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## Outline

- Motivation for frequent subsequence search
- applications, variance in needs and sequence definitions,
- what do we already know?
- connection to itemsets, what changed?
- directed sequences, without noise/gaps and time,
- why is it sometimes more difficult?
- undirected sequences a their canonical form,
- (complete) transactional representation and connected definitions,
- GSP algorithm (Agrawal's APRIORI generalization),
- other algorithms - FreeSpan, PrefixSpan,
- summary
- categorization of methods according to sequence and pattern types,
- STULONG - a case study.


## Frequent subsequences - example 1: DNA

- motif discovery
- searches for short sequential patterns in a file of unaligned DNA or protein sequences,
- searches for discriminative patterns (characteristics)
* typical for one sequence class, unusual in the other classes,
* this pattern could relate with the biological/regulation function of the (protein) class,
- transcription factor interacts with DNA through a particular motif,
- frequent subsequence search is a subtask,
- event = nucleotide, string (no time), undirected DNA.
$>23066$
atgacgtgtctgtatattaataagctaacccgcattgagttaaccaataacggattccatacacaatacg gccaacagagaaagatacctgtgctcacgccattgcttatattggctggttacaatgtgcactatcaatt ttttaaataa
>23067
ttgactgtgaaaattacaggagctacaaaaatgaaccgattctcaaaaactcaaatttatttacattgga taacgetgcttttcgttgcaataacctatgccgcgatggaactccgtggctggtttcctaaaggtagtag tacttatctgctgatgcgagaaacacattacaatgcgggtatattcgtttgggtgttaatgttttcacge ctgattataaaacaccgttatagtgatccttctattgtgccaccgccacctgcctggcaaatgaaagcgg cttcgctaatgcacatcatgctttatataaccttccttgcgcttcctctgctggggattgctttgatggc ttacagtggaaaatcgtggagtttccttggtttcaatgtgtctccctttgttaccccaaacagcgaaatt aaagcactgataaaaaatattcacgaaacctgggcaaatataggctactttttaatcgtagctcacgctg gcgcagcactctttcatcactacattcagaaagataatactctgttacgaatgatgcctcgccgcaaata a
>23069
gtggcggagagagggggatttgaacccccggtagagttgcccctactccggttttcgagacctatgctat gggttaataaaatcaatatattatgtgttttatttggaataaatattctatatttaggattgaaaaatca gatggttagcatcaaacaacctcagaatattccaagcaaacaggttaaaaataaaactgcacccgaacaa ttgataacgacagaaaacgccttttccgagccaccaaaattacttcgcatcctatttattgctcacgtta acgecttgtataactcgagctctccacggtatttaacctctcttctgtttaactataattccaataaatc tcgtcactga



## Frequent subsequences - example 2: insurance

- event is signing of a insurance contract of a certain type,
- several events may occur concurrently,
- sequence is a chronological series of events,
- analogy: directed acyclic graph, the edge length equals time between events,
- interesting patterns: typical contract sequences (signed in a reasonable time span).


Meyer: Sequence Mining in Marketing.

## Frequent subsequences - similarity to frequent itemsets

- first of all, similarity in task representation,
- the process can be intrinsically identical, but we ask different questions
- itemsets: which insurance contracts people arrange concurrently,
- sequences: how people arrange insurance contracts in their course of life,
- transaction representation still formally possible and helpful (universal)
- more factors must be concerned and stored.

| Transaction | Items (insurance type) |
| :---: | :---: |
| $t_{1}$ | home, life |
| $t_{2}$ | car, home |
| $t_{3}$ | pension, life |
| $t_{4}$ | travel |
| $t_{5}$ | pension, life |
| $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |


| Customer | Date (time) | Items (insurance type) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $c_{1}$ | 5.10 .2003 | home, life |
| $c_{1}$ | 8.1 .2005 | travel |
| $c_{1}$ | 3.8 .2010 | car, pension |
| $c_{2}$ | 10.10 .2003 | car, home |
| $c_{2}$ | 20.11 .2006 | pension |
| $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ | $\ldots$ |

## Frequent subsequences - similarity to frequent itemsets

- secondly, similarity in terms of task solution,
- APRIORI property can easily be generalized for sequences:

Each subsequence of a frequent sequence is frequent.

