

Assessment of the quality of a prediction^{*}

Roger Sewell[†]

roger.sewell@cantab.net

May 1, 2024

Acknowledgements: To Elisabeth Crowe, David Rimmer, Edwin Carter, and Sam Pumphrey for helpful comments.

Abstract

Shannon defined the mutual information between two variables. We illustrate why the true mutual information between a variable and the predictions made by a prediction algorithm is not a suitable measure of prediction quality, but the apparent Shannon mutual information (ASI) is; indeed it is the unique prediction quality measure with either of two very different lists of desirable properties, as previously shown by de Finetti and other authors. However, estimating the uncertainty of the ASI is a difficult problem, because of long and non-symmetric heavy tails to the distribution of the individual values of $j(x, y) = \log \frac{Q_y(x)}{P(x)}$. We propose a Bayesian modelling method for the distribution of $j(x, y)$, from the posterior distribution of which the uncertainty in the ASI can be inferred. This method is based on Dirichlet-based mixtures of skew-Student distributions. We illustrate its use on data from a Bayesian model for prediction of the recurrence time of prostate cancer. We believe that this approach is generally appropriate for most problems, where it is infeasible to derive the explicit distribution of the samples of $j(x, y)$, though the precise modelling parameters may need adjustment to suit particular cases.

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Definitions and rationale	3
2.1	Notation	3
2.2	Reasoning leading to choice of Apparent Shannon Information, definitions, and basic properties	3
2.3	Conditions for measurement	4
3	Properties	4
3.1	List of basic properties	5
3.2	Betting outcome prediction	5
3.3	Relevance to design of algorithms based on Bayesian inference	5

^{*}Second version deposited in arxiv; RFS version 1.15.1.1 ; reference [1] updated.

[†]Trinity College, Cambridge; but at the time this work was done employed full time by Cambridge Consultants.

4	Stability and estimation	6
4.1	A problem: point estimates based on finite datasets do not suffice	6
4.2	The suggested approach	7
5	Discussion	9
A	Outline proof of uniqueness	10
B	Details of modelling method used	11
B.1	Overall model hierarchy	11
B.2	Modifications to the model for modelling prostate cancer recurrence times	13
B.3	Sampling from the posterior distribution of the model	13
B.4	Methods for choosing hyperparameters	14
B.5	The skew-Student distribution	14
B.6	The proGamma distribution	14
B.7	Parameter settings for modelling of $j(x, y)$ data	15
B.8	Parameter settings and model modifications for modelling of prostate cancer recurrence times	15

1 Introduction

In many machine-learning situations a prediction or classification algorithm is trained on data for which the right answer is known – so called “supervised” learning on training data – and then required to make predictions on data to which it has not previously been exposed. There are numerous methods for assessing the quality of the resulting predictions; many depend on a particular measure of cost of error. For example, where the prediction provides a point value rather than a probability distribution, the expectation of squared difference between the true value and the predicted value is one such measure.

However, there are many situations where a variety of cost functions may be relevant to prediction, depending on who is using the prediction¹. We adopt the Bayesian paradigm, so that a high quality but imperfect prediction will provide not a point value of the variable being predicted, but a probability distribution on it[2, 3]. Hilden[4] surveyed many ways of measuring the quality of such predictions.

It is our belief that one method in particular provides the most appropriate means of assessing the performance of the upper end of the quality range for prediction algorithms independent of any specific cost function; that measure is the Apparent Shannon Information (ASI) in the predictions about the true values. This paper recalls that method and its desirable properties. We claim no originality in inventing this method (believing Claude Shannon[5] to be its conceptual father in the 1940s), nor in realising the nature of its desirable properties[6, 7, 8] (with minor differences). We strongly believe that it is used far less often than it should be, and therefore wish to remind those constructing and assessing prediction algorithms of its benefits.

However, there are difficulties assessing the value of this measure using only finite amounts of data. We also offer in this paper a Bayesian approach to evaluating the ASI, based on skew-Student mixture

¹For an example to keep in mind while reading this paper, consider a patient who has been diagnosed with cancer, and is interested in when he will die, in order that he may thriftily take out life insurance only for the periods in which the risk is high. The insurance company, his doctor, the patient himself, and his relatives may all have very different views on what cost function is appropriate, but all will benefit from having an accurate probability distribution on time of death from a prediction algorithm.

models, and illustrate the measurement with results from work on prediction of the recurrence of prostate cancer, also using skew-Student mixture models.

We also do not claim that this method is suitable for distinguishing the difference in performance of two imperfect prediction algorithms that produce only point-value outputs rather than probability distributions over the possible outputs.

Further, we do not consider in this paper the cost of execution of any algorithm, merely the quality of the predictions it makes. Clearly in any real-life choice of algorithm, such issues enter the decision along with the quality of the predictions made, and if formal trade-offs between error costs and implementation costs are needed it will be necessary to specialise further to the particular cost function that is relevant.

The rationale for using the ASI and definitions are in section 2. Section 3 recalls the properties of the ASI. Section 4 illustrates the need for a means of estimating the ASI beyond simply averaging log probability ratios over a finite unseen dataset, and provides that means, and section 5 presents our conclusions.

2 Definitions and rationale

2.1 Notation

We suppose we wish to predict the value of a random variable x taking values in some measurable space X , and to do so on the basis of some data y taking values in a measurable space Y . We suppose also that we have some prior information on the likely values of x in the absence of knowledge of y . Given a possible prediction algorithm, we suppose it in general to output a probability distribution Q_y on x which depends on y ; in general this distribution may not be the Bayesian posterior distribution $P(x|y)$, but as a probability distribution it must none the less have integral of 1.0. We will understand this to cover also the situation that the algorithm outputs a point value of x , when for any measurable subset $X_1 \subseteq X$, $Q_y(X_1)$ will be 1 if X_1 contains that point value of x and 0 otherwise.

