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Abstract
In practical applications of machine learning, it is often desirable to identify and abstain on examples where the model’s predictions are likely to be incorrect. We consider the problem of selecting a budget-constrained subset of test examples to abstain on, with the goal of maximizing performance on the remaining examples. We develop a novel approach to this problem by analytically optimizing the expected marginal improvement in a desired performance metric, such as the area under the ROC curve or Precision-Recall curve. We compare our approach to other abstention techniques for deep learning models based on posterior probability and uncertainty estimates obtained using test-time dropout. On various tasks in computer vision, natural language processing, and bioinformatics, we demonstrate the consistent effectiveness of our approach over other techniques.

Code: https://goo.gl/WMQBAk

1. Introduction
Machine learning is poised to drive and transform many application domains. However, when machine learning classifiers are deployed in real-world environments, they tend to fail quietly when faced with noisy or out-of-distribution examples. Selective classification refers to the situation where a classifier has the option of "rejecting" or abstaining on a prediction. Classifiers that do not abstain on cases when they are likely to be incorrect can cause accidents or limit adoption. As an example, if an autonomous vehicle that uses a neural network to detect pedestrians is likely to be incorrect, then it should rely on the output of other sensors for the braking decision (Bojarski et al. (2016)). Similarly, a medical diagnosis model should not classify with high confidence when it should be flagging difficult cases for human intervention (Jiang et al. (2012)). Otherwise, incorrect diagnoses could prevent future adoption of machine learning models in medicine.
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Selective classification has been extensively studied in specific contexts such as SVMs, nearest-neighbors and boosting (Fumera and Roli (2002); Hellman (1970); Cortes et al. (2016)). Abstention strategies have also been proposed that require the cost of abstention relative to misclassification to be specified (Cordella et al. (1995); De Stefano et al. (2000); Pietraszek (2005)). Unfortunately, it is often not clear in practice how to set these costs, especially when the performance metric of interest is based on the relative rankings of the predictions (as with Area Under the ROC curve) rather than errors on individual predictions.

A promising strategy for selective classification in neural networks is to use Bayesian Deep Learning to obtain uncertainty estimates and abstain on predictions with high uncertainty. In Bayesian Deep Learning, the weights parameterizing a deep learning model are considered to be drawn from some prior distribution rather than having fixed values (Bay (2018); Krueger et al. (2018)). This typically requires special techniques for training the model and cannot usually be applied retroactively to an existing trained model. One exception is test-time dropout or monte-carlo dropout (Gal and Graharamani (2016)), which is based on the observation that leaving dropout enabled during prediction time is equivalent to approximate inference in a Gaussian process model. However, it remains to be seen whether the implicit covariance matrix for the Gaussian process in test-time dropout is effective for selective classification in practice.

An alternative to test-time dropout that can be applied to any deep learning model is a baseline method described by Hendrycks & Gimpel (Hendrycks and Gimpel (2017)). Hendrycks & Gimpel show that low-confidence examples in a multiclass model can be detected by looking at the softmax probability of the most probable class; the lower the probability, the greater the likelihood that the prediction is incorrect. The equivalent in a binary classification setting with a sigmoid output (which is analogous to a 2-class softmax) is to look at the distance of the sigmoid output from 0.5; the smaller the distance from 0.5, the lower the confidence in the prediction.

One issue with the approach of Hendrycks & Gimpel is that modern neural networks are often notoriously miscalibrated (Guo et al. (2017)) - thus, a sigmoid output of 0.5 does not necessarily indicate that there is a 50% probability that the example is a positive. Fortunately, if the network was trained using a held-out validation set, methods such as temperature scaling (Guo et al. (2017)), platt scaling (Platt (1999)) and isotonic regression (Zadrozny and Elkan (2002)) can be applied to correct this miscalibration.

Unfortunately, even when we consider using "calibrated distance from 0.5" for selective classification, two further issues emerge. The first is that using "distance from 0.5" as a threshold implicitly suggests that 0.5 is the prediction that the model makes in the absence of other information. While this is true for balanced datasets, it is far from true in the presence of class imbalance (which occurs in real-word datasets); if the ratio of positives to negatives is 1:9, a calibrated model would make a prediction of 0.1 in the absence of any other information. The second issue is that a "distance from 0.5" threshold also assumes that we value correctly-predicted positives as much as we value correctly-predicted negatives, but this may also not be true in practice; if the metric we wish to optimize is the area under the Precision-Recall curve (AuPRC), we find that correctly-predicted positives matter more than correctly-predicted negatives.
In this paper, we propose a novel solution to the aforementioned shortcomings of "calibrated distance from 0.5" for selective classification by directly optimizing a target metric of interest (in our case AuROC or AuPRC). Given the calibrated probability estimates for each example, we estimate the Marginal Change in AuROC (McAuROC) or Marginal Change in AuPRC (McAuPRC) if the classifier were to abstain on that prediction. We then abstain on those examples that would give the biggest estimated improvement in AuROC or AuPRC (depending on which metric we wish to optimize). We find that this approach produces superior AuROC and AuPRC compared to abstention based on test-time dropout and "calibrated distance from 0.5", particularly in the presence of class imbalance. We generalize the method to the multi-class setting, where it continues to be effective, and discuss extensions such as adaptation to an unknown test-set imbalance. Our approach can be readily applied to existing models and easily adopted in practical settings.

