ON MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT THE BRIER SCORE IN BINARY PREDICTION MODELS

LINARD HOESSLY

ABSTRACT. The Brier score is a widely used metric evaluating overall performance of predictions for binary outcome probabilities in clinical research. However, its interpretation can be complex, as it does not align with commonly taught concepts in medical statistics. Consequently, the Brier score is often misinterpreted, sometimes to a significant extent, a fact that has not been adequately addressed in the literature. This commentary aims to explore prevalent misconceptions surrounding the Brier score and elucidate the reasons these interpretations are incorrect.

1. INTRODUCTION: WHAT IS THE BS?

The BS [7] is a widely used metric evaluating the accuracy of probabilistic predictions in binary outcomes for clinical research [31, 19]. It assesses the overall performance of prediction models that estimate the likelihood of medical outcomes like disease progression or treatment response.

Given a set of probabilistic predictions p_i and corresponding observed outcomes y_i , the Brier score (BS) is defined as:

$$BS(p, y) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (p_i - y_i)^2$$

where:

(1.1)

- *n* is the total number of predictions and observations,
- p_i represents the predicted probability of an event occurring for the *i*-th case (e.g., the probability of a patient developing a condition),
- y_i is the actual observed outcome (coded as 1 if the event occurred, 0 if it did not).

Typically, the y_i in such prediction models are assumed to be realisations of independent Bernoulli random variables $Y_i \sim Bern(q_i)$, where $q_i \in [0, 1]$ [19, 30]. Two random variables are independent if the probability of an outcome for one is unaffected by the outcome of the other, for a formal explanation see, e.g., [37]. Correspondingly the best i-th prediction that can be obtained is the true underlying probability, i.e. $p_i = q_i$.

BS offers a comprehensive evaluation of probabilistic predictions and is a strictly proper scoring rule [8, Theorem 1], meaning that it incentivizes honest probabilistic forecasting as in expectation it is minimised if and only if the predictions are the true probabilities [17]. Note that there is a difference between good predictions with respect to true probabilities versus usefulness of the predictions in a clinical context: While a clinician might find it easiest to work with a classification of patients into zeros and ones or something very close to that, the quality of a probabilistic prediction model is judged based on how close the predictions are to the true probabilities. As the BS is strictly proper, the expectation of BS is minimised if and only if the predictions correspond to the true probabilities. If desired, based on the predictions, as a second step the predictions can be used to derive and evaluate a classification [18] or analysed with respect clinical consequences, e.g., via net benefit [33]. However, the qualities such evaluations judge is different to the BS [4, 18], in particular these are not strictly proper.

Despite its widespread use [34, 25, 28], the BS is potentially often misunderstood in clinical research. Unlike more familiar statistical notions, it does not fit neatly into traditional statistical concepts potentially commonly taught in medical education [22, 3, 27, 29]. Furthermore, the BS is mathematically equivalent to the mean squared error (MSE), a concept introduced by C.F. Gauss [15]. The MSE is widely applied in least squares regression [11, § 11.3.1], statistical learning [23, § 2.2.1], or machine learning evaluation [13]. The connection of BS and MSE can also lead to confusion. BS and MSE are used in different contexts, as the BS compares a probability to an outcome of the binary random variable in the sense of scoring rules [17], while the MSE usually compares two real continuous values, in statistics typically comparing an estimator

LINARD HOESSLY

to the true value [11]. In particular, misconceptions about the BS are not uncommon and can sometimes be reinforced by potentially misleading statements in the literature [32, 33, 31, 1, 36, 10]. Given the importance of accurate interpretation in clinical applications, it is crucial to address these misunderstandings.

Several works have explored the evaluation of binary predictive models. [33] thoroughly reviews recent and more traditional measures for prediction models, Harrell [19, § 10] provides a comprehensive overview of regression model performance metrics, Steyerberg [31] offers far-reaching guide to prediction model building in medicine, while [38] discusses the Gini coefficient, Pietra index, and other classification measures. Other studies, such as [21], examine alternative metrics designed to improve model performance assessment, and [5] compares the BS with net benefit analysis in diagnostic testing. Furthermore there are various decompositions of the BS [39], some can also be used to construct statistical tests for the BS [30]. BS also remains significant in AI-driven medical predictions [9].

This commentary aims to clarify common misunderstandings about the BS, explain why they arise, and provide guidance on its appropriate interpretation in clinical research.

Related literature. Some of our points have been previously observed. We review related references that observe similar findings. However, given the widespread use of the BS, our literature review is necessarily partial. [24] outlines examples where the model comparison of expected BSs is potentially contrary to how a human would judge when comparing two models. [30] outlined the distinction between calibration and prediction error, as well as the misunderstanding that lower BS indicates better calibration.

Acknowledgements. We thank Lucia de Andres Bragado and Matthew Parry for helpful discussions.

2. More on the BS

In this section, we review key properties of the BS, delve into some mathematical points, and discuss the means we will use to understand the BS.

As a first point, when considering the BS of (1.1), there are two simple related BSs. On the one hand, one can compare (1.1) to the BS when entering $p_{1/2} = (1/2, \dots, 1/2)$, giving $BS(p_{1/2}, y) = 1/4$. On the other hand, we can compare (1.1) to the BS when entering the mean incidence $\bar{y}_v = (\bar{y}, \dots, \bar{y})$, which gives

$$BS(\bar{y}_v, y) = \bar{y} - \bar{y}^2.$$

Clearly, $BS(p_{1/2}, y) = 1/4 \ge BS(\bar{y}_v, y) = \bar{y} - \bar{y}^2$. Both for very high or very low incidences, $BS(\bar{y}_v, y)$ is low. Furthermore we note that $\bar{y} - \bar{y}^2$ si symmetric around 0.5, see Figure 1, and e.g. for $\bar{y} = 0.1$ or $\bar{y} = 0.9$, $BS(\bar{y}_v, y) = 0.09$.

2.1. Key properties about the BS. Below, we summarise essential insights into the BS for the basic understanding of the reader.

