On Over-fitting in Model Selection and Subsequent Selection Bias in Performance Evaluation

Gavin C. Cawley   GCC@CMP.UEA.AC.UK
Nicola L. C. Talbot   NLCT@CMP.UEA.AC.UK
School of Computing Sciences
University of East Anglia
Norwich, United Kingdom NR4 7TJ

Abstract

Model selection strategies for machine learning algorithms typically involve the numerical optimisation of an appropriate model selection criterion, often based on an estimator of generalisation performance, such as k-fold cross-validation. The error of such an estimator can be broken down into bias and variance components. While unbiasedness is often cited as a beneficial quality of a model selection criterion, we demonstrate that a low variance is at least as important, as a non-negligible variance introduces the potential for over-fitting in model selection as well as in training the model. While this observation is in hindsight perhaps rather obvious, the degradation in performance due to over-fitting the model selection criterion can be surprisingly large, an observation that appears to have received little attention in the machine learning literature to date. In this paper, we show that the effects of this form of over-fitting are often of comparable magnitude to differences in performance between learning algorithms, and thus cannot be ignored in empirical evaluation. Furthermore, we show that some common performance evaluation practices are susceptible to a form of selection bias as a result of this form of over-fitting and hence are unreliable. We discuss methods to avoid over-fitting in model selection and subsequent selection bias in performance evaluation, which we hope will be incorporated into best practice. While this study concentrates on cross-validation based model selection, the findings are quite general and apply to any model selection practice involving the optimisation of a model selection criterion evaluated over a finite sample of data, including maximisation of the Bayesian evidence and optimisation of performance bounds.

Keywords: model selection, performance evaluation, bias-variance trade-off, selection bias, over-fitting

1. Introduction

This paper is concerned with two closely related topics that form core components of best practice in both the real world application of machine learning methods and the development of novel machine learning algorithms, namely model selection and performance evaluation. The majority of machine learning algorithms are based on some form of multi-level inference, where the model is defined by a set of model parameters and also a set of hyper-parameters (Guyon et al., 2009), for example in kernel learning methods the parameters correspond to the coefficients of the kernel expansion and the hyper-parameters include the regularisation parameter, the choice of kernel function and any associated kernel parameters. This division into parameters and hyper-parameters is typically

performed for computational convenience; for instance in the case of kernel machines, for fixed values of the hyper-parameters, the parameters are normally given by the solution of a convex optimisation problem for which efficient algorithms are available. Thus it makes sense to take advantage of this structure and fit the model iteratively using a pair of nested loops, with the hyper-parameters adjusted to optimise a model selection criterion in the outer loop (model selection) and the parameters set to optimise a training criterion in the inner loop (model fitting/training). In our previous study (Cawley and Talbot, 2007), we noted that the variance of the model selection criterion admitted the possibility of over-fitting during model selection as well as the more familiar form of over-fitting that occurs during training and demonstrated that this could be ameliorated to some extent by regularisation of the model selection criterion. The first part of this paper discusses the problem of over-fitting in model selection in more detail, providing illustrative examples, and describes how to avoid this form of over-fitting in order to gain the best attainable performance, desirable in practical applications, and required for fair comparison of machine learning algorithms.

Unbiased and robust[1] performance evaluation is undoubtedly the cornerstone of machine learning research; without a reliable indication of the relative performance of competing algorithms, across a wide range of learning tasks, we cannot have the clear picture of the strengths and weaknesses of current approaches required to set the direction for future research. This topic is considered in the second part of the paper, specifically focusing on the undesirable optimistic bias that can arise due to over-fitting in model selection. This phenomenon is essentially analogous to the selection bias observed by Ambroise and McLachlan (2002) in microarray classification, due to feature selection prior to performance evaluation, and shares a similar solution. We show that some, apparently quite benign, performance evaluation protocols in common use by the machine learning community are susceptible to this form of bias, and thus potentially give spurious results. In order to avoid this bias, model selection must be treated as an integral part of the model fitting process and performed afresh every time a model is fitted to a new sample of data. Furthermore, as the differences in performance due to model selection are shown to be often of comparable magnitude to the difference in performance between learning algorithms, it seems no longer meaningful to evaluate the performance of machine learning algorithms in isolation, and we should instead compare learning algorithm/model selection procedure combinations. However, this means that robust unbiased performance evaluation is likely to require more rigorous and computationally intensive protocols, such a nested cross-validation or "double cross" (Stone, 1974).

None of the methods or algorithms discussed in this paper are new; the novel contribution of this work is an empirical demonstration that over-fitting at the second level of inference (i.e., model selection) can have a very substantial deleterious effect on the generalisation performance of state-of-the-art machine learning algorithms. Furthermore the demonstration that this can lead to a misleading optimistic bias in performance evaluation using evaluation protocols in common use in the machine learning community is also novel. The paper is intended to be of some tutorial value in promoting best practice in model selection and performance evaluation, however we also hope that the observation that over-fitting in model selection is a significant problem will encourage much needed algorithmic and theoretical development in this area.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows: Section 2 provides a brief overview of the kernel ridge regression classifier used as the base classifier for the majority of the experimental work

---

1. The term "robust" is used here to imply insensitivity to irrelevant experimental factors, such as the sampling and partitioning of the data to form training, validation and test sets; this is normally achieved by computationally expensive resampling schemes, for example, cross-validation (Stone, 1974) and the bootstrap (Efron and Tibshirani, 1994).

and Section 3 describes the data sets used. Section 4 demonstrates the importance of the variance of the model selection criterion, as it can lead to over-fitting in model selection, resulting in poor generalisation performance. A number of methods to avoid over-fitting in model selection are also discussed. Section 5 shows that over-fitting in model selection can result in biased performance evaluation if model selection is not viewed as an integral part of the modelling procedure. Two apparently benign and widely used performance evaluation protocols are shown to be affected by this problem. Finally, the work is summarised in Section 6.

2. Kernel Ridge Regression

In this section, we provide a brief overview of the Kernel Ridge Regression (KRR) classifier (Saunders et al., 1998), also known as the Least-Squares Support Vector Machine (Suykens et al., 2002), Regularised Least Squares (Rifkin and Lippert, 2007), Regularisation Network (Poggio and Girosi, 1990) etc., used as the base classifier in most of the empirical demonstrations in the sequel. Assume we are given labeled training data, $\mathcal{D} = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^{\ell}$, where $x_i \in \mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^d$ is a vector of input features describing the ith example and $y_i \in \{-1, +1\}$ is an indicator variable such that $y_i = +1$ if the ith example is drawn from the positive class, $\mathcal{C}^+$, and $y_i = -1$ if from the negative class, $\mathcal{C}^-$. Further let us assume there are ℓ^+ positive examples and $\ell^- = \ell - \ell^+$ negative examples. The Kernel Ridge Regression classifier aims to construct a linear model $f(x) = w \cdot \phi(x) + b$ in a fixed feature space, $\phi : \mathcal{X} \to \mathcal{F}$, that is able to distinguish between examples drawn from $\mathcal{C}^-$ and $\mathcal{C}^+$, such that

$$x \in \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \mathcal{C}^+ & \text{if } f(x) \geq 0 \\ \mathcal{C}^- & \text{otherwise} \end{array} \right. .$$

However, rather than specifying the feature space, $\mathcal{F}$, directly, it is induced by a kernel function, $\mathcal{K} : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X} \to \mathbb{R}$, giving the inner product between the images of vectors in the feature space, $\mathcal{F}$, that is, $\mathcal{K}(x, x') = \phi(x) \cdot \phi(x')$. A common kernel function, used throughout this study, is the Gaussian radial basis function (RBF) kernel

$$\mathcal{K}(x, x') = \exp\left\{-\eta \|x - x'\|^2\right\}, \tag{1}$$

where η is a kernel parameter controlling the sensitivity of the kernel function. However, the interpretation of the kernel function as evaluating the inner product between points in an implied feature space is valid for any kernel for which the kernel matrix $K = [k_{ij} = \mathcal{K}(x_i, x_j)]_{i,j=1}^{\ell}$ is positive definite (Mercer, 1909), such that

$$a^T K a > 0, \qquad \forall\, a \neq 0.$$

The model parameters (w, b) are given by the minimum of a regularised (Tikhonov and Arsenin, 1977) least-squares loss function,

$$L = \frac{1}{2} \|w\|^2 + \frac{1}{2\lambda} \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} [y_i - w \cdot \phi(x_i) - b]^2, \tag{2}$$

where λ is a regularisation parameter controlling the bias-variance trade-off (Geman et al., 1992). The accuracy of the kernel machine on test data is critically dependent on the choice of good values for the *hyper-parameters*, in this case λ and η. The search for the optimal values for such hyper-parameters is a process known as *model selection*. The representer theorem (Kimeldorf and Wahba,

1971) states that the solution to this optimisation problem can be written as an expansion of the form

$$w = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \alpha_i \phi(x_i) \quad \Longrightarrow \quad f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \alpha_i \mathcal{K}(x_i, x) + b.$$

The dual parameters of the kernel machine, α, are then given by the solution of a system of linear equations,

$$\begin{bmatrix} K + \lambda I & 1 \\ 1^T & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \alpha \\ b \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} y \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}. \tag{3}$$

where $y = (y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_\ell)^T$, which can be solved efficiently via Cholesky factorisation of $K + \lambda I$, with a computational complexity of $O(\ell^3)$ operations (Suykens et al., 2002). The simplicity and efficiency of the kernel ridge regression classifier makes it an ideal candidate for relatively small-scale empirical investigations of practical issues, such as model selection.

