

Superensemble Classifier for Improving Predictions in Imbalanced Datasets

Tanujit Chakraborty¹  and Ashis Kumar Chakraborty²

¹ and ² SQC and OR Unit, Indian Statistical Institute, 203, B. T. Road, Kolkata - 700108, India

Abstract

Learning from an imbalanced dataset is a tricky proposition. Because these datasets are biased towards one class, most existing classifiers tend not to perform well on minority class examples. Conventional classifiers usually aim to optimize the overall accuracy without considering the relative distribution of each class. This article presents a superensemble classifier, to tackle and improve predictions in imbalanced classification problems, that maps Hellinger distance decision trees (HDDT) into radial basis function network (RBFN) framework. Regularity conditions for universal consistency and the idea of parameter optimization of the proposed model are provided. The proposed distribution-free model can be applied for feature selection cum imbalanced classification problems. We have also provided enough numerical evidence using various real-life data sets to assess the performance of the proposed model. Its effectiveness and competitiveness with respect to different state-of-the-art models are shown.

Keywords: Ensemble classifier; imbalanced data; hellinger distance; decision tree; radial basis function network.

1. Introduction

Distribution-free models are specially used in the fields of statistics and data mining for more than fifty years now, mainly for their robustness and ability to deal with complex data structures [1]. However, traditional classifiers usually make a simple assumption that the classes to be distinguished should have a comparable number of instances [2]. This assumption doesn't often hold in many real-world classification problems. Real-world data sets are usually skewed, in which many of the cases belong to a larger class, and fewer cases belong to a smaller, yet usually more interesting class. These are also the cases where the cost of misclassifying minority examples is much higher concerning the seriousness of the problem we are dealing with [3]. Due to higher weightage is given to the majority class, these systems tend to misclassify the minority class examples as the majority, and lead to a high false negative rate. For example, consider a binary classification problem with the

¹Corresponding author: Tanujit Chakraborty (tanujit_r@isical.ac.in)

class distribution of 90 : 10. In this case, a straightforward method of guessing all instances to be positive class would achieve an accuracy of 90%.

To deal with imbalanced datasets, there are many approaches developed in the literature. One way to deal with the imbalanced data problems is to modify the class distributions in the training data by applying sampling techniques to the dataset. Sampling techniques either oversamples the minority class to match the size of the majority class [4] or undersamples the majority class to match the size of the minority class [5]. Synthetic minority oversampling technique (SMOTE) is among the most popular methods that oversample the minority class by generating artificially interpolated data [6]. Hybrid sampling approaches, viz. SMOTE with data cleaning methods (for example, Tomek links (TL) and edited nearest neighbor (ENN) rule) not only balances the data but also removes noisy instances lying on the wrong side of the decision boundaries [7]. Sometimes different combinations of undersampling, oversampling and ensemble learning techniques are used to tackle the curse of imbalanced datasets [8]. But these approaches have apparent deficiencies like undersampling majority instances may lose potential useful information of the data set and oversampling increases the size of the training data set, which may increase computational cost. To overcome this problem, “imbalanced data-oriented” algorithms are designed which can handle class imbalanced without any modification in class distribution. HDDT [9] uses Hellinger distance (HD) as decision tree splitting criterion and it is insensitive towards the skewness of the class distribution [10]. Some other pieces of literature are HD based random forest (HDRF) [11] and class confidence proportion decision tree (CCPDT), robust decision tree-based algorithms which can also handle original imbalanced datasets [12]. Though HDDTs are robust, skew-sensitive and mitigate the need for sampling, they are high variance estimator and a greedy algorithm.

To mitigate these problems of HDDT suffering from sticking to local minima and overfitting the data set, an ensemble learning approach is adopted in this paper. Important prerequisites for building a “good” ensemble classifier is to choose the base classifier to be simple and as accurate as possible and distinct from the other classifier(s) used [2]. Two such widely used models for ensemble learning are decision tree (DT) and artificial neural networks (ANN). Extensive works are done earlier on the mapping of tree-based models to ANN in the previous literature [13, 14, 15, 16, 17]. However, training multilayer perceptrons (MLP) usually takes longer time and finding the number of nodes in the hidden layer of MLP is a challenging task whereas RBFN has the advantages of having only one hidden layer, faster convergence, easy interpretability and universal consistency [18]. But RBFN also assumes having equal class distribution during implementation in classification problems. Motivated by the above discussion, we propose in the present paper a novel superensemble classifier based on HDDT and RBFN. Harnessing the ensemble formulation, we try to exploit the strengths of HDDT and RBFN models to overcome their drawbacks. The approach is first developed in theoretical details and latter different training schemes are experimentally evaluated on various small and medium-sized real world imbalanced data sets having high dimensional feature spaces. The proposed superensemble model has the advantages of significant accuracy, very less number of tuning parameters and ability to handle small or medium-sized datasets. Another major advantage of the proposed algorithm

is its interpretability as compared to more “black-box-like” complex models. Our proposed distribution-free superensemble classifier is found to be universally consistent and an idea on parameter optimization of the model is also proposed in this paper.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 illustrates the major problems when the dataset is imbalanced in nature. Section 3 outlines the HDDT, RBFN algorithm and the details of the proposed hybrid approach. Section 4 presents the theoretical properties of the approach. Section 5 is devoted to computational experiments and comparisons. Conclusions and discussions of the paper are given in Section 6.