- (BI) Range and interpretation: The BS takes values in the interval [0, 1], with lower values typically indicating more accurate probabilistic predictions.
- (BII) The BS is a random variable: The BS is a random variable as it measures deviations between predicted probabilities and stochastic outcomes. In a clinical prediction model, the outcome y_i is a realisation of $Y_i \sim \text{Bern}(q_i)$, where $q_i \in [0, 1]$.
- (BIII) Optimal predictions and true probabilities: The (unique) optimal predictions minimising the expected BS are the true outcome probabilities, i.e., $p_i = q_i$, as the BS is a strictly proper scoring rule [8, Theorem 1].
- (BIV) Expectation of BS for n = 1: Knowing the true probability, we can calculate the expectation. For n = 1, let $Y_1 \sim Bern(q_1), q_1 \in [0, 1]$ with prediction $p_1 \in [0, 1]$. Then the expectation of BS is given as

$$g(p_1, q_1) := \mathbb{E}_{Y_1 \sim Bern(q_1)}[BS(p_1, Y_1)] = p_1^2 - 2p_1q_1 + q_1$$

For the interested reader, the calculation is given in Appendix B.1. The optimal prediction minimising (2.1) is $p_1 = q_1$. We next go through two key cases

• For perfect prediction, the expectation value is given by

(2.2)
$$f(q_1) = q_1 - q_1^2.$$

As examples, consider the following cases:

(2.1)

- if $q_1 = 1/2 = p_1$, the expected BS is f(1/2) = 1/4 corresponding to the maximum of (2.2),

- if for
$$q_1 = 1/10 = p_1$$
, $f(1/10) = 9/100$.

The expectation of the BS as a function of q_1 , when $p_1 = q_1$, i.e., (2.2), looks as follows:



FIGURE 1. Expectation of the BS for the optimal prediction as a function of the underlying true probability with $p_1 = q_1$.

- Next we compare the expected BS under perfect prediction with $p_1 = q_1$ to
 - the expectation of the BS under perfect prediction but increased true probability, i.e., $\tilde{p}_1 := p_1 + \varepsilon = \tilde{q}_1 = q_1 + \varepsilon$, and taking the difference

(2.3)
$$g(q_1 + \varepsilon, q_1 + \varepsilon) - g(q_1, q_1) = \varepsilon(1 - 2q_1 - \varepsilon)$$

Note that the difference depends strongly on q_1 .

- to the expectation of the BS with same true probability but slightly wrong prediction $\tilde{p}_1 := p_1 + \varepsilon, \tilde{q}_1 = q_1$ and taking the difference

$$g(q_1 + \varepsilon, q_1) - g(q_1, q_1) = \varepsilon^2$$

Note that the difference depends does not depend on q_1 . The calculations are in Appendix § B.2.

- From the previous point, we conclude that if we slightly predict wrong, the costs are almost inexistent, e.g. if the true probability is q_1 but we predicted $p_1 = q_1 + 0.1$, the expected difference between the BS of the perfect prediction and the slightly wrong one is 0.01 by (2.4). However, if the true probability is changed e.g. from $q_1 = 0.1$ to $\tilde{q}_1 = 0.2$ and we have perfect prediction, the expected difference of the BSs is 0.07 by (2.3).
- (BV) Dependence of expectation and distribution of BS on true probabilities: The BS with several observations as in (1.1) consists of the mean value of the one-dimensional BS's. The expectation of BS in (1.1) and its distribution depend on the true outcome probabilities q_i , which are generally unknown, even when these are used as predictions. Based on (2.2) or Figure 1 its follows e.g. that when the q_i are mostly concentrated around zero and one, then the expectation of the BS under perfect predictions (1.1) is close to zero. On the other hand, when they are mostly concentrated around e.g. 0.5, the expectation of the BS (1.1) with perfect predictions is close to 0.25.
- (BVI) Unobservability of true probabilities in clinical data: In practice, the true probability of an event occurring for an individual patient is not directly observable. Each patient is unique, and we only observe whether the event occurs or not (i.e., a binary outcome).

In particular we note that although individual-level true probabilities will remain unknown, we can approximate their average value across a population by calculating the mean of observed outcomes in overall, or in similar patient groups. This provides a practical way to assess model calibration in clinical settings via calibration in the large (CIL) [6, 35]

(2.5)
$$CIL(p,y) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i$$

2.2. Notable mathematical features about the BS. Below, we summarise basic mathematical properties of the BS for the understanding of the reader. Mathematical details and arguments are given in Appendix B.3.

Consider the BS of *n* outcomes, where each $Y_i \sim Bern(q_i)$. Let the expected incidence be denoted by \bar{q} , i.e. $\bar{q} := \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} q_i}{n}$.

(2.4)

(MI) BS of non-informative model that uses prevalence as prediction, i.e. $p = (\bar{y}, \dots, \bar{y})$: The BS of (1.1) with the non-informative mean as predictor $\bar{y}_v = (\bar{y}, \dots, \bar{y})$, is given by $\bar{y} - \bar{y}^2$, i.e.

$$BS(\bar{y}_v, y) = \bar{y} - \bar{y}^2.$$

(MII) Bound on expectation of perfect prediction, i.e. for $p = (q_1, \dots, q_n)$: The expected value of the average BS of (1.1) with the true probabilities as predictors, i.e., $p = (q_1, \dots, q_n)$, is bounded above by $\bar{q} - \bar{q}^2$, i.e.,

$$\mathbb{E}[BS((q_1,\cdots,q_n),(Y_1,\cdots,Y_n))] \le \bar{q} - \bar{q}^2,$$

with equality if and only if $q_i = \bar{q}$ for all $i \in [n]$.

(MIII) Typical BS with perfect prediction for large n: Assume the true probabilities q_i itself are realisations of random variables $Q_i \sim F$. Then, by the law of large numbers(LLN) the BS (1.1) for n big roughly equals $\mathbb{E}[BS(Q_1, Y_1)]$, and probabilities for deviation from this value can be calculated via the central limit theorem (CLT). Hence $\mathbb{E}[BS(Q_1, Y_1)]$ roughly equals $BS((q_1, \dots, q_n), (y_1, \dots, y_n))]$ for n large, and \bar{y} roughly equals \bar{q} . More detail on this perspective is in Appendix § A.

2.3. Main takeaways of the observations on the BS. To summarise our previous points, we conclude that an observed BS is a function of

- (I) the underlying true probabilities (the q_i s),
- (II) the closeness of the predictions when compared to the true probabilities (how close p_i is from q_i),
- (III) some randomness that comes from the Bernoulli random variables (the observed y_i that are realisations of $Y_i \sim Bern(q_i)$).

The influence of the randomness decreases with n (in idealised proper settings by LLN and CLT), and the expectation of the BS can be seen as the long term average, which represent typical values if n is big.

