Full Model Selection in the Space of Data Mining Operators



Quan Sun, Bernhard Pfahringer and Michael Mayo

Department of Computer Science The University of Waikato, New Zealand {qs12, bernhard, mmayo}@cs.waikato.ac.nz



Te Whare Wananga o Waikato

1 Introduction

In this paper, we propose a framework and a novel algorithm for the full model selection (FMS) problem. The proposed algorithm, combining both genetic algorithms (GA) and particle swarm optimization (PSO), is named GPS, in which a GA is used for searching the optimal structure of a data mining solution, and PSO is used for searching the optimal parameter set for a particular structure instance.

2 The DMO space

We define a search space that consists of all data mining operators that are applicable to a given dataset for a user-specified goal, such as a set of outlier filters, a set of feature selection methods, a set of data transformation techniques and a set of machine learning algorithms. In this sense, we call the subject of interest "the space of data mining operators (DMO)", or simply "the DMO space".

3 The GA-PSO-FMS (GPS) system

The basic steps of the GPS algorithm are: for each GA iteration, firstly a population of DMO template instances is randomly generated (Figure 2 and Figure 3). Then, the placeholders of each template instance are randomly populated with the DMO objects in Table 1. Then, PSO is used for searching an optimal parameter setting for each template instance. The population is sorted by PSO-based evaluation scores. At the end of each GA iteration, typical GA operators can be applied for generating new template instances. The above procedure is repeated *T* times.

BasicGPSProcedure(*T*,*P*,*M*,*W*,*G*): Input: *T* (num.generations for GA), *P* (population size for GA), **M** (num.evolutions for PSO), **W** (swarm size for PSO), **G** (goal metric)

1 ►

- 2 **for** *i* ← 1 to **T**
- 3 Get **P** random template instances

BasicPSOProcedure(*M*,*W*,*G*,*I*,*c*1=2.0,*c*2=2.0): Input: **M** (num.evolutions), **W** (swarm size), **G** (goal metric, default AUC), *I* (a solution template instance), *c1*, *c2* are the weighting coefficients for the personal best the global best positions, default *c1=c2*=2.0

2 population $\leftarrow \emptyset$





Figure 3. A graphical representation of a DMO solution template instance.

- Populate template instances with objects in Table 1
- Use **BasicPSOProcedure**(*M*,*W*,*G*,*I*) to search for the optimal parameter set for each template instance I (optimizing the goal metric **G**), and assign an evaluation score to each template instance I
- Sort the population by evaluation scores
- Do crossover // we use simple one point crossover between the top 20% template instances
- Do *mutation* // we randomly choose 30% template instances from the population, and randomly change one DMO in each template instance
- Replace the last **N** template instances with the **N** new 9 template instances generated in crossover and mutation, where $N = (0.2 + 0.3) \times P$

10 solution-best ← population-best 11 endfor

12 return solution-best

3 particle p.global-best $\leftarrow \emptyset$

4 Initialize swarm (*W* particles) based on *I* 5 **for** *i* ← **M**

- **foreach** particle *p* in population do
- UpdateVelocity(*p*, *c1*, *c2*)
- UpdatePosition(*p*) 8
- $p.G \leftarrow EvaluateTemplateInstance(p, G, I)$
- 10 if $p.G \ge p.personal-best$ 11
 - p.personal-best ← p.position
 - if $p.G \ge p.global-best$
 - p.global-best \leftarrow p.personal-best
- 14 endfor

6

9

12

13

- 15 endfor
- 16 **return** p.global-best

Figure 4. Pseudocode of the GPS algorithm

4 Experimental Results

We experiment with ten real-world classification problems. To test the performance of the GPS algorithm, we implemented a variant of the PSMS system (a PSO-based FMS algorithm) proposed in [1] with the DMO objects defined in Table 1. Figure 6 shows a summary of a comparison of AUC performance between GPS and PSMS under 30 different configurations over ten datasets.



Figure 5. AUC performance 6. AUC performance Figure comparison for the MiniBooNe. between GPS and PSMS under 30 different configurations. particle identification dataset.

Data Sampling	Date Cleansing		Feature Trans.	Feature Sel.
SMOTE oversampling	NumericCleaner		Normalize Standarlize	CfsSubsetEval InfoGainAttributeEval
Resample with replacement	RemoveUseless		Center AddNoise	GainRatioAttributeEval PrincipalComponents
Resample without	ReplaceMissingValues		Discretize NominalToBinary	ChiSquaredAttributeEval Do nothing
Do nothing	Do notring		Do nothing	
Algorithm		HyperParameters		
Bagging with RandomTree		Num.Bagging.Iterations[int], Num.Atts[int], Tree.Depth[int]		
Bagging with REPTree		Num.Bagging.Iterations[int], Num.Folds[int], Tree.Depth[int]		
AdaBoost.M1 with DecisionStump		Num.Boosting.Iterations[int], UseResample[boolean]		
LogitBoost with DecisionStump		Num.Boosting.Iterations[int], UseResample[boolean]		
Bagging with J48 Decision Tree		Num.Bagging.Iterations[int], TreePrune[boolean], Conf.[real]		
RotationForest with REPTree		Num.Iterations[int], PctRemoved [real], Projection {PCA, RandomProj}		

Table 1. WEKA [2] algorithms and filters that are used as the **DMO** objects in the GPS algorithm

5 Conclusions

Our experimental results show that the GPS algorithm outperforms the PSMS system, the state-of-the-art PSObased FMS algorithm on the ten real-world datasets studied in this paper. In the longer version of this paper, we also theoretically examined the feasibility of using the divide and conquer idea for speeding up the GPS algorithm.

References

- [1] H. J. Escalante, M. Montes, and L. E. Sucar. Particle swarm model selection. Journal of Machine Learning Research, 10:405 – 440, 2009.
- [2] M. Hall, E. Frank, G. Holmes, B. Pfahringer, P. Reutemann, and I. Witten. The WEKA data mining software: An update. SIGKDD *Explorations*, 11(1), 2009...