## Growing decision trees **STAT 4710**

October 26, 2023

### **Rolling into a new unit!**

## **Unit 1:** R for data mining **Unit 2:** Prediction fundamentals Unit 3: Regression-based methods **Unit 4:** Tree-based methods

**Unit 5:** Deep learning



**Lecture 1:** Growing decision trees

**Lecture 2:** Tree pruning and bagging

Lecture 3: Random forests

**Lecture 4:** Boosting

**Lecture 5:** Unit review and quiz in class





- Linear regression
- Logistic regression
- Ridge, lasso, elastic net



Most methods covered so far based on  $\hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1 X_1 + \cdots + \hat{\beta}_{p-1} X_{p-1}$ :

- Linear regression
- Logistic regression
- Ridge, lasso, elastic net

Notable exception: K-nearest neighbors (recall Unit 2)



Most methods covered so far based on  $\hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1 X_1 + \cdots + \hat{\beta}_{p-1} X_{p-1}$ :

- Linear regression
- Logistic regression
- Ridge, lasso, elastic net

Notable exception: K-nearest neighbors (recall Unit 2) In Unit 4 we will leave the land of linearity.



Most methods covered so far based on  $\hat{\beta}_0 + \hat{\beta}_1 X_1 + \cdots + \hat{\beta}_{p-1} X_{p-1}$ :

Decision trees (lectures 1 and 2) are predictive models based on recursively partitioning the feature space.

Decision trees (lectures 1 and 2) are predictive models based on recursively partitioning the feature space.



Decision trees (lectures 1 and 2) are predictive models based on recursively partitioning the feature space.

Their prediction rules can be nicely illustrated and are very interpretable.





Decision trees (lectures 1 and 2) are predictive models based on recursively partitioning the feature space.

Their prediction rules can be nicely illustrated and are very interpretable.

However, trees are somewhat unstable and do not give the best prediction performance.





Decision trees (lectures 1 and 2) are predictive models based on recursively partitioning the feature space.

Their prediction rules can be nicely illustrated and are very interpretable.

However, trees are somewhat unstable and do not give the best prediction performance.

Nevertheless, trees can be used as building blocks for state-of-the-art prediction performance:

- Random forests (lecture 3)
- Boosting (lecture 4)





### **Hitters** data

Major League Baseball Data from the 1986 and 1987 seasons.

- Observations: 322 MLB players
- Features: Assists, AtBat,...,Hits,...,Years (19 total)

• Response: Salary (1987 annual salary on opening day in thousands of dollars)



Image credit: DALL-E 3



#### **Tree** $\iff$ **Partition into nested, axis-aligned rectangles**



Nodes without any descendants called leaf nodes or terminal nodes (equivalent)

Each terminal node corresponds to a rectangular region of feature space.





#### 238

117.5

1

### Mathematical expression of the prediction rule







### Mathematical expression of the prediction rule

A trained tree consists of:

• 
$$M$$
 regions  $\widehat{R}_1, \ldots, \widehat{R}_M$ 

• response values  $\hat{c}_1, \ldots, \hat{c}_M$ 







### Mathematical expression of the prediction rule

A trained tree consists of:

• 
$$M$$
 regions  $\widehat{R}_1, \ldots, \widehat{R}_M$ 

• response values  $\hat{c}_1, \ldots, \hat{c}_M$ 

For a new feature vector  $X^{\text{test}}$ , predict the constant value  $\hat{c}_m$  for region  $\widehat{R}_m$ :

$$\widehat{Y}^{\text{test}} = \widehat{c}_m \text{ if } X^{\text{test}} \in \widehat{R}_m$$

(continuous or categorical response)









Suppose we partition on  $X_i$ .

Suppose we partition on  $X_i$ .

• If  $X_i$  is continuous, we just find a split point s and split into  $\{X: X_j < s\} \text{ and } \{X: X_j \ge s\}.$ 

Suppose we partition on  $X_i$ .

- If  $X_i$  is continuous, we just find a split point s and split into  $\{X: X_i < s\} \text{ and } \{X: X_i \ge s\}.$
- $\{X: X_i \in \{a, c\}\}$  and  $\{X: X_i \in \{b, d, e\}\}$ .

