

# Extrapolating expected accuracies for recognition tasks

**Charles Zheng**

*Department of Statistics  
Stanford University  
Palo Alto, CA*

CHARLES.Y.ZHANG@GMAIL.COM

**Rakesh Achanta**

*Department of Statistics  
Stanford University  
Palo Alto, CA*

**Yuval Benjamini**

*Department of Statistics  
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem,  
Jerusalem, Israel*

YUVAL.BENJAMINI@MAIL.HUJI.AC.IL

**Editor:** No One Yet

## Abstract

The difficulty of multi-class classification generally increases with the number of classes. Using data from a subset of the classes, can we predict how well a classifier will scale with an increased number of classes? Under the assumption that the classes are sampled identically and independently from a population, and under the assumption that the classifier is based on independently learned scoring functions, we show that the expected accuracy when the classifier is trained on  $k$  classes is the  $k - 1$ st moment of a certain distribution that can be estimated from data. We present an unbiased estimation method based on the theory, and demonstrate its application on a facial recognition example.

**Keywords:** Multiclass classification

## 1. Introduction

Many machine learning tasks are interested in recognizing or identifying an individual instance within a large set of possible candidates. These problems are usually modeled as multi-class classification problems, with a large and possibly complex label set. Leading examples include detecting the speaker from his voice patterns (Togneri and Pullella, 2011), identifying the author from her written text (Stamatatos et al., 2014), or labeling the object category from its image (Duygulu et al., 2002; Deng et al., 2010; Oquab et al., 2014). In all these examples, the algorithm observes an input  $x$ , and uses the classifier function  $h$  to guess the label  $y$  from a large label set  $\mathcal{S}$ .

There are multiple practical challenges in developing recognition systems for large label sets. Collecting high quality training data is perhaps the main obstacle, as the costs scale with the number of classes. It can be affordable to first collect data for a small set of classes, even if the long-term goal is to generalize to a larger set. Furthermore, classifier development can be accelerated by training first on fewer classes, as each training cycle may

require substantially less resources. Indeed, due to interest in how small-set performance generalizes to larger sets, such comparisons can be found in the literature (Oquab et al., 2014; Griffin et al., 2007). A natural question is how does changing the size of the label set affect the classification accuracy?

Technically, we consider a pair of classification problems on finite label sets: a source task with label set  $\mathcal{S}_{k_1}$  of size  $k_1$ , and a target task with a larger label set  $\mathcal{S}_{k_2}$  of size  $k_2 > k_1$ . For each label set  $\mathcal{S}_k$ , one constructs the classification rule  $h^{(k)} : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_k$ . Supposing that in each task, the test example  $(X^*, Y^*)$  has a joint distribution, define the generalization accuracy for label set  $\mathcal{S}_k$  as

$$\text{GA}_k = \Pr[h^{(k)}(X^*) = Y^*]. \quad (1)$$

The problem of *performance extrapolation* is the following: using data from only the source task  $\mathcal{S}_{k_1}$ , predict the accuracy for a target task with a larger unobserved label set  $\mathcal{S}_{k_2}$ .

A natural use case for performance extrapolation would be in the deployment of a facial recognition system. Suppose a system was developed in the lab on a database of  $k_1$  individuals. Clients would like to deploy this system on a new larger set of  $k_2$  individuals. Performance extrapolation could allow the lab to predict how well the algorithm will perform on the client's problem, accounting for the difference in label set size.

Extrapolation should be possible when the source and target classifications are two instances of a similar recognition problem. In many cases, the set of categories  $\mathcal{S}$  is to some degree a random or arbitrary selection out of a larger, perhaps infinite, set of potential categories  $\mathcal{Y}$ . Yet any specific experiment uses a fixed finite set. For example, categories in the classical Caltech-256 image recognition dataset (Griffin et al., 2007) were assembled by aggregating keywords proposed by students and then collecting matching images from the web. The arbitrary nature of the label set is even more apparent in biometric applications (face recognition, authorship, fingerprint identification) where the labels correspond to human individuals (Togneri and Pellella, 2011; Stamatatos et al., 2014). In all these cases, the number of the labels used to define a concrete dataset is therefore an experimental choice rather than a property of the domain. Despite the arbitrary nature of these choices, such datasets are viewed as representing the larger problem of recognition within the given domain, in the sense that success on such a dataset should inform performance on similar problems.

In this paper, we assume that both  $\mathcal{S}_{k_1}$  and  $\mathcal{S}_{k_2}$  are independent identically distributed (i.i.d.) samples from a population (or distribution) of labels  $\pi$ , which is defined on the label space  $\mathcal{Y}$ . These assumptions help concretely analyze the generalization accuracy, although both are only approximate characterizations of the label selection process, which is often at least partially manual. Since we assume the label set is random, the generalization accuracy of a given classifier becomes a random variable. Performance extrapolation then becomes the problem of estimating the average generalization accuracy  $\text{AGA}_k$  of an i.i.d. label set  $\mathcal{S}_k$  of size  $k$ . The condition of i.i.d. sampling of labels ensures that the separation of labels in a random set  $\mathcal{S}_{k_2}$  can be inferred by looking at the empirical separation in  $\mathcal{S}_{k_1}$ , and therefore that some estimate of the average accuracy on  $\mathcal{S}_{k_2}$  can be obtained. We also make the assumption that the classifiers train a separate model for each class. This convenient property allows us to characterize the accuracy of the classifier by selectively conditioning on one class at a time.

Our paper presents two main contributions related to extrapolation. First, we present a theoretical formula describing how average accuracy for smaller  $k$  is linked to average accuracy for label set of size  $K > k$ . We show that accuracy at any size depends on a *favorability* function  $D$ , which is determined by properties of the data distribution and the classifier. Second, we propose an estimation procedure that allows extrapolation of the observed average accuracy curve from  $k_1$ -class data to a larger number of classes, based on the theoretical formula. Under certain conditions, the estimation method has the property of being an unbiased estimator of the average accuracy.

The paper is organized as follows. In the rest of this section, we discuss related work. The framework of randomized classification is introduced in Section 2, and there we also introduce a toy example which is revisited throughout the paper. Section 3 develops our theory of extrapolation, and Section 3.3 we suggest an estimation method. In Section 5, we demonstrate our method on a facial recognition problem, making use of the OpenFace feature extraction network Amos et al. (2016). In Section 6 we discuss modeling choices and limitations of our theory, as well as potential extensions.

### 1.1 Related work

Linking performance between two different but related classification tasks can be considered an instance of transfer learning (Pan and Yang, 2010). Under Pan and Yang’s terminology, our setup is an example of multi-task learning, because the source task has labeled data, which is used to predict performance on a target task that also has labeled data. Applied examples of transfer learning from one label set to another include Oquab et al. (2014), Donahue et al. (2014), Sharif Razavian et al. (2014). However, there is little theory for predicting the behavior of the learned classifier on a new label set. Instead, most research classification for large label sets deal with the computational challenges of jointly optimizing the many parameters required for these models for specific classification algorithms (Crammer and Singer, 2001; Lee et al., 2004; Weston et al., 1999). Gupta et al. (2014) presents a method for estimating the accuracy of a classifier which can be used to improve performance for general classifiers, but doesn’t apply for different set sizes.

The theoretical framework we adopt is one where there exists a family of classification problems with increasing number of classes. This framework can be traced back to Shannon (1948), who considered the error rate of a random codebook, which is a special case of randomized classification. More recently, a number of authors have considered the problem of high-dimensional feature selection for multiclass classification with a large number of classes (Pan et al., 2016; Abramovich and Pensky, 2015; Davis et al., 2011). All of these works assume specific distributional models for classification compared to our more general setup. However, we do not deal with the problem of feature selection.

Perhaps the most similar method that deals with extrapolation of classification error to a larger number of classes can be found in Kay et al. (2008). They trained a classifier for identifying the observed stimulus from a functional MRI scan of brain activity, and were interested in its performance on larger stimuli sets. They proposed an extrapolation algorithm as a heuristic with little theoretical discussion. In Section 4 we interpret their method within the our theory, and discuss cases where it performs well compared to our algorithm.

## 2. Randomized classification

### 2.1 Setup

The randomized classification model we study has the following features. We assume that there exists an infinite, perhaps continuous, label space  $\mathcal{Y}$  and a example space  $\mathcal{X} \in \mathbb{R}^p$ . We assume there exists a prior distribution  $\pi$  on the label space  $\mathcal{Y}$ . And for each label  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ , there exists a distribution of examples  $F_y$ . In other words, for an example-label pair  $(X, Y)$ , the conditional distribution of  $X$  given  $Y = y$  is given by  $F_y$ .

