

Quantifying Uncertainty and Variability in Machine Learning: Confidence Intervals for Quantiles in Performance Metric Distributions

Christoph Lehmann^{1,*} and Yahor Paromau¹

¹Center for Scalable Data Analytics and Artificial Intelligence (ScaDS.AI)
Dresden/Leipzig, Technische Universität Dresden, Germany

*Corresponding author: Christoph Lehmann, christoph.lehmann@tu-dresden.de

January 29, 2025

Abstract

Machine learning (ML) models are widely used in applications where reliability and robustness are critical, including healthcare, finance, and infrastructure management. Model evaluation often relies on single-point estimates of performance metrics such as accuracy, F1 score, or mean squared error, that fail to capture the inherent variability in model performance. This variability arises from multiple sources, including train-test split, data augmentation strategies, weights initialization, and hyperparameter tuning. Investigating the characteristics of performance metric distributions, rather than focusing on a single point only, is essential for informed decision-making during model selection and optimization, especially in high-stakes settings.

How does the performance metric vary due to intrinsic uncertainty in the selected modeling approach? For example, train-test split is modified, initial weights for optimization are modified or hyperparameter tuning is done using an algorithm with probabilistic nature?

This perspective shifts the focus from identifying a single best model to understanding a distribution of the performance metric that captures variability across different training conditions. By running multiple experiments with varied settings, empirical distributions of performance metrics can be generated. Analyzing these distributions can lead to more robust and reliable models that generalize well across diverse scenarios.

This contribution explores the use of quantiles and confidence intervals to analyze such distributions, providing a more complete understanding of model performance and its uncertainty. Aimed at a statistically interested audience within the machine learning community, the suggested approaches are easy to implement and apply to various performance metrics for classification and regression problems. Given the often long training times in ML, particular attention is given to small sample sizes (in the order of 10–25). Finally, the emphasis of the presentation is placed on practical applicability rather than on less relevant technical or methodological details.

Keywords— machine learning, uncertainty, variation, performance metrics, quantile estimation, confidence intervals, bootstrapping, nonparametric


1 Introduction

In machine learning (ML) training, outcomes are influenced by numerous factors, including the train-test split, optimizer choice, initial weights, hyperparameter optimization etc. In the sense of scientific meaning, these factors are so-called confounding factors and analyzing those is considered good practice, as it enables a comprehensive understanding of the experimental conditions.


In contrast, while confounding factors are examined in the typical ML workflow, this is often done in an unsystematic manner, with a primary focus on achieving the best single value for a target metric of interest (TMoI). But simply selecting the best single value does not reflect the training process as an experiment, as even with a fixed choice of (hyper)parameters, results can vary due to the probabilistic nature of the modeling approach, for example due to weights initialization or data augmentation.

The objective of this work is to represent results of ML training as a distribution of the TMoI (such as e.g. accuracy or root mean squared error (RMSE)) conditional on the confounding factors. Drawing from a distribution of some TMoI can be realized by using seed-controlled train runs of a ML pipeline. Thereby, one confounding factor is varied based on seeds, as e.g. initial weights of a model, the train-test data split etc. The resulting single values can be interpreted as repeated measurements from the distribution of the TMoI for a given confounding factor, that allows to quantify its impact on the TMoI. A distributional view allows for the evaluation of the training process in terms of uncertainty that can be quantified from a statistical perspective. Generating such repeated measurements can be quite costly, as running ML training needs time and computing resources. Therefore, a small to medium amount of such measurements is assumed throughout this contribution. This amount of measurements is referred to as the sample size n which will be in the order of 10-50. Note that this sample size n needs to be clearly separated from the data volume (train or test data size) within some ML training. The presented methodology does not consider the data size that is used for the training itself.

Figure 1 shows examples of empirical distributions of the RMSE for a regression problem and the accuracy rate of a classification problem. Each of these empirical distributions is generated based on approximately 1 000 seed-controlled train runs for different confounding factors. Figure 1(a) shows two regression



(a) Empirical distributions of RMSE for regression.



(b) Empirical distributions of accuracy for classification.

Figure 1: Examples of empirical distributions of TMoIs based on approx. 1 000 seed-controlled train runs.

approaches for the same data (this is from the real data use case Superconductors, see Section 4.2): deep neural network (DNN, fully connected) and gradient boosting trees (GBT). For both approaches, the different train runs are generated by seed-controlled train-test splits.

Figure 1(b) illustrates classifier training runs using a convolutional neural network applied to the same dataset (from the real-data use case Simpsons characters, see Section 4.2). One set of training runs was generated through seed-controlled hyperparameter optimization (HO), specifically using the Tree-Structured Parzen Estimator, where the seeds control initialization. The other set of runs was generated through seed-controlled data augmentation. In practice, hundreds or even thousands of repetitive measurements are rarely available. As a consequence, the actual resulting empirical distributions consisting of observations from 10 or 25 repeated measurements typically will not look so smoothly as shown in Figure 1. Hence, the contribution at hand demonstrates how to work with modestly sized samples to gain insights into the unknown underlying distribution. Such analyses are a typical task of inferential statistics and involve considerations of uncertainty.

Bringing into play the uncertainty perspective, this contribution aims to bridge the gap between statistics and ML by integrating statistical perspectives into ML practice. When interconnecting statistics and ML, clear definitions of terms are crucial. Therefore, the following central terms are defined as follows.

- **Theoretical Distribution:** A theoretical distribution represents an idealized or assumed model for how probability mass is distributed. Such a model can be characterized by parameters or quantities as mean, variance, quantiles etc. The theoretical true values of these quantities are typically unknown and need to be estimated based on data/samples.
- **Estimation:** The process of deriving or approximating unknown values such as parameters or unknown quantities based on observed data. The estimator is a formula or rule used to derive an estimate of an unknown statistical quantity or parameter based on a sample. For instance, the sample mean is an estimator of the population mean. Estimation can result in a single value (point estimation) or a range of values (interval estimation).
- **Uncertainty:** The degree to which an estimator may be inaccurate or vary, caused by the sampling error in some data. In ML, uncertainty can stem from factors like variability in data, algorithm stochasticity etc.
- **Confidence Interval:** A confidence interval (CI) extends point estimation by providing a range of plausible values for a statistical quantity. The larger the range of values, the greater the uncertainty about the estimate. Conversely, narrower intervals indicate higher precision. Thus, a CI reflects the uncertainty inherent in the estimation process and provides a way to communicate the reliability of an estimate.

The core contributions of this article are as follows:

1. Offering a more distributional perspective for the TMOI instead of single-value considerations. This is done by utilizing quantiles to characterize the distribution of a specific TMOI, rather than solely focusing on aggregation (e.g. by average values).
2. The suggested approach is applicable to all continuous TMOIs. Thus, it relates to classification (accuracy, precision, F1, ...) and regression (RMSE, MAE, ...) tasks.
3. Quantifying the uncertainty of distributional quantiles in terms of CIs.

Directly examining some specific TMOI distribution provides more insightful results, than focusing solely on a single value. For instance, analyzing the 25% quantile of an accuracy rate reveals that the accuracy falls below this threshold in only 25% of cases. Similarly, evaluating the 90% quantile of the RMSE indicates that it exceeds this threshold in just 10% of cases. In finite data, the sampling error introduces statistical uncertainty for any quantile, such as the 25% or 90%, which can be quantified through a CI. The CI reflects reliability through its confidence level and interval length. Consider a comparison of classifiers A and B, using accuracy as the TMOI and a seed-controlled data split as a confounding factor. The CIs for the 25% quantile of accuracy might show a similar level for both classifiers, but classifier B could have a shorter interval, suggesting greater stability.

To make the possibilities especially with CIs even more concrete, let's look at concrete results that refer to the distributions in Figure 1. The following concrete numbers are actual results from the experiments that are described in Section 4.2.

For the regression problem in Figure 1(a) two concrete interval estimates¹ for the 90% quantile of the RMSE are [10.8, 11.2] (DNN) and [9.8, 10.2] (GBT), based on a sample size $n = 25$ and confidence level 0.9. It can be seen, that the GBT approach achieves a lower overall RMSE level. The concrete intervals have comparable length, which indicates a comparable deviation for both underlying distributions. As a consequence, one would prefer the prediction model from the GBT approach.

For the classification problem in Figure 1(b), let's start with the average values for each sample ($n = 25$), which are 0.874 (hyperparameter optimization, HO) and 0.872 (data augmentation, DA). These average values are quite close, suggesting no relevant difference at first glance. However, the picture changes when we consider the interval estimates for the 10% quantile of accuracy, with confidence level 0.9. For HO, the interval is [0.870, 0.873], while for DA, it is [0.860, 0.868]. The HO case shows slightly higher accuracy compared to the DA case. More remarkably, there is a substantial difference in the lengths of these intervals by approximately factor 3. The longer interval for the DA case indicates a higher overall deviation in its underlying distribution compared to the HO case. This suggests that the use of HO leads to more stability

¹Here, the nonparametric exact CI from Section 3.3 is used.

in accuracy, making it less variable compared to DA. As a consequence, one would prefer the resulting model from HO. Instead of some concrete model choice conclusion, the greater variability from the DA could indicate weaknesses in the train and/or test data as well. Thus, it is a starting point for improving the data quality. Such conclusions are possible when analyzing quantiles in conjunction with uncertainty quantification. Instead of such a descriptive analysis, there might be predefined requirements for some ML model in terms of precision and stability that can be checked based on a distributional perspective based on quantiles and their uncertainties.

