

# IRTForests

## Random Forest × Item Response Theory Diagnostics

Andrew T. Scott · Fall 2025

[github.com/ascott02/IRTForests](https://github.com/ascott02/IRTForests)

# Random Forest × Item Response Theory

- Trees become respondents, images become items.
- Response matrix records per-tree correctness on held-out examples.
- Goal: explain RF behavior via IRT ability & difficulty signals.

# GenAI In the Loop Scientific Exploration

- Started from a focused README spec outlining goals, datasets, and diagnostics.
- Automated notebook + CLI runs to regenerate every experiment end-to-end.
- Promoted the resulting figures and tables into this deck, sharpening the story each loop.

# Motivation & Guiding Questions

- Random forests bundle weak learners; IRT recasts each tree as a respondent with latent ability ( $\theta$ ).
- Held-out images become items whose difficulty ( $\delta$ ) emerges from tree wins and losses.
- How do  $\theta$  and  $\delta$  steer backbone choices, surface label issues, and focus the next curation loop?

# Story Arc

1. **Background:** IRT mechanics + RF diagnostics we rely on.
2. **Pipeline:** Datasets, embeddings, and response matrices powering the studies.
3. **Case Studies:** Baseline CIFAR, MobileNet upgrade, and MNIST control.
4. **Synthesis:** Cross-study comparisons, takeaways, and next steps.

# Why Item Response Theory for Random Forests?

- Trees answer the same held-out images, so treat them as “test takers.”
- Latent **ability** ( $\theta$ ) ranks trees; latent **difficulty** ( $\delta$ ) flags ambiguous images.
- Shared scales let us compare studies, backbones, and curation tactics directly.

# Item Response Theory Building Blocks

## Core Terms

- Ability ( $\theta$ ): respondent skill; higher  $\rightarrow$  higher success odds.
- Difficulty ( $\delta$ ): item hardness; higher  $\rightarrow$  harder even for strong respondents.
- Discrimination ( $a$ ): slope near  $\delta$ .
- Guessing ( $c$ ): floor for multiple-choice exams (rare here).


## Ensemble Analogy

- Respondents  $\rightarrow$  decision trees on a shared test set.
- Items  $\rightarrow$  images; responses are binary (tree correct?).
- Response matrix  $R_{ij} \in \{0, 1\}$  feeds variational IRT.
- Outputs: posteriors over  $\theta_i$ ,  $\delta_j$ , and information curves.

# Rasch (1PL) Model in One Picture

$$\Pr(R_{ij} = 1 \mid \theta_i, \delta_j) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-(\theta_i - \delta_j)}}$$

- Single global slope keeps parameters on a shared logit scale.
- $(\theta - \delta) = 0 \Rightarrow 50\%$  success; shifts left/right change odds.
- Fisher information peaks where curves are steepest—prime for spotting uncertainty.
- [IRT ICC Visualizer](#)



1PL logistic curves for items of varying difficulty



## What We Extract from IRT

- **Ability histograms** flag low-skill trees worth pruning.
- **Difficulty ladders** highlight mislabeled or ambiguous items.
- **Wright maps** overlay  $\theta$  and  $\delta$  to expose coverage gaps.
- **Information curves** reveal where ensemble confidence is fragile.
- Together they explain *who* struggles and *why* beyond RF metrics.

# Margins, Entropy, and Ensemble Confidence

- Tree votes yield class probabilities we mine for uncertainty signals.
- **Margin**  $m(x) = P(\hat{y} = y_{true}) - \max_{c \neq y_{true}} P(\hat{y} = c)$  near 0 marks ambiguity; negative marks systematic flips.
- **Entropy** captures ensemble disagreement; combining both with  $\delta$  surfaces mislabeled or OOD items and tracks curation gains.

# Pipeline Overview

## Data Prep (done)

- Stratified CIFAR-10 subset: 10k / 2k / 2k splits.
- Resize 64×64, normalize, PCA → 128-D embeddings (plus MobileNet-V3 cache).
- MNIST mini: 4k / 800 / 800 digits, normalized 28×28 grayscale.
- Artifacts cached in `data/cifar10_subset.npz` , `data/cifar10_embeddings.npz` , and `data/mnist/mnist_split.npz` .