A random classification task can be generated as follows. The label set  $\mathcal{S} = \{Y^{(1)}, \dots, Y^{(k)}\}$  is generated by drawing labels  $Y^{(1)}, \dots, Y^{(k)}$  i.i.d. from  $\pi$ . For each label, we sample a training set and a test set. The training set is obtained by sampling  $r_{train}$  observations  $X_{j,train}^{(i)}$  i.i.d. from  $F_{Y^{(i)}}$  for  $j = 1, \dots, r_{train}$  and  $i = 1, \dots, k$ . The test set is likewise obtained by sampling  $r$  observations  $X_j^{(i)}$  i.i.d. from  $F_{Y^{(i)}}$  for  $j = 1, \dots, r$ .

We assume that the classifier  $h(x)$  works by assigning a score to each label  $y^{(i)} \in \mathcal{S}$ , then choosing the label with the highest score. That is, there exist real-valued *score functions*  $m_{y^{(i)}}(x)$  for each label  $y^{(i)} \in \mathcal{S}$ . Since the classifier is allowed to depend on the training data, it is convenient to view it (and its associated score functions) as random. We write  $H(x)$  when we wish to work with the classifier as a random function, and likewise  $M_y(x)$  to denote the score functions when they are considered as random.

For a fixed instance of the classification task with labels  $\mathcal{S} = \{y^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^k$  and associated score functions  $\{m_{y^{(i)}}\}_{i=1}^k$ , recall the definition of the  $k$ -class generalization error (1). Assuming that there are no ties, it can be written in terms of score functions as

$$\text{GA}_k(h) = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k \Pr[m_{y^{(i)}}(X^{(i)}) = \max_j m_{y^{(j)}}(X^{(i)})],$$

where  $X^{(i)} \sim F_{y^{(i)}}$  for  $i = 1, \dots, k$ . However, when we consider the labels  $\{Y^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^k$  and associated score functions to be random, the generalization accuracy also becomes a random variable.

Suppose we specify  $k$  but do not fix any of the random quantities in the classification task. Then the  $k$ -class *average generalization accuracy* of a classifier is the expected value of the generalization accuracy  $\text{GA}_k(H)$  resulting from a random set of  $k$  labels,  $Y^{(1)}, \dots, Y^{(k)} \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \pi$ , and their associated score functions:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{AGA}_k &= \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k \Pr[M_{Y^{(i)}}(X^{(i)}) = \max_j M_{Y^{(j)}}(X^{(i)})] \\ &= \Pr[M_{Y^{(1)}}(X^{(1)}) = \max_j M_{Y^{(j)}}(X^{(1)})]. \end{aligned}$$

The last line follows from noting that all  $k$  summands in the previous line are identical. [The definition of average generalization accuracy is illustrated in Figure 1.]

#### 2.1.1 MARGINAL CLASSIFIER

In our analysis, we do not want the classifier to rely too strongly on complicated interactions between the labels in the set. We therefore propose the following property of marginal separability for classification models:




Figure 1: **Average generalization accuracy:** A diagram of the random quantities underlying the average generalization accuracy for  $k$  labels ( $\text{AGA}_k$ ). At the training stage (left), a set of  $k$  labels  $\mathcal{S}$  is sampled from the prior  $\pi$ , and score functions are trained from examples for these classes. At the test stage (right), one true class  $Y^*$  is sampled uniformly from  $\mathcal{S}$ , as well as a test example  $X^*$ .  $\text{AGA}_k$  measures the expected accuracy over these random variables.

**Definition 1** *The classifier  $H(x)$  is called a marginal classifier if the score function  $M_{y^{(i)}}(x)$  only depends on the label  $y^{(i)}$  and the class training set  $X_{j,\text{train}}^{(i)}$ .*

$$M_{y^{(i)}}(x) = g(x; y^{(i)}, X_{1,\text{train}}^{(i)}, \dots, X_{r_{\text{train}},\text{train}}^{(i)})$$

This means that the score function for  $y^{(i)}$  does not depend on other labels  $y^{(j)}$  or their training samples. Therefore, each  $M_y$  can be considered to have been drawn from a distribution  $\nu_y$ . Classes “compete” only through selecting the highest score, but not in constructing the score functions. The operation of a marginal classifier is illustrated in figure 2.

The *marginal* property allows us to prove strong results about the accuracy of the classifier under i.i.d. sampling assumptions.

#### Comments:

1. If  $H$  is a marginal classifier then  $M_{Y^{(i)}}$  is independent of  $Y^{(j)}$  and  $M_{Y^{(j)}}$  for  $i \neq j$ .
2. Estimated Bayes classifiers are primary examples of marginal classifiers. Let  $\hat{f}_y$  be a density estimate of the example distribution under label  $y$  obtained from the empirical distribution  $\hat{F}_y$ . Then, we can use the estimated density to produce the score functions:

$$m_y^{\text{EB}}(x) = \log(\hat{f}_y(x)).$$




Figure 2: **Classification rule:** Top: Score functions for three classes for a one-dimensional example space. Bottom: The classification rule chooses between  $y^{(1)}, y^{(2)}$  or  $y^{(3)}$  by choosing the maximal score function.

The resulting empirical approximation for the Bayes classifier would be

$$h^{EB}(x) = \text{argmax}_{y \in \mathcal{S}} (m_y^{EB}(x)).$$

3. Both the Quadratic Discriminant Analysis and the naive Bayes classifiers can be seen as specific instances of an estimated Bayes classifier <sup>1</sup>. For QDA, the score function is given by

$$m_y^{QDA}(x) = -(x - \mu(\hat{F}_y))^T \Sigma(\hat{F}_y)^{-1} (x - \mu(\hat{F}_y)) - \log \det(\Sigma(\hat{F}_y)),$$

where  $\mu(F) = \int y dF(y)$  and  $\Sigma(F) = \int (y - \mu(F))(y - \mu(F))^T dF(y)$ . In Naive Bayes, the score function is

$$m_y^{NB}(x) = \sum_{j=1}^p \log \hat{f}_{y,j}(x),$$

where  $\hat{f}_{y,j}$  is a density estimate for the  $j$ -th component of  $\hat{F}_y$ .

4. For some classifiers,  $M_y$  is a deterministic function of  $y$  (and therefore  $\nu_y$  is degenerate). A prime example is when exists fixed or pre-trained embeddings  $g, \tilde{g}$  that map labels  $y$  and examples  $x$  into  $R^p$ . Then

$$M_y^{embed} = -\|g(y) - \tilde{g}(x)\|_2. \quad (2)$$

This describes, for example, a 1-nearest neighbor classifier.

5. There are many classifiers which do not satisfy the marginal property, such as multinomial logistic regression, multilayer neural networks, decision trees, and k-nearest neighbors.

---

1. QDA is the special case of the estimated Bayes classifier when  $\hat{f}_y$  is obtained as the multivariate Gaussian density with mean and covariance parameters estimated from the data. Naive Bayes is the estimated Bayes classifier when  $\hat{f}_y$  is obtained as the product of estimated componentwise marginal distributions of  $p(x_i|y)$

*Notational remark.* Henceforth, we shall relax the assumption that the classifier  $H(x)$  is based on a training set. Instead, we assume that there exist score functions  $\{M_{Y^{(i)}}\}_{i=1}^k$  associated with the random label set  $\{Y^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^k$ , and that the score functions  $M_{Y^{(i)}}$  are independent of the test set. The classifier  $H(x)$  is marginal if and only if  $M_{Y^{(i)}}$  are independent of both  $Y^{(j)}$  and  $M_{Y^{(j)}}$  for  $j \neq i$ .

## 2.2 Estimation of average accuracy

Before tackling extrapolation, it is useful to discuss a simpler task of generalizing accuracy results when the target set is *not* larger than the source set. Suppose we have test data for a classification task with  $k_1$  classes. That is, we have a label set  $\mathcal{S}_{k_1} = \{y^{(i)}\}_{i=1}^{k_1}$  and its associated set of score functions  $M_{y^{(i)}}$ , as well as test observations  $(x_1^{(i)}, \dots, x_r^{(i)})$  for  $i = 1, \dots, k_1$ . What would be the predicted accuracy for a new randomly sampled set of  $k_2 \leq k_1$  labels?