2.4. Means of understanding the BS. We will use the following approaches to better understand the BS (1.1):

- Expectation of the BS: We will analyze the expected value the BS (1.1) takes, which will help to illustrate typical observed values of the BS.
- Simulation-Based Evaluations: We assess the BS's behavior by simulating Bernoulli outcomes with different probability distributions for q_i and different sample sizes. This approach intuitively explores properties in both realistic and idealized medical prediction scenarios. We will use the following elements in our simulations, where we give more detail in the Appendix § D via the Aims, Datagenerating mechanism, Estimands and other targets, Methods, Performance measures (ADEMP) framework [26].
 - Sample size n:. Settings considered: $n \in \{300, 1000\}$.
 - True distribution: The $q_i \in [0, 1]$ used to simulate $Y_i \sim Bern(q_i)$. The q_i itself are considered as realisations of random variables.
 - **Predictor distribution**: The $p_i \in [0, 1]$ used in (1.1). These are considered as functions of q_i with potentially random error.
 - Estimand: Includes median BS and 2.5% resp. 97.5% quantiles.

3. MISCONCEPTIONS

Below is a list of the most common misinterpretations of the BS when evaluating probability predictions for binary events. Each misconception is later accompanied by an explanation and examples illustrating why it is incorrect. Some of these misunderstandings are fundamentally equivalent, though they are not always recognised as such.

- #1: A BS of 0 means a perfect model, and a perfect model has BS 0.
- #2: When comparing two prediction models, the model with lower BS is better.
- #3: A low BS indicates good calibration.
- #4: Having a BS of around $\bar{y} \bar{y}^2$ where \bar{y} is the mean observed incidence means we have a useless or non-informative model.
- #5: For an observed incidence of \bar{y} , the BS (1.1) for reasonable predictions can not be bigger than $\bar{y} \bar{y}^2$.

3.1. Misconception #1: A BS of 0 means a perfect model, and a perfect model has BS 0. We first look at what it means in practice if we observe a BS of 0. The observed BS is a function of the predictions and the observed outcomes. A BS of 0 implies perfect alignment between predicted probabilities and observed outcomes. While the true probabilities are unknown, they lie within [0, 1], and we usually expect that a majority is in (0, 1). Hence, rather than signalling a perfect model, an observed BS of 0 potentially indicates a serious error. Given the binary outcomes, this would imply predictions were exclusively 0 or 1, contradicting the goal of probability estimation.

Note that there is a caveat, with very low or very high incidence, low BS can occur, as even the BS of the noninformative prediction \bar{y}_v gives a very low BS (MI).

Next we consider the second point. Under the assumption that at least one of the true probabilities is in (0, 1), a BS of 0 is mathematically impossible for the perfect model (see Appendix C). Consider expected values of a perfect model, i.e. a model where the predictions equal the underlying probabilities. If n = 1, and say $q_1 = 0.1$, this expectation is not equal to zero for the perfect model by (2.2), nor can an observed BS be equal to zero. If we evaluate several perfect predictions, the corresponding expected value of the BS is the mean over (2.2) which is not zero (unless for all $i, q_i \in \{0, 1\}$).

To illustrate this and for later reference, we present simulations with perfect predictions, showing that even ideal models do not yield a BS of 0. In fact, expected BSs for a perfect model can be notably high.

True distribution	Predictor distribution	n	Median of BS (2,5%-&97,5%- Q)
Unif(0,1)	Perfect	300	0.167(0.144, 0.19)
$\operatorname{Unif}(0,1)$	Perfect	1000	0.167(0.154, 0.179)
$\operatorname{Unif}(0,1)$	+Unif(-0.2, 0.2)	300	0.179(0.156, 0.203)
$\operatorname{Unif}(0,1)$	+Unif(-0.2, 0.2)	1000	0.179(0.165, 0.193)
Smoke prediction	Perfect	300	0.168(0.145, 0.191)
Smoke prediction	Perfect	1000	0.168(0.156, 0.181)
Smoke prediction	Biased $+0.1$	300	0.178(0.161, 0.196)
Smoke prediction	Biased $+0.1$	1000	0.178(0.169, 0.188)
Osteo prediction	Perfect	300	0.054(0.037, 0.074)
Osteo prediction	Perfect	1000	0.054(0.045, 0.065)
Osteo prediction	Biased $+0.1$	300	0.064(0.05, 0.08)
Osteo prediction	Biased $+0.1$	1000	0.064(0.057, 0.073)
Beta(2,2)	Perfect	300	0.2(0.18, 0.22)
Beta(2,2)	Perfect	1000	0.2(0.189, 0.211)

TABLE 1. Comparison of expectation of BS under different simulation settings (Monte Carlo simulation with 5000 runs per setting)

3.2. Misconception #2: When comparing two prediction models, the model with lower BS is better. Prediction models can be compared across datasets through BSs, but caution is essential. While a lower BS for one prediction model compared to another may suggest better predictive performance, this can be entirely deceptive. Below, we present three scenarios with decreasing levels of caution, each illustrating why direct comparison of BSs may be misleading.

3.2.1. Comparing BSs Across Different Datasets with different incidences: If the true outcome distributions differ, even perfect models will yield different BS distributions and expectations. Thus, cross-dataset comparisons may lack meaningful insights. Observing different incidences indicates that the true outcome distributions differ, making the BS comparison unreliable. Recall that the BS is a function of the true underlying probabilities, the predictions and some randomness, with the true probabilities having a big influence. Hence a lower BS in prediction model A when compared to prediction model B does not necessarily indicate a superior model in A with more accurate predictions, as the expectation of BS depends on the true probabilities (**BV**). To give a concrete example, compare, e.g. the osteoporosis prediction with 0.1 bias to the perfect smoke prediction model from Table 4. The biased osteoporosis prediction has median BS 0.064, while perfect smoke prediction has median BS 0.168, nonetheless the perfect model is obviously better.

LINARD HOESSLY

3.2.2. Comparing BSs Across Different Datasets with very similar or same incidences (also known as class imbalance) is meaningful. It is hence sometimes recommended to compare BS of two prediction models on two datasets that have similar class imbalances [10]. However, we recall that the true probability distribution is unobservable, and by (**BV**) the true values of the q_i determines the expectation of the BS. Thus, even with identical class imbalances, we cannot assume that the true probability distributions are comparable and the same caution as in the previous point should be exercised in interpreting such comparison. Descriptions in population characteristics can indicate similarities and differences of true probabilities which then influence the observed BS. To give a concrete example, compare, e.g. the example with underlying distribution Unif(0, 1) where the prediction has error +Unif(-0.2, 0.2) to the the example with underlying distribution Beta(5, 5) with perfect predictions from Table 4. Both Unif(0, 1) and Beta(5, 5) give expected incidences of 50%. The BS of predictions with errors but underlying distribution Unif(0, 1) has median BS 0.179, while perfect prediction for underlying Beta(5, 5) has median BS 0.200, nonetheless the perfect model is obviously better.

