

Better-Than-Chance Classification for Signal Detection

Jonathan Rosenblatt Roei Gilron Roy Mukamel

August 11, 2016

Abstract

[TODO]

1 Introduction

A common workflow in 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. Examples in the neuroscientific literature include Golland and Fischl [2003], Pereira et al. [2009], Varoquaux et al. [2016], and especially the recently popularized *multivariate pattern analysis* (MVPA) framework of Kriegeskorte et al. [2006]. This practice is also observed in very high profile publications in the genetics literature: Golub et al. [1999], Slonim et al. [2000], Radmacher et al. [2002], Mukherjee et al. [2003], Juan and Iba [2004], Jiang et al. [2008].

To fix ideas, we will adhere to a concrete example. In Gilron et al. [2016], the authors seek to detect brain regions which encode differences between vocal and non-vocal stimuli. Following the MVPA 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. We call this an *accuracy test*, a.k.a. *class prediction*, or *pattern discrimination*.

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. As put in Pereira et al. [2009]:

26 ... the problem of deciding whether the classifier learned to dis-
 27 criminate the classes can be subsumed into the more general ques-
 28 tion as to whether there is evidence that the underlying distribu-
 29 tions of each class are equal or not.

30 A practitioner may then call upon a two-group location test such as Hotelling’s
 31 T^2 [Anderson, 2003]. Alternatively, if the size of a brain region is too large
 32 compared to the number of observations, so that the spatial covariance can-
 33 not be fully estimated, then a high dimensional version of Hotelling’s test can
 34 be called upon, such as in Schäfer and Strimmer [2005] or Srivastava [2013].
 35 For brevity, and in contrast to *accuracy tests*, we will call any two-sample
 36 multivariate tests simply *location tests*, also termed *class comparisons*.

37 At this point, it becomes unclear which is preferable: a location test or an
 38 accuracy test? The former with a heritage dating back to Hotelling [1931],
 39 and the latter being extremely popular, as the 959 citations¹ of Kriegeskorte
 40 et al. [2006] suggest.

41 The comparison between location and accuracy tests was precisely the
 42 goal of Ramdas et al. [2016], who compared the T^2 location test to the accu-
 43 racy of *Fisher’s linear discriminant analysis* classifier (LDA). By comparing
 44 the rates of convergence of the powers to 1, Ramdas et al. [2016] concluded
 45 that accuracy and location tests are rate equivalent.

46 Asymptotic relative efficiency measures (ARE) are typically used by statis-
 47 ticians to compare between test statistics with similar rates [van der Vaart,
 48 1998]. Ramdas et al. [2016] derive the asymptotic power functions of the
 49 two test statistics, which allow to extract the ARE between Hotelling’s T^2
 50 (location) test and Fisher’s LDA (accuracy) test. Using the Theorem 14.7 in
 51 van der Vaart [1998], we deduce that the ARE is lower bounded by $2\pi \approx 6.3$.
 52 This means that Fisher’s LDA requires at least 6.3 more samples to achieve
 53 the same (asymptotic) power than the T^2 test. In this light, the accuracy test
 54 is remarkably inefficient compared to the location test. For comparison, the
 55 t-test is only 1.04 more (asymptotically) efficient than Wilcoxon’s rank-sum
 56 test [Lehmann, 2009], so that an ARE of 2.5 is strong evidence in favor of
 57 the location test.

58 Before discarding accuracy tests as inefficient, we recall that Ramdas
 59 et al. [2016] analyzed a *half-sample* holdout. The authors conjectured that a
 60 leave-one-out approach, which makes more efficient use of the data, may have
 61 better performance. Also, the analysis in Ramdas et al. [2016] is asymptotic.
 62 This eschews the discrete nature of the accuracy statistic, which will be
 63 shown to have crucial impact. Since typical sample sizes in neuroscience are
 64 not large, we seek to study which test is to be preferred in finite samples?

¹GoogleScholar. Accessed on Aug 4, 2016.

Our conclusion will be quite simple: *location tests almost always have more power than accuracy tests.*

The main argument for our statement rests upon the observation that with typical sample sizes, the accuracy test statistic is highly discrete. Discrete test statistics are known to be conservative [Hemerik and Goeman, 2014], since they are insensitive to mild perturbations of the data, and they cannot exhaust the permissible false positive rate. The degree of discretization is governed by the number of samples. In our neuroscience example from Gilron et al. [2016], 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 subjects, or the number of trial-repeats in an neuroimaging study.

The discretization effect is aggravated if the test statistic is highly concentrated. For an intuition consider the usage of a the *resubstitution accuracy* as a test statistic. This statistic simply means that the accuracy is not cross validated. If the data is high dimensional, the resubstitution accuracy will be very high due to over fitting. In a very high dimensional model, the resubstitution accuracy will be 1 for the observed data [McLachlan, 1976, Theorem 1], but also for any permutation. The concentration of resubstitution accuracy near 1, and its discreteness, render this test completely useless, with a power tending to 0 as the dimension of the model grows.

To compare the power of accuracy tests and location tests in finite samples, we perform a simulation study of a battery of test statistics. The main findings are reported in Sections 4 and 5, and the intuition for our findings is provided in Section 6, but first, the problem’s setup.

2 Problem setup

Let $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ be a class encoding. Let $x \in \mathcal{X}$ be a p dimensional feature vector. In our vocal/non-vocal example we have $\mathcal{Y} = \{-1, 1\}$ and p , the number of voxels in a brain region so that $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^{27}$.

