Performance Measures

Matthew Engelhard

Goals

- Understand and calculate common performance measures for binary classification
- Contextualize performance against that of a *no information* classifier
- Recognize that *good* performance depends on existing alternatives
- Match clinical scenarios to performance measures important in that scenario

Back to cancer prediction. Suppose our features are highly informative. What might our model's predictions look like?



Back to cancer prediction. Suppose our features are highly informative. What might our model's predictions look like?



Back to cancer prediction. Suppose our features are highly informative. What might our model's predictions look like?




below threshold: predict negative
above threshold: predict cancer positive
Benign
(NEGATIVES)
Malignant
(POSITIVES)
0.0
0.2
0.4
0.6
0.8
1.0
Predicted Probability of Malignancy


below threshold: predict negative
above threshold: predict cancer positive
TRUE NEGATIVES
FALSE POSITIVES
FALSE NEGATIVES
TRUE POSITIVES
Benign
(NEGATIVES)
Malignant
(POSITIVES)
0.0
0.2
0.4
0.6
0.8
1.0
Predicted Probability of Malignancy

Receiver Operating Characteristic Curve

- Illustrates the tradeoff between the true positive rate (i.e., sensitivity) and the false positive rate (i.e., 1– specificity) as we vary the threshold.
- The area under this curve (AUC) provides a single summarizing this tradeoff.
- Note that to get the sensitivity versus specificity curve, we simply rotate the ROC curve clockwise by 90 degrees. The areas under the two curves are the same.



So, what's a *good* AUC value?
(i.e., *good* performance)?

We'll start to answer this question by taking a look at *bad* performance.

Suppose our features contain *no information* about the label. What might our model's predictions look like?



Suppose our features contain no information about the label. What might our model's predictions look like?

- Similar distributions between positive and negative cases.
- The predicted value tells you nothing about which one it's more likely to be.



We'll try placing a threshold just like before



What is the:

(a) Sensitivity?

(b) Specificity?

(c) Positive predictive value?

We'll try placing a threshold just like before



What is the:

(a) Sensitivity?

(b) Specificity?

(c) Positive predictive value?

Our *no information* predictive model:

- Place threshold at .3
  - Sensitivity = .7
  - False positive rate = .7
  - Specificity = 1-.7

- Place threshold at *p*
  - Sensitivity = *1-p*
  - False positive rate = 1-*p*
  - Specificity = *p*



Let’s think about it a different way.

- Suppose we have no predictors – again, no information – so we decide we’ll just flip a coin instead of building a model.
  - If the coin comes up *heads*, we’ll predict *positive*.
  - If the coin comes up *tails*, we’ll predict *negative*.

Fair Coin: $P(\text{heads}) = .5$

- Sensitivity = ?
- False positive rate = ?
- Specificity = ?

Let’s think about it a different way.

- Suppose we have no predictors – again, no information – so we decide we’ll just flip a coin instead of building a model.
  - If the coin comes up *heads*, we’ll predict *positive*.
  - If the coin comes up *tails*, we’ll predict *negative*.

Fair Coin: $P(\text{heads}) = .5$

- Sensitivity = .5
- False positive rate = .5
- Specificity = .5

Let’s think about it a different way.

- Suppose we have no predictors – again, no information – so we decide we’ll just flip a coin instead of building a model.
  - If the coin comes up *heads*, we’ll predict *positive*.
  - If the coin comes up *tails*, we’ll predict *negative*.

Fair Coin: $P(\text{heads}) = .5$

- Sensitivity = .5
- False positive rate = .5
- Specificity = .5

Biased Coin: $P(\text{heads}) = p$

- Sensitivity = ?
- False positive rate = ?
- Specificity = ?

Let’s think about it a different way.

- Suppose we have no predictors – again, no information – so we decide we’ll just flip a coin instead of building a model.
  - If the coin comes up *heads*, we’ll predict *positive*.
  - If the coin comes up *tails*, we’ll predict *negative*.

Fair Coin: $P(\text{heads}) = .5$

- Sensitivity = .5
- False positive rate = .5
- Specificity = .5

Biased Coin: $P(\text{heads}) = p$

- Sensitivity = 1-*p*
- False positive rate = 1-*p*
- Specificity = *p*

Again, we arrive at the following *no information* curve

- We may choose any *p* between 0 and 1 to get:
  - Sensitivity = *p*
  - False positive rate = *p*
  - Specificity = *1-p*
- What's the area under this curve (AUC)? --> 0.5



So, what's a *good* AUC value?
(i.e., *good* performance)?

It depends.

- Are predictions better than random?
- Are predictions than the previous best performing model?
- Are predictions better than expert performance?
- Does performance exceed our (informed) expectations?

- **Is the model clinically useful?**

OK, we've quantified performance across all thresholds. But how do we use the model?

Sometimes the predicted probability really is what we care about.

- *Example*: probability of heart attack
- If so, we need to make sure our model is *calibrated*

More often, we need to pick a threshold so we can decide whether to:

- Alert a provider
- Get a biopsy
- Refer the patient
- etc

What threshold should we pick? What's the right tradeoff?



Healthcare Scenarios

Which performance measure is most important?

1. A computer vision model that detects carcinoma

Operating Point:

high sensitivity





Healthcare Scenarios

1. A computer vision model that detects carcinoma

2. An algorithm that detects atrial fibrillation in Apple Watch users

Operating Point:

high specificity





Healthcare Scenarios

1. A computer vision model that detects carcinoma

2. An algorithm that detects atrial fibrillation in Apple Watch users

3. An EHR-based model that monitors autism risk

Operating Point:

balanced





Healthcare Scenarios

1. A computer vision model that detects carcinoma
2. An algorithm that detects atrial fibrillation in Apple Watch users
3. An EHR-based model that monitors autism risk

- Sometimes specificity and sensitivity are difficult to interpret, particularly for rare conditions or events.
- The most clinically relevant measure is often the positive predictive value (or negative predictive value).

The Precision-Recall Curve
(i.e., PPV-Sensitivity Curve)

- Often has greater direct clinical relevance than the ROC curve
- The *no information* classifier always achieves PPV equal to the *base rate*, or *prevalence* (why?)
- PPV as well as the area under this curve (average precision) must be interpreted relative to prevalence



Operating Point:

high sensitivity







Operating Point:

high specificity







Operating Point:

balanced







Summary

- It is critical to understand performance measures in order to critically evaluate models and put them to clinical/healthcare use.
- To contextualize performance, we often compare models to a *no information* model whose predictions are random.
- However, *good* performance depends on existing alternative approaches, both tech- and non-tech-based, and the clinical scenario.
- Which measure is most important also depends on the clinical scenario.

Supplementary Content

Multi-class problems: “Confusion Matrix”



Multi-class problems: Binary for Label 1



False Pos

Correct Prediction

Incorrect Prediction

Multi-class problems: Binary for Label 2



Model Calibration

A very brief overview


below threshold: predict negative
above threshold: predict cancer positive
Benign
(NEGATIVES)
Malignant
(POSITIVES)
0.0
0.2
0.4
0.6
0.8
1.0
Predicted Probability of Malignancy

Assess Calibration Graphically



Assess Calibration Graphically



Assess Calibration Graphically



Model-Predicted Risk

From: https://scikit-learn.org/stable/modules/calibration.html

There are many more, of course, but classification metrics go a long way.

- Regression
  - Mean squared error (MSE)
  - Mean absolute error (MAE)
  - R^2
- Survival Analysis (i.e. failure time)
  - Concordance index
  - MSE, MAE
  - Brier Score
  - AUC_t