

Boosted decision trees

From a single tree to an XGBoost model

Martin Jullum

Insurance company Feb 4th 2019





Problem setup

• Assume with have a training data set of size n

- Response: y_i
- Covariates: $x_i = (x_{i1}, ..., x_{ip})^{\mathsf{T}}, i = 1, ..., n$
- Want to train a model f on these data such that f(x_i) approximates y_i as well as possible (on a seperate test data set!) in terms of a loss function L(y_i, f(x_i))



Tree models (I)

- Conceptually the simplest statistical model existing!
 - The function is evaluated by a series of conditional IF-ELSE rules
 - As a tree: Start at the root and work your way through the branches depending on your covariate values, ending up at the leaves





Tree models (II)



3 visualizations of the same tree model

 May be written as a weighted sum of indicator values over the regions



$$f(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{T} \theta_j \, \mathbb{1}_{\{x \in R_j\}}$$

4

Training a tree model

- Computationally intractable to find the best partitioning w.r.t. general $L(y_i, f(x_i))$
 - Use a greedy algorithm, which iteratively grows the tree
- Algorithm:
 - For each leaf node R_j , j = 1, ..., in the current tree DO:
 - For each covariate x_j , find the split point corresponding to new potential regions R_{1j} , R_{2j} minimizing the split loss

$$\sum_{i \in R_j} [L\left(y_i, \hat{y}_{R_{1j}}\right) + L\left(y_i, \hat{y}_{R_{2j}}\right)] \qquad (*)$$

where $\hat{y}_{R_{kj}} = \operatorname{argmin}_c \sum_{i \in R_{kj}} L(y_i, c).$

- Choose the leaf node, covariate and split point with smallest split loss
- Perform the split if loss reduction is large enough in terms of e.g. previous loss reductions, depth, number of nodes, etc.
- REPEAT

Properties of tree models

- Benefits
 - Models non-linearities and interactions directly
 - Invariant under monotone transformations of the covariates
 - Easy to train scales well to large data sets
 - Naturally combines continuous and categorical data
 - Easy to explain and interpret
 - Can handle missing data
 - Robust to outliers in the covariates
- Drawbacks
 - Limited predictive power
 - High variance
 - Somewhat arbitrary handling of overfitting/regularization
 - Lack smoothness



Bagging and random forest

- Bagging = Bootstrap aggregating, Breiman (1994)
 - Model ensamble technique used to improve the predictive power of single models by averaging models fitted to independent bootstrapped samples of the training data

$$\hat{f}_{bag}(x) = \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^{B} \hat{f}^{*b}(x)$$

- Prefers low bias high variance type models
- Random Forest, Breiman (2001)
 - Bagging with tree models
 - Often 100-1000 typically deep models
 - Extra trick to decrease correlation among trees:
 - For every split ,sample a few variables that are allowed to make the split



Boosting: The principle

- Kearns (1988) asked whether a set of weak learners could be combined into a strong learner
- ► Freund and Schapire (1997): YES, with AdaBoost
- AdaBoost idea
 - Iteratively fit simple models $f_m(x)$ (weak learners) trying to correct «mistakes» of previous models
 - Combine them additively into a model ensamble with good predictive performance (strong learner)

$$f^{(M)}(x) = \sum_{m=1}^{M} f_m(x)$$



Example Adaboost





Adaboost as FSAM

- ► Friedman et al. (2000): Adaboost is equivalent to Forward Stagewise Additive Modelling (FSAM) with the loss function: L(y, f(x)) = exp(-yf(x))
- FSAM: For m = 1, ..., M, find model f_m by minimizing the empirical risk

$$f_m = \arg \min_{h \in \Phi} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n L(y_i, f^{(m-1)}(x_i) + h(x_i))$$

- $f^{(m-1)}(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{m-1} f_j(x)$, with $f^{(0)}(x) = 0$
- For some model class Φ
- A very general procedure, but hard to do for general loss function



Gradient boosting

- Gradient descent
 - Iterative procedure for finding minimum of (multivariate) function s(z)
 - Iteratively take steps along the negative gradient: $z_m = z_{m-1} \rho_m s'(z_{m-1})$
- Gradient boosting (Friedman (2001))
 - Notation: Let $s_i(z) = L(y_i, z)$
 - Take a gradient descent step towards the minimum of s_i , at $z = f^{(m-1)}(x_i)$ for all i
 - Class restriction solved by using the function closest in L2 to the negative gradient: $f_{m,0} = \arg\min_{h \in \Phi} \sum_{i=1}^{n} [-s_i'(f^{(m-1)}(x_i)) h(x_i)]^2$ For Φ = Tree models, the green «loss» is fed to the tree learner (*)

• The step length:
$$\rho_m = \arg\min_{\rho} \sum_{i=1}^n L\left(y_i, f^{(m-1)}(x_i) + \rho f_{m,0}(x_i)\right)$$
,

- Finally: $f_m(x) = \gamma \rho_m f_{m,0}(x)$, for some pre-set learning rate $\gamma \in (0,1]$
- This is the most common boosting method, e.g. gbm package in R 11

