

An Efficient Implementation of Fast Clustering Based Feature Subset Selection Algorithm over High Dimensional Data

I Surya Prabha

Associate Professor

Department of IT,

Institute of Aeronautical Engineering,
Hyderabad, India.

ABSTRACT:

Feature selection involves identifying a subset of the most useful features that produces compatible results as the original entire set of features. A feature selection algorithm may be evaluated from both the efficiency and effectiveness points of view. While the efficiency concerns the time required to find a subset of features, the effectiveness is related to the quality of the subset of features. Based on these criteria, a fast clustering-based feature selection algorithm (FAST) is proposed and experimentally evaluated in this paper. The FAST algorithm works in two steps. In the first step, features are divided into clusters by using graph-theoretic clustering methods. In the second step, the most representative feature that is strongly related to target classes is selected from each cluster to form a subset of features. Features in different clusters are relatively independent; the clustering-based strategy of FAST has a high probability of producing a subset of useful and independent features.

To ensure the efficiency of FAST, we adopt the efficient minimum-spanning tree (MST) clustering method. The efficiency and effectiveness of the FAST algorithm are evaluated through an empirical study. Extensive experiments are carried out to compare FAST and several representative feature selection algorithms, namely, FCBF, ReliefF, CFS, Consist, and FOCUS-SF, with respect to four types of well-known classifiers, namely, the probability-based Naive Bayes, the tree-based C4.5, the instance-based IBI, and the rule-based RIPPER before and after feature selection. The results, on 35 publicly available real-world high-dimensional image, microarray, and text data, demonstrate that the FAST not only produces

smaller subsets of features but also improves the performances of the four types of classifiers.

INTRODUCTION

With the aim of choosing a subset of good features with respect to the target concepts, feature subset selection is an effective way for reducing dimensionality, removing irrelevant data, increasing learning accuracy, and improving result comprehensibility. Many feature subset selection methods have been proposed and studied for machine learning applications. They can be divided into four broad categories: the Embedded, Wrapper, Filter, and Hybrid approaches. The embedded methods incorporate feature selection as a part of the training process and are usually specific to given learning algorithms, and therefore may be more efficient than the other three categories. Traditional machine learning algorithms like decision trees or artificial neural networks are examples of embedded approaches.

The wrapper methods use the predictive accuracy of a predetermined learning algorithm to determine the goodness of the selected subsets, the accuracy of the learning algorithms is usually high. However, the generality of the selected features is limited and the computational complexity is large. The filter methods are independent of learning algorithms, with good generality. Their computational complexity is low, but the accuracy of the learning algorithms is not guaranteed. The hybrid are a combination of filter and wrapper methods by using a filter method to reduce search space that will be considered by the subsequent wrapper. They mainly focus on combining filter and wrapper methods to achieve the best possible

performance with a particular learning algorithm with similar time complexity of the filter methods. The wrapper methods are computationally expensive and tend to overfit on small training sets [13], [15]. The filter methods, in addition to their generality, are usually a good choice when the number of features is very large. Thus, we will focus on the filter method in this paper.

Existing System:

The embedded methods incorporate feature selection as a part of the training process and are usually specific to given learning algorithms, and therefore may be more efficient than the other three categories. Traditional machine learning algorithms like decision trees or artificial neural networks are examples of embedded approaches. The wrapper methods use the predictive accuracy of a predetermined learning algorithm to determine the goodness of the selected subsets, the accuracy of the learning algorithms is usually high. However, the generality of the selected features is limited and the computational complexity is large. The filter methods are independent of learning algorithms, with good generality. Their computational complexity is low, but the accuracy of the learning algorithms is not guaranteed. The hybrid methods are a combination of filter and wrapper methods by using a filter method to reduce search space that will be considered by the subsequent wrapper. They mainly focus on combining filter and wrapper methods to achieve the best possible performance with a particular learning algorithm with similar time complexity of the filter methods.

Disadvantages

1. The generality of the selected features is limited and the computational complexity is large.
2. Their computational complexity is low, but the accuracy of the learning algorithms is not guaranteed.

Proposed System:

Feature subset selection can be viewed as the process of identifying and removing as many irrelevant and redundant features as possible. This is because irrelevant features do not contribute to the predictive

accuracy and redundant features do not redound to getting a better predictor for that they provide mostly information which is already present in other feature(s). Of the many feature subset selection algorithms, some can effectively eliminate irrelevant features but fail to handle redundant features yet some of others can eliminate the irrelevant while taking care of the redundant features. Our proposed FAST algorithm falls into the second group. Traditionally, feature subset selection research has focused on searching for relevant features. A well-known example is Relief which weighs each feature according to its ability to discriminate instances under different targets based on distance-based criteria function. However, Relief is ineffective at removing redundant features as two predictive but highly correlated features are likely both to be highly weighted. Relief-F extends Relief, enabling this method to work with noisy and incomplete data sets and to deal with multiclass problems, but still cannot identify redundant features.

Advantages:

1. Good feature subsets contain features highly correlated with (predictive of) the class, yet uncorrelated with each other.
2. The efficiently and effectively deal with both irrelevant and redundant features, and obtain a good feature subset.

