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Applying the Conjugate Gradient Method for Text Document Categorization

Vincent Tam, Rudy Setiono and A. Santoso

Abstract

In this paper, we investigate the effectiveness of two different methods to solve the linear least squares fit (LLSF) problem for document categorization. The first method is the Singular Value Decomposition (SVD) method that has been previously used to solve the document categorization problem. The second method is the Conjugate Gradient (CG) method that is one of the most effective algorithms for solving a linear equation problem. However, up to our knowledge, the CG method has never been applied to handle the document classification problem. Therefore, we compare the effectiveness of these two LLSF methods to categorize text documents. In addition, we examine the effect of using different term weighting schemes on their performance for document classification. Lastly, we compare the performance of the LLSF classifiers against the neighborhood-based Di-KNN classifier, our best variant of the kNN classifier integrated with a dynamic threshold scheme, on the Reuters 21578 dataset. Besides being the first proposal to use the CG method for document classification, our work opens up many exciting directions for future investigation.
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1. Introduction

The linear least squares fit (LLSF) method was first proposed by Yang and Chute [3] for categorizing document collection from the MEDLINE database and Mayo patient records. Basically, this method works by learning the association between document terms and categories from manually categorized documents through adjusting a weight for each term in the document collection for each category, and using these weights to categorize new documents. The weight of each term for each category, as represented by a matrix of term-category regression coefficients, could be obtained by solving the least squares fit equation on the training set vectors.

Many algorithms such as Singular Value Decomposition (SVD) [5], Jacobi algorithm [6], Gauss-Seidel algorithm [6], Successive Over Relaxation (SOR) algorithm [6], and Conjugate Gradient (CG) [7] can be used to solve the LLSF problem. In [3], Yang and Chute used the SVD method to solve the LLSF problem, while Zhang and Oles [4] used the relaxation method to solve the least-squares problem. However, we are not aware of any work that compares the effectiveness of these different methods in categorizing documents. Therefore, we will study in this paper about the effectiveness of two different methods to solve the linear least-squares fit problem for document categorization. The first method is the SVD method, which has been used to solve the least-squares problem in some previous studies [1, 2, 3]. The second method is the Conjugate Gradient (CG) method, which is one of the most effective algorithms for solving a linear equation problem [4]. In addition, we examine the effect of using different term weighting methods on the performance of different methods when applied for solving the least-squares problem for categorizing documents. In the following sections, we will explain the SVD and CG methods individually on solving the LLSF mapping problem for document categorization.

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the vector-space model, the similarity measure, the performance measure for document classifiers and the statistical tests for performance analysis. Section 3 describes the text categorization methods including the singular value decomposition (SVD) method [5], firstly used by Yang and Chute [3] for classifying text documents, and the conjugate gradient (CG) method [7] that is an attractive approach for solving large sparse LLSF problems but never applied to categorize text documents yet. In particular, we will detail how to adapt the CG method for categorizing text documents. Section 4 evaluates and analyse the performance of the two LLSF methods against the heuristic-based Di-KNN [8, 9] document classifier on handling the Reuters 21578 dataset [8]. Lastly, we conclude our work and shed light on several directions for future exploration in Section 5.

2. Preliminaries

Vector-space model: the model has been widely used in the area of Information Retrieval [9] and in particular document categorization [4]. Basically, it creates m-dimensional vectors \( \vec{w} = (w_1, w_2, w_3, ..., w_m) \) to represent
the text document with respect to a set of m unique terms. The weight \( w_i \) associated with the term \( t_i \) depends on the term frequency \( f_i \) (the number of occurrence of term \( t_i \) in any document \( x \)), and the inverse document frequency \( idf_i \), which is equal to \( \log \left( \frac{N}{D_i} \right) \), where \( N \) is the total number of documents in the document collection and \( D_i \) is the number of documents in the document collection that contain the term \( t_i \). The weight of term \( t_i \) in the document can be calculated as follows:

\[
W_i(t_i,x) = f_i \cdot \log(N/D_i)
\]  

(1)

Similarity measure: the similarity between two documents \( \vec{d}_j \) and \( \vec{d}_k \) is normally measured using the cosine function between two vectors. This function is written as:

\[
\cos(\vec{d}_j, \vec{d}_k) = \frac{\vec{d}_j \cdot \vec{d}_k}{|\vec{d}_j| \cdot |\vec{d}_k|}
\]

(2)

where \( \cdot \) denotes the dot product of the two vectors and \( |\vec{d}_j| \) denotes the length of vector \( \vec{d}_j \). We use this function to measure the similarity between two documents in all experiments reported in this paper.

Performance measure: the performance measures for document classification algorithms [2,4] vary from the simple precision and recall measures [9] to the more complicated micro and macro \( F_i \) values [3]. Precision is the percentage of retrieved documents that are relevant while recall is the percentage of relevant documents retrieved. \( F_i \) measure was introduced by Rijnders [3] to combine recall (r) and precision (p) with an equal weight in the following formula:

\[
F_i(r, p) = \frac{2rp}{r + p}
\]

(3)

The \( F_i \) score can be computed on each individual category first and then averaged over categories, or computed globally over all the test documents. The former is known as the macro averaging, while the latter is called micro averaging. Micro-averaged \( F_i \) value is widely used in the cross-method comparison, while macro-averaged \( F_i \) is often used to measure the performance of a classifier in rare categories.