3.2.3. Comparing Models on the same dataset via BS:. Even when evaluating two models on the same dataset (with the same underlying probabilities), a lower BS in one does not always strictly imply that this model is better. There are two potential issues:

- (I) It is possible that the model that is worse has a better score by pure chance. However, with higher sample sizes this becomes more and more unlikely by the CLT (MIII).
- (II) The way in which the BS, say in expectation for simplicity, judges which model is better might not align with how a human might judge. In expectation, a change of the prediction from the perfect prediction q_i to $q_i + \varepsilon$ or $q_i - \varepsilon$ gives the same result by (2.4). However, for humans the direction can matter as well, particularly for q_i close to zero or one, which was observed in [24]. To illustrate, consider the simple with one observation from [24, § 3]. Assume the true probability of an event occurring is $P(Y_1 = 1) = \frac{1}{10}$ (i.e., 10% chance), and we compare two models with predicted probabilities:
 - Model 1: $p_1 = 0$ (predicting the event will never occur)
 - Model 2: $\tilde{p_1} = \frac{1}{4}$ (predicting the event occurs with a probability of 25%)

Using (2.1), we calculate the expectations of the BSs for the models, and get an expected BS of 0.1 for model 1, and 0.1125 for model 2. As model 1 predicts a zero probability for the observation that has actually a 10% probability, at least intuitively, 25% might seem better for human judgement.

3.3. Misconception #3: A low BS indicates good calibration. A low BS does not necessarily indicate good calibration of a model. As we have repeated, the BS is a function of the true underlying probabilities, the predictions and some randomness, with the true probabilities having a big influence. Hence it is possible that we have perfect predictions, but low or high BS due to the underlying probabilities, or similary not so accurate predictions but a BS that is low or high BS due to the underlying probabilities, see (BIV). As in expectation a change of the prediction from the perfect prediction q_i to $q_i + \varepsilon$ or $q_i - \varepsilon$ gives the same result by (2.4), miscalibration where errors tend to go mostly in one direction are not punished more. Hence in the examples below from Table 2 we observe that median BS from the prediction biased by 0.1 are the same as the one from the prediction with $+(1 - 2Bern(1/2)) \cdot 0.1$ which has prediction errors that are as often and as much higher as they are lower than the true probability.

Assessing calibration should be done using additional metrics like CIL, calibration curves or similar evaluation components [6, 35]. Therefore, while the BS is a useful measure, it should not be the sole criterion for evaluating model performance.

True distribution	Predictor distribution	n	Median CIL (2,5%-&97,5%- Q)	Median BS (2,5%-&97,5%- Q)
Unif(0,1)	Perfect	1000	0(-0.025, 0.025)	0.166(0.154, 0.179)
Unif(0,1)	+0.1	1000	0.095(0.07, 0.12)	0.176(0.163, 0.189)
Unif(0,1)	$+(1-2Bern(1/2))\cdot 0.1$	1000	0(-0.026, 0.026)	0.176(0.163, 0.189)
Osteo model	Perfect	1000	0(-0.015, 0.014)	$0.054\ (0.045, 0.065)$
Osteo model	+0.1	1000	0.1(0.085, 0.115)	0.064(0.057, 0.073)
Osteo model	$+(1-2Bern(1/2))\cdot 0.1$	1000	0.03(0.015, 0.045)	0.061(0.051, 0.071)

TABLE 2. Comparison of expectation of BS and quantiles under different simulation settings (Monte-Carlo simulation with 5000 runs per setting)

3.4. Misconception #4: Having a BS of around $\bar{y} - \bar{y}^2$ where \bar{y} is the mean observed incidence means we have a useless or non-informative model. As an example, if $\bar{y} = 0.5$, then $\bar{y} - \bar{y}^2 =$ 0.25, or , if $\bar{y} = 0.1$, then $\bar{y} - \bar{y}^2 = 0.090$. Recall from (BIII) that the lowest expected BS occurs when predicted probabilities match the true probabilities, representing a perfect prediction that cannot be improved. However, we cannot observe the true probabilities. In some cases of observed incidences around 0.5, perfect predictions yield a BS of close to 0.25, as shown in the following simulations. Hence if we observe a BS of around $\bar{y} - \bar{y}^2$, besides having a relatively bad model, the following alternative explanations could explain such a BS:

- Many of the true probabilities are around \bar{y} or $1 \bar{y}$, which can make the expected BS of perfect predictions close to $\bar{y} \bar{y}^2$ (MII).
- If n is relatively low, as the BS is a realization of a random variable (**BII**), bigger random error are likely which can make the BS higher than its expectation.

Only if we can assume that neither of the above is excluded can conclude that the prediction model used is relatively bad.

As an illustration of example values, consider the median $\bar{y} - \bar{y}^2 - BS_{perf}$ in Table 3, where BS_{perf} is the BS under perfect predictions, which depends entirely on the underlying distribution, and again these medians strongly depend on the underyling distribution, but can be very low.

True distribution	Predictor distribution	n	Median of $\bar{y} - \bar{y}^2 - BS_{perf}$ (2,5%-&97,5%- Q)
Unif(0,1)	Perfect	300	0.083(0.059, 0.105)
Unif(0,1)	Perfect	1000	0.083(0.07, 0.095)
Beta(5,5)	Perfect	300	0.022(0.006, 0.037)
Beta(5,5)	Perfect	1000	0.022(0.014, 0.031)
Osteo model	Perfect	300	0.01(0.001, 0.021)
Osteo model	Perfect	1000	0.011(0.005, 0.016)
Smoke model	Perfect	300	0.026(0.01, 0.041)
Smoke model	Perfect	1000	0.026(0.017, 0.034)

TABLE 3

3.5. Misconception #5: For an observed incidence of \bar{y} , the BS (1.1) for reasonable predictions can not be bigger than $\bar{y} - \bar{y}^2$. While a priori we would not expect the BS for reasonable predictions to be bigger than $\bar{y} - \bar{y}^2$, it can happen. As we can not observe the true probabilities (**BVI**) we can not exclude the possibility that the expected BS for perfect predictions is close to the (unobservable) expected incidence $\bar{q} := \frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} q_i}{n}$, which is the expectation of \bar{Y} . Recall again from (**BII**) that the BS is a random variable. This randomness comes from the outcomes, making also the mean incidence \bar{y} a random variable. All we know is that for perfect predictions, the probability to observe $BS > \bar{y} - \bar{y}^2$ will go to zero as $n \to \infty$ by (**MIII**). However, as in practice we will not be able to derive the perfect predictions, the expectation will be higher and this argument does not apply. Hence as in the previous point, a BS above $\bar{y} - \bar{y}^2$ can be obtained when, apart from having a relatively bad model, the following alternative cases apply:

- Many of true probabilities are around 0.5, or tend to be close to each other.
- If *n* is relatively low, as the BS is a realization of a random variable (**BII**), random error can make the BS higher than its expectation by chance.