Given n pairs of (x_i, y_i) , typically assumed i.i.d., a location test amounts to testing whether $x|y = 1$ has the the same distribution as $x|y = -1$. I.e., we test if the multivariate voxel activation pattern has the same distribution when given a vocal stimulus, as when given a non-vocal stimulus. An accuracy test amounts to learning a predictive model $\hat{f}(x)$ from some assumed model class $\hat{f} \in \mathcal{F}$. The prediction accuracy, denoted $\mathcal{E}_{\hat{f}}$, is defined as the probability of a given classifier \hat{f} of making a correct prediction. Denoting by $I(A)$ the indicator function of the event A , we have $\mathcal{E}_{\hat{f}} := \mathbf{E} \left[I(\hat{f}(x) = y) \right]$

when given a randomly drawn data point, (x, y) . A statistically significant “better than chance” estimate of $\mathcal{E}_{\hat{f}}$ is evidence that the classes are distinct.

2.1 Candidate Tests

The design of a permutation test using the prediction accuracy, requires the following design choices:

1. How to estimate accuracy?
2. Is the statistic cross validated or not?
3. For a K-fold cross validated test statistic: should the data be refolded in each permutation?
4. Permute labels of features?
5. For a K-fold cross validated test statistic: should the data folding be balanced (a.k.a. stratified)?
6. How many folds?

We will now address these questions while bearing in mind that unlike the typical supervised learning setup, we are not interested in an unbiased estimate of the prediction error, but rather in the mere detection of a difference between two groups.

How to estimate accuracy? Given a predictor \hat{f} , a natural test statistic is some estimate of its accuracy $\mathcal{E}_{\hat{f}}$. Complicating matters: very low accuracies, even 0, is evidence that the classes are separated, and we only need to invert the predictions. We can thus consider $|\mathcal{E}_{\hat{f}} - 0.5|$ as the test statistic. This, however, implies that if the classes are identical, random guessing has 0.5 accuracy. This is not true if the classes are not balanced. For unbalanced data the accuracy chance level is the probability of the majority class, we denote by \hat{p}_{max} [Golland et al., 2005, Sec 4.1]. This suggests the following test statistic $|\mathcal{E}_{\hat{f}} - \hat{p}_{max}|$. Since we will be aggregating these statistics over random data sets where \hat{p}_{max} may vary, it seems appropriate to standardize the scale of this statistic. We thus also consider the z-scored accuracy: $|\mathcal{E}_{\hat{f}} - \hat{p}_{max}| / \sqrt{\hat{p}_{max}(1 - \hat{p}_{max})}$.

131 **Cross validate or not?** Were we interested in an unbiased estimator of
132 the prediction error, there is no question that some independent validation
133 is in order. Since we are merely interested in detecting a difference between
134 classes, a biased error estimate is not an issue provided that bias is consistent
135 over all permutations. The underlying intuition is that if the exact same
136 computation is performed over all permutations, then a permutation test
137 will be “fair”, i.e., will not inflate the false positive rate. We will thus be
138 considering both cross validated accuracies, and resubstitution accuracies as
139 our test statistics, a.k.a. *resubstitution classification*.

140 **Refolding?** The standard practice in neuroimaging is to refold the data
141 after each permutation [Pereira et al., 2009]. This is imperative if permuting
142 labels while aiming at balanced data folds. This is not, however, imperative
143 in general. For simplicity, we will adhere to the standard practice of refolding
144 the data within each permutation.

145 **Permute labels of features?** While seemingly identical, the compound-
146 ing of permutations with data foldings renders these two approaches distinct.
147 As an example, consider balanced (stratified) K-fold cross validation where
148 the initial data folding is balanced. After a label permutation, the original
149 folds will probably not be balanced. If the *features* are permuted, then the
150 labels conserve their original fold assignments, and the original folds are bal-
151 anced after each permutation. Since we only report results while refolding
152 the data in each permutation, then the only difference between permuting
153 labels and permuting features seems to be a computational one. We thus
154 adhere to the more common, albeit computationally less efficient practice of
155 permuting labels.

156 **Balanced folding?** As already implied, a standard practice when cross
157 validating is to constrain the data folds to be balanced (i.e. stratified) [e.g.
158 Ojala and Garriga, 2010]. This is well justified when aiming at unbiased accu-
159 racy estimation. This also simplifies matter when aiming at signal detection,
160 as can be seen from the above discussion of the appropriate test statistic. On
161 the other hand, it may complicate matters, as can be seen from the above
162 discussion on label versus feature permutation. We will report results with
163 both balanced and unbalanced data foldings, only to discover, it does not
164 really matter.

165 **How many folds?** Different authors suggest different rules for the num-
166 ber of folds. We will be varying the number of folds. This will affect the

concentration of permutation distribution of the estimated accuracy, which will have a crucial effect on the conservativeness of the accuracy test. Our intuition suggests that since more folds imply a less concentrated estimate, then leave-one-out should be the less conservative, and 2-fold should be the most conservative.

The of tests we will be comparing is collected for convenience in Table 1.