However, for simplicity and ease of general understanding we will write formulae as if all variables are continuous with an appropriate probability density, so instead of $\int f(x) dP(x)$ we will write $\int f(x)P(x) dx$, supposing also that $Q_y(x)$ denotes the output probability density on x , and leave the reader to make the necessary notational adjustments for (partially) discrete random variables with non-zero probabilities on single-point sets.

2.2 Reasoning leading to choice of Apparent Shannon Information, definitions, and basic properties

Shannon[5] defined the mutual information $I(x; y)$ between y and x by

$$I(x; y) = \int_{X \times Y} P(x, y) \log \left(\frac{P(x|y)}{P(x)} \right) d(x, y);$$

to distinguish it from the Apparent Shannon Information introduced later, we will refer to $I(x; y)$ as the true Shannon mutual information in y about x . If the logarithm is taken to the base 2 the resulting value is reported in bits; if, as we shall, the logarithm is taken to the base e the resulting value is reported in nats or nepers (in this context the two have the same meaning).

We first need to see why $I(x; Q_y)$ is not a suitable measure of a prediction algorithm's quality. Suppose x is a variable taking only two possible values (e.g. whether a coin will come down heads or tails when next thrown), and that in the absence of any data each of the two values is equally probable. Then any algorithm which tells us the right answer with probability 1 will give us 1 bit, or about 0.69 nepers, of true mutual information in its output about x . However, so will any algorithm which with probability 1 tells us the wrong answer; this is because an answer which is known to be wrong carries in this situation

as much relevant information as one which is known to be right, as can be seen by applying an inverter to the algorithm's output. It is immediately clear to any betting man that an oracle which can tell which side of a coin will not be uppermost is in some senses just as good as one which can tell which side will be visible.

However, we are interested in assessing the quality of the original algorithm, without any correction mechanism added to its output. We therefore define the Apparent Shannon Information by

$$J(x; Q_y) = \int_{X \times Y} P(x, y) \log \left(\frac{Q_y(x)}{P(x)} \right) d(x, y),$$

where the substitution of $Q_y(x)$ for $P(x|y)$ replaces what can be deduced from the output of the algorithm with what the output of the algorithm is actually claiming. Further, we consider also a generalisation of this, where before developing the present algorithm A_1 we have a perhaps inferior algorithm A_0 , and we want to measure the quality of A_1 relative to that of A_0 . We generalise and define

$$J(x; Q_y^{A_1}; Q_y^{A_0}) = \int_{X \times Y} P(x, y) \log \left(\frac{Q_y^{A_1}(x)}{Q_y^{A_0}(x)} \right) d(x, y),$$

the apparent Shannon information from A_1 relative to that from A_0 , but where there is an understood prior distribution on x we will continue to write $J(x; Q_y)$. Note that the ASI corresponds to the difference of expectations of log probability assigned to the true values by the algorithm and by the prior (or the antecedent algorithm). As such the ASI differs only in setting of the zero point from the expected log probability measures of [6] and [7] (which also differ in zero point from each other).

Now, while it is always the case that both $I(x; y) \geq 0$ and $I(x; Q_y) \geq 0$, it is not always the case that $J(x; Q_y) \geq 0$; where $J(x; Q_y) < 0$, the output distribution Q_y is misleading in comparison with the prior (or antecedent algorithm's) distribution. The example above where an algorithm reliably predicts the wrong outcome of a coin-toss is typical of a misleading output; it scores $J(x; Q_y) = -\infty$. Equally, any other algorithm in any situation which outputs a point value (or equivalently all the probability on a single point value) will score $J(x; Q_y) = -\infty$ if the probability of that point value being wrong is non-zero.

2.3 Conditions for measurement

We wish to emphasise particularly that $J(x; Q_y)$ is to be calculated with the distribution $P(x, y)$ reflecting the distribution of new incoming problems, not some version of this that has a distribution biased in favour of seeing cases on which an algorithm has been "trained". In some situations there will be large differences between values calculated on "unseen" data (as they should be) and values calculated based on data seen in a training set. Therefore when calculating $J(x; Q_y)$ data should only be used that has not been seen during training of the algorithm.

In particular Bootstrapping ([9] page 372) is not an appropriate way of determining $J(x; Q_y)$, as it does not correctly calculate the differences between cases seen and unseen during training (see appendix to [1]).

We will discuss methods of estimating the true value of $J(x; Q_y)$ in section 4 below.

3 Properties

We now briefly recall the elementary properties of this prediction quality measure. These follow easily from the Kullback-Leibler divergence theorem, also known as Gibbs' inequality ([3] pp 34 ff), and from the Data Processing Theorem[10, 11]. (For this we assume that the variable being predicted is a real scalar, though this is not an essential limitation.)

3.1 List of basic properties

1. The true Bayesian posterior distribution $Q_y^{\text{Bayes}}(x) = P(x|y)$ maximises $J(x, Q_y)$ over all probability distributions Q_y , at the value $J(x; Q_y^{\text{Bayes}}) = I(x; y)$.
2. We have the following relationships between the ASI and true Shannon mutual information: $J(x; Q_y) \leq I(x; Q_y) \leq I(x; y)$. In other words the ASI never exceeds the true Shannon mutual information in the prediction, which in turn never exceeds the mutual information between data and predicted variable.
3. If $w = f(x)$ for some bijective differentiable function f with differentiable inverse, then $J(w; R_y) = J(x; Q_y)$, where $R_y(w) = Q_y(g(w))g'(w)$, where g' denotes the derivative of g , the inverse of f . For example, if we can predict x , a positive real variable, with a particular amount of ASI, then we can also predict $\log(x)$ with the same ASI.
4. If we start with a prior $P(x)$, then develop algorithm A_1 , then develop an improved algorithm A_2 , the ASI of A_2 relative to the prior is simply the sum of that of A_1 relative to the prior and that of A_2 relative to A_1 : $J(x; Q_y^{A_2}; Q_y^{A_1}) + J(x; Q_y^{A_1}) = J(x; Q_y^{A_2})$.
5. If there are two mutually exclusive and exhaustive events E_0, E_1 which are not observed, then $J(x; Q_y)$ will be the appropriate weighted average of $J_{E_0}(x; Q_y)$ (the ASI when E_0 occurs but is not observed) and $J_{E_1}(x; Q_y)$ (the ASI when E_1 occurs but is not observed), i.e. $J(x; Q_y) = P(E_0)J_{E_0}(x; Q_y) + P(E_1)J_{E_1}(x; Q_y)$.
6. The ASI is [6, 12, 13], up to a constant scalar multiple, the unique quality measure that is zero on the prior, is proper in the sense that the person making the prediction has no incentive to mis-state his beliefs, and depends only on Q_y .
7. The ASI is also, up to a constant scalar multiple, the unique quality measure that is zero on the prior, and has properties 3, 4, and 5 above (outline proof in appendix section A below); the scalar multiple can be resolved by using also property 1.