Depending on the application, other aspects of interest may arise beyond these examples. Viewing ML training as a controlled experiment with repeated measurements of confounding factors enables targeted investigation and evaluation of specific aspects of interest.

However, training ML models can be costly, and creating the relevant sample sizes might be hard or even impossible. Nevertheless, it turns out that an order of 15 to 25 observations is already sufficient to get reliable insights. But even a sample size of 10 observations allows for some insights that are already beyond the simple mean consideration.

The structure of this work is as follows. Section 2 presents related work and briefly describes two different perspectives on TMOI uncertainty. Section 3 describes the statistical background of quantile estimation by presenting two quantile point estimators and introducing three nonparametric approaches to estimate CIs for quantiles of some TMOI. Section 4 presents different experiments for estimation of CIs for quantiles. Therein, different types of CIs are considered. These experiments include both, values obtained from simulations and values of TMOIs of concrete use cases – classification and regression problems. Section 5 summarizes the main results and provides hints on extensions and further work.

2 Related Work

A common approach in ML training to improve model generalization is to apply resampling techniques, such as cross-validation. This process considers different train-test splits of the data and gives a more robust estimate of model performance. Although, this approach is primarily intended for improving generalization, it already reflects the variation regarding some TMOI. But the variation thereby is mainly driven by the data and it is not possible to disentangle it from other confounding factors, as e.g. hyperparameter optimization, weights initialization etc. Contributions investigating some kind of uncertainty driven by data variation, typically refer to a dedicated performance measure. Articles targeting, e.g. the F1 score are [Tak+21; Wan+15]. Thereby, [Tak+21] follows a frequentist approach, relying on asymptotic results from the multivariate Central Limit Theorem to construct confidence intervals. In contrast, [Wan+15] focuses on the variation of the F1 score using a Bayesian approach. For regression problems, [Bay+20] proposes confidence intervals for the mean test error of predictions. All these contributions, primarily analyze variation arising from data and the assumed asymptotics typically refer to the sample size of the test set.

A broader perspective, taken throughout this contribution, considers ML training as a scientific experiment, with a focus on variation arising from different confounding factors, whereby data variation is one possible confounding factor. Prior research has addressed this experimental perspective on ML training, specifically investigating different sources of variation in ML. According to [Bou+21, Appendix C.1], multiple trials optimizing the learning pipeline over various sources of variation include data splits, data order (in the context of training batches), data augmentation, model initialization (initial parameter values), model stochasticity, and hyperparameter optimization. Many ML approaches, such as deep learning or random forests, employ non-deterministic algorithms (e.g., SGD, Adam, AdaGrad) to solve the optimization problem, which is a further source of variation. A distinction between deterministic and non-deterministic approaches was pointed out e.g. in [Hot+05, p., 679]. Thereby, describing the outcome of such fitting procedure (aka optimization process in ML) as random variable aligns with the perspective in [Bou+21] or [Phi+18]. The choice of different optimization algorithms seems a process of continuous discussion, cf. [SSH21]. The relevance of these and other sources of variation depends on the methods and algorithms used. In this context, [Phi+18] points into a similar direction, while considering methods at a smaller scale and considering regression only. Their stability concept contains three components: algorithm, specified model, and data-generating process (DGP). This framework also evaluates stability without assumptions about the algorithm, specified model, or DGP, similar to [Bou+21]. In comparison to [Bou+21], there is a shift in utilizing a variation analysis not for benchmarking only, but in a more general sense to reflect about the training process for whatever ML application. Additionally, the contribution at hand elaborates on the

resulting distributions by analyzing them in terms of inferential statistics, more precisely by using quantiles. In contrast, [Bou+21] is employing only the mean.

Throughout this article, mainly the term source of variation for describing confounding factors, as e.g. data sampling, augmentation, weight initialization, hyperparameter optimization etc., according to [Bou+21] is used. An alternative term would be source of uncertainty, whereby the uncertainty notion is to be interpreted in the statistical sense. Nevertheless, the variation term can be understood in a more general manner, without a strong relation to statistics which is maybe an advantage when addressing a more non-statistical audience.

To summarize, the current contribution is agnostic regarding the method/model and the TMOI. It only assumes that repeated measurements of some arbitrary source of variation are available, typically generated through seed-controlled runs. Furthermore, it is assumed that only a limited number of measurements is available for analysis.

Note that there is also related statistical work w.r.t. quantile estimation (point and interval) that is presented in the following Section 3, Statistical Background.

3 Statistical Background

In this section, the statistical methodology used to measure uncertainty when characterizing the distribution of the TMOI is presented. Specifically, the focus is on using point estimates and CIs of particular quantiles to quantify the distribution of the TMOI. Thereby, a point estimate is a single ‘best guess’, while a CI provides a range of values that likely contains the true quantile value.

In statistical analysis, it is common to assume an independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) sample. The use of repeated measurements from seed-controlled ML runs can justify the i.i.d. assumption when varying only a single confounding factor. In the following, the random observations X_1, \dots, X_n are assumed to form an i.i.d sample from a continuous distribution.

The statistical background section covers two main topics: point estimation of quantiles and CIs for quantiles. First, the quantile definition is provided, followed by an introduction of two point estimators for quantiles. Specifically, the point estimators are: 1) the sample quantile, and 2) a linear interpolated estimator. Second, there will be presented three distribution-free approaches to estimate a CI of a quantile of a continuous distribution: 1) nonparametric exact CIs, 2) nonparametric asymptotic CIs, 3) semiparametric bootstrap CIs. For comparison reasons, the very common t -interval as CI for the expectation is considered as well.

3.1 Quantiles and Quantile Estimation

Quantile Definition

Given a random variable X with cumulative distribution function $F(x) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} P(X \leq x)$, the u -th quantile \tilde{x}_u at a given probability level u is defined as:

$$\tilde{x}_u \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} F^{-1}(u) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \inf \{x : P(X \leq x) \geq u\}, \quad u \in]0, 1[. \quad (1)$$

From the definition in (1) there can be derived the following probability statements:

$$P(X \leq \tilde{x}_u) \geq u \iff P(X > \tilde{x}_u) \leq 1 - u. \quad (2)$$

Note the implications of the inequality sign in the quantile definition such that the specified probability level u serves as a lower bound for statements about some TMOI (assume that the TMOI is described by the random variable X with distribution function F). For example, in the case of RMSE as TMOI, the 90%-quantile corresponds to the statement: ‘An RMSE of $\tilde{x}_{0.9}$ is exceeded in at most 10% of cases’, reflecting the inequality $P(X > \tilde{x}_{0.9}) \geq 1 - 0.9$. With regard to an RMSE this kind of statement is fully satisfactory. In contrast, for an accuracy as TMOI, the statement could be such as: ‘For at least 25% of cases, the accuracy is below a level $\tilde{x}_{0.25}$ ’, reflecting the inequality $P(X \leq \tilde{x}_{0.25}) \geq 0.25$. Note that instead of ‘at least’, one would prefer ‘at most’ here for considering the accuracy rate. Unfortunately, this is not possible given the quantile definition. Alternatively, the error rate (complement of accuracy) could be considered instead of the accuracy which allows for the more preferable interpretation. But there is not this kind of complementary

version for every TMOI, as e.g. the F1 score. Nevertheless, this issue is crucial especially in connection with discrete distributions, but it vanishes with growing sample size when working under the assumption of a continuous distribution for the TMOI.

Quantile Point Estimation

Consider the sample mean $\bar{X} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$ as a starting point, which is an estimator for the unknown expectation of a probability distribution. As the sample size n increases, it can be shown that the sample mean has several desirable statistical properties, such as unbiasedness (on average, it equals the true expectation) and consistency (it gets closer to the true expectation as n increases).

In contrast to expectation estimation, quantile estimation is more complex. While the expectation gives a central tendency, quantiles are more sensitive to the distribution’s shape and can vary more dramatically with a concrete sample. This makes quantile estimation a more challenging task. The more extreme the quantile level of interest (e.g., 0.05, 0.01, 0.95, or 0.99), the more observations are basically necessary. Quantiles from the ‘middle’ of a distribution (around 0.5) can be estimated more easily and more reliably. Given this effect, analyzing uncertainty in terms of quantiles requires a sufficiently large sample size. As a consequence, in ML applications where training takes a lot of time, an elaborated analysis of the tails of the TMOI distribution may be not possible at all. Therefore, a critical reflection of available data (and sample size) to investigate the uncertainties of training results is crucial.

If the underlying distribution is known, it is (more or less) straightforward to derive point estimators as well as CIs. However, in the context of ML metrics, it is difficult, if not impossible, to make any substantial assumptions for the distribution of the TMOI. As a consequence, it is assumed only that the TMOI follows a continuous distribution with cumulative distribution function F . The empirical cumulative distribution function \hat{F}_n is an estimator of the (unknown) theoretical cumulative distribution function F .

