

Combining Heterogeneous Classifiers for Relational Databases

Geetha Manjunath^{a,1}, M Narasimha Murty^b, Dinkar Sitaram^c

^a*Dept of CSA, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, India 560012*

^b*Dept of CSA, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore, India 560012*

^c*STSD, Hewlett Packard Company, Bangalore, India*

Abstract

Most enterprise data is distributed in multiple relational databases with expert-designed schema. Using traditional single-table machine learning techniques over such data not only incur a computational penalty for converting to a *flat* form (mega-join), even the human-specified semantic information present in the relations is lost. In this paper, we present a practical, two-phase hierarchical meta-classification algorithm for relational databases with a semantic divide and conquer approach. We propose a recursive, prediction aggregation technique over heterogeneous classifiers applied on individual database tables. The proposed algorithm was evaluated on three diverse datasets, namely TPCH, PKDD and UCI benchmarks and showed considerable reduction in classification time without any loss of prediction accuracy.

Keywords: heterogeneous classifier, RDF, relational data, RDBMS

1. Introduction

One of the primary application areas of pattern recognition and machine learning techniques is in the domain of business intelligence (BI) for enterprises. BI techniques are used to provide historical and predictive views of business operations enabling companies to make insightful analysis and smart timely decisions catering to significant changes in their competition as well

Email addresses: geetha.manjunath@hp.com (Geetha Manjunath), mnm@csa.iisc.ernet.in (M Narasimha Murty), dinakar.sitaram@hp.com (Dinkar Sitaram)

¹Geetha is an employee of Hewlett Packard, but this work was done at IISc.

as market condition. Therefore, knowledge mining over real enterprise data using machine learning techniques is very valuable for what is called an *intelligent enterprise*. However, application of state-of-art pattern recognition techniques in the mainstream BI has not yet taken off [Gartner report] due to lack of in-memory analytics among others. The key hurdle to make this possible is the incompatibility between the input data formats used by most machine learning techniques and the formats used by real enterprises.

Let us delve into the reason for the incompatibility a little further. Most data in real enterprises exists in multiple relational databases. Each database table typically represents an entity and is used to group data attributes of that entity. A specific attribute named as a primary key, is used in each table to identify the entity being described in that table. A table can refer to an attribute of another entity described in another database table. Such cross-linkages across tables are maintained using foreign-keys and they somewhat capture the semantic relationship between two attributes in two different tables. The overall relational structure created by the attributes in the different tables and their linkages (along with their data types) is called the database schema. These relationships can be more formally represented as E-R graphs (Entity Relationship graphs) [23]. Further, multiple database optimizations and schema normalizations are performed to balance the time and space constraints of the application, ie., minimize redundancy in repeated attribute values in different tables while optimizing database query response times (queries are usually in SQL language). So, a typical enterprise dataset resides in such expert-designed **multiple relational database tables**. On the other hand, as known, most traditional classification algorithms still assume that the input dataset is available in a single table - a *flat* representation of data attributes. So, for applying these state-of-art single-table data mining techniques to enterprise data, one needs to convert the distributed relational data into a *flat form*. This transformation can be computationally very expensive as it usually involves multiple SQL joins, takes up more space for the *fused* data and can also result in erroneous statistical information due to duplicate data (elaborated later). Lastly, and most importantly, this approach of *mega join* ignores the human-specified semantic information of the application present in the database design (schema), which can potentially aid in the classification technique.

Database Table 1: Researchers

Id	Name	Sex	Age	Department	Status
EE1	Minnie	F	38	Mob	Y
EE2	Mickey	M	51	HCI	N
EE3	John	M	42	SoA	Y
EE4	Ritu	F	35	Grid	N
EE5	Krishna	M	22	Mob	?

Database Table 2: Division

Department	Rank	Size
Mobility	2	> 10
HCI	2	> 10
SoA	1	< 10
Grid	2	< 10

Database Table 3: Publications

Paper	Type	Tier	Author
P1	Conference	1	EE1
P2	Conference	2	EE2
P3	Conference	3	EE3
P4	Journal	1	EE1
P5	Journal	1	EE4
P6	Journal	2	EE2
P7	Conference	2	EE5

Table 4: Fused Table

ENo	Name	Sex	Age	Dept	Rank	Size	Paper	Type	Tier	Status
EE1	Minnie	F	38	Mob	2	>10	P1	Conf	1	Y
EE2	Mickey	M	51	HCI	2	>10	P2	Conf	2	N
EE3	John	M	42	SoA	1	<10	P3	Conf	3	Y
EE4	Ritu	F	35	Grid	2	<10	P5	Jour	1	N
EE1	Minnie	F	38	Mob	2	>10	P4	Jour	1	Y
EE2	Mickey	M	51	HCI	2	>10	P6	Jour	2	N
EE5	Krishna	M	22	Mob	2	>10	P7	Conf	2	?

