

Risk-based Calibration for Probabilistic Classifiers

Aritz Pérez, Carlos Echegoyen and Guzmán Santafé

Abstract—We introduce a general iterative procedure called risk-based calibration (RC) designed to minimize the empirical risk under the 0-1 loss (empirical error) for probabilistic classifiers. These classifiers are based on modeling probability distributions, including those constructed from the joint distribution (generative) and those based on the class conditional distribution (conditional). RC can be particularized to any probabilistic classifier provided a specific learning algorithm that computes the classifier’s parameters in closed form using data statistics. RC reinforces the statistics aligned with the true class while penalizing those associated with other classes, guided by the 0-1 loss. The proposed method has been empirically tested on 30 datasets using naïve Bayes, quadratic discriminant analysis, and logistic regression classifiers. RC improves the empirical error of the original closed-form learning algorithms and, more notably, consistently outperforms the gradient descent approach with the three classifiers.

Index Terms—Supervised classification, probabilistic classifier, empirical risk minimization, iterative learning algorithm, gradient descent.

I. INTRODUCTION

SUPERVISED classification is one of the most crucial problems in machine learning, entailing the acquisition of a classifier that minimizes the risk for the 0-1 loss (*error*). A classifier essentially maps input variables to a set of class labels. However, given the truth probability distribution is unknown, we can not compute the error and classifiers have to be learned from i.i.d. data according to the truth distribution. Traditionally, the learning problem is tackled by minimizing empirical surrogates of the error [1], [2]. Support vector machines (SVM) [2] and logistic regression (LR) [3] exemplify such approaches, minimizing the average hinge and negative log loss on training samples, respectively.

Three main approaches to constructing classifiers are discriminative, conditional, and generative [4]. Discriminative approaches directly model decision boundaries between classes, typified by SVMs. Conditional methods, on the other hand, construct class conditional distributions and determine a classifier by selecting the class label with the maximum probability, as seen in LR. LR achieves this by minimizing the average negative log loss through gradient descent (GD). Generative classifiers present a third alternative, rooted in a joint distribution framework and utilizing Bayes’ rule to get class conditional distributions [5]. We call *probabilistic classifiers* conditional and generative approaches.

Unlike their counterparts, generative classifiers do not rely on minimizing an empirical error surrogate but instead on

measures quantifying data fitness, such as the maximum likelihood principle. To this category belong classifiers from the exponential family, like Quadratic Discriminant Analysis (QDA), and those grounded in Bayesian networks under varied assumptions, including discrete Bayesian networks [6] and conditional Gaussian networks [7]. Notably, the direct impact of the likelihood function on classification performance can become negligible as the dimensionality increases [8]. Efforts have been made to learn generative classifiers by minimizing the average negative log loss for discrete Bayesian networks through GD [9]–[12].

However, gradient descent could suffer several drawbacks, particularly those concerning constrained parameters. Violations of these constraints may yield invalid parameter values, numerical instability, and reduce model performance. Techniques like projection, parameter transformation [9], [10], or Lagrange multipliers [13] are indispensable for enforcing constraints but may introduce convergence challenges that hinder efficient optimization. Therefore, specialized methods become imperative to mitigate these challenges and ensure reliable learning of probabilistic classifiers with constrained parameters. Additionally, GD requires differentiable objective functions, typically addressing empirical error through surrogate losses like the negative log loss [3]. Furthermore, GD may entail high computational costs; for instance, computing the inverse of a covariance matrix represents a computationally intensive operation that can limit practical applications in high-dimensional domains.

One key advantage of discriminative classifiers concerning generative ones is that they directly model the decision boundary between classes, avoiding the more complex task of estimating the joint distribution, which often results in smaller errors. Additionally, discriminative classifiers tend to require fewer assumptions about the underlying data distribution, making them more flexible and generally more effective when the true data distribution is complex or unknown.

On the other hand, generative classifiers offer several key advantages. First, they provide comprehensive data modeling by capturing the joint probability distribution of input features and class labels, offering a better understanding of the data-generating process [14], [15]. Generative classifiers handle missing data effectively by marginalizing the missing values, enhancing robustness in practical scenarios [16]. Generative models can also generate synthetic data samples [17], aiding in data augmentation and anomaly detection. Moreover, they facilitate the integration of prior knowledge and domain expertise through prior distributions in a Bayesian framework. They also fit well into a Bayesian decision theory framework, optimizing decisions under uncertainty [18]. Additionally, generative classifiers often perform better with smaller training set sizes, because they approach their best performance faster,

Aritz Pérez is at the Basque Center for Applied Mathematics, 48009 Bilbao, Spain. Email: aperez@bcamath.org

Carlos Echegoyen and Guzmán Santafé are with the Spatial Statistics Group and INAMAT², Public University of Navarre, 31006 Pamplona, Spain. Email: {carlos.echegoyen, guzman.santafe}@unavarra.es

possibly with sizes logarithmic in the number of parameters [5]. Finally, When the class conditional distribution is accurately modeled within the joint distribution, generative classifiers can provide optimal predictions for a given cost-sensitive loss function without further adjustments [19]. Conditional classifiers represent an intermediate step between discriminative and generative approaches. They directly model the class conditional distribution while avoiding the need to model the marginal distribution of the input features, which is irrelevant for classification [8].

In this work, we present a method that combines the strengths of both probabilistic and discriminative approaches. The proposed method, called risk-based calibration (RC), is designed for learning the parameters of probabilistic classifiers, ensuring their performance is comparable to discriminative classifiers while preserving the advantages derived from modeling probability distributions. RC focuses on minimizing the empirical risk for 0-1 loss (empirical error) by using learning algorithms that compute the parameters in closed-form from data statistics, such as maximum log-likelihood (ML) or maximum a posteriori (MAP) learning procedures.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section II provides the background of the proposal. Section III presents a detailed and formal explanation of the proposed method. Section IV introduces the datasets used in the experiments as well as some common aspects of all the experiments. Sections V and VI show empirical results for generative and conditional classifiers respectively. Section VII summarizes the main conclusions of the current work. Finally, in the appendices, the reader can find further details on the connection of RC with previous methods (Appendix A), maximum a posteriori estimation of the parameters (Appendix B), the implementation of GD (Appendix C), and additional experimental results (Appendix D).

II. PRELIMINARIES

A. Supervised classification

The supervised classification task involves learning a classifier from a training data set that minimizes the expected loss (risk). However, this is often unreliable since we do not know the underlying probability distribution, and the problem is reformulated using surrogate functions of the available training data, such as the average loss in training (empirical risk) [1], [2].

Let $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathbb{R}^n$ and $\mathcal{Y} = \{1, \dots, r\}$ be the input space and the set of class labels, respectively. A classifier h is a function from instances to labels, $h : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$, and the set of classifiers is denoted by \mathcal{H} . Classifier families can be defined in terms of a particular functional form of their parameters. We denote by $\mathcal{H}_\Theta = \{h(\cdot; \theta) : \theta \in \Theta\}$ the family of classifiers with the parameter space $\Theta \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. One of the simplest classifiers is the linear discriminant model [20]

$$h(\mathbf{x}) = \arg \max_y \boldsymbol{\theta}_y^T \cdot (1, \mathbf{x}), \quad (1)$$

for every input $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$, where $\boldsymbol{\theta}_y = (\theta_{0,y}, \theta_{1,y}, \dots, \theta_{n,y}) \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ and n is the dimension of \mathbf{x} . In a linear discriminant model, the decision boundaries that separate the classes are

linear functions of the inputs \mathbf{x} given in terms of hyperplanes in the input space \mathcal{X} . A more general form of linear discriminant function is given by

$$h(\mathbf{x}) = \arg \max_y \boldsymbol{\theta}^T \cdot \phi(\mathbf{x}, y),$$

where $\boldsymbol{\theta} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ are the parameters and $\phi(\mathbf{x}, y) : \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y} \mapsto \mathbb{R}^d$ is the feature mapping. Intuitively, the feature mapping defines what is relevant for classifying \mathbf{x} . The linear discriminant function of Eq. 1 corresponds to the parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\boldsymbol{\theta}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\theta}_r)$, with $\boldsymbol{\theta}_y \in \mathbb{R}^{n+1}$ for $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, and the one-hot class encoding of the linear function $\psi(\mathbf{x}) = (1, \mathbf{x})$,

$$\phi(\mathbf{x}, y) = (\mathbb{1}(y=1) \cdot \psi(\mathbf{x}), \dots, \mathbb{1}(y=r) \cdot \psi(\mathbf{x})), \quad (2)$$

where $\mathbb{1}(\cdot)$ is the indicator function that takes value one when its argument is true, and zero otherwise. We call Eq. 2 with the linear function $\psi(\mathbf{x}) = (1, \mathbf{x})$ *linear feature mapping*. In general, these classifiers are linear models in the feature space defined by the mapping $\phi(\cdot)$. Other alternatives to feature mappings that are not linear include polynomial feature mapping [21], radial basis functions [22], Fourier random features [23], and embeddings based on deep learning models.

The loss function measures the discrepancy between the predicted class labels and the true class labels. Formally, the loss of a classifier h evaluated at instance (\mathbf{x}, y) , is a function $l : \mathcal{H}, (\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}) \rightarrow [0, \infty)$. The natural loss in classification is the 0-1 loss, also known as the misclassification loss, $l_{01}(h, (\mathbf{x}, y)) = \mathbb{1}(y \neq h(\mathbf{x}))$. Formally, the goal of supervised learning can be defined as selecting the classifier $h \in \mathcal{H}$ that minimizes the risk under 0-1 loss (expected 0-1 loss or *error*):

$$\min_{h \in \mathcal{H}} E_{p^*} [l_{01}(h, (\mathbf{x}, y))],$$

where $p^* \in \Delta(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ is the underlying (unknown) distribution of the data. The classifier that minimizes the error is named the Bayes classifier.