To illustrate this, we show that even for perfect predictions in some settings with low n, the probability of having a BS that is bigger than $\bar{y} - \bar{y}^2$ can be nonzero. As in practice we will not have perfect predictions, in the settings below for reasonable predictions the probability to have a BS bigger than $\bar{y} - \bar{y}^2$ is bigger, and the estimations can be understood as lower bounds for corresponding probabilities.

True Distribution	Predictor Distribution	n	Event fraction where $\bar{y} - \bar{y}^2 > BS$
Unif(0, 0.2)	Perfect	300	0.060
Unif(0.3, 0.7)	Perfect	300	0.030
Osteroporosis model	Perfect	300	0.019

TABLE 4. Comparison of expectation of BS and quantiles under different simulation settings (Monte-Carlo simulation with 5000 runs per setting)

4. Connections to some other scores

We mention three other scores connected to BS. The BS from (1.1) equals mathematically the MSE, hence its square root is the root mean squared error (RMSE):

(4.1)
$$RMSE(p,y) := \sqrt{BS(p,y)}.$$

As the square root on [0, 1] is order preserving, i.e., if $a, b \in [0, 1], a \leq b$ then $\sqrt{a} \leq \sqrt{b}$, and bijective, RMSE also takes values in [0, 1] and most of the observations we made apply sililarly to RMSE.

Two similar and often-used scores are the mean-absolute error (MAE) that is defined as

(4.2)
$$MAE(p,y) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} |p_i - y_i|$$

and the CIL [31]

(4.3)
$$CIL(p,y) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} p_i - y_i$$

These relate to BS (or RMSE) through the following inequalities [?]

$$(4.4) CIL(p,y) \le MAE(p,y) \le RMSE(p,y)$$

as well as

$$(4.5) MSE(p,y) \le MAE(p,y) \le RMSE(p,y).$$

5. Conclusions and final remarks

We have addressed several common misconceptions regarding the interpretation and use of the BS in evaluating probabilistic predictions. Summarising, the observed BS is a function of

- (I) the underlying true probabilities,
- (II) the closeness of the predictions when compared toe the true probabilities,
- (III) some randomness that comes from the Bernoulli random variables.

In particular, both calculations and simulations show that the effect of the true underlying probabilities on the expectation of BS is strong, depending on the underlying true probability much stronger than the closeness of the predictions to the true probabilities as outlined in § 2.1. We showed that a BS of zero is rather an indication of an error in realistic settings, and a very low BS does not necessarily indicate a perfect model. Indeed, the BS should be interpreted with caution, having in mind the relation to the true probabilities and the characteristics of the dataset. Direct comparisons of BSs across models on the same data can be done, and across different data should be avoided, or if done interpreted carefully. Additionally, we stressed that a low BS does not guarantee good calibration and should be complemented with additional calibration metrics. Furthermore the randomness in the BS, through the CLT, decreases as the sample size increases. A recent literature review on clinical prediction models [12] found that sample sizes used had median sample size 1250 with (Q1, Q3) = (353, 188860). Hence at least a quarter of the prediction models had relatively low sample sizes, and randomness was similar or bigger than the setting in our simulations with n = 300.

Overall, while the BS remains a valuable metric for assessing probabilistic predictions, its interpretation requires a nuanced understanding of how the underlying probabilities and closeness of predictions influence the observed BS. Once potential misconceptions are avoided, the BS serves as a reliable relative measure of overall performance. Key properties include:

- It is strictly proper and hence in expectation, it is minimised uniquely at the true probabilities, making relative comparisons on the same data meaningful [8, Theorem 1].
- It remains normalized within [0, 1].
- The RMSE, equivalent in order structure to the BS, corresponds to the l_2 norm in \mathbb{R}^n , satisfying metric properties:
 - (I) d(x, x) = 0
 - (II) If $x \neq y$, then d(x, y) > 0
 - (III) Symmetry: d(x, y) = d(y, x)
 - (IV) Triangle inequality: $d(x, z) \le d(x, y) + d(y, z)$
- As mathematically BS equals MSE, the function defining BS is convex, symmetric, and differentiable, making it well-suited for optimization.

Appendix A. Why we care about the expectation: law of large numbers and central limit theorem

Another way to understand the behavior of the BS for perfect predictions is through basic mathematical tools. Consider the setting of the simulations considered, where the true probability q_i itself is a realisation of a random variable $Q_i \sim F$. Denote by $J_n = (Q_1, \dots, Q_n)$ the random vector of the first *n* true probabilities and $Z_n = (Y_1, \dots, Y_n)$ the realisation of the corresponding *n* Bernoulli random variables. We can consider the BS of the optimal predictor J_n as

$$BS(J_n, Z_n) \xrightarrow{n \to \infty} \mathbb{E}[(Q_1 - Y_1)^2]$$

For sufficiently large n, the observed BS provides a stable estimate of its expectation by the LLN [16].

Furthermore, the individual terms $(Q_i - Y_i)^2$ have finite variance and hence by the CLT the distribution of the BS, when properly normalised, approaches a normal distribution.

(A.1)
$$\sqrt{n} \left(BS(J_n, Z_n) - \mathbb{E}[(Q_1 - Y_1)^2] \right) \xrightarrow{d} \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma^2)$$

where σ^2 represents the variance of $(Q_1 - Y_1)^2$, and \xrightarrow{d} indicated convergence in distribution [16]. This asymptotic normality allows for understanding the asymptotic behaviour of perfect predictions in the context of the simulations.

