

Loss-Controlling Calibration for Predictive Models

Di Wang, Junzhi Shi, Pingping Wang, Shuo Zhuang, Hongyue Li

Abstract—We propose a learning framework for calibrating predictive models to make loss-controlling prediction for exchangeable data, which extends our recently proposed conformal loss-controlling prediction for more general cases. By comparison, the predictors built by the proposed loss-controlling approach are not limited to set predictors, and the loss function can be any measurable function without the monotone assumption. To control the loss values in an efficient way, we introduce transformations preserving exchangeability to prove finite-sample controlling guarantee when the test label is obtained, and then develop an approximation approach to construct predictors. The transformations can be built on any predefined function, which include using optimization algorithms for parameter searching. This approach is a natural extension of conformal loss-controlling prediction, since it can be reduced to the latter when the set predictors have the nesting property and the loss functions are monotone. Our proposed method is applied to selective regression and high-impact weather forecasting problems, which demonstrates its effectiveness for general loss-controlling prediction.

Index Terms—Loss-controlling calibration, Predictive models, Selective regression, Weather forecasting.

I. INTRODUCTION

Predictive models built on modern machine learning techniques have been deployed for many areas due to their expressive power. However, many of the algorithms can not provide reliable information about the difference or distance between the prediction and the true label for a specific test object, which is essential for confidence prediction [1] and is important for high-risk applications [2]. If the prediction is a set of possible labels and the difference is the miscoverage loss for set predictors, the learning framework of conformal prediction (CP) can tackle this issue with its coverage guarantee under the assumption of exchangeability of data samples [3] [4] [5]. Furthermore, our recently proposed conformal loss-controlling prediction (CLCP) [6] extends CP from the miscoverage loss to the loss satisfying monotone conditions, which ensures that the prediction loss is not greater than a preset level for high confidence. These two existing frameworks are both limited

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant 62106169. (Corresponding author: Hongyue Li)

Di Wang is with School of Electrical and Information Engineering, Tianjin University, Tianjin 300072, China, and also with Tianjin Key Laboratory of Brain-inspired Intelligence Technology, School of Electrical and Information Engineering, Tianjin University, Tianjin 300072, China. (email: wangdi2015@tju.edu.cn).

Junzhi Shi is with School of Electrical and Electronic Engineering, Shandong University of Technology, Zibo 255000, China. (email: shijz@sdut.edu.cn)

Pingping Wang is with Qingdao Academy of Chinese Medical Science, Shandong University of Traditional Chinese Medicine, Qingdao, Shandong 266112, China. (email: wangpingping@sducm.edu.cn)

Shuo Zhuang is with School of Computer Science and Information Engineering, Hefei University of Technology, Hefei 230009, China. (email: shuozhuang@hfut.edu.cn).

Hongyue Li is with School of Electrical and Information Engineering, Tianjin University, Tianjin 300072, China. (lihongyue@tju.edu.cn).

to set predictors and non-general losses, leading to this work considering general forms of predictors and losses for loss-controlling prediction, which is a form of prediction with confidence beyond confidence sets with coverage guarantee.

CLCP is inspired by risk-controlling prediction sets [7] and conformal risk control [8], and the purpose of CLCP is to build a set predictor C_{λ^*} such that

$$P\left(L\left(Y_{n+1}, C_{\lambda^*}(X_{n+1})\right) \leq \alpha\right) \geq 1 - \delta, \quad (1)$$

where α and δ are preset parameters for loss level and significance level respectively, and L is a monotone loss function as in [7]. C_{λ} is the prediction set with the nesting property for the parameter $\lambda \in \Lambda$, where Λ is the discrete set of possible values of λ . C_{λ} is usually built on some underlying predictive model learned on training data. The optimal λ^* is obtained based on n calibration data $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$, and (X_{n+1}, Y_{n+1}) is the test feature-response pair. The randomness of the probability inequation above is from both $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ and (X_{n+1}, Y_{n+1}) . The approach of CLCP needs to calculate the $1 - \delta$ quantiles of losses on calibration data for all $\lambda \in \Lambda$ and search for λ^* based on the monotone conditions of loss functions. Although CLCP extends CP to more general cases, the forms of the set predictors and the loss functions used in CLCP are still limited.

To overcome this issue, one way is to use the learn then test process [9] to fuse multiple probability inequations like formula (1) to maintain the controlling guarantee. However, this process can not be effectively applied to our loss-controlling approach. One example is to use the Bonferroni correction to obtain the family-wise loss-controlling guarantee, where one needs to calculate the $1 - \delta/|\Lambda|$ quantile of losses for each possible $\lambda \in \Lambda$, resulting in meaningless calculation if $|\Lambda|$ is large and the number of calibration data is not. For example, if $|\Lambda| = 1000$ and $\delta = 0.1$, we need to calculate the 0.9999 quantile of losses for each possible λ , which makes sense only if the number of calibration data is more than 10000.

Therefore, to improve data efficiency, the loss-controlling calibration (LCC) approach proposed in this paper employs predefined searching functions and the transformations preserving exchangeability to avoid the multiple hypothesis testing process, whose approach is a natural extension of CLCP. Concretely, we aim to calibrate a predictive model f to obtain the calibrated predictor $F_{\hat{\lambda}}$ such that

$$P\left(L\left(Y_{n+1}, F_{\hat{\lambda}}(X_{n+1})\right) \leq \alpha\right) \geq 1 - \delta, \quad (2)$$

where $F_{\hat{\lambda}}$ can be a point, set or any other form of predictor built on f with the parameter λ . L is a measurable loss function without the need of monotone conditions. The

optimal $\hat{\lambda}$ is calculated by some predefined function and all $n + 1$ data $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^{n+1}$, i.e., the controlling guarantee of formula (2) is only for the ideal case where one has the test label. However, we can approximately obtain $\lambda^* \approx \hat{\lambda}$ using $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ in practice and the controlling guarantee can still be hold empirically in our experiments. In other words, the LCC proposed in this paper sacrifices the theoretical guarantee to efficient calibration, and the approximation is sound for large n in theory and in our empirical studies. In the experiments, we apply LCC to selective regression with single or multiple targets to calibrate point predictors to control one or multiple losses, and also apply LCC to high-impact weather forecasting applications to control the non-monotone loss related to false discovery. All of the experimental results confirm the effectiveness of our proposed LCC approach.

