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## Text Classification

- Assign text document a label based on content.
- Examples:
- E-mail filtering
- Knowedge-base creation
- E-commerce
- Question Answering
- Information Extraction


## E-mail Filtering

- Filter e-mail into folders set up by user.
- Aids searching for old e-mails
- Can be used to prioritize incoming e-mails
- High priority to e-mails concerning your Ph.D. thesis
- Low priority to "FREE Pre-Built Home Business"


## Knowedge-Base Creation

- Company web sites provide large amounts of information about products, marketing contact persons, etc.
- Categorization can be used to find companies' web pages and organize them by industrial sector.
- This information can be sold to, e.g. person who wants to market "Flat Fixer" to tire company.


## E-Commerce

- Users locate products in two basic ways: search and browsing.
- Browsing is best when user doesn't know exactly what he/she wants.
- Text classification can be used to organize products into a hierarchy according to description.
- EBay: Classification can be used to ensure that product fits category given by user.


## Question Answering

- "When did George Washington die?"
- Search document database for short strings with answer.
- Rank candidates
- Many features (question type, proper nouns, noun overlap, verb overlap, etc)
- Problem: learn if string is the answer based on its feature values.


## Information Extraction

- Want to extract information from talk announcements (room, time, date, title, speaker, etc)
- Many features may identify the information (keyword, punctuation, capitalization, numeric tokens, etc.)
- Problem: scan over text of document, filling buckets with desired information.
- Freitag (1998) showed that this approach could identify speaker ( $63 \%$ ) , location ( $76 \%$ ), start time ( $99 \%$ ) and end time ( $96 \%$ ).


## Basics of Text Classification

- Canonical Problem: Set of training documents, $\left(d_{1}, \ldots, d_{n}\right)$, with labels, $\left(y_{1}, \ldots, y_{n}\right)$. Set of test documents, $\left(x_{1}, \ldots, x_{n}\right)$.
- Goal: Assign correct labels to test documents.


## Representation

From: dyer@spdcc.com (Steve Dyer)
Subject: Re: food-related seizures?

My comments about the Feingold Diet have no relevance to your daughter's purported FrostedFlakes-related seizures. I can't imagine why you included it.

| $\downarrow$ |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| food | 1 |
| seizures | 2 |
| diet | 1 |
| catering | 0 |
| religion | 0 |
| $\vdots$ | $\vdots$ |

## Representation

- Punctuation is removed, case is ignored, words are separated into tokens. Known as "feature vector" or "bag-of-words" representation.
- Vector length is size of vocabulary. Common vocabulary size is 10,000-100,000. Classification problem is very high dimensional.


## Why is text different?

- Near independence of features
- High dimensionality (often larger vocabulary than \# of examples!)
- Importance of speed


## Word Vector has Problems

- longer document $\Rightarrow$ larger vector
- words tend to occur a little or a lot
- rare words have same weight as common words

Text is Heavy Tailed


## SMART "ltc" Transform

- new- $\mathrm{ff}_{i}=\log \left(\mathrm{tf}_{i}+1.0\right)$
- Corresponds to a power law distribution:

$$
p\left(\mathrm{tf}_{i}\right) \propto\left(1+\mathrm{tf}_{i}\right)^{\log \theta}
$$

- new-wt ${ }_{i}=$ new- $\mathrm{tf}{ }_{i} * \log \frac{\text { num-docs }}{\text { num-docs-with-term }}$ ("TFIDF")
- norm- $^{\mathrm{wt}_{i}}=\frac{\text { new-wt }_{i}}{\sqrt{\sum_{i} \text { new-wt }_{i}^{2}}}$ (unit length vectors)


## Types of Classification Problems

- Binary: label each new document as positive or negative. Is this a news article Tommy would want to read?
- Multiclass: give one of $m$ labels to each new document. Which customer support group should respond to this e-mail?
- Multitopic: assign zero to $m$ topics to each new document. Who are good candidates for reviewing this research paper?
- Ranking: rank categories by relevance. Help user annotate documents by suggesting good categories.


## Multiclass Classification

- Decision Theory: minimum error decision boundary lies where density of top two classes are equal.
- Problem: Learning densities is ineffective for classification



## Multiclass Classification

- Simple approach: construct one binary classifier to discriminate each class from the rest.
- Problem: we can't say anything about the middle regions.



## Multiclass Classification

- Better approach: construct lots of binary classifiers that, together, approximate the true boundaries.