Figure 1: Example Relational Database

1.1. A Simple Example

We will now take a simple example to study the problem. Figure 1 shows three database tables named **Researcher**, **Division**, and **Publications**. The **Researcher** table maintains the data about the different researchers in an organization - their employee identification numbers, age, department they belong and so on.. The **Division** table has data about a particular department and the **Publications** table maintains record of papers published by researchers in journals and conferences. The classification under interest is that of predicting the readiness of the researcher for a promotion. We now want to determine the status of researcher **Krishna** using a good classification algorithm.

One naive approach is to just merge the three tables with a mega join and to create the fused table shown in Table 4. Now any conventional classification algorithm can be applied over Table 4 to determine the class label of the test case (row **EE5**). However, as described earlier, this approach of creating the fused table is not feasible in real enterprises due to scalability, time and security reasons. Also, we may note that summary statistics of some attributes (rank, age) is also affected due to duplicate records for those attributes. So, the fused table approach is not only impractical, it may also result in wrong classification results.

The above problem can also be solved using relational classification algorithms that do consider detailed relationships between attributes. However, use of inductive logic programming [18,19,20] or probabilistic relational models [21,26] based techniques, make these algorithms computationally expensive for complex databases as they need propositionalization and multiple database scans for predicate selection. [20]. Further, these techniques cannot be directly applied on the relational tables, as they require propositionalization. We therefore need accurate classification algorithms that can work directly on relational data distributed across multiple database tables with well-designed schema.

1.2. The Practical Requirements

Database enthusiasts may also relate the above relational classification problem with another practical issue faced in database design, that of missing values, clearly an important problem in enterprise applications. We would like to come up with an efficient and a practical solution for such classification and missing value problems in enterprise applications. This raises some additional requirements on the technique. First of all, the algorithm should

be scalable in the size of the database tables as well as the number of such tables. It should be able to work without requiring collation or replication of data from all tables. It should preferably work directly out of existing databases since it is not feasible (from both time and space perspective) to transform data even from individual tables to different forms of representation. Since there may be different authorization controls for different databases tables, the algorithm should be modular with an ability to execute different parts of the algorithm under different user credentials. Further, the algorithm should effectively leverage the semantic grouping that is implicit in the design of the database schema. Also, no assumptions on the probability distribution or independence of the attributes grouped within tables can be made. Finally, from a practical usage perspective, the implementation should require minimum manual intervention to apply the solution on existing databases.

In this paper, we propose and describe a practical, heterogeneous classifier for relational databases that caters to all the above requirements. It uses a novel recursive prediction-aggregation technique with a modified Naive-Bayes algorithm and works directly on existing databases without any data transformation or fusion of the database tables. It also leverages application knowledge hidden in the database design using standard models to represent semantics (such as RDF). The structure of this paper is as follows. Section 2 gives related work. Section 3 describes our proposed algorithm with a brief proof. Section 4 details the implementation and results. We conclude in section 5.

2. Related Work

Peter Flach and Nicholas Lachiche in [5] provide a simple tutorial style introduction to Naive Bayesian classification of structured data. They describe three representations of structured data that can be used: (a) datalog style with data described using individuals, properties and structural predicates, (b) typical relational representation with E-R diagrams and (c) term-based representation with tuples and data functors as in Prolog. They propose two algorithms that extend Naive Bayes to handle representations the first and third representations, namely in language space (using Prolog) and individual space (using datalog style). Our algorithm handles the second case where structured data is represented using E-R diagrams for instance. Another work called Mr-SBC [4] extends the approaches proposed by Peter to

support continuous attributes using supervised discretization with a search strategy that is biased by the structure of the database.

Graph-NB [1] is also a modified Naive Bayes algorithm like ours for classifying relational datasets. They use a relationship graph like ours but for feature elimination. Additionally, their approach assumes mutual independence of all attributes and also requires the probability of table linkages, which makes it somewhat impractical. Yin, Han et al [2] propose Cross-Mine that uses tuple-id propagation to virtually associate tuple-ids of the target relation to the tuple-ids of the non-target relation. They use selective sampling method to improve scalability of the technique but their approach of mining complex rules in the second phase requires one to remember propagation paths as well as constraints on each link. We compare our algorithm with theirs to show better performance and accuracy without the second phase training.

Hongyu Guo, et al [3] propose multi-view learning techniques to formulate concept learning in multi-relational databases. Multi-view techniques are typically applied to solve information extraction [12] and text classification [13] by creating views to represent set of disjoint feature sets of a specific entity. While, use of SQL views to capture the dataset for first level classification is somewhat similar to ours, they use additional aggregation based features (COUNT, SUM, AVG) to summarize properties of a set of related objects. Our solution based on the proof provided in section 5 requires only prior probabilities (just COUNT) on the fused dataset. [3] also proposes an algorithm called MVC that uses a meta-learner to learn from the results of the classifiers applied on individual relational databases. Other such mechanisms for meta learning based on boosting [16], bagging [15] and stacking [17] require construction of different hypotheses from subsets of learning instances which do not scale on practical databases. Statistical relational learning models, specifically probabilistic relational models, have also been used in relational setting by extending Bayesian networks but again require lot of operations on the fused dataset, which we believe is not practical. Use of Naive Bayes assumption across transformational views of relational databases in our solution, removes the need for any computation on the fused dataset.