2.1 Efficient Leave-One-Out Cross-Validation

Cross-validation (e.g., Stone, 1974) provides a simple and effective method for both model selection and performance evaluation, widely employed by the machine learning community. Under k-fold cross-validation the data are randomly partitioned to form k disjoint subsets of approximately equal size. In the ith fold of the cross-validation procedure, the ith subset is used to estimate the generalisation performance of a model trained on the remaining $k - 1$ subsets. The average of the generalisation performance observed over all k folds provides an estimate (with a slightly pessimistic bias) of the generalisation performance of a model trained on the entire sample. The most extreme form of cross-validation, in which each subset contains only a single pattern is known as leave-one-out cross-validation (Lachenbruch and Mickey, 1968; Luntz and Brailovsky, 1969). An attractive feature of kernel ridge regression is that it is possible to perform leave-one-out cross-validation in closed form, with minimal cost as a by-product of the training algorithm (Cawley and Talbot, 2003). Let C represent the matrix on the left hand side of (3), then the residual error for the ith training pattern in the ith fold of the leave-one-out process is given by,

$$r_i^{(-i)} = y_i - \hat{y}_i^{(-i)} = \frac{\alpha_i}{C_{ii}^{-1}},$$

where $\hat{y}_i^{(-j)}$ is the output of the kernel ridge regression machine for the ith observation in the jth fold of the leave-one-out procedure and C_{ii}^{-1} is the ith element of the principal diagonal of the inverse of the matrix C. Similar methods have been used in least-squares linear regression for many years, (e.g., Stone, 1974; Weisberg, 1985). While the optimal model parameters of the kernel machine are given by the solution of a simple system of linear equations, (3), some form of model selection is required to determine good values for the *hyper-parameters*, $\theta = (\lambda, \eta)$, in order to maximise generalisation performance. The analytic leave-one-out cross-validation procedure described here can easily be adapted to form the basis of an efficient model selection strategy (cf. Chapelle et al., 2002; Cawley and Talbot, 2003; Bo et al., 2006). In order to obtain a continuous model selection criterion, we adopt Allen's Predicted REsidual Sum-of-Squares (PRESS) statistic (Allen, 1974),

$$\text{PRESS}(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^{\ell} \left[r_i^{(-i)} \right]^2.$$

The PRESS criterion can be optimised efficiently using scaled conjugate gradient descent (Williams, 1991) or Nelder-Mead simplex (Nelder and Mead, 1965) procedures. For full details of the training and model selection procedures for the kernel ridge regression classifier, see Cawley (2006). A public domain MATLAB implementation of the kernel ridge regression classifier, including automated model selection, is provided by the Generalised Kernel Machine (GKM) (Cawley et al., 2007) toolbox.[2]

3. Data Sets used in Empirical Demonstrations

In this section, we describe the benchmark data sets used in this study to illustrate the problem of over-fitting in model selection and to demonstrate the bias this can introduce into performance evaluation.

3.1 A Synthetic Benchmark

A synthetic benchmark, based on that introduced by Ripley (1996), is used widely in the next section to illustrate the nature of over-fitting in model selection. The data are drawn from four spherical bivariate Gaussian distributions, with equal probability. All four Gaussians have a common variance, $\sigma^2 = 0.04$. Patterns belonging to the positive classes are drawn from Gaussians centered on $[+0.4, +0.7]$ and $[-0.3, +0.7]$; the negative patterns are drawn from Gaussians centered on $[-0.7, +0.3]$ and $[+0.3, +0.3]$. Figure 1 shows a realisation of the synthetic benchmark, consisting of 256 patterns, showing the Bayes-optimal decision boundary and contours representing an a-posteriori probability of belonging to the positive class of 0.1 and 0.9. The Bayes error for this benchmark is approximately 12.38%. This benchmark is useful firstly as the Bayes optimal decision boundary is known, but also because it provides an inexhaustible supply of data, allowing the numerical approximation of various expectations.

3.2 A Suite of Benchmarks for Robust Performance Evaluation

In addition to illustrating the nature of over-fitting in model selection, we need to demonstrate that it is a serious concern in practical applications and show that it can result in biased performance evaluation if not taken into consideration. Table 1 gives the details of a suite of thirteen benchmark data sets, introduced by Rätsch et al. (2001). Each benchmark is based on a data set from the UCI machine learning repository, augmented by a set of 100 pre-defined partitions to form multiple realisations of the training and test sets (20 in the case of the larger `image` and `splice` data sets). The use of multiple benchmarks means that the evaluation is more robust as the selection of data sets that provide a good match to the inductive bias of a particular classifier becomes less likely. Likewise, the use of multiple partitions provides robustness against sensitivity to the sampling of data to form training and test sets. Results on this suite of benchmarks thus provides a reasonable indication of the magnitude of the effects of over-fitting in model selection that we might expect to see in practice.

---

2. Toolbox can be found at `http://theoval.cmp.uea.ac.uk/~gcc/projects/gkm`.

Figure 1: Realisation of the Synthetic benchmark data set, with Bayes optimal decision boundary (a) and kernel ridge regression classifier with an automatic relevance determination (ARD) kernel where the hyper-parameters are tuned so as to minimise the true test MSE (b).

Data Set	Training Patterns	Testing Patterns	Number of Replications	Input Features
banana	400	4900	100	2
breast cancer	200	77	100	9
diabetis	468	300	100	8
flare solar	666	400	100	9
german	700	300	100	20
heart	170	100	100	13
image	1300	1010	20	18
ringnorm	400	7000	100	20
splice	1000	2175	20	60
thyroid	140	75	100	5
titanic	150	2051	100	3
twonorm	400	7000	100	20
waveform	400	4600	100	21

Table 1: Details of data sets used in empirical comparison.

4. Over-fitting in Model Selection

We begin by demonstrating that it is possible to over-fit a model selection criterion based on a finite sample of data, using the synthetic benchmark problem, where ground truth is available. Here we use "over-fitting in model selection" to mean minimisation of the model selection criterion beyond the point at which generalisation performance ceases to improve and subsequently begins to decline.

Figure 1 (b) shows the output of a kernel ridge regression classifier for the synthetic problem, with the Automatic Relevance Determination (ARD) variant of the Gaussian radial basis function kernel,

$$\mathcal{K}(x,x') = \exp\left\{-\sum_{i=1}^{d}\eta_i(x_i - x_i')^2\right\},$$

which has a separate scaling parameter, η_i, for each feature. A much larger training set of 4096 samples was used, and the hyper-parameters were tuned to minimise the true test mean squared errors (MSE). The performance of this model achieved an error rate of 12.50%, which suggests that a model of this form is capable of approaching the Bayes error rate for this problem, at least in principle, and so there is little concern of model mis-specification.


(a)　　　　　　　　　　　(b)

Figure 2: Evolution of the expected four-fold cross-validation and true test mean squared error as a function of the number of iterations (optimisation steps in the minimisation of the model selection criterion) of the model selection process, for a kernel ridge regression classifier trained on the synthetic benchmark data set (a) and (b) the evolution of those statistics for a particular realisation of the data set.

A further one thousand independent realisations of this benchmark were generated, each consisting of 64 samples. A kernel ridge regression classifier, based on the ARD kernel, was constructed for each realisation, with the hyper-parameters tuned so as to minimise a four-fold cross-validation estimate of the mean squared error. The true generalisation performance of each model was estimated numerically using the underlying generative model of the data set. Figure 2 (a) shows the expected true test and cross-validation estimates of the mean squared error averaged over all 1000 realisations of the benchmark. As would be expected, the cross-validation estimate of the mean squared error, forming the model selection criterion, is monotonically decreasing. However, the expected value of the true test MSE initially shows a decrease, as the hyper-parameters are modified in a manner that provides genuine improvements in generalisation, but after a relatively short time (approximately 30–40 iterations), the test error begins to climb slowly once more as the hyper-parameters are tuned in ways that exploit the meaningless statistical peculiarities of the sample. This produces a close analog of the classic plot used to illustrate the nature of over-fitting in training, for example, Figure

9.7 of the book by Bishop (1995). Figure 2 (b) shows the same statistics for one particular realisation of the data, demonstrating that the over-fitting can in some cases be quite substantial, clearly in this case some form of early-stopping in the model selection process would have resulted in improved generalisation. Having demonstrated that the classic signature of over-fitting during training is also apparent in the evolution of cross-validation and test errors during model selection, we discuss in the next section the origin of this form of over-fitting in terms of the *bias* and *variance* of the model selection criterion.