2. Imbalanced Classification Problem

Let us first investigate the effect of class imbalance on the performance metrics and DT. It is essential to see how decision boundaries created by DT get affected by imbalance ratio (the ratio between the number of minority and majority examples).

Let X be an attribute and Y be the response class. Here Y^+ denotes majority class, Y^- denotes minority class and n is the total number of instances. Also, let $X^{\geq} \rightarrow Y^+$ and $X^{<} \rightarrow Y^-$ be two rules generated by CT. Table 1 shows the number of instances based on the rules created using CT.

Table 1: An example of notions of classification rules

class and attribute	X^{\geq}	$X^{<}$	sum of instances
Y^+	a	b	$a + b$
Y^-	c	d	$c + d$
sum of attributes	$a + c$	$b + d$	n

In the case of imbalanced dataset the majority class is always much larger than the size of the minority class, thus we will always have $a + b \gg c + d$. It is clear that the generation of rules based on confidence in CT is biased towards majority class. Various measures like information gain (IG), gini index (GI) and misclassification impurity (MI) are expressed as a function of confidence, used to decide which variable to split in the important feature selection stage [19]. From Table 1, we can define $\text{Confidence}(X^{\geq} \rightarrow Y^+) = \frac{a}{a+c}$. Let us consider a binary classification problem with the label set $\Omega = \{\omega_1, \omega_2\}$ and let $P(j/t)$ be the probability for class ω_j at a certain node t of the classification tree, where, $j = 1, 2$ for binary classification problems. These probabilities can be estimated as the proportion of points from the respective class within the data set that reached the node t . Using Table 1, we compute the following:

$$P(Y^+/X^{\geq}) = \frac{a}{a+c} = \text{Confidence}(X^{\geq} \rightarrow Y^+) \quad (1)$$

For an imbalanced dataset, Y^+ will occur more frequently with X^{\geq} & $X^{<}$ than to Y^- . So the concept of confidence is a fatal error in an imbalanced classification problem where

minority class is of more interest and data is biased towards the majority class. In binary classification, information gain for splitting a node t is defined as:

$$\text{IG} = \text{Entropy}(t) - \sum_{i=1,2} \frac{n_i}{n} \text{Entropy}(i) \quad (2)$$

where i represents one of the sub-nodes after splitting (assuming we have two sub-nodes only), n_i is the number of instances in sub-node i and n is the total number of instances. Entropy at node t is defined as:

$$\text{Entropy}(t) = - \sum_{j=1,2} P(j/t) \log(P(j/t)) \quad (3)$$

The objective of classification using CT is to maximize IG which reduces to (assuming the training set is fixed and so the first term in equation (2) is fixed as well):

$$\text{Maximize} \left\{ - \sum_{i=1,2} \frac{n_i}{n} \text{Entropy}(i) \right\} \quad (4)$$

Using Table 1 and equation (3); the maximization problem in equation (4) reduces to:

$$\text{Maximize} \left\{ \frac{n_1}{n} \left[P(Y^+/X^{\geq}) \log(P(Y^+/X^{\geq})) + P(Y^-/X^{\geq}) \log(P(Y^-/X^{\geq})) \right] + \frac{n_2}{n} \left[P(Y^+/X^{<}) \log(P(Y^+/X^{<})) + P(Y^-/X^{<}) \log(P(Y^-/X^{<})) \right] \right\} \quad (5)$$

The task of selecting the “best” set of features for node i are carried out by picking up the feature with maximum IG. As $P(Y^+/X^{\geq}) \gg P(Y^-/X^{\geq})$, we face a problem while maximizing (5). We can conclude from the above discussion that feature selection in CT based on the impurity measures is biased towards majority class.

This imbalanced problem can be looked upon from the perspective of performance evaluation metrics as well. Standard notations of a confusion matrix are given in Table 2. From Table 2 and using equation (1), we can write $P(Y^+/X^{\geq}) = \frac{\text{TP}}{\text{TP}+\text{FP}} > P(Y^-/X^{\geq}) = \frac{\text{FP}}{\text{TP}+\text{FP}}$, etc. Since the misclassification rate in the minority class is higher than the misclassification rate in the majority class, the confusion matrix based on different classification algorithms will have a fatal error. As a consequence, prediction models with imbalanced data will lead to a high false negative rate.

Table 2: Confusion matrix for binary classification problem

All instances	predicted majority class	predicted minority class
actual majority class	True Positive (TP)	False Negative(FN)
actual minority class	False Positive (FP)	True Negative (TN)

3. Solution Methodology

3.1. An Overview on HDDT

One way of handling an imbalanced dataset is to take recourse to sampling techniques during the preparation of the data set for further analysis. However, a significant disadvantage of these techniques is that in the process of sampling we either lose a lot of information in the form of losing the real-life data. HDDT uses HD as the splitting criterion to build a decision tree, has the property of skew insensitivity [9]. For the application of HD as a decision tree criterion, the final formulation can be written as follows:

$$HD = d_H(X_+, X_-) = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^k \left(\frac{|X_{+j}|}{|X_+|} - \frac{|X_{-j}|}{|X_-|} \right)^2}, \quad (6)$$

where $|X_+|$ indicates the number of examples that belong to the majority class in training set and $|X_{+j}|$ is the subset of training set with the majority class and the value j for the feature X . Similar explanation can be written for $|X_-|$ and $|X_{-j}|$ but for the minority class. Here k is the number of partitions of the feature space X . The bigger the value of HD, the better is the discrimination between the features. A feature is selected that carries the minimal affinity between the classes. Since equation (6) is not influenced by prior probability, it is insensitive to the class distribution. Based on the experimental results, Chawla [9] concluded that unpruned HDDT is recommended for dealing with imbalanced problems as a better alternative to sampling approaches.