In practice, the supervised classification problem is adapted to be tractable. Generally, following a divide-and-conquer approach, the supervised classification problem is addressed for a specific parametric family of classifiers \mathcal{H}_Θ , where Θ is the support of the parameters. This approach enables the development of efficient learning algorithms that leverage the functional form of the chosen classifier family. Besides, the adaptations of the supervised classification problem typically involve minimizing a surrogate for the error. In the standard supervised classification settings, the underlying distribution of the data $p^* \in \Delta(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$ is unknown, and we have access to a supervised training set, $(X, Y) \in \mathcal{X}^m \times \mathcal{Y}^m$, with i.i.d. instances according to p^* , $(X, Y) = \{(\mathbf{x}^i, y^i)\}_{i=1}^m$. Often, the empirical risk under the 0-1 loss (the average of the 0-1 loss in the training data or *empirical error*) is used as a surrogate for the true error, and the learning reduces to the empirical error minimization:

$$\min_{h \in \mathcal{H}_\Theta} \frac{1}{m} \sum_{\mathbf{x}, y \in X, Y} l_{01}(h, (\mathbf{x}, y)).$$

This work is focused on the minimization of the empirical error. For alternatives to the empirical error minimization, see robust risk minimization approaches [24], [25].

Even when the supervised classification problem is restricted to a particular parametric family, optimizing the empirical error can be challenging, and therefore is often replaced by an alternative loss with suitable properties for its minimization. An example of such modifications is learning logistic regression by minimizing the empirical negative log loss, $l_{\log}(h, (\mathbf{x}, y)) = -\log h(y|\mathbf{x})$, facilitated by its differentiability.

B. Generative classifiers and closed-form learning algorithms

Conditional classifiers are constructed upon a class conditional distribution. The usual approach to learning conditional classifiers is focused on obtaining an accurate model of the class conditional distribution, $h(\cdot|\mathbf{x}) \in \Delta(\mathcal{Y})$ for each $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$, and the classification corresponds to the class label with higher probability $h(\mathbf{x}) := \arg \max_y h(y|\mathbf{x})$. A typical example of conditional classifiers is LR,

$$h(y|\mathbf{x}) \propto \exp\{\boldsymbol{\theta}^T \cdot \phi(\mathbf{x}, y)\}, \quad (3)$$

for $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ and for each $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$.

The generative classifiers are constructed upon a joint probability distribution $h(\mathbf{x}, y) \in \Delta(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y})$, which by the Bayes rule obtains the class conditional distribution $h(y|\mathbf{x}) = h(\mathbf{x}, y) / \sum_{y' \in \mathcal{Y}} h(\mathbf{x}, y')$. Generative classifiers are fundamentally motivated by their ability to represent the Bayes classifier, assuming they accurately capture the conditional distribution. Generative classifiers are usually constructed upon a joint distribution from a parametric family, such as the exponential family. Common examples of generative classifiers are the quadratic discriminant analysis (QDA) and the classifiers based on Bayesian networks [8]. Generative classifiers focus the learning on obtaining a good estimate of the joint distribution, and thus, they use surrogates for the empirical risk indirectly related to classification. Hence, generative classifiers are typically learned by maximizing the log-likelihood of the joint distribution. In contrast, this work proposes a learning procedure guided by classification performance.

The current work is mainly devoted to generative classifiers with a closed-form learning algorithm based on statistics obtained from data. We say that a learning algorithm, a , has closed-form when it is a function composition of a statistics mapping function $s : \mathcal{X}^m, \mathcal{Y}^m \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^k$ and a parameter mapping function $\theta : \mathbb{R}^k \rightarrow \Theta$, $a := \theta \circ s$. Statistics mapping summarizes the relevant information in the training data (X, Y) into k statistics, which are used to compute analytically the d parameters of classifier. Generative classifiers based on the exponential family have closed-form algorithms that maximize the likelihood of the training data. In this family, the feature mapping corresponds to statistics mapping, $\phi(\cdot) = s(\cdot)$, and therefore $k = d$. Usually, statistics mapping $s(\cdot)$ and feature mapping $\phi(\cdot)$ are closely related, however, the statistics mapping can include more terms than the feature mapping (see for instance Section VI-A).

From here on, we consider that the statistics mapping involved in the closed-form learning algorithm is additively decomposable, i.e., for $(X, Y) \in \mathcal{X}^m, \times \mathcal{Y}^m$, we have that $\mathbf{s} = s(X, Y) = \sum_{\mathbf{x}, y \in X, Y} s(\mathbf{x}, y)$, where with a slight abuse

in the notation $s(X, Y)$ and $s(\mathbf{x}, y)$ denotes the statistics mapping over a training set (X, Y) and over an instance (\mathbf{x}, y) respectively.

C. Examples of generative classifiers and learning algorithms

Next, we illustrate how the statistics mapping, $s(\cdot)$, manages the statistics calculated from the training sets with two well-known generative classifiers: naïve Bayes (NB) for discrete variables, and quadratic discriminant analysis (QDA) for continuous variables. Most of the classifiers use one-hot encoding for the class-related statistics, and this is the case for both NB and QDA. The statistics mapping for both classifiers can be given by the class one-hot encoding $s(\mathbf{x}, y) = (\mathbb{1}(y = 1) \cdot \psi(\mathbf{x}), \dots, \mathbb{1}(y = r) \cdot \psi(\mathbf{x}))$, where $\psi(\mathbf{x})$ extracts the statistics from the features that typically correspond to those required to compute the zeroth, first, and second moments.

In the case of NB with discrete variables, the i -th input feature, x_i , has support $\mathcal{X}_i = \{1, \dots, r_i\}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. NB assumes that the input features are independent given the class variable, which leads to the classification rule for \mathbf{x} :

$$h(\mathbf{x}) = \arg \max_y p(y) \cdot \prod_{i=1}^n p(x_i|y),$$

where $p(y)$ is the marginal probability of the class label y and $p(x_i|y)$ is the probability of i -th input variable taken the value x_i given the class label y . These conditional distributions are assumed to be categorical, and their parameters can be given by the maximum likelihood estimates obtained from the counting statistics. In NB $\psi(\mathbf{x}) = (1, \mathbb{1}(1 = x_1), \dots, \mathbb{1}(r_1 = x_1), \dots, \mathbb{1}(1 = x_n), \dots, \mathbb{1}(r_n = x_n))$. For NB the statistics obtained from data are $s(X, Y) = (s_{0,1}, s_{1,1,1}, \dots, s_{1,r_1,1}, \dots, s_{n,r_n,1}, \dots, s_{0,r}, s_{1,1,r}, \dots, s_{1,r_1,r}, \dots, s_{n,r_n,r})$, where $s_{0,y}$ is the statistics associated to the label y of the class variable and $s_{i,x_i,y}$ is the statistics associated to the value x_i of input i given the label y . The maximum likelihood parameter mapping is given by $p(y) = s_{0,y} / \sum_{y' \in \mathcal{Y}} s_{0,y'}$ and $p(x_i|y) = s_{i,x_i,y} / \sum_{x'_i \in \mathcal{X}_i} s_{i,x'_i,y}$ for $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $x_i = 1, \dots, r_i$.

On the other hand, the QDA's classification rule is given by:

$$h(\mathbf{x}) = \arg \max_y p(y) \cdot |\Sigma_y|^{-1/2} \cdot \exp\{(\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_y)^T \Sigma_y^{-1} (\mathbf{x} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_y)\},$$

where $\boldsymbol{\mu}_y$ and Σ_y are the mean vector and covariance matrix of \mathbf{x} given the class y . This classifier is learned by estimating the maximum likelihood mean vector and covariance matrix using the statistics mapping given by $\psi(\mathbf{x}) = (1, \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{x}^2)$, with $\mathbf{x}^2 = \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{x}^T$ being a $n \times n$ matrix. The statistics obtained from data are $s(X, Y) = (s_{0,1}, \mathbf{s}_1, \mathbf{s}_1^2, \dots, s_{0,r}, \mathbf{s}_r, \mathbf{s}_r^2)$ with $\mathbf{s}_{y'} = \sum_{\mathbf{x}, y \in X, Y} \mathbb{1}(y' = y) \cdot \mathbf{x}$, and $\mathbf{s}_{y'}^2 = \sum_{\mathbf{x}, y \in X, Y} \mathbb{1}(y' = y) \cdot \mathbf{x}^2$ for $y' \in \mathcal{Y}$. The components $1, \mathbf{x}$, and \mathbf{x}^2 are used to get the maximum likelihood estimation for $p(y)$, $\boldsymbol{\mu}_y$, and Σ_y using the parameter mapping $p(y) = s_{0,y} / \sum_{y' \in \mathcal{Y}} s_{0,y'}$, $\boldsymbol{\mu}_y = \mathbf{s}_y / s_{0,y}$ and $\Sigma_y = \mathbf{s}_y^2 / s_{0,y} - \boldsymbol{\mu}_y \cdot \boldsymbol{\mu}_y^T$, for each class label $y \in \mathcal{Y}$.

Using the statistics mapping described here, we can also adapt the parameter mapping for NB and QDA to create a closed-form algorithm that maximizes the a posteriori distribution using conjugate priors (see Appendix B for further details).