4.1 Bias and Variance in Model Selection

Model selection criteria are generally based on an estimator of generalisation performance evaluated over a finite sample of data, this includes resampling methods, such as split sample estimators, cross-validation (Stone, 1974) and bootstrap methods (Efron and Tibshirani, 1994), but also more loosely, the Bayesian evidence (MacKay, 1992; Rasmussen and Williams, 2006) and theoretical performance bounds such as the radius-margin bound (Vapnik, 1998). The error of an estimator can be decomposed into two components, *bias* and *variance*. Let $G(\theta)$ represent the true generalisation performance of a model with hyper-parameters θ, and $g(\theta; \mathcal{D})$ be an estimate of generalisation performance evaluated over a finite sample, $\mathcal{D}$, of n patterns. The expected squared error of the estimator can then be written in the form (Geman et al., 1992; Duda et al., 2001),

$$E_{\mathcal{D}}\left\{[g(\theta; \mathcal{D}) - G(\theta)]^2\right\} = [E_{\mathcal{D}}\{g(\theta; \mathcal{D}) - G(\theta)\}]^2 + E_{\mathcal{D}}\left\{\left[g(\theta; \mathcal{D}) - E_{\mathcal{D}'}\left\{g(\theta; \mathcal{D}')\right\}\right]^2\right\},$$

where $E_{\mathcal{D}}\{\cdot\}$ represents an expectation evaluated over independent samples, $\mathcal{D}$, of size n. The first term, the squared *bias*, represents the difference between the expected value of the estimator and the unknown value of the true generalisation error. The second term, known as the *variance*, reflects the variability of the estimator around its expected value due to the sampling of the data $\mathcal{D}$ on which it is evaluated. Clearly if the expected squared error is low, we may reasonably expect $g(\cdot)$ to perform well as a model selection criterion. However, in practice, the expected squared error may be significant, in which case, it is interesting to ask whether the bias or the variance component is of greatest importance in reliably achieving optimal generalisation.

It is straightforward to demonstrate that leave-one-out cross-validation provides an almost un-biased estimate of the true generalisation performance (Luntz and Brailovsky, 1969), and this is often cited as being an advantageous property of the leave-one-out estimator in the setting of model selection (e.g., Vapnik, 1998; Chapelle et al., 2002). However, for the purpose of model selection, rather than performance evaluation, unbiasedness *per se* is relatively unimportant, instead the primary requirement is merely for the minimum of the model selection criterion to provide a reliable indication of the minimum of the true test error in hyper-parameter space. This point is illustrated in Figure 3, which shows a hypothetical example of a model selection criterion that is unbiased (by construction) (a) and another that is clearly biased (b). Unbiasedness provides the assurance that the minimum of the expected value of the model selection criterion, $E_{\mathcal{D}}\{g(\theta; \mathcal{D})\}$ coincides with the minimum of the test error, $G(\theta)$. However, in practice, we have only a finite sample of data, $\mathcal{D}_i$, over which to evaluate the model selection criterion, and so it is the minimum of $g(\theta; \mathcal{D}_i)$ that is of interest. In Figure 3 (a), it can be seen that while the estimator is unbiased, it has a high variance, and so there is a large spread in the values of θ at which the minimum occurs for different samples of data, and so $g(\theta; \mathcal{D}_i)$ is likely to provide a poor model selection criterion in practice. On the other hand, Figure 3 (b) shows a criterion with lower variance, and hence is the better model selection

criterion, despite being biased, as the minima of $g'(\theta; \mathcal{D}_i)$ for individual samples lie much closer to the minimum of the true test error. This demonstrates that while unbiasedness is reassuring, as it means that the form of the model selection criterion is correct *on average*, the variance of the criterion is also vitally important as it is this that ensures that the minimum of the selection criterion evaluated on a particular sample will provide good generalisation.


Figure 3: Hypothetical example of an unbiased (a) and a biased (b) model selection criterion. Note that the biased model selection criterion (b) is likely to provide the more effective model selection criterion as it has a lower variance, even though it is significantly biased. For clarity, the true error rate and the expected value of the model selection criteria are shown with vertical displacements of -0.6 and -0.4 respectively.

4.2 The Effects of Over-fitting in Model Selection

In this section, we investigate the effect of the variance of the model selection criterion using a more realistic example, again based on the `synthetic` benchmark, where the underlying generative model is known and so we are able to evaluate the true test error. It is demonstrated that over-fitting in model selection can cause both under-fitting and over-fitting of the training sample. A fixed training set of 256 patterns is generated and used to train a kernel ridge regression classifier, using the simple RBF kernel (1), with hyper-parameter settings defining a fine grid spanning reasonable values of the regularisation and kernel parameters, λ and η respectively. The smoothed error rate (Bo et al., 2006),

$$\text{SER}(\theta) = \frac{1}{2n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left[1 - y_i \tanh\left\{ \gamma f(x_i) \right\} \right]$$

is used as the statistic of interest, in order to improve the clarity of the figures, where γ is a parameter controlling the amount of smoothing applied ($\gamma = 8$ is used throughout, however the precise value is not critical). Figure 4 (a) shows the true test smoothed error rate as a function of the hyper-parameters. As these are both scale parameters, a logarithmic representation is used for both axes. The true test smoothed error rate is an approximately unimodal function of the hyper-parameters,

with a single distinct minimum, indicating the hyper-parameter settings giving optimal generalisation.

Figure 4: Plot of the true test smoothed error rate (a) and mean smoothed error rate over 100 random validation sets of 64 samples (b), for a kernel ridge regression classifier as a function of the hyper-parameters. In each case, the minimum is shown by a yellow cross, $+$.

In practical applications, however, the true test error is generally unknown, and so we must rely on an estimator of some sort. The simplest estimator for use in model selection is the error computed over an independent validation set, that is, the split-sample estimator. It seems entirely reasonable to expect the split-sample estimator to be unbiased. Figure 4 (b) shows a plot of the mean smoothed error rate using the split-sample estimator, over 100 random validation sets, each of which consists of 64 patterns. Note that the same fixed training set is used in each case. This plot is very similar to the true smoothed error, shown in Figure 4 (a), demonstrating that the split sample estimator is indeed approximately unbiased.

While the split-sample estimator is unbiased, it may have a high variance, especially as in this case the validation set is (intentionally) relatively small. Figure 5 shows plots of the split-sample estimate of the smoothed error rate for six selected realisations of a validation set of 64 patterns. Clearly, the split-sample error estimate is no longer as smooth, or indeed unimodal. More importantly, the hyper-parameter values selected by minimising the validation set error, and therefore the true generalisation performance, depends on the particular sample of data used to form the validation set. Figure 6 shows that the variance of the split-sample estimator can result in models ranging from severely under-fit (a) to severely over-fit (f), with variations in between these extremes.

Figure 7 (a) shows a scatter plot of the validation set and true error rates for kernel ridge regression classifiers for the synthetic benchmark, with split-sample based model selection using 100 random realisations of the validation set. Clearly, the split-sample based model selection procedure normally performs well. However, there is also significant variation in performance with different samples forming the validation set. We can also see that the validation set error is strongly biased, having been directly minimised during model selection, and (of course) should not be used for performance estimation.

Figure 5: Contour plot of the split-sample estimate of the smoothed error rate for a kernel ridge regression machine as a function of the hyper-parameters, for six random realisations of the validation set. The minimum is shown by a cross, $+$.

Note that in this section we have deliberately employed a split-sample based model selection strategy with a relatively high variance, due to the limited size of the validation set. A straightforward way to reduce the variance of the model selection criterion is simply to increase the size of the validation sample over which it is evaluated. Figure 8 shows the optimal hyper-parameter settings obtained using 100 realisations of validation sets of 64 (a) and 256 (b) samples. It can be clearly seen that the use of a larger validation set has resulted in a tighter clustering of hyper-parameter values around the true optimum, note also that the hyper-parameters are concentrated along the bottom of a broad valley in hyper-parameter space, so even when the selected values are different from the optimal value, they still lie in positions giving good generalisation. This is further illustrated in Figure 7 (b), where the true smoothed error rates are much more tightly clustered, with fewer outliers, for the larger validation sets than obtained using smaller validation sets, shown in Figure 7 (a).