In summary, three contributions are made in this paper:

- A learning framework named loss-controlling calibration is proposed for calibrating predictive models to make general loss-controlling prediction. The approach is a natural extension of CLCP and is easy to implement.
- By employing transformations preserving exchangeability, the distribution-free and finite-sample controlling guarantee is proved mathematically with the exchangeability assumption in the ideal condition where the test label is obtained, and a reasonable approximation approach is proposed for practice.
- The proposed LCC is applied to selective regression and weather forecasting problems, which empirically demonstrates its effectiveness for loss-controlling prediction in general cases.

The remaining parts of this paper are organized as follows. Section II reviews inductive conformal prediction and conformal loss-controlling prediction and Section III proposes the loss-controlling calibration approach with its theoretical analysis. Section IV applies the proposed approach to selective regression and high-impact weather forecasting problems to empirically verify the loss-controlling guarantee. Finally, the conclusions of this paper are drawn in Section V.

II. INDUCTIVE CONFORMAL PREDICTION AND CONFORMAL LOSS-CONTROLLING PREDICTION

This section reviews inductive conformal prediction and recently proposed conformal loss-controlling prediction. Throughout this paper, let $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^{n+1}$ be $n + 1$ data drawn exchangeably from P_{XY} on $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$. (X_{n+1}, Y_{n+1}) is the test object-response pair and the first n samples $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$ are calibration data. The lower-case letter (x_i, y_i) represents the realization of (X_i, Y_i) .

A. Inductive Conformal Prediction

Inductive conformal prediction (ICP) [10] is a variant of conformal prediction tackling the computational issue of the original conformal prediction approach. ICP starts with any measurable function $A : \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$ called nonconformity measure, and calculates n nonconformity scores as

$$A_i = A(X_i, Y_i),$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Denote $Q_{1-\delta}^{(n)}$ as the $1 - \delta$ quantile of $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^n \cup \{\infty\}$. With the assumption of exchangeability of data samples, for any preset $\delta \in (0, 1)$, ICP makes promise that

$$P\left(A(X_{n+1}, Y_{n+1}) \leq Q_{1-\delta}^{(n)}\right) \geq 1 - \delta.$$

Thus, ICP outputs the following set prediction

$$C_{1-\delta}^{(n)}(X_{n+1}) = \{y : A(X_{n+1}, y) \leq Q_{1-\delta}^{(n)}\},$$

which leads to

$$P\left(Y_{n+1} \in C_{1-\delta}^{(n)}(X_{n+1})\right) \geq 1 - \delta.$$

The nonconformity measure A is usually designed based on a point prediction model f trained on training samples drawn from P_{XY} and here is an example for a classification problem with K classes. In this situation, based on training samples, one can train a classifier $f : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [0, 1]^K$, whose k th output f_k is the estimated probability of the k th class, and the corresponding nonconformity measure can be defined as

$$A(x, y) = 1 - f_k(x),$$

which leads to the following prediction set for an input object x ,

$$C_{1-\delta}^{(n)}(x) = \{k : f_k(x) \geq 1 - Q_{1-\delta}^{(n)}\}.$$

B. Conformal Loss-Controlling Prediction

Different from ICP, the purpose of CLCP is to build predictors with loss-controlling guarantee as formula (1), whose approach is inspired by conformal risk control [8]. CLCP starts with a set-valued function $C_\lambda : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}'$ with a parameter $\lambda \in \Lambda$, where Λ is a discrete set of possible real values of λ such as from 0 to 1 with step size of 0.01. \mathcal{Y}' denotes some space of sets. For example, \mathcal{Y}' can be the power set of \mathcal{Y} for single-label classification and can be equal to \mathcal{Y} for binary image segmentation. This set-valued function C_λ needs to satisfy the following nesting property introduced in [7]:

$$\lambda_1 < \lambda_2 \implies C_{\lambda_1}(x) \subseteq C_{\lambda_2}(x). \quad (3)$$

Here we give an example of constructing the prediction set C_λ for classification problem with K classes. With the same meanings of f and f_k mentioned in Section II-A, CLCP can construct the prediction set as

$$C_\lambda(x) = \{k : f_k(x) \geq 1 - \lambda\},$$

which satisfies the nesting property of formula (3).

In addition, for each realization of response y , the loss function $L : \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y}' \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$ considered in CLCP should respect the following monotone property or nesting property:

$$S_1 \subseteq S_2 \subseteq \mathcal{Y}' \implies L(y, S_2) \leq L(y, S_1) \leq B, \quad (4)$$

where B is the upper bound.

After determining C_λ and L , for preset α and δ , CLCP **first** calculates L_i as

$$L_i(\lambda) = L(Y_i, C_\lambda(X_i))$$

for $i = 1, \dots, n$, and **then** searches for λ^* such that

$$\lambda^* = \min \left\{ \lambda \in \Lambda : Q_{1-\delta}^{(n)}(\lambda) \leq \alpha \right\},$$

where $Q_{1-\delta}^{(n)}(\lambda)$ is the $1 - \delta$ quantile of $\{L_i(\lambda)\}_{i=1}^n \cup \{B\}$. The finally obtained set predictor C_{λ^*} satisfies the controlling guarantee of formula (1), which is proved in theory for distribution-free and finite-sample conditions, and CLCP can be seen as an extension of CP for specific forms of C_λ and L [6].