2. Problem Formulation

Our goal is to identify which predictions a model should abstain on. We frame the problem in terms of abstention on a fixed budget. Formally, if \( f(S) \) is a score function that evaluates the quality of the predictions of a binary classifier on set \( S \) of examples, we wish to identify a subset \( A \) of fixed size \( |A| = m \) such that \( f(S \setminus A) \) is maximized. We note that this is an equivalent problem to abstaining on the smallest subset \( A \) such that \( f(S \setminus A) \) achieves a desired target performance. For ease of comparison between different methods, we use the former formulation. We discuss extension to the online setting in Sec. 5.2.

3. Abstention Methods

3.1 Existing Abstention Methods

3.1.1 Test-Time Dropout

Test-time dropout has been proposed as method for obtaining uncertainty estimates for the predictions of a neural network (Gal and Ghahramani (2016)). It consists of leaving dropout enabled at test-time to obtain Monte Carlo samples of the posterior distribution of the predictions under a Gaussian Process prior. The larger the variance of the Monte Carlo samples on a given test example, the greater the uncertainty of the prediction and the higher the priority for abstention.

We explored two variants of test-time dropout in the context of binary classification. The first, called pre-activation uncertainty, computes the variance of Monte Carlo samples of the logit of the sigmoid. The second, called post-activation uncertainty, computes the variance of the sigmoid output. Note that due to the saturating nature of sigmoids, there is an inverse correlation between post-activation uncertainty and the distance of the sigmoid output from 0.5. We found that the second variant performed substantially better than the first and selected it for our comparisons. The number of monte-carlo samples drawn to compute the variance was 100. Note that this rendered test-time dropout considerably slower than other methods.
3.1.2 Probability of Most Confident Class

The baseline method proposed by Hendrycks & Gimpel consists of ranking examples by the probability of the most confident class; the lower the probability, the greater the abstention priority. The analogous metric in the context of binary classification is the absolute difference of the classifier’s output from 0.5. We refer to this as the uncalibrated probability distance from 0.5. Because the predictions of a neural network are not always calibrated, we suspected that calibrating the predictions of the classifier using the methods in Sec. 3.3 may work better when measuring the difference from 0.5. We refer to this modified approach as the calibrated probability distance from 0.5. For the multi-class setting, we explored ranking examples both by the probability of the most confident softmax class (“softmax-top1”) as well as the total probability of the top two most confident softmax classes (“softmax-top2”). Calibration in the multi-class setting was done using temperature scaling(Guo et al. (2017)).

3.2 Novel Abstention Methods

While the use of 0.5 is intuitive as a threshold when the positive and negative sets are balanced, it may not be appropriate when the dataset is highly imbalanced. For instance, if the negatives outnumber the positives by 9:1, a calibrated but completely random binary classifier would output a probability of 0.1. The metric that we wish to optimize through abstention also plays a role; for instance, optimizing Area under the Precision-Recall curve (AuPRC) results in preferentially retaining correctly-predicted positives over correctly-predicted negatives, while area under ROC curve (AuROC) is not inherently biased towards positives or negatives. Motivated by these observations, we sought to develop abstention methods that directly optimize performance metrics of interest.

Figure 1: McAuROC and McAuPRC are sensitive to class imbalance, and McAuPRC favors positives relative to McAuROC. We generated simulated datasets with different class imbalances where positive examples were normally distributed around 1 with unit variance and negative examples were normally distributed around 0 with unit variance. Shown are the Marginal Change in auROC (McAuROC) and Marginal Change in auPRC (McAuPRC) as a function of the probability that an example came from the positive set. When the proportion of positives is smaller, both methods prefers to abstain on negatives. McAuPRC prefers to retain positives relative to McAuROC.
3.2.1 Marginal Change in AuROC

The Area under the ROC curve (AuROC) is commonly used to summarize the performance of a binary classifier. We assume that, for a given output threshold, examples are predicted to be positive if the classifier’s output exceeds the threshold. We denote the threshold as $t$, total negatives as $N$, total positives as $P$, correctly predicted positives as $TP(t)$ and false positives as $FP(t)$. The ROC curve is calculated by plotting the False Positive Rate $FPR(t) = \frac{FP(t)}{N}$ and the True Positive Rate $TPR(t) = \frac{TP(t)}{P}$ at all possible $t$.

A classic result is that the AuROC is equal to the probability that a randomly chosen negative is ranked below a randomly chosen positive (Fawcett (2006)). To derive this, consider the thresholds defined by the sorted list $L$ of predictions on all examples in ascending order, and let $1\{i \in -\}$ be an indicator function denoting whether example $i$ is part of the negative set. Assume that any ties are broken by some arbitrary tiebreaker function. When there are no ties, the predicted output of every negative example corresponds to a unique FPR, with $FPR(L_i) = \frac{N - \sum_{i' < i} 1\{i' \in -\}}{N}$. In the limit of infinite data, we can approximate the auROC as the rectangular sum $\frac{1}{N} \sum_i 1\{i \in -\} TPR(L_i)$. Because $TPR(L_i)$ is equal to the probability that a randomly chosen positive will be ranked higher than $L_i$, averaging over all thresholds $L_i$ where $i$ is in the negative set gives the probability that a randomly chosen positive will be ranked above a randomly chosen negative.