## Modeling Status

- RF (200 trees) trained for every study; metrics and importances saved.
- Response matrices persisted: CIFAR (200 × 2000) for PCA & MobileNet, MNIST (200 × 800) .
- 1PL Rasch (SVI, 600 epochs) complete for CIFAR; MNIST mirrors the same notebook.

# Dataset Overview

Dataset	Train	Val	Test	Feature Pipeline	Notes
CIFAR-10 subset	10,000	2,000	2,000	64×64 RGB → PCA-128 / MobileNet-V3 (960-D)	Shared splits across Study I & II
MNIST mini	4,000	800	800	28×28 grayscale → raw pixels (no PCA)	Control for clean handwriting

- All studies reuse cached artifacts under `data/` .
- CIFAR runs differ only by embeddings; labels and splits stay fixed.
- MNIST mirrors the workflow to confirm signals on cleaner data.

## Section I · Baseline Study (CIFAR + PCA)


- Establish the PCA baseline and its uncertainty signals.
- Use IRT to pinpoint weak trees and hard items that motivate stronger features.

# Study I: CIFAR-10 + PCA-128 Embeddings

- Baseline vision setup: 64×64 resize + PCA to 128 dims.
- 200-tree Random Forest with a  $200 \times 2000$  response matrix anchors the diagnostics.
- Use this run to surface weak trees and mislabeled items.

# Study I Setup: CIFAR-10 + PCA-128

- Fixed stratified CIFAR-10 split (10k / 2k / 2k).
- Resize 64×64, normalize, PCA → 128-D embeddings (``data/cifar10_embeddings.npz``).
- Response matrix 200 × 2000 with mean tree accuracy 0.176.
- Artifacts: metrics, margins, entropy, IRT outputs under ``data/`` and ``figures/``.



Study I sample grid — stratified CIFAR-10 slices


# Study I Performance (PCA-128)

Metric	Value
Test / Val / OOB acc	0.4305 / 0.4145 / 0.3730
Per-class range	0.225 (cat) → 0.595 (ship)
Mean tree accuracy	0.1759
Mean margin / entropy	−0.0028 / 2.1503
$\delta$ ↔ margin (Pearson)	−0.8286
$\delta$ ↔ entropy (Pearson)	0.6782

- Baseline ensemble underperforms due to weak PCA features yet preserves  $\delta$  alignment.
- Margins sit near zero and entropy stays high, signalling broad disagreement—prime for IRT.
- Artifacts: metrics ( `data/rf_metrics.json` ), confusion ( `data/rf_confusion.npy` ), importances, permutations.





# Study I Confusion Matrix



## Reading the matrix

- Off-diagonal spikes (cat ↔ dog, bird ↔ airplane, horse ↔ deer) mirror high- $\delta$  items.
- Ships/trucks stay >80% on-diagonal; the highlighted hotspots mark curation targets.


# Study I Diagnostics: Ability Profiles



Ability ( $\theta$ ) vs tree accuracy — Spearman  $\approx 0.99$       Wright map:  $\theta$  cluster near  $-11$ ;  $\delta$  stretches to 14


- Trees with  $\theta$  above  $-10$  beat peers by  $\sim 3$  pp even with PCA features.
- Long-tail  $\theta < -11.5$  drags accuracy, and the Wright map shows  $\delta$  stretching far beyond the compressed ability range.

# Study I Diagnostics: $\delta$ vs Error Rate




- $\delta > 10$  maps to >80% tree error—mostly ambiguous animals—while  $\delta < 0$  becomes “free points.”
- Pearson  $\approx 0.95$ , Spearman  $\approx 0.94$ : difficulty doubles as an error heat-map.

# Study I Diagnostics: $\delta$ vs RF Signals



PCA run:  $\delta$  vs margin (Pearson  $-0.83$ )



PCA run:  $\delta$  vs entropy (Pearson  $0.68$ )

- Hard items cluster bottom-right (low margin, high entropy); opposite corner houses easy wins.
- Study II mirrors the trend with even stronger correlations.

# Study I Evidence: Hard vs Easy Examples



- Hardest items skew toward ambiguous airplane/ship silhouettes and cluttered cat/dog scenes.
- Easy set is dominated by high-contrast cues (e.g., red fire trucks), yielding low  $\delta$  and entropy.