Name	Basis	CV	Accuracy	Parameters
Hotelling	Hotelling	—	—	shrink=FALSE
Hotelling.shrink	Hotelling	—	—	shrink=TRUE
lda.CV.1	LDA	TRUE	accuracy	—
lda.CV.2	LDA	TRUE	z-accuracy	—
lda.noCV.1	LDA	FALSE	accuracy	—
lda.noCV.2	LDA	FALSE	z-accuracy	—
sd	SD	—	—	—
svm.CV.1	SVM	TRUE	accuracy	cost=1e1
svm.CV.2	SVM	TRUE	accuracy	cost=1e-1
svm.CV.3	SVM	TRUE	z-accuracy	cost=1e1
svm.CV.4	SVM	TRUE	z-accuracy	cost=1e-1
svm.noCV.1	SVM	FALSE	accuracy	cost=1e1
svm.noCV.2	SVM	FALSE	accuracy	cost=1e-1
svm.noCV.3	SVM	FALSE	z-accuracy	cost=1e1
svm.noCV.4	SVM	FALSE	z-accuracy	cost=1e-1

Table 1: This table enumerates the various test statistics we will be studying. Three are location tests: Hotelling, Hotelling.shrink, and sd. *Hotelling* is the classical two-group T^2 statistic. *Hotelling.shrink* is a high dimensional version with the regularized covariance in Schäfer and Strimmer [2005]. *sd* is another high dimensional version of the T^2 , from Srivastava et al. [2013]. The rest of the tests are variations of the linear SVM, and Fisher’s LDA, with varying accuracy measures, cross validated or not, and varying tuning parameters. For example, *svm.CV.4* is a linear SVM, with *libsvm*’s cost parameter set at 0.1, using the cross validated z-scored accuracy $(|\mathcal{E}_{\hat{f}} - \hat{p}_{max}| / \sqrt{\hat{p}_{max}(1 - \hat{p}_{max})})$, see Section 2.1). Another example is *lda.noCV.1*, which is Fisher’s LDA, returning the resubstitution accuracy, without cross validation, and without z-scoring.

173

3 Controlling the False Positive Rate


174

Figure 1 demonstrates that all of the tests considered conserve the desired 0.05 false positive rate, up to varying levels of conservatism. This can be seen from the fact that the probability of rejection is no larger than 0.05 in

177

the absence of any effect, encoded by a red circle. This is true, in particular if: (a) the folds are balanced or not, (b) the tuning parameters of some test statistic are varied, (d) the number of folds is varied. We also observe that the most conservative tests are the resubstitution accuracy measures. We return to this matter in the Discussion.

Figure 1: The power of a permutation test with various test statistics. The power on the x axis. Effect are color and shape coded. The various statistics on the y axis. Their details are given in Table 1. Effects vary over 0 (red circle), 0.25 (green triangle), and 0.5 (blue square). Simulation details in Appendix B. Cross-validation was performed with balanced (stratified) and unbalanced data folding. See sub-captions.



4 Power

Having established that all of the tests in our battery control the false positive rate, it remains to be seen if they have similar power— especially when comparing the power of location tests to accuracy tests. From the simulation results reported in Appendix C we collect the following insights:

1. Location tests have more power than accuracy tests in all our configurations.

- 190 2. The conservativeness decays as the sample grows (Figures 8a, 8b and
191 9a), suggesting that concentration and/or discretization is responsible
192 for power loss.
- 193 3. The power may increase or decrease with the number of folds (Figure 5).
- 194 4. The z-scoring of the accuracies was introduced to deal with unbalanced
195 foldings. If the z-scoring has any effect at all, it merely kills power.
196 There is really no reason to use it.
- 197 5. Both accuracy and location tests are inappropriate for scale alternatives
198 (Figure 7a). This was to be expected and is reported mostly as a sanity
199 check.
- 200 6. The presence of heavy tails (Figure 7b) may reduce power, but does
201 not quantitatively change results.
- 202 7. Balanced folding typically has no effect. It increased power only for
203 the z-scored statistics (Figure 1). This is surprising given they were
204 precisely designed to deal with the presence of imbalance.
- 205 8. Varying the accuracy test's tuning parameter, such as the cost (i.e.
206 margins) has no effect on the power of the test.
- 207 9. Correlation between coordinates, mimicking temporal correlation in
208 fMRI data, has no effect on conclusions, since all test statistics account
209 for this correlation (Figure 9b).

210 The major insight from simulations is that the use of accuracy tests for
211 signal detection is underpowered compared to location tests. We now verify
212 this finding on a neuroimaging dataset.

213 5 Neuroimaging Example


214 Figure 2 is an application of both a location and an accuracy test to the data
215 of Pernet et al. [2015]. The authors of Pernet et al. [2015] collected fMRI
216 data while subjects were exposed to the sounds of human speech (vocal),
217 and other non-vocal sounds. Each subject was exposed to 20 sounds of each
218 type, totaling in $n = 40$ trials in each scan. The study was rather large and
219 consisted of about 200 subjects. The data was kindly made available by the
220 authors at the OpenfMRI website².

²<https://openfmri.org/>

221 We perform group inference using within-subject permutations using the
 222 pipeline of Stelzer et al. [2013], which was also reported in Gilron et al. [2016].
 223 For completeness, the pipeline is described in Appendix A. To demonstrate
 224 our point, we compare the *sd* location test with the *svm.cv.1* accuracy test
 225 (see Table 1 for the definition of these statistics).