The variation in performance for different realisations of the benchmark suggests that evaluation of machine learning algorithms should always involve multiple partitions of the data to form training/validation and test sets, as the sampling of data for a single partition of the data might arbitrarily favour one classifier over another. This is illustrated in Figure 9, which shows the test error rates for Gaussian Process and Kernel Logistic Regression classifiers (GPC and KLR respectively), for 100

Figure 6: Kernel ridge regression models of the synthetic benchmark, using hyper-parameters se-
lected according to the smoothed error rate over six random realisations of the validation
set (shown in Figure 5). The variance of the model selection criterion can result in models
ranging from under-fit, (a) and (b), through well-fitting, (c) and (d), to over-fit (e) and (f).

random realisations of the banana benchmark data set used in Rätsch et al. (2001) (see Section 5.1
for details). On 64 realisations of the data GPC out-performs KLR, but on 36 KLR out-performs
GPC, even though the GPC is better on average (although the difference is not statistically signif-
icant in this case). If the classifiers had been evaluated on only one of the latter 36 realisations, it
might incorrectly be concluded that the KLR classifier is superior to the GPC for that benchmark.
However, it should also be noted that a difference in performance between two algorithms is un-
likely to be of *practical* significance, even if it is *statistically* significant, if it is smaller than the
variation in performance due to the random sampling of the data, as it is probable that a greater
improvement in performance would be obtained by further data collection than by selection of the
optimal classifier.

4.3 Is Over-fitting in Model Selection Really a Genuine Concern in Practice?

In the preceding part of this section we have demonstrated the deleterious effects of the variance
of the model selection criterion using a synthetic benchmark data set, however this is not sufficient
to establish that over-fitting in model selection is actually a genuine concern in practical applica-
tions or in the development of machine learning algorithms. Table 2 shows results obtained using

(a)

(b)

Figure 7: Scatter plots of the true test smoothed error rate as a function of the validation set smoothed error rate for 100 randomly generated validation sets of (a) 64 and (b) 256 patterns.

(a)

(b)

Figure 8: Contour plot of the mean validation set smoothed error rate over 100 randomly generated validation sets of (a) 64 and (b) 256 patterns. The minimum of the mean validation set error is marked by a large (yellow) cross, and the minimum for each realisation of the validation set marked by a small (red) cross.

kernel ridge regression (KRR) classifiers, with RBF and ARD kernel functions over the thirteen benchmarks described in Section 3.2. In each case, model selection was performed independently for each realisation of each benchmark by minimising the PRESS statistic using the Nelder-Mead simplex method (Nelder and Mead, 1965). For the majority of the benchmarks, a significantly lower

Figure 9: Scatter plots of the test set error for Gaussian process and Kernel Logistic regression classifiers (GPC and KLR respectively) for 100 realisations of the `banana` benchmark.

test error is achieved (according to the Wilcoxon signed ranks test) using the basic RBF kernel; the ARD kernel only achieves statistical superiority on one of the thirteen (`image`). This is perhaps a surprising result as the models are nested, the RBF kernel being a special case of the ARD kernel, so the optimal performance that can be achieved with the ARD kernel is guaranteed to be at least equal to the performance achievable using the RBF kernel. The reason for the poor performance of the ARD kernel in practice is because there are many more kernel parameters to be tuned in model selection and so many degrees of freedom available in optimising the model selection criterion. If the criterion used has a non-negligible variance, this includes optimisations exploiting the statistical peculiarities of the particular sample of data over which it is evaluated, and hence there will be more scope for over-fitting. Table 2 also shows the mean value of the PRESS statistic, following model selection, the fact that the majority of ARD models display a lower value for the PRESS statistic than the corresponding RBF model, while exhibiting a higher test error rate, is a strong indication of over-fitting the model selection criterion. This is a clear demonstration that over-fitting in model selection can be a significant problem in practical applications, especially where there are many hyper-parameters or where only a limited supply of data is available.

Table 3 shows the results of the same experiment performed using expectation-propagation based Gaussian process classifiers (EP-GPC) (Rasmussen and Williams, 2006), where the hyper-parameters are tuned independently for each realisation, for each benchmark individually by maximising the Bayesian evidence. While the leave-one-out cross-validation based PRESS criterion is known to exhibit a high variance, the variance of the evidence (which is also evaluated over a finite sample of data) is discussed less often. We find again here that the RBF covariance function often out-performs the more general ARD covariance function, and again the test error rate is often negatively correlated with the evidence for the models. This indicates that over-fitting the evidence is also a significant practical problem for the Gaussian process classifier.

Data Set	Test Error Rate		PRESS	
	RBF	**ARD**	**RBF**	**ARD**
banana	10.610 ± 0.051	10.638 ± 0.052	60.808 ± 0.636	60.957 ± 0.624
breast cancer	$\mathbf{26.727 \pm 0.466}$	28.766 ± 0.391	70.632 ± 0.328	$\mathbf{66.789 \pm 0.385}$
diabetis	$\mathbf{23.293 \pm 0.169}$	24.520 ± 0.215	146.143 ± 0.452	$\mathbf{141.465 \pm 0.606}$
flare solar	34.140 ± 0.175	34.375 ± 0.175	267.332 ± 0.480	$\mathbf{263.858 \pm 0.550}$
german	$\mathbf{23.540 \pm 0.214}$	25.847 ± 0.267	228.256 ± 0.666	$\mathbf{221.743 \pm 0.822}$
heart	$\mathbf{16.730 \pm 0.359}$	22.810 ± 0.411	42.576 ± 0.356	$\mathbf{37.023 \pm 0.494}$
image	2.990 ± 0.159	$\mathbf{2.188 \pm 0.134}$	74.056 ± 1.685	$\mathbf{44.488 \pm 1.222}$
ringnorm	$\mathbf{1.613 \pm 0.015}$	2.750 ± 0.042	28.324 ± 0.246	$\mathbf{27.680 \pm 0.231}$
splice	10.777 ± 0.144	9.943 ± 0.520	186.814 ± 2.174	$\mathbf{130.888 \pm 6.574}$
thyroid	4.747 ± 0.235	4.693 ± 0.202	9.099 ± 0.152	$\mathbf{6.816 \pm 0.164}$
titanic	22.483 ± 0.085	22.562 ± 0.109	48.332 ± 0.622	$\mathbf{47.801 \pm 0.623}$
twonorm	$\mathbf{2.846 \pm 0.021}$	4.292 ± 0.086	$\mathbf{32.539 \pm 0.279}$	35.620 ± 0.490
waveform	$\mathbf{9.792 \pm 0.045}$	11.836 ± 0.085	61.658 ± 0.596	$\mathbf{56.424 \pm 0.637}$

Table 2: Error rates of kernel ridge regression (KRR) classifier over thirteen benchmark data sets (Rätsch et al., 2001), using both standard radial basis function (RBF) and automatic relevance determination (ARD) kernels. Results shown in bold indicate an error rate that is statistically superior to that obtained with the same classifier using the other kernel function, or a PRESS statistic that is significantly lower.

Data Set	Test Error Rate		-Log Evidence	
	RBF	**ARD**	**RBF**	**ARD**
banana	$\mathbf{10.413 \pm 0.046}$	10.459 ± 0.049	116.894 ± 0.917	$\mathbf{116.459 \pm 0.923}$
breast cancer	$\mathbf{26.506 \pm 0.487}$	27.948 ± 0.492	110.628 ± 0.366	$\mathbf{107.181 \pm 0.388}$
diabetis	$\mathbf{23.280 \pm 0.182}$	23.853 ± 0.193	230.211 ± 0.553	$\mathbf{222.305 \pm 0.581}$
flare solar	34.200 ± 0.175	$\mathbf{33.578 \pm 0.181}$	394.697 ± 0.546	$\mathbf{384.374 \pm 0.512}$
german	$\mathbf{23.363 \pm 0.211}$	23.757 ± 0.217	359.181 ± 0.778	$\mathbf{346.048 \pm 0.835}$
heart	$\mathbf{16.670 \pm 0.290}$	19.770 ± 0.365	73.464 ± 0.493	$\mathbf{67.811 \pm 0.571}$
image	2.817 ± 0.121	$\mathbf{2.188 \pm 0.076}$	205.061 ± 1.687	$\mathbf{123.896 \pm 1.184}$
ringnorm	$\mathbf{4.406 \pm 0.064}$	8.589 ± 0.097	121.260 ± 0.499	$\mathbf{91.356 \pm 0.583}$
splice	11.609 ± 0.180	$\mathbf{8.618 \pm 0.924}$	365.208 ± 3.137	$\mathbf{242.464 \pm 16.980}$
thyroid	4.373 ± 0.219	4.227 ± 0.216	25.461 ± 0.182	$\mathbf{18.867 \pm 0.170}$
titanic	22.637 ± 0.134	22.725 ± 0.133	78.952 ± 0.670	$\mathbf{78.373 \pm 0.683}$
twonorm	$\mathbf{3.060 \pm 0.034}$	4.025 ± 0.068	45.901 ± 0.577	$\mathbf{42.044 \pm 0.610}$
waveform	$\mathbf{10.100 \pm 0.047}$	11.418 ± 0.091	105.925 ± 0.954	$\mathbf{91.239 \pm 0.962}$

Table 3: Error rates of expectation propagation based Gaussian process classifiers (EP-GPC), using both standard radial basis function (RBF) and automatic relevance determination (ARD) kernels. Results shown in bold indicate an error rate that is statistically superior to that obtained with the same classifier using the other kernel function or evidence that is significantly higher.

