

Stratification of uncertainties recalibrated by isotonic regression and its impact on calibration error statistics

Pascal PERNOT ¹

*Institut de Chimie Physique, UMR8000 CNRS,
Université Paris-Saclay, 91405 Orsay, France^{a)}*

Post hoc recalibration of prediction uncertainties of machine learning regression problems by isotonic regression might present a problem for bin-based calibration error statistics (e.g. ENCE). Isotonic regression often produces stratified uncertainties, i.e. subsets of uncertainties with identical numerical values. Partitioning of the resulting data into equal-sized bins introduces an aleatoric component to the estimation of bin-based calibration statistics. The partitioning of stratified data into bins depends on the order of the data, which is typically an uncontrolled property of calibration test/validation sets. The tie-breaking method of the ordering algorithm used for binning might also introduce an aleatoric component. I show on an example how this might significantly affect the calibration diagnostics.

^{a)}Electronic mail: pascal.pernot@cnrs.fr

I. INTRODUCTION

Post hoc recalibration of machine learned (ML) prediction uncertainty for regression problems is currently an essential step to achieve reliable uncertainty quantification (UQ)¹. *Post hoc* recalibration methods include, for instance, temperature scaling²⁻⁴, isotonic regression⁵ and conformal inference^{6,7}.

Isotonic regression⁸ is used to scale prediction uncertainties by an order-preserving non-linear function. According to Busk *et al.*⁵, an isotonic regression model $f_\phi(\cdot)$ is designed to fit the empirical squared errors on a held out calibration dataset. The recalibration function $f_\phi(\cdot)$ takes as input the uncalibrated squared uncertainty u_i^2 and outputs the scaled uncertainty $s_i^2 u_i^2$ according to

$$s_i^2 u_i^2 = f_\phi(u_i^2) \quad (1)$$

Recalibration by isotonic regression has been shown to be efficient^{5,9}, but it comes with a notable side effect. As the isotonic model $f_\phi(\cdot)$ is piece-wise constant, the resulting calibrated uncertainties are stratified.

I show in this note that such a stratification of uncertainty values is problematic for the estimation of bin-based calibration statistics, as the stratification makes the ordering of uncertainties *ad hoc* and ambiguous. For this, I use a recent test dataset ($M = 13885$) of predicted atomization energies and uncertainties from Busk *et al.*⁵ where the uncertainties have been recalibrated by isotonic regression.

The next section (Sect. II) presents the calibration metrics used to evaluate the impact of stratification. Application to the dataset is presented in Sect. III, leading to the discussion of the results and conclusions in Sect. IV.

II. METHODS

A. Calibration metrics

Let us consider a set of prediction errors and uncertainties $\{E_i, u_i\}_{i=1}^M$. Average calibration can be tested by comparing the RMV/MSE ratio or $\text{Var}(Z)$ to 1 for the whole dataset¹⁰, but in order to estimate calibration errors, one needs metrics based on binned data. To do so, the dataset is ordered by increasing uncertainty values and split into N equal-size bins $B_1, \dots, B_N$. Two calibration error metrics are considered here, ENCE and ZVE:

- the Expected Normalized Calibration Error (ENCE)⁴

$$\text{ENCE} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{|MV_i^{1/2} - MSE_i^{1/2}|}{MV_i^{1/2}} \quad (2)$$

is a popular consistency metric that can be easily applied also to adaptivity by a simple change of binning scheme.

- the Z-Variance Error (ZVE)¹¹ is the mean deviation from 1 of the binned z-scores variance

$$\text{ZVE} = \exp \left(\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N |\ln v_i| \right) \quad (3)$$

accounting for the fact that the variance of z-scores is a dimensionless scale parameter

$$v_i = \text{Var} \left(\{Z_j = E_j/u_j\}_{j \in B_i} \right) \quad (4)$$

B. Calibration validation

Note that the ENCE and ZVE statistics are useful for comparisons (the closer to their target the better) but they do not come with a validation threshold and do not enable to ascertain or test perfect calibration. This is due to the fact that they are based on a mean absolute deviation (MAD) statistic which estimates a bias for biased data and a dispersion for unbiased data.^{11,12}

I have recently shown¹¹ that the search for an optimal binning scheme to estimate these statistics is irrelevant. If a dataset is strongly ill-calibrated, the ENCE or ZVE are practically independent on the number of bins. The within-bin uncertainty is compensated by the number of bins when averaging. However, for well or nearly well-calibrated datasets, the MAD statistic involved in the ENCE and ZVE definitions estimates the *dispersion* of the binned values, not their bias which is practically null. In consequence, the ENCE and ZVE values are sensitive to the within-bin uncertainty, and both are expected to be linear functions of $N^{1/2}$. In consequence, there is no best value for N , and I proposed to use as a bin-independent calibration metric the intercept of a linear interpolation of statistics estimated for a series bin numbers. These intercepts are called ENCE_0 and ZVE_0 . The 95 % confidence interval on the intercept is used to validate calibration: the interval should contain 0 for ENCE_0 and 1 for ZVE_0 .