2. order approximation

- ► Approximate $L(y_i, f^{(m-1)}(x_i) + h(x_i))$, using a 2. order Taylor approximation of $s_i(z)$ around $z = f^{(m-1)}(x_i)$
- $s^* \left(f^{(m-1)}(x_i) + h(x_i) \right) =$ $s_i \left(f^{(m-1)}(x_i) \right) + s_i' \left(f^{(m-1)}(x_i) \right) h(x_i) + \frac{1}{2} s_i'' \left(f^{(m-1)}(x_i) \right) h(x_i)^2$
- Inserting this into the FSAM solution gives

$$f_{m,0} = \arg\min_{h\in\Phi} \sum_{i=1}^{n} [s^*(f^{(m-1)}(x_i) + h(x_i))]$$

= $\arg\min_{h\in\Phi} \sum_{i=1}^{n} [s_i'(f^{(m-1)}(x_i))h(x_i) + \frac{1}{2}s_i''(f^{(m-1)}(x_i))h(x_i)^2]$
= $\arg\min_{h\in\Phi} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{2}s''(f^{(m-1)}(x_i))[-\frac{s'(f^{(m-1)}(x_i))}{s''(f^{(m-1)}(x_i))} - h(x_i)]^2$

- For Φ = Tree models, the green «loss» is fed to the tree learner (*)
- Finally: $f_m(x) = \gamma f_{m,0}(x)$, for some pre-set learning rate γ
- This is the method used by XGBoost, with Φ being tree models ¹²

Bagging vs. boosting with tree models

- Bagging
 - Combines models attempting to reduce the overall variance
 - $Var(\frac{1}{2}(X+Y)) = \frac{1}{4}Var(X) + \frac{1}{4}Var(Y) + \frac{1}{2}Cov(X,Y)$
 - Suitable to combine models with low bias (+ high variance)
 - Trains independent models easy to parallelize
- Boosting
 - Combines models attempting to reduce the overall bias (weak learner -> strong learner)
 - Suitale to combine models with low variance (+ high bias)
 - Trains dependent models sequentially
- Bagging less senstive to parameter choices than boosting
- Deep (bagging) and shallow (boosting) tree models are suitable due to mentioned benefits
 - Drawbacks of tree models are reduced by ensambling

XGBoost = eXtreme Gradient Boosting

- A machine learning library built around an efficient implementation of boosting for tree models (like GBM)
 - Developed by Tianqi Chen (Uni. Washington) i 2014
- Core library in C++, with interfaces for many languages/platforms
 - C++, Python, R, Julia, Java, etc.
 - Distributed version for Hadoop + Spark
- Engineering goal: "Push the limit of computational resources for boosted tree algorithms"
 - Parallelizable, cheap on memory, scales to large data sets
- Very powerful and flexible lots of (hyper)parameters
- Huge success
 - «Winning practically every prediction competiton on Kaggle»



XGBoost – methodological improvements

- Tree boosting inherits most benefits and fixes the drawbacks of individual tree models
- order approx. to FSAM more precise than regular gradient boosting
- Introduced regularization directly in the tree growing procedure
 - Actually tries to minimize, $L(y_i, f^{(m-1)}(x_i) + h(x_i)) + \Omega(h)$,
 - $\Omega(h) = \gamma T + \frac{1}{2}\lambda \sum_{j}^{T} w_{j}^{2} + \alpha \sum_{j}^{T} |w_{j}|$, for w_{j} the leaft values of tree of depth T
 - Also other regularization parameters available
- Subsampling of both rows and columns of covariate matrix available for better generalization properties



XGBoost – technical improvements

- Very fast and cheap on memory
 - Store data in internal sparsity aware format memory friendly
 - The tree learning algorithm utilizes the sparse structure
 - Parallelizes tree learning per covariate
 - Example: n=2*10^6, p=200, Y={0,1}, depth=6, 150sec with 16 threads, a few GB of RAM consumption.
- Allows the user to view the performance of the current model during training
- Can automatically stop boosting when performance on spearate (cross) validation set decreases
- User can set custom loss function and evaluation metric for stopping
- Implemented direct handling of missing values learning a default direction for NA

XGBoost – community contributions

- ► DART (Dropout Additive Regression Trees) (Feb 2016)
 - Drop given proportion of trained trees when learning a new tree
 - More randomization -> link to random forest
- ► Histogram approach (Jan 2017)
 - Discretize continuous covariates into default bins for faster training, 4-10 times faster
- ► GPU version (Aug 2017)
 - 2-4 times faster than histogram approach on CPU
- Covariate contribution per prediction supported natively by SHAP (Oct 2017)
- Monotonic constraints (Jan 2018) and feature interaction constraints (Nov 2018)

XGBoost – Remarks

- Competitors
 - LightGBM (Microsoft)
 - Very similar, not as mature and feature rich
 - Has pushed the development of XGBoost
 - Still slightly faster than XGBoost?
 - CatBoost (Yandex, "Russian Google")
 - Also similar, but handles categorical variables directly
 - Was much slower, but has improved a lot
- XGBoost can be called from caret, h2o R-packages + scikitlearn in Python
- I have still not seen an example where Random Forest outperforms a tuned XGBoost model!
- Main disadvantage? «Hard» to fit optimal model with many hyperparameters

Key resources

- Didrik Nielsen, Master thesis NTNU, 2016: <u>https://brage.bibsys.no/xmlui/handle/11250/2433761</u>
- Chen & Guestrin (2016), XGBoost: A Scalable Tree Boosting System: <u>https://arxiv.org/abs/1603.02754</u>
- ▶ Hastie et al. (2009), Elements of Statistical Learning, Ch 9.2 + 10
- XGBoost Github: <u>https://github.com/dmlc/xgboost</u>
- XGBoost documentation: <u>http://xgboost.readthedocs.io</u>
- Slides from Meetup in LA with Tianqi Chen: <u>http://datascience.la/xgboost-workshop-and-meetup-talk-with-tianqi-chen/</u>