III. LOSS-CONTROLLING CALIBRATION AND ITS THEORETICAL ANALYSIS

This section introduces the extension of CLCP to general cases with the proposed loss-controlling calibration, analyze it theoretically in the ideal case and promotes it to control multiple losses jointly.

A. Loss-Controlling Calibration

CLCP needs nesting properties for C_λ and L , which limits its applicability. Therefore, we propose loss-controlling calibration for general predictors and loss functions. We denote F_λ as a predictor built on a predictive model f learned from training data, where λ is a parameter taking values from a discrete set Λ . For LCC, we emphasize that $F_\lambda : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}'$ can be any kind of predictor, i.e., \mathcal{Y}' does not have to be the set of label sets. Besides, Λ can be any discrete set such as the set of multi-dimensional vectors as in [9]. Also, the loss function $L : \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y}' \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$ considered for LCC can be any measurable function bounded above by B , i.e., for each object-response pair (x, y) ,

$$L(y, F_\lambda(x)) \leq B. \quad (5)$$

Given these general conditions, one way of constructing loss-controlling guarantee is to use multiple hypothesis testing process developed in learn then test [9]. However, this may lead to calculating the $1 - \delta/|\Lambda|$ quantiles of losses on calibration data, which may be meaningless for our loss-controlling approach when the number of calibration data is small or moderate. Thus, we propose to use a predefined function s independent of $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^{n+1}$ to do the trick, where s stands for searching since it can be defined as an optimization algorithm for parameter searching. The approach of LCC is very similar to CLCP and we first introduce it for comparison, leaving the analysis of it to the next section.

After determining F_λ and L , for preset α and δ , LCC **first** calculates L_i on calibration data as

$$L_i(\lambda) = L(Y_i, F_\lambda(X_i)), \quad (6)$$

and **then** search for λ^* such that

$$\lambda^* = s \left(\left\{ \lambda \in \Lambda : Q_{1-\delta}^{(n)}(\lambda) \leq \alpha \right\} \right), \quad (7)$$

where $s : P(\Lambda) \rightarrow \Lambda$ is the predefined searching function defined on the power set of Λ , whose output is an element of its input, and $Q_{1-\delta}^{(n)}(\lambda)$ is the $1 - \delta$ quantile of $\{L_i(\lambda)\}_{i=1}^n \cup \{B\}$.

The final predictor built by LCC is F_{λ^*} , which is very similar to $F_{\hat{\lambda}}$ satisfying the loss-controlling guarantee as formula (2). The relation between F_{λ^*} and $F_{\hat{\lambda}}$ will be introduced in Section II-B.

It can be seen that LCC is exactly CLCP if $\Lambda \subset \mathcal{R}$, F_λ is a set predictor with nesting property as formula (3), L is monotone as formula (4) and s is the min function. Therefore, for LCC we also use the same notations of L_i and $Q_{1-\delta}^{(n)}(\lambda)$ as CLCP to represent similar concepts. Here we summarized LCC in Algorithm 1.

Algorithm 1 Loss-Controlling Calibration

Input:

Calibration dataset $\{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$, test input object x_{n+1} , the predictor F_λ , the loss function L satisfying formula (5), the predefined searching function s , preset $\alpha \in \mathcal{R}$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$.

Output:

Calibrated prediction for y_{n+1} .

- 1: Based on formula (6), calculate $\{L_i(\lambda)\}_{i=1}^n$.
 - 2: Search for λ^* satisfying formula (7).
 - 3: **return** $F_{\lambda^*}(x_{n+1})$
-

B. Theoretical Analysis of Loss-Controlling Calibration

This section provides the theoretical insights of LCC. Let $Q_{1-\delta}^{(n+1)}(\lambda)$ be the $1 - \delta$ quantile of $\{L_i(\lambda)\}_{i=1}^{n+1}$. Define $\hat{\lambda}$ as

$$\hat{\lambda} = s \left(\left\{ \lambda \in \Lambda : Q_{1-\delta}^{(n+1)}(\lambda) \leq \alpha \right\} \right), \quad (8)$$

which is very similar to λ^* especially for large n , as $Q_{1-\delta}^{(n+1)}(\lambda)$ and $Q_{1-\delta}^{(n)}(\lambda)$ are nearly the same in that case.

Here we introduce the definition of (α, δ) -loss-controlling predictors and then prove loss-controlling guarantee with $\hat{\lambda}$ based on the theorem about transformations preserving exchangeability developed in [11] and introduced in [12] as Theorem 3.

Definition 1. Given a loss function $L : \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y}' \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$ and a random sample $(X, Y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, a random function F whose realization is in the space of functions $\mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}'$ is a (α, δ) -loss-controlling predictor if it satisfies that

$$P \left(L(Y, F(X)) \leq \alpha \right) \geq 1 - \delta,$$

where the randomness is both from F and (X, Y) .

Next we prove in Theorem 1 that $F_{\hat{\lambda}}$ is a (α, δ) -loss-controlling predictor.

