weight=None, coef0=0.0,
  decision function shape='ovr', degree=3, gamma=0.001, kernel='rbf',
  max iter =- 1, probability = False, random state = None, shrinking=True,
  tol=0.001, verbose=False)
```
clf.predict(digits.data[-1:])

 $array([8])$

Example: classifiers in scikit-learn $\left| \begin{array}{c} \end{array} \right|$ Every classifier object supports

```
from sklearn import sym
2 clf = svm.SVC(gamma=0.001, C=100.)
  clf.fit(digits.data[:-1], digits.target[:-1])
3
```
a fit method, which takes observations and labels and adjusts the model parameters to best fit that data.

```
SVC(C=100.0, cache_size=200, class_weight=None, coef0=0.0,
  decision function shape='ovr', degree=3, gamma=0.001, kernel='rbf',
  max iter =- 1, probability = False, random state = None, shrinking=True,
  tol=0.001, verbose=False)
```
clf.predict(digits.data[-1:])

 $array([8])$

 $array([8])$

Example: classifiers in scikit-learn

```
from sklearn import svm
2 clf = svm.SVC(gamma=0.001, C=100.)
  clf.fit(digits.data[:-1], digits.target[:-1])
```

```
SVC(C=100.0, cache_size=200, class_weight=None, coef0=0.0,
  decision function shape='ovr', degree=3, gamma=0.001, kernel='rbf',
  max iter =- 1, probability = False, random state = None, shrinking=True,
  tol=0.001, verbose=False)
```


Review: linear regression

$$
y = X\beta + \epsilon
$$

Predictors
$$
X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}
$$

Coefficients
$$
\beta \in \mathbb{R}^d
$$

Noise
$$
\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}^n
$$

Response
$$
y \in \mathbb{R}^n
$$

Ordinary least squares (OLS) $\min_{\beta} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i} (y_i - \beta^T x_i)^2$

Minimizes the sum of the squared residuals between the response and the model prediction. OLS is computationally convenient. The solution can be expressed as an expression of X.

Review: linear regression

$$
y = X \beta + \epsilon
$$

In many applications (e.g., audio, genomics, medical imaging), we expect only a few coefficients to be non-zero. That is, we expect the coefficients to be **sparse**.

Review: linear regression

$$
y = X\beta + \epsilon
$$
\n

Predictors	$X \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$
Coefficients	$\beta \in \mathbb{R}^d$
Noise	$\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}^n$

\nResponse

\n $y \in \mathbb{R}^n$

The key tradeoff here is that whereas OLS had a nice closed-form solution, we have to find a solution to the LASSO using optimization techniques, but that's okay, because sklearn will solve the optimization for us.

F1 score is a good way to assess performance on these kinds of problems. It is a harmonic mean between the recall and precision. https://scikit-learn.org/stable/modules/generated/sklearn.metrics.f1_score.html

Gaussian **M**ixture **M**odel

Unsupervised learning example: k-GMM in sklearn

https://scikit-learn.org/stable/auto_examples/datasets/plot_iris_dataset.html https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Iris_flower_data_set

Basic idea: model data as mixture of Gaussians each Gaussian generates one cluster

For each cluster, estimate mean and covariance Computationally hard...

...but can approximate via EM

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Expectation-maximization_algorithm

Basic idea: model data as mixture of Gaussians each Gaussian generates one cluster

For each cluster, estimate mean and covariance Computationally hard...

...but can approximate via EM

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Expectation-maximization_algorithm

Letting these ellipses represent the level sets of three Gaussians, we hope to see something like this picture.

Basic idea: model data as mixture of Gaussians each Gaussian generates one cluster

For each cluster, estimate mean and covariance Computationally hard...

...but can approximate via EM

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Expectation-maximization_algorithm

Of course, GMM is just one of many clustering algorithms we could choose from. For other options (though hardly an exhaustive list) and a good overview, see here: <https://scikit-learn.org/stable/modules/clustering.html>

Letting these ellipses represent the level sets of three Gaussians, we hope to see something like this picture.

we happen to know that there are really three classes here (there are three species in the data), but typically, we don't know the classes ahead of time, so we don't know how to choose n_components. This is called **model selection**. More on this in a few slides.

The EM algorithm is sensitive to its starting conditions, so we tell sklearn to run the EM algorithm multiple times (10, in this case), with different (random) starting conditions, and it keeps the one with the highest likelihood.

This tells sklearn to estimate a covariance matrix separately for each cluster. Other options include estimating one covariance shared across all clusters ('tied') and estimating spherical covariances for each cluster ('spherical').

Of course, because we chose the wrong number of components, we fail to recover the true cluster structure of the data.