Quantiles can be estimated by so-called order statistics based on the sample quantiles. The order statistics $X_{(i)}, i = 1, \dots, n$ are the (random) observations X_1, \dots, X_n arranged in increasing order:

$$X_{(1)} \leq X_{(2)} \leq \dots \leq X_{(n)}. \quad (3)$$

There is a relationship between sample quantiles and order statistics, as shown in [Van00, p. 305]:

$$\hat{Q}(u) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \hat{F}_n^{-1}(u) = X_{(i)}, \quad \text{for } u \in \left] \frac{i-1}{n}, \frac{i}{n} \right]. \quad (4)$$

Deriving quantiles based on the order statistics according to (4) is a common estimation approach. Thereby, the expression in (4) represents a step function. To obtain a smoother behavior instead of the stepwise characteristics, the following fractional quantile estimator based on the linear interpolation of order statistics can be used (cf. [Hut02, p. 332, eqn. (2.1)]),

$$\hat{Q}_L(u) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (1 - \epsilon)X_{(\lfloor n'u \rfloor)} + \epsilon X_{(\lfloor n'u \rfloor + 1)}, \quad \frac{1}{n+1} < u < \frac{n}{n+1}, \quad (5)$$

with $n' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} n + 1$, $\epsilon \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} n'u - \lfloor n'u \rfloor$ and $\lfloor \cdot \rfloor$ denoting the floor function.

For sake of simplicity and applicability we concentrate on practicability of quantile estimators and their behavior with regard to small samples, see Section 4. Note that the default in Python in the `numpy.quantile()` function as well as in the R base `quantile()` function is the estimator \hat{Q}_L (type=7 for both). Furthermore, the quantile estimator \hat{Q} is quite often introduced in statistical courses (and still a commonly investigated estimator). As a consequence, the further considerations for point estimation are restricted to these two estimators mainly.

For the interested readers only, the remarks in the following last paragraph should provide a very brief impression of the field of quantile point estimation in statistical research. However, this paragraph can be skipped without any consequences for the basic understanding of the remaining article.

Note that there exist many quantile estimators that are investigated under certain conditions. Commonly, these quantile estimators show different behavior w.r.t. the underlying distribution and there is no single estimator that outperforms all others over all different types of distributions, cf. [DK24; DLP94]. There are different approaches to get and evaluate quantile estimators, which typically depend strongly on the distributional assumptions. Looking at so-called L-estimators (\hat{Q}_L belongs to the class of L-estimators), that have preferable statistical properties, but so far these properties hold under the assumption of distributions

belonging to a scale or location-scale family, cf. [Li+12]. Furthermore, there is still ongoing research also for the optimal order statistic as an estimator, cf. [BP23] and references therein. A more general, nonparametric framework is considered by [Zie09], whereby the concept of the most concentrated median-unbiased estimator is used. Although, the presented estimators therein are having desirable properties, the approaches are complex and not necessarily applicable for practical purposes for non-statisticians. Furthermore, there is no clear consensus about the quality criteria of a quantile estimator (e.g. mean-unbiasedness in [Li+12], median-unbiasedness in [Zie09]). Another interesting criterion especially for quantile estimation is not the (unknown) ‘true’ quantile itself (see unbiasedness), but the probability statement that is associated with the quantile, cf. [PTM21].

3.2 Confidence Interval for the Mean (*t*-Interval)

Although this contribution focuses on quantiles, the common CI for the expectation, known as the *t*-interval (due to the use of the *t*-distribution), is introduced for didactic purposes. This *t*-interval is also applied later for comparison reasons.

Assume a normal distribution for the random variable X , i.e. $X \sim N(\mu, \sigma^2)$ with unknown expectation $\mu \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{E}[X] \in \mathbb{R}$ and unknown variance $\sigma^2 > 0$. If the task is to estimate the unknown quantity μ (which is a distribution parameter here), the sample mean \bar{X} is a reasonable point estimator with desirable statistical properties. Due to limited data and sampling error, the point estimation is associated with uncertainty (different samples provide different estimates), which is generally reflected by the deviation of the estimator. Quantifying this deviation allows for the construction of an interval estimate rather than a point estimate. Consider the random interval,

$$I_t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \left[\bar{X} \pm t_{n-1, 1-\alpha/2} \frac{S}{\sqrt{n}} \right], \quad (6)$$

where \bar{X} denotes the sample mean, $t_{n-1, 1-\alpha/2}$ represents the $(1 - \alpha/2)$ quantile of a *t*-distribution with $n - 1$ degrees of freedom, and S is the sample standard deviation (calculated using division by $n - 1$). Under the normality assumption $X \sim N(\mu, \sigma^2)$, it holds that

$$P(\mu \in I_t) = 1 - \alpha.$$

Thus, I_t is a CI for the parameter μ at the chosen confidence level $(1 - \alpha) \in]0, 1[$, cf. [CB02, p. 429]. In the following sections introducing CIs for quantiles, the quantity of interest is a specific quantile, rather than the parameter μ as in the *t*-interval. Thereby, the structure of the resulting CIs will differ from (6), as they may not necessarily include a corresponding point estimator or exhibit symmetry around the quantity of interest.

As the *t*-interval is applied later for comparison reasons, there are made some final remarks regarding the normality assumption in connection with some TMoI from ML. As described in [Bou+21, Section 6 and Figure G.3], it might be reasonable to assume normality. There are two targets of this assumption. First, assuming normality directly for the TMoI, which might be justified in some cases, see the high p -values in [Bou+21, Figure G.3]. Second, when averaging multiple i.i.d. measurements, asymptotic normality of this mean can be justified by the Central Limit Theorem (CLT). In contrast to looking at quantiles, applying some version of the CLT refers to consideration of the mean of some TMoI. Note that, the CI in (6) is asymptotically equivalent to a more general case with asymptotic normality based on the CLT for the estimator \bar{X} , but without any distributional assumption for the TMoI directly. For the same confidence level, the CI given in (6) is larger than its asymptotic version based on the CLT without distributional assumptions (that is due to the larger variance of the *t* distribution). Therefore, in practical applications with less knowledge about the underlying distribution, the *t*-interval is preferred against its asymptotic version, as it is the more conservative choice, cf. [HMC19, pp. 240]. Because of that and while working with small sample sizes (order of 10-15) and the above mentioned insights w.r.t. normality of the TMoI by [Bou+21], the CI in (6) will be used for comparison reasons (see Section 4). Moreover, the *t*-interval is reasonable for comparison because the mean is known to be well-estimated in many scenarios. Thus, these interval estimates can serve as a optimal-case benchmark for the performance of other methods when estimating statistical quantities.

3.3 Nonparametric Exact Confidence Intervals

The standard approach to construct an exact CI for some quantile is based on order statistics and the binomial distribution. For some quantile level $u \in]0, 1[$, a CI $[X_{(k)}, X_{(l)}]$ can be constructed based on

$$P(X_{(k)} \leq F^{-1}(u) \leq X_{(l)}) = r(k, l, n, u), \quad 1 \leq k < l \leq n, \quad (7)$$

with $r(k, l, n, u) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{s=k}^{l-1} \binom{n}{s} u^s (1-u)^{n-s}$. Then, (7), which does not depend on F , describes an exact CI with confidence level $1 - \alpha$ for $F^{-1}(u)$ if $r(k, l, n, u) = 1 - \alpha$. The term ‘exact’ refers to the fact that the confidence level can be computed precisely. This contrasts with an asymptotic CI (see Section 3.4), where the confidence level is approached as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and is only approximate for finite n .

A two-sided CI with confidence level $1 - \alpha$ according to (7) exists if and only if (see [ZZ05, p. 68, eqn. (1)])

$$u^n + (1 - u)^n \leq \alpha. \quad (8)$$

As a consequence of (8), there is needed a minimum sample size for every combination of quantile level u and confidence level $1 - \alpha$. Some selected combinations are shown in Table 1. With small sample sizes, it

		quantile level u					
confidence level $(1 - \alpha)$		0.01	0.025	0.05	0.1	0.25	0.5
	0.90	230	91	45	22	9	5
	0.95	299	119	59	29	11	6
	0.99	459	182	90	44	17	8

Table 1: Required minimum sample sizes n for two-sided, nonparametric exact CIs for the u -quantile at confidence level $1 - \alpha$ according to (8) (table is symmetric for quantile levels around 0.5).

only makes statistical sense to estimate quantiles around 0.5. The larger the sample size, the more extreme quantiles can be accurately estimated.

With the binomial distribution being discrete, the confidence level is not achieved exactly, but only as a lower bound. Thus, the resulting interval is of greater length, than intended by the theoretical confidence level. Thereby, often there can be constructed many CIs that align with the confidence level. To deal with these issues, there exist different construction approaches to find short intervals with a coverage probability being as close as possible to the pre-determined confidence level (see e.g. the references in [ZZ05]). The contribution at hand, applies the construction approach proposed in [ZZ05, pp. 68, Section 2], that is based on linear optimization. This optimization minimizes the expected length of the CI, while matching the pre-determined confidence level. This optimization approach is based on random indices for the order statistics and as a result it provides a probabilistic weighting of two CIs instead of a single CI, see [ZZ05, p. 69]. This concept is referred to as randomized estimation, which requires a randomization step for the final decision. Specifically, the lambda values obtained from the optimization process represent probabilities, and a random choice is made between the two potential CIs based on these probabilities. While such a randomization step may seem unconventional, it contributes to making the estimates more robust and achieving certain desirable properties.