• If  $X_i$  is categorical, e.g. with levels  $\{a, b, c, d, e\}$ , then we need to split the levels into two groups, e.g.  $\{a, c\}$  and  $\{b, d, e\}$ , giving the partitions





As usual, we are given a training dataset

For a fixed *M*, we seek rectangles  $\widehat{R}_1, \ldots, \widehat{R}_M$  and values  $\hat{c}_1, \ldots, \hat{c}_M$  to minimize the residual sum of squares (RSS):

$$\widehat{R}_{1}, ..., \widehat{R}_{M}, \widehat{c}_{1}, ..., \widehat{c}_{M} = \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{R_{1},...,R_{M},c_{1},...,c_{M}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (Y_{i} - \widehat{Y}_{i})^{2}$$

$$(X_1, Y_1), \ldots, (X_n, Y_n).$$



Asι

For  $\hat{c}_1,$ 

usual, we are given a training dataset 
$$(X_1, Y_1), \dots, (X_n, Y_n)$$
.  
a fixed  $M$ , we seek rectangles  $\widehat{R}_1, \dots, \widehat{R}_M$  and values  
 $\dots, \widehat{c}_M$  to minimize the residual sum of squares (RSS):  
 $\widehat{R}_1, \dots, \widehat{R}_M, \widehat{c}_1, \dots, \widehat{c}_M = \underset{R_1, \dots, R_M, c_1, \dots, c_M}{\arg \min} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \widehat{Y}_i)^2$   
 $\arg \min_{R_1, \dots, R_M, c_1, \dots, c_M} \left\{ \sum_{i:X_i \in R_1} (Y_i - c_1)^2 + \dots + \sum_{i:X_i \in R_M} (Y_i - c_M)^2 \right\}$ 

1



Asι

For  $\hat{c}_1$ ,

usual, we are given a training dataset 
$$(X_1, Y_1), \dots, (X_n, Y_n)$$
.  
a fixed  $M$ , we seek rectangles  $\widehat{R}_1, \dots, \widehat{R}_M$  and values  
 $\dots, \widehat{c}_M$  to minimize the residual sum of squares (RSS):  
 $\widehat{R}_1, \dots, \widehat{R}_M, \widehat{c}_1, \dots, \widehat{c}_M = \underset{R_1, \dots, R_M, c_1, \dots, c_M}{\operatorname{arg min}} \sum_{i=1}^n (Y_i - \widehat{Y}_i)^2$   
arg min  
 $R_1, \dots, R_M, c_1, \dots, c_M$   
 $\left\{ \sum_{i:X_i \in R_1} (Y_i - c_1)^2 + \dots + \sum_{i:X_i \in R_M} (Y_i - c_M)^2 \right\}$   
RSS for  $R_1$   
RSS for  $R_M$ 



#### **Training a regression tree Optimal** $\hat{c}_m$ given $\widehat{R}_m$



#### First let's consider a simpler problem, where rectangles $\widehat{R}_1, \ldots, \widehat{R}_M$ are given:



#### **Training a regression tree Optimal** $\hat{c}_m$ given $\widehat{R}_m$

$$\hat{c}_1, \dots, \hat{c}_M = \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{c_1, \dots, c_M} \left\{ \sum_{i: X_i \in \widehat{R}_1} (Y_i - c_1) \right\}$$



### First let's consider a simpler problem, where rectangles $\widehat{R}_1, \ldots, \widehat{R}_M$ are given:



#### Training a regression tree **Optimal** $\hat{c}_m$ given $\widehat{R}_m$

$$\hat{c}_{1}, \dots, \hat{c}_{M} = \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{c_{1},\dots,c_{M}} \left\{ \sum_{i:X_{i} \in \widehat{R}_{1}} (Y_{i} - c_{1})^{2} + \dots + \sum_{i:X_{i} \in \widehat{R}_{M}} (Y_{i} - c_{M})^{2} \right\}$$

We're fitting a constant to each region, so the solution is

$$\hat{c}_m = \text{mean}\left(\{Y_i: X_i\}\right)$$



First let's consider a simpler problem, where rectangles  $\widehat{R}_1, \ldots, \widehat{R}_M$  are given:

$$\in \widehat{R}_m$$
}).







The optimal set of rectangles is computationally intractable to find. In practice, we employ a greedy top-down algorithm:







The optimal set of rectangles is computationally intractable to find. In practice, we employ a greedy top-down algorithm:

1. Fit constant model to the entire space and calculate RSS.





The optimal set of rectangles is computationally intractable to find. In practice, we employ a greedy top-down algorithm:

- 1. Fit constant model to the entire space and calculate RSS.
- 2. Find split of the whole region that decreases RSS the most.