- the anti-monotone property can also be transformed to monotone one:

No supersequence of an infrequent sequence can be frequent.

- the model APRIORI-like algorithm for sequential data
- a direct analogy of the APRIORI algorithm for itemsets,
- the basic operations (informal - a reminder only):

1. search for trivial frequent sequences (typically of the length 0 or 1 ),
2. generate candidate sequences with the length incremented by 1 ,
3. check for their actual support in the transaction database,
4. reduce the candidate sequence set

* a subset of frequent sequences of the given length is created,

5. until the frequent sequence set non-empty go to the step 2 .

## Frequent substrings - a trivial APRIORI application

- a string
- a directed sequence, an equidistant step, exactly one item per transaction,
- events given by a symbol alphabet, a pattern is an ordered list of neighboring events,
$-\left\langle a_{1} \ldots a_{m}\right\rangle$ is a subsequence of $\left\langle b_{1} \ldots b_{n}\right\rangle$ iff $\exists i a_{1}=b_{i} \wedge \cdots \wedge a_{m}=b_{i+m}$.
- Example: DNA sequence ( $n=20, A=\{a, g, t\}$ )

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{ttg} \text { a a } \mathrm{ag} \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{~g} \mathrm{gttg} \text { a } \operatorname{tgtt} \quad \mathrm{s}>10 \%, \mathrm{~s}=\mathrm{f} /(\mathrm{n}-\mathrm{m}+1)
\end{aligned}
$$

| i | $C_{i}$ | $L_{i}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | $\{\mathrm{a}\},\{\mathrm{g}\},\{\mathrm{t}\}$ | $\{\mathrm{a}\},\{\mathrm{g}\},\{\mathrm{t}\}$ |
| 2 | $(9$ patterns $)$ | $\{\mathrm{aa}\},\{\mathrm{ga}\},\{\mathrm{gg}\},\{\mathrm{gt}\},\{\mathrm{tg}\},\{\mathrm{tt}\}$ |
| 3 | $\{\mathrm{aaa}\},\{$ gaa $\},\{$ gga $\}, \ldots(12$ patterns $)$ | $\{$ gaa $\},\{\mathrm{ggg}\},\{\mathrm{gtt}\},\{\mathrm{tga}\},\{\mathrm{ttg}\}$ |
| 4 | $\{$ gggg $\},\{\mathrm{gttg}\},\{$ tgaa $\},\{$ ttga $\}$ | $\{\mathrm{gggg}\},\{$ tgaa $\},\{\mathrm{ttga}\}$ |
| 5 | $\{$ ttgaa $\}$ | $\{\mathrm{ttgaa}\}$ |

- how to check for support quickly, i.e. how to find all subsequence occurrences in a sequence?
- algorithms Knuth-Morris-Pratt or Boyer-Moore.


## Canonical form for sequences

- a canonical (standard) code word
- a unique sequence representation, based on the symbol alphabet ordering,
- a usual (not necessary) choice:
* the lexicographical symbol alphabet ordering $a<b<c<\ldots$,
* the lexicographically smallest (smaller) code word taken as canonical ( $b a c<c a b$ ),
- a directed sequence
- the only interpretation (way of reading), each (sub)sequence is a canonical code word,
- an undirected sequence
- two possible ways of reading = two alternative code words,
- the routine application of lexicographical ordering is not possible,
- prefix property in a space of canonical code words does not hold:
* every prefix of a canonical word is a canonical word itself,

| sequence | canonical form | prefix | canonical form |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $b a b$ | $b a b$ | $b a$ | $a b$ |
| $c a b d$ | $c a b d$ | $c a b$ | $b a c$ |

- we have to find a different way of forming code words.


## Canonical form for undirected sequences

- The canonical code words with the prefix property will be formed as follows
- even and odd length words will be handled separately,
- code words are started in the middle of sequence,

|  | even length | odd length |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| sequence | $a_{m} a_{m-1} \ldots \ldots a_{2} a_{1} b_{1} b_{2} \ldots \ldots b_{m-1} b_{m}$ | $a_{m} a_{m-1} \ldots \ldots a_{2} a_{1} a_{0} b_{1} b_{2} \ldots \ldots b_{m-1} b_{m}$ |
| code word | $a_{1} b_{1} a_{2} b_{2} \ldots a_{m-1} b_{m-1} a_{m} b_{m}$ | $a_{0} a_{1} b_{1} a_{2} b_{2} \ldots a_{m-1} b_{m-1} a_{m} b_{m}$ |
| code word | $b_{1} a_{1} b_{2} a_{2} \ldots b_{m-1} a_{m-1} b_{m} a_{m}$ | $a_{0} b_{1} a_{1} b_{2} a_{2} \ldots \ldots b_{m-1} a_{m-1} b_{m} a_{m}$ |