III. RISK-BASED CALIBRATION

The risk-based calibration algorithm (RC) is an iterative heuristic method to improve the empirical risk under 0-1 loss of a probabilistic classifier using a closed-form learning algorithm. This method is founded on the very basic intuition of modifying the statistics used by the closed-form learning algorithm, guided by the stochastic 0-1 loss for each instance. The stochastic 0-1 loss of the probabilistic classifier h in (\mathbf{x}, y) is given by

$$l_{s01}(h, (\mathbf{x}, y)) = 1 - h(y|\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{y' \neq y} h(y'|\mathbf{x}), \quad (4)$$

that corresponds to the expected loss of a randomized classifier that selects label y with probability $h(y|\mathbf{x})$ for $y \in \mathcal{Y}$.

We aim at finding the parameters θ^* that minimize the empirical risk of the stochastic 0-1 loss (*empirical stochastic error*). Given a training set (X, Y) , the empirical stochastic error is zero when $h(y|\mathbf{x}) = 1$ for all $\mathbf{x}, y \in X, Y$. Intuitively, it is possible to lead the statistic \mathbf{s} , and thus the model parameters, $\theta(\mathbf{s})$, towards the optimal classifier by strengthening the statistics $s(\mathbf{x}, y)$ and weakening $s(\mathbf{x}, y')$ for $\mathbf{x}, y \in X, Y$ and every $y' \in \mathcal{Y}$ with $y' \neq y$. The strengthening-weakening update is given by the classifier's stochastic 0-1 loss at point (\mathbf{x}, y) .

We propose to shrink the empirical stochastic error by raising $h(y|\mathbf{x})$ and by dropping $h(y'|\mathbf{x})$ for (\mathbf{x}, y) according to the stochastic 0-1 loss by calibrating the set of statistics, \mathbf{s} , used to obtain the model parameter. The calibration of \mathbf{s} is performed by adding $s(\mathbf{x}, y)$ with a weight $1 - h(y|\mathbf{x})$ (strengthening $h(y|\mathbf{x})$), and by subtracting $s(\mathbf{x}, y')$ with a weight $h(y'|\mathbf{x})$ for all $y' \neq y$ (weakening $h(y'|\mathbf{x})$). The strengthening-weakening calibration is directly give by Ep. 4 Combining both terms, given the classifier h , we have the following updating rule of the statistics \mathbf{s} given (\mathbf{x}, y) :

$$\mathbf{s} = \mathbf{s} + s(\mathbf{x}, y) - \sum_{y' \in \mathcal{Y}} h(y'|\mathbf{x}) \cdot s(\mathbf{x}, y'). \quad (5)$$

Given the data (X, Y) and the classifier h , and due to the additive nature of the statistics \mathbf{s} , the updating rule is simply given by:

$$\mathbf{s} = \mathbf{s} + s(X, Y) - s(X, h), \quad (6)$$

where $s(X, h) = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in X} \sum_{y' \in \mathcal{Y}} h(y'|\mathbf{x}) \cdot s(\mathbf{x}, y')$ is the probabilistic estimate of the statistics given the probabilistic classifier h .

The RC procedure is described in Algorithm 1, where, at each iteration, h corresponds to the probabilistic classifier with parameters $\theta(\mathbf{s})$, and $lr > 0$ is the learning rate.

Algorithm 1: **RC** (X, Y)

```

1    $\mathbf{s} \leftarrow s(X, Y)$ 
2   do {
3      $\mathbf{s} \leftarrow \mathbf{s} - lr \cdot (s(X, h) - s(X, Y))$ , for  $h$  with
       $\theta(\mathbf{s})$ 
4   } until Stop criterion is met

```

The initialization of the statistics (step 1 in Algorithm 1) can be arbitrary, as long as the statistics remain consistent and produce valid parameters. However, we recommend initializing them using $s(X, Y)$. The statistics obtained from training data provide a more competitive starting point from the empirical error point of view. However, it is possible to try different runs using bootstrap samples from the training data to avoid the convergence to a poor local optima.

The computational cost of each iteration is given by the statistics mapping $s(\cdot)$ and parameter mapping $\theta(\cdot)$. The computational complexity of the statistics mapping is linear in the number of training samples m and the dimension of the statistics k , $\mathcal{O}(d \cdot k)$, while the computation of the parameter mapping is independent of m and is usually linear in the number of statistics and parameters $\mathcal{O}(d + |\theta|)$. Due to the additively decomposable assumption for the statistics mapping, it is possible to speed up the RC by using stochastic and minibatch versions, which process subsets of the data in each iteration.

A relevant property of RC is that the sample size of the updated statistics remains invariant to iterations. This is because the strengthening-weakening strategy comes from the stochastic 0-1 loss (Eq. 4) and satisfies $\sum_{y' \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathbb{1}(y = y') - h(y'|\mathbf{x}) = 0$ for any $\mathbf{x}, y \in \mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}$. However, discrepancies between the class conditional probabilities given by the classifier and the class labels in the training set can sometimes lead to invalid parameters. To address this, we simply allow the learning process to continue by updating only those statistics that would result in valid parameters, freezing the rest.

The RC is a general-purpose algorithm for learning probabilistic classifiers that presents some connections to other existing methods proposed in the literature. The analysis of the connections with three iterative learning algorithms is presented in Appendix A: Discriminative frequency estimate for classifiers based on discrete Bayesian networks [12], GD for LR, and the TM algorithm for generative classifiers from the exponential family [26], [27].

IV. DATASETS AND EXPERIMENTAL SETTING

In this section, we will introduce the datasets used in the experiments and some common elements to all the experiments in the current paper. All the experiments are focused on the minimization of the empirical error.

The implementations of the classifiers, learning algorithms, and experiments are available online in the public Python repository at https://gitlab.bcamath.org/aperez/risk-based_calibration.

We utilize 30 public available datasets [28]–[33], each characterized by different numbers of instances (m) and variables (n). Table I provides an overview of the datasets used for the experiments, where the "Index" column serves as the identifier referenced along the empirical analysis. This comprehensive collection covers a wide range of domains and complexities, ensuring a robust evaluation of the proposed method across diverse real-world scenarios. Note that the 512 features of the datasets {3, 4, 8, 20, 30} are provided by ResNet18 [34] pre-trained deep neural networks for image

classification problems. These specific datasets contain a larger number of instances and input variables compared to the others.

All algorithms have been run 64 iterations with a fixed learning rate of $lr = 0.1$. The performance is measured in terms of the empirical error. We use two closed-form learning algorithms for the probabilistic classifiers: Maximum Likelihood (ML) and maximum a posteriori (MAP) (see Section II-C and VI-A, and Appendix B, respectively). The parameters of the classifiers are also initialized according to ML and MAP, respectively.

The proposed method, RC, is compared with GD using the same parameter initialization. The main results are summarized in tables indexed by dataset with the following description of the columns: The "ML" (or "MAP") column shows empirical error given by ML (or MAP) parameters and constitutes the initialization of RC and GD; the "RC" and "GD" columns provide the minimum empirical error reached by RC and GD algorithm in 64 iterations, respectively, and the best result for each dataset is highlighted in bold; the "Iter" columns contain the iteration at which RC and GD reach the minimum empirical error in 64 iterations. The "Reach" column shows the number of iterations required by RC to achieve an error that is less than or equal to the lowest error obtained by GD in 64 iterations. As the reach is smaller, it indicates that the error reduction of RC is steeper and faster than that of GD. The "avg." row presents the average errors and number of iterations across the 30 datasets, and the average reach is computed with those datasets in which RC obtains an error that is less than or equal to the lowest error of GD.

Index	Data	m	n
1	adult	48842	14
2	blood transfusion	748	4
3	catsvsdogs	23262	512
4	cifar10	60000	512
5	climate model	360	18
6	diabetes	768	8
7	ecoli	327	5
8	fashion mnist	70004	512
9	german numer	1000	24
10	glass	204	8
11	haberman	305	3
12	heart	270	13
13	indian liver	579	10
14	ionosphere	351	32
15	iris	150	4
16	letterrecog	20000	16
17	liver disorder	345	5
18	magic	19020	10
19	mammographic	829	5
20	mnist	70000	512
21	optdigits	5620	47
22	pulsar	17898	8
23	qsar	1055	39
24	redwine	1599	10
25	satellite	6435	36
26	sonar	207	60
27	splice	1000	60
28	svmguide3	1243	21
29	vehicle	846	18
30	yearbook	37921	512

TABLE I: Data sets.

Index	ML	RC	Iter	GD	Iter	Reach
1	0.187	0.149	28	0.170	64	7
2	0.250	0.217	33	0.221	22	10
3	0.037	0.014	64	0.037	1	1
4	0.211	0.116	64	0.210	12	2
5	0.042	0.014	57	0.022	63	29
6	0.224	0.199	16	0.207	50	5
7	0.560	0.560	1	0.560	1	1
8	0.203	0.107	64	0.203	1	1
9	0.221	0.203	40	0.219	4	8
10	0.211	0.201	10	0.211	1	1
11	0.233	0.233	1	0.233	1	1
12	0.148	0.115	12	0.130	49	6
13	0.313	0.268	12	0.290	63	6
14	0.251	0.251	1	0.251	1	1
15	0.040	0.033	30	0.040	1	1
16	0.383	0.269	63	0.370	64	2
17	0.310	0.304	47	0.310	1	1
18	0.248	0.173	63	0.188	63	13
19	0.179	0.172	17	0.179	1	1
20	0.119	0.049	64	0.118	5	2
21	0.071	0.016	64	0.071	1	1
22	0.032	0.025	62	0.029	60	5
23	0.184	0.107	46	0.184	1	1
24	0.418	0.380	64	0.414	5	2
25	0.204	0.136	64	0.200	23	2
26	0.150	0.000	19	0.034	62	8
27	0.083	0.025	61	0.061	61	8
28	0.227	0.143	53	0.173	55	5
29	0.364	0.200	63	0.318	62	5
30	0.150	0.077	64	0.145	14	3
avg.	0.208	0.159	42	0.193	27	5

TABLE II: Empirical error of NB with ML.