3.2 Betting outcome prediction

One may also ask what the significance of a positive value of $J(x; Q_y)$ is. One possible characterisation is via the following betting scheme.

Each of two individuals 1 and 2 has a prediction algorithm (A_1 and A_2 respectively) for predicting x from y . Each player places a sum M of money into a pile in front of him, keeping the two piles separate. Each time a new value of y is observed, each player i makes his prediction $Q_y^{A_i}$, a distribution on x . Each time the true value x corresponding to a prediction becomes known, the amount of money currently in each player i 's pile is multiplied by $\frac{Q_y^{A_i}(x)}{P(x)}$. At the end of the game each player pockets the pile in front of him.

It is then easy to verify that the geometric expected value in each pile i approaches ∞ as the number of predictions checked approaches ∞ if and only if the predictions being made satisfy $J(x; Q_y^{A_i}) > 0$; the geometric expected ratio of player 1's pile to player 2's pile approaches ∞ if and only if $J(x; Q_y^{A_1}) > J(x; Q_y^{A_2})$. In other words betting according to the predictions works without diversification if and only if the predictions carry positive apparent Shannon information.

3.3 Relevance to design of algorithms based on Bayesian inference

Algorithms based on Bayesian inference can be designed using the inherent capability of Bayesian techniques to consider a range of different models for the probability distributions involved, and to

choose optimally and probabilistically between them. So why then might one want to measure the performance of such an algorithm ?

Consider a situation where pairs (x, y) arrive to be processed, with y observed but x hidden and to be inferred or predicted. The population arriving comes from a joint distribution $P(x, y)$; suppose that the true marginal distribution $P(x)$ and the true likelihood $P(y|x)$ are known, so that the true Bayesian posterior $P(x|y)$ can be calculated.

It would then be appropriate that the prediction quality measure is optimised by setting $Q_y(x) = P(x|y)$. This is indeed the case, as seen in section 3.1 item 1 above.

However, in many situations a Bayesian investigator is handicapped by only knowing his own prior on the unknown and his own approximation to the likelihood. Either or both of these may have been learned from data, for example training data. Such learning may well have been done by comparing the posterior model probabilities for a number of possible models (distribution families), and the choice between models may have been done optimally, given the available information. Nonetheless, the question of which initial candidate set of models to choose between is one to which Bayesian techniques provide no definitive answer. Therefore it is still of interest, given two Bayesian algorithms designed from different selections of possible models, to ask which is better.

One way of doing this is to combine the sets of training data used in each development and use the combined set in the standard Bayesian model choice procedure with both models included on the candidate list; indeed this is expected to produce a combined algorithm at least as good as the better algorithm and possibly better than both. Sometimes, however, access to one of the training sets or model definitions is limited for e.g. commercial reasons, and in that situation the measurement of $J(x; Q_y)$ for each algorithm provides an appropriate answer. One must, however, ensure that data previously seen by either algorithm is excluded from such a test set.

4 Stability and estimation

Given a prediction algorithm and some unseen data with corresponding right answers, how do we measure the apparent information content ?

For example, we might develop an algorithm for prediction of time of recurrence of prostate cancer, based on a training dataset of information about a series of patients and the times cancer recurred in those patients. We then might have a disjoint set of patients for whom we have the same input information y and actual outcome data x , for whom we produce predictions Q_y , and we want to measure $J(x; Q_y)$.

4.1 A problem: point estimates based on finite datasets do not suffice

Given that $J(x; Q_y) = \int P(x, y) \log \left(\frac{Q_y(x)}{P(x)} \right) d(x, y) = E \log \left(\frac{Q_y(x)}{P(x)} \right)$, one obvious approach is to observe previously unseen data y and corresponding correct answers x , apply the $Q_y(x)$ prediction algorithm, and calculate for each (x, y) pair the value of $j(x, y) = \log \left(\frac{Q_y(x)}{P(x)} \right)$, then take the average of these values over the data points observed. (It might even be tempting to suggest that the uncertainty in the result would be Gaussian with standard deviation equal to that of $j(x, y)$ divided by the square root of the number of points observed minus one. This, however, would be very misleading.)

The essential problem is illustrated by the measurements of $j(x, y)$ taken from just such a Bayesian algorithm trained to predict time of recurrence of prostate cancer from a set of biomarkers[1], a histogram of which on data points not seen during training is shown in Figure 1. The average value of $j(x, y)$ over these data points is +0.096 nepers, but if the one point at -6.58 nepers were not included it would be +0.112, which given the narrowness of the main distribution is quite a big difference (the false assumption that these data were Gaussianly distributed would suggest that the mean is known to a standard deviation of 0.034 nepers, making this change more than 3.2 standard deviations).




Figure 1: Histogram of $j(x, y)$ for data points not seen during training, where the prediction algorithm is using a range of biomarkers and clinical data to predict time of recurrence of prostate cancer following radical prostatectomy.

We therefore need to know not only the average of the $j(x, y)$, but its distribution, in order that we may know just how uncertain our quality measure is.