- canonical is the lexicographically smaller code word in the table,
- the sequence is extended by adding
- a pair $a_{m+1} b_{m+1}$ or $b_{m+1} a_{m+1}$,
- one item at the front and one item at the end.
- an example

| even length |  | odd length |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| sequence | code words |  | sequence | code words |  |
| $a t$ | $a t$ | ta | ule | lue | leu |
| data | atda | taad | rules | luers | leusr |

## Canonical form for undirected sequences - the prefix property

- Prefix property proof for the new representation by contradiction

1. suppose the prefix property does not hold,
2. then there exists a canonical code word $w_{m}=a_{1} b_{1} a_{2} b_{2} \ldots a_{m-1} b_{m-1} a_{m} b_{m}$,
3. whose prefix $w_{m-1}=a_{1} b_{1} a_{2} b_{2} \ldots a_{m-1} b_{m-1}$ is not a canonical code word,
4. as a consequence we have $w_{m}<v_{m}$, where $v_{m}=b_{1} a_{1} b_{2} a_{2} \ldots b_{m-1} a_{m-1} b_{m} a_{m}$,
5. and $v_{m-1}<w_{m-1}$, where $v_{m-1}=b_{1} a_{1} b_{2} a_{2} \ldots b_{m-1} a_{m-1}$,

6 . however $v_{m-1}<w_{m-1} \Rightarrow v_{m}<w_{m}$

- because $v_{m-1}$ is a prefix of $v_{m}$ and $w_{m-1}$ is a prefix of $w_{m}$,

7. $v_{m}<w_{m}$ from the step 6 contradicts $w_{m}<v_{m}$ from the step $4 \square$.

## Canonical form for undirected sequences - efficiency

- two possible code words can be created and compared in $\mathcal{O}(m)$,
- an additional symmetry flag introduced for each sequence enables the same in $\mathcal{O}(1)$

$$
s_{m}=\bigwedge_{i=1}^{m}\left(a_{i}=b_{i}\right)
$$

- the symmetry flag is maintained in constant time with

$$
s_{m+1}=s_{m} \wedge\left(a_{m+1}=b_{m+1}\right)
$$

- sequence extension is permissible when the flag:
- if $s_{m}=$ true, it must be $a_{m+1} \leq b_{m+1}$,
- if $s_{m}=$ false, any relation between $a_{m+1}$ and $b_{m+1}$ is possible.
- sequences and symmetry flags at the beginning
- even length: an empty sequence, $s_{0}=1$,
- odd length: all frequent alphabet symbols, $s_{1}=1$,
- the procedure guarantees exclusively the canonical sequence extensions.


## Frequent subsequences - APRIORI application to undirected sequences

- consider undirected sequences, otherwise the formalization as yet
$-\left\langle a_{1} \ldots a_{m}\right\rangle$ is a subsequence of $\left\langle b_{1} \ldots b_{n}\right\rangle$ if:
$\exists i a_{1}=b_{i} \wedge \cdots \wedge a_{m}=b_{i+m}$, or
$\exists i a_{1}=b_{i+m} \wedge \cdots \wedge a_{m}=b_{i}$.
- Example: DNA sequence $(n=20, A=\{a, g, t\})$

|  | $s>10 \%, s=f /[2(n-m+1)]$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{ttg} \mathrm{a} a \mathrm{agggg} \mathrm{gtg}$ a tgtt | $\mathrm{s}_{\mathrm{gtt}}=4 / 36, \mathrm{~s}_{\mathrm{gggg}}=4 / 34$ |