3.4 Nonparametric Asymptotic Confidence Intervals

It can be shown that the random sample quantiles $F^{-1}(u), u \in]0, 1[$ of a continuous distribution F are asymptotically normal (cf. [Van00, Corollary 21.5, pp., 307]). Based on this asymptotic normality, a nonparametric CIs can be constructed via the application of the so-called probability integral transform, see [Van00, Example 21.8, p., 309]. The resulting CI depends on the order statistics only, i.e. it is free of any distributional assumption. In the following this type is referred to as nonparametric asymptotic CI and it is an asymptotic (approximate) version of the nonparametric exact CI from Section 3.3.

A CI for the u -th quantile $F^{-1}(u)$ of any continuous distribution function F with asymptotic confidence level $(1 - \alpha) \in]0, 1[$ is given by,

$$P(X_{(k)} < F^{-1}(u) \leq X_{(l)}) \approx 1 - \alpha, \quad (1 - \alpha) \in]0, 1[, \quad k < l, \quad (9)$$

$$\text{with indices } k \text{ and } l: \quad k, l = n \left(u \pm z_{\alpha/2} \sqrt{\frac{u(1-u)}{n}} \right). \quad (10)$$

Thereby, $z_{\alpha/2}$ denotes the $\alpha/2$ quantile of the standard normal distribution and n is the sample size. Note that the confidence level in (9) is achieved asymptotically as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Because of the real valued nature of the expression in (10), there are not necessarily valid index values (i.e. $1 \leq k < l \leq n$) for every combination of u, n and $(1 - \alpha)$. Table 2 provides an overview of valid combinations. The values in Table 2 were computed based on the constraint $1 \leq k < l \leq n$ for every combination of quantile level u and confidence level $(1 - \alpha)$. After ensuring the constraint $k, l \in [1, n]$ real-

		quantile level u								
confidence level $(1 - \alpha)$		0.01	0.05	0.1	0.25	0.5	0.75	0.9	0.95	0.99
0.90		446	87	42	16	7	9	25	52	268
0.95		563	110	53	19	8	12	35	73	381
0.99		846	164	79	28	11	20	60	127	657

Table 2: Minimum values for sample size n w.r.t. confidence level and quantile level for valid non-parametric asymptotic CIs.

valued indices for k and l may occur, which can be handled by applying the linearly interpolating quantile estimator $\hat{Q}_L(\cdot)$ from (5). Then, as quantile level in $\hat{Q}_L(\cdot)$ the levels k/n and l/n are used to compute the final CI boundaries. Note that the minimum sample sizes in Table 2 are larger than those for the exact nonparametric CI in Table 1. This is because asymptotic methods are only approximately valid for finite n , and to ensure a sufficiently good approximation, a larger sample size is required.

3.5 Semi-Parametric Bootstrap Confidence Intervals

Beside the above presented nonparametric approaches, a resampling approach like bootstrapping also is appropriate to address uncertainty without any distributional assumptions. Thereby, applying nonparametric bootstrap for variance estimation and generating CIs is straightforward for e.g. the mean, cf. [ET94]. Unfortunately, the standard nonparametric bootstrap fails in case of CI calculation for quantile estimation (except from the median), due to an unstable bootstrap distribution, see [Hes15, Section 3.3, p. 378]. Another issue when applying the standard nonparametric bootstrap for quantiles, is that for quantile levels near the tails (e.g., 1%, 5%, 95%, or 99%), all considerations are bounded by the observed minimum and maximum values in the initial sample. In connection with small sample size this problem increases. A potential solution is the generalized bootstrap, a variant of the parametric bootstrap (cf., [Wan+10]). In this approach, a generalized Laplace distribution is fitted to the observed sample, and bootstrap samples are subsequently generated from this fitted distribution. The challenge of handling very small sample sizes ($n < 10$) can be addressed using the exact bootstrap method (cf. [Kis13; Bro06]), whereby all possible bootstrap samples are considered. This contribution, however, assumes a minimum sample size of $n \geq 10$.

A further bootstrapping approach is a so-called semiparametric bootstrap proposed by [Hut02]. This approach employs a quantile function estimator that extrapolates into the tails. Thereby it is only assumed a continuous distribution with support over the real line. This is in contrast to [Wan+10], where a concrete distributional assumption is made. As the goal here is to work with as less as possible distributional assumptions, the semiparametric approach of [Hut02] is used here for further investigation. The concrete procedure is as follows.

1. The bootstrap starts by drawing a random sample of size n from the uniform distribution on $(0, 1)$, i.e. there are actually drawn the quantile levels.

- The drawn quantile levels are transformed into a bootstrap sample based on the initial sample X_1, \dots, X_n via the following quantile estimator \hat{Q}_T (see [Hut02, p. 333, eqn. (2.2)]),

$$\hat{Q}_T(u) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} X_{(1)} + (X_{(2)} - X_{(1)}) \log(n'u), & 0 < u \leq \frac{1}{n+1}, \\ \hat{Q}_L(u), & \frac{1}{n+1} < u < \frac{n}{n+1}, \\ X_{(n)} - (X_{(n)} - X_{(n-1)}) \log(n'(1-u)), & \frac{n}{n+1} \leq u < 1. \end{cases} \quad (11)$$

In (11) it denotes $n' \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} n + 1$ and \hat{Q}_L the linear interpolation quantile estimator from (5).

- The quantity of interest is calculated based on the resulting bootstrap sample. Here, this is some quantile with a given level u that is estimated with the sample quantile estimator as already given in (4).

Repeating these three steps, there can be generated the bootstrap distribution of the quantity of interest. The final CI is derived by extracting the corresponding percentiles/quantile from the bootstrap distribution according to the intended confidence level. E.g. the interval [2.5% quantile, 97.5% quantile] represents a 95% confidence level interval. The point estimator used here, is the sample quantile \hat{Q} from (4).

The transformation done in the second step is a nonparametric version of the probability integral transform used for constructing nonparametric CIs for quantiles as presented in Section 3.4. Thus, the only distributional property required for the semiparametric bootstrap is the uniform distribution of quantiles, which is a provable result based on the probability integral transform. This is in contrast to the generalized bootstrap method, as discussed in [Wan+10], whereby the use of a generalized Laplace distribution is an assumption only.

4 Experiments and Results

This section describes concrete experiments for the presented point estimators and the CIs in Section 3 for various settings. The first part contains simulations for potential types of typical performance metric distributions, esp. distributions with bounded support on the unit interval. These simulations should close the gap due to the more general perspective of the existing contributions dealing with CIs of quantiles. The considered distributions therein rarely refer to distributions with bounded support (cp. [Hut02]). Furthermore, [ZZ05] does not contain any simulation studies.

The second part analyzes concrete ML applications, considering classification and regression problems. For the simulation part and the application part there were used mainly the same settings in terms of sample sizes and repetitions.

All simulations and experiments based on real data were run on a high performance computing cluster. In case of GPU utilization there were used NVIDIA A100-SXM4 Tensor Core-GPUs and NVIDIA H100-SXM5 Tensor Core-GPUs. The simulations do not benefit from any GPU usage and were run on Intel Xeon Platinum 8470 (52 cores) @ 2.00 GHz with 512 GB RAM. The software stack comprises R for the simulations and Python/Pytorch for all ML related applications. The relevant code of the use cases and the simulation, as well as implementations of the different types of CIs, will be made available online.

4.1 Simulation

Previous work on quantile CIs, such as [Hut02], considers distributions with unbounded support (e.g., normal, logistic, Laplace, Cauchy) or left-bounded support (e.g., log-normal, exponential). To extend this prior research and account for the characteristics of TMOI distributions in ML, the simulations presented here include the following distributions with two-sided bounded support: right-skewed Beta, left-skewed Beta, symmetric Beta, and uniform distributions. These distributions with two-sided bounded support on the unit interval, are selected to reflect the properties of TMOIs such as the F1 score or the accuracy rate. The considered normal distribution is parametrized to be mainly concentrated within the unit interval. This is to consider the simplest assumption for some TMOI (although with actual bounded support, when applied to F1 score or accuracy). All these distributions including their parameters are shown in Figure 2. For comparison reasons later on, the interdecile range from 10% to 90% quantile is marked by the red dashed line. Note the bimodality of the normal mixture, as such a behavior could be possible as well (even multimodality could be possible).




Figure 2: Densities of all considered distributions in simulation. Dashed line in red: interdecile range (10%, 90%).

Quantile Point Estimation

The behavior of the two point estimators introduced in Section 3.1 is investigated in this section. Additionally, a third point estimator based on the semiparametric bootstrap approach is considered. Specifically, the median (50% percentile) of the bootstrap distribution is chosen as the point estimate for the quantile. While bootstrapping primarily focuses on estimating the variation of the estimator rather than the point estimate itself, using the median of the bootstrap distribution provides a simple, pragmatic approach that is easy to apply.

There are two basic criteria to assess an estimator's behavior:

1. Bias: the average difference between the estimator and the true value (here: the true quantile value).
2. MSE/RMSE: combines bias and variability (spread) of the estimates relative to the true value.

In the simulation, the true quantile values are known. Based on the criteria above, an estimator with zero bias (unbiased) or less bias and a small RMSE is preferred.