V. EXPERIMENTS WITH NB AND QDA

NB and QDA were introduced in section II-C as illustrative examples of generative classifiers alongside the closed-form algorithm that RC utilizes to perform the calibration of these classifiers. In this section, we summarize the empirical results obtained with NB and QDA.

A. RC for NB

NB is a classification model that deals with discrete variables. To adapt the datasets from Table I for use with NB models, each continuous variable is discretized into 5 categories according to a k-means strategy [35], where the values in each bin belong to the same cluster. The results are presented in Tables II and III.

According to Table II, RC improves the ML initialization in 27 out of 30 datasets. In all these cases, RC obtains lower errors than GD. The average reach of RC is 5 indicating that it produces a steeper and faster empirical error reduction than GD. In Table III, when MAP learning is used, RC reduces the initial error across 21 datasets, with RC proving superior to GD in 18 of them. The average reach is 5. The behavior of RC is clearly superior to GD for learning NB.

B. RC for QDA

The experimental results obtained with QDA are summarized in Tables IV and V for ML and MAP, respectively. According to Table IV, RC improves the ML initialization in 29 out of 30 datasets. In these datasets, RC obtains lower errors

Index	MAP	RC	Iter	GD	Iter	Reach
1	0.187	0.149	35	0.170	64	7
2	0.250	0.217	38	0.221	22	3
3	0.037	0.014	64	0.037	1	1
4	0.211	0.119	64	0.210	11	2
5	0.042	0.031	14	0.028	60	-
6	0.224	0.202	16	0.207	49	8
7	0.560	0.560	1	0.560	1	1
8	0.204	0.135	36	0.204	3	2
9	0.222	0.203	41	0.218	60	9
10	0.240	0.240	1	0.230	29	-
11	0.233	0.233	1	0.233	1	1
12	0.148	0.111	57	0.130	49	7
13	0.314	0.309	2	0.290	62	-
14	0.251	0.251	1	0.251	1	1
15	0.040	0.040	1	0.040	1	1
16	0.384	0.384	1	0.370	64	-
17	0.307	0.304	38	0.307	1	1
18	0.248	0.174	63	0.188	63	13
19	0.179	0.172	16	0.179	1	1
20	0.119	0.056	62	0.119	7	2
21	0.073	0.063	6	0.073	10	2
22	0.032	0.025	64	0.029	64	5
23	0.190	0.190	1	0.190	1	1
24	0.417	0.417	1	0.414	3	-
25	0.205	0.202	4	0.200	24	-
26	0.145	0.000	18	0.034	56	11
27	0.083	0.025	61	0.061	61	8
28	0.229	0.146	54	0.173	55	5
29	0.369	0.369	1	0.317	62	-
30	0.150	0.077	64	0.145	15	3
avg.	0.210	0.181	28	0.194	30	4

TABLE III: Empirical error of NB with MAP.

than GD except in (5) where they tie. The average reach in this scenario is 6. In Table V, when MAP learning is used, RC also reduces the initial error in 29 datasets. In all these datasets, RC achieves lower errors than GD except in three cases, obtaining equal results in two of them. The average reach is also 6. Again, the behavior of RC is clearly superior to GD for learning QDA.

VI. RC FOR LOGISTIC REGRESSION

One of the most popular conditional classifiers is LR (see Eq. 3), which is typically learned using GD to minimize the empirical risk under the negative log loss. In this section, we present a closed-form algorithm for LR, enabling its learning using RC. The proposed closed-form learning algorithm is based on a generative formulation of LR under parametric assumptions.

A. Closed-form algorithm for LR

Let $h(\mathbf{x}, y) = h(y) \prod_{i=1}^n h(x_i|y)$, where $h(y)$ is a categorical distribution with parameters p_1, \dots, p_r , $h(x_i|y)$ is a Gaussian distribution with mean $\mu_{i,y}$ and variance σ_i^2 for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $y \in \mathcal{Y}$. This generative classifier corresponds to the naïve Bayes classifier based on conditional Gaussian networks [7] under homoscedasticity assumption, i.e., the variance of each continuous variable does not depend on the class. The connection between both models is explained and analyzed in [5], [20]. By the Bayes rule $h(\mathbf{x}, y)$ leads to the conditional class distribution:

$$h(y|\mathbf{x}) \propto \exp\{\phi(\mathbf{x}, y)^T \cdot \boldsymbol{\theta} - c_y\}, \quad (7)$$

Index	ML	RC	Iter	GD	Iter	Reach
1	0.196	0.149	63	0.196	1	1
2	0.234	0.202	19	0.234	1	1
3	0.008	0.000	58	0.008	1	1
4	0.064	0.000	63	0.064	1	1
5	0.014	0.000	4	0.000	16	4
6	0.234	0.193	60	0.201	47	21
7	0.101	0.073	63	0.089	10	5
8	0.068	0.000	62	0.068	1	1
9	0.210	0.114	44	0.210	1	1
10	0.343	0.123	64	0.255	14	5
11	0.239	0.223	23	0.233	7	16
12	0.133	0.056	62	0.107	22	12
13	0.444	0.295	8	0.444	1	1
14	0.046	0.003	15	0.037	3	4
15	0.020	0.013	24	0.020	1	1
16	0.102	0.035	64	0.102	7	2
17	0.333	0.278	27	0.310	52	8
18	0.215	0.141	53	0.214	2	2
19	0.185	0.169	6	0.179	58	4
20	0.016	0.000	62	0.016	1	1
21	0.012	0.000	24	0.012	1	1
22	0.033	0.021	6	0.023	14	2
23	0.201	0.027	64	0.201	1	1
24	0.589	0.420	63	0.465	2	63
25	0.116	0.032	64	0.116	1	1
26	0.000	0.000	1	0.000	1	1
27	0.026	0.000	12	0.026	1	1
28	0.165	0.104	60	0.165	1	1
29	0.084	0.030	56	0.084	1	1
30	0.097	0.001	64	0.097	1	1
avg.	0.151	0.090	42	0.139	9	6

TABLE IV: Empirical error of QDA with ML.

Index	MAP	RC	Iter	GD	Iter	Reach
1	0.193	0.150	64	0.193	1	1
2	0.225	0.211	41	0.206	3	-
3	0.008	0.000	62	0.008	1	1
4	0.063	0.000	64	0.063	1	1
5	0.014	0.000	5	0.006	7	3
6	0.245	0.201	45	0.201	32	45
7	0.141	0.089	45	0.135	5	8
8	0.068	0.000	63	0.068	1	1
9	0.214	0.112	57	0.214	1	1
10	0.358	0.216	14	0.328	4	4
11	0.246	0.223	37	0.236	7	26
12	0.137	0.074	62	0.130	2	2
13	0.480	0.238	30	0.304	37	7
14	0.051	0.003	41	0.046	2	5
15	0.033	0.027	32	0.027	4	32
16	0.135	0.050	64	0.135	2	2
17	0.333	0.284	44	0.313	23	5
18	0.217	0.142	63	0.216	2	2
19	0.258	0.169	64	0.214	16	3
20	0.016	0.000	63	0.016	1	1
21	0.013	0.000	27	0.013	1	1
22	0.038	0.023	56	0.028	62	2
23	0.226	0.045	64	0.226	1	1
24	0.411	0.360	34	0.411	1	1
25	0.139	0.047	64	0.139	1	1
26	0.000	0.000	1	0.000	1	1
27	0.026	0.000	10	0.026	1	1
28	0.167	0.109	63	0.167	1	1
29	0.112	0.071	64	0.112	1	1
30	0.099	0.001	63	0.099	1	1
avg.	0.156	0.095	47	0.143	7	6

TABLE V: Empirical error of QDA with MAP.

where $\phi(\mathbf{x}, y)$ is the linear feature mapping, and $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_r)$ are the parameters with $\theta_y = (\theta_{0,y}, \theta_{1,y}, \dots, \theta_{n,y})$ for $y \in \mathcal{Y}$; and $\theta_{0,y} = \log p_y$, $\theta_{i,y} = \log \mu_{i,y} / \sigma_i^2$, and $c_y = \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_{i,y}^2 / \sigma_i^2 + 1/2 \log \sigma_i^2$ for $y = 1, \dots, r$ and $i = 1, \dots, n$. By grouping terms, the conditional class distribution corresponds to Eq. 3 with $\theta = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_r)$, $\theta_{y,0} = c_y + \log p_y$ for $y = 1, \dots, r$.

Now, we are in a position to define a closed-form learning algorithm for LR that maximizes the likelihood of the data (ML). The statistics mapping is simply given by the concatenation of the linear feature mapping, and the squares of the input features (x_1^2, \dots, x_n^2) , $s(\mathbf{x}, y) = (\phi(\mathbf{x}, y), x_1^2, \dots, x_n^2)$, with $s(X, Y) = (s_{0,1}, \mathbf{s}_1, \dots, s_{0,r}, \mathbf{s}_r, \mathbf{s}^2)$ with $\mathbf{s}^2 = (s_1^2, \dots, s_n^2) = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in X} (x_1^2, \dots, x_n^2)$. The parameter mapping corresponds to $p(y) = s_{0,y} / \sum_{y'} s_{0,y'}$, the mean vector $\boldsymbol{\mu}_y = (\mu_{1,y}, \dots, \mu_{n,y}) = \mathbf{s}_y / s_{0,y}$ for $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, and the variance vector $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2 = (\sigma_1^2, \dots, \sigma_n^2) = \mathbf{s}^2 / \sum_{y' \in \mathcal{Y}} s_{0,y'} - \sum_{y' \in \mathcal{Y}} p(y') \cdot \boldsymbol{\mu}_{y'}^2$ with $\boldsymbol{\mu}_y^2 = (\mu_{1,y}^2, \dots, \mu_{n,y}^2)$.¹ Using the same statistics mapping, we can adapt the parameter mapping to create a closed-form algorithm that maximizes a posteriori distribution using the conjugate priors (see Appendix B for further details).