Note that  $\text{AGA}_{k_2}$  is the expected value of the accuracy on the new set of  $k_2$  labels. Therefore, any unbiased estimator of  $\text{AGA}_{k_2}$  will be an unbiased predictor for the accuracy on the new set.

Let us start with the case  $k_2 = k_1 = k$ . For each test observation  $x_j^{(i)}$ , define the ranks of the candidate classes  $\ell = 1, \dots, k$  by

$$R_j^{i,\ell} = \sum_{s=1}^k I\{m_{y^{(\ell)}}(x_j^{(i)}) \geq m_{y^{(s)}}(x_j^{(i)})\}.$$

The test accuracy is the fraction of observations for which the correct class also has the highest rank

$$\text{TA}_k = \frac{1}{rk} \sum_{i=1}^k \sum_{j=1}^r I\{R_j^{i,i} = k\}. \quad (3)$$

Taking expectations over both the test set and the random labels, the expected value of the test accuracy is  $\text{AGA}_k$ ; hence,  $\text{TA}_k$  provides the desired estimator.

Next, let us consider the case where  $k_2 < k_1$ . Consider label set  $\mathcal{S}_{k_2}$  obtained by sampling  $k_2$  labels uniformly without replacement from  $\mathcal{S}_{k_1}$ . Since  $\mathcal{S}_{k_2}$  is unconditionally an i.i.d. sample from the population of labels  $\pi$ , the test accuracy of  $\mathcal{S}_{k_2}$  is an unbiased estimator of  $\text{AGA}_{k_2}$ . However, we can get a better unbiased estimate of  $\text{AGA}_{k_2}$  by averaging over all the possible subsamples  $\mathcal{S}_{k_2} \subset \mathcal{S}_{k_1}$ . This defines the average test accuracy over subsampled tasks,  $\text{ATA}_{k_2}$ .

*Remark.* Naïvely, computing  $\text{ATA}_{k_2}$  requires us to train and evaluate  $\binom{k_1}{k_2}$  classification rules. However, for marginal classifiers, retraining the classifier is not necessary. Looking at the rank  $R_j^{i,i}$  of the correct label  $i$  for  $x_j^{(i)}$ , allows us to determine how many subsets  $\mathcal{S}_2$  will result in a correct classification. Specifically, there are  $R_j^{i,i} - 1$  labels with a lower score than the correct label  $i$ . Therefore, as long as one of the classes in  $\mathcal{S}_2$  is  $i$ , and the other  $k_2 - 1$  labels are from the set of  $R_j^{i,i} - 1$  labels with lower score than  $i$ , the classification of  $x_j^{(i)}$  will be correct. This implies that there are  $\binom{R_j^{i,i}-1}{k_2-1}$  such subsets  $\mathcal{S}_2$  where  $x_j^{(i)}$  is

classified correctly, and therefore the average test risk for all  $\binom{k_1}{k_2}$  subsets  $\mathcal{S}_2$  is

$$\text{ATA}_{k_2} = \frac{1}{\binom{k_1}{k_2}} \frac{1}{rk_2} \sum_{i=1}^{k_1} \sum_{j=1}^r \binom{R_j^{i,i} - 1}{k_2 - 1}. \quad (4)$$

### 2.3 Toy Example: Bivariate normals

Let us illustrate these ideas using a toy example. Let  $(Y, X)$  have a bivariate normal joint distribution,

$$(Y, X) \sim N \left( \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \rho \\ \rho & 1 \end{pmatrix} \right),$$

as illustrated in figure 3(a). Therefore, for a given randomly drawn label  $Y$ , the conditional distribution of  $X$  for that label is univariate normal with mean  $\rho Y$  and variance  $1 - \rho^2$ :

$$X|Y = y \sim N(\rho y, 1 - \rho^2).$$

Supposing we draw  $k = 3$  labels  $y_1, y_2, y_3$ , the classification problem will be to assign a test instance  $X^*$  to the correct label. The test instance  $X^*$  would be drawn with equal probability from one of three conditional distributions  $X|Y = y^{(i)}$ , as illustrated in figure 3(b, top). The Bayes rule assigns  $X^*$  to the class with the highest density  $p(x|y_i)$ , as illustrated by figure 3(b, bottom): it is therefore a marginal classifier, with score function

$$M_{y^{(i)}}(x) = \log(p(x|y^{(i)})) = -\frac{(x - \rho y)^2}{2(1 - \rho^2)} + \text{const.}$$

For this model, the generalization accuracy of the Bayes rule for any label set  $\{y^{(1)}, \dots, y^{(k)}\}$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{GA}_k(y_1, \dots, y_k) &= \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k \Pr_{X \sim p(x|y_i)} [p(X|y_i) = \max_{j=1}^k p(X|y_j)] \\ &= \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k \Phi \left( \frac{y^{[i+1]} - y^{[i]}}{2\sqrt{1 - \rho^2}} \right) - \Phi \left( \frac{y^{[i-1]} - y^{[i]}}{2\sqrt{1 - \rho^2}} \right) \end{aligned}$$

where  $\Phi$  is the standard normal cdf,  $y^{[1]} < \dots < y^{[k]}$  are the sorted labels, and  $y^{[0]} = -\infty$  and  $y^{[k+1]} = \infty$ . We numerically computed  $\text{GA}_k(y_1, \dots, y_k)$  for randomly drawn labels  $Y_1, \dots, Y_k \stackrel{iid}{\sim} N(0, 1)$ ; the distributions of  $\text{GA}_k$  for  $k = 2, \dots, 10$  are illustrated in figure 4. The mean of the distribution of  $\text{GA}_k$  is the  $k$ -class average risk,  $\text{AGA}_k$ . The theory presented in the next section deals with how to analyze the average risk  $\text{AGA}_k$  as a function of  $k$ .

### 3. Extrapolation

The section is organized as follows. We begin by introducing an explicit formula for the average accuracy  $\text{AGA}_k$ . The formula reveals that  $\text{AGA}_k$  is determined by moments of a one-dimensional function  $D(u)$ . Through this formula, therefore, we can infer through




Figure 3: **Toy example:** *Left:* The joint distribution of  $(X, Y)$  is bivariate normal with correlation  $\rho = 0.7$ . *Right:* A typical classification problem instance from the bivariate normal model with  $k = 3$  classes. (*Top*): the conditional density of  $X$  given label  $Y$ , for  $Y = \{y^{(1)}, y^{(2)}, y^{(3)}\}$ . (*Bottom*): the Bayes classification regions for the three classes.




Figure 4: **Generalization accuracy for toy example:** The distribution of the generalization accuracy for  $k = 2, 3, \dots, 10$  for the bivariate normal model with  $\rho = 0.7$ . Circles indicate the average generalization accuracy  $\text{AGA}_k$ ; the red curve is the theoretically computed average accuracy.

subsample accuracies estimates of  $D(u)$ . These estimates allow us to extrapolate the average generalization accuracy to an arbitrary number of labels.

The result of our analysis is to expose the average accuracy  $\text{AGA}_k$  as the weighted average of a function  $D(u)$ , where  $D(u)$  is independent of  $k$ , and where  $k$  only changes the weighting. The result is stated as follows.

**Theorem 2** *Suppose  $\pi$ ,  $\{F_y\}_{y \in \mathcal{Y}}$  and score functions  $M_y$  satisfy the tie-breaking condition. Then, there exists a cumulative distribution function  $D(u)$  defined on the interval  $[0, 1]$  such that*

$$\text{AGA}_k = 1 - (k-1) \int D(u) u^{k-2} du. \quad (5)$$

The tie-breaking allows us to neglect specifying the case when margins are tied.

**Definition 3** Tie-breaking condition: *for all  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ ,  $M_Y(x) \neq M_{Y'}(x)$  with probability one for  $Y, Y'$  independently drawn from  $\pi$ .*

In practice, one can simply break ties randomly, which is mathematically equivalent to adding a small amount of random noise  $\epsilon$  to the function  $\mathcal{M}$ .

### 3.1 Analysis of average accuracy

For the following discussion, we often consider a random label with its associated score function and example vector. Explicitly, this sampling can be written:

$$Y \sim \pi, M_Y|Y \sim \nu_Y, X|Y \sim F_Y.$$

Similarly we use  $(Y', M_{Y'}, X')$  and  $(Y^*, M_{Y^*}, X^*)$  for two more triplets with independent and identical distributions. Specifically,  $X^*$  will typically note the test example, and therefore  $Y^*$  the true label and  $M_{Y^*}$  its score function.

