Carnegie Mellon University

Learning Decision Trees When You Cannot Trust Your Labels



Łukasz Sztukiewicz^{1,2} Jack H. Good² Artur W. Dubrawski²

¹ Faculty of Computing and Telecommunications, Poznan University of Technology, Poznan, Poland ²Auton Lab, School of Computer Science, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA, USA

Motivation	Demonstration	Performance	
Context	We compare the decision boundaries of selected	We demonstrate the models	

 Real-world datasets are noisy We compare the decision boundaries of selected methods trained on noisy data with 20% corrupted labels.

We demonstrate the models' relative performance to a standard Decision Tree algorithm measured by the Relative Weighted F1 score.

- Corrupted labels can hinder performance, increase size and prolong training times of models
- Relabeling is complex, costly and time-consuming

Objective

 To robustly learn a single decision tree without making assumptions about label noise

Clean data



Noisy data

Accuracy: 80.64%



- Ours (Base)
- Ours (FL)

Acknowledgement

Methods

Kernel Density Decision





Tree^[1]

 Fuzzification natively represents uncertainty in the tree structure



 Kernels smooth and increase margin of decision boundaries



Robust Splitting Criterion^[2]

 Takes into account unreliability of the data during decision tree induction Our Method (FL

)ecisio

Accuracy: 99.89%

Robustness

The authors would like to thank Rachel Burcin and John Dolan for making the RISS program possible and members of AutonLab for their continuous guidance and support. This work was partially funded by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency under award FA8750-17-2-0130.

References

[1] J. H. Good, K. Miller, and A. Dubrawski, Density "Kernel Decision Trees" Proceedings AAAI Spring of the Symposium on AI Engineering, 2022 [2] J. Abellán and S. Moral, "Building classification trees total using the uncertainty criterion" International Journal of Intelligent Systems, 2003 [3] J. H. Good, T. Kovach, K. Miller and A. Dubrawski, "Feature Learning for Interpretable, Performant Decision Trees" Advances in Neural Information Processing

Feature Transformation Learning^[3]

Gradient-based optimization helps in obtaining small, performant trees





We report Expected Loss of Accuracy (ELA) with respect to the clean dataset. The score is averaged across 10%, 20%, 30%, and 40% noise ratios scaled by a factor of 100 to improve readability. The best result is bolded, second best is underlined.

dataset	DecisionTree	GradientBoosting	RandomForest	Ours (Base)	Ours (FL)
balance-scale	53.8 ± 3.0	24.3 ± 2.2	31.8 ± 2.6	$19.5~\pm~1.4$	15.9 ± 0.9
btsc	51.4 ± 2.8	37.0 ± 2.2	46.7 ± 1.8	$\overline{30.5 \pm 2.0}$	$29.6~\pm~2.2$
iris	32.5 ± 4.2	24.0 ± 3.6	$17.8~\pm~3.3$	7.7 ± 2.5	$8.9~\pm~3.0$
kc2	37.5 ± 2.9	29.3 ± 2.8	31.8 ± 3.0	22.2 ± 2.5	$\overline{24.3 \pm 2.9}$
wdbc	31.7 ± 2.5	17.6 ± 2.7	13.7 ± 2.8	$13.3~\pm~2.9$	16.2 ± 3.2

Systems, 2023