The optimal set of rectangles is computationally intractable to find. In practice, we employ a greedy top-down algorithm:

- 1. Fit constant model to the entire space and calculate RSS.
- 2. Find split of the whole region that decreases RSS the most.





The optimal set of rectangles is computationally intractable to find. In practice, we employ a greedy top-down algorithm:

- 1. Fit constant model to the entire space and calculate RSS.
- 2. Find split of the whole region that decreases RSS the most.





The optimal set of rectangles is computationally intractable to find. In practice, we employ a greedy top-down algorithm:

- 1. Fit constant model to the entire space and calculate RSS.
- 2. Find split of the whole region that decreases RSS the most.





The optimal set of rectangles is computationally intractable to find. In practice, we employ a greedy top-down algorithm:

- 1. Fit constant model to the entire space and calculate RSS.
- 2. Find split of the whole region that decreases RSS the most.




The optimal set of rectangles is computationally intractable to find. In practice, we employ a greedy top-down algorithm:

- 1. Fit constant model to the entire space and calculate RSS.
- 2. Find split of the whole region that decreases RSS the most.





The optimal set of rectangles is computationally intractable to find. In practice, we employ a greedy top-down algorithm:

- 1. Fit constant model to the entire space and calculate RSS.
- 2. Find split of the whole region that decreases RSS the most.





The optimal set of rectangles is computationally intractable to find. In practice, we employ a greedy top-down algorithm:

- 1. Fit constant model to the entire space and calculate RSS.
- 2. Find split of the whole region that decreases RSS the most.





The optimal set of rectangles is computationally intractable to find. In practice, we employ a greedy top-down algorithm:

- 1. Fit constant model to the entire space and calculate RSS.
- 2. Find split of the whole region that decreases RSS the most.





The optimal set of rectangles is computationally intractable to find. In practice, we employ a greedy top-down algorithm:

- 1. Fit constant model to the entire space and calculate RSS.
- 2. Find split of the whole region that decreases RSS the most.





The optimal set of rectangles is computationally intractable to find. In practice, we employ a greedy top-down algorithm:

- 1. Fit constant model to the entire space and calculate RSS.
- 2. Find split of the whole region that decreases RSS the most.





The optimal set of rectangles is computationally intractable to find. In practice, we employ a greedy top-down algorithm:

- 1. Fit constant model to the entire space and calculate RSS.
- 2. Find split of the whole region that decreases RSS the most.





The optimal set of rectangles is computationally intractable to find. In practice, we employ a greedy top-down algorithm:

- 1. Fit constant model to the entire space and calculate RSS.
- 2. Find split of the whole region that decreases RSS the most.
- 3. Find the split for each rectangle that decreases its RSS the most. Among these, choose best.





The optimal set of rectangles is computationally intractable to find. In practice, we employ a greedy top-down algorithm:

- 1. Fit constant model to the entire space and calculate RSS.
- 2. Find split of the whole region that decreases RSS the most.
- 3. Find the split for each rectangle that decreases its RSS the most. Among these, choose best.





The optimal set of rectangles is computationally intractable to find. In practice, we employ a greedy top-down algorithm:

- 1. Fit constant model to the entire space and calculate RSS.
- 2. Find split of the whole region that decreases RSS the most.
- 3. Find the split for each rectangle that decreases its RSS the most. Among these, choose best.





The optimal set of rectangles is computationally intractable to find. In practice, we employ a greedy top-down algorithm:

- 1. Fit constant model to the entire space and calculate RSS.
- 2. Find split of the whole region that decreases RSS the most.
- 3. Find the split for each rectangle that decreases its RSS the most. Among these, choose best.





The optimal set of rectangles is computationally intractable to find. In practice, we employ a greedy top-down algorithm:

- 1. Fit constant model to the entire space and calculate RSS.
- 2. Find split of the whole region that decreases RSS the most.
- 3. Find the split for each rectangle that decreases its RSS the most. Among these, choose best.





The optimal set of rectangles is computationally intractable to find. In practice, we employ a greedy top-down algorithm:

- 1. Fit constant model to the entire space and calculate RSS.
- 2. Find split of the whole region that decreases RSS the most.
- 3. Find the split for each rectangle that decreases its RSS the most. Among these, choose best.





