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AI: It’s…

…about learning, or it’s not AI
…not only machine learning, but…
…also about learning machines
…weak or strong, but…
…actually all of it’s still weak…
…so what’s the fuss?
AI Systems Think (sic) Differently

“A yellow school bus parked in a parking lot”
INTELLIGENT MACHINERY, A HERETICAL THEORY

"You cannot make a machine to think for you". This is a commonplace that is usually accepted without question. It will be the purpose of this paper to question it.
AI Education: Turing’s Component List

- Memory (chronological log)
- ‘Indexes of experience’ (event-based log)
- Special features observed in the indexes already used
- Experience of outcome (+/- weights)
- Crude rules of thumb (heuristics) for outcome classification (supervised), over time replace by sophisticated rules (unsupervised)
- Random noise
Officials from the Cleveland Clinic and IBM demonstrated how doctors might one day use IBM’s Watson technology to diagnose patients and come up with treatments. From left to right are Sean Steenberge, a student at the Clinic’s Lerner College of Medicine, Michael Barborak, a senior software developer and research from IBM, and Julie Tebo, an assistant professor with the college of medicine.
What can Learning Machines Learn?

• Spatial distributions
  - People movement during an epidemic
  - Information diffusion about an epidemic
  - Geographical spread, probabilistic models

• Networks and graphs
  - Social networks
  - Preferential attachment and strata
  - Hubs, bridges, giant components,…

• How to learn

• How to communicate
Data Visualisation without AI, no probs

Boman, M.; Ghaffar, A.; Liljeros, F. and Stenhem, M. Social network visualization as a contract tracing tool
AAMAS 2006

Figure 1: MRSAApp plot for MRSA Dataset Stockholm 2004, with the x-axis mapped onto In Degree and the y-axis mapped onto Out Degree, at t = 2000 days.
The AI Question (Vapnik 1990)

What must one know *a priori* about an unknown functional dependency in order to estimate it on the basis of observations?

*Old answer:* Almost everything

*New answer:* Some general properties of the set of functions to which the unknown dependency belongs
## AI Prediction meets Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predicted condition</th>
<th>True condition</th>
<th>Accuracy (ACC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td></td>
<td>$\frac{\sum \text{True positive}}{\sum \text{Total population}}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Predicted condition</td>
<td></td>
<td>$\frac{\sum \text{True positive} + \sum \text{True negative}}{\sum \text{Total population}}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>positive</td>
<td>False positive, False omission rate (FOR) $\frac{\sum \text{False negative}}{\sum \text{Predicted condition negative}}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>False negative, Type II error $\frac{\sum \text{False positive}}{\sum \text{Predicted condition positive}}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>negative</td>
<td>True negative  $\frac{\sum \text{False negative}}{\sum \text{Predicted condition negative}}$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$\frac{\sum \text{Correct predictions}}{\sum \text{Predictions}}$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Positive predictive value (PPV), Precision
$\frac{\sum \text{True positive}}{\sum \text{Predicted condition positive}}$

### False discovery rate (FDR)
$\frac{\sum \text{False positive}}{\sum \text{Predicted condition positive}}$

### False omission rate (FOR)
$\frac{\sum \text{False negative}}{\sum \text{Predicted condition negative}}$

### Negative predictive value (NPV)
$\frac{\sum \text{True negative}}{\sum \text{Predicted condition negative}}$

### Positive likelihood ratio (LR+)
$\frac{\sum \text{True positive}}{\sum \text{False positive}}$

### Negative likelihood ratio (LR−)
$\frac{\sum \text{False negative}}{\sum \text{True negative}}$

### Diagnostic odds ratio (DOR)
$\frac{\sum \text{Positive likelihood ratio (LR+)}}{\sum \text{Negative likelihood ratio (LR−)}}$

### F1 score
$\frac{2 \cdot \frac{\sum \text{True positive}}{\sum \text{Predicted condition positive}} \cdot \frac{\sum \text{True positive}}{\sum \text{Total population}}}{\frac{\sum \text{True positive}}{\sum \text{Predicted condition positive}} + \frac{\sum \text{True positive}}{\sum \text{Total population}}}$