Theorem 1. Suppose $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^{n+1}$ are $n + 1$ data drawn exchangeably from P_{XY} on $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, $F_\lambda : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}'$ is a function with the parameter λ taking values from a discrete set Λ , $L : \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y}' \rightarrow \mathcal{R}$ is a loss function satisfying formula (5) and $L_i(\lambda)$ is defined as formula (6). Denote $s : P(\Lambda) \rightarrow \Lambda$ as any searching function defined on the power set of Λ whose

output is the element of its input. For any preset $\alpha \in \mathcal{R}$, if L also satisfies the following conditions,

$$\min_{\lambda} \max_i L_i(\lambda) < \alpha, \quad (9)$$

then for any $\delta \in (\frac{1}{n+1}, 1)$, we have

$$P\left(L\left(Y_{n+1}, F_{\hat{\lambda}}(X_{n+1})\right) \leq \alpha\right) \geq 1 - \delta,$$

where $\hat{\lambda}$ is defined as formula (8).

Proof. Formula (9) implies that $\hat{\lambda}$ is well defined. As $\hat{\lambda}$ is defined on the whole dataset $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^{n+1}$ with the function s , one can treat $\{L_i(\hat{\lambda})\}_{i=1}^{n+1}$ as a transformation τ applied to $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^{n+1}$, i.e.,

$$\{L_i(\hat{\lambda})\}_{i=1}^{n+1} = \tau\left(\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^{n+1}\right)$$

Besides, based on Theorem 3 in [12], this transformation preserves exchangeability, since for each permutation π_1 , there exists a permutation $\pi_2 = \pi_1$, such that

$$\pi_1\left(\{L_i(\hat{\lambda})\}_{i=1}^{n+1}\right) = \tau \circ \pi_2\left(\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^{n+1}\right),$$

for all possible $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^{n+1}$. It follows that

$$P\left(L_{n+1}(\hat{\lambda}) \leq Q_{1-\delta}^{(n+1)}(\hat{\lambda})\right) \geq 1 - \delta, \quad (10)$$

as $Q_{1-\delta}^{(n+1)}(\hat{\lambda})$ is just the corresponding $1 - \delta$ quantile of the exchangeable variables $\{L_i(\hat{\lambda})\}_{i=1}^{n+1}$. (See Lemma 1 in [13]).

By definition of the function s , we have $Q_{1-\delta}^{(n+1)}(\hat{\lambda}) \leq \alpha$. This combining formula (10) leads to

$$P\left(L_{n+1}(\hat{\lambda}) \leq \alpha\right) \geq 1 - \delta,$$

which completes the proof. \square

Theorem 1 shows the loss-controlling guarantee for the ideal case where (X_{n+1}, Y_{n+1}) is available, whose approach can be approximated using Algorithm 1 in practice. The conditions that $\delta \in (\frac{1}{n+1}, 1)$ and formula (9) holds imply that λ^* is well defined, which makes us able to obtain λ^* based on the searching function s . Also, by definition, one can conclude that

$$\left\{\lambda \in \Lambda : Q_{1-\delta}^{(n)}(\lambda) \leq \alpha\right\} \subseteq \left\{\lambda \in \Lambda : Q_{1-\delta}^{(n+1)}(\lambda) \leq \alpha\right\},$$

which indicates that searching λ in the left set above is reasonable, especially for large n . The proof in Theorem 1 only needs s to be a predefined function independent of $\{(X_i, Y_i)\}_{i=1}^{n+1}$. Thus, one can define s as an optimization algorithm based on another hold-out dataset for parameter searching.

C. Controlling Multiple Losses

Due to the general forms of the calibrated predictors and the loss functions, one can consider using LCC to control multiple

losses jointly. Suppose the j th loss on i th calibration sample with λ is $L_{j,i}(\lambda)$, the loss level for j th loss is α_j and the number of losses is m . One simple method is to search for λ^* such that,

$$\lambda^* = s\left\{\lambda \in \Lambda : Q_{j,1-\delta/m}^{(n)}(\lambda) \leq \alpha_j, j = 1, \dots, m\right\}, \quad (11)$$

where $Q_{j,1-\delta/m}^{(n)}(\lambda)$ is the $1 - \delta/m$ quantile of $\{L_{j,i}(\lambda)\}_{i=1}^n \cup \{B\}$. Therefore, to control multiple losses jointly, one may have to calculate the $1 - \delta/m$ quantiles, which only makes sense when m is small.

To show that searching with formula (11) is reasonable, the following Corollary 1 is introduced to control multiple losses jointly when the test label is obtained, and concludes that one can search for $\hat{\lambda}$ such that

$$\hat{\lambda} = s\left\{\lambda \in \Lambda : Q_{j,1-\delta/m}^{(n+1)}(\lambda) \leq \alpha_j, j = 1, \dots, m\right\}, \quad (12)$$

where $Q_{j,1-\delta/m}^{(n+1)}(\lambda)$ is the $1 - \delta/m$ quantile of $\{L_{j,i}(\lambda)\}_{i=1}^{n+1}$.

Corollary 1. Assume that λ is an m -dimensional vector and for each $j = 1, \dots, m$, $L_{j,i}(\lambda)$ only depends on its j th dimension λ_j , i.e.,

$$L_{j,i}(\lambda) \equiv L_{j,i}(\lambda_j). \quad (13)$$

For any preset $\alpha_j \in \mathcal{R}$, if $L_{j,i}$ also satisfies the following conditions,

$$\min_{\lambda} \max_i L_{j,i}(\lambda) < \alpha_j, \quad (14)$$

then for any $\delta \in (\frac{1}{n+1}, 1)$, we have

$$P\left(L_{j,n+1}(\hat{\lambda}) \leq \alpha_j, j = 1, \dots, m\right) \geq 1 - \delta,$$

where $\hat{\lambda}$ is defined as formula (12).