| i | $C_{i}$ | $L_{i}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | \{\} | \{\} |
| 1 | $\{\mathrm{a}\},\{\mathrm{g}\},\{\mathrm{t}\}$ | $\{\mathrm{a}\},\{\mathrm{g}\},\{\mathrm{t}\}$ |
| 2 | \{at $\},\{\mathrm{ag}\},\{\mathrm{at}\},\{\mathrm{gg}\},\{\mathrm{gt}\},\{\mathrm{tt}\}$ | \{aa\}, \{gg\}, \{gt \}, \{tt \} |
| 3 | \{aaa\}, \{aag\}, \{aat\}, \{gag\}, \{gat\}, \{tat\}, \{aga\}, \{agg\},\{agt\}, $\{\mathrm{ggg}\},\{\mathrm{ggt}\},\{\mathrm{tgt}\},\{a t a\},\{\operatorname{atg}\},\{a t t\},\{\mathrm{gtg}\},\{\mathrm{gtt}\},\{\mathrm{ttt}\}$ | \{ggg\}, \{gtt \} |
| 4 | ```{aaaa}, {aaag}, {aaat}, {gaag}, {gaat}, {taat}, {agta}, {agtg}, {ggta}, {agtt}, {tgta}, {ggtg}, {ggtt}, {tgtg}, ...in total 27 (1) patterns``` | \{gggg \} |

## A generalized subsequence definition in transactional representation

- Items: $I=\left\{i_{1}, i_{2}, \ldots, i_{m}\right\}$,
- itemsets: $\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{k}\right) \subseteq I, k \geq 1, x_{i} \in I$,
- sequences: $\left\langle s_{1}, \ldots, s_{n}\right\rangle, s_{i}=\left(x_{1}, x_{2}, \ldots, x_{k}\right) \subseteq I, s_{i} \neq \emptyset, x_{1}<x_{2}<\ldots<x_{k}$,
- an ordered list of elements, elements = itemsets,
- the canonical representation: lexicographical ordering of items in each itemset,
- example: $\langle a(a b c)(a c) d(c f)\rangle$, a simplification of the form: $\left(x_{i}\right) \sim x_{i}$,
- the sequence length $l$
- given by the number of item instances (occurrences) in sequence,
- $l$-sequence contains exactly $l$ item instances,
- ex.: $\langle a(a b c)(a c) d(c f)\rangle$ is a 9 -sequence,
- $\alpha$ is a subsequence of $\beta, \beta$ is a supersequence of $\alpha$ : $\alpha \sqsubseteq \beta$
$-\alpha=\left\langle a_{1}, \ldots, a_{n}\right\rangle, \beta=\left\langle b_{1}, \ldots, b_{m}\right\rangle, \exists 1 \leq j_{1}<\ldots<j_{n} \leq m, \forall i=1 \ldots n: a_{i} \subseteq b_{j_{i}}$,
- example: $\langle a(b c) d f\rangle \sqsubseteq\langle a(a b c)(a c) d(c f)\rangle,\langle d(a b)\rangle \nsubseteq\langle a(a b c)(a c) d(c f)\rangle$
- a sequence database: $S=\left\{\left\langle s i d_{1}, s_{1}\right\rangle \ldots,\left\langle s i d_{k}, s_{k}\right\rangle\right\}$
- a set of ordered pairs a sequence identifier and a sequence.


## Subsequence search in transaction representation

- Support of $\alpha$ sequence in the database $S$
- the number of sequences $s \in S$ satisfying: $\alpha \sqsubseteq s$,
- Subsequence search in transaction representation, task definition
- input: $S$ a $s_{\text {min }}$ - minimum support,
- output: the complete set of frequent sequential patterns
* all the subsequences with or above the threshold frequency.

| Id | Sequence |
| :---: | :---: |
| 10 | $\langle a(a b c)(a c) d(c f)\rangle$ |
| 20 | $\langle(a d) c(b c)(a e)\rangle$ |
| 30 | $\langle(e f)(a b)(d f) c b\rangle$ |
| 40 | $\langle e g(a f) c b c\rangle$ |


| Id | Time | Items |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 | $t_{1}$ | $a$ |
| 10 | $t_{2}$ | $a, b, c$ |
| 10 | $t_{3}$ | $a, c$ |
| 10 | $t_{4}$ | $d$ |
| 10 | $t_{5}$ | $c, f$ |


| $l$ | sequential pattern $\left(s_{\text {min }}=2\right)$ |
| :---: | :---: |
| 3 | $\langle a(b c)\rangle,\langle a b a\rangle,\langle a b c\rangle,\langle(a b) c\rangle,\langle(a b) d\rangle,\langle(a b) f\rangle,\langle a c a\rangle,\langle a c b\rangle,\langle a c c\rangle,\langle a d c\rangle, \ldots$ |
| 4 | $\langle a(b c) a\rangle,\langle(a b) d c\rangle, \ldots$ |