The function  $D$  is related to a favorability function. Favorability measures the probability that the score for the example  $x^*$  is going to be maximized by the score function  $m_y$ , compared to a random competitor  $M_{Y'}$ . Formally, we write:

$$U_{x^*}(m_y) = \Pr[m_y(x^*) > M_{Y'}(x^*)]. \quad (6)$$

Note that for fixed example  $x^*$ , favorability is monotonically increasing in  $m_y(x^*)$ . If  $m_y(x^*) > m_{y^\dagger}(x^*)$ , then  $U_{x^*}(y) > U_{x^*}(y^\dagger)$ , because the event  $\{m_y(x^*) > M_{Y'}(x^*)\}$  contains the event  $\{m_{y^\dagger}(x^*) > M_{Y'}(x^*)\}$ .

Therefore, given labels  $y^{(1)}, \dots, y^{(k)}$  and test instance  $x^*$ , we can think of the classifier as choosing the label with the greatest favorability:

$$\hat{y} = \operatorname{argmax}_{y^{(i)} \in \mathcal{S}} m_{y^{(i)}}(x^*) = \operatorname{argmax}_{y^{(i)} \in \mathcal{S}} U_{x^*}(m_{y^{(i)}}).$$

Furthermore, via a conditioning argument, we see that this is still the case even when the test instance and labels are random:

$$\hat{Y} = \operatorname{argmax}_{Y^{(i)} \in \mathcal{S}} M_{Y^{(i)}}(X^*) = \operatorname{argmax}_{Y^{(i)} \in \mathcal{S}} U_{X^*}(M_{Y^{(i)}}).$$

The favorability takes values between 0 and 1, and when any of its arguments are random, it becomes a random variable with a distribution supported on  $[0, 1]$ . In particular, we consider the following two random variables:

- a. the *incorrect-label* favorability  $U_{x^*}(M_Y)$  between a given fixed test instance  $x^*$ , and the score function of a random incorrect label  $M_Y$ , and
- b. the *correct-label* favorability  $U_{X^*}(M_{Y^*})$  between a random test instance  $X^*$ , and the score function of the correct label,  $M_{Y^*}$ .

### 3.1.1 INCORRECT-LABEL FAVORABILITY

The incorrect-label favorability can be written explicitly as

$$U_{x^*}(M_Y) = \Pr[M_Y(x^*) > M_{Y'}(x^*) | M_Y]. \quad (7)$$

Note that  $M_Y$  and  $M_{Y'}$  are identically distributed, and are both unrelated to  $x^*$  that is fixed. This leads to the following result:

**Lemma 4** *Under the tie-breaking condition, the incorrect-label favorability  $U_{x^*}(M_Y)$  is uniformly distributed for any  $x^* \in \mathcal{X}$ , and*

$$\Pr[U_{x^*}(M_Y) \leq u] = u. \quad (8)$$

Proof is in the appendix.

### 3.1.2 CORRECT-LABEL FAVORABILITY

The correct-label favorability is

$$U^* = U_{X^*}(M_{Y^*}) = \Pr[M_{Y^*}(X^*) > M'_{Y'}(X^*) | Y^*, M_{Y^*}, X^*]. \quad (9)$$

The distribution of  $U^*$  will depend on  $\pi$ ,  $F_y$  and  $\nu_y$ , and generally cannot be written in a closed form. However, this distribution is central to our analysis—indeed, we will see that the function  $D$  appearing in theorem 2 is defined as the cumulative distribution function of  $U^*$ .

The special case of  $k = 2$  shows the relation between the distribution of  $U^*$  and the average generalization accuracy,  $\text{AGA}_2$ . In the two-class case, the average generalization accuracy is the probability that a random correct label score function gives a larger value than a random distractor:

$$\text{AGA}_2 = \Pr[M_{Y^*}(X^*) > M_{Y'}(X^*)].$$

where  $Y^*$  is the correct label, and  $Y'$  is a random incorrect label. If we condition on  $Y^* = y^*$ ,  $M_{Y^*} = m_{y^*}$  and  $X^* = x^*$ , we get

$$\text{AGA}_2 = \mathbf{E}[\Pr[M_{Y^*}(X^*) > M_{Y'}(X^*) | Y^*, M_{Y^*}, X^*]].$$

Here, the conditional probability inside the expectation is the correct-label favorability. Therefore,

$$\text{AGA}_2 = \mathbf{E}[U^*] = \int D(u)du,$$

where  $D(u)$  is the cumulative distribution function of  $U^*$ ,  $D(u) = \Pr[U^* \leq u]$ . Theorem 2 extends this to general  $k$ ; we now give the proof.

**Proof of Theorem 2.**

Without loss of generality, suppose that the true label is  $Y^*$  and the incorrect labels are  $Y^{(1)}, \dots, Y^{(k-1)}$ . We have

$$\text{AGA}_k = \Pr[M_{Y^*}(X^*) > \max_{i=1}^{k-1} M_{Y^{(i)}}(X^*)] = \Pr[U^* > \max_{i=1}^{k-1} U_{X^*}(M_{Y^{(i)}})]$$

recalling that  $U^* = U_{X^*}(M_{Y^*})$ . Now, if we condition on  $X^* = x^*$ ,  $Y^* = y^*$  and  $M_{Y^*} = m_{y^*}$ , then the random variable  $U^*$  becomes fixed, with value

$$u^* = U_{x^*}(m_{y^*}).$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{AGA}_k &= \mathbf{E}[\Pr[U^* > \max_{i=1}^{k-1} U_{X^*}(M_{Y^{(i)}}) | X^* = x^*, Y^* = y^*, M_{Y^*} = m_{y^*}]] \\ &= \mathbf{E}[\Pr[U^* > \max_{i=1}^{k-1} U_{X^*}(M_{Y^{(i)}}) | X^* = x^*, U^* = u^*]] \end{aligned}$$

Now define  $U_{max,k-1} = \max_{i=1}^{k-1} U_{X^*}(M_{Y^{(i)}})$ . Since by Lemma 4,  $U_{X^*}(M_{Y^{(i)}})$  are i.i.d. uniform conditional on  $X^* = x^*$ , we know that

$$U_{max,k-1} | X^* = x^* \sim \text{Beta}(k-1, 1). \quad (10)$$

Furthermore,  $U_{max,k-1}$  is independent of  $U^*$  conditional on  $X^*$ . Therefore, the conditional probability can be computed as

$$\Pr[U^* > U_{max,k-1} | X^* = x^*, U^* = u^*] = \int_{u^*}^1 (k-1)u^{k-2} du.$$

Consequently,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{AGA}_k &= \mathbf{E}[\Pr[U^* > \max_{i=1}^{k-1} U_{x^*}(M_{Y^{(i)}}) | X^* = x^*, U^* = u^*]] \\ &= \mathbf{E}\left[\int_0^{U^*} (k-1)u^{k-2} du | U^* = u^*\right] \\ &= \mathbf{E}\left[\int_0^1 I\{u \leq U^*\} (k-1)u^{k-2} du\right] \\ &= (k-1) \int_0^1 \Pr[U^* \geq u] u^{k-2} du. \end{aligned}$$

Or equivalently,

$$\text{AGA}_k = 1 - (k-1) \int D(u) u^{k-2} du.$$

where  $D(u)$  denotes the cumulative distribution function of  $U^*$  on  $[0, 1]$ :

$$D(u) = \Pr[U_{X^*}(M_{Y^*}) \leq u]. \quad (11)$$

□.

Theorem 2 expresses the average accuracy as a weighted integral of the function  $D(u)$ . Having this theoretical result allows us to understand how the expected  $k$ -class risk scales with  $k$  in problems where all the relevant densities are known. However, applying this result in practice to estimate  $\text{AGA}_k$  requires some means of estimating the unknown function  $D$ —which we discuss in the section ?.