# Study I Takeaways

- Weak PCA features create long tails in both ability ( $\theta$ ) and difficulty ( $\delta$ ), exposing erratic trees.
- Margin and entropy correlate with  $\delta$ , but clusters of high-difficulty animals persist across diagnostics.
- Visual inspection confirms mislabeled or low-signal items driving high  $\delta$ , motivating feature upgrades.

## Section II · Feature-Rich CIFAR (MobileNet)

- Hold the splits fixed to isolate feature gains.
- Test whether richer embeddings tighten  $\theta$  spread and retain  $\delta$  alignment.


## Study II: CIFAR-10 + MobileNet Embeddings

- Swap PCA features for MobileNet-V3 (960-D) while keeping tree count and splits constant.
- Compare RF metrics, uncertainty signals, and IRT parameters against the baseline.





# Study II Setup: CIFAR-10 + MobileNet-V3

- Reuse Study I splits to isolate feature effects.
- Extract 960-D MobileNet-V3 Small embeddings (``data/cifar10_mobilenet_embeddings.npz``).
- Response matrix  $200 \times 2000$  with mean tree accuracy 0.482.
- Artifacts live under ``data/mobilenet/*`` and ``figures/mobilenet/``.




Study II sample grid — same splits, MobileNet embeddings

## Study II Performance (MobileNet-V3)


Metric	Value
Test / Val / OOB acc	0.8090 / 0.8135 / 0.7967
Per-class range	0.68 (cat) → 0.915 (ship)
Mean tree accuracy	0.4817
Mean margin / entropy	0.2806 / 1.4663
$\delta$  margin (Pearson)	-0.8825
$\delta$  entropy (Pearson)	0.8113

- Pretrained features boost accuracy by 37 pp while strengthening  $\delta$  correlations.
- Higher margins and lower entropy show confidence gains except on stubborn animal classes.
- Artifacts: metrics, response matrix, signals, and IRT outputs under `data/mobilenet/`.

# Study II Diagnostics: $\delta$ vs RF Signals





$\delta$  vs margin (Pearson  $-0.88$ )



$\delta$  vs entropy (Pearson  $0.81$ )

- MobileNet compresses the easy cluster (high margin, low entropy) while isolating true hard cases.
- Larger  $|\text{corr}|$  values show tighter agreement between  $\delta$  and RF uncertainty.
- Cat/dog confusions persist, marking curation targets

# Study II Diagnostics: Ability Profiles




Ability ( $\theta$ ) vs tree accuracy — Pearson 0.983

Wright map:  $\theta$  variance shrinks to 0.25

- $\theta$  mean  $-0.21 \pm 0.25$ : trees cluster far tighter than the PCA baseline ( $\sigma$  0.55  $\rightarrow$  0.25).
- Ability remains tied to per-tree accuracy, so feature quality—rather than tree diversity—now caps gains.

# Study II Diagnostics: $\delta$ vs Error Rate



- Pearson 0.922 keeps  $\delta$  aligned with mean tree error even at the higher accuracy ceiling.
- Hardest items ( $\delta > 8$ ) persist—mostly cat/dog overlaps and ambiguous aircraft—while the easy zone ( $\delta < -3$ ) expands.

## Study II Takeaways

- MobileNet embeddings add 37 pp of accuracy while collapsing ability variance ( $\sigma_\theta$  0.55  $\rightarrow$  0.25).
- $\delta$  stays aligned with RF uncertainty, isolating a smaller yet stubborn ambiguous cluster.
- Residual cat/dog confusion points to data curation as the next lever.

## Section III · Control Study (MNIST)

- Probe the pipeline on a high-signal, low-noise dataset.
- Confirm that IRT still mirrors RF uncertainty when accuracy is near perfect.


## Study III: MNIST Mini-Study

- Lightweight handwriting dataset to validate RF × IRT beyond CIFAR-10.
- Acts as a control where ambiguity is rare yet still detectable.





## Study III Setup: MNIST Mini-Study

- Split 4k / 800 / 800 digits with stratified sampling and a fixed seed.
- Flatten 28×28 grayscale digits; no augmentation.
- Train a 200-tree RF on raw pixels; response matrix  $200 \times 800$ .
- Artifacts land in `data/mnist/` with plots in `figures/mnist/`.