4.2 The suggested approach

Rasmussen and others have investigated using Student distributions to model this data and infer uncertainty [8, 14, 15], encountering difficulty because of the tendency for there to be long heavy tails that are not symmetric. We propose a related method, using the skew-Student distribution, which lacks reflection symmetry about its mean, as follows.

We create a parametric Bayesian model for the distribution of $j(x, y)$, then draw random samples $(\theta_k)_{k=1, \dots, K}$ from the distribution on the parameters given the $j(x, y)$ data. For each sample θ_k we can calculate the mean μ_k of the resulting sample of the distribution, and hence get a histogram, cumulative distribution, etc of the desired value $J(x; Q_y)$.

We illustrate how this idea works before defining the details of the modelling. Figure 2 shows the actual distributions resulting from three of the samples of θ_k when this modelling process is run on the $j(x, y)$ data of Figure 1, and Figure 3 shows the resulting cumulative posterior distribution of $J(x; Q_y)$ given the $j(x, y)$ data.

This cumulative distribution and the samples that gave it allow us to report our uncertainty on $J(x; Q_y)$ for example as mean 0.107, median 0.106, 0.025 quantile 0.043, and 0.975 quantile 0.172 nepers. The specific value 0.096 which is the mean of the $j(x, y)$ not surprisingly lies comfortably with these results.

Obviously the model used for this purpose needs to be appropriately flexible. The method used here is to create a hierarchical Bayesian model based around a Dirichlet-mixed skew-Student mixture; the details are in the appendix section B. The key element of this is the skew-Student distribution, which is




Figure 2: Three samples of the distributions specified by the posterior distribution of the θ_k given the $j(x, y)$ data. For each (green) distribution a mean value can be calculated, since the distribution's parameters are known. Given a large number of such samples of the mean, the posterior distribution of the mean can be reconstructed as in Figure 3.




Figure 3: The cumulative distribution of $J(x; Q_y)$ based on modelling the $j(x, y)$ data calculated from the data points unseen during training.

the marginal distribution of $\frac{\sigma z + \nu}{\sqrt{\alpha}} + \mu$ that results from z being distributed according to a standard unit Gaussian and α being Gamma distributed independently of z , where σ, μ, ν are parameters, along with m and if desired r , respectively the shape and scale parameters of the relevant Gamma distribution.

Obviously it is important that in the absence of $j(x, y)$ data the resulting distribution is sufficiently broad; for the particular parameters used here the 0.025 and 0.975 centiles of the effective prior distribution on $J(x; Q_y)$ are respectively -2 and +2 nepers approximately. This might not be sufficiently wide for prediction algorithms that provide much more information, and suitable adjustments in the parameters in section B.7 will then be needed, particularly if the number of data points is low.

Critics of this approach will surely point out that the results therefore depend on the prior used for this modelling and the precise samples θ_k used, both of which are true. More importantly, there are likely to be some instances where the distribution of the $j(x, y)$ carries a known parametric form (though we have not yet encountered such a situation), in which circumstances it would clearly be more appropriate to use that parametric form rather than one introduced *ex vacuo*.

5 Discussion

In the situation where we are interested in predicting the value of a variable x , with the prediction potentially to be used by many users with different cost functions, the key attribute of a high quality prediction algorithm is that its predictions should not be wrong, i.e. that the true value of x should be predicted with as high a probability (or density) as possible.

While it is true that point value predictions may suffice where all that matters is, for example, the mean squared distance of the point prediction from the true value, there are many situations where the relationship between the true value and its eventual effects is much more complicated. Measurement of apparent Shannon information tells us exactly how reliable the original prediction is compared with the prior, and simultaneously tells us how reliable derived values are, at least for smoothly and bijectively related ones.

As indicated in section 3.1 points 6 and 7, ASI is characterised by being the unique quality measure with a simple list of desirable properties; indeed there are two such lists, of very different nature, each of which yields the same quality measure.

The effect of optimising a prediction according to the ASI criterion is often counter-intuitive; tests with naive human subjects usually result in negative values even with respect to very broad priors, even when attempting to predict values of things you might think the subjects would know a lot about. It is also much more difficult to obtain positive ASI from a prediction algorithm than one might think; the characterisation by the betting scheme of section 3.2 perhaps gives some intuitive idea why this might be so. This is why we believe this is the right way to assess high quality prediction algorithms – it is sensitive to their potential failings.

A genuine argument against using the ASI in the past is that it has been difficult to know how uncertain the value is that is obtained by simply averaging values $j(x, y)$ over a finite previously unseen dataset. The difficulty of doing this appears to have lain in the asymmetry of the heavy tails of typical distributions of $j(x, y)$. We believe that the remedy to this lies as indicated in extending the Bayesian nature of the investigation process to cover not only the prediction algorithm itself, but also the modelling of the uncertainty of $j(x, y)$, and in particular in using the skew-Student distribution as the fundamental building block of such a model. Clearly such a process is affected by the prior used, but in practice, as in many applications of Bayesian inference, so long as the prior is chosen to be sufficiently broad and “uninformative”, the exact details of the prior turn out to be relatively unimportant. In this particular instance it appears in particular to be important that the “uninformative” nature of the prior also covers the extent of asymmetry, if any, in individual mixture component distributions.

A Outline proof of uniqueness

In the following discussion we will assume for simplicity that all the random variables are real-valued. However this is not a necessary assumption, and the reader should have no difficulty converting for example to the situation where random variables have values in \mathbb{R}^n , where the main change needed is that $g'(x)$ (the absolute value of the derivative of g at x) needs replacing by $\left| \det \left(\frac{\partial g}{\partial x} \right) \right|$, the absolute value of the Jacobian determinant.

Suppose then $\phi(z_1, z_0, E)$ is a real-valued quality measure taking as arguments two random variables and a conditioning event E which is unobserved but restricts us to only part of the total probability space. Suppose q_1, q_0 are two functions of a real variable giving density functions on the reals, so that if x, y are random variables then $q_i(y)(x)$ is also a random variable.