### 3.2 Favorability and average accuracy for the toy example

Recall that for the toy example from Section 2.3, the score function  $M_y$  was a non-random function of  $y$  that measures the distance between  $x$  and  $\rho y$

$$M_y(x^*) = \log(p(x^*|y)) = -\frac{(x^* - \rho y)^2}{2(1 - \rho^2)}$$

For this model, the favorability function  $U_{x^*}(m_y)$  compares the distance between  $x^*$  and  $\rho y$  to the distance between  $x^*$  and  $\rho Y'$  for a randomly chosen distractor  $Y' \sim N(0, 1)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} U_{x^*}(m_y) &= \Pr[|\rho y - x^*| > |\rho Y' - x^*|] \\ &= \Phi\left(\frac{x^* + |\rho y - x^*|}{\rho}\right) - \Phi\left(\frac{x^* - |\rho y - x^*|}{\rho}\right), \end{aligned}$$

where  $\Phi$  is the standard normal cumulative distribution function. Figure 5(a) illustrates the level sets of the function  $U_{x^*}(m_y)$ . The highest values of  $U_{x^*}(m_y)$  are near the line  $x^* = \rho y$  corresponding to conditional mean of  $X|Y$ : as one moves farther from the line,  $U_{x^*}(m_y)$  decays. Note however that large values of  $x^*$  and  $y$  (with the same sign) result in larger values of  $U_{x^*}(m_y)$  since it becomes unlikely for  $Y' \sim N(0, 1)$  to exceed  $Y = y$ .

Using the formula above, we can calculate the correct-label favorability  $U^* = U_{X^*}(M_{Y^*})$  and its cumulative distribution function  $D(u)$ . The function  $D$  is illustrated in figure 5(b) for the current example with  $\rho = 0.7$ . The red curve in figure 4 was computed using the formula

$$\text{AGA}_k = 1 - (k - 1) \int D(u) u^{k-2} du.$$




Figure 5: **Favorability for toy example:** *Left:* The level curves of the function  $U_{x^*}(m_y)$  in the bivariate normal model with  $\rho = 0.7$ . *Right:* The function  $D(u)$  gives the cumulative distribution function of the random variable  $U_{X^*}(M_Y)$ .

It is illuminating to consider how the average accuracy curves and the  $D(u)$  functions vary as we change the parameter  $\rho$ . Higher correlations  $\rho$  lead to higher accuracy, as seen in figure 6(a), where the accuracy curves are shifted upward as  $\rho$  increases from 0.3 to 0.9. The favorability  $U_{x^*}(m_y)$  tends to be higher on average as well, which leads to lower values of the cumulative distribution function—as we see in figure 6(b), where the function  $D(u)$  becomes smaller as  $\rho$  increases.




Figure 6: **Average accuracy with different  $\rho$ 's:** *Left:* The average accuracy  $\text{AGA}_k$ . *Right:*  $D(u)$  function for the bivariate normal model with  $\rho \in \{0.3, 0.5, 0.7, 0.9\}$ .

### 3.3 Estimation

Next, we discuss how to use data from smaller classification tasks to extrapolate average accuracy. Assume that we have data from a  $k_1$ -class random classification task, and would like to estimate the average accuracy  $\text{AGA}_{k_2}$  for  $k_2 > k_1$  classes. Our estimation method will use the  $k$ -class average test accuracies,  $\text{ATA}_2, \dots, \text{ATA}_{k_1}$  (see Eq 4), for its inputs.

The key to understanding the behavior of the average accuracy  $\text{AGA}_k$  is the function  $D$ . We adopt a linear model

$$D(u) = \sum_{\ell=1}^m \beta_\ell h_\ell(u), \quad (12)$$

where  $h_\ell(u)$  are known basis functions, and  $\beta_\ell$  are the linear coefficients to be estimated. Since our proposed method is based on the linearity assumption (12), we call it the *regression method* for extrapolation.

Conveniently, the  $\text{AGA}_k$  can also be expressed in terms of the  $\beta_\ell$  coefficients. If we plug in the assumed linear model (12) into the identity (5), then we get

$$1 - \text{AGA}_k = (k-1) \int D(u) u^{k-2} du \quad (13)$$

$$= (k-1) \int_0^1 \sum_{\ell=1}^m \beta_\ell h_\ell(u) u^{k-2} du \quad (14)$$

$$= \sum_{\ell=1}^m \beta_\ell H_{\ell,k} \quad (15)$$

where

$$H_{\ell,k} = (k-1) \int_0^1 h_\ell(u) u^{k-2} du. \quad (16)$$

The constants  $H_{\ell,k}$  are moments of the basis function  $h_\ell$ : hence we call this method the *moment method*. Note that  $H_{\ell,k}$  can be precomputed numerically for any  $k \geq 2$ .

Now, since the test accuracies  $\text{ATA}_k$  are unbiased estimates of  $\text{AGA}_k$ , this implies that the regression estimate

$$\hat{\beta} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\beta} \sum_{k=2}^{k_1} \left( (1 - \text{ATA}_k) - \sum_{\ell=1}^m \beta_\ell H_{\ell,k} \right)^2$$

is unbiased for  $\beta$ . The estimate of  $\text{AGA}_{k_2}$  is similarly obtained from (15), via

$$\widehat{\text{AGA}}_{k_2} = 1 - \sum_{\ell=1}^m \hat{\beta}_\ell H_{\ell,k_2}. \quad (17)$$

### 3.4 Model selection

Accurate extrapolation using the regression method depends on a good fit between the linear model (12) and the true discriminability function  $D(u)$ . However, since the function  $D(u)$  depends on the unknown joint distribution of the data, it makes sense to let the data help us choose a good basis  $\{h_u\}$  from a set of candidate bases.

Extending the analogy between the regression method for prediction extrapolation and the well-studied problem of using regression to predict out-of-sample, we consider using *cross-validation* for model selection (Hastie et al., 2009). However, it is necessary to adjust the cross-validation procedure because of two particular differences between the usual prediction problem and the problem of prediction extrapolation: (i) while cross-validation is motivated for a setup with i.i.d. training and test data, in prediction extrapolation the training data (the average test accuracies) are in fact highly correlated, and (ii) in prediction extrapolation, we know that the prediction is to be made in a particular direction (extrapolating to large  $k$ ). Therefore, we use deterministic splits to minimize the dependence between the folds, splitting the training data into two halves: the first half consisting of  $\{\text{ATA}_2, \dots, \text{ATA}_{\lfloor k_1/2 \rfloor}\}$  and the second half consisting of  $\{\text{ATA}_{\lfloor k_1/2 \rfloor+1}, \dots, \text{ATA}_{k_1}\}$ . Furthermore, since we are only interested in how well the models *extrapolate* from small numbers of classes to a larger number of classes, and not in any other direction of prediction, we train

on the first half of the data and only predict on the held-out point  $\text{ATA}_{k_1}$  in the second half of the data<sup>2</sup> to evaluate cross-validation accuracy. Then, using  $\text{ATA}_{k_1}$  as the ground truth, we choose the basis that yields the closest prediction for  $\hat{\text{AGA}}_{k_1}$  in terms of absolute difference.

#### 4. Simulation study

We ran simulations to check how the proposed extrapolation method performs in different settings. The results are displayed in Figure 7. We varied the number of classes  $k_1$  in the source dataset, the difficulty of classification, and the basis functions. We generated data according to a mixture of isotropic multivariate Gaussian distributions: labels  $Y$  were sampled from  $Y \sim N(0, I_{10})$ , and the examples for each label sampled from  $X|Y \sim N(Y, \sigma^2 I_{10})$ . The noise-level parameter  $\sigma$  determines the difficulty of classification. Similarly to the real-data example, we consider a 1-nearest neighbor classifier, which is given a single training instance per class.

For the estimation, we use the cross-validation procedure described in section 3.4 to select the parameter  $h$  of the “radial basis”

$$h_\ell(u) = \Phi\left(\frac{\Phi^{-1}(u) - t_\ell}{h}\right).$$

where  $t_\ell$  are a set of regularly spaced knots which are determined by  $h$  and the problem parameters. Additionally, we add a constant element to the basis, equivalent to adding an intercept to the linear model (12).

The rationale behind the radial basis is to model the density of  $\Phi^{-1}(U^*)$  as a mixture of gaussian kernels with variance  $h^2$ . To control overfitting, the knots are separated by at least a distance of  $h/2$ , and the largest knots have absolute value  $\Phi^{-1}(1 - \frac{1}{rk_1^2})$ . The size of the maximum knot is set this way since  $rk_1^2$  is the number of ranks that are calculated and used by our method. Therefore, we do not expect the training data to contain enough information to allow our method to distinguish between more than  $rk_1^2$  possible accuracies, and hence we set the maximum knot to prevent the inclusion of a basis element that has on average a higher mean value than  $u = 1 - \frac{1}{rk_1^2}$ . However, in simulations we find that the performance of the basis depends only weakly on the exact positioning and maximum size of the knots, as long as sufficiently large knots are included; the bandwidth  $h$  is the most crucial parameter. In the simulation, we use a grid  $h = \{0.1, 0.2, \dots, 1\}$  for the cross-validated selection of the bandwidth.