---

**Wikipedia:** Positive and negative predictive values
Prediction - A Recent Example

Predicting of anaphylaxis in big data EMR by exploring machine learning approaches

Isabel Segura-Bedmar, Cristobal Colón-Ruiz, Miguél Ángel Tejedor-Alonso, Mar Moro-Moro

Highlights

- Identification of anaphylaxis cases in records by machine learning classifiers.
- Linear classifiers achieve very high performance (F1 = 95%).
- CNN provides slightly better performance, but with higher computation time.
- The use of undersampling does not improve the results.
Representation and Classification

- **Document representation**
  - Bag of words
  - Bag of words (tf-idf)
  - Average of word embeddings
  - Bag of centroids

- **Classifiers**
  - SVM
  - Logistic Regression
  - Random Forest
  - MLP
  - K-NN
  - Multinomial NB

- **Prediction of anaphylaxis cases**

**EMRs** → Word Embedding Model → Document representation → Classifiers → Prediction of anaphylaxis cases
Perceptron Convergence Theorem (Minsky and Papert 1988)

If a set of examples is learnable (100% correct classification, cf. gold standard), the perceptron learning rule will find the necessary weights

- in a finite number of steps
- independent of the initial weights

The rule does gradient descent search in weight space, so if a solution exists, gradient descent is guaranteed to find an optimal solution for any 1-layer neural network

C.R. Dyer, Univ of Wisconsin (remix)
Large-scale machine learning of media outlets for understanding public reactions to nation-wide viral infection outbreaks

Sungwoon Choi a, b, Jangho Lee a, Min-Gyu Kang c, Hyeyoung Min d, Yoon-Seok Chang e, Sungroh Yoon b, c, f

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmeth.2017.07.027

Highlights

- The emotional public responses to a nation-wide outbreak of Middle East respiratory syndrome (MERS) in Korea was analyzed.
- Massive media outlet data was collected during the outbreak.
- An intriguing loop of information transfers between the media and the public was discovered.
- This method would be helpful for alleviating the unnecessary fear and overreaction of the public regarding infectious diseases.
Visualization of Sentiment for MERS

The number of people who died of MERS

Anger
Fear
Hate

The number of deaths started to decrease, and so did the public fear.

However, no more death case was reported, and the public fear vanished.

Three death cases were reported after a hiatus, and the public fear started to grow again.
Machine learning has become an increasingly powerful tool for solving complex problems, and its application in public health has been underutilized. The objective of this study is to test the efficacy of a machine-learned model of foodborne illness detection in a real-world setting. To this end, we built FINDER, a machine-learned model for real-time detection of foodborne illness using anonymous and aggregated web search and location data. We computed the fraction of people who visited a particular restaurant and later searched for terms indicative of food poisoning to identify potentially unsafe restaurants. We used this information to focus restaurant inspections in two cities and demonstrated that FINDER improves the accuracy of health inspections; restaurants identified by FINDER are 3.1 times as likely to be deemed unsafe during the inspection as restaurants identified by existing methods. Additionally, FINDER enables us to ascertain previously intractable epidemiological information, for example, in 38% of cases the restaurant potentially causing food poisoning was not the last one visited, which may explain the lower precision of complaint-based inspections. We found that FINDER is able to reliably identify restaurants that have an active lapse in food safety, allowing for implementation of corrective actions that would prevent the potential spread of foodborne illness.
Data: It’s...

...never enough for machine learning
...almost never BIG
...always noisy: humans make noise
...not always best to impute
...a terrible idea to ask organisations and companies to put their data into common repositories
...about cleaning and cleaning and cleaning and cleaning and: in the end you might be able to do some AI programming
AI Programming (Minsky 1961)

Search – through some large space of solution attempts
Pattern-recognition – restricting to appropriate methods
Learning – by directing search according to experience
Planning – by analysing and further directing search
Induction – for general purpose intelligent machines
Isn’t it very close to Epidemiology?

Search
Pattern-recognise
Learn
Plan
Induce
Case-Based Reasoning, yes?