3.2. An Overview on RBFN

RBFN is a family of ANNs, consists of only a single hidden layer and uses a nonlinear function called radial basis function as an activation function, unlike MLP. Figure 1 gives an example of RBFN with one hidden layer. RBFN is presented as a three-layered feed-forward structure where input layer distributes inputs to the hidden layer which contains neurons with nonlinear activation function [20]. Since gaussian functions are most frequently used in this layer, we use the gaussian kernel in this paper:

$$\phi_i(x_i) = \phi(\|x_i - c_i\|; \sigma_i) = \exp\left(-\frac{\|x_i - c_i\|^2}{2\sigma_i^2}\right)$$

where x is an input vector, ϕ_i is the output of i^{th} hidden neuron in the hidden layer with centers c_i and σ_i as the standard deviation. Finally, the output layer can be written as a weighted sum of hidden layer outputs:

$$f(x_i) = \sum_{j=1}^k w_j \phi(\|x_i - c_j\|) + w_0,$$




Figure 1: An example of Radial basis network with one hidden layer.

where w_j is the weight of the link from j^{th} hidden neuron to the i^{th} output neuron. An interesting property of RBFN which distinguishes it from other types of ANNs is that here the center vector can be selected as cluster centers of the input data. For practical use, the number of clusters is usually chosen to be much smaller than the number of data points resulting in RBFN of less complexity than other types of ANNs.

3.3. Proposed Superensemble Classifier

The motivation behind designing a superensemble classifier for imbalanced data sets is: (1) one would like to work with the original dataset without taking recourse to sampling; (2) we would like to ignore the drawbacks of single classifiers (HDDT and RBFN) and harnessing their positiveness; (3) high prediction accuracy. Here we are going to discuss our proposed approach which utilizes the power of HDDT as well as the superiority of RBF networks.

In the proposed model, we first split the feature space into areas by HDDT algorithm (discussed in Section 3.1). Based on feature rankings provided by HDDT, a set of important features are chosen and extracted from the training dataset. We then build the RBFN model using the important variables obtained through HDDT algorithm along with the prediction results obtained from HDDT as another input information in the input layer of the network. The effectiveness of the proposed classifier lies in the selection of important features and use of prediction results of HDDT followed by the application of the RBFN model. The inclusion of HDDT output as an additional input feature not only improves the model accuracy but also increases class separability. The proposed superensemble classifier can handle imbalance through the implementation of HDDT in selecting features as well as the incorporation of its predicted classes tied up with one hidden layered RBFN model. This hybridization improves the performances of single classifiers as well as reduces the biases and variances of HDDT and RBFN. The informal workflow of our proposed model is as follows:

- Apply HDDT algorithm to rank the feature, extracts important features and find the splits between different adjacent values of the feature using HD values (equation (6)).




Figure 2: An example of superensemble classifier with $X_i; i = 1, 2, 3, 4, 5$ as Important features obtained by HDDT, L_i as leaf nodes and OP as HDDT output. Creation of HDDT (Left) and one hidden layered RBFN model (Right).

- Choose the features that have maximum HD value. We further grow unpruned HDDT and record its outputs. HDDT has an in-built important feature selection mechanism and it takes into account the imbalanced nature of the dataset.
- Export important input variables along with additional feature (prediction result of HDDT algorithm) to the RBFN model and a neural network is generated.
- RBFN model uses a gaussian kernel as an activation function, and parameter optimization is done using a gradient descent algorithm (to be discussed in Section 4.2). Finally, we record the final predicted class levels.

This algorithm is a multi-step problem-solving approach such as handling imbalanced class distribution, selecting important features and finally getting an improved prediction. Due to the fact that HDDT is found to be robust in handling the curse of imbalanced datasets, thus incorporation of its predicted class levels along with important features obtained by HDDT as input features in RBFN will necessarily improve the performance of the single classifiers. A flowchart of the superensemble classifier is presented in Figure 2.

4. Theoretical Properties of the Proposed Model

Our proposed superensemble classifier has the following architecture: (1) it extracts important features from the feature space using HDDT algorithm; (2) it builds one hidden layered RBFN model with the important features extracted using HDDT along with HDDT outputs as an additional feature. We investigate the theoretical properties of the proposed model by introducing a set of regularity conditions for consistency of HDDT followed by the consistency results of RBFN algorithm. Further, an idea about parameter optimization in the superensemble model is proposed in Section 4.2.