4.4 Avoiding Over-fitting in Model Selection

It seems reasonable to suggest that over-fitting in model selection is possible whenever a model selection criterion evaluated over a finite sample of data is directly optimised. Like over-fitting in training, over-fitting in model selection is likely to be most severe when the sample of data is small and the number of hyper-parameters to be tuned is relatively large. Likewise, assuming additional data are unavailable, potential solutions to the problem of over-fitting the model selection criterion are likely to be similar to the tried and tested solutions to the problem of over-fitting the training criterion, namely regularisation (Cawley and Talbot, 2007), early stopping (Qi et al., 2004) and model or hyper-parameter averaging (Cawley, 2006; Hall and Robinson, 2009). Alternatively, one might minimise the number of hyper-parameters, for instance by treating kernel parameters as simply parameters and optimising them at the first level of inference and have a single regularisation hyper-parameter controlling the overall complexity of the model. For very small data sets, where the problem of over-fitting in both learning and model selection is greatest, the preferred approach would be to eliminate model selection altogether and opt for a fully Bayesian approach, where the hyper-parameters are integrated out rather than optimised (e.g., Williams and Barber, 1998). Another approach is simply to avoid model selection altogether using an ensemble approach, for example the Random Forest (RF) method (Breiman, 2001). However, while such methods often achieve state-of-the-art performance, it is often easier to build expert knowledge into hierarchical models, for example through the design of kernel or covariance functions, so unfortunately approaches such as the RF are not a panacea.

While the problem of over-fitting in model selection is of the same nature as that of over-fitting at the first level of inference, the lack of mathematical tractability appears to have limited the theoretical analysis of model selection via optimisation of a model selection criterion. For example, regarding leave-one-out cross-validation, Kulkarni et al. (1998) comment "In spite of the practical importance of this estimate, relatively little is known about its properties. *The available theory is especially poor when it comes to analysing parameter selection based on minimizing the deleted estimate*." (our emphasis). While some asymptotic results are available (Stone, 1977; Shao, 1993; Toussaint, 1974), these are not directly relevant to the situation considered here, where over-fitting occurs due to optimising the values of hyper-parameters using a model selection criterion evaluated over a finite, often quite limited, sample of data. Estimates of the variance of the cross-validation error are available for some models (Luntz and Brailovsky, 1969; Vapnik, 1982), however Bengio and Grandvalet (2004) have shown there is no unbiased estimate of the variance of (k-fold) cross-validation. More recently bounds on the error of leave-one-out cross-validation based on the idea of *stability* have been proposed (Kearns and Ron, 1999; Bousquet and Elisseeff, 2002; Zhang, 2003). In this section, we have demonstrated that over-fitting in model selection is a genuine problem in machine learning, and hence is likely to be an area that could greatly benefit from further theoretical analysis.

5. Bias in Performance Estimation

Avoiding potentially significant bias in performance evaluation, arising due to over-fitting in model selection, is conceptually straightforward. The key is to treat both training *and* model selection together, as integral parts of the model fitting procedure and ensure they are never performed separately at any point of the evaluation process. We present two examples of potentially biased evaluation protocols that do not adhere to this principle. The scale of the bias observed on some data sets

is much larger than the difference in performance between learning algorithms, and so one could easily draw incorrect inferences based on the results obtained. This highlights the importance of this issue in empirical studies. We also demonstrate that the magnitude of the bias depends on the learning and model selection algorithms involved in the comparison and that combinations that are more prone to over-fitting in model selection are favored by biased protocols. This means that studies based on potentially biased protocols are not internally consistent, even if it is acknowledged that a bias with respect to other studies may exist.

5.1 An Unbiased Performance Evaluation Methodology

We begin by describing an unbiased performance protocol, that correctly accounts for any over-fitting that may occur in model selection. Three classifiers are evaluated using an unbiased protocol, in which model selection is performed separately for each realisation of each data set. This is termed the "internal" protocol as the model selection process is performed independently within each fold of the resampling procedure. In this way, the performance estimate includes a component properly accounting for the error introduced by over-fitting the model selection criterion. The classifiers used were as follows: RBF-KRR—kernel ridge regression with a radial basis function kernel, with model selection based on minimisation of Allen's PRESS statistic, as described in Section 2. RBF-KLR—kernel logistic regression with a radial basis function kernel and model selection based on an approximate leave-one-out cross-validation estimate of the log-likelihood (Cawley and Talbot, 2008). EP-GPC—expectation-propagation based Gaussian process classifier, with an isotropic squared exponential covariance function, with model selection based on maximising the marginal likelihood (e.g., Rasmussen and Williams, 2006). The mean error rates obtained using these classifiers under an unbiased protocol are shown in Table 4. In this case, the mean ranks of all methods are only minimally different, and so there is little if any evidence for a statistically significant superiority of any of the classifiers over any other. Figure 10 shows a critical difference diagram (Demšar, 2006), providing a graphical illustration of this result. A critical difference diagram displays the mean rank of a set of classifiers over a suite of benchmark data sets, with cliques of classifiers with statistically similar performance connected by a bar. The critical difference in average ranks required for a statistical superiority of one classifier over another is also shown, labelled "CD".


Figure 10: Critical difference diagram (Demšar, 2006) showing the average ranks of three classifiers with internal model selection protocol.

Data Set	GPC (internal)	KLR (internal)	KRR (internal)
banana	10.413 ± 0.046	10.567 ± 0.051	10.610 ± 0.051
breast cancer	26.506 ± 0.487	26.636 ± 0.467	26.727 ± 0.466
diabetis	23.280 ± 0.182	23.387 ± 0.180	23.293 ± 0.169
flare solar	34.200 ± 0.175	34.197 ± 0.170	34.140 ± 0.175
german	23.363 ± 0.211	23.493 ± 0.208	23.540 ± 0.214
heart	16.670 ± 0.290	16.810 ± 0.315	16.730 ± 0.359
image	2.817 ± 0.121	3.094 ± 0.130	2.990 ± 0.159
ringnorm	4.406 ± 0.064	1.681 ± 0.031	1.613 ± 0.015
splice	11.609 ± 0.180	11.248 ± 0.177	10.777 ± 0.144
thyroid	4.373 ± 0.219	4.293 ± 0.222	4.747 ± 0.235
titanic	22.637 ± 0.134	22.473 ± 0.103	22.483 ± 0.085
twonorm	3.060 ± 0.034	2.944 ± 0.042	2.846 ± 0.021
waveform	10.100 ± 0.047	9.918 ± 0.043	9.792 ± 0.045

Table 4: Error rate estimates of three classifiers over a suite of thirteen benchmark data sets: The results for each method are presented in the form of the mean error rate over test data for 100 realisations of each data set (20 in the case of the `image` and `splice` data sets), along with the associated standard error.

It is not unduly surprising that there should be little evidence for any statistically significant superiority, as all three methods give rise to structurally similar models. The models though differ significantly in their model selection procedures, the EP-GPC is based on stronger statistical assumptions, and so can be expected to excel where these assumptions are justified, but poorly where the model is mis-specified (e.g., the ringnorm benchmark). The cross-validation based model selection procedures, on the other hand, are more pragmatic and being based on much weaker assumptions might be expected to provide a more consistent level of accuracy.

5.2 An Example of Biased Evaluation Methodology

The performance evaluation protocol most often used in conjunction with the suite of benchmark data sets, described in Section 3.2, seeks to perform model selection independently for only the first five realisations of each data set. The median values of the hyper-parameters over these five folds are then determined and subsequently used to evaluate the error rates for each realisation. This "median" performance evaluation protocol was introduced in the same paper that popularised this suite of benchmark data sets (Rätsch et al., 2001) and has been widely adopted (e.g., Mika et al., 1999; Weston, 1999; Billings and Lee, 2002; Chapelle et al., 2002; Chu et al., 2003; Stewart, 2003; Mika et al., 2003; Gold et al., 2005; Peña Centeno and D., 2006; Andelić et al., 2006; An et al., 2007; Chen et al., 2009). The original motivation for this protocol was that the internal model selection protocol was prohibitively expensive using workstations available (Rätsch et al., 2001), which was perfectly reasonable at the time, but is no longer true.[3] The use of the median, however, can be expected to introduce an optimistic bias into the performance estimates obtained using this "median" protocol. Firstly all of the training data comprising the first five realisations have been