Coming to database-related literature, the problem of analyzing the co-occurrence of attributes across database records to automatically derive attribute relationships in the form of association rules is well-researched. A variation of that technique, called associative classification [29,30] where as-

sociation rules are generated over databases and analyzed for classification, have been proposed as well. However such techniques typically work well for datasets with nominal attributes, as the rules are usually based on attribute value comparisons.

More complex algorithms to efficiently classify relational data have been tried as well. R Alfred, et al [10] use a genetic semi-supervised clustering algorithm to aggregate data in multiple tables. In [24], Neville and Jensen describe an iterative classification procedure that exploits specified relationships in relational data for getting greater classification accuracy with a simple Bayesian classifier that dynamically updates the attributes of some objects as high confidence inferences are made about related objects. Taskar, et al, present a new approach [11] of using a single probabilistic model for the entire database that captures interactions between instances in the domain.

Finally, we would like to comment upon a conceptual similarity of our semantic divide-and-conquer approach with pattern synthesis approaches. In order to enable classification of high dimensionality data despite small number of test samples, pattern synthesis algorithms derive new training data by artificially interpolating the available data. One common approach used there is to partition the attributes into groups and generating new training data by merging permutations of those attribute groups. The phenomenon happening in classification of relational databases is similar to that technique. Fusion of all the database tables will actually result in synthetic patterns (new rows in Figure 1). However, it may be noted that, the synthetic patterns generated due to the mega-join are actually more relevant when compared to the general pattern synthesis conditions as the attribute grouping is more semantic oriented rather than ad-hoc partitioning of the attributes. Having said that, our technique does not generate these synthetic patterns and uses only valid test patterns and hence benefit the accuracy of the classification.

.

3. The Proposed Solution

The approach described in this paper works directly on existing database tables to determine the class label of the test case. It does not require any data transformation or fusion of the database tables and leverages application knowledge hidden in the database design .

3.1. Conceptual Overview

We now give an intuitive description of our approach to the solution using Figure 1 as reference. For this, firstly, we observe that, as in any well designed database, the class label or the attribute of interest (status) is just in one of the tables (here table 1). Let us call this class label of interest as *target attribute(status)* and the table containing the target attribute as the *target table (Researchers table)*. While one can perform the classification task just using attributes in the target table, ignoring the effect of the attributes in the other tables may not be useful. So, we first need to somehow propagate the class label to all the relevant tables. Figure 2 shows the tables of our running example, now extended to include the class label. The dotted column in tables 2 and 3 of figure 2 shows the propagated class label (computed during the data preparation phase described in section 4.1). The problem now reduces to using these individual modified tables for the classification, learn the class label for the test record in each table and then *appropriately* aggregate that information to get to the combined result for the missing class label.

So, the proposed algorithms has a pre-processing phase where the target attribute is propagated to all tables, followed by a two-phase classification which uses a semantic divide and conquer approach. In the first phase, the classification is performed at individual table level and in the second phase, these labels are combined for the final class label. Clearly, the above approach can support different classifiers to be applied on individual tables in the first phase, taking care of the heterogeneous distributions of attributes of multiple entities in the enterprise application. So, if the class label propagation and aggregation stages can leverage the semantics of the database schema, then we are in good shape. We now describe the technique in more detail.

3.2. Label Propagation

As discussed before, expert database designers typically group sets of related attributes of an entity into separate database tables and explicitly state the relationships between the tables (primary-foreign keys). We use this implicit knowledge of attribute dependencies to perform label propagation and generate appropriate views of the tables for the first-phase.

We introduce a concept of Join Graph to represent the semantic dependency between database tables. The edges in the Join graph represent (a)

Database Table 1: Researchers

Id	Name	Sex	Age	Department	Status
EE1	Minnie	F	38	Mob	Y
EE2	Mickey	M	51	HCI	N
EE3	John	M	42	SoA	Y
EE4	Ritu	F	35	Grid	N
EE5	Krishna	M	22	Mob	?