Our goal is to derive a formula for the expected Marginal Change in auROC (McAuROC) if an example is abstained on at a threshold $t$, and use this to decide which examples to abstain on. Formally, let $\Delta AuROC(t)$ denote the change in AuROC caused by abstaining on a single example at threshold $t$. We will analyze the effect of abstaining on positives and negatives separately. Let $\Delta^+ AuROC(t)$ denote the change in AuROC caused if the example abstained on is a positive, and let $\Delta^- AuROC(t)$ denote the change in AuROC caused if the example abstained on is a negative. Formally, if $1\{x \in +\}$ is an indicator function denoting whether the example abstained on is a positive, then $\Delta^+ AuROC(t) = 1\{x \in +\} \Delta AuROC(t)$ and $\Delta^- AuROC(t) = (1 - 1\{x \in +\}) \Delta AuROC(t)$.

Let $p(t)$ be the calibrated probability that an example with predicted output $t$ is a positive (in other words, $p(t) := E[1\{x \in +\}]$). Let $AuROC^*$ denote the current AuROC. Note that the True Negative Rate $TNR(t) = 1 - \frac{FP(t)}{N}$ is the probability that a randomly chosen negative will be ranked below threshold $t$. Using the fact that the AuROC is the probability that a random negative will be ranked below a random positive, we get:

$$\Delta^+ AuROC(t) = \frac{(P)(AuROC^*) - 1\{x \in +\}TNR(t)}{P - 1\{x \in +\}} - AuROC^*$$

$$= 1\{x \in +\} \frac{AuROC^* - TNR(t)}{P - 1\{x \in +\}}$$

$$\approx 1\{x \in +\} \frac{AuROC^* - TNR(t)}{P} \text{ When } P >> 1$$

$$E[\Delta^+ AuROC(t)] \approx p(t) \frac{AuROC^* - TNR(t)}{P}$$
As TPR\( (t) \) is the probability that a random positive will be ranked above threshold \( t \), we also get:

\[
\Delta^- \text{AuROC}(t) = \frac{(N)(\text{AuROC}^*) - (1 - 1\{x \in +\}) \text{TPR}(t)}{N - (1 - 1\{x \in +\})} - \text{AuROC}^*
\]

\[
= (1 - 1\{x \in +\}) \frac{\text{AuROC}^* - \text{TPR}(t)}{N - (1 - 1\{x \in +\})}
\]

\[
\approx (1 - 1\{x \in +\}) \frac{\text{AuROC}^* - \text{TPR}(t)}{N} \quad \text{When } N \gg 1
\]

\[
E[\Delta^- \text{AuROC}(t)] \approx (1 - p(t)) \frac{\text{AuROC}^* - \text{TPR}(t)}{N}
\]

We sum these to get:

\[\text{McAuROC}(t) = E[\Delta^+ \text{AuROC}(t)] + E[\Delta^- \text{AuROC}(t)] \quad (1)\]

Our formula for McAuROC\( (t) \) relies on \( P \), \( N \), \( p(t) \), TPR\( (t) \), TNR\( (t) \) and \( \text{AuROC}^* \).

How can we estimate these values on the test set in the absence of labeled data? Let \( L_{\text{test}} \) represent the list of predicted values on the test set. We observe that, given accurate estimates of \( p(t) \), we have:

\[
E[P] = \sum_i E[1\{i \in +\}] = \sum_i p(L_{i}\text{test})
\]

\[
E[N] = \sum_i E[1\{i \in -\}] = \sum_i (1 - p(L_{i}\text{test}))
\]

\[
E[\text{TP}(t)] = \sum_{i|L_{i}\text{test} > t} E[1\{i \in +\}] = \sum_{i|L_{i}\text{test} > t} p(L_{i}\text{test})
\]

\[
E[\text{FP}(t)] = \sum_{i|L_{i}\text{test} > t} E[1\{i \in -\}] = \sum_{i|L_{i}\text{test} > t} (1 - p(L_{i}\text{test}))
\]

Using these expected values, we can estimate TPR\( (t) \) as \( \frac{E[\text{TP}(t)]}{E[P]} \) and TNR\( (t) \) as \( \frac{E[\text{TN}(t)]}{E[N]} \).

Because the \( \text{AuROC} \) is equal to \( \frac{1}{N} \sum_i 1\{i \in -\} \text{TPR}(L_i) \), we can estimate \( \text{AuROC}^* \) on the test set as:

\[
\text{AuROC}^* = \frac{1}{E[N]} \sum_i E[1\{i \in -\}] \frac{E[\text{TP}(L_{i}\text{test})]}{E[P]} = \frac{1}{E[N]} \sum_i (1 - p(L_{i}\text{test})) \frac{E[\text{TP}(L_{i}\text{test})]}{E[P]}
\]

The function \( p(t) \) is estimated by applying calibration to the validation set as discussed in Sec. 3.3.

3.2.2 Marginal Change in AuPRC

The area under the Precision-Recall curve (AuPRC) is often preferred to \( \text{AuROC} \) when illustrating the performance of a classifier when the proportion of negatives is far larger than the proportion of positives. The derivation for the expected Marginal Change in AuPRC (McAuPRC) is similar in spirit to the derivation for McAuROC, and is provided in the supplement.

3.2.3 Adapting to the multi-class setting

Metrics such as \( \text{AuROC} \) and \( \text{AuPRC} \) are defined for the binary classification setting, but they can be easily adapted to the multi-class setting by treating each class as a separate binary classification task. In other words, we compute the the \( \text{AuROC}/\text{AuPRC} \) for each task.
separately and then take the mean across all tasks. The analog for McAUROC/McAUPRC is again to treat each class as a separate binary classification task, compute the McAUROC/McAUPRC for each task, and then take the mean across all tasks. In the experiments on CIFAR10, "mean-mcauroc" refers to taking the mean McAUROC across all tasks for each example.