The estimator's behavior is empirically analyzed with respect to bias and RMSE across different distributions, using 2000 simulation runs. Figure 3 shows the modulus bias and RMSE normalized to the true quantile values for various point estimators: sample quantile (\hat{Q}), interpolated quantile (\hat{Q}_L), and bootstrap median, across different quantile levels. The bootstrap distributions (used for the bootstrap median estimator) are based on 2000 bootstrap samples. The modulus relative bias is represented as a bar plot, with the corresponding relative RMSE indicated by dots. The colors represent the different estimators. A horizontal black dashed line at the 5% threshold is included for orientation. Figure 3 shows the following key observations. As the sample size n increases, both (relative) bias and RMSE decrease overall. Along the quantile levels, a (skewed) U-shape is observed, with lower relative bias and RMSE in the middle quantiles. This illustrates the earlier point that quantiles are easier to estimate in the 'middle' of a distribution than in the tails. Moreover, upper quantiles are slightly easier to estimate than lower ones, with relative bias and RMSE being higher for lower quantiles. Regarding the different estimators, the sample quantile demonstrates the best overall performance. In contrast, the linear interpolated estimator and the bootstrap median perform worse, particularly for lower quantiles. However, for middle to upper quantile levels, the differences between all estimators diminish.

For clarity, only the plots for distributions with at least one modulus relative bias value above the 5% threshold are shown. The remaining distributions (normal and normal mixture) have modulus relative bias values of less than 2% across all quantile levels. Especially, the results for the normal distribution are shown



Figure 3: Average modulus relative bias of different quantile point estimators: sample quantile (\hat{Q}), interpolated quantile (\hat{Q}_L), bootstrap median. Points are indicating the corresponding relative RMSE. The black dashed line marks the 5% threshold. Shown results based on 2 000 simulation runs and 2 000 bootstrap samples for different quantile levels.

later for comparison reasons (see Figure 8). However, their overall pattern is consistent with the shown distributions. What also becomes apparent here, is the strong influence of the underlying distribution type to the quantile estimation. As a consequence the order of the relative bias and RMSE are very different among the distributions.

Quantile Interval Estimation

This section applies the CIs from Section 3 to the simulated data in terms of the distributions from Figure 2.

In [Hut02, p. 336] there are performed 1 000 bootstrap samples for $n = 10$ and $n = 25$ for confidence level of $1 - \alpha = 0.95$. In contrast, the study at hand expands on prior work by investigating sample sizes of $n = 10, 15, 25, 50$ and confidence levels of $1 - \alpha = 0.9, 0.95, 0.99$. To ensure comparability, all simulations were conducted with 1 000, 2 000, and 5 000 simulation runs, as well as with 1 000, 1 000, 5 000, and 10 000 bootstrap samples. These variations did not substantially impact the results. Especially for bootstrapping it is of interest how many bootstrap samples to generate. Thereby, for estimation of CIs (in case of variance estimation for the mean) an order of $B \geq 500$ or even 2 000 is needed, see [ET94, Chapter 14]. In contrast, [Hes15] recommends a number of 10k bootstrap replicates. Contributions that investigate bootstrapping approaches as e.g. [Wan+10; Hut02; WWH15; HS08; NN20] are using an amount of 2 000 and/or 1 000 bootstrap samples. In connection with our observations, an order of 1 000 or 2 000 bootstrap samples seems sufficient to get stable outcomes. All results presented here are based on 2 000 simulation runs and 2 000 bootstrap samples.

Empirical evaluation of interval estimates in statistics typically relies on two main criteria: 1) the empirical confidence level and 2) the interval length. In general, shorter intervals are preferred if the empirical confidence level aligns with the theoretical confidence level. Theoretically, higher confidence levels lead to longer intervals, while lower confidence levels result in shorter intervals. As a consequence, there is typically a trade-off between confidence level and interval length.

Figure 4 displays the empirical confidence levels of simulated CIs for all the distributions from Figure 2. A single point in Figure 4 (and also Figure 5) is characterized by:

1. distribution, represented by plotting symbol (asterisk, square, triangle etc.)

2. CI type (bootstrap (Section 3.5), non-parametric exact (Section 3.3), non-parametric asymptotic (Section 3.4), t -interval for mean (Section 3.2)), represented by color
3. statistic (quantiles with levels 5%, 10%, 25%, 50%, 75%, 90%, 95%, mean), shown at vertical axis
4. confidence level $1 - \alpha$, represented by subplot rows
5. sample size, represented by subplot columns

Finally, each point in Figure 4 represents an empirical confidence level (see horizontal axis), which is the proportion of the 2000 simulated CIs that contain the true value of the quantity of interest. The empirical confidence level illustrates the frequentist interpretation of a CI, meaning that the proportion of estimated intervals covering the true value of the quantity of interest should be close to the theoretical confidence level. It is important to note that this interpretation reflects the overall success rate, yet it remains impossible to identify which specific intervals include the true value.

Figure 4 may appear complex at first glance, but mainly the overall comparison with the theoretical confidence level, represented by the red dashed line in each subplot, is the key point of interest. Broadly speaking, if a certain type of CI (represented by color) performs well, the points (representing the empirical confidence level) are located near the red dashed line. This is most easily seen in the subplots on the far right, which represent simulations for $n = 50$. For this sample size, the empirical confidence levels of the simulated CIs closely align with the theoretical confidence levels. In contrast, in the subplots on the far left for $n = 10$, the difference appears mainly in the vertical direction. The aforementioned effect, where quantile estimation is easier in the middle of a distribution than in the tails, is evident. Empirical confidence levels of CIs for quantile levels around 50% (e.g. 25%, 75%), are the only ones that align with the theoretical confidence level. With increasing sample size, CIs for quantiles near the tails improve and become more closely aligned with the confidence level. Thereby, the nonparametric exact interval performs exceptionally well over all sample sizes in terms of empirical coverage. This is largely due to the use of the randomized estimator, which helps to average out interval estimates that either exceed or fall short of the theoretical confidence level. It should also be noted that not all types of CIs are valid for every combination of quantile level, confidence level, and sample size. From the perspective of minimum sample size requirements, this issue was discussed in Section 3, see Tables 1 and 2. Although bootstrap CIs lack such restrictions, they tend to perform poorly when other CI types are invalid for the same sample size. However, despite a drop in the empirical confidence level, down to around 0.85, bootstrap CIs could still serve as a practical alternative in cases where no other method is available. Lastly, differences among the considered distributions are negligible in terms of empirical coverage probability.

Another important aspect is the length of the estimated intervals. Figure 5 shows the average length normalized to the interdecile range (i.e. the difference between 90% quantile and 10% quantile) of the corresponding distribution for all intervals based on 2000 simulation runs. The corresponding interdecile ranges are illustrated in Figure 2. For comparison, Figure 5 shows the median level of the normalized average length of the CI for the mean, marked by the black dashed line. Due to the stability of the mean's estimate, there is minimal deviation in these CIs' average lengths. This is not surprising, as the mean is well-known being a stable estimator under quite general conditions. Given the mean's stability, it is unlikely that a quantile CI will have shorter length than the t -intervals for the mean with the same confidence level. Therefore, quantile CI average lengths that are comparable to those of the mean's CI (black dashed line) are considered reasonable. In statistical inference, a shorter CI is preferred as long as the desired confidence level is achieved. Figure 5 shows that the average length of CIs increases with higher confidence levels and decreases with larger sample sizes, an effect aligning with theoretical expectations. In skewed distributions (beta_left, beta_right), quantiles toward the long tail can be estimated more reliably, resulting in shorter CIs. This is due to the positions of the considered quantiles (5%, 10%, 90%, and 95%), which are not extreme and are relatively close to the bulk of the data, minimizing the impact of rare extreme values. In contrast, quantiles in the opposite direction are subject to greater variability due to extreme values, leading to less reliable estimates (i.e. greater interval length) for these quantiles in skewed distributions.

Overall, for sample sizes up to 25, it seems reasonable to choose a maximum confidence level of 0.9 because higher confidence levels result in larger interval lengths and lower precision. Intervals for a confidence level of 0.99 were also calculated, and they showed good empirical coverage aligning well with the theoretical confidence level. However, these intervals were much longer: up to twice the interdecile range. Such long intervals are not practical for most applications, so this confidence level is not considered further. For sake




Figure 4: Empirical confidence level (along the horizontal axis) for different types of simulated CIs for quantile levels 5%, 10%, 25%, 50%, 75%, 90%, 95% and the mean for confidence levels $1-\alpha = 0.90, 0.95$ and sample sizes $n = 10, 15, 25, 50$. Shown results based on 2000 simulation runs and 2000 bootstrap samples.




Figure 5: Normalized average interval length (reference: interdecile range) for different distributions for different types of simulated CIs for quantile levels 5%, 10%, 25%, 50%, 75%, 90%, 95% and the mean for confidence levels $1-\alpha = 0.90, 0.95$ and sample sizes $n = 10, 15, 25, 50$. Shown results based on 2000 simulation runs and 2000 bootstrap samples.

of completeness, the simulations as described above were run for a theoretical confidence level of 0.8 as well. But there was no benefit: while empirical coverage showed even more variation, the precision gain by shorter interval estimates was negligible. As a consequence, a confidence level of around 0.9 seems reasonable overall for sample sizes up to 25.