## GSP: Generalized Sequential Patterns [Agrawal, Srikant, 1996]

- applies the core idea of APRIORI to sequential data,
- the key issue is generation of the candidate sequential patterns
- divided into two steps

1. join

* $l$-sequence is created by joining of two (l-1)-sequences,
* (l-1)-sequences can be joined when identical after removal of the first item in one and the last one in second,

2. prune

* skip each $l$-sequence which contains an infrequent (l-1)-subsequence.

| $L_{3}$ | $C_{4}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | after join | after prune |
| $\langle(a b) c\rangle,\langle(a b) d\rangle$, | $\langle(a b)(c d)\rangle$ | $\langle(a b)(c d)\rangle$ |
| $\langle a(c d)\rangle,\langle(a c) e\rangle$, | $\langle(a b) c e\rangle$ |  |
| $\langle b(c d)\rangle,\langle b c e\rangle$ |  |  |

Agrawal, Srikant: Mining Sequential Patterns: Generalizations and Performance.

## Example: GSP, $s_{\min }=2$

| Id | Sequence |
| :---: | :---: |
| 10 | $\langle(b d) c b(a c)\rangle$ |
| 20 | $\langle(b f)(c e) b(f g)\rangle$ |
| 30 | $\langle(a h)(b f) a b f\rangle$ |
| 40 | $\langle(b e)(c e) d\rangle$ |
| 50 | $\langle a(b d) b c b(a d e)\rangle$ |



## APRIORI algorithm for sequences - disadvantages

- the generate (join step) and test (prune step) method,
- the problems discussed in terms of frequent itemsets persist and intensify

1. generates a large amount of candidate patterns

- obvious even for 2-sequences: $m \times m+\frac{m(m-1)}{2} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}\left(m^{2}\right)$ (for itemsets it was just the second fraction, one third or so of candidates),

2. requires a lot of database scans

- one scan per sequence length,
- the number of scans given by the max pattern length the length $\leq \max (|s|, s \in S)$ (typically $\gg m$ ), (max itemset length is $m$ and thus $m$ scans at most),

3. search for long sequential patterns is difficult

- the total amount of candidate patterns is exponential with the pattern length, (the same growth as for itemsets, however the problem $\max (|s|, s \in S) \gg m$ ).
- the disadvantages addressed by alternative methods in FreeSpan and PrefixSpan algorithms.


## FreeSpan [Han, Pei, Yin, 2000], $s_{\text {min }}=2$

- takes the recursive divide and conquer approach
- decides along the decreasingly sorted list of frequent items,

$$
* f \text {-list }=\langle(a: 4),(b: 4),(c: 4),(d: 3),(e: 3),(f: 3)\rangle,
$$

* $(g: 1)$ is not frequent,
- the sequential patterns splits into disjoint groups
* the patterns containing the most frequent item only,
* the patterns containing the second most frequent item and no less frequent items, etc.
- creates a projection sequence database (one per each group)
* from sequences it removes all the items disregarded by the group,
* it removes sequences missing item which must be in the pattern.
- subproblems have fewer items (beginning), and contain fewer sequences (end of $f$-list).

| Id | Sequence | a-projection | b-projection | $\ldots$ | f-projection |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 10 | $\langle a(a b c)(a c) d(c f)\rangle$ | $\langle a a a\rangle$ | $\langle a(a b) a\rangle$ | $\ldots$ | $\langle a(a b c)(a c) d(c f)\rangle$ |
| 20 | $\langle(a d) c(b c)(a e)\rangle$ | $\langle a a\rangle$ | $\langle a b a\rangle$ | $\ldots$ |  |
| 30 | $\langle(e f)(a b)(d f) c b\rangle$ | $\langle a\rangle$ | $\langle(a b) b\rangle$ | $\ldots$ | $\langle(e f)(a b)(d f) c b\rangle$ |
| 40 | $\langle e g(a f) c b c\rangle$ | $\langle a\rangle$ | $\langle a b\rangle$ | $\ldots$ | $\langle e(a f) c b c\rangle$ |