Database Table 2: Division (extended view)

Department	Rank	Size	
Mobility	2	> 10	Y
HCI	2	> 10	N
SoA	1	< 10	Y
Grid	2	< 10	N

Database Table 3: Publications (extended view)

Paper	Type	Tier	Author	
P1	Conference	1	EE1	Y
P2	Conference	2	EE2	N
P3	Conference	3	EE3	Y
P4	Journal	1	EE1	Y
P5	Journal	1	EE4	N
P6	Journal	2	EE2	N
P7	Conference	2	EE5	

Figure 2: The Example Database shown with label propagation




Figure 3: The Join Graph for the example database

primary-key to foreign-key relationship (b) foreign-key to primary-key relationship and (c) Additional expert-specified attribute relationship (if any). The Join Graph corresponding to the running example is shown in Figure 3.

Definition:

A Join Graph is an undirected, labeled graph (V, E, W) , where V is a set of vertices, one vertex per table in the database, E is a set of labeled edges and W is the set of labels (attribute pairs). An edge (V_i, V_j) with label $\langle l_i, l_j \rangle \in W$ exists if Table V_i can be directly operated with Table V_j using a SQL JOIN clause $V_i.l_i = V_j.l_j$.

This Join Graph can be generated automatically using the database meta data, based on the primary and foreign key directives provided by the database administrator. Additionally, the administrator can prune the graph to remove nodes corresponding to database tables that are perceived to be unrelated to the classification under consideration. In order to enable this visual modification by the administrator so that additional expert information about the application knowledge can be included, we represent the Join graph using semantic web models (RDF).

RDF (Resource Description Framework ()) is the core data model specified by Semantic Web [27] and gives a very simple way of representing the semantics. The edges of the Join Graph are represented as RDF triples and edge-reification is used to associate a label to the edge. Please note that we only represent meta data using this model, the dataset as such is not transformed to this tuple form. A database administrator can give additional directives on the visualized RDF file to include hidden data semantics to enhance the graph. The expert can also set explicit clauses (in OWL) to aid the inference mechanism supported over RDF [28]. For example, if "Employee-Id" in one table is same as "Author" in an another table, that can be specified as "Same-As" directive. Such information enables informed pruning of the graph before class label propagation. We believe this facility would reduce the effort needed to capture experts knowledge and semantics of the database design. A trivial use of RDF that nevertheless provides good benefits, is to just specify the subset of attributes that are relevant to the classification task (expert-directed feature elimination!). In fact, this was found to be very useful for the TPC-H customer database. A sample RDF file for that example is given in Section 4. In general, while RDF does provide some nice advantages when used to represent the database meta data, our algorithm does not really depend upon the use of that model for correctness

or accuracy. Any other means of specifying the semantics of the Join Graph can also be used.

Now that the Join Graph represents the semantic relationships between the database tables, the process of class label propagation can be automated using this graph. Each edge of the graph is traversed in breadth first order and new database views are created in such a way that the class labels from target table is propagated to the other tables. A topological sort of the nodes of the Join Graph will determine a valid order for class label propagation. The class label propagation starts from the target table and proceeds outwards until either a leaf node (table) or an already extended table is reached.

Simple SQL statements are automatically generated to create these extended tables. For example, to create an extended Publications table, the following SQL statements to create new view is generated and executed

```
CREATE VIEW Publications_ext FROM Publications, Researchers
SELECT Paper, Type, Tier, Author, Status
WHERE Researcher.Id = Division.Author
```

As may be obvious from Figure 2, the extended table consists of all the relevant attributes of the original table and an additional new attribute with propagated values of the target attribute. One advantage of using database views to do the class label propagation is that, we get a live transformation. If the original databases are updated, the views also get correspondingly updated by definition. Even 1-to-many and many-to-1 relationships are automatically handled with appropriately duplicated rows in the views. This makes it more convenient for practical scenarios. Additionally, if there are any authorization restrictions on some databases, the same authorization will be extended to the views as well, and the first-level classification on this live view can be performed by the authorized user. It may be noted that since the first phase of the classification is purely at individual table-level, it is possible to execute the first-level classification task under different user credentials.

3.3. Label Aggregation

As described in section 3.1, our approach to classification is in two phases. In the first phase after label propagation, classification is done in the individual (extended) tables and in the second phase, the predictions from this ensemble of individual table classifiers are aggregated appropriately to get

the end result. The first phase is very similar to any traditional classification procedure. Depending upon the distribution of the data and the type of attributes, an appropriate classifier is chosen and its parameters are learnt in the training phase. Any classifier that provides confidence measure with its predicted class label can be used. We look at the detailed algorithm used in these two phases now.

3.4. Notations and Assumptions

Below are some symbolic notations used in the rest of this section.

- The Dataset X contains N database tables represented as $X_i, i = 1, \dots, N$
In the running example, X has 3 database tables (Table 1-3 of Figure 1)
- T_i is a transformed database view of X_i and includes the (possibly propagated) class label attribute. In the running example, the transformed views are the 3 tables of Figure 2
- H_i a classifier for table T_i appropriately chosen based on the characteristics of the table data.
- D_i is the number of dependent database tables of T_i as per the Join Graph, i.e., $D_i = \{T_j : edge < T_i, T_j > \in E\}$
- The target attribute takes K distinct class labels, $C_k, k = 1, \dots, K$
- P_{C_k} represents the prior probability for class label C_k over the aggregated/fused dataset.
- $P_{C_k}^i$ represents the class prior for C_k as obtained from a single transformed table, T_i .
- $P(C_k|T_i)$ is the posterior probability of class label C_k just based on the data attributes of T_i got by using classifier H_i .

