Similarity Learning via Boosting

Thiago Rodrigo Ramos

05 de Julho de 2024

I completed my PhD at IMPA, at the Centro PI (Center for Projects and Innovation)

- Stone Pagamentos (2020): Credit Scoring
	- ExactBoost: directly boosting the margin in combinatorial and
- Dasa (2021): Uncertainty Quantification
	- Split conformal prediction for dependent data
- Rede Globo (2022): Record Linkage
	- Similarity Learning via Boosting

- Stone Pagamentos (2020): Credit Scoring
	- ExactBoost: directly boosting the margin in combinatorial and non-decomposable metrics
- Dasa (2021): Uncertainty Quantification
	- Split conformal prediction for dependent data
- Rede Globo (2022): Record Linkage
	- Similarity Learning via Boosting

- Stone Pagamentos (2020): Credit Scoring
	- ExactBoost: directly boosting the margin in combinatorial and
- Dasa (2021): Uncertainty Quantification
	- Split conformal prediction for dependent data
- Rede Globo (2022): Record Linkage
	- Similarity Learning via Boosting

- Stone Pagamentos (2020): Credit Scoring
	- ExactBoost: directly boosting the margin in combinatorial and
- Dasa (2021): Uncertainty Quantification
	- Split conformal prediction for dependent data
- Rede Globo (2022): Record Linkage
	- Similarity Learning via Boosting

Figure: This scene from "Tropa de Elite" was filmed on IMPA

Figure: Filme "Ricos de amor" da Netflix

Multiple very large datasets with movies information (e.g. IMDB, TMDB, Rotten Tomatoes)

How can we match similar entries from potentially large datasets to create a richer dataset?

Naive solution: Check all pairs

Naive solution: Check all pairs

How to filter out entries that are highly dissimilar?

Similarity hashing

One possible solution is to define a hash code for each entry

One possible solution is to define a hash code for each entry and then block similar movies together

Given datasets A, B for $A \in \mathcal{A}$ we want to find similar items $B \in \mathcal{B}$ while doing as few pairwise comparisons as possible.

Recall :=
$$
\frac{1}{|\mathcal{M}|} \sum_{(\ell,r) \in \mathcal{M}} \mathbf{1}_{[A_{\ell} \text{ and } B_{r} \text{ share a block}]
$$
;
\n $RR := 1 - \frac{1}{|\mathcal{N}|} \sum_{(\ell,r) \in \mathcal{N}} \mathbf{1}_{[A_{\ell} \text{ and } B_{r} \text{ share a block}]}$
\n $H := 2 \frac{\text{Recall} \cdot \text{RR}}{\text{Recall} + \text{RR}}$

where $\mathcal{N} := [N_{\mathcal{A}}] \times [N_{\mathcal{B}}]$ denotes all possible pairs and M denotes the set of matching pairs:

$$
\mathcal{M} := \{ (\ell, r) \in \mathcal{N}, A_{\ell} \sim_R B_r, (A_{\ell}, B_r) \in \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B} \}.
$$

A possible solution is to use Locality Sensitive Hashing (LSH)

How to find out which red point is closest to the blue point?

Select a random hyperplane...

and another...

This creates a partition

Compare only points in the same partition!

Boost can be used to learn these hyperplanes effectively using a data-driven approach!

- $Rule_1:$ Is it from 2002?
- Rule₂: Is it from Brazil?

. . .

• Rule₃: Name starts with "c"?

• Rule_T: The second letter in its name is an "i"?

- $Rule_1$: Is it from 2002?
- Rule₂: Is it from Brazil?

. . .

• Rule₃: Name starts with "c"?

• Rule_T: The second letter in its name is an "i"?

- $Rule_1$: Is it from 2002?
- Rule₂: Is it from Brazil?

. . .

- Rule₃: Name starts with "c"?
- Rule_T: The second letter in its name is an "i"?

- $Rule_1$: Is it from 2002?
- Rule₂: Is it from Brazil?

. . .

• Rule₃: Name starts with "c"?

• Rule_T: The second letter in its name is an "i"?

- $Rule_1$: Is it from 2002?
- Rule₂: Is it from Brazil?

. . .

• Rule₃: Name starts with "c"?

• Rule $_T$: The second letter in its name is an "i"?

Step 1: For each Rule, the model learns positive weights associated to its relevance and an error value

- Rule₁ has relevance $\alpha_1 = 0.31$
- Rule₂ has relevance $\alpha_2 = 0.29$
- Rule₃ has relevance $\alpha_3 = 0.25$

```
• Rule<sub>T</sub> has relevance \alpha_T = 0.015
```


Step 1: For each Rule, the model learns positive weights associated to its relevance and an error value

- Rule₁ has relevance $\alpha_1 = 0.31$
- Rule₂ has relevance $\alpha_2 = 0.29$
- Rule₃ has relevance $\alpha_3 = 0.25$.

