



Decision tree modeling with relational views

Fadila Bentayeb, Jérôme Darmont

► **To cite this version:**

Fadila Bentayeb, Jérôme Darmont. Decision tree modeling with relational views. XIIIth International Symposium on Methodologies for Intelligent Systems (ISMIS 02), Jun 2002, Lyon, France. Springer, pp.423-431, 2002.

HAL Id: hal-00145444

<https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-00145444>

Submitted on 10 May 2007

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Decision tree modeling with relational views

Fadila Bentayeb and Jérôme Darmont

ERIC – Université Lumière Lyon 2
5 avenue Pierre Mendès-France
69676 Bron Cedex
France
{bentayeb | jdarmont}@eric.univ-lyon2.fr

Abstract. Data mining is a useful decision support technique that can be used to discover production rules in warehouses or corporate data. Data mining research has made much effort to apply various mining algorithms efficiently on large databases. However, a serious problem in their practical application is the long processing time of such algorithms. Nowadays, one of the key challenges is to integrate data mining methods within the framework of traditional database systems. Indeed, such implementations can take advantage of the efficiency provided by SQL engines.

In this paper, we propose an integrating approach for decision trees within a classical database system. In other words, we try to discover knowledge from relational databases, in the form of production rules, via a procedure embedding SQL queries. The obtained decision tree is defined by successive, related relational views. Each view corresponds to a given population in the underlying decision tree. We selected the classical Induction Decision Tree (ID3) algorithm to build the decision tree. To prove that our implementation of ID3 works properly, we successfully compared the output of our procedure with the output of an existing and validated data mining software, SIPINA. Furthermore, since our approach is tuneable, it can be generalized to any other similar decision tree-based method.

Keywords: Integration, Databases, Data Mining, Decision trees, Relational views.

1 Introduction

Recently, an important research effort has been made to apply data mining operations efficiently on large databases. Indeed, data mining tool vendors tend to integrate more and more database features in their products. However, in practice, the long processing time required by data mining algorithms remains a critical issue. Current systems consume minutes or even hours to answer simple mining queries on very large databases. On the other hand, database vendors recently began to integrate data mining methods in the heart of their systems. Hence, integrating data mining algorithms within the framework of traditional

database systems [2] becomes one of the key challenges for research in both the databases and data mining fields.

A first step in this integration process has been achieved by the rise of data warehousing, whose primary purpose is decision support rather than reliable storage. A closely related area is called On-Line Analytical Processing (OLAP) [3]. There has also been an impressive amount of work related to association rules, their generalization, and their scalability [6,11]. Relatively, less work has been done in the context of other classical data analysis techniques from the machine learning field, e.g., clustering or classification. In this area, most research focused on scaling data mining techniques to work with large data sets [1,4].

To truly integrate data mining methods into their systems, database vendors recently developed extensions to SQL and Application Programming Interfaces (APIs) [5,7,9,12]. These tools allow client applications to explore and manipulate existing mining models and their applications through an interface similar to that used for exploring tables, views and other first-class relational objects.

In this paper, we propose to integrate classical data analysis techniques (namely, decision tree-based methods) within relational database systems. To achieve this goal, we only use existing structures, namely, relational views that we exploit through SQL queries.

To illustrate our approach, we chose to integrate the ID3 decision tree-based method [10], which is a supervised learning method generating knowledge in a production rule-set form. We selected ID3 mainly because it is quite simple to implement. However, we plan to take other, more elaborate methods into account, since our approach is now validated.

Such algorithms as ID3 generate a decision tree that is a succession of smaller and smaller partitions of an initial training set. Our key idea comes from this very definition. Indeed, we can make an analogy between building successive, related partitions (different populations) and creating successive, related relational views. Each node of the decision tree is associated with the corresponding view. Since SQL database management systems provide a rich set of primitives for data retrieval, we show that data mining algorithms can exploit them efficiently, instead of developing all requirement functionality from scratch.

To achieve this goal, we designed a PL/SQL stored procedure that uses SQL queries to generate the decision tree. Note that the views that are successively created can be stored and thus queried or analyzed after the tree is generated, if needed. The main differences between our approach and the existing ones are: (1) existing methods extend SQL to support mining operators when our approach only uses existing SQL statements and structures; (2) existing methods use APIs when our approach does not; and (3) existing methods store the obtained mining models into an extended relational table as in [8]. In our approach, the mining model we obtain is defined as a traditional table representing the decision tree and a set of successive, related views representing the nodes of the tree.