Depending on the datasets, the ENCE and ZVE values for small numbers of bins (typically $N^{1/2} < 4 - 6$) present notable deviations from the expected linearity and should not be included in the linear fit. At the other extremity of the bin-size range, it is better to keep only bins with at least 30 points.¹³




Figure 1. Stratification statistics of the uncertainties of QM9 validation dataset after recalibration by isotonic regression.

III. APPLICATION

A. The dataset

I use here the QM9 validation dataset presented in Busk *et al.*⁵. It contains $M = 13\,885$ predicted atomization energies (V) and uncertainties (u_V) and reference values (R). These data are transformed to $E = R - V$ and $u = u_V$. The uncertainties result from a *post hoc* recalibration by isotonic regression.

B. Stratification and binning

The dataset contains only 138 unique uncertainty values, 87 of them being assigned to a single point. In consequence, most uncertainty values are stratified, and 13 798 points are distributed among 51 uncertainty values. This distribution is shown in Fig. 1. The stratification is mostly notable for uncertainty values between 0.005 and 0.02 eV [Fig. 1(a)], where the largest stratum contains about 1500 points. Ordering of the strata by decreasing size [Fig. 1(b)] shows that there are ten strata with more than 500 points.

For binning these data into equal-size bins, the data have first to be ordered. Considering the number of ties, the resulting order might depend firstly on how the ordering algorithms resolves ties and secondly on the initial order of the data in the dataset. Once the data are

ordered, they are split into bins, which, depending on the number of bins, might result into the fractioning of a large number of strata. The problem does not lie into the splitting of the uncertainties themselves, but into the ordering and splitting of the associated errors, which can have a strong impact on the binned calibration statistics.

Note that alternative binning schemes such as equal-width bins could be considered, but they present other difficulties for the estimation of error statistics (e.g. bins of very different sizes).

C. Data ordering and calibration statistics

As a worst case scenario, one can imagine that the data associated to a given uncertainty value are ordered according to the absolute errors. The gradient of absolute errors within a stratum would result after splitting into bins with strong under- and over-estimated uncertainties, and therefore very bad local calibration statistics [Fig. 2(b)]. By comparison, the original order of the dataset (which is assumed to be random and uncorrelated with $|E|$) results in a more reasonable reliability diagram [Fig. 2(a)]. One can see also that the ENCE is strongly affected by the ordering, from 0.063 for unordered data to 0.33 for ordered ones and $N = 50$ bins. I chose here a large number of bins in order to accentuate the effect (for small numbers of bins, the ordering is averaged out within larger bins, but the error statistic is less accurate). For 15 bins, which seems to be customary in the community, the ENCE still increases from 0.05 to 0.13 upon ordering the data by $|E|$.

A more plausible scenario is a random perturbation of the data order. In fact this results into rather small fluctuations of the ENCE: 0.064(4) ($N = 50$) where the mean and standard deviation are estimated from a Monte Carlo sample of size 250. For the ZVE statistic in the same conditions, one gets 1.14(1).

As the values of ENCE and ZVE statistics depend on the number of bins, bin-independent ENCE_0 and ZVE_0 calibration statistics have also been used to evaluate the impact of data ordering. The results can be seen on Fig. 3. The ENCE and ZVE values for a series of bin numbers and the regression lines using data with $N^{1/2} > 6$ have been plotted for 250 random orderings of the data (blue points and lines). The 95 % confidence intervals for the intercept parameters have been plotted as thick vertical segments. For comparison, the regression line and confidence interval on ENCE_0 and ZVE_0 for the *unperturbed* dataset have been also reported (red points and lines). Although the perfect calibration could be rejected by both statistics for the unperturbed dataset (the 95 % confidence intervals do not contain




Figure 2. Impact of data ordering on reliability diagrams and ENCE values: (a) original data order; (b) data reordered by increasing absolute errors. A large number of bins (50) has been chosen to make the problem stand out.




Figure 3. Impact of the data ordering on the ENCE_0 and ZVE_0 validation statistics.

the target values), there is a non-negligible fraction of the randomly reordered datasets for which validation is positive (about 8 % for ENCE_0 and 34 % for ZVE_0).