Significance test: to compare the performance of two different classifiers, we follow Yang and Liu [1] to perform the micro and macro sign tests. The micro sign test is a sign test designed for comparing two systems based on their binary decision on all test document/category pairs. By counting \( n \), the number of times where systems A and system B differ and \( k \), the number of times where system A is better than system B, we can measure the performance of systems A compared to system B using the binomial distribution method (if \( n \leq 12 \)) or the normal distribution method (if \( n > 12 \)). The macro sign test is similar to the micro sign test. However in the macro sign test, we compare the two systems based on their decision solely on each individual category.

3. The Text Categorization Methods

3.1. Singular Value Decomposition (SVD)

SVD is a direct method to solve the linear least-squares problem. This method is a very powerful technique for dealing with sets of equations where the coefficient matrices are either singular or very close to singular. In many cases, where the other direct methods for solving linear least-squares problem such as Gaussian elimination and LU decomposition failed to give a satisfactory result, the SVD technique can still give a good result [5].

Using the SVD method, any \( M \times N \) matrix \( A \) whose number of rows \( M \) is greater than or equal to its number of columns \( N \), can be written as the product of an \( M \times N \) column-orthogonal matrix \( U \), an \( N \times N \) diagonal matrix \( S \) with positive or zero elements (the singular values), and the transpose of an \( N \times N \) orthogonal matrix \( V \). In other words, it can be described using the following figure:

\[
A = \begin{bmatrix}
U & | & S_1 & | & S_2 & | & \cdots & | & S_N
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \vec{v}^T \end{bmatrix}
\]

Figure 1: SV Decomposition of Matrix A

The matrices \( U \) and \( V \) are each orthogonal with their columns as orthonormal:

\[
U^T \cdot U = V^T \cdot V = I \quad \text{and} \quad V \cdot V^T = I
\]

To obtain the term-category association matrix \( F \), we need to form matrices \( A \) and \( B \) where a row in matrix \( A \) represents document \( i \) in the training set, a column in the matrix \( A \) represents a term \( j \) in the document collection, a row in the matrix \( B \) represents assignment of \( i \)th document to the category set, and a column in the matrix \( B \) represents a category in the category set. For example, if \( b_{ij} \) value is equal to 1, it means that the \( i \)th document in the training document collection belong to the \( j \)th category and if the value is equal to 0, it means that the \( i \)th document does not belong to the \( j \)th category.

The solution for the linear least squares fit problem can

\[
F = B^T (A^T)^{-1} = B^T U S^{-1} V^T
\]

(4)
be obtained using the following formula:
After the solution matrix $F$ was computed, we need to run a cross validation test on the training documents to compute the category specific thresholds as in the $k$NN classifier. Besides, the categories for each test document is determined based on $F$, the original test document vector $\tilde{d}$, and the cosine function for similarity measures. For detail, refer to [10].

3.2. Conjugate Gradient (CG) Method

Conjugate Gradient is the most prominent iterative method for solving a large sparse linear least squares problem:

$$Ax = b$$ (5)

where matrix $A$ is a known large sparse positive definite matrix, $x$ is an unknown vector, and $b$ is a known vector [7]. In the text document classification problem, $A$ is the matrix representation of all documents in the training set, $x$ is the term category association vector and $b$ is a vector representing the category assignment for each training document. This method is especially good for document classification problem because text document classification normally creates a large sparse representation matrix.

The CG method proceeds by generating vector sequences of iterates (i.e., successive approximations to the solution), residuals corresponding to the iterates, and directions used in updating the iterates and residuals:

$$p^{(0)} = r^{(0)} = b - Ax^{(0)}$$ (5)

In every iteration of the method, two inner products are performed in order to compute update scalars that are defined to make the sequences satisfy certain orthogonality conditions. For a symmetric positive definite linear system, these conditions imply that the distance to the true solution is minimized in some norm.

Unlike the SVD method which could compute the solution matrix $F$ (matrix $F$ represents the weight of each term in the collection for all the categories used), the CG method could only compute the solution vector $x$ (vector $x$ represents the weight of each term in the collection for a single category). Therefore, after the solution vector $x$ for each of the categories had been computed, we should combine all the solution vectors to form a solution matrix $F$ which is similar to the one used for the SVD method. The solution matrix $F$ could then be used to compute the category specific threshold by running the cross validation test on the training documents (see [1, 9] for detail on cross validation test). The categories assignment for each test document can be determined by using similar steps as explained previously for the SVD method.

