

# Advanced School in Artificial Intelligence

## Performance Metrics

**Elena Bellodi**  
**[elena.bellodi@unife.it](mailto:elena.bellodi@unife.it)**

*Progetto di alta formazione in ambito tecnologico economico e culturale per una regione della conoscenza europea e attrattiva approvato e cofinanziato dalla Regione Emilia-Romagna con deliberazione di Giunta regionale n. 1625/2021*



**Università  
degli Studi  
di Ferrara**

## Outline

- Metrics for Hard Prediction
- Metrics for Ranking Prediction
- Metrics for Regression

## Outline

- Metrics for Hard Prediction
- Metrics for Ranking Prediction
- Metrics for Regression

## Predictive machine learning scenarios

- **Hard Prediction (Classification):** Predict a single category for each instance
  - *Accuracy, Error, Precision, Recall (Sensitivity), Specificity, F1 Score*
- **Ranking Prediction:** learn a model that outputs a score vector  $s(x)=(s_1(x),\dots,s_k(x))$  over the  $k$  classes
  - $s_i(x)$  is the score assigned to class  $C_i$  for instance  $x$ . This score indicates how likely it is that class label  $C_i$  applies. If we only have 2 classes,  $s(x)$  denotes the score of the positive class for  $x$
  - *ROC, Precision-Recall Curves*





## Predictive machine learning scenarios

- **Probability Estimation:** learn a model that outputs a probability vector over classes
- **Regression:** learn an approximation  $g : X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$  to the true labelling function  $f$
- The metrics that you choose to evaluate your machine learning model is very important. Choice of metrics influences how the performance of machine learning algorithms is measured and compared

## Metrics for hard prediction

### Confusion matrix

- For **classification problems** where the output can be of two or more classes
- Each column refers to **actual classes as recorded in the test set** 
- Each row to **classes as predicted by the classifier**



Predicted	Actual	
	Positives	Negatives
Positives	TP	FP
Negatives	FN	TN

Assume positive label as true and negative label as false

**True positive (TP):** predicted class true coincides with actual one, which is true

**True negative (TN):** predicted false class coincides with actual false class

**False positive (FP):** the actual data is false and the predicted is true

**False negative (FN):** the actual data is true while the predicted is false

## Metrics for hard prediction


### Confusion matrix

		Actual	
		Positives	Negatives
Predicted	Positives	TP	FP
	Negatives	FN	TN

- Find a solution that maximizes TP and TN and minimizes FP and FN
- In the best solution FN and FP are 0

## Metrics for hard prediction

### Confusion matrix



Predicted	Actual		
	Positives	Negatives	Marginals
Positives	<b>30</b>	10	40
Negatives	20	<b>40</b>	60
Marginals	50	50	100

Predicted	Actual		
	Positives	Negatives	Marginals
Positives	<b>20</b>	30	50
Negatives	20	<b>30</b>	50
Marginals	40	60	100

same marginals, but  
the classifier makes  
a random choice



## Metrics for hard prediction

### Accuracy

- the proportion of **correctly classified test instances**

		Actual	
		Positives	Negatives
Predicted	Positives	TP	FP
	Negatives	FN	TN

$$Accuracy = \frac{TP + TN}{TP + TN + FP + FN}$$

**Good** when the number of examples for each label is nearly balanced.

**Really bad** when the set of examples is **unbalanced** (data are a majority of one class).

## Metrics for hard prediction

### Accuracy

- The number of correct predictions made by the model.

		Actual	
		Positives	Negatives
Predicted	Pos	5	0
	Neg	0	95

If we have 100 test examples, 5 examples are + and 95 are -, even when the model predicts ALWAYS NEGATIVE the accuracy is 95% 🗨️