[^0]
## PrefixSpan [Pei, Han et al., 2001]

- a similar idea, more efficient than its predecessor FreeSpan,
- the projection based on prefix subsequence occurrence (in FreeSpan arbitrary occurrence)
- allows for a more efficient database decomposition,
- $\beta=\left\langle s_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, s_{m}^{\prime}\right\rangle$ is a prefix of $\alpha=\left\langle s_{1}, \ldots, s_{n}\right\rangle$ if:
(1) $m \leq n$, (2) $\forall i \leq m-1 s_{i}^{\prime}=s_{i}$, (3) $s_{m}^{\prime} \subseteq s_{m}$,
(4) $\forall$ items from $\left(s_{m}-s_{m}^{\prime}\right)>\forall$ items from $s_{m}^{\prime}$,
- ex.: $\langle a\rangle,\langle a a\rangle,\langle a(a b)\rangle$ and $\langle a(a b c)\rangle$ are the prefixes $\langle a(a b c)(a c) d(c f)\rangle$,
- ex.: $\langle a b\rangle,\langle a(b c)\rangle$ are not the prefixes $\langle a(a b c)(a c) d(c f)\rangle$,
- informally: postfix is a prefix complement
- ex.: prefix $\langle a\rangle$ has wrt $\langle a(a b c)(a c) d(c f)\rangle$ the postfix $\langle(a b c)(a c) d(c f)\rangle$,
- ex.: prefix $\langle a a\rangle$ has wrt $\langle a(a b c)(a c) d(c f)\rangle$ the postfix $\langle(-b c)(a c) d(c f)\rangle$,
- $\alpha^{\prime} \sqsubseteq \alpha$ is a projection $\alpha$ wrt the prefix $\beta \sqsubseteq \alpha$, if:
(1) $\alpha^{\prime}$ has a prefix $\beta$,
(2) there is no $\alpha^{\prime \prime}$ that is (i) a supersequence of $\alpha^{\prime}$ (i.e. $\alpha^{\prime} \sqsubset \alpha^{\prime \prime}$ ),
(ii) subsequence of $\alpha$ and (iii) has the prefix $\beta$,
- ex.: the projection of $\langle a(a b c)(a c) d(c f)\rangle$ wrt the prefix $\langle(a c) d\rangle$ is $\langle(a c) d(c f)\rangle$.


## PrefixSpan - algorithm, example ( $s_{\min }=2$ )

- PrefixSpan: the input is $S$ and $s_{\text {min }}$

1. $i=1$, the init projection prefix database $\left.S\right|_{\alpha_{0}}=\left.S\right|_{\emptyset}=S$,
2. repeat for all the projection prefix databases $\left.S\right|_{\alpha_{i-1}}$
(a) find frequent i-patterns (sufficient support in $\left.\alpha_{i-1} \cdot S\right|_{\alpha_{i-1}}$ ),
(b) until the set of i-patterns is not empty
i. split the state space having the i-patterns $\left(\alpha_{i}\right)$ as prefixes a projection database set originates $\left.S\right|_{\alpha_{i}}=\left.\left(\left.\alpha_{i-1} \cdot S\right|_{\alpha_{i-1}}\right)\right|_{\alpha_{i}}$,
ii. $i=i+1$ and go to the step (2).

| Id | Sequence |
| :---: | :---: |
| 10 | $\langle a(a b c)(a c) d(c f)\rangle$ |
| 20 | $\langle(a d) c(b c)(a e)\rangle$ |
| 30 | $\langle(e f)(a b)(d f) c b\rangle$ |
| 40 | $\langle e g(a f) c b c\rangle$ |