3.3 Calibration

Correct calibration of probabilities is important for several of the abstention methods we study. Given the outputs $L$ of a binary classifier, calibration refers to learning a function $p$ such that $p(L_i)$ is equal to the probability that example $i$ is part of the positive set. In this work, we use two existing calibration approaches: Platt Scaling (Platt (1999)), which uses logistic regression to learn the function $p$, and Temperature Scaling (Guo et al. (2017)), which is a variant of Platt scaling that has proven effective for multi-class neural networks. Calibration was performed using data from the validation set. Temperature Scaling was used in the multi-class experiments on CIFAR10. Platt Scaling was used in the remaining binary classification experiments due to its superior performance relative to Temperature Scaling.

4. Empirical Validation

4.1 Setup

We investigated the empirical performance of the various abstention methods across diverse tasks. For each task, we trained 10 models under different random seeds using Keras (Chollet (2018)) with the TensorFlow backend. For each abstention method, we abstained on 20% of the examples. Results at 5% abstention follow similar trends and are included in the supplement. To assess whether one abstention method was significantly better than another, we used an exact Wilcoxon signed-rank test at a significance threshold of $p \leq 0.05$. We chose this test because it is designed to handle paired samples (results for the same random seed are correlated) without making any other assumptions about the distribution. We used the exact version of the test because the Gaussian approximation is not appropriate for a sample size of 10. In the figures below, a method is colored green if it is no worse than any other method in the comparison as measured by the Wilcoxon test. A method is colored orange if it is no better than any other method in the comparison as measured by the Wilcoxon test. Methods satisfying neither (or both) conditions are colored in gray.

4.2 Natural Language Processing

We used the large movie review (IMDB) sentiment classification dataset (Maas et al. (2011)) and the corresponding convolutional neural network architecture that ships with Keras (Chollet (2018)). The training set contained 20K examples and the validation set contained 10K examples. Since test-time dropout required taking 100 Monte-Carlo samples per prediction, we ran the comparisons on only 10K testing-set examples.
Figure 2: Curve optimization performs well on IMDB sentiment classification. Improvement in AuROC/AuPRC achieved by different abstention methods with 20% abstention. Colored dots represent models trained with different random seeds. Bar height corresponds to median improvement across all random seeds. Best performing methods are colored green, worst performing methods are colored orange. "Best" and "worst" were determined by the Wilcoxon test as described in Sec. 4.1. Median performance before abstention was 93.05% AuROC and 92.72% AuPRC. The ratio of positives to negatives was roughly 1:1.

4.3 Bioinformatics

Predicting regulatory biochemical activity of non-coding DNA sequences is a difficult and complex task. Recently, CNN models have been proposed to predict chromatin accessibility (a biochemical marker of regulatory DNA) in different cell types from DNA sequences. However, even the best computational models achieve only fair performance. We trained the Basset architecture (Kelley et al. (2016)), a multi-task CNN model to map 4-channel (A, C, G, T) one-hot encoded DNA sequences to binary chromatin accessibility outputs across 16 hematopoietic cell types (16 binary classification tasks) (Corces et al. (2016)). The dataset contained 837,977 sequences underlying in vivo chromatin accessible sites across all 16 cell types. We evaluated the abstention methods on two tasks (cell types): pre-leukemic hematopoietic stem cells (task 3: pHSC_ATAC) and leukemia stem cells (task 4: LSC_ATAC). The ratio of negatives:positives for both tasks was roughly 2:1. Since test-time dropout required taking 100 Monte-Carlo samples per prediction, we ran the abstention method comparisons on only 10K testing-set examples.

4.3.1 Computer Vision

We trained VGG models on CIFAR10 data using the architecture and hyperparameter settings from (Geifman and El-Yaniv (2017)). The first 10K examples in the CIFAR10 training set were used as a validation set for early stopping and calibration. Models weights were saved only at the best-performing epoch out of all epochs trained. To explore differences in the behavior of abstention methods on models with poor performance compared to models with strong performance, we trained models both 10 epochs and 100 epochs. We compared mean McAuROC across all tasks to abstention based on the top-1 softmax probability and the sum of the top-2 softmax probabilities. Calibrated probabilities computed via temperature scaling (Guo et al. (2017)) were supplied to all abstention methods. Due
Figure 3: Curve optimization performs well at distinguishing regions active in pre-leukemic hematopoetic stem cells. Median performance before abstention was 83.01% AuROC and 73.22% AuPRC. Ratio of positives:negatives was roughly 1:2. See caption of Fig. 2 for figure interpretation.

Figure 4: Curve optimization performs well at distinguishing regions active in leukemia stem cells. Median performance before abstention was 81.07% AuROC and 69.54% AuPRC. Ratio of positives:negatives was roughly 1:2. See caption of Fig. 2 for figure interpretation.

to the lagging performance of test-time dropout in the binary classification experiments (consistent with prior work (Geifman and El-Yaniv (2017)) that found that using the top-1 softmax probability performs comparable to or better than test-time dropout), we excluded test-time dropout from the multi-class comparison for computational efficiency. Because the CIFAR10 dataset is balanced across all classes, we analyzed the behavior of McAuROC over McAuPRC.