3.5. Detailed Algorithm

We now describe the overall algorithm for predicting the class label of the test records. Algorithm NBSplit-Train will be used for data preparation (including creation of extended views of the tables by class label propagation) and training phase.

3.5.1. Algorithm NBSplit-Train:

Input: Database $X = \{X_i, i = 1, \dots, N\}$

Output: Classifiers H_i ; Class Priors $P_{C_k}^i, P_{C_k}$

Steps:

1. Read database schema of base tables in X and capture the dependencies in an RDF file which the application expert can edit.
2. Read the edited RDF file and create the Join Graph $\langle V, E, W \rangle$ for the application
3. Let $X_r \in V$ be the vertex corresponding to the target table, T_r
4. Starting at vertex X_r , determine a valid edge order containing $E' \subseteq E$ with a breadth first search on the Join Graph.
5. For every edge, $(X_p, X_q) \in E'$ with label $\langle l_p, l_q \rangle$:
Create T_q , an extended view of X_q , by joining Tables T_p and X_q with clause $T_p.l_p = X_q.l_q$.
6. Training: For each table view, $T_i, i = 1, \dots, N$
 - Compute priors, $P_{C_k}^i, k = 1, \dots, K$
 - Build a suitable classifier H_i from the training set T_i (classical training phase)
7. Fusion (optional): Create a fused table by successively joining $T_i, i = 1, \dots, N$ and compute class priors in the fused table, $P_{C_k}, k = 1, \dots, K$.

In step 1 and 2, an initial RDF model of the Join Graph is created by reading the meta-data of the database, which can be edited by experts to add more semantics. In step 3 and 4, the order of class label propagation is determined. Step 6 is the training step for the first level classification. Here, different classification algorithms can be learnt for different tables based on the attribute distribution. Step 7 optionally computes the class priors from a fusion table or alternatively one can assume uniform priors for each class. The output of the training phase is a set of classifiers and class priors if computed.

3.5.2. Algorithm NBSplit-Test:

Input: Database X , Classifiers H_i ; Class Priors $P_{C_k}^i, P_{C_k}$, Sorted edges of Join Graph E'

Output: Predicted class label L for each test sample.

Steps:

1. Create a test view Q_r of the target table, X_r to extract the required test record

2. For every edge $(X_p, X_q) \in E'$ with label $\langle l_p, l_q \rangle$:
Create Q_q , a filtered view of X_q , using a JOIN of Q_p and X_q with join clause $Q_p.l_p = X_q.l_q$
3. For each test record in table, $Q_i, i = 1..N$
Compute table-level posterior probabilities, $P(C_k|T_i)$ for each class $k = 1..K$, using the corresponding earlier trained classifier, H_i
4. Now traverse the Join Graph in depth first order to determine a table order for aggregation, V' .
5. For each node $X_j \in V'$, recursively compute scaled posterior using the following product over itself and its dependent tables, D_i

$$P(C_k|T_j) = \frac{\{P_{C_k} \prod_i P(C_k|T_i)\}}{\prod_i P_{C_k}^i}$$
6. Classify the test sample to belong to class L when the target table is reached in the recursion. L is given by the following equation:

$$L = \operatorname{argmax}_k \left\{ \frac{P_{C_k} \prod_i P(C_k|T_i)}{\prod_i P_{C_k}^i} \right\}$$

Algorithm NBSplit-Test is used for classifying the test samples, details of which is described above. After extracting the test record from the target table in step 1, new filtered views are created in step 2 to extract relevant attributes for table-level classification. After filtering this step may even result in conflicts in the value of the propagated status (target label), wherein diverse status values are seen for same attribute lists. That condition arises due to one-to-many relations in the database system, which is resolved using a simple scheme of voting on conflicting test samples. In step 3, table-level posterior probabilities are computed. The recursive aggregation is performed in step 5. The function used for aggregation is derived in the next section. The final decision (in step 6) is based on the class that gets the highest computed aggregated posterior probability at the root of the Join Graph.

3.6. Proof by Induction

We now give a simple proof for the aggregation equation used in steps 5 and 6 of the algorithm NBSplit-Test, assuming binary classification. The proof is based on induction over depth of the Join Graph, d . We would like to prove the decision rule

Decide C1 if

$$\frac{\{P_{C_1} \prod P(C_1|T_i)\}}{\prod P_{C_1}^i} \geq \frac{\{P_{C_2} \prod P(C_2|T_i)\}}{\prod P_{C_2}^i} \quad (1)$$

Firstly, the basis condition is when $(d = 0)$, in which case equation (1) trivially reduces to Bayes Rule. From a practical standpoint, this condition

occurs when the number of nodes in the Join Graph is just one (a single table classifier).

