Problem Set #6 Northwestern University EECS 348, Spring 2010

Turn-in procedure: You can turn this in via e-mail in PDF format (to BOTH vrastogi at u.northwestern.edu and ddowney at eecs.northwestern.edu) OR by hardcopy on Friday to Ford 3-345 (slide your assignment under the door) BUT NOTE that access to the Ford 3-345 office is not guaranteed after 5PM. As with homework #5, the reason for the hardcopy option is that typing this particular assignment might be burdensome. It's also okay to e-mail a PDF scan of a hand-written copy. If you send e-mail, use EECS 348 Homework 6 as the e-mail subject line.

White wire	Red wire	Blue wire	Green wire	Explosion
0	0	0	0	1
0	0	1	1	0
0	1	0	0	0
0	1	1	0	1
1	0	0	0	1
1	0	1	1	1
1	1	0	0	1

Table 1: Training data

White wire	Red wire	Blue wire	Green wire	Explosion
0	0	1	0	1
0	0	1	1	1
1	1	0	1	1

Table 2: Validation data

- You're trying to develop a predictor for whether a particular type of explosive device can be disarmed by cutting specific wires within it. The device has four wires of varying colors, and in experiments on recently seized devices, you've observed the training data shown in Table 1. (1 indicates the wire has been cut, or an explosion).
 - a. (4 points) Draw the decision tree that results when using **Table 1** for training. Always split on the feature (wire) that *minimizes* expected entropy after the split, defined as:

$$EAfter(Explosion | Feature) = \sum_{v} P(Feature = v)H(Explosion | Feature = v)$$

where

H(Explosion|Feature = v) =

 $-\sum_{v'} P(Explosion = v' | Feature = v) \log P(Explosion = v' | Feature = v)$ (use the above expressions rather than the mutual information expression from the lecture nodes; the above is similar but removes a constant term and fixes a typo) So for example,

EAfter(red wire | explosion) = - (3/7) ((2/3) log (2/3) + (1/3) log (1/3))

$$-(4/7)((3/4) \log (3/4) + (1/4) \log (1/4)) = 0.258,$$

versus

EAfter(green wire | explosion) = - (2/7) ((1/2) log (1/2) + (1/2) log (1/2)) - (5/7) ((4/5) log (4/5) + (1/5) log (1/5)) = 0.241

So splitting on green wire first is preferable to red wire (though white or blue may be better still). Feel free to use the above expressions (e.g. cutting and pasting into a spreadsheet or search engine) to perform your computations quickly. You should only need to compute about 7 more of these, total.

- b. (1 point) Assume you generate the small set of validation data in Table 2. What is your decision tree's accuracy on the validation data?
- c. (2 points) Which node(s) does the validation data suggest you should prune from your original tree? Prune the best node you can find -- what is the accuracy of your pruned tree on the validation data?
- d. (1 point) What would your tree look like trained on Table 1 if you didn't use any inductive bias? You don't have to draw it, just explain in one or two sentences. With that tree, could you classify the third (last) example in the validation set?



- 2) Consider the above Bayesian Network. Here each letter represents a Boolean random variable. The probability distribution for each variable given its parents is shown. In the tables, P(A) indicates the probability that A is 1 (true); to get the probability that A is false, use 1 -P(A).
 - a. (1 point) Assume C is known to be true. Will knowing the value of B affect the estimated probability that D is true?
 - b. (1 point) What is $P(A, \neg B, \neg C, \neg D, E)$? Show your work.
 - c. (1 point) What is P(C)? Show your work.
 - d. (2 points) How many different numbers would you need to specify the full joint distribution of all five variables, if there weren't any conditional independences? How does this compare to the number of parameters above?

- 3) Pick some problem you're interested in modeling that can be described in about five random variables. So for example, you might choose to predict who will win the next Cubs game, based on the ERA of each starting pitcher, whether the game is home or away, and what the winning percentage of the opponent is.
 - a. (1 point) Draw a Bayes Net capturing your domain -- you **don't** need to specify any probability numbers, just the graph.
 - b. (1 point) Explain one or two conditional independencies exhibited in your graph. If there aren't any, describe the conditional independence that would be most plausible (or "least implausible") in your domain.