Intuitively, think of $q_1(y), q_0(y)$ as being the predictions of x made by the two different algorithms from data y , and of $\phi(q_1(y)(x), q_0(y)(x), E)$ as (somehow) measuring the quality of algorithm represented by q_1 relative to that represented by q_0 under the circumstance that E is true (but not known to be), so that $q_1(r)$ denotes the probability distribution on x resulting from the algorithm trying to deduce the value of the random variable x from that of y given the particular value r of y .

More technically, suppose (Ω, M, P) is a probability space, X is the set of real-valued random variables on it having density functions, G is the set of diffeomorphisms² $\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, H is the set of bijections $\mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, F is the set of probability density functions on \mathbb{R} , and Q the set of functions $\mathbb{R} \rightarrow F$.

Now suppose that $x, y \in X$ and that $\phi : X \times X \times M \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is a function. In the following we use the notation $P(x@a)$ to denote the value of the probability density function of the random variable x at the value a .

Suppose ϕ has the following properties for all $z_1, z_0 \in X, q, q_0, q_1, q_2 \in Q, E \in M, g \in G$:

1. If $\hat{q}(r)(s)$ is defined to be $P(x@s|y=r)$ and similarly $\bar{q}(r)(s) = P(x@s)$, then

$$I(x; y) = \phi(\hat{q}(y)(x), \bar{q}(y)(x), \Omega).$$

(The value on the Bayesian posterior relative to the prior is the true Shannon mutual information.)

2. For any $g \in G$,

$$\phi(T_g(q_1)(y)(g^{-1}(x)), T_g(q_0)(y)(g^{-1}(x)), E) = \phi(q_1(y)(x), q_0(y)(x), E),$$

where $T_g(q)(r)(s) = g'(s)q(r)(g(s))$, with the dash denoting differentiation. (Consequent predictions of diffeomorphically related variables have the same prediction quality; T_g transforms a prediction q about s given r into one about $g^{-1}(s)$.)

- 3.

$$\phi(z_2, z_0, E) = \phi(z_2, z_1, E) + \phi(z_1, z_0, E).$$

(The increase in quality from algorithm 0 to algorithm 2 is the sum of the increases from 0 to 1 and from 1 to 2.)

4. If $E_1, E_2 \in M, E_1 \cap E_2 = \emptyset$ then

$$P(E_1 \cup E_2)\phi(z_1, z_0, E_1 \cup E_2) = P(E_1)\phi(z_1, z_0, E_1) + P(E_2)\phi(z_1, z_0, E_2).$$

(The quality measure averages correctly over unobserved other circumstances.)

We then claim that it follows (assuming the existence of sufficiently varied random variables) that

$$\phi(q_1(y)(x), q_0(y)(x), E) = \int P(x, y|E) \log \left(\frac{q_1(y)(x)}{q_0(y)(x)} \right) d(x, y),$$

²A diffeomorphism here is a bijective differentiable function whose inverse is differentiable.

and hence by 3 any absolute quality measure that satisfies these properties and assigns zero to the algorithm that just outputs the prior distribution on x and ignores the value of y is the apparent Shannon information.

We will however only sketch the outline of a proof, leaving the reader to fill in the details; this outline goes as follows.

Property 4 is first used to show that $\phi(z_1, z_0, E)$ is the expectation given E of a random variable $:\Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which sends ω to a function of $(z_1(\omega), z_0(\omega))$, so that we can write

$$\phi(z_1, z_0, E) = \int P(z_1, z_0 | E) f(z_1, z_0) d(z_1, z_0)$$

for some function $f : \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$.

Next, property 2 allows us to deduce that for any positive real r , $\phi(rz_1, rz_0, E) = \phi(z_1, z_0, E)$, so in fact $f(z_1, z_0)$ is a function of $\alpha = \frac{z_1}{z_0}$. Rewriting $f(z_1, z_0)$ as $f(\alpha)$, property 3 then tells us that $f(\alpha_1 \alpha_2) = f(\alpha_1) + f(\alpha_2)$, from which we learn that f is a constant multiple of the logarithm.

Finally, property 1 tells us that the scalar multiple must be unity, which gives the desired result.

B Details of modelling method used

This appendix contains the details of the modelling used in section 4.2 above. The case of modelling the $j(x, y)$ data was done with one set of hyperparameter values (listed in section B.7), the case of modelling the recurrence times for prostate cancer patients with a different set (listed in section B.8), as well as some further modifications to allow for some recurrence times being unobserved, which are listed in section B.2 below.

B.1 Overall model hierarchy

Let x_k denote the k th data point to be modelled.

Let C denote the number of mixture components, c an individual component, c_k the mixture component to which x_k is adherent, and \mathbf{c} the vector of the c_k s.

For other variables subscripts are used for two purposes: first, to indicate which component of a vector of such parameters is being used; second, to modify the variable name to indicate a similar variable at a higher level of the model. Thus \mathbf{S} denotes the vector of scale matrices for the mixture components, \mathbf{S}_c denotes the scale matrix for mixture component c , $\mathbf{R}_\mathbf{S}$ denotes the vector of scale matrices for \mathbf{S} , while $\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{S}_c}$ denotes the component of $\mathbf{R}_\mathbf{S}$ that applies to \mathbf{S}_c .

All variable with names starting \mathbf{S} or \mathbf{R} are positive definite symmetric $N \times N$ real matrices.