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 explains the principle of our approach. Section 3 details our implementation of ID3 and the functionality of our stored procedure. Section 4 presents the experiments we

performed to validate our approach. We finally conclude this paper and discuss research perspectives in Section 5.

2 Principle of our approach

Induction graphs are data mining tools that produce "if-then"-like rules. They take as input a set of objects (tuples, in the relational databases vocabulary) described by a collection of attributes. Each object belongs to one of a set of mutually exclusive classes. The induction task determines the class of any object from the values of its attributes. A training set of objects whose class is known is needed to build the induction graph. Hence, an induction graph building method takes as input a set of objects defined by predictive attributes and a class attribute, which is the attribute to predict.

Then, these methods apply successive criteria on the training population to obtain groups wherein the size of one class is maximized. This process builds a tree, or more generally a graph. Rules are then produced by following the paths from the root of the tree (whole population) to the different leaves (groups wherein the one class represents the majority in the population strength). Figure 1 provides an example of decision tree with its associated rules, where $p(\text{Class } \#i)$ is the probability of objects to belong to Class $\#i$.




Fig. 1. Example of decision tree

In our approach, the root node of the decision tree is represented by a relational view corresponding to the whole training dataset. Since each sub-node in the decision tree represents a sub-population of its parent node, we build for each node a relational view that is based on its parent view. Then, these views are used to count the population strength of each class in the node with simple `GROUP BY` queries. These counts are used to determine the criteria that helps either partitioning the current node into a set of disjoint sub-partitions based

on the values of a specific attribute or concluding that the node is a leaf, i.e., a terminal node. To illustrate how these views are created, we represented in Figure 2 the SQL statements for creating the views associated with the sample decision tree from Figure 1. This set of views constitutes the decision tree.

```
Node #0: CREATE VIEW v0 AS SELECT att1, att2, class FROM training_set
Node #1.1: CREATE VIEW v11 AS SELECT att2, class FROM v0 WHERE att1='A'
Node #1.2: CREATE VIEW v12 AS SELECT att2, class FROM v0 WHERE att1='B'
Node #2.1: CREATE VIEW v21 AS SELECT class FROM v11 WHERE att2=0
Node #2.2: CREATE VIEW v22 AS SELECT class FROM v11 WHERE att2=1
```

Fig. 2. Relational views associated with sample decision tree

3 Implementation

We used Oracle 8i to implement the ID3 method, under the form of a PL/SQL stored procedure named `BuildTree`. Its full, commented code, installation and de-installation scripts, the sample datasets we used to validate our code, and a short user manual are freely available on-line¹.

3.1 Data structures

To build a decision tree, we need to manage: (1) the nodes of the tree; and (2) the candidate attributes for splitting a node, and the associated new nodes each attribute would generate. Hence, we implemented the following data structures.

Stack of nodes. The stack structure for nodes is justified by the fact we encountered system errors when coding our tree building procedure recursively. Hence, we handled recursivity ourselves with a stack.

An individual node is a record composed of the following fields: `num`, node number; `nview`, name of the relational view that is associated with the node; `rule`, the explicit rule that lead to the creation of the node, e.g., `GENDER=FEMALE` (this is only stored for result output); `entrop`, node entropy (which variation expresses the discriminating power of an attribute); and `pop`, node population strength.

List of candidates. Our list of candidates must contain a set of attributes, the information gain associated with these attributes (expressed as a difference in entropy weighted averages), and a list of the nodes that would be generated

¹ <http://eric.univ-lyon2.fr/~jdarmont/download/buildtree.zip>

if the current attribute was selected for splitting the current node. Hence, we need a list of lists. Such a data structure is impossible to achieve with the usual PL/SQL collections. The solution we adopted in this first implementation is using the extended relational features of Oracle. We used a relational table as our principal list, with an embedded table (collection) as the list of nodes.

As a consequence, our table of candidates is composed of the following fields: **att_name**, considered attribute name; **gain**, information gain; and **nodes**, embedded list of associated nodes.

3.2 Algorithm

Input parameters. The input parameters of our algorithm are given in Table 1.

Parameter	Name	Default value
Data source table name	table_name	—
Class attribute (attribute to predict)	class	—
Result table name	res_name	BTRES
(Strict) minimum information gain for node building	min_gain	0
Root node view name	root_view	BROOT
Clean-up views after execution (True/False)	del	TRUE

Table 1. Algorithm input parameters

Pseudo-code. We suppose we can call a procedure named **Entropy()** that computes both the entropy and the population strength of a node. These data are used when computing the information gain. **Entropy()** has actually been coded in PL/SQL. Our algorithm pseudo-code for the **BuildTree** procedure is provided in Figure 3.