**Good** when the number of examples for each class is nearly balanced

**Really bad** when the set of examples is unbalanced (data are a majority of one class)

## Metrics for hard prediction

### Error rate

- The proportion of incorrectly classified test instances

		Actual	
		Positives	Negatives
Predicted	Positives	TP	FP
	Negatives	FN	TN

$$\text{Error rate} = \frac{FP + FN}{TP + TN + FP + FN}$$

**Equal to  $1 - \text{Accuracy}$**

## Metrics for hard prediction

### Error rate

- The proportion of incorrectly classified test instances

		Actual	
		Positives	Negatives
Predicted	Positives	TP	FP
	Negatives	FN	TN

$$\text{Error rate} = \frac{FP + FN}{TP + TN + FP + FN}$$

**Equal to  $1 - \text{Accuracy}$**

## Metrics for hard prediction

### True Positive Rate and False Positive Rate

- The proportion of examples classified as positive (negative) among those that are actually true (false)

		Actual	
		Positives	Negatives
Predicted	Positives	TP	FP
	Negatives	FN	TN

$$TP\ Rate = \frac{TP}{TP + FN}$$

$$FP\ Rate = \frac{FP}{FP + TN}$$

## Metrics for hard prediction

### Precision (P)

- The proportion of examples predicted as true which are actually true

		Actual	
		Positives	Negatives
Predicted	Positives	TP	FP
	Negatives	FN	TN

$$Precision = \frac{TP}{TP + FP}$$



## Metrics for hard prediction

### Precision (P)

- The proportion of examples predicted as true which are actually true

$$Precision = \frac{TP}{TP + FP}$$

- **Good** when we need to minimize false positives
  - If we have 100 examples, 5 examples are +, if the model predicts ALWAYS TRUE  $P = 5 / (5+95) = 0.05 = 5\%$  (FP high: 95)
  - If it predicts ALWAYS FALSE except for 1 + example classified as +,  $P = 1 / (1+0) = 100\%$  (FP: 0)
- **Precision** is about being precise. So even if we managed to capture only one cancer case, and we captured it correctly, then we are 100% precise.

## Metrics for hard prediction

- Precision is a **counterpart** to TP rate:
  - TP rate is the proportion of predicted positives among the actual positives
  - P is the proportion of actual positives among the predicted positives

$$Precision = \frac{TP}{TP + FP}$$

- **If the minority class is the class of interest and very small**, accuracy and performance on the majority class are not the right quantities to optimise → **USE PRECISION** instead

## Metrics for hard prediction

### Recall (R) or Sensitivity

- Equal to TP Rate 

		Actual	
		Positives	Negatives
Predicted	Positives	TP	FP
	Negatives	FN	TN

$$Recall = \frac{TP}{TP + FN}$$

If we have 100 examples, 5 examples are +, if the model predicts ALWAYS TRUE recall is 100%, ALWAYS FALSE has recall 0%, ALWAYS FALSE except for ONE correct true has recall 20%

- **Good** when we need to minimize false negatives.
- Recall is not so much about capturing cases correctly but more about capturing all cases that have “cancer” with the answer as “cancer”.

## Metrics for hard prediction

- So basically if we want to focus more on **minimizing false negatives**, we would want our Recall to be as close to 100% as possible without precision being too bad
- if we want to focus on **minimizing false positives**, then our focus should be to make Precision as close to 100% as possible.

## Metrics for hard prediction

### Specificity

- The proportion of false examples that are predicted as false.

		Actual	
		Positives	Negatives
Predicted	Positives	TP	FP
	Negatives	FN	TN

$$\text{Specificity} = \frac{TN}{TN + FP}$$

**Good** when we need to minimize false positive.  
The exact **opposite** of **Recall**.

If we have 100 examples, 5 examples are +, if the model returns ALWAYS TRUE the specificity is 0%, ALWAYS FALSE the specificity is 100%

## Metrics for hard prediction

### F-Measure or F1-Score

- Considers Precision and Recall to give a score that represents both.
- Computed as the Harmonic mean

$$FMeasure = \frac{2 * Precision * Recall}{Precision + Recall}$$

With Recall=40% and Precision=60%  
the F-Measure is 48%.  
With Recall=5% and Precision=100%  
the F-Measure is 9.5%.

If Accuracy and Recall are similar, the F-Measure behaves similar to an arithmetic mean, but as the difference between the two values increases, the **F-Measure returns a score that tends to follow the lowest value the higher the difference is.**



Next...

Metrics for ranking prediction