226 In agreement with our simulation results, the location test (*sd*) discovers
 227 more brain regions when compared to an accuracy test (*svm.cv.1*). The
 228 former discovers 1,232 regions, while the latter only 441, as depicted in
 229 Figure 2. We emphasize that both test statistics were compared with the
 230 same permutation scheme, and the same error controls, so that any difference
 231 in detections is due to their different power.

232 Having established that accuracy tests are underpowered both in simula-
 233 tion and in application, we wish to identify the conditions under which this
 234 will occur, and discuss implications on the practice of accuracy tests.



*Figure 2: Brain regions encoding information discriminating between vocal and non-vocal stimuli. Map reports the centers of 27-voxel sized spherical regions, as discovered by an accuracy test (*svm.cv.1*), and a location test (*sd*). *svm.cv.1* was computed using 5-fold cross validation, and a cost parameter of 1. Region-wise significance was determined using the permutation scheme of Stelzer et al. [2013], followed by region-wise $FDR \leq 0.05$ control using the Benjamini-Hochberg procedure [Benjamini and Hochberg, 1995]. Number of permutations equals 400. The location test detect 1,232 regions, and the accuracy test 441, 399 of which are common to both. For the details of the analysis see Appendix A and Gilron et al. [2016].*

235 6 Discussion

236 We have set out to understand which of the tests is more powerful: the ac-
237 curacy test or the location test. Using simulations, we have concluded that
238 the location tests are preferable. Their high dimensional versions such as
239 Srivastava [2013] and Schäfer and Strimmer [2005] are preferable for typical
240 neuroimaging problems such as MVPA. We attribute this to several phe-
241 nomena: (a) Discretization introduced in finite samples by the accuracy test
242 statistic. (b) Inefficient use of the data for the validation holdout set. In our
243 high dimensional setup, we also confirmed that high-dimensional versions of
244 the T^2 test, such as Srivastava [2013] or Schäfer and Strimmer [2005] are
245 preferable over the original T^2 .

246 The insensitivity of the power to the number of folds suggests that most
247 of the power is lost due to the discretization and not to the holdouts size. The
248 degree of discretization is governed by the sample size. For this reason, an
249 asymptotic analysis such as Ramdas et al. [2016] may uncover the holdout
250 inefficiency, but will not uncover the discretization effect. The practical ad-
251 vice for the practitioner, is that for the purpose of signal detection, there
252 is typically a multivariate test (be it a location test or other), that is more
253 powerful than an accuracy test. There is also a good chance that it would
254 be easier to implement, since no cross validation will be involved.

255 6.1 Ease of implementation

256 A very important consideration is the ease of implementation. The need for
257 cross validation of the accuracy test greatly increases its computational com-
258 plexity. Moreover, anyone who has actually implemented tests with discrete
259 statistics, will attest they are more prone to programming errors. This is
260 because their unforgiveness to the type of inequalities used. Indeed, mistak-
261 enly replacing a weak inequality with a strong inequality in one's program
262 may considerably change the results. This is not the case for continuous test
263 statistics.

264 6.2 A good accuracy test

265 In Section 6.6 we discuss cases where an accuracy test cannot replace a
266 location test. For such cases we collect some conclusions from our simulations
267 on the best practices for accuracy tests.

- 268 1. The conservativeness of accuracy tests decrease with sample size.

- 269 2. Cross validating has more power than resubstitution. The power loss
270 due to the smaller samples when cross validating, is smaller than the
271 power loss due to the concentration of the resubstitution statistic (Fig-
272 ure 8).
- 273 The power loss due to the holdout inefficiency is smaller than the power
274 loss due to the concentration of the resubstitution accuracy. For large
275 sample sizes, discretization and concentration have weaker effects, and
276 the cross validated accuracy may be replaced with the computationally
277 more efficiency resubstitution accuracy.
- 278 3. Permuting features is easier than permuting labels. It allows to preserve
279 balanced folds after a permutation without refolding, thus reducing
280 computational complexity.
- 281 4. There is no gain in z-scoring the accuracy scores.
- 282 5. Cross validated accuracy with balanced folds has more power than un-
283 balanced folds. We currently have no intuition to offer for this phe-
284 nomenon.
- 285 6. It is unclear what is the effect of the number of folds. More folds in-
286 crease power by reducing the number of holdout samples. On the other
287 hand, it increases the concentration of the accuracy statistic. Com-
288 pounded with the discreteness of the accuracy statistic, this decreases
289 power.
- 290 7. The value of the tuning parameters of a classifier have little to no
291 effect.

292 6.3 Smoothing accuracy estimates

293 It may be possible to alleviate the effect of discretization by appropriate cross-
294 validation. The discreteness of the accuracy statistic can be “smoothed” by
295 allowing the test sample to be drawn with replacement. The *bootstrap* may
296 seem like a candidate approach, but since the original data always serves as
297 a test set, the accuracy can still only assume $1/n$ values. This is not the case,
298 however, for the *leave-one-out bootstrap estimator* (B-LOO) and the *0.632*
299 *bootstrap estimator* (B-0.632) [Hastie et al., 2003, Sec 7.11], which we define
300 below for completeness. By the same rational, the degree of conservatism
301 should decrease with the number of bootstrap samples.