3.3 Result output

The output of our stored procedure, namely a decision tree, is stored into a relational table whose name is specified as an input parameter. The table structure reflects the hierarchical structure of the tree. Its fields are: **node**, node ID number (primary key, root node is always #0 — note that there is a direct link between the node ID and the associated view name); **parent**, ID number of parent node in the tree (foreign key, references a node ID number); **rule**, the rule that lead to the creation of this node, e.g., **GENDER=FEMALE**; and for each value V of attribute E, a field labelled **E.V**, population strength for the considered value of the attribute in this node.

Such a table is best queried using Oracle SQL hierarchical statements. The result is directly a textual description of the output decision tree. A sample query

```

Create result table
Create root node using the data source table
Compute root node entropy and population strength
Push root node
Update result table with root node
While the stack is not empty do
    Pop current node
    Clean candidate list
    For each attribute but the class attribute do
        Create a new candidate
        For each possible value of current attribute do
            Build new node and associated relational view
            Compute new node entropy and population strength
            Update information gain
            Insert new node into current candidate node list
        End for (each value)
    End for (each attribute)
    Search for maximum information gain in candidate list
    For each candidate do
        If current attribute bears the greater information gain then
            For each node in the list of nodes do
                Push current node
                Update result table with current node
            End for (each node)
        Else
            For each node in the list of nodes do
                Destroy current node
            End for (each node)
        End if
    End for (each candidate)
End while (stack not empty)

```

Fig. 3. Pseudo-code for the BuildTree stored procedure

is provided in Figure 4. From this representation, it is very easy to deduce the corresponding set of production rules.

4 Tests and results

The aim of these experiments is to prove our implementation of the ID3 decision tree generation method functions properly. For this sake, we compared the output of our procedure with the output of a validated data mining tool, SIPINA [13], which can be configured to apply ID3 as well, on several datasets. Due to space constraints, we only present here our most significant experiment. However, the full range of our experiments is available on-line¹.

The dataset we selected is designed to test decision tree building methods. It is aimed at predicting which classes of passengers of the Titanic are more likely to

```
SELECT LEVEL, node, parent, rule, E_1, E_2, ... FROM btres
CONNECT BY node = parent START WITH node = 0
```

Fig. 4. Hierarchical SQL query for decision tree display

survive the wreck. The attributes are: CLASS = {1ST | 2ND | 3RD | CREW}; AGE = {ADULT | CHILD}; GENDER = {FEMALE | MALE}; and SURVIVOR = {NO | YES} (class attribute). There are 2201 tuples. Since the CLASS attribute has four modalities (distinct values), it can generate numerous nodes, and thus a relatively dense tree.

The results provided by our procedure, `BuildTree`, are provided in Figure 5. Note that we added in our result query the computation of the relative populations in each node (in percentage). Due to the tree width, the results provided by SIPINA are split-up in Figures 6 and 7. The common point in these two figures is the root node. As expected, the results provided by SIPINA and `BuildTree` are the same.

LEVEL	NODE	PARENT	RULE	SURVIVOR_NO	P_NO	SURVIVO_YES	P_YES
1	0			1490	68%	711	32%
2	1	0	GENDER=FEMALE	126	27%	344	73%
3	13	1	CLASS=CREW	3	13%	20	87%
3	14	1	CLASS=1ST	4	3%	141	97%
4	21	14	AGE=CHILD	0	0%	1	100%
4	22	14	AGE=ADULT	4	3%	140	97%
3	15	1	CLASS=2ND	13	12%	93	88%
4	19	15	AGE=CHILD	0	0%	13	100%
4	20	15	AGE=ADULT	13	14%	80	86%
3	16	1	CLASS=3RD	106	54%	90	46%
4	17	16	AGE=CHILD	17	55%	14	45%
4	18	16	AGE=ADULT	89	54%	76	46%
2	2	0	GENDER=MALE	1364	79%	367	21%
3	3	2	CLASS=CREW	670	78%	192	22%
3	4	2	CLASS=1ST	118	66%	62	34%
4	11	4	AGE=CHILD	0	0%	5	100%
4	12	4	AGE=ADULT	118	67%	57	33%
3	5	2	CLASS=2ND	154	86%	25	14%
4	9	5	AGE=CHILD	0	0%	11	100%
4	10	5	AGE=ADULT	154	92%	14	8%
3	6	2	CLASS=3RD	422	83%	88	17%
4	7	6	AGE=CHILD	35	73%	13	27%
4	8	6	AGE=ADULT	387	84%	75	16%