B. Experiments using RC for LR

Next, we provide the set of experiments on the minimization of the empirical error for LR. The experiments have been performed with RC using the closed-form algorithms given in VI-A (ML and MAP) and GD of the empirical risk under the negative log loss. RC and GD starts from the same initialization corresponding to ML and MAP parameters obtained from data. Additionally, in Appendix D-B we include results for random initialization that highlights the robustness and efficiency of RC.

Tables VI and VII show the performance of RC for ML and MAP, respectively. RC reduces the initial error in 29 datasets for both initializations, obtaining better results than GD in 24 out of 29 cases with ML and in 25 out of 29 cases with MAP. The average reach of RC is 13 and 16, for ML and MAP respectively. Once again, the results show the ability of RC to improve the closed-form algorithms and its superiority concerning GD for learning LR.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

This work proposes an iterative learning algorithm called risk-based calibration (RC) to minimize the empirical error of probabilistic classifiers.

RC can be used to learn any probabilistic classifier, whether generative or conditional, as long as the classifier has a closed-form learning algorithm that involves two steps: statistics collection from data and analytical parameter computation from the obtained statistics. Typical examples include classifiers from the exponential family, such as naïve Bayes and quadratic discriminant analysis, which can benefit from the

¹In this work, we are considering $\psi(\cdot) = (1, \mathbf{x})$ to be linear on \mathbf{x} , but the proposal can be easily extended to arbitrary $\psi(\cdot)$ by using its corresponding class one-hot feature mapping (Eq. 2), and a statistics mapping corresponding to $\phi(\mathbf{x}, y)$ concatenated with the squares of $\psi(\cdot)$, $s(\mathbf{x}, y) = (\phi(\mathbf{x}, y), \psi(\mathbf{x})^2)$.

Index	ML	RC	Iter	GD	Iter	Reach
1	0.190	0.178	64	0.182	64	17
2	0.239	0.229	3	0.229	6	3
3	0.033	0.017	64	0.027	64	13
4	0.221	0.142	64	0.199	64	7
5	0.044	0.031	33	0.036	36	27
6	0.246	0.216	36	0.219	64	32
7	0.119	0.098	35	0.119	1	1
8	0.212	0.137	64	0.199	64	6
9	0.233	0.212	39	0.212	38	39
10	0.358	0.299	62	0.333	61	4
11	0.256	0.256	1	0.256	1	1
12	0.163	0.148	19	0.144	47	-
13	0.304	0.278	52	0.283	10	5
14	0.174	0.125	9	0.123	17	-
15	0.040	0.033	7	0.040	1	1
16	0.397	0.239	64	0.365	64	4
17	0.339	0.333	21	0.333	42	21
18	0.219	0.211	61	0.214	64	29
19	0.191	0.177	47	0.180	48	15
20	0.136	0.064	64	0.120	64	6
21	0.092	0.038	64	0.084	64	5
22	0.029	0.025	36	0.028	61	3
23	0.206	0.132	62	0.148	58	17
24	0.428	0.396	46	0.400	56	7
25	0.212	0.163	64	0.202	64	9
26	0.285	0.087	39	0.101	62	24
27	0.205	0.156	31	0.158	35	26
28	0.235	0.175	51	0.181	42	11
29	0.539	0.234	63	0.316	64	13
30	0.152	0.087	64	0.098	64	29
avg.	0.217	0.164	44	0.184	46	13

TABLE VI: Empirical error of LR with ML.

Index	MAP	RC	Iter	GD	Iter	Reach
1	0.190	0.178	64	0.182	64	15
2	0.238	0.227	40	0.229	7	15
3	0.033	0.017	64	0.027	64	13
4	0.221	0.142	64	0.199	64	7
5	0.047	0.031	34	0.039	35	22
6	0.246	0.216	38	0.219	64	31
7	0.128	0.104	39	0.116	48	12
8	0.212	0.137	64	0.199	64	6
9	0.233	0.212	53	0.212	38	53
10	0.382	0.304	43	0.328	58	5
11	0.252	0.252	1	0.252	1	1
12	0.159	0.148	57	0.144	52	-
13	0.301	0.278	59	0.285	14	28
14	0.185	0.125	9	0.125	39	9
15	0.060	0.040	19	0.047	30	6
16	0.398	0.239	64	0.366	64	4
17	0.339	0.333	23	0.333	45	23
18	0.219	0.211	61	0.214	63	29
19	0.191	0.177	48	0.179	54	38
20	0.136	0.064	64	0.120	64	6
21	0.092	0.038	64	0.084	64	5
22	0.029	0.025	36	0.028	62	3
23	0.206	0.130	64	0.148	55	17
24	0.421	0.396	45	0.396	64	-
25	0.211	0.162	62	0.202	64	9
26	0.285	0.087	43	0.101	61	25
27	0.205	0.157	29	0.159	35	22
28	0.235	0.175	52	0.181	42	11
29	0.540	0.238	62	0.307	64	16
30	0.152	0.087	64	0.098	64	29
avg.	0.218	0.164	48	0.184	50	16

TABLE VII: Empirical error of LR with MAP.

RC algorithm. Additionally, we show how to use the proposed procedure to learn the logistic regression classifier. The main difference between RC and other alternatives is that RC focuses on the calibration of the statistics rather than the parameters. This calibration is performed using information from the stochastic 0-1 loss function, ensuring that the learning process directly targets the minimization of the empirical error.

In the experiments, RC consistently achieved lower empirical errors than the gradient descent approach when learning naïve Bayes, quadratic discriminant analysis, and logistic regression classifiers. This demonstrates the effectiveness and robustness of RC to learn probabilistic classifiers by minimizing the empirical error. The ability of RC to reduce the empirical error reveals its potential as a preferred choice when learning probabilistic classifiers from data.

The implementations of the classifiers, learning algorithms, and experiments are available online in the public Python repository at https://gitlab.bcamath.org/aperez/risk-based_calibration.