Now to prove the induction rule, let us consider an intermediate node in the Join Graph, R which is at a depth d and has r successors. Without loss of generality, figure 3 for our running example could represent one such intermediate node R (Researcher table) which is dependent on node J (Publications table) and D (Division table). So by induction hypothesis (the decision rule holds for node D and node J), that is, there exists a classifier H_d that can classify a test sample distributed across D and its descendants based on rule (1). This classifier will give the same decision as that given by fusing all attributes of D and those of its descendants. Similarly for table J and its descendants. Specifically, this classifier could be Naive Bayes. So, the probability that the sample gets a class label C_1 based on information in table R can be given by

$$P(C_1|X_R) = \frac{P(r_1|C_1)P(r_2|C_1) \dots P(r_r|C_1)P_{C_1}^R}{\sum_i P(X_R|C_i)P_{C_i}^R} \quad (2)$$

For proving the induction rule, we apply Naive Bayes rule across columns of a hypothetical table (X) got by fusing columns from tables R, D and J. So, the columns of the fused table X would be $r_1, r_2, \dots, r_r, d_1, d_2, \dots, d_d, j_1, j_2, \dots, j_j$ and the posterior probability based on table X will be

$$\begin{aligned} P(X|C_1) &= (P(r_1|C_1)P(r_2|C_1) \dots P(r_r|C_1)) \\ &\quad (P(d_1|C_1) \dots P(d_d|C_1))(P(j_1|C_1) \dots P(j_j|C_1)) \\ \iff P(X|C_1) &= \frac{P(C_1|X_R)P(C_1|X_D)P(C_1|X_J)}{P_{C_1}^R P_{C_1}^D P_{C_1}^J} * Q \end{aligned}$$

where

$$Q = \sum_i (P(X_R|C_i)P_{C_i}^R) \sum_i (P(X_D|C_i)P_{C_i}^D) \sum_i (P(X_J|C_i)P_{C_i}^J)$$

Now the decision rule for binary classification based on integrated data is:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Decide } C_1 \text{ if} \quad & P(C_1|X) \geq P(C_2|X) \\ \Rightarrow & P(X|C_1)P_{C_1} \geq P(X|C_2)P_{C_2} \\ \Rightarrow & \frac{P(C_1|X_R)P(C_1|X_U)P(C_1|X_J)P_{C_1}}{P_{C_1}^R P_{C_1}^U P_{C_1}^J} \geq \frac{P(C_2|X_R)P(C_2|X_U)P(C_2|X_J)P_{C_2}}{P_{C_2}^R P_{C_2}^U P_{C_2}^J} \end{aligned}$$

Generalizing the above equation,
 Decide C1 if
$$\frac{\{P_{C_1} \prod P(C_1|T_i)\}}{\prod P_{C_1}^i} \geq \frac{\{P_{C_2} \prod P(C_2|T_i)\}}{\prod P_{C_2}^i}$$

Hence, the proof.

4. Implementation and Results

Our implementation of the proposed algorithm is in Java and uses the Weka 3.5.7 ML package for the classifiers and the Jena library to model the Join Graph in RDF. The test databases are hosted on PostgreSQL 8.2 database server on a Windows XP machine. We evaluated the proposed algorithm on three types of datasets (a) TPCCH database benchmark to show practical applicability (b) UCI (Lung Cancer) dataset to prove its correctness (c) a multi-relational dataset (the financial database from PKDD Cup 99) to compare with prior relational classification techniques. More details of these results are given in the following paragraphs.

4.1. TPCCH benchmark

TPCH [33] is a decision support database benchmark for Customer Relationship Management with its data chosen to have broad industry-wide relevance. Using TPCCH, we compared the training time of our proposed Split-NB algorithm with Naive Bayes on fused tables. As seen in Table 1, there is an order of magnitude difference in the number of records that need to be processed, ie., 165000 records need to be processed if using a fused table as opposed to 296 in our technique. This difference has obvious benefits in training time of any classifier used.

Further, since TPCCH is a real enterprise database, use of RDF to specify the data of interest (in step 1 of §3.5.1) was very useful. For example, out of the 8 tables in the TPCCH database, only 3 tables were needed (CUSTOMER, ORDERS and NATION) to predict whether a given customer was likely to buy an household item. Also, the ORDERS table originally had 9 attributes of which we found that only four attributes were meaningful for the classification. The sample RDF file used for TPCCH is shown in Figure 5. Our solution is fully automated, just a change in the RDF file is sufficient to run the classification task on a new database.