Search
Pattern-recognise
Learn
Plan
Induce

The Strand
AI Programming (Minsky 1961)

Search – through some large space of solution attempts
Pattern-recognition – restricting to appropriate methods
Learning – by directing search according to experience
Planning – by analysing and further directing search
Induction – for general purpose intelligent machines
AI Programming (Minsky 1961)
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Search (McCulloch & Pitts 1943)

“There is the genetical or evolutionary search by which a combination of genes is looked for, the criterion being survival value. The remarkable success of this search confirms to some extent the idea that intellectual activity consists mainly of various kinds of search.”

upon reading Turing (1937)
AI Programming (Minsky 1961)

Search – through some large space of solution attempts

**Pattern-recognition** – restricting to appropriate methods

Learning – by directing search according to experience

Planning – by analysing and further directing search

Induction – for general purpose intelligent machines
Pattern Recognition (Minsky 1960)

• Classify problem situations into categories associated with the machine’s methods
• Extract heuristically significant features of objects
• Define useful properties and make them resistant to noise
• Combine many properties to form a recognition system
Normalisation and Dimensionality Reduction
The Curse of Dimensionality

www.kdnuggets.com/2017/n15.html
AI Programming (Minsky 1961)

Search – through some large space of solution attempts
Pattern-recognition – restricting to appropriate methods
Learning – by directing search according to experience
Planning – by analysing and further directing search
Induction – for general purpose intelligent machines
Learning

The basic learning heuristic is to use successful methods.
The advanced learning heuristic is meta-level learning: learning how to learn (e.g., a program-writing program).
Success-reinforced models are averaging models and leads to stimulus-response-type reasoning.
Stimulus-Response Learning

- A machine receives stimuli via its sensors or receptors
- A machine acts or performs actions via its effectors
- That an action is a response to a stimulus means they co-occur; to add a particular time, does not add to expressive power
- Since both stimulus and response may be complicated, their relation is complicated, even in this simplest case
- Reinforcement learning lets a machine mirror itself in the results of its actions
Simple Learning Limitations

XOR is a function that cannot be learned by a perceptron: let + correspond to output 1 and – to output 0, then XOR is not linearly separable.

Simple learning machines are (digital) automata, whereas some organic processes are analog, like the human respiratory system (nervous response to blood CO₂ levels).
Modeling reservoir computing with the discrete nonlinear Schrödinger equation

Simone Borlenghi,† Magnus Boman,‡,§ and Anna Delin†,∥
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(Received 26 April 2018; published 1 November 2018)

We formulate, using the discrete nonlinear Schrödinger equation (DNLS), a general approach to encode and process information based on reservoir computing. Reservoir computing is a promising avenue for realizing neuromorphic computing devices. In such computing systems, training is performed only at the output level by adjusting the output from the reservoir with respect to a target signal. In our formulation, the reservoir can be an arbitrary physical system, driven out of thermal equilibrium by an external driving. The DNLS is a general oscillator model with broad application in physics, and we argue that our approach is completely general and does not depend on the physical realization of the reservoir. The driving, which encodes the object to be recognized, acts as a thermodynamic force, one for each node in the reservoir. Currents associated with these thermodynamic forces in turn encode the output signal from the reservoir. As an example, we consider numerically the problem of supervised learning for pattern recognition, using as a reservoir a network of nonlinear oscillators.

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevE.98.052101
AI Programming (Minsky 1961)

Search – through some large space of solution attempts
Pattern-recognition – restricting to appropriate methods
Learning – by directing search according to experience
**Planning – by analysing and further directing search**
Induction – for general purpose intelligent machines
Planning

• Costly to replan over and over again
• Time constraints: Real-time? Online? Batch?
• Learning how to plan, or planning how to learn?
• Can an AI system break rules?
• Norm- rather than rule-regulation?
• Weak AI vs. Strong AI
AI Programming (Minsky 1961)

- Search – through some large space of solution attempts
- Pattern-recognition – restricting to appropriate methods
- Learning – by directing search according to experience
- Planning – by analysing and further directing search
- Induction – for general purpose intelligent machines
Induction (Elman 1990)

“... by themselves, the simple learning systems are useful only in recurrent situations; they cannot cope with any significant novelty. Nontrivial performance is obtained only when learning systems are supplemented with classification or pattern-recognition methods of some inductive ability”.