REFERENCES

- [1] T. Hastie, R. Tibshirani, and J. Friedman, *The Elements of Statistical Learning: Data Mining, Inference, and Prediction*. Springer, 2009.
- [2] V. Vapnik, *The nature of statistical learning theory*. Springer Science & Business media, 2013.
- [3] D. W. Hosmer Jr, S. Lemeshow, and R. X. Sturdivant, *Applied logistic regression*. John Wiley & Sons, 2013.
- [4] T. Jebara, *Machine Learning: Discriminative and Generative*. Springer New York, NY, 2012.
- [5] A. Ng and M. Jordan, “On discriminative vs. generative classifiers: A comparison of logistic regression and naïve Bayes,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 14, 2001.
- [6] C. Bielza and P. Larrañaga, “Discrete Bayesian network classifiers: A survey,” *ACM Computing Surveys*, vol. 47, no. 1, pp. 1–43, 2014.
- [7] A. Pérez, P. Larrañaga, and I. Inza, “Supervised classification with conditional Gaussian networks: Increasing the structure complexity from naïve Bayes,” *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning*, vol. 43, no. 1, pp. 1–25, 2006.
- [8] N. Friedman, D. Geiger, and M. Goldszmidt, “Bayesian Network Classifiers,” *Machine Learning*, vol. 29, no. 2–3, pp. 131–163, 1997.
- [9] R. Greiner, X. Su, B. Shen, and W. Zhou, “Structural extension to logistic regression: Discriminative parameter learning of belief net classifiers,” *Machine Learning*, vol. 59, pp. 297–322, 2005.
- [10] T. Roos, H. Wettig, P. Grünwald, P. Myllymäki, and H. Tirri, “On discriminative Bayesian network classifiers and logistic regression,” *Machine Learning*, vol. 59, pp. 267–296, 2005.
- [11] F. Pernkopf and J. Bilmes, “Discriminative versus generative parameter and structure learning of Bayesian network classifiers,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2005, pp. 657–664.
- [12] J. Su, H. Zhang, C. X. Ling, and S. Matwin, “Discriminative parameter learning for Bayesian networks,” in *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2008, pp. 1016–1023.
- [13] D. P. Bertsekas, “Nonlinear programming,” *Journal of the Operational Research Society*, vol. 48, no. 3, pp. 334–334, 1997.
- [14] S. Augenstein, H. B. McMahan, D. Ramage, S. Ramaswamy, P. Kairouz, M. Chen, R. Mathews, and B. A. y Arcas, “Generative models for effective ML on private, decentralized datasets,” in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- [15] H. GM, M. K. Gourisaria, M. Pandey, and S. S. Rautaray, “A comprehensive survey and analysis of generative models in machine learning,” *Computer Science Review*, vol. 38, p. 100285, 2020.
- [16] A. P. Dempster, N. M. Laird, and D. B. Rubin, “Maximum likelihood from incomplete data via the EM algorithm,” *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B*, vol. 39, no. 1, pp. 1–22, 1977.
- [17] Y. Sun, A. Cuesta-Infante, and K. Veeramachaneni, “Learning vine copula models for synthetic data generation,” *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 33, no. 01, pp. 5049–5057, July 2019.
- [18] K. P. Murphy, *Machine Learning: A Probabilistic Perspective*. The MIT Press, 2012.
- [19] C. Elkan, “The foundations of cost-sensitive learning,” in *International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 17, no. 1, 2001, pp. 973–978.
- [20] C. M. Bishop, *Pattern Recognition and Machine Learning*. Springer, 2006.
- [21] J. O. Rawlings, S. G. Pantula, and D. A. Dickey, Eds., *Polynomial Regression*. Springer New York, 1998, pp. 235–268.
- [22] Y. Wu, H. Wang, B. Zhang, and K.-L. Du, “Using radial basis function networks for function approximation and classification,” *ISRN Applied Mathematics*, pp. 1–34, 2012.
- [23] A. Rahimi and B. Recht, “Random features for large-scale kernel machines,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 20, 2007.
- [24] S. Mazuelas, A. Zanoni, and A. Pérez, “Minimax classification with 0-1 loss and performance guarantees,” in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 33, 2020, pp. 302–312.
- [25] S. Mazuelas, Y. Shen, and A. Pérez, “Generalized maximum entropy for supervised classification,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 68, no. 4, pp. 2530–2550, 2022.
- [26] D. Edwards and S. L. Lauritzen, “The TM algorithm for maximising a conditional likelihood function,” *Biometrika*, vol. 88, no. 4, pp. 961–972, 12 2001.
- [27] G. Santafé, J. A. Lozano, and P. Larrañaga, “Discriminative vs. Generative Learning of Bayesian Network Classifiers,” in *Symbolic and Quantitative Approaches to Reasoning with Uncertainty*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2007, pp. 453–464.
- [28] D. Dua and C. Graff, “UCI machine learning repository,” 2017.
- [29] J. Elson, J. J. Douceur, J. Howell, and J. Saul, “Asirra: A captcha that exploits interest-aligned manual image categorization,” in *ACM Conference on Computer and Communications Security (CCS)*. Association for Computing Machinery, Inc., 2007.
- [30] A. Krizhevsky, “Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images,” Tech. Rep., 2009.
- [31] Y. LeCun, C. Cortes, and C. Burges, “MNIST handwritten digit database,” *ATT Labs*, vol. 2, 2010.
- [32] M. Abadi, A. Agarwal, P. Barham, E. Brevdo, Z. Chen, C. Citro, G. S. Corrado, A. Davis, J. Dean, M. Devin *et al.*, “Tensorflow: Large-scale machine learning on heterogeneous systems,” 2015.
- [33] H. Xiao, K. Rasul, and R. Vollgraf, “Fashion-MNIST: a novel image dataset for benchmarking machine learning algorithms,” *CoRR*, vol. abs/1708.07747, 2017.
- [34] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun, “Deep residual learning for image recognition,” in *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2016, pp. 770–778.
- [35] R. Dash, R. L. Paramguru, and R. Dash, “Comparative analysis of supervised and unsupervised discretization techniques,” *International Journal of Advances in Science and Technology*, vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 29–37, 2011.

APPENDIX A

CONNECTIONS BETWEEN RC AND OTHER METHODS

This section shows the connection of RC with three iterative learning procedures: Discriminative frequency estimate for learning classifiers based on discrete Bayesian networks, GD for LR, and the TM algorithm for generative classifiers from the exponential family.

A. Discriminative frequency estimate

Discriminative Frequency Estimate (DFE) [12] is used for learning the parameters of classifiers based on discrete Bayesian networks [6], such as naïve Bayes (NB). The main motivation for DFE is that learning discrete Bayesian networks based on gradient descent over the empirical risk under the negative log loss [9] is computationally demanding. DFE is an iterative procedure where, at each iteration, the statistics used to derive the parameters of a discrete Bayesian network

classifier are updated. Using our notation, the updating rule is given by:

$$\mathbf{s} = \mathbf{s} + \sum_{\mathbf{x}, y \in X, Y} (1 - h(y|\mathbf{x})) \cdot s(\mathbf{x}, y)$$

This corresponds to a heuristic that strengthens the statistics $s(\mathbf{x}, y)$ according to the stochastic 0-1 loss. The main difference from RC in the context of discrete Bayesian network classifiers is that DFE does not weaken the incorrect statistics associated with the instance (\mathbf{x}, y) , $s(\mathbf{x}, y')$ for $y' \neq y$. An important negative consequence is that DFE increases the equivalent sample size of the statistics \mathbf{s} , at each iteration by $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon_{s01} \cdot m)$, where ϵ_{s01} is the empirical risk under the stochastic 0-1 loss of the classifier obtained in the previous iteration. This can have dramatic effects with large training sets or when the number of iterations for convergence is large. The main limitation of DFE is that it only applies to discrete Bayesian network classifiers.

In Table IX of Appendix D we have summarized an experimental comparison between RC using ML and DFE for learning NB. These results clearly show that RC outperforms DFE.

B. The connection between RC and gradient descent for LR

In the case of LR, RC is equivalent to GD for the empirical risk under the negative log loss when RC uses a particular closed-form learning algorithm. This algorithm is related to the empirical average of the feature mapping used by LR. In Section VI, we present LR with linear feature mapping, while here we consider Eq. 2 an arbitrary function $\psi(\cdot)$.

Proposition 1. *Let h be a classifier given by Eq. 3 for the feature mapping given in Eq. 2 with arbitrary $\psi(\cdot)$, $a = \theta \circ s$ be a learning algorithm for h , and (X, Y) be a training set of size m . The RC update rule is equivalent to GD of the empirical risk under the log loss if the learning algorithm a is given by the statistics mapping $s(\mathbf{x}, y) = \phi(\mathbf{x}, y)$ and the parameter mapping $\theta(\mathbf{s}) = \mathbf{s}/m$.*

Proof. On the one hand, the RC updating rule with learning rate $lr > 0$ is given by:

$$\mathbf{s}_{y'} = \mathbf{s}_{y'} - lr \cdot \sum_{\mathbf{x}, y} \phi(\mathbf{x}) \cdot (h(y'|\mathbf{x}) - \mathbb{1}(y' = y)),$$

for $s_{y'} \in \mathcal{Y}$. Then, using the parameter mapping, we have that

$$\boldsymbol{\theta} = \boldsymbol{\theta} - \frac{lr}{m} \cdot \sum_{\mathbf{x}, y \in X, Y} \sum_{y' \in \mathcal{Y}} \phi(\mathbf{x}, y) \cdot (h(y'|\mathbf{x}) - \mathbb{1}(y' = y))$$

On the other hand, the gradient descent of the average negative log loss of h , $R(h) = -1/m \sum_{(\mathbf{x}, y)} \log h(y|\mathbf{x})$, with respect to $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ is

$$\frac{\delta R(h)}{\delta \boldsymbol{\theta}} = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{\mathbf{x}, y \in X, Y} \sum_{y' \in \mathcal{Y}} \phi(\mathbf{x}, y) \cdot (h(y'|\mathbf{x}) - \mathbb{1}(y' = y)),$$

which leads to the same parameter updating rule as RC. \square

C. The connection between RC and TM

The TM [26] is an iterative algorithm for maximizing the conditional likelihood using maximum likelihood learning procedures. Conditional log likelihood is proportional to the empirical risk under the negative log loss. TM is a general purpose algorithm that can be used for both regression ($\mathcal{Y} \subset \mathbb{R}$ continuous) and classification ($\mathcal{Y} = \{1, \dots, r\}$ categorical).

At each iteration t , the TM solves two steps:

- T-step: Compute the gradient of the marginal log-likelihood with respect to the parameters:

$$\frac{\delta LL(X; \boldsymbol{\theta})}{\delta \boldsymbol{\theta}},$$

with $LL(X, \boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in X} \log \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} h(\mathbf{x}, y; \boldsymbol{\theta})$.

- M-step: solve the maximization problem.

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t+1)} = \arg \max_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} LL(X, Y; \boldsymbol{\theta}) - \frac{\delta LL(X; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)})}{\delta \boldsymbol{\theta}} \cdot \boldsymbol{\theta},$$

where $\delta LL(X; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)})/\delta \boldsymbol{\theta}$ denotes the derivative of the marginal log-likelihood with respect to the parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ evaluated at $\boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}$. The T-step is based on an approximation to the conditional log-likelihood function, obtained by linearizing the marginal log-likelihood.

In classification, $\mathcal{Y} = \{1, \dots, r\}$, the M-step is equivalent to finding $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ so that the next equality holds:

$$\frac{\delta LL(X, Y; \boldsymbol{\theta})}{\delta \boldsymbol{\theta}} = \frac{\delta LL(X, h(\cdot|X; \boldsymbol{\theta}^{(t)}))}{\delta \boldsymbol{\theta}},$$

with $LL(X, h(\cdot|X; \boldsymbol{\theta})) = \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in X} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} h(y|\mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\theta}) \cdot \log h(\mathbf{x}, y; \boldsymbol{\theta})$. The TM differentiates the minimal sufficient statistics that depend on the class variable, u , from those independent of the class v , $s(X, Y) = (u(X, Y), v(X))$. For the particular case of generative classifiers from the exponential family, the TM iterates by updating the minimal sufficient statistics that depend on the class. Following our notation, it can be shown that TM reduces to:

$$\mathbf{u}^{(t+1)} = \mathbf{u}^{(t)} + u(X, Y) - u(X, h^{(t)}),$$

where the parameters of the model at iteration $t + 1$ are given by the maximum likelihood sufficient statistics $\mathbf{s} = (\mathbf{u}^{(t+1)}, \mathbf{v}^{(0)})$, with $\mathbf{v}^{(0)} = v(X)$. In summary, for the particular case of generative classifiers from the exponential family using the maximum likelihood learning algorithm, and a learning rate of $lr = 1$, TM and RC are equivalent.