---

3. All of the experimental results presented in this paper were obtained using a single modern Linux workstation.

Data Set	KRR (internal)	KRR (median)	Bias
banana	10.610 ± 0.051	10.384 ± 0.042	0.226 ± 0.034
breast cancer	26.727 ± 0.466	26.377 ± 0.441	0.351 ± 0.195
diabetis	23.293 ± 0.169	23.150 ± 0.157	0.143 ± 0.074
flare solar	34.140 ± 0.175	34.013 ± 0.166	0.128 ± 0.082
german	23.540 ± 0.214	23.380 ± 0.220	0.160 ± 0.067
heart	16.730 ± 0.359	15.720 ± 0.306	1.010 ± 0.186
image	2.990 ± 0.159	2.802 ± 0.129	0.188 ± 0.095
ringnorm	1.613 ± 0.015	1.573 ± 0.010	0.040 ± 0.010
splice	10.777 ± 0.144	10.763 ± 0.137	0.014 ± 0.055
thyroid	4.747 ± 0.235	4.560 ± 0.200	0.187 ± 0.100
titanic	22.483 ± 0.085	22.407 ± 0.102	0.076 ± 0.077
twonorm	2.846 ± 0.021	2.868 ± 0.017	-0.022 ± 0.014
waveform	9.792 ± 0.045	9.821 ± 0.039	-0.029 ± 0.020

Table 5: Error rate estimates of three classifiers over a suite of thirteen benchmark data sets: The results for each method are presented in the form of the mean error rate over test data for 100 realisations of each data set (20 in the case of the image and splice data sets), along with the associated standard error.

used during the model selection process for the classifiers used in every fold of the re-sampling. This means that some of the test data for each fold is no longer statistically "pure" as it has been seen during model selection. Secondly, and more importantly, the median operation acts as a variance reduction step, so the median of the five sets of hyper-parameters is likely to be better on average than any of the five from which it is derived. Lastly, as the hyper-parameters are now fixed, there is no longer scope for over-fitting the model selection criterion due to peculiarities of the sampling of data for the training and test partitions in each realisation.

We begin by demonstrating that the results using the internal and median protocols are not commensurate, and so the results obtained using different methods are not directly comparable. Table 5 shows the error rate obtained using the RBF-KRR classifier with the internal and median performance evaluation protocols and the resulting bias, that is, the difference between the mean error rates obtained with the internal and median protocols. It is clearly seen that the median protocol introduces a positive bias on almost all benchmarks (twonorm and waveform being the exceptions) and that the bias can be quite substantial on some benchmarks. Indeed, for several benchmarks, breast cancer, german, heart and thyroid in particular, the bias is larger than the typical difference in performance between classifiers evaluated using an unbiased protocol. Demšar (2006) recommends the Wilcoxon signed ranks test for determination of the statistical significance of the superiority of one classifier over another over multiple data sets. Applying this test to the data shown for EP-GPC (internal), RBF-KLR (internal) and RBF-KRR (median), from Tables 4 and 5, reveals that the RBF-KRR (median) classifier is statistically superior to the remaining classifiers, at the 95% level of significance. A critical difference diagram summarising this result is shown in Figure 12. However, the difference in performance is entirely spurious as it is purely the result of reducing the effects of over-fitting in model selection and does not reflect the true operational performance of the combination of classifier and model selection method. It is clear then that results obtained using

the internal and median protocols are not directly comparable, and so reliable inferences cannot be drawn by comparison of results from different studies, using biased and unbiased protocols.

5.2.1 IS THE BIAS SOLELY DUE TO INADVERTENT RE-USE OF TEST SAMPLES?

One explanation for the observed bias of the median protocol is that some of the training samples for the first five realisations of the benchmark, which have been used in tuning the hyper-parameters, also appear in the test sets for other realisations of the benchmark used for performance analysis. In this section, we demonstrate that this inadvertent re-use of test samples is not the only cause of the bias. One hundred replications of the internal and median protocol were performed using the `synthetic` benchmark, for which an inexhaustible supply of i.i.d. data is available. However, in this case in each realisation, 100 training sets of 64 patterns and a large test set of 4096 samples were generated, all mutually disjoint. This means the only remaining source of bias is the amelioration of over-fitting in model selection by the reduction of variance by taking the median of the hyper-parameters over the first five folds (cf. Hall and Robinson, 2009). Figure 11 shows the mean test errors for the internal and median protocols over 100 replications, showing a very distinct optimistic bias in the median protocol (statistically highly significant according to the Wilcoxon signed ranks test, $p < 0.001$), even though there is absolutely no inadvertent re-use of test data.


Figure 11: Mean error rates for the internal and median evaluation protocols for the `synthetic` benchmark, without inadvertent re-use of test data.

5.2.2 IS THE MEDIAN PROTOCOL INTERNALLY CONSISTENT?

Having established that the median protocol introduces an optimistic bias, and that the results obtained using the internal and median protocols do not give comparable results, we next turn our attention to whether the median protocol is internally consistent, that is, does the median protocol give the correct rank order of the classifiers? Table 6 shows the performance of three classifiers evaluated using the median protocol; the corresponding critical difference diagram is shown in Figure 13. In this case the difference in performance between classifiers is not statistically significant according to the Friedman test, however it can clearly be seen that the bias of the median protocol

Data Set	EP-GPC (median)	RBF-KLR (median)	RBF-KRR (median)
banana	10.371 ± 0.045	10.407 ± 0.047	10.384 ± 0.042
breast cancer	26.117 ± 0.472	26.130 ± 0.474	26.377 ± 0.441
diabetis	23.333 ± 0.191	23.300 ± 0.177	23.150 ± 0.157
flare solar	34.150 ± 0.170	34.212 ± 0.176	34.013 ± 0.166
german	23.160 ± 0.216	23.203 ± 0.218	23.380 ± 0.220
heart	16.400 ± 0.273	16.120 ± 0.295	15.720 ± 0.306
image	2.851 ± 0.102	3.030 ± 0.120	2.802 ± 0.129
ringnorm	4.400 ± 0.064	1.574 ± 0.011	1.573 ± 0.010
splice	11.607 ± 0.184	11.172 ± 0.168	10.763 ± 0.137
thyroid	4.307 ± 0.217	4.040 ± 0.221	4.560 ± 0.200
titanic	22.490 ± 0.095	22.591 ± 0.135	22.407 ± 0.102
twonorm	3.241 ± 0.039	3.068 ± 0.033	2.868 ± 0.017
waveform	10.163 ± 0.045	9.888 ± 0.042	9.821 ± 0.039

Table 6: Error rate estimates of three classifiers over a suite of thirteen benchmark data sets: The results for each method are presented in the form of the mean error rate over test data for 100 realisations of each data set (20 in the case of the image and splice data sets), along with the associated standard error.

has favored one classifier, namely the RBF-KRR, much more strongly than the others. It seems feasible then that the bias of the median protocol may be sufficient in other cases to amplify a small difference in performance, due perhaps to an accidentally favorable choice of data sets, to the point where it spuriously appears to be statistically significant. This suggests that the median protocol may be unreliable and perhaps should be deprecated.


Figure 12: Critical difference diagram (Demšar, 2006) showing the average ranks of three classifiers, EP-GPC and RBF-KLR with internal model selection protocol and RBF-KLR using the optimistically biased median protocol (cf. Figure 10).

Next, we perform a statistical analysis to determine whether there is a statistically significant difference in the magnitude of the biases introduced by the median protocol for different classifiers,

Data Set	RBF-KRR bias	RBF-EP-GPC bias	Wilcoxon p-value
banana	0.226 ± 0.034	0.043 ± 0.012	< 0.05
breast cancer	0.351 ± 0.195	0.390 ± 0.186	0.934
diabetis	0.143 ± 0.074	-0.053 ± 0.051	< 0.05
flare solar	0.128 ± 0.082	0.050 ± 0.090	0.214
german	0.160 ± 0.067	0.203 ± 0.051	0.458
heart	1.010 ± 0.186	0.270 ± 0.120	< 0.05
image	0.188 ± 0.095	-0.035 ± 0.032	0.060
ringnorm	0.040 ± 0.010	0.006 ± 0.002	< 0.05
splice	0.014 ± 0.055	0.002 ± 0.014	0.860
thyroid	0.187 ± 0.100	0.067 ± 0.064	0.159
titanic	0.076 ± 0.077	0.147 ± 0.090	0.846
twonorm	-0.022 ± 0.014	-0.180 ± 0.032	< 0.05
waveform	-0.029 ± 0.020	-0.064 ± 0.022	0.244

Table 7: Results of a statistical analysis of the bias introduced by the median protocol into the test error rates for RBF-KRR and RBF-EP-GPC, using the Wilcoxon signed ranks test.