Proof. The conditions of formula (13) and (14) guarantee that $\hat{\lambda}$ is well defined, and with Theorem 1, we have

$$P\left(L_{j,n+1}(\hat{\lambda}) > \alpha_j\right) \leq \delta/m,$$

for each $j = 1, \dots, m$, which leads to the conclusion of Corollary 1. \square

The conditions that $\delta \in (\frac{1}{n+1}, 1)$ and formula (13) and (14) hold are assumed to make sure that both $\hat{\lambda}$ and λ^* exist, which can be replaced or relaxed in practice. However, the extra assumptions indicate the difficulty of jointly controlling multiple losses, since one needs to take into account many aspects to avoid from searching optimal λ in an empty set.

IV. EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we first apply LCC to selective regression on 20 public datasets for single-target regression, which tests the ability of LCC to calibrate point predictors. Then we conduct experiments on 6 public datasets for selective regression with multiple targets to verify the approach of jointly controlling

multiple losses using formula (11). Finally, we introduce LCC to high-impact weather forecasting applications to control the non-monotone loss related to false discovery. We use Python [14] to conduct the experiments. The statistical learning methods in Section IV-A and IV-B were coded with Scikit-learn [15] and the deep neural nets in Section IV-C were coded with Pytorch [16].

TABLE I
DATASETS FOR SINGLE-TARGET REGRESSION

Dataset	Examples	Dimensionality	Source
abalone	4177	8	UCI
bank8fh	8192	8	Delve
bank8fm	8192	8	Delve
bank8nh	8192	8	Delve
bank8nm	8192	8	Delve
boston	506	13	UCI
cooling	768	8	UCI
heating	768	8	UCI
istanbul	536	7	UCI
kin8fh	8192	8	Delve
kin8fm	8192	8	Delve
kin8nh	8192	8	Delve
kin8nm	8192	8	Delve
laser	993	4	KEEL
puma8fh	8192	8	Delve
puma8fm	8192	8	Delve
puma8nh	8192	8	Delve
puma8nm	8192	8	Delve
stock	950	9	KEEL
treasury	1048	15	Delve

A. LCC for Selective Regression with Single Target

Selective regression is the selective prediction task for regression problems, which we introduce here referring to [17]. Selective regression model is a model with the ability to abstain from making prediction when lacking confidence. The model can be comprised of a prediction function f and a hard selection function g . For a given input object x , a selective model predicts the label as $f(x)$ if $g(x) = 1$, and abstains from making prediction if $g(x) = 0$. The hard selection function g can be built on a soft selection function \bar{g} and a threshold λ , such that $g(x) = 1$ if $\bar{g}(x) \leq \lambda$ and $g(x) = 0$ if $\bar{g}(x) > \lambda$. An example is to use a function related to estimated conditional variance as $\bar{g}(x)$.

The objective of a selective regression model can be formalized as minimizing the risk $E((Y - f(X))^2 g(X))$ in the condition that $E(g(X))$ is not too low, where $E(g(X))$ is a performance indicator called coverage. Therefore, we conduct experiments in this section to build selective regression models to control the prediction loss $(y - f(x))^2 g(x)$, whose informational efficiency is measured by $1 - E(g(X))$, which is estimated using test data and is recorded as miscoverage in Fig. 2. Lower miscoverage means better performance for selective models.

The empirical studies were conducted on 20 public datasets for single-target regression, which are from Delve [18], KEEL

[19] and UCI [20] repositories and the information is summarized in TABLE I.

We employ bagging trees to build selective regression models, and the corresponding prediction function $f(x)$ and soft selection function $\bar{g}(x)$ are constructed using the mean and the standard variance of the predictions made by tree members. The selective regression model for calibration in this paper is formalized as

$$F_{\lambda}(x) = \begin{cases} f(x) & \bar{g}(x) \leq \lambda, \\ \emptyset & \bar{g}(x) > \lambda. \end{cases}$$

All features and labels were normalized to $[0, 1]$ with min-max normalization. For each dataset, 20% of the data were used for testing and 80% and 20% of the remaining data were used for training and calibration. Random forests (RF) [21] and extremely randomized trees (ERT) [22] were used to build selective regression models with the default meta-parameters set by Scikit-learn. The data split process for each dataset was randomly conducted 10 times and the average results were recorded in Fig. 1 and Fig. 2, where we set $\alpha \in \{0.003, 0.005, 0.01, 0.03, 0.05\}$ and $\delta \in \{0.1, 0.15, 0.2\}$. The λ^* is searched from 0 to 1 with step size being 0.01, and the search function s is the max function, since we prefer low miscoverage for selective regression models.

The bar plots in Fig. 1 demonstrate that the frequency of the losses being above α is near or below preset δ , which verifies the loss-controlling guarantee of LCC for point predictors empirically, since the frequency is an estimation of the following probability

$$P\left(L\left(Y_{n+1}, F_{\lambda^*}(X_{n+1})\right) > \alpha\right),$$

which we expect to be below δ . In Fig. 2, we can observe that tuning α and δ can change miscoverage of selective regression models, which is reasonable since high levels of loss and significance relax the constraints on the prediction losses. This indicates that one should set α and δ properly for specific applications, making the trade-off between prediction loss and miscoverage.

TABLE II
DATASETS FOR MULTI-TARGET REGRESSION

Dataset	Examples	Dimensionality	Targets
enb	768	8	2
rf1	9125	64	8
rf2	9125	576	8
scm1d	9803	280	16
scm20d	8966	61	16
scpf	1137	23	3

B. LCC for Selective Regression with Multiple Targets

The purpose of this section is to test the approach with formula (11) for controlling multiple losses. The datasets for multi-target regression are collected from Mulan library [23] and the information of each dataset is listed in TABLE II. For




Fig. 1. Frequencies of the prediction losses being greater than α vs. $\delta = 0.1, 0.15, 0.2$ on test data for selective single-target regression. The first row and the second row correspond to RF and ERT respectively. Different columns represent different α . The bars are all near or below δ , indicating the controlling guarantee of LCC empirically.