We believe the main reason for the limited use of TM is the difficulty of its implementation. This is mainly due to the necessity of understanding the intricate details of the exponential family model, such as minimal sufficient statistics and those dependent or independent of the class variable. For instance, one of the few examples of TM usage is outlined in [27], where the authors used it to learn classifiers based on Bayesian networks with categorical variables. The primary methodological challenge in that work involves updating the minimal sufficient statistics of conditional distributions over categorical variables while maintaining their consistency. This unnecessarily complicates the implementation of the learning method, particularly since its complexity strongly depends on the number of states of the categorical variables. This

complexity is apparent when compared to RC, which merely requires the iterative application of maximum likelihood learning with probabilistically labeled data.

APPENDIX B

MAXIMUM A POSTERIORI PARAMETER MAPPING

An alternative to the maximum likelihood parameter estimation is a Bayesian estimation of the parameters. In Bayesian estimation, we assume a prior for the distribution of the parameters. Then, given the data, we obtain the posterior distribution of the parameters and select the parameters of its mode (maximum a posteriori parameters, MAP). For certain, parametric distributions, there are prior distributions over their parameters that allow obtaining the MAP parameters in closed form.

NB is based on the categorical distribution and the Bayesian conjugate of the categorical distribution is the Dirichlet distribution. Let's take the categorical distribution $p(y)$ for $y \in \mathcal{Y} = \{1, \dots, r\}$ and the prior Dirichlet distribution for its parameters

$$\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\theta_1, \dots, \theta_r) \sim \text{Dir}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}),$$

with hyperparameters $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_r)$. The posterior distribution of the parameters of $p(y)$ after observing $Y = \{y_i\}_{i=1}^m$ is given by:

$$\boldsymbol{\theta} \sim \text{Dir}(\boldsymbol{\alpha} + (m_1, \dots, m_r)),$$

where $m_{y'} = \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \mathbb{1}(y' = y)$ for $y' \in \mathcal{Y}$. The MAP corresponds to:

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}'_y = \frac{m_y + \alpha_y - 1}{m + \alpha - r},$$

with $\alpha = \sum_{y=1}^r \alpha_y$. By taking $\alpha_y = m_0/r + 1$ for $y \in 1$ we have the more intuitive MAP

$$\boldsymbol{\theta}'_y = \frac{m_y + m_0/r}{m + m_0},$$

where m_0 can be interpreted as the equivalent sample size of the prior. In the experiments with MAP we have taken $m_0 = r$. The same analysis follows for all the conditional distributions that are involved in NB, $p(x_i|y)$ for $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, and $i = 1, \dots, n$ with $x_i \in \{1, \dots, r_i\}$.

QDA is based on a categorical distribution $p(y)$ and n -dimensional Gaussian density functions $p(\mathbf{x}|y)$ for $y \in \mathcal{Y}$. The Bayesian conjugate of the parameters of a multivariate Gaussian distribution is the normal distribution for the mean and the inverse-Wishart distribution for the covariance:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu|\Sigma &\sim \mathcal{N}(\mu_0, 1/\kappa_0\Sigma) \\ \Sigma &\sim \mathcal{W}^{-1}(T_0, \nu_0) \end{aligned}$$

The posterior distribution for the parameters given the observations $X = \{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m\}$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mu|\Sigma &\sim \mathcal{N}(\mu', 1/\kappa'\Sigma) \\ \Sigma &\sim \mathcal{W}^{-1}(\Sigma', \nu') \end{aligned}$$

Then, the MAP parameters for the mean and the covariance matrix are

$$\begin{aligned} \mu' &= \frac{\kappa_0\mu_0 + m\hat{\mu}}{\kappa_0 + m} \\ \Sigma' &= \frac{T_0 + m\hat{\Sigma} + \frac{\kappa_0 \cdot m}{\kappa_0 + m}(\hat{\mu} - \mu_0) \cdot (\hat{\mu} - \mu_0)^T}{\nu_0 + m + n + 1}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{\mu}$ and $\hat{\Sigma}$ are the sample mean and covariance matrix. We propose the following re-parametrization in terms of $m_1, m_2 \geq 0$, $\kappa_0 = m_1$, $T_0 = m_2\Sigma_0$ and $\nu_0 = (m_2 - n - 1)$, for the sake of interpretability. Under this re-parametrization and neglecting the term $(\kappa_0 \cdot m)(\hat{\mu} - \mu_0) \cdot (\hat{\mu} - \mu_0)^T / ((\nu_0 + m + n + 1) \cdot (\kappa_0 + m))$ because usually $\kappa_0 \ll m$, we have the next intuitive MAP parameters in terms of prior mean vector μ_0 and covariance matrix Σ_0 with weights m_1 and m_2 , respectively:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu' &= \frac{m_1 \cdot \mu_0 + m\hat{\mu}}{m_1 + m} \\ \Sigma' &= \frac{m_2 \cdot \Sigma_0 + m\hat{\Sigma}}{m_2 + m} \end{aligned}$$

Here, m_1 and m_2 can be interpreted as the equivalent sample size of the priors for the mean vector and covariance matrix, respectively. In the experiments with MAP we have taken $m_1 = m_2 = 10$. This MAP estimate is used for the parameters of $p(\mathbf{x}|y)$ for $y \in \mathcal{Y}$, while the MAP parameters of $p(y)$ are obtained using the same procedure of NB. We have followed a similar approach for the parameter mapping used in the closed-form algorithm of LR.

APPENDIX C

GRADIENT DESCENT

In this section, we give the details of the gradient descent updating rule for the empirical risk under the negative log loss for the three classifiers considered in the experiments of this paper. In addition, we explain the transformations used to satisfy the parameter constraints. All the classifiers have been expressed into the exponential family form,

$$h(y|\mathbf{x}) \propto \exp\{\boldsymbol{\eta}^T \cdot s(\mathbf{x}, y) + A_y(\boldsymbol{\eta}^T)\}.$$

This simplifies obtaining a clear expression for the gradient of the parameters and puts all the considered models into a comparable form.

The exponential family form of the conditional probability modeled by NB is given by feature mapping corresponding to the one-hot encoding of each feature and the class $\phi(\mathbf{x}, y) = (\mathbb{1}(1 = y), \mathbb{1}(1 = y)\mathbb{1}(1 = x_1), \dots, \mathbb{1}(1 = y)\mathbb{1}(r_1 = x_1), \dots, \mathbb{1}(1 = y)\mathbb{1}(1 = x_n), \dots, \mathbb{1}(r = y)\mathbb{1}(r_n = x_n), \dots, \mathbb{1}(r = y)\mathbb{1}(1 = x_n), \dots, \mathbb{1}(r = y)\mathbb{1}(r_n = x_n))$ and the parameters $\boldsymbol{\eta} = (\boldsymbol{\eta}_0, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{1,0}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{n,0}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{1,r}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\eta}_{n,r})$ with $\boldsymbol{\eta}_0 = (\eta_{0,y} = \log p(y))_{y=1}^r$ and $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{i,y} = (\eta_{i,x_i,y} = \log p(x_i|y))_{x_i=1}^{r_i}$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$ and $y \in \mathcal{Y}$. For NB $A_y(\boldsymbol{\eta}^T) = 0$. The gradient descent updating rule is given by:

$$\eta_{0,y'} = \eta_{0,y'} - \frac{lr}{m} \sum_{\mathbf{x}, y \in X, Y} (h(y'|\mathbf{x}) - \mathbb{1}(y' = y))$$

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_{i,x'_i,y'} &= \eta_{i,x'_i,y'} \\ &- \frac{lr}{m} \sum_{\mathbf{x}, y \in X, Y} \mathbb{1}(x'_i = x_i) \cdot (h(y'|\mathbf{x}) - \mathbb{1}(y' = y)) \end{aligned}$$

for $y' = 1, \dots, r$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, and $x'_i = 1, \dots, r_i$.

Then, after applying the gradient descent updating rule, the natural parameters are transformed into probabilities by exponentiation and by projecting them into the simplex. Alternatives to the projection to the simplex include using softmax to obtain proper probability distributions. Unfortunately, by using these transformations the descent in the average negative log loss is no longer guaranteed.

