

On permutation testing of classification accuracy for signal detection

Jonathan Rosenblatt *

*Ben-Gurion University of the Negev, Beer-Sheva, Israel

Submitted to Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America

[TODO]

XXX | YYY | ZZZ

Introduction

A common workflow in genetics or neuroimaging consists of fitting a classifier, and estimating its predictive accuracy using cross validation. Given that the cross validated accuracy is a random quantity, it is then common to test if the cross validated accuracy is significantly better than chance using a permutation test. Genetic examples include [TODO: elaborate][1, 2]. Neuroscience examples include the recently popularized *multivariate pattern analysis* (MVPA) [3, 4, 5].

To fix ideas, we will adhere to a Neuroscientific example: In [10], the authors seek to detect auditory brain regions which distinguish between vocal and non-vocal stimuli. According to the MVPA analysis workflow, the localization problem is cast as a supervised learning problem: if the type of the stimulus can be predicted from the spatial activation pattern, significantly better than chance, then a region is declared to encode vocal/non-vocal information.

This same signal detection task can be also approached as a two-group multivariate test: Inferring that a region encodes vocal/non-vocal information, is essentially inferring that the spatial distribution of brain activations is different given a vocal/non-vocal stimulus. A practitioner may then call upon a two-group Hotelling test [6]. If the size of the brain region is too large compared to the number of observations, so that the spatial covariance cannot be fully estimated, then a high dimensional version of the Hotelling test can be called upon, such as [7].

At this point, it becomes unclear which is the preferred avenue. This question was indeed the subject of [8], which compared the Hotelling test to the classification accuracy of *Fisher’s linear discriminant analysis* (LDA) [9]. Their asymptotic analysis concluded that methods are equivalent with respect to the order of convergence to a consistent test. The same authors did find that the methods differ in the constants governing the convergence.

Those constants, are the focus of this contribution. In particular, which signal detection method is to be preferred in finite samples? Our conclusion is quite simple: signal detection using multivariate tests almost always has more power than using the accuracy test statistic.

The main argument for our statement rests upon the observation that with typical sample sizes, the accuracy test statis-

tic is highly discrete. Discrete test statistics are known to be conservative, since they cannot exhaust the permissible type I error rates. For the accuracy test statistic, the degree of discretization is governed by the number of samples. In our running example [10], the classification is performed based on 40 trials, so that the test statistic may assume only 40 possible values. This number of examples is not unusual if considering this is the number of subject in a genetic study, or the number of trial repeats in an fMRI brain scan.

The discretization effect is further augmented if the test statistic is highly concentrated. For some intuition consider the usage of the train-accuracy test statistic (i.e., not cross validated). Because the testing problem is high dimensional, the observed train accuracy will be high. But the same will occur in every permutation. The permutation accuracies will tend to concentrate around 1 with a granularity depending on the sample size. In a very high dimensional setup, the accuracy will be 1 for the observed data, but also for any permuted data set. The permutation p-value will thus be 1 for almost all samples, and the null will never be rejected.

In the following, we look into the conservativeness of signal detection using an the classification accuracy. We start by establishing a best practice for permutation testing using the accuracy test statistic,

We discuss the problem characteristics that govern the magnitude of the conservativeness, and try to offer an intuition to the scope of the observation that a multivariate test should always be preferred over a classification approach.

How to perform the permutation test?

To discuss the power of a permutation test with the accuracy, we need to establish some best practices for such a test. The design of the test consists of the following choices:

- What test statistic?** What is the test statistic?
- Cross validated or not?** Is the statistic cross validated or not?
- What folding scheme?** Assuming the statistic is
- How many folds?**

Power
fff

Discussion
fff
Reserved for Publication Footnotes

1. Jiang W, Varma S, Simon R (2008) Calculating confidence intervals for prediction error in microarray classification using resampling. *Statistical Applications in Genetics and Molecular Biology* 7(1).

2. Radmacher MD, McShane LM, Simon R (2002) A Paradigm for Class Prediction Using Gene Expression Profiles. *Journal of Computational Biology* 9(3):505–511.

3. Kriegeskorte N, Goebel R, Bandettini P (2006) Information-based functional brain mapping. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* 103(10):3863–3868.

4. Varoquaux G et al. (2016) Assessing and tuning brain decoders: cross-validation,

caveats, and guidelines. working paper or preprint.

5. Golland P, Fischl B (2003) Permutation tests for classification: towards statistical significance in image-based studies. (Springer), Vol. 3, pp. 330–341.
6. Fujikoshi Y, Ulyanov VV, Shimizu R (2011) Multivariate Statistics: High-Dimensional and Large-Sample Approximations. (John Wiley & Sons).
7. Srivastava MS (2013) On testing the equality of mean vectors in high dimension. *Acta et Commentationes Universitatis Tartuensis de Mathematica* 17(1):31–56.
8. Ramdas A, Singh A, Wasserman L (2016) Classification Accuracy as a Proxy for Two Sample Testing. *arXiv:1602.02210* [cs, math, stat].
9. Hastie T, Tibshirani R, Friedman J (2003) *The Elements of Statistical Learning*. (Springer).
10. Gilron R, Rosenblatt J, Koyejo O, Poldrack RA, Mukamel R (2016) Quantifying spatial pattern similarity in multivariate analysis using functional anisotropy. *arXiv:1605.03482* [q-bio].