4.1. Regularity Conditions for Universal Consistency

Let \underline{X} be the space of all possible values of d features and C be the set of all possible binary class labels. We are given a training sample with n observations $L = \{(X_1, C_1), (X_2, C_2), \dots, (X_n, C_n)\}$, where $X_i = (X_{i1}, X_{i2}, \dots, X_{id}) \in \underline{X}$ and $C_i \in C$. Also let $\Omega = \{\omega_1, \omega_2, \dots, \omega_{k_n}\}$ be a partition of the feature space \underline{X} . We denote $\tilde{\Omega}$ as one such partition of Ω . Define $L_{\omega_i} = \{(X_i, C_i) \in L : X_i \in \omega_i, C_i \in C\}$ as the subset of L induced by ω_i and let $L_{\tilde{\Omega}}$ denote the partition of L induced by $\tilde{\Omega}$. The value of HD obtained using Eqn. (6) is used to partition \underline{X} into a set $\tilde{\Omega}$ of nodes and then we can construct a classification function on $\tilde{\Omega}$. There exists a partitioning classification function $p : \tilde{\Omega} \rightarrow C$ such that p is constant on every node of $\tilde{\Omega}$. Now, let us define \tilde{L} to be the space of all learning samples and \mathbb{D} be the space of all partitioning classification function, then $\Phi : \tilde{L} \rightarrow \mathbb{D}$ such that $\Phi(L) = (\psi \circ \phi)(L)$, where ϕ maps L to some induced partition $(L)_{\tilde{\Omega}}$ and ψ is an assigning rule which maps $(L)_{\tilde{\Omega}}$ to p on the partition $\tilde{\Omega}$. The most basic reasonable assigning rule ψ is the plurality rule $\psi_{pl}(L_{\tilde{\Omega}}) = p$ such that if $x \in \omega_i$, then

$$p(\underline{x}) = \arg \max_{c \in C} |L_{c, \omega_i}|.$$

The plurality rule is used to classify each new point in ω_i as belonging to the class (either 0 or 1 in this case) most common in L_{ω_i} . This rule is very important in proving risk consistency of the HDDT algorithm. Binary split function partitions a parent node $\omega_i \subseteq \underline{X}$ into a non-empty child nodes ω_1 and ω_2 , called left child and right child node respectively. We use HD measure (see in Section 3.1) as goodness of split criterion and for any parent node ω_i , the goodness of split criterion ranks the split function and build the tree. The stopping rule in HDDT is chosen as the minimum number of split in the posterior sample, called minsplit function ($r(\omega_i)$). If $r(\omega_i) \geq \alpha$, then ω_i will split into two child nodes and if $r(\omega_i) < \alpha$, then ω_i is a leaf node and no more split is required. Here α is determined by the user, though for practice it is usually taken as 10% of the training sample size.

Thus HDDT is a binary tree-based classification and partitioning scheme Φ , defined as an assignment rule applied to the limit of a sequence of induced partitions $\phi^{(i)}(L)$, where $\phi^{(i)}(L)$ is the partition of the training sample L induced by the partition $(\phi_i \circ \phi_{i-1} \circ \dots \circ \phi_1)(\underline{X})$. For every node ω_i in a partition $\tilde{\Omega}$ such that $r(\omega_i) \geq \alpha$, then the function $\phi(\tilde{\Omega})$ splits each node into two child nodes using the binary split in the question set as determined by \mathcal{G} . For other nodes $\omega_i \in \tilde{\Omega}$ such that $r(\omega_i) < \alpha$, then $\phi(\tilde{\Omega})$ leaves ω_i unchanged. For a partition $\tilde{\Omega}$ of X , let $\tilde{\Omega}[x \in X] = \{\omega \in \tilde{\Omega} : x \in \omega\}$ be the node ω in $\tilde{\Omega}$ which contains x . Mathematically, we can write

$$\Phi(L) = (\psi \circ \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \phi^{(i)})(L) \quad (\text{where, } \phi^{(i)}(L) = L_{(\phi_i \circ \phi_{i-1} \circ \dots \circ \phi_1)(\underline{X})}).$$

The conditions for risk consistency of HDDT are given in Theorem 1.

Theorem 1. Suppose $(\underline{X}, \underline{Y})$ be a random vector in $\mathbb{R}^d \times C$ and L be the training set consisting of n outcomes of $(\underline{X}, \underline{Y})$. Let Φ be a HDDT scheme such that

$$\Phi(L) = (\psi_{pl} \circ \lim_{i \rightarrow \infty} \phi^{(i)})(L) \quad (\text{where, } \psi_{pl} \text{ is the plurality rule}).$$

Also suppose that all the split function in HDDT in the question set associated with Φ are axis-parallel splits and satisfies shrinking cell condition. If for every n and $w_i \in \tilde{\Omega}_n$, the induced subset L_{w_i} has cardinality $\geq k_n$, where $\frac{k_n}{\log(n)} \rightarrow \infty$, then Φ is risk consistent.

Proof. The proof of the theorem is very similar to the proof of the consistency of the classification tree [21] and histogram based partitioning and classification schemes [22]. The conditions for consistency require each cell of every partition belongs to a fixed Vapnik-Chervonenkis class of sets and also every cell must contain k_n points satisfying $\frac{k_n}{\log(n)} \rightarrow \infty$ as sample size approaches to infinity. For detailed proof, the reader may refer to [21, 22]. \square

Remark. It should be noted that the choice of important features based on HDDT is a greedy algorithm and the optimality of local choices of the best feature for a node doesn't guarantee that the constructed tree will be globally optimal [2].