The optimal set of rectangles is computationally intractable to find. In practice, we employ a greedy top-down algorithm:

- 1. Fit constant model to the entire space and calculate RSS.
- 2. Find split of the whole region that decreases RSS the most.
- 3. Find the split for each rectangle that decreases its RSS the most. Among these, choose best.
- 4. Repeat until there are M regions.





The optimal set of rectangles is computationally intractable to find. In practice, we employ a greedy top-down algorithm:

- 1. Fit constant model to the entire space and calculate RSS.
- 2. Find split of the whole region that decreases RSS the most.
- 3. Find the split for each rectangle that decreases its RSS the most. Among these, choose best.
- 4. Repeat until there are M regions.





#### **Training a regression tree Final output**





#### **Training a classification tree** The misclassification error objective





 $X_1$ 

## **Training a classification tree** The misclassification error objective

As usual, we are given a training dataset  $(X_1, Y_1), \ldots, (X_n, Y_n)$ , where the response Y is binary.

For a fixed *M*, we seek rectangles  $\widehat{R}_1, \ldots, \widehat{R}_M$  and values  $\hat{c}_1, \ldots, \hat{c}_M$  to minimize the misclassification error:

$$\widehat{R}_1, \dots, \widehat{R}_M, \widehat{c}_1, \dots, \widehat{c}_M = \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{R_1, \dots, R_M, c_1, \dots, c_M} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n I(Y_i \neq \widehat{Y}_i)$$



## **Training a classification tree** The misclassification error objective

As usual, we are given a training dataset  $(X_1, Y_1), \ldots, (X_n, Y_n)$ , where the response Y is binary. For a fixed *M*, we seek rectangles  $\widehat{R}_1, \ldots, \widehat{R}_M$  and values  $\hat{c}_1, \ldots, \hat{c}_M$  to minimize the misclassification error: n 1

$$\widehat{R}_{1}, \dots, \widehat{R}_{M}, \widehat{c}_{1}, \dots, \widehat{c}_{M} = \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{R_{1},\dots,R_{M},c_{1},\dots,c_{M}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} I(Y_{i} \neq \widehat{Y}_{i})$$
$$= \operatorname*{arg\,min}_{R_{1},\dots,R_{M},c_{1},\dots,c_{M}} \frac{1}{n} \left\{ \sum_{i:X_{i} \in R_{1}} I(Y_{i} \neq c_{1}) + \dots + \sum_{i:X_{i} \in R_{M}} (Y_{i} \neq c_{M}) \right\}$$



#### **Training a classification tree Optimal** $\hat{c}_m$ given $\widehat{R}_m$

$$\hat{c}_1, \dots, \hat{c}_M = \underset{c_1, \dots, c_M}{\operatorname{arg\,min}} \frac{1}{n} \left\{ \sum_{i: X_i \in \widehat{R}_1} I(Y_i \neq X_i) \right\}$$

# First let's consider a simpler problem, where rectangles $\widehat{R}_1, \ldots, \widehat{R}_M$ are given: $\neq c_1) + \dots + \sum_{i:X_i \in \widehat{R}_M} (Y_i \neq c_M) \left\{ \widehat{R}_1 \right\}$



## **Training a classification tree Optimal** $\hat{c}_m$ given $\widehat{R}_m$

$$\hat{c}_1, \dots, \hat{c}_M = \underset{c_1, \dots, c_M}{\operatorname{arg\,min}} \frac{1}{n} \left\{ \sum_{i: X_i \in \widehat{R}_1} I(Y_i \neq X_i) \right\}$$

We're fitting the same category to each region, so the solution is the majority vote:

$$\widehat{c}_m = \text{mode}\left(\{Y_i : X_i \in \widetilde{A}\}\right)$$

First let's consider a simpler problem, where rectangles  $\widehat{R}_1, \ldots, \widehat{R}_M$  are given: 







Misclassification error:







Misclassification error:

$$\frac{1}{n} \left\{ \sum_{i:X_i \in R_1} I(Y_i \neq c_1) + \dots + \sum_{i:X_i \in R_M} (Y_i \neq C_M} (Y_i \neq$$

In example at right, no choice of split point decreases misclassification error.

 $Y_i \neq c_M$ )





Misclassification error:

$$\frac{1}{n} \left\{ \sum_{i:X_i \in R_1} I(Y_i \neq c_1) + \dots + \sum_{i:X_i \in R_M} (Y_i \neq C_M} (Y_i \neq$$

In example at right, no choice of split point decreases misclassification error.

