CS442/542b: Artificial Intelligence II Prof. Olga Veksler

Lecture 5: Machine Learning Boosting

Boosting: motivation

- It is usually hard to design an accurate classifier which generalizes well
- However it is usually easy to find many "rule of thumb" or "weak" classifiers
 - A classifier is weak if it is only slightly better than random guessing
 - Weak classifier example: if an email has word "money" classify it as spam
 - This classifier is likely to be better than random guessing
- Can we combine several weak classifiers to produce an accurate classifier?
 - Question people have been working on since 1980's
 - Ada-Boost (1996) the first practical boosting algorithm

Ada Boost

 Assume we have 2-class classification problem, with labels +1 and -1

• **y**_i∈ {-1,1}

Ada boost will produce a discriminant function:

$$g(x) = \sum_{t=1}^{l} \alpha_t h_t(x) = \alpha_1 h_1(x) + \alpha_2 h_2(x) + \dots + \alpha_T h_T(x)$$

where h_t(x) is a "weak" classifier, for example:

$$h_t(x) = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{if email has word "money"} \\ 1 & \text{if email doesn't have "money} \end{cases}$$

As usual, the final classifier is the sign of the discriminant function f_{final}(x) = sign[g(x)]









- Ada boost is very simple to implement, provided you have an implementation of a "weak learner"
- Will work as long as the "basic" classifier *h*_t(*x*) is at least slightly better than random
 - will work if the error rate of h_t(x) is less than 0.5
 - 0.5 is the error rate of a random guessing classifier for a 2class problem
- Can be applied to boost any classifier, not necessarily weak
 - but there may be no benefits in boosting a "strong" classifier



























AdaBoost Comments

- But we are really interested in the generalization properties of f_{FINAL}(x), not the training error
- AdaBoost was shown to have excellent generalization properties in practice
 - the more rounds, the more complex is the final classifier, so overfitting is expected as the training proceeds
 - but in the beginning researchers observed no overfitting of the data
 - It turns out it does overfit data eventually, if you run it really long
- It can be shown that boosting "aggressively" increases the margins of training examples, as iterations proceed
 - margins continue to increase even when training error reaches zero
 - Helps to explain empirically observed phenomena: test error continues to drop even after training error reaches zero