Note that the semiparametric bootstrap approach could lead to non-plausible values for distributions with compact support as the extrapolation could exceed the boundaries. Here, this happened in cases, where only a bootstrap interval could be estimated and no other approach provides a valid interval. Thus, this problem relates to outer quantiles. Concretely, the fraction of interval estimates beyond the limits $[0, 1]$ was up to approximately 0.33 of simulations in 90% of the cases. In 10% of the cases, this fraction increased up to approximately 0.6 – 0.8 of the simulated intervals. For the experiments at hand, non-plausible interval boundaries were adjusted by setting exceeding values according to the natural limits of the metric, such as zero or one in case of accuracy, F1 score, etc. Although there is an alternative quantile estimator presented in [Hut02] for distributions with positive support, this does not solve the issue of a natural positive upper limit as e.g. one.

A useful observation is that the CI for the mean (orange) produces short intervals with little variation. This is not surprising because the sample mean as estimator tends to stabilize quickly under quite general conditions. Although, the normality assumption for the t -interval is violated here, as most distributions are not normal. However, the application of goodness-of-fit tests (Lilliefors and Shapiro-Wilk) to the samples from different distributions show that normality cannot be strongly rejected. The p -values are mainly in the range of 0.2–0.25, with many around 0.5 or higher. This result is due to the small sample sizes ($n = 10$ or $n = 15$), which are compatible with many distributions, including the normal distribution. For larger samples ($n = 25$ or $n = 50$), the CLT ensures that the t -interval behaves like an approximate interval that no longer depends on strict normality but only requires a sufficiently large sample size. As a result, especially with small samples, the CI for the mean provides a reasonable way to describe some aspects of the unknown distribution while accounting for uncertainty already.

Finally, some comparisons of the simulation results can be made with other existing contributions. A first comparison can be done with the simulation results based on generalized bootstrap from [Wan+10]. Although slightly different theoretical distributions are considered therein, they remain comparable (e.g., Beta distributions with varying parameters). For small sample sizes ($n = 10, 15$), the empirical coverage probabilities of the generalized bootstrap are slightly lower than those of the semiparametric bootstrap but with shorter average interval lengths. Furthermore, [Wan+10] also explores parametric bootstrap methods, which could serve as a best-case bound for bootstrap CI estimation.

Another comparison can be made with the simulation results from [NN20], whose detailed numbers are provided in a supplementary document available on the publisher’s website. The study by [NN20] investigates many various approaches for constructing approximate CIs for quantiles, whereby considering sample sizes of $n = 10, 50, 100, 1000$. Although the paper primarily focuses on theoretical distributions that are less relevant for TMOs with bounded support in ML, such as the normal, gamma, Pareto, and t -distributions, it allows for comparison of results for the normal distribution. For the sample sizes of $n = 10$ and $n = 50$, the empirical coverage and average lengths of the estimated CIs show a comparable order, particularly for the reasonable results.

Overall, these comparisons suggest that the approaches presented here give acceptable CI results, at least leaving limited potential for substantial improvement by using other approaches.

4.2 Real Data Use Cases

This section applies the presented point estimators and the CIs from Section 3 to the following three real data use cases from ML applications. The goal here is not to tune the models for best results in terms of the task (classification, regression), rather than analyze an experiment setting as it is.

- (a) *Simpsons characters*: The Simpsons use case contains an image classification task focused on recognizing 20 different characters from *The Simpsons* series. The dataset for this task is publicly available at <https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/alexattia/the-simpsons-characters-dataset/versions/3>.
- (b) *CIFAR10*: The CIFAR10 use case is an image classification task involving the categorization of images into one of 10 classes, such as airplanes, cars, and animals. This dataset is widely used as a benchmark in ML and is available at <https://www.cs.toronto.edu/~kriz/cifar.html> This use




Figure 6: Examples of empirical distributions of TMOIs, each distribution based on approx. 1 000 seed-controlled train runs.

case is also investigated in [Bou+21], wherein an order of 200 training runs is performed to investigate the uncertainties of different sources of variation.

- (c) *Superconductors*: The superconductors use case is a regression task and targets predicting the critical temperature of a superconductor. The main task here is to find the relevant features for the prediction task. The superconductors dataset can be found at <https://doi.org/10.24432/C53P47>. Details about the physical background can be found in [Ham18].

Table 3 gives an overview of the most important properties of the considered use cases.

Property	Simpsons characters	CIFAR10	Superconductors
Data	20 characters, ≈ 200 - 4 000 images per class	60k images, 10 classes	≈ 21k observations, 81 features
Task	Classification	Classification	Regression
TMOI	Accuracy	Accuracy	RMSE
Method	CNN: simple, VGG16	CNN: VGG11	DNN, GBT
SoV	Train-test split, initial weights, data augmentation, dropout, hyperparameter optimization (Tree-Structured Parzen Estimator)	Train-test split, initial weights, data augmentation, dropout, data order, hyperparameter optimization (Tree-Structured Parzen Estimator)	Train-test split, initial weights, dropout, data order, row subsampling (GBT), hyperparameter optimization (Tree-Structured Parzen Estimator)
#SoV	5	6	6
#repetitions	500 (2x), 1000 (21x)	500 (1x), 1000 (5x)	500 (1x), 1000 (12x)
#experiments	23	6	13

Table 3: Overview of use cases and their properties (CNN - Convolutional Neural Network, DNN - Deep Neural Network, GBT - Gradient Boosting Tree, SoV - Source of Variation)

For all use cases, different sources of variation were evaluated by performing approximately 500 to 1 000 seed-controlled repetitions for each source. Note that this is a comparable high number of repetitions (compare to 200 repetitions in [Bou+21]) and it required a total of approx. 19 000 GPU hours.

A so-called ‘experiment’ in Table 3 means running a number of seed-controlled repetitions for some source of variation for fixed values of other confounding factors. Thereby, some sources of variation, as e.g. hyperparameter optimization, allow for multiple settings such that for every chosen optimizer an amount of repetitions is run. Thus, there can be more experiments than sources of variation. All experiments are conducted independently, i.e. each run starts from scratch without being influenced by the results of other runs.

The result of every experiment is the empirical distribution that is generated by the corresponding seed-controlled repetitions. The kernel density estimates of some selected empirical distributions over all use cases are shown in Figure 6. The following evaluations assume that the true, unknown quantities (here: quantiles and mean) can be well approximated by the corresponding estimates derived from these quite extensive distributions. Thus, these large empirical distributions are comparable to the role of theoretical distributions in the simulations in Section 4.1. Consequently, the point estimate from the large empirical

distribution is used as a reference for interval estimates. For quantile estimation, the sample quantile is used according to (4).

Finally, an important hint on the seed control. The sources of variation are controlled by setting the state of the corresponding random number generator (RNG) used by the functions being invoked. Identifying the relevant RNG can be a tricky task because different libraries utilize different RNG implementations. For example, Scikit-learn relies on NumPy’s RNG (`numpy.random.RandomState`), and as a result, most of its functions accept either an instance of `numpy.random.RandomState` or an integer seed. On the other hand, PyTorch employs its own RNG implementation (`torch.Generator`). Functions in PyTorch rely on the `torch.Generator` instance, either accepting a specific instance or using the global (per-device) instance, as seen in operations like Dropout. To ensure reproducibility in PyTorch, it is also necessary to explicitly enable deterministic algorithms by using `torch.use_deterministic_algorithms`. This is because certain operations may exhibit non-deterministic behavior due to hardware-level optimizations or asynchronous execution. Additionally, one might control the state of Python’s native RNG using `random.seed`. In this work, a total of seven RNGs are involved and used. Overall, careful investigation and identification of relevant seeds is a crucial part of such experiments.

Quantile Point Estimation

Analogously to Section 4.1, the behavior of the two point estimators introduced in Section 3.1 as well as the median of the bootstrap distribution are considered. Again, the primary criteria for assessing an estimator’s performance are bias and RMSE. Note that calculating both bias and RMSE requires knowledge of the true (unknown) quantile values. In this case, the ‘true’ quantile values are approximated by the sample quantile estimates derived from the extensive empirical distributions (up to 1 000 observations).

Figure 7 illustrates the average of modulus bias and RMSE, normalized to the true quantile values, for various point estimators: sample quantile (\hat{Q}), interpolated quantile (\hat{Q}_L), and bootstrap median, across different quantile levels. The bootstrap distributions, used for estimating the bootstrap median, are based on 2 000 bootstrap samples. The modulus relative bias is displayed as a bar plot, with the corresponding relative RMSE represented by a dot. Colors are used to differentiate the estimators. Figure 7 shows the




Figure 7: Mean modulus relative bias of different quantile point estimators: sample quantile (\hat{Q}), interpolated quantile (\hat{Q}_L), bootstrap median. Points are indicating the corresponding relative RMSE. Shown results based on 2 000 simulation runs and 2 000 bootstrap samples for different quantile levels.

following key observations. As the sample size n increases, both (modulus) bias and RMSE decrease overall. Along the quantile levels, a (skewed) U-shape is observed, with lower relative bias and RMSE in the middle quantiles.