 $Y_i \neq c_M$ )





Misclassification error:

$$\frac{1}{n} \left\{ \sum_{i:X_i \in R_1} I(Y_i \neq c_1) + \dots + \sum_{i:X_i \in R_M} (X_i \neq c_1$$

In example at right, no choice of split point decreases misclassification error.

Misclassification error not sensitive enough to find good split points at each step.

 $Y_i \neq c_M$ )







If  $\hat{p}_m$  is region *m* class 1 proportion, misclassification error in that region is  $\min(\hat{p}_m, 1 - \hat{p}_m)$ .





- If  $n_m$  is the number of training observations in that region, then

Total misclassification error  $= \frac{1}{4} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^{4} \right\}$ 

$$\frac{1}{n} \left\{ \sum_{i:X_i \in R_1} I(Y) \right\}$$

If  $\hat{p}_m$  is region *m* class 1 proportion, misclassification error in that region is min $(\hat{p}_m, 1 - \hat{p}_m)$ .







- If  $n_m$  is the number of training observations in that region, then



If  $\hat{p}_m$  is region *m* class 1 proportion, misclassification error in that region is min $(\hat{p}_m, 1 - \hat{p}_m)$ .

$$X_{i} \neq c_{1}) + \dots + \sum_{i:X_{i} \in R_{M}} (Y_{i} \neq c_{M}) \begin{cases} X_{2} \\ \vdots \\ X_{i} \in R_{M} \end{cases}$$





- If  $n_m$  is the number of training observations in that region, then



Replace misclassification error  $\min(\hat{p}_m, 1 - \hat{p}_m)$  by the Gini index =  $2\hat{p}_m(1 - \hat{p}_m)$ :

If  $\hat{p}_m$  is region *m* class 1 proportion, misclassification error in that region is min $(\hat{p}_m, 1 - \hat{p}_m)$ .

$$Y_i \neq c_1) + \dots + \sum_{i:X_i \in R_M} (Y_i \neq c_M) \left\{ X_2 \right\}$$

 $= \frac{1}{m} \left\{ n_1 \min(\hat{p}_1, 1 - \hat{p}_1) + \dots + n_M \min(\hat{p}_M, 1 - \hat{p}_M) \right\}$ 





 $X_1$ 

- If  $n_m$  is the number of training observations in that region, then



Total Gini index = 
$$\frac{1}{n} \{ n_1 \cdot 2\hat{p}_1(1 - \hat{p}_1) + \dots + n_M \cdot 2\hat{p}_M(1 - \hat{p}_M) \}.$$

If  $\hat{p}_m$  is region *m* class 1 proportion, misclassification error in that region is min $(\hat{p}_m, 1 - \hat{p}_m)$ .

$$Y_i \neq c_1) + \dots + \sum_{i:X_i \in R_M} (Y_i \neq c_M)$$

$$1 - \hat{p}_1) + \dots + n_M \min(\hat{p}_M, 1 - \hat{p}_M) \}$$

Replace misclassification error  $\min(\hat{p}_m, 1 - \hat{p}_m)$  by the Gini index =  $2\hat{p}_m(1 - \hat{p}_m)$ :





 $X_1$ 














No splits















Total Gini index =  

$$\frac{1}{n} \left\{ n_1 \cdot 2\hat{p}_1(1-\hat{p}_1) + \dots + n_M \cdot 2\hat{p}_M(1-\hat{p}_1) + \dots + n_M$$



 $X_2$ 



The optimal set of rectangles is computationally intractable to find. In practice, we employ a greedy top-down algorithm based on total Gini index:

#### Total Gini index = $\frac{1}{n} \left\{ n_1 \cdot 2\hat{p}_1 (1 - \hat{p}_1) + \dots + n_M \cdot 2\hat{p}_M (1 - \hat{p}_M) \right\}$



 $X_2$ 



The optimal set of rectangles is computationally intractable to find. In practice, we employ a greedy top-down algorithm based on total Gini index:

1. Fit constant model to the entire space and calculate (total) Gini index.

#### Total Gini index = $\frac{1}{n} \left\{ n_1 \cdot 2\hat{p}_1(1 - \hat{p}_1) + \dots + n_M \cdot 2\hat{p}_M(1 - \hat{p}_M) \right\}$





- 1. Fit constant model to the entire space and calculate (total) Gini index.
- 2. Find split of the whole region that decreases total Gini index the most.





