Proper and equitable scores: a resolved dilemma

Zied Ben Bouallègue

7th International Verification Methods Workshop Berlin, May 8-11, 2017



Definitions

In a nutshell:

- a **proper score** is based on a scoring rule consistent with the forecast interpretation
- an equitable score is a score for which all unskilful forecasts have the same expected score





Proper Scores for Probability Forecasts Can Never Be Equitable

Jolliffe and Stephenson, 2008

"It would be ideal to have a verification score that is both proper and equitable, but ..."



Elementary scoring matrix

Scoring matrix for forecast z, verification y, event threshold θ , penalty asymmetry α :

$$\begin{array}{c|c} y \geq \theta \\ 1 & 0 \\ z \geq \theta & 1 & 0 & \alpha \\ 0 & 1 - \alpha & 0 \end{array}$$

Asymmetry

- penalty α in case of a false alarm
- penalty 1- α in case of a missed event

Elementary score for probabilistic forecasts

• defined for a given threshold θ and a given asymmetry α :

$$s_{\alpha,\theta}(z,y) = \begin{cases} 1-\alpha & \text{if} \quad y \ge \theta > z \\ \alpha & \text{if} \quad z \ge \theta > y \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

- consistent scoring rule for **quantile forecasts** at probability level 1α
- block unit for the definition of proper probabilistic scores

(Ehm et al. 2016)

• elementary skill score: forecast economic value for a user with a cost/loss ratio α

Forecast Skill Card

Elementary skill score as a function of :

- probability level 1α
- event base rate π







• Fixed event:

integrate elementary (skill) score over a vertical line : Brier (skill) score





• Fixed event:

integrate elementary (skill) score over a vertical line : Brier (skill) score

• Fixed probability level:

integrate elementary (skill) score over a horizontal line : Quantile (skill) score



• Fixed event:

integrate elementary (skill) score over a vertical line : Brier (skill) score

- Fixed probability level:
 - integrate elementary (skill) score over a horizontal line : Quantile (skill) score
- All events and probability levels:

integrate elementary (skill) score over the whole 2d card: Continuous ranked prob. (skill) score





• Fixed event:

integrate elementary (skill) score over a vertical line : Brier (skill) score

• Fixed probability level:

integrate elementary (skill) score over a horizontal line : Quantile (skill) score

• All events and probability levels:

integrate elementary (skill) score over the whole 2d card: Continuous ranked prob. (skill) score

New approach:

• Fixed relationship between probability level and event base rate:

 $\alpha = \pi$

integrate elementary (skill) score over the ascendant diagonal:

Diagonal (skill) score



Threshold

Diagonal score(s)

Family of scores:

• Elementary diagonal scores :

```
expected score \propto 1 - (H - F) (H= hit rate, F=false alarm rate)
```

- Ranked version : sum of elementary diagonal scores
- Continuous version : integral over all α

Proprieties:

- **Proper**: based on consistent scoring rules
- Equitable: same expected score when H=F





Synthetic dataset

Toy-model :

• Observation $Y \mid \mu \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu, \sigma^2)$ with $\mu \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1 - \sigma^2)$

• Forecast
$$F \mid \mu \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu + b, \sigma^2)$$
 with $\mu \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1 - \sigma^2)$

(Lerch et al. 2017)

b= forecast bias

 σ governs predictability (ex: small σ , high signal-to-noise ratio)

- $\sigma=0$ perfect det. forecast
- $\sigma=1$ unconditional forecast



Score properties

Scores as a function of the signal-to-noise ratio:



(a) norm. Brier score (b) norm. diagonal score for $\pi = 2/3$

- -- unconditional forecast
- --- perfect forecast
- biased forecast (b=0.5)
 - biased forecast (b=1)

• Decomposition of the scores into UNC - RES + REL

• Discrimination (resolution): necessary and sufficient condition for skill in (b)

Score properties

Scores as a function of the forecast bias:



(a) norm. Brier score (b) norm. diagonal score for $\pi = 2/3$ $\sigma = 0.75$

- --- unconditional forecast
- --- perfect forecast
- biased forecast

- Score minimised when the forecast bias is zero (reliable forecast)
- Symmetry around unbiased forecast score and convergence towards uncond. forecast score in (b)



The impenetrable hedge: a note on propriety, equitability and consistency Jolliffe, 2008

"It is plausible that asymmetric scores may be required when cost and loss functions are taken into account, but to have highly **asymmetric scores determined solely by the base rate** seems less plausible"



Diagonal score interpretation

Diagonal scores:

- Assume a fixed relationship between event base rate and cost-loss ratio ($\alpha = \pi$)
 - o user's risk aversion increases with the intensity of the event under focus
 - appropriate for user with interest for high impact weather: rare events (small π) **and** potential high losses (small α)
- Focus on the maximum discriminative ability of the system

(Manzato 2006)





2m-temperature

IFS ensemble performance as a function of the forecast lead time:



Lead time [days]

Skill scores based onBrier score

Diagonal score

for $\pi = 2/3$

Summary

- **Elementary score** : block score unit for the definition of consistent scoring rules ٠
- Forecast skill card : elementary skill scores as the event and probability level varies ٠
- **Diagonal score** : new summary score with *interesting* interpretations and properties ٠





 $y \ge \theta$

References

Ehm W., T. Gneiting, A. Jordan and F. Krüger, 2016. Of Quantiles and Expectiles: Consistent Scoring Functions, Choquet Representations, and Forecast Rankings, J.R. Statist. Soc. B, 136,1505-1510.

Jolliffe I.T. and D.B. Stephenson, 2008. Proper scores for probability forecasts can never be equitable. Mon. Weather Rev., 136,1505-1510.

Jolliffe I.T., 2008. The impenetrable hedge: a note on propriety, equitability and consistency. Met. Apps, 15, 25-29.

Lerch S., T. L. Thorarinsdottir, F. Ravazzolo and T. Gneiting, 2017. Forecaster's Dilemma: Extreme Events and Forecast Evaluation, Statist. Sci., 32, 106-127.

Manzato A., 2006. A Note On the Maximum Peirce Skill Score, Wea. Forecasting, 22, 1148-1154.