. .

```
• Rule<sub>T</sub> has relevance \alpha_T = 0.015
```


• Using such rules and its weights, we can construct a similarity function between items A and B given by:

$$
f^*(A, B) = \sum_{i=1}^{T} \alpha_i \text{Rule}_i(A) \text{Rule}_i(B)
$$

where $\text{Rule}_i(x) = 1$ if x satisfies Rule_i and -1 otherwise

- Intuitively, for we want for some $\theta \in (0,1)$:
	- if A and B are match then $f^*(A, B) \ge \theta \approx 1$
	- if A and B are not match then $f^*(A, B) \le -\theta \approx -1$,

• Using such rules and its weights, we can construct a similarity function between items A and B given by:

$$
f^*(A, B) = \sum_{i=1}^{T} \alpha_i \text{Rule}_i(A) \text{Rule}_i(B)
$$

where $\text{Rule}_i(x) = 1$ if x satisfies Rule_i and -1 otherwise

- Intuitively, for we want for some $\theta \in (0,1)$:
	- if A and B are match then $f^*(A, B) \ge \theta \approx 1$
	- if A and B are not match then $f^*(A, B) \le -\theta \approx -1$,

Theorem

If $\theta > 0$, then f^* satisfies the previous condition with probability at least $1 - \varepsilon$, where:

$$
\varepsilon := 2^T \prod_{t=1}^T \text{error}_t^{1/2 - \theta} (1 - \text{error}_t)^{\theta - 1/2}
$$
 (1)

$$
+\frac{8}{\theta}\left(\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{A},n}}(\mathcal{K})+\mathcal{R}_{\mathcal{S}_{\mathcal{B},n}}(\mathcal{K})\right).
$$
 (2)

Furthermore, if there exists $\gamma > 0$ such that for all $t \in [T], \gamma \leq (1/2 - \text{error}_t)$ and θ < 2 γ , then the term in [\(1\)](#page-35-0) decreases exponentially with T.

The proof relies on concentration of measure, margin theory and Rademacher complexity properties

- To construct a single-bit hash we draw a random rule R following the
- We say that two items A and B have the same single-bit hash if
- It is easy to show that

$$
\mathbb{P}[R(A) = R(B)] = \frac{1 + f^*(A, B)}{2}.
$$

- To construct a single-bit hash we draw a random rule R following the distribution $\mathbb{P} (R = \text{Rule}_i) = \alpha_i$
- We say that two items A and B have the same single-bit hash if
- It is easy to show that

$$
\mathbb{P}[R(A) = R(B)] = \frac{1 + f^*(A, B)}{2}.
$$

- To construct a single-bit hash we draw a random rule R following the distribution $\mathbb{P} (R = \text{Rule}_i) = \alpha_i$
- We say that two items A and B have the same single-bit hash if $R(A) = R(B)$
- It is easy to show that

$$
\mathbb{P}[R(A) = R(B)] = \frac{1 + f^*(A, B)}{2}.
$$

- To construct a single-bit hash we draw a random rule R following the distribution $\mathbb{P} (R = \text{Rule}_i) = \alpha_i$
- We say that two items A and B have the same single-bit hash if $R(A) = R(B)$
- It is easy to show that

$$
\mathbb{P}[R(A) = R(B)] = \frac{1 + f^*(A, B)}{2}.
$$

- To construct a single-bit hash we draw a random rule R following the distribution $\mathbb{P} (R = \text{Rule}_i) = \alpha_i$
- We say that two items A and B have the same single-bit hash if $R(A) = R(B)$
- It is easy to show that

$$
\mathbb{P}[R(A) = R(B)] = \frac{1 + f^*(A, B)}{2}.
$$

We combine several single-bit hashes via the following algorithm:

Algorithm Algorithm to construct the hash codes

Require: $k, L \in \mathbb{N}$, convex weights $(\alpha_t)_{t=1}^T$, Rules $(\text{Rule}_t)_{t=1}^T$ 1: for $i \leftarrow 1$ to L do 2: for $j \leftarrow 1$ to k do 3: $g_{i,j} \leftarrow \text{Rule}_t$ with probability α_t 4: end for 5: $g_i \leftarrow (g_{i,1}, \ldots, g_{i,k})$ 6: end for 7: $q \leftarrow (q_1, \ldots, q_L)$ 8: return g

Two elements A and B are tested for similarity if $g_i(A) = g_i(B)$ for some $i=1,\ldots,L$

Theorem

Consider datasets A and B such that $|A| = N_A$ and $|B| = N_B$. Suppose our condition holds for $\theta > 0$. Then, given $\gamma \in (0, 1)$, if we set:

$$
\rho := \frac{\log\left(\frac{2}{1+\theta}\right)}{\log\left(\frac{2}{1-\theta}\right)}, \ k := \lceil \log_{\frac{2}{1+\theta}} N_{\mathcal{A}} \cdot N_{\mathcal{B}} \rceil \text{ and } L := \left\lceil \frac{2(N_{\mathcal{A}} \cdot N_{\mathcal{B}})^{\rho} \log(1/\gamma)}{1+\theta} \right\rceil,
$$

then

$$
\mathbb{E}\left[\text{Recall}\right] \ge (1-\gamma)(1-\varepsilon), \quad \mathbb{E}\left[\text{RR}\right] \ge \left(1 - \frac{|\mathcal{M}| + L}{N_{\mathcal{A}} \cdot N_{\mathcal{B}}}\right)(1-\varepsilon).
$$

Both expectations are with respect to the randomness in the hash code.

Table: Harmonic mean for each model and dataset.

Similarity hashing: Boosting

At each iteration $t = 1, \ldots, T$ of the boosting process, our model assigns a weight α^*_t to a specific feature of the dataset to block. This weight serves as an indicator of the significance of this feature in matching entities.

Figure: Feature relevance identified by the model during the boosting step for the musicbrainz dataset.

Thank you!