Definition 1 (B-LOO). Denoting by $C^{(i)}$ the index set of bootstrap samples, b , where observation i is not in the train set, *leave-one-out bootstrap* estimate is defined as:

$$\mathcal{E}_{BLOO} := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{|C^{(i)}|} \sum_{b \in C^{(i)}} I(\hat{f}^b(x_i) = y_i).$$

Equivalently, denoting by $S^{(b)}$ the indexes of observations, i , that are not in the bootstrap train sample b ,

$$\mathcal{E}_{BLOO} := \frac{1}{B} \sum_{b=1}^B \frac{1}{|S^{(b)}|} \sum_{i \in S^{(b)}} I(\hat{f}^b(x_i) = y_i).$$

Definition 2 (B-0.632). Denoting by \mathcal{E}_{resub} the resubstitution accuracy estimate, the B-0.632 accuracy estimator, $\mathcal{E}_{0.632}$, is defined as

$$\mathcal{E}_{0.632} := 0.368 \mathcal{E}_{resub} + 0.632 \mathcal{E}_{BLOO}.$$

302 The simulation results reported in Figure 3, with naming conventions in
 303 Table 2. It can be seen that selecting test sets with replacement does increase
 304 the power, when compared to V-fold cross validation, but still falls short from
 305 the power of location tests. It can also be seen that power increases with the
 306 number of Bootstrap replications, itself reducing the level of discretization.
 307 The type of Bootstrap, B-LOO versus B-0.632, does not change the power.
 308 Again, consistent with the observation that it is discretization that drives
 309 the power loss.

Name	Basis	Boot Type	B	Accuracy	Parameters
lda.Boot.1	LDA	B-0.632	10	accuracy	–
lda.Boot.2	LDA	B-LOO	10	accuracy	–
svm.Boot.1	SVM	B-0.632	10	accuracy	cost=1e1
svm.Boot.2	SVM	B-LOO	10	accuracy	cost=1e1
svm.Boot.3	SVM	B-0.632	50	accuracy	cost=1e1
svm.Boot.4	SVM	B-LOO	50	accuracy	cost=1e1

Table 2: The same as Table 1 for bootstrapped accuracy estimates. B-LOO and B-0.632 are defined in definitions 1 and 2 respectively. B denotes the number of Bootstrap samples.

310




Figure 3: *Bootstrap: The power of a permutation test with various test statistics. The power on the x axis. Effect are color and shape coded. The various statistics on the y axis. Their details are given in tables 1 and 2. Effects vary over 0 (red circle), 0.25 (green triangle), and 0.5 (blue square). Simulation details in Appendix B.*

311 6.4 High dimensional classifiers

312 It is known that when $p > n$ Hotelling's T^2 , and Fisher's LDA are not
313 computable. In our simulations, in which $p = 23$ and $n = 40$ is "almost"
314 high dimensional, but still allows to compute both tests. We have simulated
315 two high dimensional versions of Hotelling's T^2 : *sd* [Srivastava, 2013] and
316 *Hotelling.shrink* [Schäfer and Strimmer, 2005]. The former solves the dimen-
317 sionality problem by assuming independence over coordinates, and the latter
318 by Tikhonov regularization of the covariance, a-la ridge regression. The cor-
319 responding high dimensional accuracy tests would be a *naïve Bayes* classifier,
320 and l_2 regularized SVM [Ramdas et al., 2016]. We conjecture that they would

not alter our conclusions, since the main force driving the conservatism is discretization, which they do not solve.

6.5 Related Literature

Olivetti et al. [2012] and Olivetti et al. [2014] looked into the problem of choosing a good accuracy test. They propose a new test they call an *independence test*, and demonstrate by simulation that it has more power than other accuracy tests, and can deal with non-balanced data sets. We did not include this test in the battery we compared, but we note the following: (a) The independence test of Olivetti et al. [2012] relies on a discrete test statistic. This means that in the cases that the accuracy test is called upon for discriminating populations, it will probably be underpowered compared to location tests. (b) In contrast with the underlying motivation of Olivetti et al. [2012]’s independence test, we did not find that balancing the data folds is crucial for an accuracy test.

Golland et al. [2005] study accuracy tests using simulation, neuroimaging data, genetic data, and analytically. Their analytic results formalize our intuition from Section 1 on the effect of concentration of the accuracy statistic: The finite Vapnik–Chervonenkis (VC) dimension requirement [Golland and Fischl, 2003, Sec 4.3] prevents the permutation p-value from (asymptotically) concentrating. They also find that the power decreases with the level of discretization of the statistic. This is seen in their Figure 4, where the size of the test-set, K , governs the discretization. Since they permute features, and not labels, then all their permutation samples are balanced, and there is no issue of refolding.

Golland et al. [2005] simulate the power of an accuracy test using a multivariate Gaussian mixture, with a parameter p governing the separation between classes. Under their model $(x_i|y_i = 1) \sim p\mathcal{N}(\mu_1, I) + (1 - p)\mathcal{N}(\mu_2, I)$ and $(x_i|y_i = -1) \sim (1 - p)\mathcal{N}(\mu_1, I) + p\mathcal{N}(\mu_2, I)$. Varying p interpolates between the null distribution ($p = 0.5$) and a location shift model ($p = 0$). We perform the same simulation as Golland et al. [2005], after reparametrizing p so that $p = 0$ corresponds to the null model, and $p = 23$ to be comparable to our other simulations. We find that in this mixture class of models, like the location class of models, a location test has more power than an accuracy test (Figure 4).