Fig. 5. BuildTree result for TITANIC




Fig. 6. SIPINA result for TITANIC (GENDER=MALE)




Fig. 7. SIPINA result for TITANIC (GENDER=FEMALE)

5 Conclusion and perspectives

Major database vendors have all started to integrate data mining features into their systems, through extensions of the SQL language and APIs. In this paper, we presented a slightly different approach for integrating data mining operators into a database system. Namely, we implemented the ID3 method, which we selected for its simplicity, as a stored procedure that builds a decision tree by associating each node of the tree with a relational view. It is very easy to deduce a set of production rules from the output of our procedure. This approach has three advantages over the "black box" tools currently proposed by database vendors: (1) no extension of the SQL language is needed; (2) no programming through an API is required; and (3) the views associated with the nodes of a decision tree can be stored for further analysis (descriptive statistics or clustering on the sub-population, deployment of a new decision tree from this node, etc.). The concurrent splitting alternatives could even be retained if needed.

We successfully checked that the results provided by our implementation of ID3 were correct by comparing the output of our procedure to the output of the SIPINA software, which is a well-known and reliable data mining platform, on several test datasets of growing complexity.

The perspectives opened by this study are numerous. From a technical point of view, the performance of our solution could be improved at least at two levels. First, there is room for code optimization, e.g., by replacing the relational table with an embedded collection by more efficient, in-memory data structures. Second, a more global optimization scheme could be achieved by indexing the source table so that building and exploiting the views is faster.

We also need to test the results obtained by **BuildTree** on very large databases. This would help us determining how well our procedure scales up. We also plan to compare the performances (i.e., response time) of **BuildTree** and **SIPINA** on such very large databases (that do not fit into a computer's main memory) in order to check out that our approach indeed takes advantage of the host DBMS capabilities.

Eventually, we chose to first implement a very simple decision tree building method (**ID3**). It would be interesting to enrich our stored procedure with other, more elaborate methods. Our idea is to make them available through simple parameterization and keep the tree building as transparent to the user as possible. We could also integrate other procedures for helping users to complete the machine learning process, e.g., scoring and cross-validation procedures.

References

1. R. Agrawal, H. Mannila, R. Srikant, H. Toivonen, and A. Verkamo. Fast discovery of association rules. In *Advances in Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, pages 307–328, 1996.
2. S. Chaudhuri. Data mining and database systems: Where is the intersection? *Data Engineering Bulletin*, 21(1):4–8, 1998.
3. E. F. Codd. Providing olap (on-line analytical processing) to user-analysts: An it mandate. Technical report, E.F. Codd and Associates, 1993.
4. J. Gehrke, R. Ramakrishnan, and V. Ganti. Rainforest - a framework for fast decision tree construction of large datasets. In *24th International Conference on Very Large Data Bases (VLDB 98)*, New York City, USA, pages 416–427. Morgan Kaufmann, 1998.
5. IBM. Db2 intelligent miner scoring. <http://www-4.ibm.com/software/data/iminer/scoring>, 2001.
6. R. Meo, G. Psaila, and S. Ceri. A new sql-like operator for mining association rules. In *22th International Conference on Very Large Data Bases (VLDB 96)*, Mumbai, India, pages 122–133. Morgan Kaufmann, 1996.
7. Microsoft. Introduction to ole-db for data mining. <http://www.microsoft.com/data/oledb>, July 2000.
8. A. Netz, S. Chaudhuri, J. Bernhardt, and U. Fayyad. Integration of data mining and relational databases. In *26th International Conference on Very Large Data Bases (VLDB 00)*, Cairo, Egypt, pages 719–722. Morgan Kaufmann, 2000.
9. Oracle. Oracle 9i data mining. White paper, June 2001.
10. J. R. Quinlan. Induction of decision trees. *Machine Learning*, 1:81–106, 1986.
11. S. Sarawagi, S. Thomas, and R. Agrawal. Integrating mining with relational database systems: Alternatives and implications. In *ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data (SIGMOD 98)*, Seattle, USA, pages 343–354. ACM Press, 1998.

12. S. Soni, Z. Tang, and J. Yang. Performance study microsoft data mining algorithms. Technical report, Microsoft Corp., 2001.
13. D. A. Zighed and R. Rakotomalala. Sipina-w(c) for windows: User's guide. Technical report, ERIC laboratory, University of Lyon 2, France, 1996.