We found that curve optimization according to mean-mcauroc was the best for optimizing mean AuROC. For optimizing top-1 or top-2 accuracy, the best strategy differs based on the performance of the model. If the model has high performance (Fig 5), then for optimizing top-1 or top-2 accuracy it is best to simply abstain according to the (calibrated) softmax probabilities of the top-1 or top-2 classes respectively. Note that in this scenario, softmax-top1 performs worse than mean-mcauroc for optimizing top-2 accuracy, and softmax-top2 performs worse than mean-mcauroc for optimizing top-1 accuracy. Thus, mean-mcauroc may still be a good choice if one wishes to attain good overall performance across several metrics. If the model has weak performance (Fig. 6), our analysis suggests that it is best
to use mean-mcauroc for optimizing all three metrics (mean AuROC, top-1 accuracy and top-2 accuracy). We hypothesize that this is because mean-mcauroc uses information from all the softmax classes to get a good overall estimate of the quality of the ranking of the example.

Figure 5: Curve optimization performs best for mean AuROC and second-best on top-1 and top-2 accuracy on CIFAR10 VGG models trained for 100 epochs. Median performance before abstention was 90.15% top 1 accuracy, 96.55% top-2 accuracy and 99.43% mean auROC. See caption of Fig. 2 for figure interpretation.

Figure 6: Curve optimization performs best on all metrics on CIFAR10 VGG models trained for 10 epochs. Median performance before abstention was 55.34% top 1 accuracy, 75.35% top 2 accuracy and 91.45% mean auROC. See caption of Fig. 2 for figure interpretation.

5. Discussion

5.1 Domain Adaptation for Class Imbalance

The fact that McAuROC and McAuPRC are computed purely from a set of calibrated probabilities lends itself to domain adaptation for class imbalance. To demonstrate this, we constructed an IMDB dataset where the training and validation sets had a 1:1 ratio of negatives:positives, but the test set had a 2:1 ratio. In this scenario, calibrated probabilities
computed on the validation set do not directly apply to the testing set. However, by assuming that the inherent distributions of positive and negative examples had not changed (only their ratio had), we could parameterize the test-set distribution as a mixture of the distributions of positives and negatives in the validation set. The optimal mixing parameter then gave us an estimate of the test-set class imbalance, which we used to adjusted our calibrated probabilities to match the testing set. On the IMDB dataset, we found that the imbalance-adjusted probabilities successfully improved the performance of curve optimization relative to unadjusted probabilities (Fig. 7). See the supplement for more details.

Figure 7: **Adapting to test-set imbalance improves curve optimization on unbalanced IMDB.** Improvements after 20% abstention. Median AuPRC before abstention was 87.28%. See caption of Fig. 2 for figure interpretation.

5.2 Extension to the Online Setting

While we evaluated our algorithms in the context of batch testing, our approaches could be extended to on-line testing by estimating the percentiles of the abstention scores using the validation set and only abstaining on an example if its estimated percentile exceeds a certain threshold. This would prove effective if the distribution of the testing set is similar to that of the validation set.

5.3 Additional Supplementary Analyses

Please see the supplement for additional work. This includes: (1) a recursive extension of McAuROC and McAuPRC that updates the abstention priorities to account for the change in class imbalance as more examples are evicted, (2) analysis of abstention methods in the presence of artificial training-set noise, (3) novel diagnostics of the effectiveness of abstention methods based on influence functions, and (4) analysis of an influence-based abstention method. In all our supplementary analyses, curve optimization performs favorably.

5.4 Conclusion

We presented an analytically-derived formula for identifying which examples to abstain on given their calibrated probabilities. We demonstrated the usefulness of this approach in the binary and multi-class classification setting for pruning misclassified examples on diverse tasks with varying performance and class imbalance. One advantage of relying only on probabilities is the potential for domain adaptation, as discussed in the case where the
testing-set has a different class imbalance from the validation set. We note that our approach can work with any set of calibrated probabilities and is not restricted to deep learning. It could also be combined with the work of Geifman & El-Yaniv (Geifman and El-Yaniv (2017)) to obtain a selective classifier that achieves a target risk level with high probability. We hope that as high-performing machine learning classifiers become more ubiquitous in applications, tools for flagging and abstaining on misclassified examples become invaluable to practitioners and researchers alike.
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Appendix A. Supplementary methods

A.1 Derivation for McAuPRC

The area under the Precision-Recall curve (AuPRC) is often preferred to AuROC when illustrating the performance of a classifier when the proportion of negatives is far larger than the proportion of positives. The PR curve is calculated by plotting the precision \( Pr(t) = \frac{TP(t)}{TP(t) + FP(t)} \) and the recall (which is synonymous with TPR(t)) at all possible \( t \).

Our goal is to derive a formula for the expected Marginal Change in AuPRC (McAuPRC) as examples are abstained on at a threshold \( t \).

A classic result is that the AuPRC is equal to the average precision over all the positives. To derive this, consider the thresholds defined by the sorted list \( L \) of predictions on all examples in ascending order, and let \( 1\{i \in +\} \) be an indicator function denoting whether example \( i \) is part of the positive set. If ties are broken by an arbitrary tiebreaking function, then every positive example in \( L \) corresponds to a unique TPR, with \( TPR(L_i) = \frac{\sum_{i' \leq i} 1\{i' \in +\}}{P} \).

In the limit of infinite data, we can approximate the AuPRC as the rectangular sum \( \frac{1}{P} \sum_i 1\{i \in +\} Pr(L_i) \), which is the average precision over all the positives.