6.6 Reservations

Some reservations to the generality of our findings are in order. Firstly, not all accuracy tests are concerned with signal detection. Consider brain




Figure 4: **Mixture:** $\mathbf{x}_i = \chi_i \mu + \eta_i$; $\chi_i = \{-1, 1\}$ and $\text{Prob}(\chi_i = 1) = (1/2 - p)^{y_i^*} (1/2 + p)^{1 - y_i^*}$. μ is a p -vector with $3/\sqrt{p}$ in all coordinates. The effect, p , is color and shape coded and varies over 0 (red circle), $1/4$ (green triangle) and $1/2$ (blue square).

358 decoding for machine interfaces, and clinical diagnosis, where the presence
 359 of a medical condition is predicted from imaging data [e.g. Olivetti et al.,
 360 2012, Wager et al., 2013]. In those examples, the purpose of the test is not
 361 to detect a difference between classes, but to actually test the performance
 362 of a particular classifier. As put by Ojala and Garriga [2010]:

363 ...these tests study whether the classifier is using the described
 364 properties and not whether the plain data contain such properties.
 365 For studying the characteristics of a population represented by
 366 the data, standard statistical test could be used.

367 This is because classification is harder than detection. We may be able
 368 to detect a difference between classes, but not be able to classify examples
 369 significantly better than chance.

370 Secondly, it may be argued that accuracy tests permits the separation
 371 between classes in high dimensions, such as in *reproducing kernel Hilbert*
 372 *spaces* (RKHS) by using non-linear predictors. This is a false argument—
 373 accuracy test do not have any more flexibility than location tests. Indeed, it
 374 is possible to test for location in the same dimension the classifier is learned.
 375 Gretton et al. [2012] is an example where the test for location is performed
 376 in the RKHS of the data. It is also possible to test for the equality of two
 377 multivariate distributions without specifying any a-priori alternative [e.g. ?]).
 378 On the other hand, based on our reported neuroimaging example, and others,
 379 we find that a location test in the original feature space is indeed a simple
 380 and powerful approach to signal detection.

381 6.7 Epilogue

382 Given all the above, we find the popularity of accuracy tests quite puzzling.
 383 We believe this is due to a reversal of the inference cascade. Researchers
 384 first fit a classifier, and then ask if the classes are any different. Were they
 385 to start by asking if classes are any different, and only then try to classify,
 386 then location tests would naturally arise as the preferred method. As put by
 387 Ramdas et al. [2016]:

388 The recent popularity of machine learning has resulted in the ex-
 389 tensive teaching and use of prediction in theoretical and applied
 390 communities and the relative lack of awareness or popularity of
 391 the topic of Neyman-Pearson style hypothesis testing in the com-
 392 puter science and related “data science” communities.

393 And more simply by Frank Harrell in the **CrossValidated** Q&A site³:

394 ... your use of proportion classified correctly as your accuracy
 395 score. This is a discontinuous improper scoring rule that can be
 396 easily manipulated because it is arbitrary and insensitive.

397 7 Acknowledgments

³[http://stats.stackexchange.com/questions/17408/
 how-to-assess-statistical-significance-of-the-accuracy-of-a-classifier](http://stats.stackexchange.com/questions/17408/how-to-assess-statistical-significance-of-the-accuracy-of-a-classifier).

References

- T. W. Anderson. *An Introduction to Multivariate Statistical Analysis*. Wiley-Interscience, Hoboken, NJ, 3 edition edition, July 2003. ISBN 978-0-471-36091-9.
- Y. Benjamini and Y. Hochberg. Controlling the false discovery rate: a practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. *JOURNAL-ROYAL STATISTICAL SOCIETY SERIES B*, 57:289–289, 1995.
- R. Gilron, J. Rosenblatt, O. Koyejo, R. A. Poldrack, and R. Mukamel. Quantifying spatial pattern similarity in multivariate analysis using functional anisotropy. *arXiv:1605.03482 [q-bio]*, May 2016.
- P. Golland and B. Fischl. Permutation tests for classification: towards statistical significance in image-based studies. In *IPMI*, volume 3, pages 330–341. Springer, 2003.
- P. Golland, F. Liang, S. Mukherjee, and D. Panchenko. Permutation Tests for Classification. In P. Auer and R. Meir, editors, *Learning Theory*, number 3559 in Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pages 501–515. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, June 2005. ISBN 978-3-540-26556-6 978-3-540-31892-7. doi: 10.1007/11503415_34.
- T. R. Golub, D. K. Slonim, P. Tamayo, C. Huard, M. Gaasenbeek, J. P. Mesirov, H. Coller, M. L. Loh, J. R. Downing, M. A. Caligiuri, C. D. Bloomfield, and E. S. Lander. Molecular Classification of Cancer: Class Discovery and Class Prediction by Gene Expression Monitoring. *Science*, 286(5439):531–537, Oct. 1999. ISSN 0036-8075, 1095-9203. doi: 10.1126/science.286.5439.531.
- A. Gretton, K. M. Borgwardt, M. J. Rasch, B. Schölkopf, and A. Smola. A Kernel Two-sample Test. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 13:723–773, Mar. 2012. ISSN 1532-4435.
- T. Hastie, R. Tibshirani, and J. Friedman. *The Elements of Statistical Learning*. Springer, July 2003. ISBN 0-387-95284-5.
- J. Hemerik and J. Goeman. Exact testing with random permutations. *arXiv:1411.7565 [math, stat]*, Nov. 2014.
- H. Hotelling. The Generalization of Student’s Ratio. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 2(3):360–378, Aug. 1931. ISSN 0003-4851, 2168-8990. doi: 10.1214/aoms/1177732979.