Figure 13: Critical difference diagram showing the average ranks of three classifiers with the median model selection protocol (cf. Figure 10).

for each benchmark data set.[4] First the bias introduced by the use of the median protocol was computed for the RBF KRR and RBF EP-GPC classifiers as the difference between the test set error estimated by the internal and median protocols. The Wilcoxon signed rank test was then used to determine whether there is a statistically significant difference in the bias, over the 100 realisations of the benchmark (20 in the case of the `image` and `splice` benchmarks). The results obtained are shown in Table 7, the p-value is below 0.05 for five of the thirteen benchmarks, indicating that in each case the median protocol is significantly biased in favour of the RBF KRR classifier. Clearly, as the median protocol does not impose a commensurate bias on the estimated test error rates for different classifiers, it does not provide a reliable protocol for comparing the performance of machine learning algorithms.

---

4. We are grateful to an anonymous reviewer for suggesting this particular form of analysis.

Figure 14: Mean ranks of three classifiers as a function of the number of folds used in the repeated split sample model selection procedure employed by the kernel ridge regression (RBF-KRR) machine, using (a) the unbiased *internal* protocol and (b) the biased *median* protocol.

In the final illustration of this section, we show that the magnitude of the bias introduced by the median protocol is greater for model selection criteria with a high variance. This means the median protocol favors most the least reliable model selection procedures and as a result does not provide a reliable indicator even of relative performance of classifier-model selection procedures combinations. Again the RBF-KRR model is used as the base classifier, however in this case a repeated split-sample model selection criterion is used, where the data are repeatedly split at random to form disjoint training and validation sets in proportions 9:1, and the hyper-parameters tuned to optimise the average mean-squared error over the validation sets. In this way, the variance of the model selection criterion can be controlled by varying the number of repetitions, with the variance decreasing as the number of folds becomes larger. Figure 14 (a) shows a plot of the average ranks of EP-GPC and RBF-KLR classifiers, with model selection performed as in previous experiments, and RBF-KRR with repeated split-sample model selection, as a function of the number of folds. In each case the unbiased internal evaluation protocol was used. Clearly if the number of folds is small (five or less), the RBF-KRR model performs poorly, due to over-fitting in model selection due to the high variance of the criterion used. However, as the number of folds increases, the variance of the model selection criterion falls, and the performances of all three algorithms are very similar. Figure 14 (b) shows the corresponding result using the biased median protocol. The averaging of hyper-parameters reduces the apparent variance of the model selection criterion, and this disguises the poor performance of the RBF-KRR model when the number of folds is small. This demonstrates that the bias introduced by the median protocol favors most the worst model selection criterion, which is a cause for some concern.

Data Set	External	Internal	Bias
banana	10.355 ± 0.146	10.495 ± 0.158	0.140 ± 0.035
breast cancer	26.280 ± 0.232	27.470 ± 0.250	1.190 ± 0.135
diabetis	22.891 ± 0.127	23.056 ± 0.134	0.165 ± 0.050
flare solar	34.518 ± 0.172	34.707 ± 0.179	0.189 ± 0.051
german	23.999 ± 0.117	24.217 ± 0.125	0.219 ± 0.045
heart	16.335 ± 0.214	16.571 ± 0.220	0.235 ± 0.073
image	3.081 ± 0.102	3.173 ± 0.112	0.092 ± 0.035
ringnorm	1.567 ± 0.058	1.607 ± 0.057	0.040 ± 0.014
splice	10.930 ± 0.219	11.170 ± 0.280	0.240 ± 0.152
thyroid	3.743 ± 0.137	4.279 ± 0.152	0.536 ± 0.073
titanic	22.167 ± 0.434	22.487 ± 0.442	0.320 ± 0.077
twonorm	2.480 ± 0.067	2.502 ± 0.070	0.022 ± 0.021
waveform	9.613 ± 0.168	9.815 ± 0.183	0.203 ± 0.064

Table 8: Error rate estimates for kernel ridge regression over thirteen benchmark data sets, for model selection schemes that are internal and external to the cross-validation process. The results for each approach and the relative bias are presented in the form of the mean error rate over for 100 realisations of each data set (20 in the case of the image and splice data sets), along with the associated standard error.

5.3 Another Example of Biased Evaluation Methodology

In a biased evaluation protocol, occasionally observed in machine learning studies, an initial model selection step is performed using all of the available data, often interactively as part of a "preliminary study". The data are then repeatedly re-partitioned to form one or more pairs of random, disjoint design and test sets. These are then used for performance evaluation *using the same fixed set of hyper-parameter values*. This practice may seem at first glance to be fairly innocuous, however the test data are no longer statistically pure, as they have been "seen" by the models in tuning the hyper-parameters. This would not present a serious problem were it not for the danger of over-fitting in model selection, which means that in practice the hyper-parameters will inevitably be tuned to an extent in ways that take advantage of the statistical peculiarities of this particular set of data rather than only in ways that favor improved generalisation. As a result the hyper-parameter settings retain a partial "memory" of the data that now form the test partition. We should therefore expect to observe an optimistic bias in the performance estimates obtained in this manner.

Table 8 shows a comparison of 10-fold cross-validation estimates of the test error rate, for kernel ridge regression with a Gaussian radian basis function kernel, obtained using protocols where the model selection stage is either *external* or *internal* to the cross-validation procedure. In the external protocol, model selection is performed once using the entire design set, as described above. In the internal protocol, the model selection step is performed separately in each fold of the cross-validation. The internal cross-validation procedure therefore provides a more realistic estimate of the performance of the combination of model selection and learning algorithm that is actually used to construct the final model. The table also shows the relative bias (i.e., the mean difference between the internal and external cross-validation protocols). The external protocol clearly exhibits a consistently optimistic bias with respect to the more rigorous internal cross-validation protocol, over

all thirteen benchmarks. Furthermore, the bias is statistically significant (i.e., larger than twice the standard error of the estimate) for all benchmarks, apart from `splice` and `twonorm`. In many cases, the bias is of similar magnitude to the typical difference observed between competitive learning algorithms (cf. Table 4). In some cases, for example, `banana` and `thyroid` benchmarks, the bias is of a surprising magnitude, likely to be large enough to conceal even the true difference between even state-of-the-art and uncompetitive learning algorithms. This clearly shows that the external cross-validation protocol exhibits a consistent optimistic bias, potentially of a very substantial magnitude even when the number of hyper-parameters is small (in this case only two), and so should not be used in practice.

6. Conclusions

In this paper, we have discussed the importance of bias and variance in model selection and performance evaluation, and demonstrated that a high variance can lead to over-fitting in model selection, and hence poor performance, even when the number of hyper-parameters is relatively small. Furthermore, we have shown that a potentially severe form of selection bias can be introduced into performance evaluation by protocols that have been adopted in a number of existing empirical studies. Fortunately, it seems likely that over-fitting in model selection can be overcome using methods that have already been effective in preventing over-fitting during training, such as regularisation or early stopping. Little attention has so far been focused on over-fitting in model selection, however in this paper we have shown that it presents a genuine pitfall in the practical application of machine learning algorithms and in empirical comparisons. In order to overcome the bias in performance evaluation, model selection should be viewed as an integral part of the model fitting procedure, and should be conducted independently in each trial in order to prevent selection bias and because it reflects best practice in operational use. Rigorous performance evaluation therefore requires a substantial investment of processor time in order to evaluate performance over a wide range of data sets, using multiple randomised partitionings of the available data, with model selection performed separately in each trial. However, it is straightforward to fully automate these steps, and so requires little manual involvement. Performance evaluation according to these principles requires repeated training of models using different sets of hyper-parameter values on different samples of the available data, and so is also well-suited to parallel implementation. Given the recent trend in processor design towards multi-core designs, rather than faster processor speeds, rigorous performance evaluation is likely to become less and less time-consuming, and so there is little justification for the continued use of potentially biased protocols.

Acknowledgments

References

D. M. Allen. The relationship between variable selection and prediction. *Technometrics*, 16:125–127, 1974.

C. Ambroise and G. J. McLachlan. Selection bias in gene extraction on the basis of microarray gene-expression data. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 99(10):6562–6566, May 14 2002. doi: 10.1073/pnas.102102699.

S. An, W. Liu, and S. Venkatesh. Fast cross-validation algorithms for least squares support vector machines and kernel ridge regression. *Pattern Recognition*, 40(8):2154–2162, August 2007. doi: 10.1016/j.patcog.2006.12.015.

E. Andelić, M. Schaffön̈er, M. Katz, S. E. Krüger, and A. Wendermuth. Kernel least-squares models using updates of the pseudoinverse. *Neural Computation*, 18(12):2928–2935, December 2006. doi: 10.1162/neco.2006.18.12.2928.

Y. Bengio and Y. Grandvalet. No unbiased estimator of the variance of k-fold cross-validation. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 5:1089–1105, 2004.

S. A. Billings and K. L. Lee. Nonlinear Fisher discriminant analysis using a minimum squared error cost function and the orthogonal least squares algorithm. *Neural Networks*, 15(2):263–270, March 2002. doi: 10.1016/S0893-6080(01)00142-3.