As the overall relative bias is quite small (with a maximum bias of approximately 1%), there is little substantial or practical difference between the various estimators. Furthermore, the relative RMSE is in a comparable order for all estimators as well. The overall level of relative bias and RMSE is in contrast to the simulation cases shown in Figure 3 with overall bias levels far above 1%. An interesting comparison can be made with the simulation results for the normal distribution, applying the three quantile point estimators. Figure 8 illustrates these simulation results. Figure 8 shows an overall level for relative bias mainly below




Figure 8: Simulation for normal distribution. Mean modulus relative bias of different quantile point estimators: sample quantile (\hat{Q}), interpolated quantile (\hat{Q}_L), bootstrap median. Points are indicating the corresponding relative RMSE. Shown results based on 2 000 simulation runs and 2 000 bootstrap samples for different quantile levels.

1%, which is comparable to the overall level in Figure 7. Nevertheless, there is still a difference in the behavior among the various estimators across the quantile levels. Given these observations, this suggests the very cautious conclusion that the empirical distributions here behave more like a normal distribution than, for example, a uniform distribution (at least from the bias perspective of quantile point estimators).

Quantile Interval Estimation

As last part of the experiments section, the results of the CI estimations for the real data uses cases are shown.

The results of different types of estimated CIs for all experiments are shown in Figures 9 and 10. As there is no systematic and remarkable difference between the estimated CIs for the accuracy rate in the classification tasks (Simpsons characters, CIFAR10) and the RMSE in the regression task (superconductors), all use cases were aggregated into one plot. That means, every single boxplot in Figures 9, 10 comprises a total of 42 experiments. The basic information remains the same as in Figures 4 and 5, but the single points (different distributions of 42 experiments) are aggregated by a boxplot. Shortly speaking, the basic observations from the simulation cases (see Figures 4, 5) remain more or less the same in the real data use cases and this evaluation refers mainly to the new aspects.

Figure 9 shows the overall comparison of the empirical confidence level with the theoretical confidence level, represented by the red dashed line in each subplot. A certain type of CI (represented by color) performs well, if the corresponding boxplot is mainly located near the red dashed line. Remember that not all types of CIs are valid for every combination of quantile level, confidence level, and sample size. This aspect of minimum sample size requirements was discussed in Sections 3.4 and 3.3 (esp. see Tables 2, 1) and in the simulation part above. Considering the normalized average length of the estimated CIs in Figure 10, again, give a comparable conclusion as already for the simulation cases. Remember that a shorter CI is preferred as long as the desired confidence level is maintained. Again, as reference point there is chosen the median of the mean CIs (represented by black dashed line). Note that, due to very stable estimates of the mean, esp. the boxplots for the mean are hard to recognize. In comparison to the simulation cases, there are fewer extreme values regarding the average length of the CI. This is likely due to the empirical distributions not being heavily skewed (see remarks to normality property below). Furthermore, while extrapolating using the semiparametric bootstrap, no implausible interval boundaries were estimated. This is simply caused by the empirical distributions being sufficiently distant from the natural limits of the TMOI (e.g. zero or one). The




Figure 9: Empirical confidence level for different types of estimated CIs for quantile levels 5%, 10%, 25%, 50%, 75%, 90%, 95% and the mean for confidence levels $1 - \alpha = 0.90, 0.95$ and sample sizes $n = 10, 15, 25, 50$. Shown results based on 2000 samples of size n and 2000 bootstrap samples. A total of 42 experiments is considered.




Figure 10: Normalized average interval length (reference: interdecile range) for different distributions for different types of estimated CIs for quantile levels 5%, 10%, 25%, 50%, 75%, 90%, 95% and the mean for confidence levels $1 - \alpha = 0.90, 0.95$ and sample sizes $n = 10, 15, 25, 50$. Shown results are based on 2000 samples of size n and 2000 bootstrap samples. A total of 42 experiments is considered.

conclusion from the real data use cases remains largely consistent with the findings from the simulations. For sample sizes up to 25, it seems reasonable to choose a maximum confidence level of 0.9 due to the reduced precision associated with larger interval lengths at higher confidence levels. While semiparametric bootstrap intervals can offer useful insights even with small sample sizes, this comes at the cost of longer CI estimates. It is important to emphasize that checking the minimum sample size requirements for nonparametric CIs provides valuable information about the quality of the bootstrap intervals that can be expected. Upper quantiles (beyond 75% level) can be estimated more reliably than lower quantiles (below 25% level). Note that this asymmetry is reflected in the minimum sample requirements in Table 2.

Analogously to the discussion of the normality distribution for the simulated data, goodness-of-fit tests (Lilliefors and Shapiro-Wilk) are computed for the empirical data as well. Thus, the p -values are calculated for all samples that are drawn from the large empirical distributions. Thereby, the p -values are in the same order as for the simulated data. Note that this compatibility with the normal distribution is further supported by the fact that the behavior of the CIs estimates closely aligns with the simulation results for the normal distribution (compare location area of the boxplots in Figures 9, 10 with location of normal distribution in simulation results in Figures 4, 5). A single exception here are the samples in the CIFAR10 use case from the left-skewed distribution in Figure 6(b) (yellow color). In this experiment, SGD is used as optimizer in connection with hyperparameter optimization. The p -values of these small samples that are generated from this distribution are mainly below 0.1. With growing sample size ($n = 25, 50$) these p -values tend to zero and the normality property would be rejected.

5 Conclusion and Further Work

Different estimation approaches for quantiles were applied, with special focus on TMOIs from machine learning. The estimation referred to point estimation and interval estimation of quantiles. Simulations were considered to investigate selected distributions, especially those with bounded support. Real data use cases were based on empirical distributions of the accuracy rate for classification and the RMSE for regression tasks.

The analyzed point estimators (sample quantile, linear interpolation, and semiparametric bootstrap median) demonstrated good statistical performance in terms of bias and RMSE across various sample sizes, with the sample quantile being a reasonable point estimator across different types of distributions. Nevertheless, in the real-data use cases, all presented estimators provided useful results, which may be attributed to the actual distributions' shapes not deviating too much from a normal distribution. As expected, quantiles from the middle (around 50%) of a distribution can be estimated more reliably than those from the tails. Furthermore, upper quantiles tend to be estimated slightly better than lower ones. Nevertheless, caused by e.g. the sampling error, the point estimators are coming along with uncertainty. This uncertainty can be quantified by applying the investigated CIs for quantiles. For practical applications, the uncertainty perspective in terms of intervals should be included, especially when comparing different settings.

For CI estimation of quantiles, it was found that a sample size of $n = 15, \dots, 25$ is an acceptable order to quantify the distribution of some TMOI for quantile levels up to the 90% (and 10% for lower quantiles). A sample size of $n = 10$ can also provide insight up to the 1st and 3rd quartiles, though with less statistical quality. In this case, intervals based on semiparametric bootstrap were found to offer a possibility to quantify uncertainty even when other nonparametric alternatives are not valid due to the small sample size. Although showing less statistical quality (w.r.t. empirical confidence level and interval length), the resulting intervals still could provide some tendency. Nevertheless, if some resulting interval estimation is apparently quite lengthy, this is typically an indication of a too small sample, that does not contain sufficient information about the quantity of interest. Thus, the more extreme the quantile to be estimated, the larger the required sample size. Upper quantiles (beyond 75% level) can be estimated slightly more reliably than lower quantiles (below 25% level).

The standard nonparametric asymptotic CI approach showed good results for surprisingly small sample sizes (noting the asymptotic aspect) of $n = 10$. Up to a sample size of $n = 15$ the confidence level should not exceed 0.9. A practical way to evaluate the appropriate sample size is by considering the minimum sample size requirement for nonparametric CIs according to Tables 2, 1. These minimum sample sizes provide useful guidance esp. when caution is necessary, helping to avoid unreliable results.

The standard t -interval for the mean was used as benchmark for all the other results. Additionally, it

turned out as an alternative when CI estimations for quantiles show unsatisfactory results in cases with small sample size. But considering the mean only may obscure many important aspects and should be used carefully, even though using the mean is a standard approach. Altogether, it is recommended to stick to the t -interval when considering the mean only, as it provides insight into the uncertainty very easily.

Note the difference from common CIs, such as the t -interval for the mean, which is symmetric around the point estimate of the mean. Except for the nonparametric asymptotic CI, the quantile CI estimations presented here do not include a dedicated point estimate. As a result, when point estimates and interval estimates are used together, it is possible that the point estimate may not fall within the interval estimate. To avoid such inconsistencies, it is important to use point and interval estimators consistently. For instance, when using the semiparametric bootstrap approach and calculating estimates based on bootstrap percentiles, the point estimate will fall within the interval estimate (or, in extreme cases, align exactly with one of its boundaries), if the percentiles are computed consistently applying either the sample quantile estimator or the linear interpolated quantile estimator. This applies analogously when using the nonparametric asymptotic CI. Finally, the sample quantile estimator can be used consistently in conjunction with the nonparametric exact CI.

Although the contribution relied on nonparametric approaches for estimating quantiles and CIs, the real-data use cases suggest that a normality assumption may be reasonable in many cases. In particular, the application of goodness-of-fit tests for normality showed that, in the case of small samples, this assumption can serve at least as a reasonable starting point.

Due to the definition of quantiles, there exists an asymmetry between error-oriented and outcome-oriented metrics in machine learning. For instance, accuracy and F1 score focus on positive outcomes, while measures such as RMSE and error rates emphasize undesirable outcomes, aligning with a ‘risk-oriented perspective’. While the quantile perspective is appropriate for error-oriented metrics, it should be applied more cautiously to outcome-oriented metrics. Overall, such quantification of certain TMOI can serve as the foundation for risk quantification in machine learning systems from the application perspective, as it provides an indication of loss or damage probability.