- 432 W. Jiang, S. Varma, and R. Simon. Calculating confidence intervals for
433 prediction error in microarray classification using resampling. *Statistical*
434 *Applications in Genetics and Molecular Biology*, 7(1), 2008.
- 435 L. Juan and H. Iba. Prediction of tumor outcome based on gene expression
436 data. *Wuhan University Journal of Natural Sciences*, 9(2):177–182, Mar.
437 2004. ISSN 1007-1202, 1993-4998. doi: 10.1007/BF02830598.
- 438 N. Kriegeskorte, R. Goebel, and P. Bandettini. Information-based functional
439 brain mapping. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the*
440 *United States of America*, 103(10):3863–3868, July 2006. ISSN 0027-8424,
441 1091-6490. doi: 10.1073/pnas.0600244103.
- 442 E. L. Lehmann. Parametric versus nonparametrics: two alternative method-
443 ologies. *Journal of Nonparametric Statistics*, 21(4):397–405, 2009. ISSN
444 1048-5252. doi: 10.1080/10485250902842727.
- 445 G. J. McLachlan. The bias of the apparent error rate in discriminant analysis.
446 *Biometrika*, 63(2):239–244, Jan. 1976. ISSN 0006-3444, 1464-3510. doi:
447 10.1093/biomet/63.2.239.
- 448 S. Mukherjee, P. Tamayo, S. Rogers, R. Rifkin, A. Engle, C. Campbell,
449 T. R. Golub, and J. P. Mesirov. Estimating dataset size requirements
450 for classifying DNA microarray data. *Journal of Computational Biology:*
451 *A Journal of Computational Molecular Cell Biology*, 10(2):119–142, 2003.
452 ISSN 1066-5277. doi: 10.1089/106652703321825928.
- 453 M. Ojala and G. C. Garriga. Permutation Tests for Studying Classifier Perfor-
454 mance. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 11(Jun):1833–1863, 2010.
455 ISSN 1533-7928.
- 456 E. Olivetti, S. Greiner, and P. Avesani. Induction in Neuroscience with
457 Classification: Issues and Solutions. In G. Langs, I. Rish, M. Grosse-
458 Wentrup, and B. Murphy, editors, *Machine Learning and Interpretation*
459 *in Neuroimaging*, number 7263 in Lecture Notes in Computer Science,
460 pages 42–50. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2012. ISBN 978-3-642-34712-2
461 978-3-642-34713-9. doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-34713-9_6.
- 462 E. Olivetti, S. Greiner, and P. Avesani. Statistical independence for the
463 evaluation of classifier-based diagnosis. *Brain Informatics*, 2(1):13–19, Dec.
464 2014. ISSN 2198-4018, 2198-4026. doi: 10.1007/s40708-014-0007-6.

- 465 F. Pereira, T. Mitchell, and M. Botvinick. Machine learning classifiers and
466 fMRI: A tutorial overview. *NeuroImage*, 45(1, Supplement 1):S199–S209,
467 Mar. 2009. ISSN 1053-8119. doi: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2008.11.007.
- 468 C. R. Pernet, P. McAleer, M. Latinus, K. J. Gorgolewski, I. Charest, P. E. G.
469 Bestelmeyer, R. H. Watson, D. Fleming, F. Crabbe, M. Valdes-Sosa, and
470 P. Belin. The human voice areas: Spatial organization and inter-individual
471 variability in temporal and extra-temporal cortices. *NeuroImage*, 119:164–
472 174, Oct. 2015. ISSN 1053-8119. doi: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2015.06.050.
- 473 M. D. Radmacher, L. M. McShane, and R. Simon. A Paradigm for
474 Class Prediction Using Gene Expression Profiles. *Journal of Computa-
475 tional Biology*, 9(3):505–511, June 2002. ISSN 1066-5277. doi: 10.1089/
476 106652702760138592.
- 477 A. Ramdas, A. Singh, and L. Wasserman. Classification Accuracy as a Proxy
478 for Two Sample Testing. *arXiv:1602.02210 [cs, math, stat]*, Feb. 2016.
- 479 J. Schäfer and K. Strimmer. A Shrinkage Approach to Large-Scale Covariance
480 Matrix Estimation and Implications for Functional Genomics. *Statistical
481 Applications in Genetics and Molecular Biology*, 4(1), Jan. 2005. ISSN
482 1544-6115. doi: 10.2202/1544-6115.1175.
- 483 D. K. Slonim, P. Tamayo, J. P. Mesirov, T. R. Golub, and E. S. Lander. Class
484 Prediction and Discovery Using Gene Expression Data. In *Proceedings of
485 the Fourth Annual International Conference on Computational Molecular
486 Biology*, RECOMB ’00, pages 263–272, New York, NY, USA, 2000. ACM.
487 ISBN 978-1-58113-186-4. doi: 10.1145/332306.332564.
- 488 M. S. Srivastava. On testing the equality of mean vectors in high dimension.
489 *Acta et Commentationes Universitatis Tartuensis de Mathematica*, 17(1):
490 31–56, June 2013. ISSN 2228-4699. doi: 10.12697/ACUTM.2013.17.03.
- 491 M. S. Srivastava, S. Katayama, and Y. Kano. A two sample test in high
492 dimensional data. *Journal of Multivariate Analysis*, 114:349–358, Feb.
493 2013. ISSN 0047-259X. doi: 10.1016/j.jmva.2012.08.014.
- 494 J. Stelzer, Y. Chen, and R. Turner. Statistical inference and multiple test-
495 ing correction in classification-based multi-voxel pattern analysis (MVPA):
496 Random permutations and cluster size control. *NeuroImage*, 65:69–82, Jan.
497 2013. ISSN 1053-8119. doi: 10.1016/j.neuroimage.2012.09.063.