Our goal is to derive a formula for the expected Marginal Change in AuPRC (McAuPRC) if an example is abstained on at a threshold \( t \). We first note that abstaining on an example at \( t \) affects the precision at all positives ranked below \( t \). Let \( \Delta Pr(t', t) \) denote the expected change in the precision at \( t' \) caused by abstaining on an example at \( t \). Let \( 1\{x \in +\} \) be an indicator function denoting whether the example \( x \) that is abstained on is a positive. We have:

\[
\Delta Pr(t', t) = \frac{TP(t') - 1\{x \in +\}}{TP(t') + FP(t') - 1} - \frac{TP(t')}{TP(t') + FP(t')}
\]

\[
= \frac{TP(t') - 1\{x \in +\}(TP(t') + FP(t'))}{(TP(t') + FP(t') - 1)(TP(t') + FP(t'))}
\]

\[
= \frac{Pr(t') - 1\{x \in +\}}{TP(t') + FP(t') - 1}
\]

\[
\approx \frac{Pr(t') - 1\{x \in +\}}{TP(t') + FP(t')} \quad \text{When } TP(t') + FP(t') >> 1
\]

\[
McPr(t', t) := E[\Delta Pr(t', t)] \approx \frac{Pr(t') - p(t)}{TP(t') + FP(t')}
\]

We are now prepared to compute McAuPRC. Let \( \Delta AuPRC(t) \) denote the change in AuPRC when an example is evicted at threshold \( t \), and let \( AuPRC^* \) denote the current value of the AuPRC. Using the fact that the AuPRC is the average precision over all the
When \( P \gg 1 \)

McAuPRC\((t)\) := \(E[\DeltaAuPRC(t)]\)

Because we do not have access to \(1\{i \in +\}\) on the test set, we approximated it using its expected value \(p(L_i)\). We also substitute TP\((t)\), FP\((t)\) and \(P\) with their expected values on the test set and use them to estimate \(Pr(t)\) and \(AuPRC^*\), analogous to what was done in the section on AuROC.
A.2 Recursive Marginal AuROC/AuPRC

The formulas for McAuROC($t$) and McAuPRC($t$) contain terms whose values change as more and more test-set examples are abstained on. Thus, it can be beneficial to recompute McAuROC($t$) and McAuPRC($t$) every time an example is removed from the test set (see Fig. 8). This can prevent unexpected results when a large fraction of the dataset is selected for abstention. We refer to these variants of curve optimization as recursive, because the calculation of the marginals is repeated every time an example is identified for abstention. One drawback of the recursive variants is that they are designed for the batch setting and are not easily adaptable to the online setting.

![Recursive McAuROC and McAuPRC](image)

Figure 8: **Recursive McAuROC and McAuPRC correct for change in class imbalance as examples are evicted.** We generated a simulated dataset containing 30% positives using a similar procedure as for Fig. 1 in the main text. Abstention priority is plotted against the probability that an example is a positive. As examples are evicted, the class imbalance becomes more even and recursive metrics adjust the abstention priority accordingly.
A.3 Influence-Based Abstention

We hypothesized that incorrect predictions on the test set may be heavily influenced by noisy training points. Thus, if we identify a subset of training points that appear likely to be noisy or mislabeled, we can abstain on those test-set examples for which the predictions are most heavily influenced by the noisy training points. To achieve this, we utilize influence functions for understanding the model’s predictions and their relation to the training data (Koh and Liang (2017)).

We first assess the influence of each training point on the validation set loss and identify those training points with negative influence. We denote those points as our noisy training set $S_{\text{Noise}}$.

Our goal is to abstain on those examples from the testing set that are most impacted by $S_{\text{Noise}}$. To do this, we first estimate the change in the parameters caused by removal of $S_{\text{Noise}}$ and then estimate the change in the test-set predictions caused by the change in parameters. The influence of removing a training point $z$ on the parameters $\hat{\theta}$ can be estimated as $\frac{1}{n}H_{\hat{\theta}}^{-1}\nabla_{\theta}L(z, \hat{\theta})$, where $n$ is the size of the training set, $L(z, \hat{\theta})$ is the loss function of the model on training example $z$ with parameters $\hat{\theta}$, and $H_{\hat{\theta}} := \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}\nabla_{\theta}^2L(z_i, \hat{\theta})$ (Koh and Liang (2017)). Based on this, we estimate the total influence on the parameters of removing the set $S_{\text{Noise}}$ as $\Delta \hat{\theta} = \sum_{z \in S_{\text{Noise}}} \frac{1}{n}H_{\hat{\theta}}^{-1}\nabla_{\theta}L(z, \hat{\theta})$. Given $\Delta \hat{\theta}$, we approximate the effect on the prediction $O(z_{\text{test}}, \hat{\theta})$ for a given testing example $z_{\text{test}}$ as $\nabla_{\theta}O(z_{\text{test}}, \hat{\theta})^T\Delta \hat{\theta}$. Using this, we can abstain on those examples with the largest estimated absolute change in $O(z_{\text{test}}, \hat{\theta})$ due to removal of $S_{\text{Noise}}$. Results are in Sec. B.3.
A.4 Domain Adaptation for Class Imbalance