Appendix B. More detail for mathematical understanding BS

B.1. Expectation of BS in one dimension. Consider $Y_1 \sim Bern(q_1), q_1 \in [0, 1]$ and one prediction $p_1 \in [0, 1]$, then the expected BS is given as

$$\mathbb{E}[BS(p_1, Y)] = p_1^2 - 2p_1q_1 + q_1$$

In order to derive the above formula, we can proceed as follows. The expected BS is

$$\mathbb{E}[BS(p_1, Y_1)] = \mathbb{E}[(p_1 - Y_1)^2]$$

We can expand the terms to get

$$\mathbb{E}[(p_1 - Y_1)^2] = \mathbb{E}[p_1^2 - 2p_1Y_1 + Y_1^2]$$

Since p_1, p_1^2 are constants, we get:

$$\mathbb{E}[p_1^2 - 2p_1Y_1 + Y_1^2] = p_1^2 - 2p_1\mathbb{E}[Y_1] + \mathbb{E}[Y_1^2].$$

For a Bernoulli-distributed variable Y_1 :

$$\mathbb{E}[Y_1] = q_1, \quad \mathbb{E}[Y_1^2] = \mathbb{E}[Y_1] = q_1.$$

Hence the expected BS is:

$$\mathbb{E}[BS(p_1, Y_1)] = p_1^2 - 2p_1q_1 + q_1$$

B.2. Differences in expectation of BS in one dimension. Recall that

$$g(p_1, q_1) = p_1^2 - 2p_1q_1 + q_1.$$

• To derive the first result, we compute:

$$g(q_1 + \varepsilon, q_1 + \varepsilon) - g(q_1, q_1) = q_1^2 + 2q_1\varepsilon + \varepsilon^2 - 2(q_1^2 + 2q_1\varepsilon + \varepsilon^2) + q_1 + \varepsilon - q_1 + q_1^2$$

Thus,

$$g(q_1, q_1) - g(q_1 + \varepsilon, q_1 + \varepsilon) = \varepsilon (1 - 2q_1 - \varepsilon)$$

• For the second expression,

$$g(q_1 + \varepsilon, q_1) - g(q_1, q_1) = -q_1^2 - 2q_1\varepsilon - \varepsilon^2 + 2q_1^2 + 2q_1\varepsilon - q_1$$
$$= q_1^2 - \varepsilon^2 - q_1$$

Thus, the difference:

$$g(q_1 + \varepsilon, q_1) - g(q_1, q_1) = \varepsilon^2$$

B.3. Understanding the expectation of the general BS. In case $p_1 = q_1$, the expectation value of BS is given by

(B.1)
$$f(p_1) = p_1 - p_1^2$$

This is a strictly concave function, meaning that for any $\alpha \in [0, 1]$ and any $x, y \in [0, 1]$,

(B.2)
$$f((1-\alpha)x + \alpha y) \ge (1-\alpha)f(x) + \alpha f(y)$$

Now we come back to the case where we have n observations and we consider the BS.

Lemma B.1. Consider the BS of n outcomes, where $\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} y_i}{n} = \bar{y}$. Then the BS of (1.1) with prevalence as predictors, i.e., $(p_1, \dots, p_n) = (\bar{y}, \dots, \bar{y})$ equals $\bar{y} - \bar{y}^2$, i.e.

$$BS((\bar{y},\cdots,\bar{y}),(y_1,\cdots,y_n))=\bar{y}-\bar{y}^2$$

Proof. Let n = a + b such that $\bar{y} = \frac{a}{a+b}$, and BS is given as

$$\frac{1}{a+b}(a(\frac{a}{a+b}-1)^2 + b(\frac{a}{a+b})^2)$$

which we rewrite as

$$\frac{a}{a+b}\left(\frac{a}{a+b}-1\right)^2 - \left(\frac{a}{a+b}-1\right)\left(\frac{a}{a+b}\right)^2 = \bar{y}(\bar{y}-1)^2 + (1-\bar{y})\bar{y}^2 = \bar{y}-\bar{y}^2$$

Lemma B.2. Consider the BS of n outcomes, where $\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} q_i}{n} = \bar{q}$. Then the expected value of the average BS of (1.1) with the true probabilities as predictors, i.e., $(p_1, \dots, p_n) = (q_1, \dots, q_n)$, is bounded above by $\bar{q} - \bar{q}^2$, i.e.

$$\mathbb{E}[BS((q_1,\cdots,q_n),(Y_1,\cdots,Y_n))] \le \bar{q} - \bar{q}^2,$$

with equality if and only if $q_i = \bar{q}$ for all $i \in [n]$.

Proof. Let $n \ge 1$. Then

$$\mathbb{E}[BS((q_1, \cdots, q_n), (Y_1, \cdots, Y_n))] = \frac{1}{n} (\sum_{i=1}^n q_i - q_i^2)$$

We can rewrite this as

$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} q_i - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} q_i^2 = \bar{q} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} q_i^2$$

As the function $x \to x^2$ is strictly convex, we can apply Jensens Inequality to get

$$\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}q_{i}^{2} \ge (\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}q_{i})^{2} = \bar{q}^{2},$$

such that finally we can bound it as

$$\bar{q} - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} q_i^2 \ge \bar{q} - \bar{q}^2.$$

The statement with equality if and only if $q_i = \bar{q}$ for all $i \in [n]$ also follows from Jensen.

Another simple observation, with proof here is the following

Lemma B.3. Consider the BS of n outcomes, where $\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} q_i}{n} = c$. Then the expected value of the average BS of (1.1) with the non-informative mean as predictors, i.e., $(p_1, \dots, p_n) = (c, \dots, c)$, is given by $c - c^2$, *i.e.*

$$\mathbb{E}[BS((c,\cdots,c),(Y_1,\cdots,Y_n))] = c - c^2$$

Proof. Using (2.1) and (1.1) we get

$$\mathbb{E}[BS((c,\cdots,c),(Y_1,\cdots,Y_n))] = \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n c^2 - \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n 2cq_i + \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^n q_i$$

which we can simplify using $\frac{\sum_{i=1}^{n} q_i}{n} = c$ to get

$$c^{2} - 2c\frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}q_{i} + \frac{1}{n}\sum_{i=1}^{n}q_{i} = c^{2} - 2c^{2} + c = c - c^{2}$$

which is what we wanted to show.

Appendix C. Mathematical proof impossibility of BS 0

Recall the assumption.

Assumption 1. Assume at least one of the true probabilities q_i are in (0, 1).