- 1. Fit constant model to the entire space and calculate (total) Gini index.
- 2. Find split of the whole region that decreases total Gini index the most.





- 1. Fit constant model to the entire space and calculate (total) Gini index.
- 2. Find split of the whole region that decreases total Gini index the most.





- 1. Fit constant model to the entire space and calculate (total) Gini index.
- 2. Find split of the whole region that decreases total Gini index the most.





- 1. Fit constant model to the entire space and calculate (total) Gini index.
- 2. Find split of the whole region that decreases total Gini index the most.





- 1. Fit constant model to the entire space and calculate (total) Gini index.
- 2. Find split of the whole region that decreases total Gini index the most.





Total Gini index = The optimal set of rectangles is computationally intractable to find. In practice, we employ a greedy  $\frac{1}{n} \left\{ n_1 \cdot 2\hat{p}_1(1 - \hat{p}_1) + \dots + n_M \cdot 2\hat{p}_M(1 - \hat{p}_M) \right\}$ top-down algorithm based on total Gini index:

- 1. Fit constant model to the entire space and calculate (total) Gini index.
- 2. Find split of the whole region that decreases total Gini index the most.



 $X_{\gamma}$ 



- 1. Fit constant model to the entire space and calculate (total) Gini index.
- 2. Find split of the whole region that decreases total Gini index the most.





- 1. Fit constant model to the entire space and calculate (total) Gini index.
- 2. Find split of the whole region that decreases total Gini index the most.





- 1. Fit constant model to the entire space and calculate (total) Gini index.
- 2. Find split of the whole region that decreases total Gini index the most.





- 1. Fit constant model to the entire space and calculate (total) Gini index.
- 2. Find split of the whole region that decreases total Gini index the most.





- 1. Fit constant model to the entire space and calculate (total) Gini index.
- 2. Find split of the whole region that decreases total Gini index the most.





Total Gini index = The optimal set of rectangles is computationally intractable to find. In practice, we employ a greedy  $\frac{1}{n} \left\{ n_1 \cdot 2\hat{p}_1(1 - \hat{p}_1) + \dots + n_M \cdot 2\hat{p}_M(1 - \hat{p}_M) \right\}$ top-down algorithm based on total Gini index:

- 1. Fit constant model to the entire space and calculate (total) Gini index.
- 2. Find split of the whole region that decreases total Gini index the most.
- 3. Find the split for each rectangle that decreases its Gini index the most. Among these, choose largest decrease in  $n_m \cdot 2\hat{p}_m(1-\hat{p}_m)$ .





Total Gini index = The optimal set of rectangles is computationally intractable to find. In practice, we employ a greedy  $\frac{1}{n} \left\{ n_1 \cdot 2\hat{p}_1(1 - \hat{p}_1) + \dots + n_M \cdot 2\hat{p}_M(1 - \hat{p}_M) \right\}$ top-down algorithm based on total Gini index:

- 1. Fit constant model to the entire space and calculate (total) Gini index.
- 2. Find split of the whole region that decreases total Gini index the most.
- 3. Find the split for each rectangle that decreases its Gini index the most. Among these, choose largest decrease in  $n_m \cdot 2\hat{p}_m(1-\hat{p}_m)$ .





Total Gini index = The optimal set of rectangles is computationally intractable to find. In practice, we employ a greedy  $\frac{1}{n} \left\{ n_1 \cdot 2\hat{p}_1(1 - \hat{p}_1) + \dots + n_M \cdot 2\hat{p}_M(1 - \hat{p}_M) \right\}$ top-down algorithm based on total Gini index:

- 1. Fit constant model to the entire space and calculate (total) Gini index.
- 2. Find split of the whole region that decreases total Gini index the most.
- 3. Find the split for each rectangle that decreases its Gini index the most. Among these, choose largest decrease in  $n_m \cdot 2\hat{p}_m(1-\hat{p}_m)$ .





Total Gini index = The optimal set of rectangles is computationally intractable to find. In practice, we employ a greedy  $\frac{1}{n} \left\{ n_1 \cdot 2\hat{p}_1(1 - \hat{p}_1) + \dots + n_M \cdot 2\hat{p}_M(1 - \hat{p}_M) \right\}$ top-down algorithm based on total Gini index:

- 1. Fit constant model to the entire space and calculate (total) Gini index.
- 2. Find split of the whole region that decreases total Gini index the most.
- 3. Find the split for each rectangle that decreases its Gini index the most. Among these, choose largest decrease in  $n_m \cdot 2\hat{p}_m(1-\hat{p}_m)$ .