The results suggest room for improvement, particularly for the estimation of extreme quantiles in small samples. To address this, further developments of the semiparametric bootstrap approach might be of interest. Such a development is discussed in [WWH15], who investigate additional semiparametric tail-extrapolated quantile estimators in combination with smoothed bootstrap methods and direct density estimation based on characteristic functions. The results show promising coverage probabilities and narrower interval lengths, even for extreme quantiles with small sample sizes. However, these approaches are technically complex and require some implementational effort. Unfortunately, the simulations therein do not consider distributions with bounded support (apart from the exponential distribution [WWH15, Section 7, pp. 2131]).

Another extension could be the application of importance sampling for the CI bounds based on estimating quantiles from the bootstrap distribution as in [HS08]. In [HS08], the considered statistical quantities are a regression parameter in Cox’s proportional hazards model and a correlation. Thus, the impact on quantile estimation needs to be investigated.

An additional consideration and extension is the distinction between single interval estimations for specific quantiles of interest versus simultaneous confidence intervals, as discussed in [Hay14]. For quantile estimation, this distinction is important because of the dependency among quantiles.

All relevant code and implementations of the non-standard CI estimators will soon be made available on <https://github.com>.

Acknowledgments

The authors acknowledge the financial support by the Federal Ministry of Education and Research of Germany and by Sächsische Staatsministerium für Wissenschaft, Kultur und Tourismus in the programme Center of Excellence for AI-research ‘Center for Scalable Data Analytics and Artificial Intelligence Dresden/Leipzig’, project identification number: ScaDS.AI

The authors gratefully acknowledge the computing time made available to them on the high-performance computer at the NHR Center of TU Dresden. This center is jointly supported by the Federal Ministry of

Education and Research and the state governments participating in the NHR (www.nhr-verein.de/unsere-partner).

References

- [Bay+20] Pierre Bayle et al. “Cross-validation confidence intervals for test error”. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 33 (2020), pp. 16339–16350. URL: https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2020/file/bce9abf229ffd7e570818476ee5d7Paper.pdf (cit. on p. 4).
- [BP23] Mariusz Bieniek and Luiza Pańczyk. “On the choice of the optimal single order statistic in quantile estimation”. In: *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics* 75.2 (2023), pp. 303–333. DOI: 10.1007/s10463-022-00845-3 (cit. on p. 7).
- [Bou+21] Xavier Bouthillier et al. “Accounting for variance in machine learning benchmarks”. In: *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems* 3 (2021), pp. 747–769 (cit. on pp. 4, 5, 7, 16).
- [Bro06] Erik Brodin. “On quantile estimation by bootstrap”. In: *Computational statistics & data analysis* 50.6 (2006), pp. 1398–1406. DOI: 10.1016/j.csda.2005.08.004 (cit. on p. 9).
- [CB02] George Casella and Roger Berger. *Statistical Inference*. CRC Press, 2002 (cit. on p. 7).
- [DLP94] Terry Dielman, Cynthia Lowry, and Roger Pfaffenberger. “A comparison of quantile estimators”. In: *Communications in Statistics-Simulation and Computation* 23.2 (1994), pp. 355–371. DOI: 10.1080/03610919408813175 (cit. on p. 6).
- [DK24] Dagmara Dudek and Anna Kuczmaszewska. “Some practical and theoretical issues related to the quantile estimators”. In: *Statistical Papers* (2024), pp. 1–17. DOI: 10.1007/s00362-024-01543-3 (cit. on p. 6).
- [ET94] Bradley Efron and Robert J Tibshirani. *An introduction to the bootstrap*. CRC press, 1994 (cit. on pp. 9, 12).
- [Ham18] Kam Hamidieh. “A data-driven statistical model for predicting the critical temperature of a superconductor”. In: *Computational Materials Science* 154 (2018), pp. 346–354. ISSN: 0927-0256. DOI: 10.1016/j.commatsci.2018.07.052 (cit. on p. 16).
- [Hay14] AJ Hayter. “Simultaneous confidence intervals for several quantiles of an unknown distribution”. In: *The American Statistician* 68.1 (2014), pp. 56–62. DOI: 10.1080/00031305.2013.869259 (cit. on p. 21).
- [Hes15] Tim C Hesterberg. “What teachers should know about the bootstrap: Resampling in the undergraduate statistics curriculum”. In: *The american statistician* 69.4 (2015), pp. 371–386. DOI: 10.1080/00031305.2015.1089789 (cit. on pp. 9, 12).
- [HMC19] Robert V Hogg, Joseph W McKean, and Allen T Craig. *Introduction to Mathematical Statistics*. Pearson Education, 2019 (cit. on p. 7).
- [Hot+05] Torsten Hothorn et al. “The design and analysis of benchmark experiments”. In: *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* 14.3 (2005), pp. 675–699. DOI: 10.1198/106186005X59630 (cit. on p. 4).
- [HS08] Jiaqiao Hu and Zheng Su. “Bootstrap quantile estimation via importance resampling”. In: *Computational statistics & data analysis* 52.12 (2008), pp. 5136–5142. DOI: 10.1016/j.csda.2008.05.022 (cit. on pp. 12, 21).
- [Hut02] Alan D Hutson. “A semi-parametric quantile function estimator for use in bootstrap estimation procedures”. In: *Statistics and Computing* 12.4 (2002), pp. 331–338. DOI: 10.1023/A:1020783911574 (cit. on pp. 6, 9, 10, 12, 15).

- [Kis13] Joanna Kisielinska. “The exact bootstrap method shown on the example of the mean and variance estimation”. In: *Computational Statistics* 28 (2013), pp. 1061–1077. DOI: 10.1007/s00180-012-0350-0 (cit. on p. 9).
- [Li+12] Ling-Wei Li et al. “On unbiased optimal L-statistics quantile estimators”. In: *Statistics & Probability Letters* 82.11 (2012), pp. 1891–1897. DOI: 10.1016/j.spl.2012.05.027 (cit. on p. 7).
- [NN20] Chaitra H Nagaraja and Haikady N Nagaraja. “Distribution-free Approximate Methods for Constructing Confidence Intervals for Quantiles”. In: *International Statistical Review* 88.1 (2020), pp. 75–100. DOI: 10.1111/insr.12338 (cit. on pp. 12, 15).
- [PTM21] Matti Pajari, Maria Tikanmäki, and Lasse Makkonen. “Probabilistic evaluation of quantile estimators”. In: *Communications in Statistics-Theory and Methods* 50.14 (2021), pp. 3319–3337. DOI: 10.1080/03610926.2019.1696975 (cit. on p. 7).
- [Phi+18] Michel Philipp et al. “Measuring the stability of results from supervised statistical learning”. In: *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics* 27.4 (2018), pp. 685–700. DOI: 10.1080/10618600.2018.1473779 (cit. on p. 4).
- [SSH21] Robin M Schmidt, Frank Schneider, and Philipp Hennig. “Descending through a Crowded Valley - Benchmarking Deep Learning Optimizers”. In: *Proceedings of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*. Ed. by Marina Meila and Tong Zhang. Vol. 139. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research. PMLR, July 2021, pp. 9367–9376. URL: <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v139/schmidt21a.html> (cit. on p. 4).
- [Tak+21] Kanae Takahashi et al. “Confidence interval for micro-averaged F1 and macro-averaged F1 scores”. In: *Applied Intelligence* (2021), pp. 1–12. DOI: 10.1007/s10489-021-02635-5 (cit. on p. 4).
- [Van00] Aad W Van der Vaart. *Asymptotic statistics*. Vol. 3. Cambridge university press, 2000. DOI: 10.1017/CB09780511802256 (cit. on pp. 6, 8).
- [Wan+10] Bin Wang et al. “Comparison of bootstrap and generalized bootstrap methods for estimating high quantiles”. In: *Journal of statistical planning and inference* 140.10 (2010), pp. 2926–2935. DOI: 10.1016/j.jspi.2010.03.016 (cit. on pp. 9, 10, 12, 15).
- [Wan+15] Yu Wang et al. “Confidence Interval for F_1 Measure of Algorithm Performance Based on Blocked 3×2 Cross-Validation”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* 27.3 (2015), pp. 651–659. DOI: 10.1109/TKDE.2014.2359667 (cit. on p. 4).
- [WWH15] Lai Wei, Dongliang Wang, and Alan D Hutson. “An investigation of quantile function estimators relative to quantile confidence interval coverage”. In: *Communications in Statistics-Theory and Methods* 44.10 (2015), pp. 2107–2135. DOI: 10.1080/03610926.2013.775304 (cit. on pp. 12, 21).
- [Zie09] Ryszard Zieliński. “Optimal nonparametric quantile estimators. Towards a general theory. A survey”. In: *Communications in Statistics—Theory and Methods* 38.7 (2009), pp. 980–992. DOI: 10.1080/03610920802351127 (cit. on p. 7).
- [ZZ05] Ryszard Zieliński and Wojciech Zieliński. “Best exact nonparametric confidence intervals for quantiles”. In: *Statistics* 39.1 (2005), pp. 67–71. DOI: 10.1080/02331880412331329854 (cit. on pp. 8, 10).