Further, we build the RBFN model with HDDT extracted features and OP as another input feature in the RBFN model. The dimension of the input layer in the RBFN model, denoted by $d_m (\leq d)$, is the number of important features obtained by HDDT + 1. RBFN model consists of strictly one hidden layer, and due to this, the superensemble model is easily interpretable and fast in implementation. Our next objective is to discuss the sufficient condition for universal consistency of RBFN model. After incorporating HDDT output in the feature space, we have n training sequence $\xi_n = \{(Z_1, Y_1), \dots, (Z_n, Y_n)\}$ of n i.i.d copies of $(\underline{Z}, \underline{Y})$ taking values from $\mathbb{R}^{d_m} \times C$, a classification rule realized by a one-hidden layered neural network is chosen to minimize the empirical L_1 risk. Define the L_1 error of a function $\psi : \mathbb{R}^{d_m} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ by $J(\psi) = E\{|\psi(Z) - Y|\}$.

Consider a RBF network with one hidden layer and at most k nodes for a fixed gaussian function ϕ (as defined in Section 3.2), is given by the equation:

$$f(z_i) = \sum_{j=1}^k w_j \phi(\|z_i - c_j\|) + w_0,$$

where $w_0, w_1, \dots, w_k \in [-b, b]$ ($b > 0$) and $c_1, c_2, \dots, c_k \in \mathbb{R}^{d_m}$. The weights w_j and c_j are parameters of the RBF network and ϕ is the radial basis function. Choosing gaussian basis function as radial basis function which is a decreasing function such that $\phi(z) \rightarrow 0$ as $x \rightarrow \infty$. The next Theorem due to krzyzak et al. [23] gives regularity conditions for the universal consistency of RBFN model. But for the sake of completeness, we are rewriting Theorem 2 of [23] in our context.

Theorem 2. *If $k \rightarrow \infty$, $k = o\left(\frac{n}{\log n}\right)$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$ in the RBFN model having gaussian radial basis function ϕ , and in which all the parameters are chosen by empirical risk minimization, then RBFN model is said to be universally consistent for all distribution of $(\underline{Z}, \underline{Y})$.*

Remark. *We can conclude that if the superensemble classifier satisfies the regularity conditions as stated in Theorem 1 and Theorem 2, then the algorithm will be universally consistent. This is a fundamental property of any classifier for its robustness and general use. But computationally choosing parameters of RBFN by minimizing empirical L_1 risk will be very costly. In practice, parameters of the RBFN model are learned by a gradient descent algorithm, discussed in the next subsection.*

4.2. Optimization of Model Parameters

Here we will discuss the tuning parameters of the proposed superensemble classifier. In the first stage of the pipeline model, ‘minsplit’ function (see Section 4.1) to be chosen as 10% of the training dataset is recommended as the stopping rule in HDDT algorithm. Further, we grow unpruned HDDT and use HDDT suggested features and HDDT output as an additional feature in the input feature space of RBFN. RBF network is designed using a linear combination of gaussian basis functions. Therefore we need to use some optimization algorithm for empirical error (to be denoted by E in the rest of the paper) minimization on ξ_n [24]. Three important parameters to be optimized while training RBF network are: centers (c_i), standard deviation (σ_i) and weights (w_j) of each neuron. We use a gradient descent algorithm over E to perform the optimization task in RBFN model [25], as follows:

$$\Delta c_i = -\rho_c \nabla_{c_i} E,$$

$$\Delta \sigma_i = -\rho_\sigma \frac{\partial E}{\partial \sigma_i},$$

$$\Delta w_j = -\rho_w \frac{\partial E}{\partial w_j},$$

where ρ_c, ρ_σ and ρ_w are small positive constants. By this way, the parameters of the gaussian basis function will be optimized. Generalization error is estimated by cross-validation method, and the optimum value of k can be found by trial and error.

5. Computational Experiments

In this section, we describe the datasets in brief and also discuss performance evaluation metric. Subsequently, we are going to report the experimental results and compare our proposed model with other state-of-the-art classifiers.

5.1. Data Description

The proposed model is evaluated using five publicly available datasets from a wide variety of application areas such as management, business, and medicine, available at UCI Machine Learning repository [26] and a previous study [17]. Breast cancer dataset consists of 9 discrete features whereas pima diabetes dataset has 8 continuous features in its feature space. German credit card dataset (also popularly know as Statlog dataset) consists of 13 qualitative features and 7 numerical features. In this dataset, entries represent persons who take credit by a bank, and each person is classified as good or bad credit risks according to the set of attributes. Page blocks database has numeric attributes, contain blocks of the page layout of a document that has been detected by a segmentation process. Indian business school dataset contains 10 continuous and 7 categorical variable on the characteristics of students admitting in a business school and the response variable denotes whether the student will be placed or not at the end of the curriculum. To measure the level of imbalance of these datasets, we compute the coefficient of variation (CV) which is the proportion of the deviation in the observed number of samples for each class versus the expected number of examples in each class [27]. We have chosen three datasets with a CV more than equal to 0.30— a class ratio of 2 : 1 on a binary dataset as imbalanced data. Table 3 gives an overview of these data sets.