#### Comparison to Kay

In their paper<sup>3</sup>, Kay et al. (2008) proposed a method for extrapolating classification accuracy to a larger number of classes. The method depends on repeated kernel-density estimation (KDE) steps. Because the method is only briefly motivated in the original text,

---

2. Alternatively, one could also evaluate predictions for all points in the held-out data, but due to correlation, this makes only a minor difference to the result.  
 3. page 29 of supplement to Kay et al. (2008)

we present it in our notation. It is perhaps worthwhile to compare this to their original presentation.

For  $k_1$  observed classes, let  $m_{y_j}(x_i) \ 1 \leq i, j \leq k_1$  be the observed score comparing feature vector of the  $i$ 'th class  $x_i$  to the label of the  $j$ 'th class  $y_j$ . The KDE method proposes to estimate the density of scores for each distractor class using a Gaussian kernel function  $K$   $\hat{f}_i(m) = \frac{1}{k_1-1} \sum_{j \neq i} K(m_{y_j}(x_j), m)$ . Probability of error against a single competitor is then computed for each class separately by integrating the density above the observed true score  $m_{y_i}(x_i)$ , in  $h_2(i) = \int_{m_{y_i}(x_i)}^{\infty} \hat{f}(m) dm$ . The probability of accurate classification of the  $i$ 'th class against  $k_2 - 1$  competitors is  $h_{k_2}(i) = (1 - h(i))^{k_2-1}$ . The average over the  $k_1$  classes is the estimated generalization accuracy  $\widehat{AGA}_{KDE} = \frac{1}{k_1} \sum_{i=1}^{k_1} h_{k_2}(i)$ .

This extrapolation method can be described in our framework as follows. Let  $F_x$  be the cumulative distribution function of  $M_{Y'}(x)$  for a random label  $Y' \sim \pi$ . For each test instance  $x_j^{(i)}$ , let  $\hat{F}_{x_j^{(i)}}(m_{y^{(i)}}(x_j^{(i)}))$  be an estimate of  $F_{x_j^{(i)}}(m_{y^{(i)}}(x_j^{(i)}))$ . The particular estimation method recommended by Kay et al. (2008) is to estimate the density  $f_{x_j^{(i)}}$  by using kernel-density estimation with a Gaussian kernel and a bandwidth chosen via pseudolikelihood cross-validation (Cao et al., 1994); however, our criticism is not specific to the use of a particular estimator for  $\hat{F}_x$ . Extrapolate using the formula

$$\widehat{AGA}_k = \frac{1}{k_1 r} \sum_{i=1}^{k_1} \sum_{j=1}^r \hat{F}_{x_j^{(i)}}(m_{y^{(i)}}(x_j^{(i)}))^{k-1}$$

While no justification is given for the method in Kay et al. (2008), one possible justification is the fact that

$$AGA_k = \mathbf{E}[F_X(M_Y(X))^{k-1}]$$

Therefore, the method can give good extrapolations when the estimated probabilities  $\hat{F}_{x_j^{(i)}}(m_{y^{(i)}}(x_j^{(i)}))$  are close to the true probabilities  $F_{x_j^{(i)}}(m_{y^{(i)}}(x_j^{(i)}))$ .

Note that the method depends heavily on the density estimation step. If the kernel bandwidth is too small compared to the number of classes, the extrapolated accuracy will be upwardly biased. To see this, consider a class  $i$  that is correctly classified in the original class set. That is,  $m_{y_i}(x_i) > m_{y_j}(x_i)$  for every  $j \neq i$ . If we use for  $\hat{f}_i$  the unsmoothed empirical density,  $h_2(i)$  will be 1 and therefore  $h_{k_2}(i)$  will be 1 as well. In other words, the method relies on smoothing of each class to generate a the tail density that exceeds  $m_{y_i}(x_i)$ , and therefore it is highly dependent on the choice of kernel bandwidth.

In our simulation, we tested our own implementation of the KDE method, using the two methods for cross-validated KDE estimation provided in the `stats` package in the R statistical computing environment: biased cross-validation and unbiased cross-validation (Scott, 1992).

## Simulation Results

We see in 7 that the cross-validated regression method (CV-reg) and the KDE methods with unbiased and biased cross-validation (KDE-UCV, KDE-BCV) perform comparably in the gaussian simulations. We studied how the difficulty of extrapolation relates to both the

$k_1$	$k_2$	CV-reg	KDE-BCV	KDE-UCV
500	1000	<b>0.032</b> (0.001)	0.090 (0.001)	0.067 (0.001)
500	2000	<b>0.044</b> (0.002)	0.088 (0.001)	0.059 (0.001)
500	5000	0.073 (0.004)	0.079 (0.001)	<b>0.051</b> (0.001)
500	10000	0.098 (0.004)	0.076 (0.001)	<b>0.045</b> (0.001)
5000	10000	<b>0.009</b> (0.000)	0.038 (0.000)	0.028 (0.000)
5000	20000	<b>0.015</b> (0.001)	0.028 (0.000)	0.019 (0.000)
5000	50000	<b>0.032</b> (0.002)	0.035 (0.000)	0.053 (0.000)
5000	100000	<b>0.054</b> (0.003)	0.065 (0.000)	0.086 (0.000)

Table 1: Maximum RMSE (se) across all signal-to-noise-levels in predicting  $\text{TA}_{k_2}$  from  $k_1$  classes in multivariate gaussian simulation. Standard errors were computed by nesting the maximum operation within the bootstrap, to account for added variance from selection.

absolute size of the number of classes and the factor of increase from the source number of classes  $k_1$  to the target number of classes  $k_2$ . Our simulation has two settings for  $k_1 = \{500, 5000\}$ , and within each setting we have extrapolations to 2 times, 4 times, 10 times, and 20 times the number of classes.

Within each problem setting defined by the number of source and target classes ( $k_1, k_2$ ), we use the maximum RMSE across all signal-to-noise settings to quantify the overall performance of the method, as displayed in Table 1.

The results also indicate that more accurate extrapolation appears to be possible for smaller extrapolation ratios  $\frac{k_2}{k_1}$  and larger  $k_1$ . The cross-validated regression method improves in worst-case RMSE when moving from  $k_1 = 500$  to  $k_1 = 5000$  while keeping the factor of increase fixed, most dramatically in the case  $\frac{k_2}{k_1} = 2$  when it improves from a maximum RMSE of  $0.032 \pm 0.001$  to 0.009 when going from  $k_1 = 500$  to  $k_1 = 5000$ , which is 3.5-factor reduction in worst-case RMSE, but also gaining at least a 1.8-factor reduction in RMSE when going from the smaller problem to the larger problem in the other three cases.

The kernel-density method produces comparable results, but can be seen to depend strongly on the choice of bandwidth selection: KDE-UCV and KDE-BCV show very different performance profiles, although they differ only in the choice between unbiased and biased cross-validation, respectively. Also, the KDE methods show significant estimation bias, as can be seen from Figure 8. This can be explained by the fact that the KDE method ignores the bias introduced by exponentiation. That is, even if  $\hat{p}$  is an unbiased estimator of  $p$ ,  $\hat{p}^k$  may *not* be a very good estimate of  $p^k$ , since

$$p^k = \mathbf{E}[\hat{p}]^k \neq \mathbf{E}[\hat{p}^k].$$

unless  $\hat{p}$  is a degenerate random variable (constant). Otherwise, for large  $k$ ,  $\hat{p}^k$  may be an extremely biased estimate of  $p$ . Our proposed method avoids this source of bias by estimating the  $(k - 1)$ st moment of  $D(u)$  directly. As we see in Figure 8, correcting for the bias of exponentiation helps greatly to reduce the overall bias. Indeed, while CV-reg shows comparable bias for the 500 to 10000 extrapolation, the bias is very well-controlled in all of the  $k_1 = 5000$  extrapolations.





Figure 7: **Simulation results (RMSE):** Simulation study consisting of multivariate Gaussian  $Y$  with nearest neighbor classifier. Prediction RMSE vs true  $k_2$ -class accuracy for cross-validated regression method with radial basis (`r.cv.gauss`), KDE-based methods with biased cross-validation (`kde_bcv`) and unbiased cross-validation (`kde_ucv`).