In the case where test set imbalance does not match the imbalance of training and validation sets, the calibrated probabilities learned using the validation set would not generalize to the testing set. Fortunately, if we make the assumption that the distributions of positives and negatives is the same between the validation and testing set, we can use a mixture model to infer the class imbalance of the testing set and adjust our calibrated probabilities accordingly. The mixture model is learned as follows. First, we apply a Gaussian kernel density estimator (KDE) as implemented by scikit (Pedregosa et al. (2011)) to the validation set where the bandwidth is selected by Scott’s rule (Scott (1992)). From this, we can obtain the probability density function (PDF) for the positive and negative examples as follows: let $p_{\text{valid}}(x)$ denote the validation-set calibrated probability on an example $x$, and let $PDF_{\text{valid}}(x)$ denote the validation set’s PDF (as estimated by the KDE) at example $x$. If $\alpha_{\text{valid}}$ denotes the proportion of positives in the validation set, then the PDFs for the positives and negatives are:

$$PDF_{\text{positives}}(x) = \frac{1}{\alpha_{\text{valid}}}PDF_{\text{valid}}(x) \times p_{\text{valid}}(x)$$

$$PDF_{\text{negatives}}(x) = \frac{1}{1 - \alpha_{\text{valid}}}PDF_{\text{valid}}(x) \times (1 - p_{\text{valid}}(x))$$

Having estimated $PDF_{\text{positives}}$ and $PDF_{\text{negatives}}$, we are now in a position to learn $\alpha_{\text{test}}$, which is the proportion of positives in the testing set. We again apply a Gaussian KDE with bandwidth selected by Scott’s rule to the test set to estimate $PDF_{\text{test}}(x)$. We seek to fit $\alpha_{\text{test}}$ such that:

$$PDF_{\text{test}}(x) = \alpha_{\text{test}}PDF_{\text{positives}}(x) + (1 - \alpha_{\text{test}})PDF_{\text{negatives}}(x) \quad (2)$$

We can frame this as an optimization problem over all the examples $x$ in the testing set. For the unbalanced IMDB dataset (Sec. B.4), we were able to obtain accurate estimates of $\alpha_{\text{test}}$ using a Limited-memory BFGS (Avriel (2003)) optimizer for the minimization as implemented by scipy (Jones et al. (2001–)). We used the square loss - specifically:

$$\text{Loss}(x) = (PDF_{\text{test}}(x) - (\alpha_{\text{test}}PDF_{\text{positives}}(x) + (1 - \alpha_{\text{test}})PDF_{\text{negatives}}(x)))^2 \quad (3)$$

Once we have $\alpha_{\text{test}}$, we can compute the adjusted probabilities $p_{\text{test}}(x)$ as follows:

$$p_{\text{test}}(x) = \frac{\alpha_{\text{test}}PDF_{\text{positives}}(x)}{\alpha_{\text{test}}PDF_{\text{positives}}(x) + (1 - \alpha_{\text{test}})PDF_{\text{negatives}}(x)} \quad (4)$$
Appendix B. Supplementary Results

B.1 Results with 5% abstention

Figure 9: Curve optimization performs well on IMDB sentiment classification. Improvement in AuROC/AuPRC achieved by different abstention methods with 5% abstenion. Colored dots represent models trained with different random seeds. Bar height corresponds to median improvement across all random seeds. Best performing methods are colored green, worst performing methods are colored orange. "Best" and "worst" were determined by the Wilcoxon test as described in the main text. Median performance before abstention was 93.05% AuROC and 92.72% AuPRC. The ratio of positives to negatives was roughly 1:1.

Figure 10: Curve optimization performs well at distinguishing regions active in pre-leukemic hematopoetic stem cells. Median performance before abstention was 83.01% AuROC and 73.22% AuPRC. Ratio of positives:negatives was roughly 1:2. See caption of Fig. 9 for figure interpretation.
Figure 11: **Curve optimization performs well at distinguishing regions active in leukemia stem cells.** Median performance before abstention was 81.07% AuROC and 69.54% AuPRC. Ratio of positives:negatives was roughly 1:2. See caption of Fig. 9 for figure interpretation.

Figure 12: **Curve optimization performs best for mean AuROC and second-best on top-1 or top-2 accuracy on CIFAR10 VGG models trained for 100 epochs.** Median performance before abstention was 90.15% top 1 accuracy, 96.55% top-2 accuracy and 99.43% mean auROC. See caption of Fig. 9 for figure interpretation.

Figure 13: **Curve optimization performs best on mean AuROC and top-2 accuracy on CIFAR10 VGG models trained for 10 epochs.** Median performance before abstention was 55.34% top 1 accuracy, 75.35% top 2 accuracy and 91.45% mean auROC. See caption of Fig. 9 for figure interpretation.
B.2 Results in Noisy Settings

Noisy and unreliable labels are sometimes inevitable in real-world datasets. This problem is particularly bad if the labels are crowd-sourced (Frnay and Verleysen (2014)). One goal of abstention methods is to mitigate the effects of noisy training labels by flagging test examples whose top influences contain several noisy training examples. In what follows, we introduce varying amount of noise into training and validation labels and show that our abstention approach is still effective. In addition, we demonstrate that examples selected for abstention by our method have a disproportionately large number of noisy labels among their top influences.

Our case study in this section is topic classification. We extracted the two most common topics (‘earnings’ and ‘acquisitions’) from the Reuters newswire topic classification dataset (Lewis (1997)). We trained a fully connected neural network with 6 dense layers with 16 neurons each. Each dense layer was followed by ReLU activation and dropout with probability 0.5. Finally, there was an output layer with one neuron followed by a sigmoid activation. Isotonic regression was used for calibration because of its superior performance relative to Platt scaling.