Strategy of deep learning (Jordan 1986, Elman 1990): Extract heuristically significant features of objects
Emotion Recognition as an Example of AI

Unpublished work, with Abubakr Karali
Emotion Recognition

- The Paul Ekman (FACS) paradigm vs. machine learning
- The umami of emotions
- The dream of transfer learning
- Serendipitous synergy
- Ethics, bias, and fear of AI
- *Lie to me*, not forgetting the Chinese ghost
Traditional Facial Action Coding Units 2
Traditional Facial Action Coding Units 1
A Systemic Model of Sensemaking

M. Boman and D. Gillblad, Learning machines for computational epidemiology, doi: 10.1109/BigData.2014.7004419
~4,500 variables, n=5,218, complete data
Machine Learning methods for Quantitative Radiomic Biomarkers

Chintan Parmar1,2,4,*, Patrick Grossmann3,5,*, Johan Bussink4, Philippe Lambin3 & Hugo J. W. L. Aerts3,4,5

Radiomics extracts and mines large number of medical imaging features quantifying tumor phenotypic characteristics. Highly accurate and reliable machine-learning approaches can drive the success of radiomic applications in clinical care. In this radiomic study, fourteen feature selection methods and twelve classification methods were examined in terms of their performance and stability for predicting overall survival. A total of 440 radiomic features were extracted from pretreatment computed tomography (CT) images of 466 lung cancer patients. To ensure the unbiased evaluation of different machine-learning methods, publicly available implementations along with reported parameter configurations were used. Furthermore, we used two independent radiomic cohorts for training (n = 310 patients) and validation (n = 154 patients). We identified that Wilcoxon test based feature selection method WLCX (stability = 0.84 ± 0.05, AUC = 0.65 ± 0.02) and a classification method random forest RF (RSD = 3.52%, AUC = 0.66 ± 0.03) had highest prognostic performance with high stability against data perturbation. Our variability analysis indicated that the choice of classification method is the most dominant source of performance variation (34.21% of total variance). Identification of optimal machine-learning methods for radiomic applications is a crucial step towards stable and clinically relevant radiomic biomarkers, providing a non-invasive way of quantifying and monitoring tumor-phenotypic characteristics in clinical practice.
Feature Selection and Classification

Figure 2. Heatmap depicting the predictive performance (AUC) of feature selection (in rows) and classification (in columns) methods. It can be observed that RF, BAG and BY classification methods and feature selection methods WLCX, MRMR and MIFS shows relatively high predictive performance in many cases.
Ethics

- Interpretability
- Transparency
- Accountability
- What black boxes do you use?
The Mythos of Model Interpretability

Zachary C. Lipton

(Submitted on 10 Jun 2016 (v1), last revised 6 Mar 2017 (this version, v3))

Supervised machine learning models boast remarkable predictive capabilities. But can you trust your model? Will it work in deployment? What else can it tell you about the world? We want models to be not only good, but interpretable. And yet the task of interpretation appears underspecified. Papers provide diverse and sometimes non-overlapping motivations for interpretability, and offer myriad notions of what attributes render models interpretable. Despite this ambiguity, many papers proclaim interpretability axiomatically, absent further explanation. In this paper, we seek to refine the discourse on interpretability. First, we examine the motivations underlying interest in interpretability, finding them to be diverse and occasionally discordant. Then, we address model properties and techniques thought to confer interpretability, identifying transparency to humans and post-hoc explanations as competing notions. Throughout, we discuss the feasibility and desirability of different notions, and question the oft-made assertions that linear models are interpretable and that deep neural networks are not.

Comments: presented at 2016 ICML Workshop on Human Interpretability in Machine Learning (WHI 2016), New York, NY

Subjects: Machine Learning (cs.LG); Artificial Intelligence (cs.AI); Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (cs.CV); Neural and Evolutionary Computing (cs.NE); Machine Learning (stat.ML)

Cite as: arXiv:1606.03490 [cs.LG]
(or arXiv:1606.03490v3 [cs.LG] for this version)
The Largest Problem for AI: Talent

Christian Drosten: Spend money on training and labs
John Nkengasong: 1.500 epidemiologists for 1.2B Africans
Take Home Message

Don’t believe the hype!