Then the overall model hierarchy can be represented by the following equations; we start with those at the top of the hierarchy. $\mu_{\mu_\mu}, \mathbf{S}_{\mu_\mu}, m_{\mathbf{S}_\mu}, m_{\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{S}_\mu}}, \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{S}_\mu}}, N, \kappa_\nu, \kappa_\eta, \kappa_C, a_m, b_m, N_m, m_{\mathbf{R}_\mathbf{S}}, \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{R}_\mathbf{S}}, a_{m_\mathbf{S}}, b_{m_\mathbf{S}}$ are constant hyperparameters, values given in sections B.7 or B.8 below depending on application.

$$P(C | \kappa_C) = \begin{cases} \kappa_C^{C-1} (1 - \kappa_C) & (C > 0) \\ 0 & (C = 0) \end{cases} \quad (\text{exponential on integers})$$

$$\eta_c = \kappa_\eta / C$$

$$P(p|\eta, C) = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\sqrt{C}} \frac{\Gamma(\sum_{c=1}^C \eta_c)}{\prod_{c=1}^C \Gamma(\eta_c)} \prod_{c=1}^C p_c^{\eta_c-1} & \left(\sum_{c=1}^C p_c = 1 \right) \\ 0 & \text{(otherwise)} \end{cases} \quad (\text{Dirichlet})$$

$$P(c_k @ c | p) = p_c$$

$$P(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{S}_\mu} | m_{\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{S}_\mu}}, \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{S}_\mu}}, N) = \text{Wishart}(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{S}_\mu}; m_{\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{S}_\mu}}, \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{S}_\mu}}, N)$$

where

$$\text{Wishart}(\mathbf{S}; m, \mathbf{R}, N) = \frac{\det(\mathbf{R})^{m + \frac{N-1}{2}}}{\pi^{N(N-1)/4} \prod_{j=0}^{N-1} \Gamma(m + \frac{j}{2})} \det(\mathbf{S})^{m-1} e^{-\text{trace}(\mathbf{R}\mathbf{S})}$$

$$P(\mathbf{S}_\mu | m_{\mathbf{S}_\mu}, \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{S}_\mu}, N) = \text{Wishart}(\mathbf{S}_\mu; m_{\mathbf{S}_\mu}, \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{S}_\mu}, N)$$

$$P(\mu_\mu | \mu_{\mu_\mu}, \mathbf{S}_{\mu_\mu}) = \text{Gaussian}(\mu_\mu; \mu_{\mu_\mu}, \mathbf{S}_{\mu_\mu})$$

where

$$\text{Gaussian}(x; \mu, \mathbf{S}) = \sqrt{\det\left(\frac{\mathbf{S}}{2\pi}\right)} e^{-\frac{1}{2}(x-\mu)'\mathbf{S}(x-\mu)}$$

where ' denotes transpose.

$$P(m_{\mathbf{S}} | a_{m_{\mathbf{S}}}, b_{m_{\mathbf{S}}}, N) \propto \text{proGamma}(m_{\mathbf{S}}; a_{m_{\mathbf{S}}}, b_{m_{\mathbf{S}}}, N, 1)$$

where the proGamma distribution is defined below in section B.6.

$$P(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{S}} | m_{\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{S}}}, \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{S}}}, N) = \text{Wishart}(\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{S}}; m_{\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{S}}}, \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{S}}}, N)$$

$$P(\mathbf{S}_c | m_{\mathbf{S}}, \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{S}}, N) = \text{Wishart}(\mathbf{S}_c; m_{\mathbf{S}}, (m_{\mathbf{S}} - 1)\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{S}}, N)$$

$$P(m_c | a_m, b_m, N_m) \propto \text{proGamma}(m_c; a_m, b_m, N_m, 1)$$

$$r_c = m_c - 1$$

$$P(\alpha_k | m, r) = \frac{r_{c_k}^{m_{c_k}}}{\Gamma(m_{c_k})} \alpha_k^{m_{c_k}-1} e^{-r_{c_k} \alpha_k} \quad (\alpha_k > 0) \quad (\text{Gamma})$$

$$P(\nu_c | \kappa_\nu, \mathbf{S}_c) = \text{Gaussian}\left(\nu_c; 0, \frac{\mathbf{S}_c}{\kappa_\nu}\right)$$

$$P(\mu_c | \mu_\mu, \mathbf{S}_\mu) = \text{Gaussian}(\mu_c; \mu_\mu, \mathbf{S}_\mu)$$

$$P(x_k | \mathbf{c}, \mu, \nu, \alpha, \mathbf{S}) = \text{Gaussian}\left(x_k; \mu_{c_k} + \frac{\nu_{c_k}}{\sqrt{\alpha_k}}, \alpha_k \mathbf{S}_{c_k}\right)$$

For convenience we also include the detailed definitions of the perhaps less familiar skew-Student and proGamma distributions in sections B.5 and B.6 below.

B.2 Modifications to the model for modelling prostate cancer recurrence times

For modelling prostate cancer recurrence times, the above model was modified in the following ways.

First, the scalar x_k representing a $j(x, y)$ value is replaced by a vector x_k whose first component $x_{k,1}$ represents the logarithm of the true time at which recurrence occurs (which may or may not be observed), and whose remaining components represent logarithms of the various biochemical marker levels and clinical variables used for the prediction.

Second, the observed data vector y_k is modelled as follows:

$$y_{k,1} = (x_{k,1} + n_{k,1}) \wedge z_k$$

$$y_{k,\bar{1}} = (x_{k,\bar{1}} + n_{k,\bar{1}})$$

where $a \wedge b$ denotes the minimum of a and b and $\bar{1}$ denotes all indices other than 1, and where

$$P(n_k | m_n, r_n, \mathbf{S}_n, N) = \sqrt{\det\left(\frac{\mathbf{S}_n}{2\pi}\right)} \frac{\Gamma(m_n + \frac{N}{2})}{\Gamma(m_n)} \frac{r_n^{m_n}}{(r_n + \frac{1}{2}n'_k \mathbf{S}_n n_k)^{m_n + \frac{N}{2}}} \quad (\text{Student})$$

$$r_n = m_n$$

$$P(z_k) = \text{Gaussian}(z_k; \mu_z, \mathbf{S}_z)$$

where $m_n, \mathbf{S}_n, \mu_z, \mathbf{S}_z$ are additional constant hyperparameters, and z_k is the logarithm of the duration of observation if recurrence was not observed in case k (and is known to be greater than $y_{k,1}$ otherwise). $y_{k,1}$ denotes the earlier of the time the patient's follow-up ceased with the patient recurrence-free or the time cancer returned.