B.2.1 Resistance to Noisy Labels

We evaluated different abstention procedures at increasing levels of noise: 10%, 20%, and 30%. To introduce 10% noise, we selected a subset of size one tenth of the training set and flipped their labels. The same was done for the validation set. Test set remained clean. Then we trained new models on the new datasets with the same architecture. This was repeated for 20% noise and 30% noise. The results for a select subset of high-performing methods for 20% abstention are shown in figures 14 and 15.

B.2.2 Influence of Mislabeled Training Examples

We hypothesized that incorrect or low-confidence predictions on the test set may be heavily influenced by noisy training points, implying that a successful abstention procedure would preferentially select those test points that are most influenced by mislabeled training examples. To test this hypothesis, we artificially mislabeled points in the training set and used influence functions to assess the influence of those points on test-set predictions. For the top 10 test examples selected for abstention by a given method, we ranked the training points by the magnitude of their influence and computed the percentage of the top 50 most influential training points that were deliberately mislabeled. The results for select high-performing methods for 5% abstention are summarized in table 1.
Figure 14: **Average post-abstention AuPRC ranks with increasing noise levels on Reuters dataset.** For a given noise level, the average rank of the post-abstention AuPRC of each method (out of 10 methods in total) was computed across ten models trained with different random seeds. The average rank was then plotted at different noise levels. Higher is better.
Figure 15: **Average post-abstention auROC ranks with increasing noise levels on Reuters dataset.** Higher is better.

Table 1: **Proportion of influential training points on abstained examples that were intentionally mislabeled.** For each abstention method at a given noise level, the 10 testing-set examples with the highest abstention scores were identified and the top 50 most influential training points on these testing-set examples were computed. The proportion of the top 50 points that were intentionally mislabeled is shown. Cells with the highest proportion in their column are in bold. Noise level indicates the overall proportion of examples in the training set that were intentionally mislabeled.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>NOISE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncalib. Uncertainty</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calib. Uncertainty</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal AUPRC</td>
<td><strong>14.2%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recursive Marg. AUPRC</td>
<td><strong>14.2%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncalib. Prob from 0.5</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calib. Prob from 0.5</td>
<td>12.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
B.3 Results with Influence-Based Abstention

We trained a CNN on a binary classification task to distinguish the digit 1 from the digit 7 on MNIST data (LeCun et al. (1998)). We added noise to the dataset by flipping the labels on 10% of the examples in the training and validation sets. The model had two convolutional layers with $32 \times 3 \times 3$ filters and ReLU activations, followed by global max-pooling, followed by dropout with $p = 0.5$, followed by a dense ReLU layer with 128 neurons, followed by the sigmoid output. The model attained an accuracy of 95% on the testing set (which did not have noise added). Calibration of predictions was done using isotonic regression.

We used influence-based abstention (Sec. A.3), recursive marginal AuROC, and recursive marginal AuPRC to rank testing-set examples in ascending order of abstention priority and plotted the drop in accuracy as increasing numbers of examples were included. Results are shown in Fig. 16. Influence-based abstention shows a downward trend as more examples are included, suggesting that the method is capable of ranking examples according to the likelihood that the prediction is correct. However, both curve-based abstention methods outperformed influence-based abstention in this experiment.

![Figure 16: Accuracy vs. # of included examples for influence-based abstention.](image)

Testing-set examples were sorted in increasing order of influence of detrimental training examples. Drop in accuracy with inclusion of more testing-set examples is plotted. Results with recursive marginal auROC and recursive marginal AuPRC are also shown for comparison.
B.4 Results with Domain Adaptation for Class Imbalance

To test our strategy for domain adaptation in the presence of a different class imbalance in the test set versus the validation set (Sec. A.4), we modified the IMDB test set to have 15K samples and a 2:1 imbalance in favor of negatives. The training and validation sets were kept the same. The effect of the domain adaptation on the probabilities is illustrated in Figures 17 and 18, and the results after 20% abstention are shown in Fig. 19.

![Graph showing calibration curves](image)

**Figure 17:** Domain adaptation for class imbalance fixes calibration on IMDB unbalanced test set. Shown are calibration curves on the test set. "no_calibration" refers to the calibration curve achieved by the original sigmoid outputs of the neural net. "platt_scaled_posterior" refers to the result of calibrating probabilities using the balanced validation set. "imbalance_adapted_probs" refers to domain-adapted probabilities derived using the method in Sec. A.4. We see that the domain adaption strategy achieves near-perfect calibration on the test set.
Figure 18: **Scatterplot of probabilities before and after domain adaptation for class imbalance on unbalanced IMDB dataset.** X-axis denotes the probabilities output after calibration using the balanced validation set (before domain adaptation). Y-axis denotes the probabilities after domain adaptation. We see that, after adjustment, the probability of being a positive is routinely lower. 0.5 in the validation set corresponds to roughly 1/3 in the testing set, consistent with the fact that the negatives:positives ratio is 1:1 in the validation set and 2:1 in the testing set.
Figure 19: **Adapting to test-set imbalance improves curve optimization on unbalanced IMDB.** Improvements after 20% abstention. **Top Row:** Adapted McAuROC vs. unadapted McAuROC vs. random. **Bottom Row:** Adapted McAuPRC vs. unadapted McAuPRC vs. random. Median AuROC before abstention was 92.99% and Median AuPRC before abstention was 87.28%. Training and validation sets had a 1:1 imbalance of negatives:positives, but testing set had a 2:1 imbalance. See caption of Fig. 9 for figure interpretation.