```
qmm = mixture.GaussianMixture(n components=3, n init=10,
                                     covariance type='full')
\overline{2}3
  qmm.fit(R)labs = qmm.predict(R)for i in np.unique(labs):
5
       plt.scatter(sepal ratio[labs==i], petal ratio[labs==i],
6
                     c = colors(i))\overline{7}
```


But even if we choose the correct number of components, the "ratio" representation of the data collapses the versicolor and virginica species, and we get a weird solution.

Clustering with the correct number of components in the original 4-dimensional space recovers the truth.

How should we choose the number of clusters in practice?

Again, typically we don't know, e.g., that there are three species in the data

One popular solution is to use an **information criterion**

- measures how well a model reflects data
- penalizes model complexity

Examples:

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bayesian_information_criterion https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Akaike_information_criterion https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mallows%27s_Cp

See also

https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Minimum_description_length

For different numbers of components and different covariance estimation methods, we're going to fit a GMM with that many components and using that covariance estimation method.

This is a simplified version of the demo here: https://scikit-learn.org/stable/auto_examples/mixture/plot_gmm_selection.html

Now, let's have a look at the BIC scores. Within each covariance estimation method, the number of components with the lowest BIC is the one we should choose.

Now, let's have a look at the BIC scores. Within each covariance estimation method, the number of components with the lowest BIC is the one we should choose.

Spherical and diagonal covariance both seem to think that more components is always better (at least up to 6, anyway). This is unsurprising given the data: it's simple to check that the dimensions of the iris data are correlated.

Now, let's have a look at the BIC scores. Within each covariance estimation method, the number of components with the lowest BIC is the one we should choose.

The lesson here is not that one of these methods will always be best, but that even a principled technique like BIC may sometimes give us the wrong answer.

Model selection in $sklearn$ We need to do a bit of annoying work

because matplotlib doesn't have good support for "grouped" bar plots like this.

If we did not alter the placement of the bars with this extra barwidth business, we would end up with a stacked bar graph like this one.

1750

1500

We also have to alter the location of the ticks on the x-axis, which would otherwise be aligned to the first bar in each group.

If we did not alter the placement of the bars with this extra barwidth business, we would end up with a stacked bar graph like this one.

1750

1500

Similar to model selection, sklearn includes tools for cross-validation (CV) CV is how we choose parameters like alpha in the LASSO

Basic idea:

Try many different choices of parameter Keep the one that gives the best performance on the train data

There are many ways to do this, but we'll focus on K-fold CV See https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Cross-validation (statistics) for more

Cross-validation in sklearn: K-fold CV

We split the training data into K "folds" (K=5 in the example at right). For each fold, we train on the other K-1 folds and evaluate the trained model on the "held-out" fold.

Cross-validation in sklearn: K-fold CV

We split the training data into K "folds" (K=5 in the example at right). For each fold, we train on the other K-1 folds and evaluate the trained model on the "held-out" fold.

On each fold, we evaluate all of the models that are under consideration. We then average each model over the folds and keep the model with the best average score.

Image credit: https://scikit-learn.org/stable/modules/cross_validation.html