Study III sample grid — curated MNIST mini split

## Study III Performance (MNIST)

Metric	Value
Train / Val / Test	4000 / 800 / 800
RF test / val / OOB	0.9475 / 0.9413 / 0.9140
Mean margin / entropy	0.5546 / 1.0351
$\delta$  margin (Pearson)	-0.950
$\delta$  entropy (Pearson)	0.958
$\theta$ mean $\pm$ $\sigma$	4.23 $\pm$ 0.44
$\delta$ mean $\pm$ $\sigma$	-1.75 $\pm$ 8.19

- Ambiguous digits (e.g., brushed 5 vs 6) spike  $\delta$  toward  $\pm 20$ ; elsewhere the forest is decisive.
- Low entropy + high margin line up with low  $\delta$ , giving a “sanity benchmark” beyond CIFAR.

# Study III Diagnostics: $\delta$ vs RF Signals




$\delta$  vs margin (Pearson  $-0.95$ )


$\delta$  vs entropy (Pearson  $0.96$ )

- Clean digits show near-perfect alignment between  $\delta$  and RF uncertainty.
- Only a handful of  $\delta > 12$  digits drive the residual uncertainty (stroke collisions like 3/5, 4/9).

# Study III Diagnostics: Ability Profiles



Ability ( $\theta$ ) vs tree accuracy — Pearson 0.995




Wright map:  $\theta$  mean  $4.23 \pm 0.44$ ;  $\delta$  mean  $-1.75 \pm 8.19$

- $\theta$  mean  $4.23 \pm 0.44$  shows strong consensus, while  $\delta$  mean  $-1.75 \pm 8.19$  keeps heavy tails for ambiguous strokes.
- Shared scales expose plentiful easy wins with a few sharp spikes—opposite of the CIFAR

baseline

# Study III Diagnostics: $\delta$ vs Error Rate



- Pearson 0.962 keeps  $\delta$  tied to mean tree error despite the high accuracy ceiling.
- $\delta > 12$  corresponds to stroke-collided 3/5/8 and 4/9 pairs; the long negative tail is trivial for the ensemble.



## Study III Takeaways

- $\delta$  and RF uncertainty agree almost perfectly, while  $\theta$  stays high yet still flags the rare ambiguous strokes.
- The control study confirms the RF  $\times$  IRT pipeline holds outside noisy vision data.

## Section IV · Cross-Study & Diagnostics

- Compare backbones and datasets on a shared  $\theta/\delta$  scale.
- Surface recurring themes before the close.

# Cross-Study Snapshot

Study	Feature Backbone	Test Acc	$\delta$  margin (Pearson)	$\delta$  entropy (Pearson)	$\theta \sigma$	$\delta \sigma$
Study I: CIFAR + PCA-128	PCA-128	0.4305	-0.8286	0.6782	0.55	4.10
Study II: CIFAR + MobileNet	MobileNet-V3 (960-D)	0.8090	-0.8825	0.8113	0.25	4.67
Study III: MNIST Mini	Raw pixels	0.9475	-0.950	0.958	0.44	8.19

- Feature backbone drives both accuracy gains and  $\delta$  alignment strength.
- $\theta$  variance collapses with MobileNet (0.25) while MNIST keeps moderate spread despite high accuracy.
- MNIST  $\delta \sigma$  expands to 8.19, highlighting rare but extreme digit ambiguities versus CIFAR's visual noise.



# Key Takeaways

- IRT mirrors RF uncertainty:  $\theta$  tracks per-tree accuracy and  $\delta$  tracks item error across studies.
- Feature backbones reshape the  $\theta/\delta$  landscape—MobileNet curbs variance yet preserves a hard-item tail.
- Pairing  $\delta$  with margins and entropy cleanly triages ambiguous classes without manual inspection.
- MNIST confirms the pipeline before we branch to new domains.

## Next Steps

- Extend notebooks to auto-export the comparison tables and montages.
- Run the queued 2PL/3PL experiments ( `reports/discrimination_analysis_plan.md` ).
- Correlate  $\theta$  with tree structure (depth, leaf count) to guide pruning.
- Scale the  $\delta$  + margin triage on CIFAR before moving to tabular studies.