Third, the following equations replace the corresponding ones in the hierarchy of section B.1:

$$P(m_c | a_m, b_m, N_m) \propto \text{proGamma}(m_c; a_m, b_m, N_m, 2) \quad (\text{proGamma type 2 – see section B.6})$$

$$r_c = m_c$$

B.3 Sampling from the posterior distribution of the model

Exploration of the posterior distribution given the data was done using Markov chain Monte-Carlo by Gibbs resampling along sets of mutually independent axes, using standard methods. In particular the proGamma distribution can be resampled using adaptive rejection sampling[16].

Convergence time was assessed by creating synthetic datasets whose true parameters were known and ensuring that run time was long enough for the resulting distributions to be approximately independent of starting parameters, where the starting parameters were initialised either from the true values or from random values from their priors. For modelling the distribution of $J(x; Q_y)$, having obtained many sets of posterior joint parameter samples given the information values $j(x, y)$ whose distribution is being modelled, the mean of each such distribution was calculated analytically and considered as a set of posterior samples of the apparent information content being estimated. Mean, median, and centiles of this distribution were then estimated from the respective statistics of this set of samples.

For modelling recurrence times of prostate cancer, having obtained many sets of posterior joint parameter samples given the observed data vectors, the marginal distribution of recurrence time was calculated for each such joint parameter sample, and the equiprobable mixture of these distributions returned as the predictive distribution on recurrence time.

B.4 Methods for choosing hyperparameters

Bayesian model choice was undertaken for the establishment of appropriate values of the top level hyperparameters, using thermodynamic integration[17]. Where uncertainty of the posterior model probabilities was too big to choose between close candidate values of the hyperparameters, samples from the overall prior model were examined by the human eye to look for similarity to the observed data patterns.

B.5 The skew-Student distribution

The combined effect of the equations in section B.1 for the distributions of α_k and x_k is that

$$P(x_k|\mathbf{c}, \mu, \nu, m, r, \mathbf{S}, N) = \frac{r^m}{\Gamma(m)} \sqrt{\det\left(\frac{\mathbf{S}}{2\pi}\right)} \frac{1}{(r + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{y}'\mathbf{S}\mathbf{y})^{m+\frac{N}{2}}} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\nu'\mathbf{S}\nu} \times \\ \left(\Gamma\left(m + \frac{N}{2}\right) {}_1F_1\left(m + \frac{N}{2}; \frac{1}{2}; \frac{(\mathbf{y}'\mathbf{S}\nu)^2}{4(r + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{y}'\mathbf{S}\mathbf{y})}\right) + \frac{\mathbf{y}'\mathbf{S}\nu}{\sqrt{r + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{y}'\mathbf{S}\mathbf{y}}} \Gamma\left(m + \frac{N+1}{2}\right) {}_1F_1\left(m + \frac{N+1}{2}; \frac{3}{2}; \frac{(\mathbf{y}'\mathbf{S}\nu)^2}{4(r + \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{y}'\mathbf{S}\mathbf{y})}\right) \right) \text{ where } {}_1F_1 \text{ denotes the relevant hypergeometric function, given by}$$

$${}_1F_1(a; b; z) = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} \frac{\Gamma(a+j)/\Gamma(a)}{\Gamma(b+j)/\Gamma(b)} \frac{z^j}{j!},$$

and where $\mathbf{y}, \mu, \nu, m, \mathbf{R}, \mathbf{S}$ respectively stand for $(\mathbf{x}_k - \mu_{c_k}), \mu_{c_k}, \nu_{c_k}, m_{c_k}, \mathbf{R}_{c_k}, \mathbf{S}_{c_k}$. The properties of the 1-dimensional version of this distribution were reviewed in [12].

B.6 The proGamma distribution

(We would be glad to hear from anybody with a better known name for this family of distributions, as also from anybody able to evaluate the normalisation constants.)

The proGamma distributions are the conjugate distributions for the shape parameter m of the Gamma and Wishart distributions, with respect to three different parameterisations of the Gamma distribution.

The type 0 proGamma distribution is the simplest, conjugate to the usual parameterisation of the Gamma with shape parameter m and scale parameter r , i.e.

$$P(x|m, r) = \frac{r^m}{\Gamma(m)} x^{m-1} e^{-rx},$$

as well as to the Wishart parameterised by m and \mathbf{R} , i.e.

$$P(\mathbf{S}|m, \mathbf{R}, N) = \frac{\det(\mathbf{R})^{m+\frac{N-1}{2}}}{\pi^{N(N-1)/4} \prod_{j=0}^{N-1} \Gamma\left(m + \frac{j}{2}\right)} \det(\mathbf{S})^{m-1} e^{-\text{trace}(\mathbf{R}\mathbf{S})}.$$

It is given by

$$P(m|a, b, N, v=0) \propto \frac{e^{-(a+Nb)m}}{\left(\prod_{j=0}^{N-1} \Gamma\left(m + \frac{j}{2}\right)\right)^b}$$

for $m > 0$, where N is 1 for the Gamma and is otherwise the dimensionality of the Wishart. Parameter restrictions are that b must be positive and N must be a positive integer.

The type 1 proGamma distribution is instead conjugate with respect to n to the Gamma distribution parameterised by $(m, r) = (n, (n-1)t)$ (or for the Wishart $(m, \mathbf{R}) = (n, (n-1)\mathbf{T})$), so that the inverse of the mean of the Gamma or Wishart distributed quantity doesn't vary as n varies. It now takes the form

$$P(m|a, b, N, v=1) \propto \begin{cases} \frac{e^{(a+Nb)m} (m-1)^{Nb\left(m+\frac{N-1}{2}\right)}}{\left(\prod_{j=0}^{N-1} \Gamma\left(m+\frac{j}{2}\right)\right)^b} & (m > 1) \\ 0 & (\text{otherwise}) \end{cases},$$

where the parameter restrictions are again that both a and b must be positive, but the support of the distribution is now $m > 1$ rather than the $m > 0$ which applies for types 0 and 2.