Table 3: Characteristics of the data sets used in experimental evaluation

Dataset	Classes	Objects (n)	Number of feature (p)	Number of (+)ve instances	Number of (-)ve instances	CV
breast cancer	2	286	9	201	85	0.41
german credit card	2	1000	20	700	300	0.40
indian business school	2	480	17	400	80	0.56
page blocks	2	5473	10	4913	560	0.80
pima diabetes	2	768	8	500	268	0.30

5.2. Performance Metrics

The performance evaluation measure used in our experimental analysis is based on the confusion matrix in Table 2. Area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUC) is a popular metric for evaluating performances of imbalanced datasets and higher the value of AUC, the better the classifier is.

$$\text{AUC} = \frac{\text{Sensitivity} + \text{Specificity}}{2}; \text{ where, Sensitivity} = \frac{TP}{TP+FN}; \text{ Specificity} = \frac{TN}{FP+TN}.$$

5.3. Results and Comparisons

In order to show the impact of the proposed superensemble classifier, it is applied to the high-dimensional small or medium-sized datasets from various applied areas. These are such types of datasets in which not only classification is the task but also feature selection plays a vital role as well. To start, we first shuffled the observations in each of the five different datasets randomly and split them into training, validation and test datasets in a ratio of 50 : 25 : 25. We have repeated each of the experiments 5 times with different

randomly assigned training, validation and test sets. Further, we compare our proposed classifier mostly with “imbalanced data-oriented” classifiers as baseline comparisons. Even we apply different sampling approaches over traditional classifiers and evaluate AUC values to see the competitiveness of the proposed model. All the classifiers are implemented in the R statistical package, and sampling techniques are applied in python toolbox on a PC with 8GB memory.

5.3.1. Baseline Comparisons

We start the experimental analysis by implementing CT algorithm to five publicly available imbalanced datasets. Tree-based CT model is trained using *rpart* package implementation in R. CT uses gini index, and C_p has been used for selection of variables to enter and leave the tree structure. Further, an ensemble of trees, random forests (RF), was implemented using *randomForest* package in R. We reports their prediction performances in Table 4. Another simple nonparametric algorithm, k-nearest neighbor (RF) is applied to the datasets using *class* implementation in R. To implement neural nets, we first standardize the datasets and run the ANN model. And we used “logsig” transfer function to bring back the original form at the end of modeling. We implemented the ANN model with different combinations of hidden layers without employing any other feature selection algorithm using *neuralnet* package. Since the datasets are small or medium sample sized, thus going beyond 2 hidden layered (2HL) neural net will overfit the datasets. For one hidden layer (1HL) ANN model, the number of hidden neurons are chosen as 2/3 the size of the input layer, plus the size of the output layer. But for 2HL ANN model number of neurons in 1st HL are chosen as 2/3 the size of the input layer and the number of neurons in 2nd HL are chosen as 1/3 the size of the input layer. RBFN is a particular class of ANN which uses radial basis kernel for nonlinear classification. Using *RSNNS* package, we applied the RBFN model with gaussian kernel function, and the maximum number of iterations in all these NN implementations are chosen as 100. Execution time for RBFN model is lesser than ANN but higher than tree-based models.

We now implemented HDDT algorithm by using R Package ‘CORElearn’ for learning from imbalanced datasets. HDDT usually achieved higher accuracy than CT and RF. This indicates that “imbalanced data-oriented” classifiers perform better than the conventional supervised classifiers designed for general purposes. Further, we implemented HDRF, CCPDT which are among other imbalanced data-oriented algorithms. Finally, we applied our proposed superensemble classifier which is a pipeline model. In the first stage, we select important features using HDDT and record its classification outputs. In the next step, we design a neural network with the above mentioned important features along with HDDT output as an additional feature vector. While RBFN implementation, we used gaussian kernel and used gradient descent algorithm for parameter optimization (see details in Section 4.2). HDDT reduces the dimension of the feature set and passes HDDT outputs (taking into account the curse of dimensionality) to the RBFN model, and RBFN improves the predictions. We reported the performance of various classifiers in terms of AUC value in Table 4. It is clear from Table 4 that our proposed methodology achieved better performance than

other state-of-the-art for most of the datasets used in this study other than page blocks data.

Table 4: AUC results (and their standard deviation) of classification algorithms over original imbalanced test datasets

Classifiers	breast cancer	German credit card	Indian business school	page blocks	pima diabetes
CT	0.603 (0.04)	0.665 (0.03)	0.810 (0.04)	0.950 (0.00)	0.724 (0.02)
RF	0.690 (0.06)	0.725 (0.03)	0.850 (0.04)	0.964 (0.00)	0.747 (0.04)
k-NN	0.651 (0.03)	0.727 (0.01)	0.750 (0.03)	0.902 (0.02)	0.730 (0.05)
RBFN	0.652 (0.06)	0.723 (0.04)	0.884 (0.05)	0.935 (0.01)	0.725 (0.04)
HDDT	0.625 (0.04)	0.738 (0.04)	0.933 (0.02)	0.974 (0.00)	0.760 (0.02)
HDRF	0.636 (0.04)	0.742 (0.03)	0.939 (0.02)	0.988 (0.00)	0.760 (0.03)
CCPDT	0.618 (0.05)	0.712 (0.05)	0.912 (0.03)	0.971 (0.00)	0.753 (0.01)
ANN (with 1HL)	0.585 (0.03)	0.700 (0.03)	0.768 (0.05)	0.918 (0.02)	0.649 (0.03)
ANN (with 2HL)	0.621 (0.02)	0.715 (0.02)	0.820 (0.04)	0.925 (0.01)	0.710 (0.03)
Superensemble Classifier	0.720 (0.06)	0.798 (0.04)	0.964 (0.01)	0.985 (0.00)	0.789 (0.05)