Fig. 2. Miscoverage of selective predictions vs. $\delta = 0.1, 0.15, 0.2$ on test data for selective single-target regression. The first row and the second row correspond to RF and ERT respectively. Different columns represent different α . Tuning α and δ can change Miscoverage, which indicates the trade-off between loss level and informational efficiency.

each dataset, the same normalization and partition processes as those in Section IV-A were conducted and we trained RF and ERT for multi-target regression with Scikit-learn using default meta-parameters. For m -target regression, we obtain the m -dimensional mean and standard variance function based on the tree members, which are also denoted as $f(x)$ and $\bar{g}(x)$ respectively with $f^{(j)}(x)$ and $\bar{g}^{(j)}(x)$ representing the j th component. Therefore, the selective regression model with m -dimensional parameter λ in this paper is an m -dimensional function $F_\lambda(x)$, whose j th component is defined as

$$F_\lambda^{(j)}(x) = \begin{cases} f^{(j)}(x) & \bar{g}^{(j)}(x) \leq \lambda_j, \\ \emptyset & \bar{g}^{(j)}(x) > \lambda_j, \end{cases}$$

where λ_j is the j th element of λ . This model consists of m single-target regressors and the m losses in this empirical study are just m individual losses considered in Section IV-A, i.e.,

the i th loss is $(y^{(j)} - f^{(j)}(x))^2 g^{(j)}(x)$, where $g^{(j)}(x)$ is the corresponding hard selection function of $\bar{g}^{(j)}(x)$. We search for λ^* as formula (11) with s aiming to find maximum possible λ_j for each j and combine them as λ^* , since we prefer low miscoverage for each target.

We set $\delta \in \{0.1, 0.15, 0.2\}$ and set all α_j as the same α , which is taken from $\{0.003, 0.005, 0.01, 0.03, 0.05\}$. To verify the loss-controlling guarantee for multiple losses, we use the test data to calculate the frequency of $\max_j L_{j,n+1}(\lambda^*)$ being above α , since it is an estimation of the following probability

$$P\left(\max_j L_{j,n+1}(\lambda^*) > \alpha\right),$$

which we expect to be below δ if the losses are jointly controlled. The experimental results on test data are shown in Fig. 3 and Fig. 4, where we denote MaxLoss as $\max_j L_{j,n+1}(\lambda^*)$




Fig. 3. Frequencies of the maximum prediction losses being greater than α vs. $\delta = 0.1, 0.15, 0.2$ on test data for selective multi-target regression. The first row and the second row correspond to RF and ERT respectively. Different columns represent different α . The bars are all near or below δ , indicating the controlling guarantee based on formula (11) empirically.




Fig. 4. Mean Miscoverage of selective predictions vs. $\delta = 0.1, 0.15, 0.2$ on test data for selective multi-target regression. The first row and the second row correspond to RF and ERT respectively. Different columns represent different α . Tuning α and δ can change Mean Miscoverage, which indicates the trade-off between loss level and informational efficiency.

and Mean Miscoverage as the mean value of m miscoverages for m targets, which is a way of measuring informational efficiency for selective regression with multiple targets.

The bar plots in Fig. 3 empirically confirm the controlling guarantee implied by Corollary 1 and the results in Fig. 4 also indicates that tuning α and δ can affect informational efficiency of the models. Since RF and ERT can build accurate prediction functions for rf1 and rf2, the frequencies of MaxLoss being above α can be very low and the Mean Miscoverage is zero for each preset α in the experiments, indicating the importance of designing accurate prediction functions for selective regression. Although the prediction functions for the other four datasets are not as accurate as those for rf1 and rf2, we can always tune α and δ to change Mean Miscoverage under the loss-controlling guarantee, which demonstrates the flexibility of our approach. Also, this trade-

off between the loss level α , confidence level $1 - \delta$ and Mean Miscoverage should be made based on specific applications.

C. LCC for high-impact weather forecasting

We apply LCC to high-impact weather forecasting, which is based on postprocessing of numerical weather prediction (NWP) models [24] [25] [26], i.e., learning a predictor whose inputs are forecasts made by NWP models and outputs are corresponding high-impact weather. We use LCC to post-process the ensemble forecasts issued by European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts (ECMWF) [27]. The forecasts are obtained from the THORPEX Interactive Grand Global Ensemble (TIGGE) dataset [28]. We concentrate on 2-m maximum temperature and minimum temperature forecasts initialized at 0000 UTC with the forecast lead times from 12nd hour to 36th hour. The resolution of the forecast fields is




Fig. 5. Frequencies of the prediction losses being greater than α for different δ and α on test data of HighTemp and LowTemp datasets. All bars being near or below the preset δ confirms the controlling guarantee of LCC empirically.




Fig. 6. Distributions of the prediction losses for different δ and α on test data of HighTemp and LowTemp datasets. The losses are controlled by α and δ properly to achieve the empirical validity in Fig. 1.

$0.5^\circ \times 0.5^\circ$ and the corresponding label fields with the same resolution are calculated using the ERA5 reanalysis data [29]. The area covers the main parts of North China, East China and Central China, ranging from 109°E to 122°E in longitude and from 29°N to 42°N in latitude with the grid size being 27×27 . The HighTemp and LowTemp datasets introduced in [6] are used for empirical studies. The inputs in HighTemp are 2-m maximum temperature forecasting fields and the corresponding label fields are whether the observed 2-m maximum temperature is above 35°C for each grid. Similarly, the inputs in LowTemp are 2-m minimum temperature forecasting fields and the corresponding label fields are whether the observed 2-m minimum temperature is below -15°C for each grid. The sample sizes of HighTemp and LowTemp are 1200 and 1233 respectively.