Num of records in Nation table :	99
Num of records in Customer table:	99
Num of records in Orders table:	98
Total No. records with relational data:	296
Total No. records in the fused tables:	165000
Number of training samples for NBSplit	296
Num of training samples in fused data	165000
Time for training with fused tables	772 msec
Time for training with relational tables	20 msec

Table 1: Training Time for TPCD dataset

4.2. Financial Database from PKDD Cup

As a second experiment, we compared the accuracy of our algorithm with an other popular multi-relational classifier called Cross Mine [2], over a well-known relational dataset. As shown in Table 2, our technique performs extremely well, while CrossMine gave about 85% accuracy, our technique for PKDD database give even upto 100% accuracy. For this, we experimented with multiple classifiers on individual tables and chose the best classifier (SVM) for the individual tables and used the proposed aggregation mechanism across tables.

We did a few more experiments with this dataset to determine the need for the proposed algorithm. Since root (target) table contains the target attribute, can we use just the root table and ignore the rest of the tables? Well, is the aggregation mechanism really needed ? Results showed that just using root table for classification (using SVM) was insufficient, gives only about 77.5% accuracy. We also found that sometimes elimination of non-contributing tables (for example, Transaction table) can give much better results . Similarly, inclusion of Account and Order tables increased the accuracy results.This proves the benefit of using hidden semantics of schema design and modified RDF specified by the application expert .

4.3. Lung-Cancer Dataset from UCI

Finally, we confirmed the correctness and accuracy of our algorithm using a standard single-table dataset. We artificially loaded the 58 attributes of the Lung Cancer dataset into 7 tables in Star schema. We executed our algorithm over this distributed data and compared the results with fused

Accuracy with Cross Mine Algorithm	85%
Accuracy with NB-Split (SVM in phase 1)	100%
Best Accuracy using only the root table	77.5%
NB-Split (Multi-layer Perceptron)	92.5%
NB-Split (ML Perceptron) w/o Table Trans	95%
NB-Split (Heterogeneous Classifiers)	90%
NB-Split (Hetero Classifiers) w/o Trans	95%

Table 2: Results for Financial DB

dataset for multiple single-table classifiers. The results are shown in the Radar graph of Figure 4. As seen, the predictions got by both these procedures were exactly the same when we used Naive Bayes classifier at local level (both assuming Naive Bayes condition). While this exercise is not meant to compare the classifiers, it proves the effectiveness and correctness of our localized aggregation technique for diverse table-level classifiers.




Figure 4: Classification Accuracy

5. Conclusions

We proposed a practical, heterogeneous classification algorithm for relational databases, using a 2-phase meta-classification approach with a new aggregation mechanism. Our main premise is that since most databases are well designed by experts, we need to use this implicit semantics. The presented algorithm has heterogeneous classification and methods of applying it

to a practical relation database used in real life. For making this possible, we have presented a new recursive aggregation technique to collate heterogeneous classifiers applied at individual tables. We have demonstrated a good improvement in classification training time for TPCCH and proved that there is no loss of accuracy due to aggregation. We also showed the benefits of our approach over prior efforts. As next step, we would like to extend this technique to include auto-selection of the right classifier at the table level. Secondly, classification accuracy can be improved by eliminating some non-contributing tables. For this, we plan to associate an entropy metric with individual database tables and select the right subgraph from the Join Graph that minimizes the information loss.

References

1. Homgyan Liu, Xiaoxin Yin, Jiawei Han, “An Efficient Multi-relational Naive Bayesian Classifier Based on Semantic Relationship Graph”, ACM MRDM, 2005
2. Xiaoxin Yin, Jiawei Han, Jiong Yang, Philip S Yu, “CrossMine: Efficient Classification Across Multiple Database Relations”, ICDE 04, 2004
3. Hongyu Guo, Hema L Victor, “Mining Relational Databases with Multi-View Learning”, ACM MRDM 05.
4. Michelangelo Ceci, Annalisa Appice, Donato Malerba, “Mr-SBC: a Multi-Relational Naive Bayes Classifier”, LNCS, PKDD 2003
5. Peter A. Flach, Nicolas Lachiche, “Naive Bayesian Classification of Structured Data”, Machine Learning, 2004
6. Xindong Wu, Chengqi Zhang, “Database classification for multi-database mining”, Information Systems archive, March 2005, ISDN:0306-4379
7. Huan Liu, Hongjun Lu, Jun Yao, “Toward Multidatabase Mining: Identifying Relevant Databases”, IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering, July 2001
8. Shichao Zhang, Xindong Wu, Chengqi Zhang, “Multidatabase mining”, IEEE Comput. Intell. Bulletin 2003
9. Jing-Feng Guo, Jing Li, “An Efficient Relational Decision Tree Classification Algorithm”, ICNC 07
10. Rayner Alfred and Dimitar Kazakov, “Aggregating Multiple Instances in Relational Database Using Semi-Supervised Genetic Algorithm-based Clustering Technique”, ADBIS 2007