4. Experiments

For this experiment, we did not study the effect of using our full dataset since we did not have enough resources to handle the full dataset. Both the SVD and the CG method were implemented using Matlab Version 6.1 and were run under UNIX environment. The SVD method took approximately 2 hours to finish while the CG method needed roughly 10.6 hours. The CG methods needed much longer time because this method could only process one category at each time, while the SVD method could process all the categories at once. However, our experimental results show that the CG method could return a more accurate result compared to the SVD algorithm, especially for the rare categories. In addition, we include the result of the Support Vector Machine (SVM) classifier [1], a machine-learning algorithm adapted for document classification, for comparison purpose. Furthermore, we compare these results against those of a heuristic-based $k$-Nearest Neighborhood improved with a dynamic threshold scheme (Dk-ANN) [10].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classifier</th>
<th>Recall</th>
<th>Precision</th>
<th>Micro $F_1$</th>
<th>Macro $F_1$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SVD (tf)</td>
<td>0.8524</td>
<td>0.8272</td>
<td>0.8396</td>
<td>0.5572</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVD (tfidf)</td>
<td>0.8535</td>
<td>0.5224</td>
<td>0.8375</td>
<td>0.3622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG (tf)</td>
<td>0.8609</td>
<td>0.8114</td>
<td>0.8354</td>
<td>0.6116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG (tfidf)</td>
<td>0.0711</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
<td>0.0396</td>
<td>0.0280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dk-ANN</td>
<td>0.8734</td>
<td>0.8605</td>
<td>0.8669</td>
<td>0.5790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVM</td>
<td>0.8120</td>
<td>0.8137</td>
<td>0.8599</td>
<td>0.6261</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Results of the SVD, SVM and CG Classifiers.

Table 1 details our experimental results using the SVD and CG algorithm for classifying text document in the Reuters 21578 dataset [9]. These results clearly show that in terms of macro averaged $F_1$ score, the CG method outperforms the SVD method. On the other hand, in terms of micro-averaged $F_1$ both the SVD and CG methods perform almost similarly. The best result obtained by the SVD method is only slightly higher than the result obtained by the CG method. The micro $F_1$ score of CG method is lower compared to the SVM (Singular Value Decomposition) method as in [1] (0.8399). However, the macro $F_1$ score of CG method is higher than the SVM (0.3231). To study the performance of each classifier further, we also conducted an investigation on the classifier performance on the top 10 categories. For more detail, refer to [9].

Tables 2 and 3 below show the results of our significance test results on different classifiers. Table 3 clearly shows that based on the micro significance test, the SVD algorithm using the $t_f$ weighting scheme and the Dk-ANN performs the best. However, the CG method with the
tf*idf weighting scheme outperforms all the other LLSF algorithms tested and performs as good as the Dt-kNN classifier based on the macro significance test (Table 4). This is probably because the CG method could find a more accurate term-category association matrix, especially for the category with low number of training documents compared to the direct methods for solving the LLSF problem such as the SVD method.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classifier</th>
<th>SVD (tf)</th>
<th>SVD (tf*idf)</th>
<th>CG (tf)</th>
<th>CG (tf*idf)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dt-kNN</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>&gt;=</td>
<td>&gt;=</td>
<td>&gt;=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVD (tf)</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>&gt;=</td>
<td>&gt;=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVD (tf*idf)</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>&gt;=</td>
<td>&gt;=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG (tf)</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>&lt;=</td>
<td>&lt;=</td>
<td>&lt;=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Micro Significance Test Result for different classifiers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classifier</th>
<th>SVD (tf)</th>
<th>SVD (tf*idf)</th>
<th>CG (tf)</th>
<th>CG (tf*idf)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dt-kNN</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVD (tf)</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVD (tf*idf)</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CG (tf)</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
<td>=</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Macro Significance Test Result for different classifiers

Our experiments also found that the SVD algorithm performs better in conjunction with tf weighting scheme, while the CG method could perform better in conjunction with the tf*idf weighting scheme. These results reinforced the observations we obtained in some previous work [9] which stated that a classifier could perform optimally only in conjunction with a certain term weighting scheme.

5. Concluding remarks

In this paper, we experimented with different document classifiers such as the neighborhood-based Dt-kNN [8, 9] (a variant of the k Nearest Neighbor [8]) classifier against the LLSF (Linear Least Squares Fit) classifiers, including the Singular Value Decomposition (SVD) and Conjugate Gradient (CG) methods, for categorizing documents in the Reuters 21578 dataset. Besides being the first attempts to use the CG method as a document classifier, our work also investigated the effect of using different term weighting schemes towards the performance of each classifier. Agreed with our previous study [9], these experimental results showed that each classifier could perform optimally only in conjunction with a certain term weighting scheme. For example, the LLSF classifier performed better in conjunction with the tf*idf weighting scheme. Furthermore, our work opens numerous possibilities for future exploration. An example is the integration of the CG method into the modern digital libraries to categorize the vast amount of stored documents. Another potential application is the possible use of the SVD or CG method implemented on the e-mail or Short Message Service (SMS) server side to quickly categorize and possibly remove any unwanted emails or short messages in mobile phones due to spamming.
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