5.3.2. Experiments with Sampling Techniques

Table 5: AUC value (and their standard deviation) for balanced datasets (using SMOTE and SMOTE+ENN) on different classifiers

Data	Sampling Techniques	kNN	CT	RF	ANN (with 1HL)	ANN (with 2HL)	RBFN
breast cancer	SMOTE	0.700 (0.02)	0.665 (0.05)	0.722 (0.01)	0.605 (0.07)	0.680 (0.05)	0.704 (0.04)
	SMOTE+ENN	0.685 (0.03)	0.650 (0.03)	0.708 (0.01)	0.600 (0.06)	0.652 (0.06)	0.700 (0.03)
german credit card	SMOTE	0.758 (0.04)	0.745 (0.02)	0.762 (0.01)	0.740 (0.03)	0.735 (0.02)	0.764 (0.00)
	SMOTE+ENN	0.760 (0.03)	0.778 (0.02)	0.770 (0.02)	0.750 (0.02)	0.720 (0.02)	0.765 (0.00)
indian business school	SMOTE	0.783 (0.01)	0.845 (0.02)	0.859 (0.01)	0.765 (0.01)	0.798 (0.03)	0.905 (0.01)
	SMOTE+ENN	0.801 (0.01)	0.850 (0.01)	0.875 (0.00)	0.798 (0.02)	0.807 (0.03)	0.914 (0.00)
page blocks	SMOTE	0.927 (0.01)	0.965 (0.00)	0.967 (0.01)	0.933 (0.01)	0.942 (0.02)	0.954 (0.00)
	SMOTE+ENN	0.935 (0.01)	0.952 (0.00)	0.966 (0.01)	0.925 (0.01)	0.937 (0.01)	0.949 (0.01)
pima diabetes	SMOTE	0.770 (0.05)	0.758 (0.02)	0.753 (0.03)	0.698 (0.05)	0.719 (0.02)	0.745 (0.03)
	SMOTE+ENN	0.788 (0.04)	0.760 (0.01)	0.761 (0.02)	0.712 (0.04)	0.725 (0.02)	0.748 (0.02)

The application of data preprocessing steps to balance the class distributions is found useful to solve the curse of dimensionality. It has an advantage that these approaches are independent of the classifiers used [7]. But the major disadvantage is that it changes the original dataset. In this subsection, we try to find out the effectiveness of sampling methods on the imbalanced datasets. “Imbalanced-learn” is a python toolbox, used to tackle the curse of imbalanced datasets, provides application of a wide range of available sampling methods [8]. SMOTE [6] and SMOTE+ENN [7] are among the most popular oversampling and combination of oversampling and undersampling methods, respectively. We implement these two sampling techniques using “*imbalanced-learn*” open-source toolbox in python¹ with the default parameters available in the toolbox. These methods provide us balanced

¹<https://github.com/scikit-learn-contrib/imbalanced-learn>

datasets with equal class distributions. On the balanced datasets, we implement traditional models like k-NN, CT, RF, ANN (1HL), ANN (2HL), RBFN models. Results based on the application of different single traditional classifiers on two different sampling techniques are reported in Table 5.

Remark. *From Table 4 and Table 5, we can conclude that our proposed model performs reasonably well as compared to baseline models as well as single classifiers oversampling methods. We have highlighted the highest AUC value in both the tables with dark black for all the datasets. It is clear from computational experiments that our model stands as very much competitive with current state-of-the-art models.*

6. Conclusions and Discussions

In this paper, we proposed a novel distribution-free superensemble classifier which is a hybridization of HDDT and RBFN model for improving predictions in binary imbalanced classification problems. Because allocating half of the training examples to the minority class doesn't provide the optimal solution in most of the real-life problems [28]. It is important to note that "imbalanced data-oriented" algorithms perform well on the original imbalanced datasets [10]. If one would like to work with the original data without taking recourse to sampling, our proposed methodology will be quite handy. Our proposed model takes into account data imbalance and is useful for feature selection cum classification problems having small or medium-sized datasets. Through computational experiments, we have shown our proposed methodology performed better as compared to the other state-of-the-art. The model also has the desired statistical properties like universal consistency, less tuning parameters and achieves higher accuracy. We thereby conclude that for the imbalanced datasets it is sufficient to use superensemble classifier without taking recourse to sampling or any other "imbalanced data-oriented" single classifiers. The usefulness and effectiveness of the model lie in its robustness and easy interpretability as compared to complex "black-box-like" models. The proposed classifier will perform significantly well in imbalanced frameworks where our job is feature selection cum classification. If feature selection is not a part of the data analysis, like datasets from controlled/lab experiments (for example, NASA software testing datasets), our model will perform quite similar to HDDT and RBFN and very less gain in prediction can be obtained. But no model can have superior advantages, and this can be justified with *no free lunch theorem* [29]. An immediate extension of this work is possible for multi-class classification problems in imbalanced frameworks.

Acknowledgements

The authors are grateful to the editors and anonymous referees for careful reading, constructive comments and insightful suggestions, which have significantly improved the quality of the paper.