## Error Correcting Output Coding

- Idea: Represent each label as a length $l$ binary code. Learn one binary classifier for each of the $l$ bits in the code.
- For each example, assign label with "closest" code.
- Motivation: errors can be corrected using more bits than are needed to partition labels.

$$
\begin{array}{l|lllllll}
1 & +1 & +1 & +1 & +1 & -1 & -1 & -1 \\
2 & +1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & +1 & -1 & -1 \\
3 & -1 & +1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & +1 & -1 \\
4 & -1 & -1 & +1 & -1 & -1 & -1 & +1
\end{array}
$$

Code matrix

## ECOC: The Loss Function

- ECOC works best when margin values are used

$$
\begin{equation*}
\hat{H}(x)=\arg \min _{c \in\{1, \ldots, m\}} \sum_{i=1}^{l} g\left(f_{i}(x) M_{c i}\right) \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

- The loss function $(g)$ is a transform on the outputs:


Hamming


Hinge (SVM)


Logistic

## ECOC: Some Results

- ECOC works better than using the usual multiclass approach for DTs and NNs. (Dietterich and Bakiri, 1995).
- Loss-based decoding works better than Hamming decoding using SVMs (Allwein et. al., 2000).
- ECOC w/ loss decoding very effective for text classification (Rennie and Rifkin, 2001).


## Multiclass Classification: Interesting Questions

- Is a continuous code matrix useful? (Crammer \& Singer 2001)
- How do you construct best code matrix? (Crammer \& Singer 2000) (Assumes existence of binary classifiers)


## Multitopic Classification

- A document may be composed of many different topics.
- Zero or many topics per document.
- "Label" is a bit vector of topic indicators.

| Iraq <br> Politics |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Oil | London <br> Traffic <br> Taxes |

## Multitopic Classification

- Basic approach: learn a binary classifier for each topic.

| Iraq | vs. | Non-Iraq |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Politics | vs. | Non-Politics |
| Oil | vs. | Non-Oil |

- Problem: "Iraq" doucument contains other things too.


## Multitopic Classification

- How to identify part of document that gives it "Iraq" topic?
- Easier problem: How do we model a multi-topic document?


## Multitopic Classification

- If we ignore word order, each word is randomly generated from one of $m$ topicmodels.
- Problem becomes: how do we learn model for each topic?
- Ueda and Saito (2003) suggest modeling text as a multinomial and learning the models with an EM-like algorithm.



## Parametric Mixture Model

- Let $\vec{y}$ be a label (bit vector)
- Let $\vec{\theta}_{t}=\left(\theta_{t 1}, \ldots, \theta_{t V}\right)$ be the model for topic $t$.
- Let $h_{t}(\vec{y})$ be the label $\vec{y}$ mixing proportion for topic $t$.

Model for a document with label $\vec{y}$ is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\phi(\vec{y})=\sum_{t=1}^{m} h_{t}(\vec{y}) \vec{\theta}_{t} . \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

- Parameters for $\vec{y}$ are a convex combination


## Parametric Mixture Model

- Simple case (PMM1): Assume $h_{t}(\vec{y})$ equals $\frac{1}{k}, k$ is number of non-zero bits in $\vec{y}$. (convex optimization)
- Harder case (PMM2): Learn $h_{t}(\vec{y})$ via EM.
- Ueda and Saito: PMM1 works better than NB, SVM, kNN and NN. PMM2 useful in certain cases.
- PMM related to (McCallum 1999) and Latent Dirichlet Analysis (Blei, Ng, Jordan 2002)


## Multitopic Classification: Interesting Problems

- Identify region(s) of document corresponding to topic(s)
- Capturing correlation between topics
- Hierarchy of topics (is parent or child more appropriate?)


## Ranking

- How do you design a personalized search engine?
- Input: Ranking of documents based on relevance
- Want to learn a function that assigns rankings given a query


## Ranking

- Option 1: Label documents rank $R$ or higher "relevant," $R+1$ or lower "not-relevant," train a classifier. Rank based on classifier confidence values.
- Option 2: Train regression algorithm on rank values. Rank based on regression outputs.
- Option 3: Train a ranking algorithm.


## Ranking

- A ranking algorithm has same form as classification and regression algorithms.
- Example: $f(x)=\sum w_{i} x_{i}$ (linear)
- Difference is training
- Question: What constitutes a mistake?


## Ranking: What is a Mistake?

- Classification: mistake if predicted rank, $r$, greater than $R$ and real rank, $r^{t}$ less than $R$ (or vice versa)
- Regression: error is difference between predicted value and true rank, $\left(r-r^{t}\right)^{2}$
- Ranking: mistake if documents are in wrong order


## Ranking Loss: Examples

- Let $\left\{d_{1}, \ldots, d_{n}\right\}$ be a set of documents.
- Let $\left\{y_{1}^{t}, \ldots, y_{n}^{t}\right\}$ be the true ranks.
- Let $\left\{\hat{y}_{1}, \ldots, \hat{y}_{n}\right\}$ be the predicted ranks.
- Let $e_{i}=\left|y_{i}^{t}-\hat{y}_{i}\right|$.
- Loss $=\sum_{i} e_{i}$.


## Ranking Loss

- Ranking Loss better suited to a ranking problem
- Crammer and Singer (2002) show that using a ranking loss function works better on text than using the zero-one classification loss.


## Review

- "Text Classification" appears in many forms
- Multiclass classification
- Multitopic classification
- Ranking


## Tokenization

- First step of text classification is tokenization.