Lemma C.1. Let $n \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 1}$, and let $y = (y_1, \dots, y_n)$ be a realisation of a sequence of independent random variables, where $Y_i \sim Bern(q_i)$. If assumption 1 holds, the BS of the perfect prediction $p_{perf} = (q_1, \dots, q_n)$ is bigger than zero, i.e.,

$$BS(p_{perf}, y) > 0.$$

Proof. Denote by $q = (q_1, \dots, q_n)$ the vector of true probabilities, which also determines the perfect prediction vector $p_{perf} = q$. Assume we reordered them such that q_1 is in (0, 1), which holds by assumption assumption 1. Define the following constant

$$\varepsilon := \min\{q_1, 1 - q_1\}$$

By reordering and assumption, $\varepsilon > 0$. We can bound $BS(p_{perf}, y)$ from below as follows

$$0 < \frac{\varepsilon^2}{n} \le BS(p_{perf}, y).$$

Appendix D. More details for the simulation via the ADEMP framework

We give more details on the simulations used in ADEMP framework [26]. It took roughly 1h to run it on a Mac Studio M2 Max 2023.

D.1. Aims.

- The main aim is to compare BS across different settings both for true probabilities as well as predictions, which are based on the perfect prediction with some noise or bias added through median.
- A secondary aim is to compare BS to the mean incident BS, to compare it to CIL. In particular to estimate the probability that $\bar{y} \bar{y}^2 > BS_{perf}$, and to estimate median of $\bar{y} \bar{y}^2 BS_{perf}$.

D.2. Data Generating Mechanism.

D.2.1. y_i entered in the BS. We sample true values for q_i under some distributions which are subsequently used to simulate $Y_i \sim Bern(q_i)$. The sample distribution for q_i are based on the following:

- Unif(a, b), where $(a, b) \in \{(0, 1), (0.3, 0.7), (0, 0.2)\}$.
- $Beta(\alpha, \beta)$, where $(\alpha, \beta) \in \{(2, 2), (5, 5)\}.$
- Osteoporosis: Logistic regression model based on NHANES 2007/2008 [14] data using the nhanesApackage [2] with complete case analysis; 7% have osteoporosis.
 - Outcome: Osteoporosis.
 - Predictors: Vitamin D, calcium, weight, height, smoking, number of persons in household, age, US citizen status, education, gender. The following were considered nonlinear via rcs spline transformation with rms R-package [20] with 3 default knots:Vitamin D, calcium, age.
- Smoking: Logistic regression model based on NHANES 2007/2008 [14] data using the nhanesA-package [2] with complete case analysis; 26.3% do smoke.
 - Outcome: Smoking.
 - Predictors: Vitamin D, calcium, bmi, osteoporosis, number of persons in household, age, US citizen status, education, gender. The following were considered nonlinear via rcs spline transformation with rms R-package [20] with 3 default knots:Vitamin D, calcium, bmi, age.

D.2.2. Predictions p_i entered in the BS. The predictions entered are functions of the q_i , and the following settings are considered:

- Perfect: $p_i = q_i$, i.e., perfect predictions.
- +0.1: $p_i = q_i + 0.1$, i.e., slightly biased predictions.
- +Unif(-0.2, 0.2): $p_i = q_i + X_i$, where $X_i \sim Unif(-0.2, 0.2)$, i.e., fairly disturbed but unbiased predictions.
- $+(1-2Bern(1/2)) \cdot 0.1$: $p_i = q_i + (1-2X_i) \cdot 0.1$, where $X_i \sim Bern(1/2)$, i.e., slightly disturbed but unbiased predictions.

In case the p_i are smaller than zero then p_i is set to zero, and if they are bigger than one set to one.

D.2.3. Sample Size. Sample sizes considered are $n = \{300, 1000\}$.

D.2.4. Number of DGM Scenarios and Simulation Runs.

- |# options for dist. Y $|\cdot| \#$ options for dist. p $= 7 \cdot 4 = 28$ scenarios.
- N = 5000 simulation repetitions per scenario.

D.3. Estimand/Target of Analysis.

- Mean of BS.
- 2.5% and 97.5% quantile of BS.

D.4. Methods.

D.4.1. Basis of Simulations. The simulation is run as a Monte-Carlo simulation, where for the two settings based on NHANES data, the q_i are based on the predicted value of the logistic regression for the corresponding observation, and the q_i are subsampled without replacement.

D.5. Performance Measures.

- Median of BS calculated as sample median.
- 2.5% and 97.5% quantile of BS calculated as corresponding quantiles.
- CIL and its comparison to the BS.
- estimate the probability that \$\bar{y} \bar{y}^2 > BS_{perf}\$.
 estimate the median of \$\bar{y} \bar{y}^2 BS_{perf}\$.