Implementation

Implementation is the stage of the project when the theoretical design is turned out into a working system. Thus it can be considered to be the most critical stage in achieving a successful new system and in giving the user, confidence that the new system will work and be effective. The implementation stage involves careful planning, investigation of the existing system and its constraints on implementation, designing of methods to achieve changeover and evaluation of changeover methods.

Main Modules:-

1. User Module:

In this module, Users are having authentication and security to access the detail which is presented in the

ontology system. Before accessing or searching the details user should have the account in that otherwise they should register first.

2. Distributed Clustering:

The Distributional clustering has been used to cluster words into groups based either on their participation in particular grammatical relations with other words by Pereira et al. or on the distribution of class labels associated with each word by Baker and McCallum . As distributional clustering of words are agglomerative in nature, and result in suboptimal word clusters and high computational cost, proposed a new information-theoretic divisive algorithm for word clustering and applied it to text classification. Proposed to cluster features using a special metric of distance, and then makes use of the of the resulting cluster hierarchy to choose the most relevant attributes. Unfortunately, the cluster evaluation measure based on distance does not identify a feature subset that allows the classifiers to improve their original performance accuracy. Furthermore, even compared with other feature selection methods, the obtained accuracy is lower.

3. Subset Selection Algorithm

The Irrelevant features, along with redundant features, severely affect the accuracy of the learning machines. Thus, feature subset selection should be able to identify and remove as much of the irrelevant and redundant information as possible. Moreover, “good feature subsets contain features highly correlated with (predictive of) the class, yet uncorrelated with (not predictive of) each other. Keeping these in mind, we develop a novel algorithm which can efficiently and effectively deal with both irrelevant and redundant features, and obtain a good feature subset.

4. Time Complexity:

The major amount of work for Algorithm 1 involves the computation of SU values for TR relevance and F-Correlation, which has linear complexity in terms of the number of instances in a given data set. The first part of the algorithm has a linear time complexity in terms of the number of features m . Assuming features

are selected as relevant ones in the first part, when $k \frac{1}{4}$ only one feature is selected.

CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have presented a novel clustering-based feature subset selection algorithm for high dimensional data.

The algorithm involves

- 1) Removing irrelevant features,
- 2) Constructing a minimum spanning tree from relative ones, and
- 3) Partitioning the MST and selecting representative features. In the proposed algorithm, a cluster consists of features. Each cluster is treated as a single feature and thus dimensionality is drastically reduced. We have compared the performance of the proposed algorithm with those of the five well-known feature selection algorithms FCBF, ReliefF, CFS, Consist, and FOCUS- SF on the 35 publicly available image, microarray, and text data from the four different aspects of the proportion of selected features, runtime, classification accuracy of a given classifier, and the Win/Draw/Loss record. Generally, the proposed algorithm obtained the best proportion of selected features, the best runtime, and the best classification accuracy for Naive Bayes, C4.5, and RIPPER, and the second best classification accuracy for IB1. The Win/Draw/Loss records confirmed the conclusions. We also found that FAST obtains the rank of 1 for microarray data, the rank of 2 for text data, and the rank of 3 for image data in terms of classification accuracy of the four different types of classifiers, and CFS is a good alternative. At the same time, FCBF is a good alternative for image and text data. Moreover, Consist, and FOCUS-SF are alternatives for text data.

REFERENCES

- [1] H. Almuallim and T.G. Dietterich, “Algorithms for Identifying Relevant Features,” Proc. Ninth Canadian Conf. Artificial Intelligence, pp. 38-45, 1992.
- [2] H. Almuallim and T.G. Dietterich, “Learning Boolean Concepts in the Presence of Many Irrelevant

Features,” Artificial Intelligence, vol. 69, nos. 1/2, pp. 279-305, 1994.

[3] A. Arauzo-Azofra, J.M. Benitez, and J.L. Castro, “A Feature Set Measure Based on Relief,” Proc. Fifth Int’l Conf. Recent Advances in Soft Computing, pp. 104-109, 2004.

[4] L.D. Baker and A.K. McCallum, “Distributional Clustering of Words for Text Classification,” Proc. 21st Ann. Int’l ACM SIGIR Conf. Research and Development in information Retrieval, pp. 96-103, 1998.

[5] R. Battiti, “Using Mutual Information for Selecting Features in Supervised Neural Net Learning,” IEEE Trans. Neural Networks, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 537-550, July 1994.

[6] D.A. Bell and H. Wang, “A Formalism for Relevance and Its Application in Feature Subset Selection,” Machine Learning, vol. 41, no. 2, pp. 175-195, 2000.

[7] J. Biesiada and W. Duch, “Features Election for High-Dimensional data a Pearson Redundancy Based Filter,” Advances in Soft Computing, vol. 45, pp. 242-249, 2008.

[8] R. Butterworth, G. Piatetsky-Shapiro, and D.A. Simovici, “On Feature Selection through Clustering,” Proc. IEEE Fifth Int’l Conf. Data Mining, pp. 581-584, 2005.

[9] C. Cardie, “Using Decision Trees to Improve Case-Based Learning,” Proc. 10th Int’l Conf. Machine Learning, pp. 25-32, 1993.

[10] P. Chanda, Y. Cho, A. Zhang, and M. Ramanathan, “Mining of Attribute Interactions Using Information Theoretic Metrics,” Proc. IEEE Int’l Conf. Data Mining Workshops, pp. 350-355, 2009.