| Prefix | Projection database (postfixes) or patterns |
| :---: | :---: |
| $\langle a\rangle$ | $\langle(a b c)(a c) d(c f)\rangle,\left\langle\left(\_d\right) c(b c)(a e)\right\rangle,\left\langle\left(\_b\right)(d f) c b\right\rangle,\langle(-f) c b c\rangle$ |
|  | 2-patterns: $\langle a a\rangle: 2,\langle a b\rangle: 4,\langle a c\rangle: 4,\langle a d\rangle: 2,\langle a f\rangle: 2,\langle(a b)\rangle: 2$ |
| $\langle b\rangle$ | $\left\langle\left(\_c\right)(a c) d(c f)\right\rangle,\left\langle\left(\_c\right)(a e)\right\rangle,\langle(d f) c b\rangle,\langle c\rangle$ |
|  | 2-patterns: $\langle b a\rangle: 2,\langle b c\rangle: 3,\langle(b c)\rangle: 2,\langle b d\rangle: 2,\langle b f\rangle: 2$ |
| $\langle a a\rangle$ | $\left\langle\left(\_b c\right)(a c) d(c f)\right\rangle,\langle(-e)\rangle$ |
|  | STOP (no 3-patterns) |
| $\langle(a b)\rangle$ | $\langle(-c)(a c) d(c f)\rangle,\langle(d f) c b\rangle$ |
|  | 3-patterns: $\langle(a b) c\rangle: 2,\langle(a b) d\rangle: 2,\langle(a b) f\rangle: 2$ |

## Frequent sequence search - problem generalization

- subsequence definition (slide 13) is still not general enough for certain practical problems,
- ex.: book stores

| ID | Time | Items |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| C1 | 1 | Ringworld |
| C1 | 2 | Foundation |
| C1 | 15 | Ringworld Engineers, Second Foundation |
| C2 | 1 | Foundation, Ringworld |
| C2 | 20 | Foundation and Empire |
| C2 | 50 | Ringworld Engineers |



- the GSP algorithm contributed in several additional aspects

1. introduction of time constraints

- adjoining sequence elements must not be too far (MaxGap) nor close (MinGap),

2. extended transaction definition

- the items with near time stamps included in the same transaction,
- sliding window, the parameter WinSize gives its size,

3. a taxonomy of items

- a directed acyclic graph defines a concept hierarchy built upon items.


## Episodal rules

- association rule analogy,
- predict the further development of sequence with the aid of patterns,
- ex.: the only sequence, the only item per position, MaxGap=3

- $S$ is a sequence, $\alpha=\langle A B\rangle$ and $\beta=\langle A B C\rangle$ its subsequences,
- $\alpha$ is a prefix of $\beta$,
- episodal rule is a probabilistic implication
$-\alpha \Rightarrow \operatorname{postfix}(\beta, \alpha)$, i.e. $\langle A B\rangle \Rightarrow\langle C\rangle$
- likewise for association rules, min support parameter is usually completed by min confidence
$-\operatorname{conf}(\alpha \Rightarrow \operatorname{postfix}(\beta, \alpha))=\frac{s(\beta, S, 3)}{s(\alpha, S, 3)}=\frac{1}{2}$.


## Frequent subsequences - summary, categorization

- Different problem types distinguished according to the sequence types
- single vs more sequences in a database
* asks for different support definition,
- directed vs undirected sequences
* asks for different treatment of canonical representation,
- one item vs more items per single sequence position
* influences complexity of the solution,
- constraints may be needed
* e.g. the window size for transaction definition,
* MinGap and MaxGap for sequence definition,
* constraints extend practical applicability, slightly increase complexity,
- a taxonomy of items may exist
* similar to constraints - extends applicability, but it may increase complexity,
- items or (labeled) intervals
* an interval: $I=($ start, end, label $)$.
- the next lecture: from sequences towards structural patterns (trees/graphs).


## Recommended reading, lecture resources

:: Reading

- Agrawal, Srikant: Mining Sequential Patterns.
- Agrawal, Srikant: MSPs: Generalizations and Performance.
- from APRIORI towards its sequential versions AprioriAll and GSP,
- http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.95.2818\&rep=rep1\&type=pdf,
- Pei, Han et al.: PrefixSpan: Mining Sequential Patterns by Prefix-Projected Growth.
- FreeSpan (idea) and PrefixSpan algorithms, efficiency comparison with GSP,
- http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.12.7211,
- Mannila et al.: Discovery of Frequent Episodes in Event Sequences.
- episodal rules,
- http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/summary?doi=10.1.1.49.3594,
- Borgelt: Frequent Pattern Mining.
- undirected sequences,
- http://www.borgelt.net/teach/fpm/slides.html.
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[^0]:    Pei, Han et al.: PrefixSpan: Mining Sequential Patterns by Prefix-Projected Growth.