```
from sklearn. model selection import cross val score
 1
    (n \text{ samp, dim, k}) = (200, 500, 10)\overline{2}beta = np{\textcdot}zeros(dim)3
    inds = np.random-choice(np.arange(dim), size=k, replace=False)4
    beta[inds] = 5 * np.random.randn(k)5
    X = np.random.randn(n samp, dim)6
    y = np.dot(X, beta) + 0.1*np.random.randn(n samp)We pass a model, observations,
 9
    lasso = Lasso(alpha=5)labels, and a number of folds to 
10
    scores = cross val score(lasso, X, Y, cv=10)
                                                            the cross val score function.
11
    scores
array([0.48286732, 0.31126123, 0.21513214, 0.40061088, 0.40758368,
       0.38318857, 0.25855801, 0.30367255, 0.52062931, 0.41335016])
```
cross val score performs cv splits. On each split, we hold out one fold, train on the rest, and evaluate on the held-out fold. cross val score returns an array of the scores obtained in this way.

```
from sklearn.model selection import cross val score
    alphavals = np.array([0.1, 0.5, 1.0, 5, 10.0, 50, 100])mean scores = np \cdot zeros(alpha \cdot a)sd scores = np{\text{-}zeros(alphabetals{.shape})5
    for i in range(len(alphavals)):
 6
        lasso = Lasso(alpha = alpha = alpha = b[i])scores = \csc val score(lasso, X, y, cv=10)
 8
 9
        mean scores[i] = np.macan (scores)sd scores[i] = np.std(scores)
10
11
12
    plt.errorbar(alphavals, mean scores, yerr=2*sd scores,
                 color='blue', linewidth=3, elinewidth=1)
13
                                                                score
14
   plt.xscale('log'); plt.ylabel('r2 score')
   =plt.xlabel(r'LASSO regularization parameter $\alpha$'
15
```
The score method of the Lasso model is the r2score, which we saw a few slides ago.

Now, we're going to do exactly the same thing, but for several different choices of alpha.

By default, cross val score evaluates based on the score method supplied by the model. This can be changed by specifying the scoring parameter.

Assessing Models: sklearn.metrics

```
gmm = mixture.GaussianMixture(n components=3, n init=10,
                              covariance type='full')
qmm.fit(R)labs = qmm.predict(R)for i in np.unique(labs):
   plt.scatter(sepal ratio[labs==i], petal ratio[labs==i],
                c = colors(i)
```
sklearn.metrics contains a bunch of useful methods for evaluating models.

Example: the adjusted Rand index measures how well two clusterings agree. It's a good measure of how well a clustering that we come up with agrees with the truth. ARI=1 is perfect, ARI=0 is random chance.

from sklearn.metrics import adjusted rand score 1 adjusted rand score(labs, iris.target) $\overline{2}$

0.5075234747132037

https://scikit-learn.org/stable/modules/model_evaluation.html

Model persistence: pickling model objects

```
beta = np{\text -}zeros(dim)inds = np.randomોcode(np.arange(dim), size=k, replace=False)
 2.
   beta[inds] = 5 * np.random.randn(k)3
   (n \text{ samp, dim, k}) = (200, 500, 10)4
   X = np.random.randn(n samp, dim)5
   y = np.dot(X, beta) + 0.1*np.random.randn(n train)6
 R
   lasso = Lasso(alpha=1)lasso.fit(X, y)
 9
   import pickle
12
   s = pickle.dumps(lasso)13
   xtest = np.random.random(1, dim)14
   ytest = np.dot(xtest,beta) + 0.1*np.random.randn(1)
```

```
15
   lasso2 = pickle.loads(s)
```

```
16
   lasso.predict(xtest), lasso2.predict(xtest)
```

```
(\text{array}([-0.60337359]), \text{array}([-0.60337359]))
```
Using the pickle module, we can train a model, and save it in a file and load it again later (e.g., for use in a different program, on a different data set, etc.). We'll see a similar pattern again soon when we discuss TensorFlow.

Here we're picking lasso, and reloading it into lasso2. Note that the two models are indeed the same.