IV. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

We have seen that *post hoc* calibration of prediction uncertainties by isotonic regression poses a challenge for the estimation of calibration metrics. This is due to the stratification of the calibrated uncertainties which causes an ambiguity on the ordering of the uncertainties. This ambiguity affects the binning of data for the estimation of calibration statistics. Reordering the dataset by increasing absolute errors might be catastrophic, whereas random reordering seems to have a more gentle effect on calibration error statistics. However, I have shown that calibration validation tests can be randomly affected by the choice of ordering, leading to ambiguous conclusions.

One has therefore to keep in mind that validation of the calibration of a dataset with stratified uncertainties might be dependent on the order of the data in the dataset. I am *not* suggesting that users permute their data until calibration is validated. Instead, it would be nice if they could provide an estimation of the impact of such permutations on their calibration error statistics.

The use of *centered* isotonic regression¹⁴ which keeps the desirable properties of isotonic regression without the stratification inconvenient would be a simple way to solve this problem.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I warmly thank J. Busk for providing me the data of the BUS2022 case.

AUTHOR DECLARATIONS

Conflict of Interest

The authors have no conflicts to disclose.

CODE AND DATA AVAILABILITY

The code and data to reproduce the results of this article are available at <https://github.com/ppernot/isotonic/releases/tag/v0.0> and at Zenodo (<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.8017641>). The R,¹⁵ [ErrViewLib](#) package implements the validation functions used in the present study, under version ErrViewLib-v1.7.0 (<https://github.com/ppernot/>

ErrViewLib/releases/tag/v1.7.0), also available at Zenodo (<https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7729100>).

REFERENCES

- ¹K. Tran, W. Neiswanger, J. Yoon, Q. Zhang, E. Xing, and Z. W. Ulissi. [Methods for comparing uncertainty quantifications for material property predictions](#). *Mach. Learn.: Sci. Technol.*, 1:025006, 2020.
- ²C. Guo, G. Pleiss, Y. Sun, and K. Q. Weinberger. [On Calibration of Modern Neural Networks](#). In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1321–1330. 2017. URL: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v70/guo17a.html>.
- ³V. Kuleshov, N. Fenner, and S. Ermon. [Accurate uncertainties for deep learning using calibrated regression](#). In J. Dy and A. Krause, editors, *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 80 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 2796–2804. PMLR, 10–15 Jul 2018. URL: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v80/kuleshov18a.html>.
- ⁴D. Levi, L. Gispán, N. Giladi, and E. Fetaya. [Evaluating and Calibrating Uncertainty Prediction in Regression Tasks](#). *Sensors*, 22(15):5540, 2022.
- ⁵J. Busk, P. B. Jørgensen, A. Bhowmik, M. N. Schmidt, O. Winther, and T. Vegge. [Calibrated uncertainty for molecular property prediction using ensembles of message passing neural networks](#). *Mach. Learn.: Sci. Technol.*, 3:015012, 2022.
- ⁶A. N. Angelopoulos and S. Bates. [A Gentle Introduction to Conformal Prediction and Distribution-Free Uncertainty Quantification](#). *arXiv:2107.07511*, July 2021.
- ⁷Y. Hu, J. Musielewicz, Z. W. Ulissi, and A. J. Medford. [Robust and scalable uncertainty estimation with conformal prediction for machine-learned interatomic potentials](#). *Mach. Learn.: Sci. Technol.*, 3:045028, November 2022.
- ⁸R. E. Barlow and H. D. Brunk. [The Isotonic Regression Problem and its Dual](#). *J. Am. Stat. Assoc.*, 67:140–147, 1972.
- ⁹J. Busk, M. N. Schmidt, O. Winther, T. Vegge, and P. B. Jørgensen. [Graph Neural Network Interatomic Potential Ensembles with Calibrated Aleatoric and Epistemic Uncertainty on Energy and Forces](#). *arXiv:2305.16325*, May 2023.
- ¹⁰P. Pernot. [Prediction uncertainty validation for computational chemists](#). *J. Chem. Phys.*, 157:144103, 2022.

- ¹¹P. Pernot. Properties of the ENCE and other MAD-based calibration metrics. *arXiv:2305.11905*, 2023. [arXiv:http://arxiv.org/abs/2305.11905](http://arxiv.org/abs/2305.11905).
- ¹²P. Pernot and A. Savin. Probabilistic performance estimators for computational chemistry methods: the empirical cumulative distribution function of absolute errors. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 148:241707, 2018.
- ¹³P. Pernot. The long road to calibrated prediction uncertainty in computational chemistry. *J. Chem. Phys.*, 156:114109, 2022.
- ¹⁴A. P. Oron and N. Flournoy. Centered Isotonic Regression: Point and Interval Estimation for Dose–Response Studies. *Stat Biopharm Res*, 9:258–267, 2017.
- ¹⁵R Core Team. *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria, 2019. URL: <http://www.R-project.org/>.