**Figure 8: Simulation results (biases):** Simulation study consisting of multivariate Gaussian  $Y$  with nearest neighbor classifier. Bias (mean predicted minus true accuracy) vs true  $k_2$ -class accuracy for cross-validated regression method with radial basis (`r.cv.gauss`), KDE-based methods with biased cross-validation (`kde_bcv`) and unbiased cross-validation (`kde_ucv`).

## 5. Experimental Evaluation

We demonstrate the extrapolation of average accuracy in two data examples: (i) predicting the accuracy of a face recognition on a large set of labels from the system’s accuracy on a smaller subset, and (ii) extrapolating the performance of various classifiers on an optical character recognition (OCR) problem in the Telugu script, which has over 400 glyphs.

The face-recognition example takes data from the “Labeled Faces in the Wild” dataset (Huang et al. (2007)), where we selected the 1672 individuals with at least 2 face photos. We form a dataset consisting of photo-label pairs  $(x_j^{(i)}, y^{(i)})$  for  $i = 1, \dots, 1672$  and  $j = 1, 2$  by randomly selecting 2 face photos for each individual. We used the OpenFace (Amos et al. (2016)) embedding for feature extraction<sup>4</sup>. In order to identify a new photo  $\bar{z}^*$ , we obtain the feature vector  $g(x^*)$  from the OpenFace network, and guess the label  $\hat{y}$  with the minimal Euclidean distance between  $g(y^{(i)})$  and  $g(x^*)$ , which implies a score function

$$M_{y^{(i)}}(x^*) = -\|g(x_1^{(i)}) - g(x^*)\|^2.$$

In this way, we can compute the test accuracy on all 1672 classes,  $\text{TA}_{1672}$ , but we also subsample  $k_1 = \{100, 200, 400\}$  classes in order to extrapolate from  $k_1$  to 1672 classes.

In the Telugu optical character recognition example (Achanta and Hastie (2015)), we consider the use of three different classifiers: logistic regression, linear support-vector machine (SVM), and a deep convolutional neural network<sup>5</sup>. The full data consists of 400 classes with 50 training and 50 test observations for each class. We also create a nested hierarchy of subsampled data consisting of (i) a subset of size 100 randomly sampled from the 400 classes, and (ii) yet another subsampled dataset consisting of 20 classes random subsampled from the size-100 subsample. We therefore study three different prediction extrapolation problems:

1. Predicting the accuracy on  $k_2 = 100$  classes from  $k_1 = 20$  classes, comparing the predicted accuracy to the test accuracy of the classifier on the 100-class subsample as ground truth.
2. Same as (1), but setting  $k_2 = 400$  and  $k_1 = 20$ , and using the full dataset for the ground truth.
3. Same as (2), but setting  $k_2 = 400$  and  $k_1 = 100$ .

Note that unlike in the case of the face recognition example, here the assumption of marginal classification is satisfied for none of the classifiers. We compare the result of our model to the ground truth obtained by using the full dataset.

- 
4. For each photo  $x$ , a 128-dimensional feature vector  $g(x)$  is obtained as follows. The computer vision library DLIB is used to detect landmarks in  $x$ , and to apply a nonlinear transformation to align  $x$  to a template. The aligned photograph is then downsampled to a  $96 \times 96$  image. The downsampled image is fed into a pre-trained deep convolutional neural network to obtain the 128-dimensional feature vector  $g(x)$ . More details are found in (Amos et al. (2016)).
  5. The network architecture is as follows: 48x48-4C3-MP2-6C3-8C3-MP2-32C3-50C3-MP2-200C3-SM.

Label	Training			Test
$y^{(1)} = \text{Amelia}$	$x_1^{(1)} =$	$x_2^{(1)} =$	$x_3^{(1)} =$	$x_*^{(1)} =$
$y^{(2)} = \text{Jean-Pierre}$	$x_1^{(2)} =$	$x_2^{(2)} =$	$x_3^{(2)} =$	$x_*^{(2)} =$
$y^{(3)} = \text{Liza}$	$x_1^{(3)} =$	$x_2^{(3)} =$	$x_3^{(3)} =$	$x_4^{(3)} =$
$y^{(4)} = \text{Patricia}$	$x_1^{(4)} =$	$x_2^{(4)} =$	$x_3^{(4)} =$	$x_4^{(4)} =$



Figure 9: **Face recognition setup (top):** Examples of labels and features from the *Labeled Faces in the Wild* dataset. **Telugu OCR (bottom):** exemplars from six of the glyph classes, along with intermediate features and final transformations from the deep convolutional network.

## RESULTS

The extrapolation results can be seen in Figure 10, which plots the extrapolated accuracy curves for each method for 100 different subsamples of size  $k_1$ . As can be seen, for all three methods, the variances decrease rapidly as  $k_1$  increases. In general, for  $k_1 > 400$  the paths of the different extrapolation curves are not very different.

The root-mean-square errors between at  $k_2 = 1672$  can be seen in Table 2. KDE-BCV achieves the best extrapolation for all three cases  $k_1 = \{100, 200, 400\}$  with KDE-UCV consistently achieving second place. These results differ from the ranking of the RMSEs for the analogous simulation when predicting  $k_2 = 2000$  from  $k_1 = 500$  for accuracies around 0.45: in the first row and second column of Figure 7, where the true accuracy is 0.43 (from setting  $\sigma^2 = 0.2$ ), the lowest RMSE belongs to KDE-UCV (RMSE=0.0361±0.001), followed closely by CV-reg (RMSE=0.0372±0.002), and KDE-BCV (RMSE=0.0635±0.001) having the highest RMSE. These discrepancies could be explained by differences between the data distributions between the simulation and the face recognition example, and also by the fact that we only have access to the  $k_2 = 1672$ -class ground truth for the real data example. In simulations, we see that the empirical test accuracy for  $k_2 = 1600$  classes and  $r = 1$  repeats varies by a standard deviation of 0.01 in signal-to-noise settings with true accuracies around 0.4. Since the RMSEs of the simulation and the real-data example differ by a little more than 2 standard deviations, it is plausible that evaluating the methods with respect to the true population accuracy AGA<sub>1672</sub> would yield a ranking that was consistent with the simulation.




Figure 10: **Predicted accuracy curves for face-recognition example:** The plots show predicted accuracies using a different source dataset size  $k_1$ . Each red curve represents the estimated accuracies using a single subsample. The black curve shows the true average accuracy.

$k_1$	100	200	400
CV-reg	0.113 (0.002)	0.058 (0.002)	0.050 (0.001)
KDE-UCV	0.082 (0.001)	0.057 (0.001)	0.035 (0.001)
KDE-BCV	<b>0.053</b> (0.001)	<b>0.037</b> (0.001)	<b>0.024</b> (0.001)

Table 2: **Face-recognition extrapolation RMSEs:** RMSE (se) on predicting TA<sub>1672</sub> from  $k_1$  classes

$k_1$	$k_2$	Classifier	True	KDE-BCV	KDE-UCV	CV-reg
20	100	Deep CNN	0.9908	0.7138	0.6507	<b>0.9905</b>
		Logistic	0.8490	<b>0.8414</b>	0.8161	0.8980
		SVM	0.7582	0.6544	0.5771	<b>0.8192</b>
20	400	Deep CNN	0.9860	0.4903	0.3863	<b>0.9614</b>
		Logistic	0.7107	0.7467	<b>0.7015</b>	0.8824
		SVM	0.5452	<b>0.5163</b>	0.4070	0.6725
100	400	Deep CNN	0.9860	0.8910	0.8625	<b>0.9837</b>
		Logistic	0.7107	<b>0.7089</b>	0.6776	0.7214
		SVM	0.5452	0.4369	0.3528	<b>0.5969</b>

Table 3: **Telugu OCR extrapolated accuracies:** Extrapolating from  $k_1$  to  $k_2$  classes in Telugu OCR for three different classifiers: logistic regression, support vector machine, and deep convolutional network

The results for Telugu OCR classification are displayed in table 3. If we rank the three extrapolation methods in terms of distance to the ground truth accuracy, we see a consistent pattern of rankings between the 20-to-100 extrapolation and the 100-to-400 extrapolation. As we remarked in the simulation, the difficulty of extrapolation appears to be primarily sensitive to the extrapolation ratio  $\frac{k_2}{k_1}$ , which are similar (5 versus 4) in the 20-to-100 and 100-to-400 problems. In both settings, CV regression comes closest to the ground truth for the Deep CNN and the SVM, but KDE-BCV comes closest to ground truth for the Logistic regression. However, even for logistic regression, CV regression does better or comparably to KDE-UCV.