References

- [1] Assessing performance and clinical usefulness in prediction models with survival outcomes: Practical guidance for cox proportional hazards models. Annals of Internal Medicine, 176(1):105–114, 2023. PMID: 36571841.
- [2]Laha Ale, Robert Gentleman, Teresa Filshtein Sonmez, Deepayan Sarkar, and Christopher Endres. nhanesa: achieving transparency and reproducibility in nhanes research. Database, Apr 15, 2024.
- [3] P. Armitage, G. Berry, and J.N.S. Matthews. Statistical Methods in Medical Research. Oxford statistical science series. Wiley, 2001.
- [4] Melissa Assel, Daniel D. Sjoberg, and Andrew J. Vickers. The brier score does not evaluate the clinical utility of diagnostic tests or prediction models. Diagnostic and Prognostic Research, 1(1), December 2017.
- Melissa Assel, Daniel D. Sjoberg, and Andrew J. Vickers. The Brier score does not evaluate the clinical utility of diagnostic tests or prediction models. Diagnostic and Prognostic Research, 1(1):19, December 2017.
- [6] Peter C. Austin and Ewout W. Steverberg. The integrated calibration index (ici) and related metrics for quantifying the calibration of logistic regression models. Statistics in Medicine, 38(21):4051-4065, 2019.
- G. W. Brier. Verification of forecasts expressed in terms of probability. Monthly Weather Review, 78(1):1 3, 1950.
- Simon Byrne. A note on the use of empirical AUC for evaluating probabilistic forecasts. Electronic Journal of Statistics, [8] 10(1):380 - 393, 2016.
- Ben Van Calster, Gary S. Collins, Andrew J. Vickers, Laure Wynants, Kathleen F. Kerr, Lasai Barrenada, Gael Varoquaux, [9] Karandeep Singh, Karel G. M. Moons, Tina Hernandez-boussard, Dirk Timmerman, David J. Mclernon, Maarten Van Smeden, and Ewout W. Steyerberg. Performance evaluation of predictive ai models to support medical decisions: Overview and guidance, 2024.
- [10] Alex Carriero, Kim Luijken, Anne de Hond, Karel G. M. Moons, Ben van Calster, and Maarten van Smeden. The harms of class imbalance corrections for machine learning based prediction models: A simulation study. Statistics in Medicine, 44(3?4), January 2025.
- [11] George Casella and Roger Berger. Statistical Inference. Duxbury Resource Center, June 2001.
- [12] Evangelia Christodoulou, Jie Ma, Gary S. Collins, Ewout W. Steyerberg, Jan Y. Verbakel, and Ben Van Calster. A systematic review shows no performance benefit of machine learning over logistic regression for clinical prediction models. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, 110:12?22, June 2019.
- [13] Peter Flach. Performance evaluation in machine learning: The good, the bad, the ugly, and the way forward. Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, 33(01):9808?9814, July 2019.
- [14] Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). Nhanes 2007-2008, 2009.
- [15] C.F. Gauss, J. Bertrand, and H.F. Trotter. Gauss's Work (1803-1826) on the Theory of Least Squares. Statistical Techniques Research Group, Section of Mathematical Statistics, Department of Mathematical [sic], Princeton University, 1957.
- [16] H.O. Georgii. Stochastics: Introduction to Probability and Statistics. De Gruyter textbook. Walter De Gruyter, 2008.
- [17] Tilmann Gneiting and Adrian E Raftery. Strictly proper scoring rules, prediction, and estimation. Journal of the American Statistical Association, 102(477):359-378, 2007.
- David J. Hand. Assessing the performance of classification methods. International Statistical Review, 80(3):400-414, 2012. [18]
- [19] F.E. Harrell. Regression Modeling Strategies: With Applications to Linear Models, Logistic and Ordinal Regression, and Survival Analysis. Springer Series in Statistics. Springer International Publishing, 2015.
- [20] Frank E Harrell Jr. rms: Regression Modeling Strategies, 2025. R package version 7.0-0.
- [21] Chenxi Huang, Shu-Xia Li, César Caraballo, Frederick A. Masoudi, John S. Rumsfeld, John A. Spertus, Sharon-Lise T. Normand, Bobak J. Mortazavi, and Harlan M. Krumholz. Performance metrics for the comparative analysis of clinical risk prediction models employing machine learning. Circulation: Cardiovascular Quality and Outcomes, 14(10):e007526, 2021.
- [22] B. Illowsky and S. Dean. Introductory Statistics 2e. OpenStax, 2013.
- [23] Gareth James, Daniela Witten, Trevor Hastie, and Robert Tibshirani. An Introduction to Statistical Learning: with Applications in R. Springer, 2013.
- [24] Stephen Jewson. The problem with the brier score, 2004.
- [25] William J. Mackillop and Carol F. Quirt. Measuring the accuracy of prognostic judgments in oncology. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, 50(1):21?29, January 1997.
- [26] Tim P. Morris, Ian R. White, and Michael J. Crowther. Using simulation studies to evaluate statistical methods. Statistics in Medicine, 38(11):2074–2102, 2019.
- [27] H. Motulsky. Intuitive Biostatistics: A Nonmathematical Guide to Statistical Thinking. Oxford University Press, 2010.
- [28] Donald A. Redelmeier, Daniel A. Bloch, and David H. Hickam. Assessing predictive accuracy: How to compare brier scores. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, 44(11):1141?1146, January 1991.
- [29]K.J. Rothman, S. Greenland, and T.L. Lash. Modern Epidemiology. Wolters Kluwer Health/Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, 2008.

LINARD HOESSLY

- [30] Kaspar Rufibach. Use of brier score to assess binary predictions. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology, 63(8):938?939, August 2010.
- [31] E.W. Steyerberg. Clinical Prediction Models: A Practical Approach to Development, Validation, and Updating. Statistics for Biology and Health. Springer International Publishing, 2019.
- [32] Ewout W Steyerberg, Frank E Harrell, Gerard J.J.M Borsboom, M.J.C Eijkemans, Yvonne Vergouwe, and J.Dik F Habbema. Internal validation of predictive models. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 54(8):774?781, August 2001.
- [33] Ewout W. Steyerberg, Andrew J. Vickers, Nancy R. Cook, Thomas Gerds, Mithat Gonen, Nancy Obuchowski, Michael J. Pencina, and Michael W. Kattan. Assessing the performance of prediction models. *Epidemiology*, 21(1):128?138, Jan 2010.
- [34] Ewout W Steyerberg, Andrew J Vickers, Nancy R Cook, Thomas Gerds, Mithat Gonen, Nancy Obuchowski, Michael J Pencina, and Michael W Kattan. Assessing the performance of prediction models: a framework for traditional and novel measures. *Epidemiology*, 21(1):128–138, January 2010.
- [35] Ben Van Calster, David J. McLernon, Maarten van Smeden, Laure Wynants, Ewout W. Steyerberg, Patrick Bossuyt, Gary S. Collins, Petra Macaskill, David J. McLernon, Karel G. M. Moons, Ewout W. Steyerberg, Ben Van Calster, Maarten van Smeden, Andrew J. Vickers, and On behalf of Topic Group 'Evaluating diagnostic tests and prediction models' of the STRATOS initiative. Calibration: the Achilles heel of predictive analytics. *BMC Medicine*, 17(1):230, December 2019.
- [36] Nan van Geloven, Daniele Giardiello, Edouard F Bonneville, Lucy Teece, Chava L Ramspek, Maarten van Smeden, Kym I E Snell, Ben van Calster, Maja Pohar-Perme, Richard D Riley, Hein Putter, and Ewout Steyerberg. Validation of prediction models in the presence of competing risks: a guide through modern methods. *BMJ*, 377, 2022.
- [37] Larry Wasserman. All of statistics : a concise course in statistical inference. Springer, New York, 2010.
- [38] Yun-Chun Wu and Wen-Chung Lee. Alternative performance measures for prediction models. PLOS ONE, 9(3):1–6, 03 2014.
- [39] J.Frank Yates. External correspondence: Decompositions of the mean probability score. Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 30(1):132?156, August 1982.

Data Center of the Swiss Transplant Cohort Study, University Basel & university hospital Basel, Basel, 4031 Switzerland

Email address: linard.hoessly@hotmail.com