The experimental setting is similar to that in Section IV-B of [6]. For each dataset, all forecasts made by the NWP

model were normalized to $[0, 1]$ by min-max normalization. 20% of the data were used for testing and 80% and 20% of the remaining data were used for training and calibration respectively. The normalized ensemble fields forecast by the NWP model are taken as input x and the set of grids having high-impact weather is the corresponding label y , which can be seen as the image segmentation problem in computer vision. Thus, we employed two fully convolutional neural networks [30] as our underlying algorithms. One was U-Net [31] and the other is the naive deep neural network (nDNN), which is the U-Net removing skip-connections. The structures of the two networks are the same as those in [6]. To train the deep nets, we further partitioned the data for training to validation part (10%) and proper training part (90%), which were used for model selection and parameter updating respectively. Adam optimization [32] with the learning rate being 0.0001 and the number of epochs being 1000 was employed for training,




Fig. 7. Distributions of normalized sizes for different δ and α on test data of HighTemp and LowTemp datasets. The predictions have reasonable sizes for both U-Net and nDNN for high-impact weather forecasting.

and the model whose binary cross entropy was the lowest on validation data was chosen as the predictive model f needing calibration. The candidate calibrated predictor F_λ is defined as

$$F_\lambda(x) = \{(p, q) : f_{(p,q)}(x) \geq \lambda\},$$

where $f_{(p,q)}(x)$ is the estimated probability for high-impact weather existing at grid (p, q) . The loss function is

$$L(y, F) = 1 - \frac{|y \cap F|}{|F|},$$

which is a non-monotone loss function related to false discovery introduced in [9], and can be seen as one minus precision for each sample. The searching function s we used is the min function, as we expect to detect more high-impact weather given the precision for each sample being controlled properly. We also tested other forms of searching functions such as the max function. However, although the controlling guarantee can be hold empirically, the constructed predictor may lose informational efficiency for applicability, implying that the forms of searching functions should be designed on a case-by-case basis. The final calibrated predictors were obtained with the proposed LCC approach and the experimental results are shown in Fig. 5, Fig. 6 and Fig. 7.

The frequencies of the prediction losses being more than α are shown in Fig. 5 with bar plots for $\delta = 0.1, 0.15$ and 0.2 . The columns represent the cases where $\alpha = 0.3, 0.35, 0.4, 0.45$ and 0.5 respectively. All bars are near or below the preset δ , which verifies loss-controlling guarantee empirically. The boxen plots of the losses for different δ and α are shown in Fig. 6, which contain more information about tails by drawing narrower boxes than box plots. It can be observed that α and δ result in larger losses, which should be preset based on specific applications. The informational efficiency of F_{λ^*} is measured using normalized size of the prediction set defined as $|F_{\lambda^*}(x)|/PQ$ in which the numbers of the vertical and the horizontal grids of prediction fields are denoted by P and Q respectively. The distributions of normalized sizes are shown

in Fig. 7, indicating that different α and δ cause different normalized sizes and there should be a trade-off among loss level α , confidence level $1 - \delta$ and informational efficiency of the predictions. Finally, all of the predictions have reasonable sizes using LCC, which demonstrates its effectiveness for high-impact weather forecasting.

V. CONCLUSION

This paper proposes loss-controlling calibration, which extends conformal loss-controlling prediction to calibrating predictive models with more general forms of calibrated predictors and losses. The finite-sample and distribution-free loss-controlling guarantee is proved by introducing a searching function and the property of transformations preserving exchangeability in the ideal case. In addition, an approximation approach for practical calibration is proposed, whose main steps are the same as those of conformal loss-controlling prediction, i.e., the main difference between loss-controlling calibration and conformal loss-controlling prediction is whether the calibrated predictors and the loss functions satisfy specific conditions. The method is applied to selective regression and high-impact weather forecasting problems, and the loss-controlling guarantee is verified empirically in these cases. Further empirical studies with case-by-case design are needed to test the loss-controlling ability of the proposed calibration approach for a wider range of applications.

REFERENCES

- [1] T. Schweder and N. L. Hjort, *Confidence, likelihood, probability: statistical inference with confidence distributions*. Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- [2] V. Balasubramanian, S.-S. Ho, and V. Vovk, *Conformal prediction for reliable machine learning: theory, adaptations and applications*. Newnes, 2014.
- [3] V. Vovk, A. Gammerman, and G. Shafer, *Algorithmic learning in a random world*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2005.
- [4] A. N. Angelopoulos and S. Bates, “A gentle introduction to conformal prediction and distribution-free uncertainty quantification,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.07511*, 2021.