> Document $\rightarrow$ Tokenization $\quad \rightarrow$ Stemming $\rightarrow$
> Feature Selection $\rightarrow$ Bag of Words
"They just canceled them completely"

| canceled | completely | just | them | they |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Tokenization

- Tokenization determines the features for the classifier
- A bad classifier with good features can easily outperform a good classifier with bad features
- Very important step!


## Tokenization

- Tokenization gets little attention
- Standard methods: separate on whitespace, alphabetic strings, alphanumeric strings.
- Problem: different tokenizations work best for different domains.
- Is there a better way?


## Compression for Word Learning

- Can compression help tokenization?
- We want tokens to reflect features that appear in the documents.
- Compression encourages the construction of features that appear more frequently than their individual characters would imply.


## Compression for Word Learning: An Idea

- Begin with individual characters as the tokens.
- Allow pairs of tokens to be compressed together.
- De Marcken (1995) did exactly this.
- Creates a hierarchical decomposition of documents.


## Compression: Examples

| Rank | $-\log p_{G}(w)$ | $w$ | $\operatorname{rep}(w)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 4.589 | . | terminal |
| 1 | 4.890 | , | terminal |
| 100 | 10.333 | [ two] | [ [two]] |
| 101 | 10.342 | [ it was] | [[ it][ was]] |
| 501 | 12.467 | [ized] | [[ize]d] |
| 502 | 12.469 | [ling] | [l[ing]] |
| 15000 | 16.684 | [ pakistan] | [[ palk[ist][an]] |
| 15001 | 16.684 | [ creativity] | [ [creat][ivity]] |
| 27167 | 18.006 | [[ massachus | tts][ institute of technology]] |

## Compression: Hierarchy Example

$$
\begin{aligned}
& [[f[\mathrm{rr}]][[\mathrm{t}[\mathrm{he}]]][[[\mathrm{p}[\mathrm{ur}]]][[\mathrm{po}] \mathrm{s}] \mathrm{e}][\mathrm{of}]]]][[[\mathrm{ma}[\mathrm{in}]][\mathrm{ta}[\mathrm{in}]]][\text { [in]g]]} \\
& [[[i n]][\mathrm{ter}]]][[\mathrm{n}[\mathrm{a}[\mathrm{t}[\mathrm{i}[\mathrm{on}]]]]][\mathrm{al}]]][[\mathrm{pe}][\mathrm{a}[\mathrm{ce}]]][\mathrm{an}] \mathrm{d}][[\mathrm{p}[\mathrm{ro}]][[\mathrm{mo}] \mathrm{t}][[\mathrm{in}] \mathrm{g}]] \\
& [\mathrm{t}[\mathrm{he}]][[\mathrm{adv}[\mathrm{a}[\mathrm{n}[\mathrm{ce}]]]][[[\mathrm{me}] \mathrm{n}] \mathrm{t}]][[\mathrm{of}][\mathrm{a}[11]]][\mathrm{pe}][\mathrm{op}][\mathrm{le}]][[\mathrm{t}[\mathrm{he}]] \\
& [[[[\text { un }][\mathrm{itt}]][\mathrm{ed}]][[[\mathrm{st}[\mathrm{at}]] \mathrm{e}] \mathrm{s}]]][[\mathrm{of}][\mathrm{a}[\mathrm{me}][\mathrm{r}[\mathrm{ic}]] \mathrm{a}]]][[\mathrm{job}][\mathrm{in}]][\mathrm{ed}]][\mathrm{in}] \\
& {[f[o[u n] d]][[i n] g][[t[h e]][[[[u n][i t]][\mathrm{ed}]][[\mathrm{n}[\mathrm{a}[\mathrm{t}[\mathrm{i}[\mathrm{on}]]]]] \mathrm{s}]]]}
\end{aligned}
$$

- Tokens can be taken from any level of the hierarchy-from "ur" to "the united nations."
- Much more useful than collecting all substrings.
- Compression object eliminates numerous meaningless strings.


## Classification via Compression

Standard compression problem:

- Want to transmit labels with fewest number of bits.
- Documents can be used as background knowledge.
- What is fewest number of bits needed to transmit labels?



## Examples of Learned Features

| $\bullet \mathrm{x}$ | comp.os.xwindows |
| :---: | :---: |
| ヶwindows | comp.os.ms-windows.misc |
| -car $\quad$ | rec.autos |
| for - sale | misc.forsale |
| -turk | talk.politics.mideast |
| 486 | comp.sys.ibm.pc.hardware |
| 3.1 | comp.os.ms-windows.misc |
| - \$ | misc.forsale |
| twcondition | misc.forsale |

## String Kernels

- Kernel method
- Documents projected into feature space of substrings
- Requires discount factor (longer strings receive less weight)
- Thought up by Haussler (1999) and Watkins (1999).
- Lodhi et. al. (2001) successfully applied string kernels to text-found they work about as well as substrings.


## Summary

- Text classification comes in many different flavors.
- Text presents interesting and unique problems.

