

# Reducing Multiclass to Binary

LING572

Fei Xia

# Highlights

- What?
  - Converting a k-class problem to a binary problem.
- Why?
  - For some ML algorithms, a direct extension to the multiclass case may be problematic.
  - Ex: Boosting, support-vector machines (SVM)
- How?
  - Many methods

# Methods

- One-vs-all
- All-pairs
- Error-correcting Output Codes (ECOC)\*\*:  
see additional slides
- ...

# One-vs-all

- Idea:
  - Each class is compared to all others.
  - $K$  classifiers: one classifier for each class.
- Training time:
  - For each class  $c_m$ , train a classifier  $cl_m(x)$ 
    - replace  $(x,y)$  with
      - $(x, 1)$  if  $y = c_m$
      - $(x, -1)$  if  $y \neq c_m$

# An example: training

- $x_1 \ c_1 \ \dots$
- $x_2 \ c_2 \ \dots$
- $x_3 \ c_1 \ \dots$
- $x_4 \ c_3 \ \dots$

for  $c_1$ -vs-all:

$x_1 \ 1 \ \dots$   
 $x_2 \ -1 \ \dots$   
 $x_3 \ 1 \ \dots$   
 $x_4 \ -1 \ \dots$

for  $c_2$ -vs-all:

$x_1 \ -1$   
 $x_2 \ 1 \ \dots$   
 $x_3 \ -1 \ \dots$   
 $x_4 \ -1 \ \dots$

for  $c_3$ -vs-all:

$x_1 \ -1 \ \dots$   
 $x_2 \ -1 \ \dots$   
 $x_3 \ -1 \ \dots$   
 $x_4 \ 1 \ \dots$

# One-vs-all (cont)

- Testing time: given a new example  $x$ 
  - Run each of the  $k$  classifiers on  $x$
  - Choose the class  $c_m$  with the highest confidence score  $cl_m(x)$ :
$$c^* = \arg \max_m cl_m(x)$$

# An example: testing

- x1 c1 ...
- x2 c2 ...
- x3 c1 ...
- x4 c3 ...

→ three classifiers

for c1-vs-all:

x ?? 1 0.7 -1 0.3

for c2-vs-all

x ?? 1 0.2 -1 0.8

for c3-vs-all

x ?? 1 0.6 -1 0.4

Test data:

x ?? f1 v1 ...

=> what's the system prediction for x?

# All-pairs

- Idea:
  - all pairs of classes are compared to each other
  - $C_k^2$  classifiers: one classifier for each class pair.
- Training:
  - For each pair  $(c_m, c_n)$  of classes, train a classifier  $cl_{mn}$ 
    - replace a training instance  $(x,y)$  with
      - $(x, 1)$  if  $y = c_m$
      - $(x, -1)$  if  $y = c_n$
      - otherwise ignore the instance



# An example: training

- $x_1 \ c_1 \ \dots$
- $x_2 \ c_2 \ \dots$
- $x_3 \ c_1 \ \dots$
- $x_4 \ c_3 \ \dots$

for  $c_1$ -vs- $c_2$ :

$x_1 \ 1 \ \dots$

$x_2 \ -1 \ \dots$

$x_3 \ 1 \ \dots$

for  $c_2$ -vs- $c_3$ :

$x_2 \ 1 \ \dots$

$x_4 \ -1 \ \dots$

for  $c_1$ -vs- $c_3$ :

$x_1 \ 1 \ \dots$

$x_3 \ 1 \ \dots$

$x_4 \ -1 \ \dots$

# All-pairs (cont)

- Testing time: given a new example  $x$ 
  - Run each of the  $C_k^2$  classifiers on  $x$
  - Max-win strategy: Choose the class  $c_m$  that wins the most pairwise comparisons:
  - Other coupling models have been proposed: e.g., (Hastie and Tibshirani, 1998)

# An example: testing

- $x_1$   $c_1$  ...
- $x_2$   $c_2$  ...
- $x_3$   $c_1$  ...
- $x_4$   $c_3$  ...

→ three classifiers

for  $c_1$ -vs- $c_2$ :

$x$  ??    1   0.7   -1   0.3

for  $c_2$ -vs- $c_3$

$x$  ??    1   0.2   -1   0.8

for  $c_1$ -vs- $c_3$

$x$  ??    1   0.6   -1   0.4

Test data:

$x$  ??    $f_1$   $v_1$  ...

=> what's the system prediction for  $x$ ?

# Summary

- Different methods:
  - Direct multiclass
  - One-vs-all (a.k.a. one-per-class):  $k$ -classifiers
  - All-pairs:  $C_k^2$  classifiers
  - ECOC:  $n$  classifiers ( $n$  is the num of columns)
- Some studies report that All-pairs and ECOC work better than one-vs-all.

**Additional slides**

# Error-correcting output codes (ECOC)

- Proposed by (Dietterich and Bakiri, 1995)
- Idea:
  - Each class is assigned a unique binary string of length  $n$ .
  - Train  $n$  classifiers, one for each bit.
  - Testing time: run  $n$  classifiers on  $x$  to get a  $n$ -bit string  $s$ , and choose the class which is closest to  $s$ .

# An example

Class	Code Word					
	vl	hl	dl	cc	ol	or
0	0	0	0	1	0	0
1	1	0	0	0	0	0
2	0	1	1	0	1	0
3	0	0	0	0	1	0
4	1	1	0	0	0	0
5	1	1	0	0	1	0
6	0	0	1	1	0	1
7	0	0	1	0	0	0
8	0	0	0	1	0	0
9	0	0	1	1	0	0

# Meaning of each column

Column position	Abbreviation	Meaning
1	vl	contains vertical line
2	hl	contains horizontal line
3	dl	contains diagonal line
4	cc	contains closed curve
5	ol	contains curve open to left
6	or	contains curve open to right



# Another example: 15-bit code for a 10-class problem

Class	Code Word														
	$f_0$	$f_1$	$f_2$	$f_3$	$f_4$	$f_5$	$f_6$	$f_7$	$f_8$	$f_9$	$f_{10}$	$f_{11}$	$f_{12}$	$f_{13}$	$f_{14}$
0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1
1	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0
2	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1
3	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
4	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1
5	0	1	0	0	1	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1
6	1	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1
7	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1
8	1	1	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	1	1
9	0	1	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	1	0	0	1	1

# Hamming distance

- Definition: the **Hamming distance** between two strings of equal length is the number of positions for which the corresponding symbols are different.
- Ex:
  - 10111 and 10010
  - 2143 and 2233
  - Toned and roses

# How to choose a good error-correcting code?

- Choose the one with large minimum Hamming distance between any pair of code words.
- If the min Hamming distance is  $d$ , then the code can correct at least  $(d-1)/2$  single bit errors.

# Two properties of a good ECOC

- Row separations: Each codeword should be well-separated in Hamming distance from each of the other codewords
- Column separation: Each bit-position function  $f_i$  should be uncorrelated with each of the other  $f_j$ .

# All possible columns for a three-class problem

Class	Code Word							
	$f_0$	$f_1$	$f_2$	$f_3$	$f_4$	$f_5$	$f_6$	$f_7$
$c_0$	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1
$c_1$	0	0	1	1	0	0	1	1
$c_2$	0	1	0	1	0	1	0	1

If there are  $k$  classes, there will be at most  $2^{k-1} - 1$  usable columns after removing complements and the all-zeros or all-ones column.

# Finding a good code for different values of $k$

- Exhaustive codes
- Column selection from exhaustive codes
- Randomized hill climbing
- BCH codes
- ...

# Results