- 498 A. W. van der Vaart. *Asymptotic Statistics*. Cambridge University Press,
499 Cambridge, UK ; New York, NY, USA, Oct. 1998. ISBN 978-0-521-49603-
500 2.
- 501 G. Varoquaux, P. R. Raamana, D. Engemann, A. Hoyos-Idrobo, Y. Schwartz,
502 and B. Thirion. Assessing and tuning brain decoders: cross-validation,
503 caveats, and guidelines. working paper or preprint, June 2016.
- 504 T. D. Wager, L. Y. Atlas, M. A. Lindquist, M. Roy, C.-W. Woo, and E. Kross.
505 An fMRI-Based Neurologic Signature of Physical Pain. *New England Jour-*
506 *nal of Medicine*, 368(15):1388–1397, Apr. 2013. ISSN 0028-4793. doi:
507 10.1056/NEJMoa1204471.

508 A Analysis pipeline

509 Here is the analysis pipeline of Stelzer et al. [2013] we for the auditory data in
 510 Gilron et al. [2016]. Denoting by $i = 1, \dots, I$ the subject index, $v = 1, \dots, V$
 511 the voxel index, and $s = 1, \dots, S$ the permutation index. Since regions⁴ are
 512 centered around a unique voxel, the voxel index v also serves as a unique
 513 region index. Algorithm 1 computes a region-wise test statistic, which is
 514 compared to its permutation null distribution computed by Algorithm 2.

Algorithm 1: Compute a group parametric map.

Data: fMRI scans, and experimental design.
Result: Brain map of group statistics: $\{\bar{T}_v\}_{v=1}^V$

```

1 for  $v \in 1, \dots, V$  do
2   for  $i \in 1, \dots, I$  do
3      $T_{i,v} \leftarrow$  test statistic for subject  $i$  in a region centered at  $v$ .
4    $\bar{T}_v \leftarrow \frac{1}{I} \sum_{i=1}^I T_{i,v}$ .
```

Algorithm 2: Compute a permutation p-value map.

Data: fMRI scans of 20 subjects, experimental design.
Result: Brain map of permutation p-values: $\{p_v\}_{v=1}^V$

```

1 for  $s \in 1, \dots, S$  do
2   permute labels;
3    $\bar{T}_v^s \leftarrow$  parametric map
```

⁴*searchlight* or *sphere* in the MVPA parlance

517 B Simulation Details

518 The following details are common to all the reported simulations, unless stated
519 otherwise in a figure’s caption. The R code for the simulations can be found
520 in [TODO].

521 Each simulation is based on 4,000 replications. In each replication, we
522 generate n i.i.d. samples from a shift model $\mathbf{x}_i = \mu \mathbf{y}_i^* + \eta_i$. Where $y_i^* = \{0, 1\}$
523 is the class of subject i in dummy coding. Recalling that $y_i = \{-1, 1\}$ is the
524 class in effect coding, then clearly $y_i = 2y_i^* - 1$. The noise is distributed as
525 $\eta_i \sim \mathcal{N}_p(0, \Sigma)$. The sample size $n = 40$. The dimension of the data is $p = 23$.
526 The covariance $\Sigma = I$. Effects, i.e. shifts μ , are equal coordinate p -vectors
527 with coordinates that vary over $\mu \in \{0, 1/4, 1/2\}$.

528 Having generated the data, we compute each of the test statistics in Ta-
529 ble 1. For test statistics that require data folding, we used 8 folds. We then
530 compute a permutation p-value by permuting the class labels, and recomput-
531 ing each test statistic. We perform 400 such permutations. We then reject
532 the $\mu_i = 0$ null hypothesis if the permutation p-value is smaller than 0.05.
533 The reported power is the proportion of replication where the permutation
534 p-value falls below 0.05.

C Simulation Results

Figure 5: *Simulation details in Appendix B except the changes in the sub-captions.*



(a) 2-fold cross validation.
Balanced folding.



(b) 20-fold cross validation.
Balanced folding

Figure 6: *Simulation details in Appendix B except the changes in the sub-captions.*






Figure 7: *Simulation details in Appendix B except the changes in the sub-captions.*



Figure 8: *Simulation details in Appendix B except the changes in the sub-captions.*




(a) **Low-Dimension:** False positive rates for $n = 40$.




(b) **High-Dimension:** False positive rates for $n = 400$.

Figure 9: *Simulation details in Appendix B except the changes in the sub-captions.*



(a) **High-Dimension, local alternative:**
 $n = 400$,
 $\mu \in \frac{1}{\sqrt{10}} \times \{0, 1/4, 1/2\}$.



(b) **AR(1) dependence:**
 $\Sigma_{k,l} = \rho^{|k-l|}; \rho = 0.8$.