Total Gini index = The optimal set of rectangles is computationally intractable to find. In practice, we employ a greedy  $\frac{1}{n} \left\{ n_1 \cdot 2\hat{p}_1(1 - \hat{p}_1) + \dots + n_M \cdot 2\hat{p}_M(1 - \hat{p}_M) \right\}$ top-down algorithm based on total Gini index:

- 1. Fit constant model to the entire space and calculate (total) Gini index.
- 2. Find split of the whole region that decreases total Gini index the most.
- 3. Find the split for each rectangle that decreases its Gini index the most. Among these, choose largest decrease in  $n_m \cdot 2\hat{p}_m(1-\hat{p}_m)$ .





Total Gini index = The optimal set of rectangles is computationally intractable to find. In practice, we employ a greedy  $\frac{1}{n} \left\{ n_1 \cdot 2\hat{p}_1(1 - \hat{p}_1) + \dots + n_M \cdot 2\hat{p}_M(1 - \hat{p}_M) \right\}$ top-down algorithm based on total Gini index:

- 1. Fit constant model to the entire space and calculate (total) Gini index.
- 2. Find split of the whole region that decreases total Gini index the most.
- 3. Find the split for each rectangle that decreases its Gini index the most. Among these, choose largest decrease in  $n_m \cdot 2\hat{p}_m(1-\hat{p}_m)$ .





Total Gini index = The optimal set of rectangles is computationally intractable to find. In practice, we employ a greedy  $\frac{1}{n} \left\{ n_1 \cdot 2\hat{p}_1(1 - \hat{p}_1) + \dots + n_M \cdot 2\hat{p}_M(1 - \hat{p}_M) \right\}$ top-down algorithm based on total Gini index:

- 1. Fit constant model to the entire space and calculate (total) Gini index.
- 2. Find split of the whole region that decreases total Gini index the most.
- 3. Find the split for each rectangle that decreases its Gini index the most. Among these, choose largest decrease in  $n_m \cdot 2\hat{p}_m(1-\hat{p}_m)$ .
- 4. Repeat until there are M regions.

 $X_{\gamma}$ 





Total Gini index = The optimal set of rectangles is computationally intractable to find. In practice, we employ a greedy  $\frac{1}{n} \left\{ n_1 \cdot 2\hat{p}_1(1 - \hat{p}_1) + \dots + n_M \cdot 2\hat{p}_M(1 - \hat{p}_M) \right\}$ top-down algorithm based on total Gini index:

- 1. Fit constant model to the entire space and calculate (total) Gini index.
- 2. Find split of the whole region that decreases total Gini index the most.
- 3. Find the split for each rectangle that decreases its Gini index the most. Among these, choose largest decrease in  $n_m \cdot 2\hat{p}_m(1-\hat{p}_m)$ .
- 4. Repeat until there are M regions.

 $X_{\gamma}$ 





# **Training a classification tree** Final output

Example: Heart disease data set.

- 303 patients with chest pain
- Binary response HD (heart disease)
- 13 demographic and clinical features



# **Training a classification tree** Final output

Example: Heart disease data set.

- 303 patients with chest pain
- Binary response HD (heart disease)
- 13 demographic and clinical features

Note: Classification trees extend seamlessly to more than two classes!



Neither tree-based nor linear models dominate the other.

Neither tree-based nor linear models dominate the other.

Each prediction method works better when the underlying trend in the data matches its modeling choice.

Neither tree-based nor linear models dominate the other.

Each prediction method works better when the underlying trend in the data matches its modeling choice.


## **Tree-based models versus linear models** Which perform better?

Neither tree-based nor linear models dominate the other.

Each prediction method works better when the underlying trend in the data matches its modeling choice.

- E.g. for classification:
  - Linear model  $\rightarrow$  linear decision boundary
  - Decision tree  $\rightarrow$  unions of rectangles



## Summary

- producing a constant prediction for feature vectors in each rectangle.
- Decision trees are built by recursively choosing
  - The optimal rectangle to split
  - The optimal feature to split that rectangle on
  - The optimal split-point for that feature
- Regression and classification trees aim to minimize squared error and misclassification error, respectively.

Decision trees partition the feature space into axis-aligned nested rectangles,