The type 2 proGamma distribution is instead conjugate with respect to n to the Gamma parameterised by $(m, r) = (n, nt)$, so that as n varies the mean of the Gamma remains constant. Similarly for the Wishart it is conjugate with respect to n where $(m, \mathbf{R}) = (n, (n + \frac{N-1}{2}) \mathbf{T})$, so that again the mean of the Wishart remains constant as n varies. It takes the form

$$P(m|a, b, N, v = 2) \propto \frac{e^{(a+Nb)m} \left(m + \frac{N-1}{2}\right)^{Nb\left(m + \frac{N-1}{2}\right)}}{\left(\prod_{j=0}^{N-1} \Gamma\left(m + \frac{j}{2}\right)\right)^b}$$

for $m > 0$, where now the parameter restrictions are that both a and b must be positive.

B.7 Parameter settings for modelling of $j(x, y)$ data

The values of the hyperparameters for the model of section B.1 when used for modelling the uncertainty of $J(x; Q_y)$ based on samples of $j(x, y)$ are as follows:

$$\begin{array}{llll} N = 1 & N_m = 1 & \kappa_\nu = 1 & \kappa_\eta = 10 \\ \kappa_C = 0.9 & \mu_{\mu_\mu} = 0 & \mathbf{S}_{\mu_\mu} = 1 & m_{\mathbf{S}_\mu} = 1.1 \\ m_{\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{S}_\mu}} = 2 & \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{S}_\mu}} = 2.8 & a_m = 1 & b_m = 3 \\ m_{\mathbf{R}_S} = 2 & \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{R}_S} = 200 & a_{m_S} = 1 & b_{m_S} = 2 \end{array}$$

B.8 Parameter settings and model modifications for modelling of prostate cancer recurrence times

The values of the hyperparameters for the model of section B.1 as modified by section B.2 for modelling the recurrence time of prostate cancer were as follows:

$$\begin{array}{llll} N = 14 & N_m = 1 & \kappa_\nu = 0.1 & \kappa_\eta = 10 \\ \kappa_C = 0.09 & \mu_{\mu_\mu} = \text{mean}(T) & \mathbf{S}_{\mu_\mu} = 6.25 \times (\text{cov}(T))^{-1} & m_{\mathbf{S}_\mu} = 2.5 \\ m_{\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{S}_\mu}} = 2 & \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{S}_\mu}} = 24 \times (\text{cov}(T))^{-1} & a_m = 1 & b_m = 20 \\ m_{\mathbf{R}_S} = 133 & \mathbf{R}_{\mathbf{R}_S} = 140 \times (\text{cov}(T))^{-1} & a_{m_S} = 1 & b_{m_S} = 0.01 \\ m_n = 5 & \mathbf{S}_n = 100I_N & \mu_z = \mu_{\mu_\mu, 1} & \mathbf{S}_z = (\text{cov}(T)_{1,1})^{-1} \end{array}$$

where T denotes the training dataset.

References

- [1] R. F. Sewell, E. J. Crowe, and S. F. Shariat, “Biomarkers can predict time of recurrence of prostate cancer with strictly positive apparent shannon information against an exponential attrition prior.” <https://arxiv.org/pdf/2404.17857.pdf>, 2010.
- [2] D. Lindley, “Scoring rules and inevitability of probability,” *International Statistical Review*, vol. 50, pp. 1–26, 1982.

- [3] David J.C. MacKay, *Information theory, inference, and learning algorithms*. Cambridge University Press, 2003.
- [4] J. Hilden, J. Habbema, and B. Bjerregaard, “The measurement of performance in probabilistic diagnosis: III: Methods based on continuous functions of the diagnostic probabilities,” *Method of Information in Medicine*, vol. 17, pp. 238–246, 1978.
- [5] C. E. Shannon, “A Mathematical Theory of Communication,” *Bell Systems Technical Journal*, vol. 27, p. 379–423, 1948.
- [6] R. Winkler, “Scoring rules and the evaluation of probability assessors,” *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, vol. 64, pp. 1073–1078, 1969.
- [7] A. Shapiro, “The evaluation of clinical predictions,” *New England Journal of Medicine*, vol. 296, no. 26, pp. 1509–1514, 1977.
- [8] David J.C. MacKay. Personal communication, 2010.
- [9] F. Harrell, K. Lee, and D. Mark, “Multivariable prognostic models: Issues in developing models, evaluating assumptions and adequacy, and measuring and reducing errors,” *Statistics in Medicine*, vol. 15, pp. 361–387, 1996.
- [10] T. Cover and J. Thomas, *Elements of Information Theory*. Wiley (New York), 1991.
- [11] C. E. Shannon and W. Weaver, *The mathematical theory of communication*. University of Illinois Press, 1949.
- [12] E. Shuford Jr., A. Albert, and H. Massengill, “Admissible probability measurement procedures,” *Psychometrika*, vol. 31, pp. 125–145, 1966.
- [13] B. de Finetti and L. Savage.
- [14] C. E. Rasmussen *et al.*, “DELVE: Data for evaluating learning in valid experiments.” <http://www.ph.tn.tudelft.nl/PRInfo/data/msg00028.html>. Downloaded 15th April 2010.
- [15] C. E. Rasmussen and R. M. Neal, “The DELVE manual.” Technical Report, University of Toronto, Department of Computer Science, 1996.
- [16] W. Gilks and P. Wild, “Adaptive rejection sampling for gibbs sampling,” *Applied Statistics*, vol. 41, pp. 337–348, 1992.
- [17] R. M. Neal, “Probabilistic inference using Markov chain Monte Carlo methods.” Technical report CRG-TR-93-1, Dept of Computer Science, University of Toronto, 1993.