C. M. Bishop. *Neural Networks for Pattern Recognition*. Oxford University Press, 1995.

L. Bo, L. Wang, and L. Jiao. Feature scaling for kernel Fisher discriminant analysis using leave-one-out cross validation. *Neural Computation*, 18(4):961–978, April 2006. doi: 10.1162/neco.2006.18.4.961.

O. Bousquet and A. Elisseeff. Stability and generalization. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 2:499–526, 2002.

L. Breiman. Random forests. *Machine Learning*, 45(1):5–32, October 2001. doi: 10.1023/A:1010933404324.

G. C. Cawley. Leave-one-out cross-validation based model selection criteria for weighted LS-SVMs. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/INNS International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN-06)*, pages 1661–1668, Vancouver, BC, Canada, July 16–21 2006. doi: 10.1109/IJCNN.2006.246634.

G. C. Cawley and N. L. C. Talbot. Efficient leave-one-out cross-validation of kernel Fisher discriminant classifiers. *Pattern Recognition*, 36(11):2585–2592, November 2003. doi: 10.1016/S0031-3203(03)00136-5.

G. C. Cawley and N. L. C. Talbot. Preventing over-fitting during model selection via Bayesian regularisation of the hyper-parameters. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 8:841–861, April 2007.

G. C. Cawley and N. L. C. Talbot. Efficient approximate leave-one-out cross-validation for kernel logistic regression. *Machine Learning*, 71(2–3):243–264, June 2008. doi: 10.1007/s10994-008-5055-9.

G. C. Cawley, G. J. Janacek, and N. L. C. Talbot. Generalised kernel machines. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/INNS International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IJCNN-07)*, pages 1720–1725, Orlando, Florida, USA, August 12–17 2007. doi: 10.1109/IJCNN.2007.4371217.

O. Chapelle, V. Vapnik, O. Bousquet, and S. Mukherjee. Choosing multiple parameters for support vector machines. *Machine Learning*, 46(1–3):131–159, January 2002. doi: 10.1023/A:1012450327387.

H. Chen, P. Tino, and X. Yao. Probabilistic classification vector machines. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, 20(6):901–914, June 2009. doi: 10.1109/TNN.2009.2014161.

W. Chu, S. S. Keerthi, and C. J. Ong. Bayesian trigonometric support vector classifier. *Neural Computation*, 15(9):2227–2254, September 2003. doi: 10.1162/089976603322297368.

J. Demšar. Statistical comparisons of classifiers over multiple data sets. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 7:1–30, 2006.

R. O. Duda, P. E. Hart, and D. G. Stork. *Pattern Classification*. John Wiley and Sons, second edition, 2001.

B. Efron and R. J. Tibshirani. *Introduction to the Bootstrap*. Monographs on Statistics and Applied Probability. Chapman & Hall, 1994.

S. Geman, E. Bienenstock, and R. Doursat. Neural networks and the bias/variance dilemma. *Neural Computation*, 4(1):1–58, January 1992. doi: 10.1162/neco.1992.4.1.1.

C. Gold, A. Holub, and P. Sollich. Bayesian approach to feature selection and parameter tuning for support vector machine classifiers. *Neural Networks*, 18(5):693–701, July/August 2005. doi: 10.1016/j.neunet.2005.06.044.

I. Guyon, A. Saffari, G. Dror, and G. Cawley. Model selection: Beyond the Bayesian/frequentist divide. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11:61–87, 2009.

P. Hall and A. P. Robinson. Reducing the variability of crossvalidation for smoothing parameter choice. *Biometrika*, 96(1):175–186, March 2009. doi: doi:10.1093/biomet/asn068.

M. Kearns and D. Ron. Algorithmic stability and sanity-check bounds for leave-one-out cross-validation. *Neural Computation*, 11(6):1427–1453, August 1999. doi: 10.1162/089976699300016304.

G. S. Kimeldorf and G. Wahba. Some results on Tchebycheffian spline functions. *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications*, 33:82–95, 1971.

S. R. Kulkarni, G. Lugosi, and S. S. Venkatesh. Learning pattern classification — a survey. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 44(6):2178–2206, October 1998.

P. A. Lachenbruch and M. R. Mickey. Estimation of error rates in discriminant analysis. *Technometrics*, 10(1):1–12, February 1968.

A. Luntz and V. Brailovsky. On estimation of characters obtained in statistical procedure of recognition (in Russian). *Techicheskaya Kibernetica*, 3, 1969.

D. J. C. MacKay. Bayesian interpolation. *Neural Computation*, 4(3):415–447, May 1992. doi: 10.1162/neco.1992.4.3.415.

J. Mercer. Functions of positive and negative type and their connection with the theory of integral equations. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London, Series A*, 209:415–446, 1909.

S. Mika, G. Rätsch, J. Weston, B. Schölkopf, and K.-R. Müller. Fisher discriminant analysis with kernels. In *Neural Networks for Signal Processing IX, Proceedings of the 1999 IEEE Signal Processing Society Workshop*, pages 41–48, Maddison, WI, USA, 21–25 August 1999. doi: 10.1109/NNSP.1999.788121.

S. Mika, G. Rätsch, J. Weston, B. Schölkpf, and K.-R. Müller. Contructing descriptive and discriminative nonlinear features: Rayleigh coefficients in kernel feature spaces. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 25(5):623–628, May 2003. doi: 10.1109/TPAMI. 2003.1195996.

J. A. Nelder and R. Mead. A simplex method for function minimization. *Computer Journal*, 7: 308–313, 1965.

T. Peña Centeno and Lawrence N. D. Optimising kernel parameters and regularisation coefficients for non-linear discriminant analysis. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 7:455–491, February 2006.

T. Poggio and F. Girosi. Networks for approximation and learning. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 78(9): 1481–1497, September 1990. doi: 10.1109/5.58326.

Y. Qi, T. P. Minka, R. W. Picard, and Z. Ghahramani. Predictive automatic relevance determination by expectation propagation. In *Proceedings of the Twenty First International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-04)*, pages 671–678, Banff, Alberta, Canada, July 4–8 2004.

C. E. Rasmussen and C. K. I. Williams. *Gaussian Processes for Machine Learning*. Adaptive Computation and Machine Learning. MIT Press, 2006.

G. Rätsch, T. Onoda, and K.-R. Müller. Soft margins for AdaBoost. *Machine Learning*, 42(3): 287–320, March 2001. doi: 10.1023/A:1007618119488.

R. M. Rifkin and R. A. Lippert. Notes on regularized least squares. Technical Report MIT-CSAIL-TR-2007-025, Computer Science and Artificial Intelligence Laboratory, MIT, May 2007.

B. D. Ripley. *Pattern Recognition and Neural Networks*. Cambridge University Press, 1996.

C. Saunders, A. Gammerman, and V. Vovk. Ridge regression learning algorithm in dual variables. In *Proceedings of the Fifteenth International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML-98)*, pages 515–521. Morgan Kaufmann, 1998.

J. Shao. Linear model selection by cross-validation. *Journal of the American Statistical Society*, 88:486–494, 1993.

I. Stewart. On the optimal parameter choice for ν-support vector machines. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 25(10):1274–1284, October 2003. doi: 10.1109/ TPAMI.2003.1233901.

M. Stone. Cross-validatory choice and assessment of statistical predictions. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B (Statistical Methodology)*, 36(2):111–147, 1974.

M. Stone. Asymptotics for and against cross-validation. *Biometrika*, 64(1):29–35, April 1977. doi: 10.1093/biomet/64.1.29.

J. A. K. Suykens, T. Van Gestel, J. De Brabanter, B. De Moor, and J. Vanderwalle. *Least Squares Support Vector Machine*. World Scientific Publishing Company, Singapore, 2002. ISBN 981-238-151-1.

A. N. Tikhonov and V. Y. Arsenin. *Solutions of Ill-posed Problems*. John Wiley, New York, 1977.

G. Toussaint. Bibliography on estimation of misclassification. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, IT-20(4):472–479, July 1974.

V. N. Vapnik. *Estimation of Dependences Based on Empirical Data*. Springer, 1982.

V. N. Vapnik. *Statistical Learning Theory*. Adaptive and learning systems for signal processing, communications and control series. Wiley, 1998.

S. Weisberg. *Applied Linear Regression*. Probability and Mathematical Statistics. John Wiley & Sons, second edition, 1985.

J. Weston. Leave-one-out support vector machines. In *Proceedings of the Sixteenth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI-99)*, pages 727–733, San Fransisco, CA, USA, 1999. Morgan Kaufmann.

C. K. I. Williams and D. Barber. Bayesian classification with Gaussian processes. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 20(12):1342–1351, December 1998. doi: 10.1109/34.735807.

P. M. Williams. A Marquardt algorithm for choosing the step size in backpropagation learning with conjugate gradients. Technical Report CSRP-229, University of Sussex, February 1991.

T. Zhang. Leave-one-out bounds for kernel machines. *Neural Computation*, 15(6):1397–1437, June 2003. doi: 10.1162/089976603321780326.