In the 20-to-400 extrapolation, which has the highest extrapolation ratio ( $\frac{k_2}{k_1} = 20$ ), none of the three extrapolation methods performs consistently well for all three classifiers. It could be the case that the variability is a dominating effect given the small training set, making it difficult to compare extrapolation methods using the 20-to-400 extrapolation task.

Unlike in the face recognition example, we did not resample training classes here, because that would require retraining all of the classifiers—which would be prohibitively time-consuming for the Deep CNN. Thus, we cannot comment on the robustness of the comparisons from this example, though it is likely that we would obtain different rankings under a new resampling of the training classes.

## 6. Discussion

In this work, we suggest treating the class set in a classification task as random, in order to extrapolate classification performance on a small task to the expected performance on a larger unobserved task. We show that average generalized accuracy decreases with increased class-set size like the  $(k-1)$ th moment of a distribution function. Furthermore, we introduce an algorithm for estimating this underlying distribution, that allows efficient computation of higher order moments. There are many choices and simplifying assumptions used in the

description of the method. In this discussion, we discuss these decisions and map some alternative models or strategies for future work.

## SAMPLING

Our analysis is currently restricted to randomized classification problems with i.i.d. sampling of classes. Extension to other sampling mechanisms, such as cluster sampling, may be possible if one can work out how the dependence between classes translates into dependence between the favorabilities  $U_{X^*}(m_{Y^{(k)}})$ .

More broadly, the assumption that the labels in  $\mathcal{S}_k$  are a random sample from a distribution  $\pi$  may be inappropriate. Many natural classification problems arise from hierarchically partitioning a space of instances into a set of labels. Therefore, rather than modeling  $\mathcal{S}_k$  as a random sample, it may be more suitable to model it as a random hierarchical partition of  $\mathcal{Y}$  (for instance, arising from an optional Pólya tree process, Wong et al. (2010)). Finally, note that we assume no knowledge about the new class-set except for its size. Better accuracy might be achieved if some partial information is known.

## ARBITRARY COST FUNCTIONS

In the current paper, we only discussed extrapolating the classification accuracy—or equivalently, the risk for the zero-one cost function. However, it is possible to extend our analysis to risk functions with arbitrary cost functions, which is the subject of forthcoming work.

## PARAMETRIC MODELS

Our CV-reg method adopts a non-parametric model of the discriminability function  $D(u)$ , in the sense that  $D(u)$  was defined via a spline expansion. However, an alternative approach is to assume a parametric family for  $D(u)$  defined by a small number of parameters. In forthcoming work, we show that under certain limiting conditions,  $D(u)$  is well-described by a two-parameter family. This substantially increases the efficiency of estimation in cases where the limiting conditions are well-approximated.

## Acknowledgments

We thank Jonathan Taylor, Trevor Hastie, John Duchi, Steve Mussmann, Qingyun Sun, and Robert Tibshirani for useful discussion. CZ is supported by an NSF graduate research fellowship, and would also like to thank the European Research Council under the ERC grant agreement n°[PSARPS-294519] for travel support.

## References

- Felix Abramovich and Marianna Pensky. Feature selection and classification of high-dimensional normal vectors with possibly large number of classes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1506.01567*, 2015.
- Rakesh Achanta and Trevor Hastie. Telugu ocr framework using deep learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1509.05962*, 2015.

- Brandon Amos, Bartosz Ludwiczuk, and Mahadev Satyanarayanan. Openface: A general-purpose face recognition library with mobile applications. Technical report, CMU-CS-16-118, CMU School of Computer Science, 2016.
- Ricardo Cao, Antonio Cuevas, and Wenceslao González Manteiga. A comparative study of several smoothing methods in density estimation. *Computational Statistics & Data Analysis*, 17(2):153–176, 1994.
- Corinna Cortes, Lawrence D Jackel, Sara A Solla, Vladimir Vapnik, and John S Denker. Learning curves: Asymptotic values and rate of convergence. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 327–334, 1994.
- Koby Crammer and Yoram Singer. On the algorithmic implementation of multiclass kernel-based vector machines. *Journal of machine learning research*, 2(Dec):265–292, 2001.
- Justin Davis, Marianna Pensky, and William Crampton. Bayesian feature selection for classification with possibly large number of classes. *Journal of Statistical Planning and Inference*, 141(9):3256–3266, 2011.
- Jia Deng, Alexander C Berg, Kai Li, and Li Fei-Fei. What does classifying more than 10,000 image categories tell us? In *European conference on computer vision*, pages 71–84. Springer, 2010.
- Jeff Donahue, Yangqing Jia, Oriol Vinyals, Judy Hoffman, Ning Zhang, Eric Tzeng, and Trevor Darrell. Decaf: A deep convolutional activation feature for generic visual recognition. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 647–655, 2014.
- Pinar Duygulu, Kobus Barnard, Joao FG de Freitas, and David A Forsyth. Object recognition as machine translation: Learning a lexicon for a fixed image vocabulary. In *European conference on computer vision*, pages 97–112. Springer, 2002.
- Gregory Griffin, Alex Holub, and Pietro Perona. Caltech-256 object category dataset. 2007.
- Maya R Gupta, Samy Bengio, and Jason Weston. Training highly multiclass classifiers. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 15(1):1461–1492, 2014.
- Trevor Hastie, Robert Tibshirani, and Jerome Friedman. *The Elements of Statistical Learning*, volume 1. Springer, 2 edition, 2009. ISBN 9780387848570. doi: 10.1007/b94608. URL <http://www.springerlink.com/index/10.1007/b94608>.
- Gary B. Huang, Manu Ramesh, Tamara Berg, and Erik Learned-Miller. Labeled faces in the wild: A database for studying face recognition in unconstrained environments. Technical Report 07-49, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, October 2007.
- Kendrick N Kay, Thomas Naselaris, Ryan J Prenger, and Jack L Gallant. Identifying natural images from human brain activity. *Nature*, 452(March):352–355, 2008. ISSN 0028-0836. doi: 10.1038/nature06713.
- Yoonkyung Lee, Yi Lin, and Grace Wahba. Multicategory support vector machines: Theory and application to the classification of microarray data and satellite radiance data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 99(465):67–81, 2004.

- Maxime Oquab, Leon Bottou, Ivan Laptev, and Josef Sivic. Learning and transferring mid-level image representations using convolutional neural networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 1717–1724, 2014.
- Rui Pan, Hansheng Wang, and Runze Li. Ultrahigh-dimensional multiclass linear discriminant analysis by pairwise sure independence screening. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 111(513):169–179, 2016.
- Sinno Jialin Pan and Qiang Yang. A survey on transfer learning. *IEEE Transactions on knowledge and data engineering*, 22(10):1345–1359, 2010.
- D. W. Scott. *Multivariate Density Estimation: Theory, Practice, and Visualization*. Wiley, 1992.
- C. E. Shannon. A Mathematical Theory of Communication. *Bell System Technical Journal*, 27(3):379–423, 1948. ISSN 00058580. doi: 10.1002/j.1538-7305.1948.tb01338.x. URL <http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/lpdocs/epic03/wrapper.htm?arnumber=6773024>.
- Ali Sharif Razavian, Hossein Azizpour, Josephine Sullivan, and Stefan Carlsson. Cnn features off-the-shelf: an astounding baseline for recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition workshops*, pages 806–813, 2014.
- Efstathios Stamatatos, Walter Daelemans, Ben Verhoeven, Patrick Juola, Aurelio López-López, Martin Potthast, and Benno Stein. Overview of the author identification task at pan 2014. In *CLEF (Working Notes)*, pages 877–897, 2014.
- Roberto Togneri and Daniel Pulella. An overview of speaker identification: Accuracy and robustness issues. *IEEE Circuits and Systems Magazine*, 11(2):23–61, 2011.
- Jason Weston, Chris Watkins, et al. Support vector machines for multi-class pattern recognition. In *ESANN*, volume 99, pages 219–224, 1999.
- Wing H Wong, Li Ma, et al. Optional polya tree and bayesian inference. *The Annals of Statistics*, 38(3):1433–1459, 2010.