References

- [1] J. L. Romeu, “On operations research and statistics techniques: Keys to quantitative data mining,” *American Journal of Mathematical and Management Sciences*, vol. 26, no. 3-4, pp. 293–328, 2006.
- [2] L. I. Kuncheva, *Combining pattern classifiers: methods and algorithms*. John Wiley & Sons, 2004.
- [3] M. Rastgoo, G. Lemaitre, J. Massich, O. Morel, F. Marzani, R. Garcia, and F. Meriaudeau, “Tackling the problem of data imbalancing for melanoma classification,” in *Bioimaging*, 2016.
- [4] H. Guo and H. L. Viktor, “Learning from imbalanced data sets with boosting and data generation: the databoost-im approach,” *ACM Sigkdd Explorations Newsletter*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 30–39, 2004.
- [5] C. Chen, A. Liaw, and L. Breiman, “Using random forest to learn imbalanced data,” *University of California, Berkeley*, vol. 110, pp. 1–12, 2004.
- [6] N. V. Chawla, K. W. Bowyer, L. O. Hall, and W. P. Kegelmeyer, “Smote: synthetic minority over-sampling technique,” *Journal of artificial intelligence research*, vol. 16, pp. 321–357, 2002.
- [7] G. E. Batista, R. C. Prati, and M. C. Monard, “A study of the behavior of several methods for balancing machine learning training data,” *ACM SIGKDD explorations newsletter*, vol. 6, no. 1, pp. 20–29, 2004.
- [8] G. Lemaitre, F. Nogueira, and C. K. Aridas, “Imbalanced-learn: A python toolbox to tackle the curse of imbalanced datasets in machine learning,” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 18, no. 17, pp. 1–5, 2017.
- [9] D. A. Cieslak and N. V. Chawla, “Learning decision trees for unbalanced data,” in *Joint European Conference on Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*. Springer, 2008, pp. 241–256.
- [10] D. A. Cieslak, T. R. Hoens, N. V. Chawla, and W. P. Kegelmeyer, “Hellinger distance decision trees are robust and skew-insensitive,” *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, vol. 24, no. 1, pp. 136–158, 2012.
- [11] C. Su, S. Ju, Y. Liu, and Z. Yu, “Improving random forest and rotation forest for highly imbalanced datasets,” *Intelligent Data Analysis*, vol. 19, no. 6, pp. 1409–1432, 2015.
- [12] W. Liu, S. Chawla, D. A. Cieslak, and N. V. Chawla, “A robust decision tree algorithm for imbalanced data sets,” in *Proceedings of the 2010 SIAM International Conference on Data Mining*. SIAM, 2010, pp. 766–777.
- [13] I. K. Sethi and M. Otten, “Comparison between entropy net and decision tree classifiers,” in *Neural Networks, 1990., 1990 IJCNN International Joint Conference on*. IEEE, 1990, pp. 63–68.
- [14] A. Sakar and R. J. Mammone, “Growing and pruning neural tree networks,” *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, vol. 42, no. 3, pp. 291–299, 1993.
- [15] M. Kubat, “Decision trees can initialize radial-basis function networks,” *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, vol. 9, no. 5, pp. 813–821, 1998.
- [16] Y. Chen, A. Abraham, and B. Yang, “Feature selection and classification using flexible neural tree,” *Neurocomputing*, vol. 70, no. 1-3, pp. 305–313, 2006.
- [17] T. Chakraborty, S. Chattopadhyay, and A. K. Chakraborty, “A novel hybridization of classification trees and artificial neural networks for selection of students in a business school,” *OPSEARCH*, vol. 55, no. 2, pp. 434–446, 2018.
- [18] J. Park and I. W. Sandberg, “Universal approximation using radial-basis-function networks,” *Neural computation*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 246–257, 1991.
- [19] P. A. Flach, “The geometry of roc space: understanding machine learning metrics through roc isometrics,” in *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-03)*, 2003, pp. 194–201.
- [20] L. Györfi, M. Kohler, A. Krzyzak, and H. Walk, *A distribution-free theory of nonparametric regression*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.
- [21] T. Chakraborty, A. K. Chakraborty, and C. Murthy, “A nonparametric ensemble binary classifier and its statistical properties,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.10928*, 2018.
- [22] G. Lugosi, A. Nobel *et al.*, “Consistency of data-driven histogram methods for density estimation and classification,” *The Annals of Statistics*, vol. 24, no. 2, pp. 687–706, 1996.
- [23] A. Krzyzak, T. Linder, and C. Lugosi, “Nonparametric estimation and classification using radial basis

- function nets and empirical risk minimization,” *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 475–487, 1996.
- [24] T. Poggio and F. Girosi, “Regularization algorithms for learning that are equivalent to multilayer networks,” *Science*, vol. 247, no. 4945, pp. 978–982, 1990.
 - [25] N. B. Karayiannis, “Reformulated radial basis neural networks trained by gradient descent,” *IEEE transactions on neural networks*, vol. 10, no. 3, pp. 657–671, 1999.
 - [26] A. Asuncion and D. Newman, “Uci machine learning repository,” 2007.
 - [27] J. Wu, H. Xiong, and J. Chen, “Cog: local decomposition for rare class analysis,” *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 191–220, 2010.
 - [28] G. M. Weiss and F. Provost, “Learning when training data are costly: The effect of class distribution on tree induction,” *Journal of artificial intelligence research*, vol. 19, pp. 315–354, 2003.
 - [29] D. H. Wolpert, “The supervised learning no-free-lunch theorems,” in *Soft computing and industry*. Springer, 2002, pp. 25–42.