- [5] M. Fontana, G. Zeni, and S. Vantini, "Conformal prediction: a unified review of theory and new challenges," *Bernoulli*, vol. 29, no. 1, pp. 1–23, 2023.
- [6] D. Wang, P. Wang, Z. Ji, X. Yang, and H. Li, "Conformal loss-controlling prediction," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.02424*, 2023.
- [7] S. Bates, A. Angelopoulos, L. Lei, J. Malik, and M. Jordan, "Distribution-free, risk-controlling prediction sets," *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, vol. 68, no. 6, pp. 1–34, 2021.
- [8] A. N. Angelopoulos, S. Bates, A. Fisch, L. Lei, and T. Schuster, "Conformal risk control," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2208.02814*, 2022.
- [9] A. N. Angelopoulos, S. Bates, E. J. Candès, M. I. Jordan, and L. Lei, "Learn then test: Calibrating predictive algorithms to achieve risk control," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.01052*, 2021.
- [10] H. Papadopoulos, "Inductive conformal prediction: Theory and application to neural networks," in *Tools in artificial intelligence*. IntechOpen, 2008.
- [11] A. Dean and J. Verducci, "Linear transformations that preserve majorization, schur concavity, and exchangeability," *Linear algebra and its applications*, vol. 127, pp. 121–138, 1990.
- [12] A. K. Kuchibhotla, "Exchangeability, conformal prediction, and rank tests," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.06095*, 2020.
- [13] R. J. Tibshirani, R. Foygel Barber, E. Candès, and A. Ramdas, "Conformal prediction under covariate shift," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 32, 2019.
- [14] G. Van Rossum and F. L. Drake, *Python 3 Reference Manual*. Scotts Valley, CA: CreateSpace, 2009.
- [15] F. Pedregosa, G. Varoquaux, A. Gramfort, V. Michel, B. Thirion, O. Grisel, M. Blondel, P. Prettenhofer, R. Weiss, V. Dubourg, J. Vanderplas, A. Passos, D. Cournapeau, M. Brucher, M. Perrot, and E. Duchesnay, "Scikit-learn: Machine learning in Python," *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 12, pp. 2825–2830, 2011.
- [16] A. Paszke, S. Gross, F. Massa, A. Lerer, J. Bradbury, G. Chanan, T. Killeen, Z. Lin, N. Gimelshein, L. Antiga, A. Desmaison, A. Kopf, E. Yang, Z. DeVito, M. Raison, A. Tejani, S. Chilamkurthy, B. Steiner, L. Fang, J. Bai, and S. Chintala, "Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning library," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 32*. Curran Associates, Inc., 2019, pp. 8024–8035. [Online]. Available: <http://papers.neurips.cc/paper/9015-pytorch-an-imperative-style-high-performance-deep-learning-library.pdf>
- [17] L. Feng, M. O. Ahmed, H. Hajimirsadeghi, and A. Abdi, "Towards better selective classification," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.09034*, 2022.
- [18] C. E. Rasmussen, R. M. Neal, G. Hinton, D. van Camp, M. Revow, Z. Ghahramani, R. Kustra, and R. Tibshirani, "Delve data for evaluating learning in valid experiments," *URL <http://www.cs.toronto.edu/delve>*, 1996.
- [19] J. Alcalá, A. Fernández, J. Luengo, J. Derrac, S. García, L. Sánchez, and F. Herrera, "Keel data-mining software tool: Data set repository, integration of algorithms and experimental analysis framework," *Journal of Multiple-Valued Logic and Soft Computing*, vol. 17, no. 2-3, pp. 255–287, 2010.
- [20] A. Asuncion and D. Newman, "Uci machine learning repository," 2007.
- [21] L. Breiman, "Random forests," *Machine Learning*, vol. 45, no. 1, pp. 5–32, 2001.
- [22] P. Geurts, D. Ernst, and L. Wehenkel, "Extremely randomized trees," *Machine learning*, vol. 63, pp. 3–42, 2006.
- [23] G. Tsoumakas, E. Spyromitros-Xioufis, J. Vilcek, and I. Vlahavas, "Mulan: A java library for multi-label learning," *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 12, pp. 2411–2414, 2011.
- [24] S. Vannitsem, D. S. Wilks, and J. Messner, *Statistical postprocessing of ensemble forecasts*. Elsevier, 2018.
- [25] S. Vannitsem, J. B. Bremnes, J. Demaeyer, G. R. Evans, J. Flowerdew, S. Hemri, S. Lerch, N. Roberts, S. Theis, A. Atencia *et al.*, "Statistical postprocessing for weather forecasts: Review, challenges, and avenues in a big data world," *Bulletin of the American Meteorological Society*, vol. 102, no. 3, pp. E681–E699, 2021.
- [26] P. Grönquist, C. Yao, T. Ben-Nun, N. Dryden, P. Dueben, S. Li, and T. Hoefler, "Deep learning for post-processing ensemble weather forecasts," *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A*, vol. 379, no. 2194, p. 20200092, 2021.
- [27] T. Palmer, "The ecmwf ensemble prediction system: Looking back (more than) 25 years and projecting forward 25 years," *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, vol. 145, pp. 12–24, 2019.
- [28] National Centers for Environmental Prediction, National Weather Service, NOAA, U.S. Department of Commerce, Japan Meteorological Agency, Japan, Met Office, Ministry of Defence, United Kingdom, China Meteorological Administration, China, Meteorological Service of Canada, Environment Canada, Korea Meteorological Administration, Republic of Korea, Meteo-France, France, European Centre for Medium-Range Weather Forecasts, and Bureau of Meteorology, Australia, "Thorpex interactive grand global ensemble (tigge) model tropical cyclone track data," Boulder CO, 2008. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.5065/D6GH9GSZ>
- [29] H. Hersbach, B. Bell, P. Berrisford, S. Hirahara, A. Horányi, J. Muñoz-Sabater, J. Nicolas, C. Peubey, R. Radu, D. Schepers *et al.*, "The era5 global reanalysis," *Quarterly Journal of the Royal Meteorological Society*, vol. 146, no. 730, pp. 1999–2049, 2020.
- [30] Z. Li, F. Liu, W. Yang, S. Peng, and J. Zhou, "A survey of convolutional neural networks: analysis, applications, and prospects," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, 2021.
- [31] O. Ronneberger, P. Fischer, and T. Brox, "U-net: Convolutional networks for biomedical image segmentation," in *International Conference on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention*. Springer, 2015, pp. 234–241.
- [32] D. P. Kingma and J. Ba, "Adam: A method for stochastic optimization," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*, 2014.