11. Ben Taskar, Eran Segal, Daphne Koller, "Probabilistic Classification and Clustering in Relational Data", Stanford University, IJCAI 2001
12. Blum A, Mitchell T M, "Combining labeled and unlabeled data with co-training", COLT 98
13. Ghani R, "Combining labeled and unlabeled data for multiclass text classification", ICML 2002
14. Paolo Giudici, "Applied Data Mining, Statistical Methods for Business and Industry", 2003
15. Breiman L, "Bagging Predictors", Machine Learning, 24 (2), 1996, 123-140.
16. Freund Y, Schapire R, "Experiments with a New Boosting Algorithm", ICML 1996.
17. David H Wolpert, "Stacked Generalization", Neural Network, 5, 1992, 241-259.
18. S Muggleton, "Inductive Logic Programming", Academic Press, New York, NY, 1992.
19. Blockeel H, DeRaedt L, Ramon J, "Top-down induction of logical decision trees", ICML 98
20. J R Quinlan, R M Cameron-Jones, "FOIL: A midterm report", Madison, WI, 1998 European Conf. Machine Learning, Vienna, Austria, 1993.
21. Getoor L, Friedman N, Koller D, Taskar B, "Learning probabilistic models of relational structure", ICML 2001.
22. Domingos P, Pazzani M, "On the optimality of the simple bayesian classifier under zero-one loss", Machine Learning, 29(2-3), pp. 103-130, 1997.
23. R Elmasri, S B Navathe, "Fundamentals of Database Systems", Addison-Wesley, 4th ed, 2004
24. Jennifer Neville, David Jensen, "Iterative Classification in Relational Data", AAAI 2002
25. S Slattery, T Mitchell, "Discovering test set regularities in relational domains", ICML 2000.
26. D Koller, A Pfeffer, "Probabilistic frame-based systems", AAAI 1998.
27. Semantic Web, W3C, <http://www.w3.org/2001/sw/>
28. RDFS, Resource Description Framework, Schema Specification 1.0, W3C Candidate Recommendation 27 March 2000

29. B Liu, W Hsu, Y Ma, “Integrating classification and association rule mining”, In Proc of KDD, 1998
30. W Li, J Han, J Pei, “CMAR: Accurate and efficient classification based on multiple class-association rules”, In Proc of ICDM, 2001
31. H Cheng, X Yan, J Han, CW Hsu, “Discriminative Frequent Pattern Analysis for Effective Classification”, ICDE 2007
32. Gartner’s take on emerging business intelligence technology, <http://itknowledgeexchange.techtarget.com/total-cio/gartners-take-on-emerging-business-intelligence-technology/>, April 2010
33. TPCB Benchmark, www.tpc.org/tpch/

```
<?xml version="1.0"?>
<!DOCTYPE rdf:RDF [
  <!ENTITY owl "http://www.w3.org/2002/07/owl#" >
  <!ENTITY xsd "http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema#" >
  <!ENTITY rdf "http://www.w3.org/1999/02/22-rdf-syntax-ns#" >
  <!ENTITY dm "http://example.org/datamining#" >
]>

<rdf:RDF
  xmlns:dm="&dm;"
  xmlns:owl="http://www.w3.org/2002/07/owl#"
  xmlns:rdf="http://www.w3.org/1999/02/22-rdf-syntax-ns#"
  xmlns:rdfs="http://www.w3.org/2000/01/rdf-schema#"
  xmlns:xsd="http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema#"

  <owl:ontology rdf:about="datamining">
  </owl:ontology>

  <dm:classification rdf:ID="work">
    <dm:targetAttr rdf:resource="#mktsid" />
    <dm:targetTable rdf:resource="#customer" />
  </dm:classification>

  <dm:table rdf:ID="customer">
    <dm:attr rdf:resource="#c_acctbal" />
    <dm:attr rdf:resource="#mktsid" />
    <dm:pkey rdf:resource="#custkey" />
    <dm:attr rdf:resource="#custkey" />
    <dm:fkey rdf:resource="#nationkey" />
    <dm:ftable rdf:resource="#nation" />
  </dm:table>

  <dm:table rdf:ID="orders">
    <dm:attr rdf:resource="#o_totalprice" />
    <dm:attr rdf:resource="#o_orderpriority" />
    <dm:pkey rdf:resource="#orderkey" />
    <dm:attr rdf:resource="#orderkey" />
    <dm:fkey rdf:resource="#custkey" />
    <dm:ftable rdf:resource="#customer" />
  </dm:table>

  <dm:table rdf:ID="nation">
    <dm:pkey rdf:resource="#nationkey" />
    <dm:attr rdf:resource="#nationkey" />
    <dm:attr rdf:resource="#n_regionkey" />
  </dm:table>
</rdf:RDF>
```

Figure 5: RDF used for masking irrelevant tables from a database