The exponential-family distribution form of the conditional probability modeled by QDA is given by the feature mapping corresponding to the class one-hot coding $\phi(\mathbf{x}, y) = (\mathbb{1}(1 = y), \mathbb{1}(1 = y) \cdot \mathbf{x}, \mathbb{1}(1 = y) \cdot \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{x}^T, \dots, \mathbb{1}(r = y), \mathbb{1}(r = y) \cdot \mathbf{x}, \mathbb{1}(r = y) \cdot \mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{x}^T)$; the parameters $\boldsymbol{\eta} = (\boldsymbol{\eta}_0, \boldsymbol{\eta}_1, \boldsymbol{\eta}_2)$ with $\boldsymbol{\eta}_0 = (\eta_{0,y} = \log p(y))_{y=1}^r$, $\boldsymbol{\eta}_1 = (\eta_{1,y} = \Sigma_y^{-1} \cdot \mu_y)_{y=1}^r$ and $\boldsymbol{\eta}_2 = (\eta_{2,y} = -1/2 \cdot \Sigma_y^{-1})_{y=1}^r$, being μ_y and Σ_y the mean vector and covariance matrix conditioned to y ; and $A_y(\boldsymbol{\eta}) = \frac{1}{4} \cdot \boldsymbol{\eta}_{2,y}^{-1} \cdot \boldsymbol{\eta}_{1,y} \cdot \boldsymbol{\eta}_{1,y}^T \cdot \boldsymbol{\eta}_{2,y}^{-1} - \frac{1}{2} \cdot \boldsymbol{\eta}_{2,y}^{-1}$. The gradient descent updating rules are given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \boldsymbol{\eta}_{1,y'} &= \boldsymbol{\eta}_{1,y'} - \frac{lr}{m} \cdot \sum_{\mathbf{x}, y} (h(y'|\mathbf{x}) - \mathbb{1}(y = y')) \\ &\quad \cdot (\mathbf{x} + 1/2 \cdot \boldsymbol{\eta}_{2,y'}^{-1} \cdot \boldsymbol{\eta}_{1,y'}) \\ \boldsymbol{\eta}_{2,y'} &= \boldsymbol{\eta}_{2,y'} - \frac{lr}{m} \cdot \sum_{\mathbf{x}, y \in X, Y} (h(y'|\mathbf{x}) - \mathbb{1}(y = y')) \\ &\quad \cdot (\mathbf{x}^2 - 1/4 \cdot \boldsymbol{\eta}_{2,y'}^{-1} \cdot \boldsymbol{\eta}_{1,y'} \cdot \boldsymbol{\eta}_{1,y'}^T \cdot \boldsymbol{\eta}_{2,y'}^{-1} + 1/2 \cdot \text{tr}(\boldsymbol{\eta}_{2,y'}^{-1})) \end{aligned}$$

for $y' = 1, \dots, r$, and being $\text{tr}(\cdot)$ the trace of a matrix. Then, after every gradient descent updating the natural parameters $\boldsymbol{\eta}_0$ are transformed into probabilities by exponentiation and by projecting them into the simplex; $\boldsymbol{\eta}_{2,y}$ is transformed into the covariance matrix $\Sigma_y = -\frac{1}{2} \cdot \boldsymbol{\eta}_{2,y}^{-1}$ and is ensured to be a positive semi-definite matrix by: i) obtaining the singular value decomposition, ii) guaranteeing that all the eigenvalues are no smaller than $\epsilon = 10^{-2}$, and iii) reconstructing the matrix using the constrained eigenvalues. Again, by transforming the obtained parameters to fulfill their associated constraints (probabilities and covariance matrices) we can not ensure that the average negative log loss descents.

LR is directly given in the exponential-family distribution form, $\boldsymbol{\eta} = \boldsymbol{\theta}$. In this work, we simply consider the feature mapping corresponding to the one-hot class encoding $\phi(\mathbf{x}, y) = (\mathbb{1}(1 = y), \mathbb{1}(1 = y) \cdot \mathbf{x}, \dots, \mathbb{1}(r = y), \mathbb{1}(r = y) \cdot \mathbf{x})$ and the parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta} = (\boldsymbol{\theta}_0, \boldsymbol{\theta}_1)$ with $\boldsymbol{\theta}_0 = (\theta_{0,y} \in \mathbb{R})_{y=1}^r$ $\boldsymbol{\theta}_1 = (\boldsymbol{\theta}_{1,y} \in \mathbb{R}^n)_{y=1}^r$. In this model $A_y(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = 0$. The gradient descent updating rule for LR is:

$$\boldsymbol{\theta} = \boldsymbol{\theta} + \frac{lr}{m} \sum_{\mathbf{x}, y \in X, Y} \phi(\mathbf{x}, y).$$

In this model, the parameters have no constraint, and thus it is guaranteed a monotonic descent of the average negative log loss, but not in terms of the empirical error.

APPENDIX D ADDITIONAL RESULTS

A. Convergence curves in mnist

Next, we show the curves of the evolution of the empirical error with respect to the number of iterations of RC and GD

in mnist dataset (20) for NB, QDA, and LR. The error curves represent 128 iterations.




Fig. 1: Evolution of the empirical error for NB in mnist.

In Figure 1, we show the error curves of RC using ML and MAP for learning NB. RC can reduce the error of the initial model using ML and MAP parameters. RC with MAP converges to a local optimum in 60 iterations, while RC with ML does not reach convergence in 128 iterations. However, the behavior using ML is better than MAP for mnist.




Fig. 2: Evolution of the empirical error for QDA in mnist.

Figure 2 shows the error curves of QDA with ML and MAP. RC shows the same behavior with ML and MAP. RC shows a significant reduction in error in the first iterations and achieves an error close to the minimum in less than 30 iterations.

Figure 3 shows the error curves of LR with ML and MAP. RC with ML and MAP shows a similar behavior. In 128 iterations, RC reduces the error from 0.14 to 0.05, and the curve's downward slope suggests that the error will keep decreasing if more iterations are used. The error curve of RC decreases faster than that obtained with GD.

B. Random initialization of parameters

Table VIII shows the behavior of RC for LR with random initialization and updating the parameters using ML. In this case, the column "Random" contains the empirical error when the model is initialized at random. RC obtain lower errors than GD in 27 datasets. In two of the three remaining datasets, both




Fig. 3: Evolution of the empirical error for LR in mnist.




Fig. 4: Evolution of the empirical error for LR in mnist with random initialization of the parameters.

algorithms tie. The results from Table VIII suggest that RC reaches the best GD result, on average, in 19 iterations. The minimum errors and number of iterations required to obtain them with RC using ML and random initialization are similar (see Table VI). Figure 4 and Figure 3 show the evolution of the error with random and ML initialization in mnist, respectively. When departing from random initialization RC produces a steeper descent in the first iterations and obtains a similar error to the ML initialization in only 2 iterations. These results suggest that RC exhibits a robust behavior independently of the initial parameters.

Index	Random	RC	Iter	GD	Iter	Reach
1	0.641	0.179	63	0.183	63	23
2	0.572	0.222	12	0.223	34	12
3	0.809	0.011	64	0.012	62	46
4	0.852	0.115	64	0.144	64	11
5	0.314	0.031	63	0.064	56	11
6	0.435	0.217	42	0.224	40	22
7	0.820	0.104	55	0.141	63	10
8	0.920	0.131	64	0.141	64	50
9	0.529	0.213	37	0.216	57	23
10	0.946	0.299	17	0.368	64	9
11	0.610	0.243	4	0.239	8	-
12	0.270	0.141	10	0.141	11	10
13	0.530	0.278	16	0.278	30	16
14	0.353	0.117	16	0.123	38	14
15	0.573	0.040	45	0.140	61	13
16	0.951	0.246	64	0.530	64	4
17	0.475	0.330	34	0.339	27	13
18	0.598	0.212	60	0.215	63	31
19	0.726	0.177	33	0.179	55	32
20	0.861	0.028	64	0.053	64	13
21	0.797	0.032	64	0.069	64	8
22	0.598	0.025	18	0.026	34	14
23	0.559	0.136	59	0.149	64	27
24	0.725	0.397	58	0.411	47	7
25	0.970	0.163	63	0.188	64	13
26	0.338	0.106	47	0.135	63	27
27	0.557	0.156	33	0.158	52	33
28	0.574	0.177	63	0.183	46	21
29	0.837	0.240	61	0.312	62	15
30	0.358	0.075	64	0.080	64	32
avg.	0.637	0.161	45	0.189	52	19

TABLE VIII: Empirical error of LR with random initialization. RC is based on the ML closed-form learning algorithm.

Index	ML	RC	Iter	DFE	Iter	Reach
1	0.187	0.149	28	0.157	64	13
2	0.250	0.217	33	0.218	4	33
3	0.037	0.014	64	0.020	64	28
4	0.211	0.116	64	0.174	64	12
5	0.042	0.014	57	0.022	13	29
6	0.224	0.199	16	0.203	19	13
7	0.560	0.560	1	0.560	1	1
8	0.203	0.107	64	0.179	64	9
9	0.221	0.203	40	0.212	44	11
10	0.211	0.201	10	0.206	19	9
11	0.233	0.233	1	0.233	1	1
12	0.148	0.115	12	0.115	23	12
13	0.313	0.268	12	0.280	42	10
14	0.251	0.251	1	0.251	1	1
15	0.040	0.033	30	0.040	1	1
16	0.383	0.269	63	0.353	51	3
17	0.310	0.304	47	0.310	1	1
18	0.248	0.173	63	0.189	52	11
19	0.179	0.172	17	0.175	12	6
20	0.119	0.049	64	0.091	64	11
21	0.071	0.016	64	0.039	62	18
22	0.032	0.025	62	0.032	2	2
23	0.184	0.107	46	0.128	63	13
24	0.418	0.380	64	0.409	5	4
25	0.204	0.136	64	0.168	62	12
26	0.150	0.000	19	0.000	41	19
27	0.083	0.025	61	0.041	60	25
28	0.227	0.143	53	0.150	61	19
29	0.364	0.200	63	0.320	59	5
30	0.150	0.077	64	0.092	64	30
avg.	0.208	0.159	42	0.179	36	12

TABLE IX: Empirical error of NB with ML. The column "DFE" shows the minimum errors obtained by DFE algorithm in 64 iterations.

C. Comparison with DFE

Table IX summarizes the comparison between RC with ML as closed-form learning algorithm and the discriminative frequency estimate (DFE) for discrete NB (see Appendix A-A). RC achieves lower errors in 25 datasets and equal in 5. The average reach of RC is 12, indicating that it produces a steeper and faster empirical error reduction than DFE. These results clearly show that RC using ML is better than DFE for learning NB.