

Neural Ensemble Search for Performant and Calibrated Predictions

Sheheryar Zaidi^{1*}

Chris Holmes¹

Arber Zela^{2*}

Frank Hutter^{2,3}

Thomas Elsken²

Yee Whye Teh¹

¹University of Oxford

²University of Freiburg

³Bosch Center for Artificial Intelligence

July 2020



DEPARTMENT OF
STATISTICS



Quantifying Uncertainty in Deep Learning

Why is uncertainty important?

- **Predictive uncertainty** can be for instance the output label together with the confidence of that prediction in classification

Quantifying Uncertainty in Deep Learning

Why is uncertainty important?

- **Predictive uncertainty** can be for instance the output label together with the confidence of that prediction in classification
- Good uncertainty estimates quantify how much we **can trust our model's predictions**

Quantifying Uncertainty in Deep Learning

Why is uncertainty important?

- **Predictive uncertainty** can be for instance the output label together with the confidence of that prediction in classification
- Good uncertainty estimates quantify how much we **can trust our model's predictions**
- Some applications where uncertainty quantification is important are:

Quantifying Uncertainty in Deep Learning

Why is uncertainty important?

- **Predictive uncertainty** can be for instance the output label together with the confidence of that prediction in classification
- Good uncertainty estimates quantify how much we **can trust our model's predictions**
- Some applications where uncertainty quantification is important are:
 - Cost-sensitive decision making (healthcare e.g. medical imaging; self-driving cars; robotics)

Quantifying Uncertainty in Deep Learning

Why is uncertainty important?

- **Predictive uncertainty** can be for instance the output label together with the confidence of that prediction in classification
- Good uncertainty estimates quantify how much we **can trust our model's predictions**
- Some applications where uncertainty quantification is important are:
 - Cost-sensitive decision making (healthcare e.g. medical imaging; self-driving cars; robotics)
 - Dealing with distribution shift (Feature skew between train and test sets; test inputs do not belong to any of the training classes)

Quantifying Uncertainty in Deep Learning

Why is uncertainty important?

- **Predictive uncertainty** can be for instance the output label together with the confidence of that prediction in classification
- Good uncertainty estimates quantify how much we **can trust our model's predictions**
- Some applications where uncertainty quantification is important are:
 - Cost-sensitive decision making (healthcare e.g. medical imaging; self-driving cars; robotics)
 - Dealing with distribution shift (Feature skew between train and test sets; test inputs do not belong to any of the training classes)
 - Safe exploration in RL, etc.

Quantifying Uncertainty in Deep Learning

Why is uncertainty important?

- **Predictive uncertainty** can be for instance the output label together with the confidence of that prediction in classification
- Good uncertainty estimates quantify how much we **can trust our model's predictions**
- Some applications where uncertainty quantification is important are:
 - Cost-sensitive decision making (healthcare e.g. medical imaging; self-driving cars; robotics)
 - Dealing with distribution shift (Feature skew between train and test sets; test inputs do not belong to any of the training classes)
 - Safe exploration in RL, etc.
- Ideally we want a system that **knows what it doesn't know**.

Calibration and Robustness to dataset shift

Are deep neural networks calibrated and robust to OOD data?

- Calibration tells us how well the predicted confidence (*probability of correctness*) of the model aligns with the observed accuracy (*frequency of correctness*).

Calibration and Robustness to dataset shift

Are deep neural networks calibrated and robust to OOD data?

- Calibration tells us how well the predicted confidence (*probability of correctness*) of the model aligns with the observed accuracy (*frequency of correctness*).
- E.g. in image classification: if the correct predicted class was always with 80% probability, then a perfectly calibrated system would imply that on 80% of the examples it predicted the true class.

Calibration and Robustness to dataset shift

Are deep neural networks calibrated and robust to OOD data?

- Calibration tells us how well the predicted confidence (*probability of correctness*) of the model aligns with the observed accuracy (*frequency of correctness*).
- E.g. in image classification: if the correct predicted class was always with 80% probability, then a perfectly calibrated system would imply that on 80% of the examples it predicted the true class.
- Usually neural networks are **not well-calibrated** making overconfident or underconfident predictions

Calibration and Robustness to dataset shift

Are deep neural networks calibrated and robust to OOD data?

- Calibration tells us how well the predicted confidence (*probability of correctness*) of the model aligns with the observed accuracy (*frequency of correctness*).
- E.g. in image classification: if the correct predicted class was always with 80% probability, then a perfectly calibrated system would imply that on 80% of the examples it predicted the true class.
- Usually neural networks are **not well-calibrated** making overconfident or underconfident predictions
- Moreover, they are fragile, i.e. **they do not have high uncertainty** on out-of-distribution (OOD) inputs.

Ensembles of neural networks

Starting point

- *Ensembles* of networks are commonly used to boost performance.

Ensembles of neural networks

Starting point

- *Ensembles* of networks are commonly used to boost performance.
- Recent interest in ensembles has been due to their strong *predictive uncertainty estimation* and *robustness to distributional shift*.

Ensembles of neural networks

Starting point

- *Ensembles* of networks are commonly used to boost performance.
- Recent interest in ensembles has been due to their strong *predictive uncertainty estimation* and *robustness to distributional shift*.
- Diversity among the *base learners'* predictions is believed to be key for strong ensembles.

Ensembles of neural networks

On diversity in ensembles

- Notation: f_{θ} is a network with weights θ , and $\ell(f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}), y)$ is the loss for (\mathbf{x}, y) . Define the ensemble of M networks $f_{\theta_1}, \dots, f_{\theta_M}$ by $F(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M f_{\theta_i}(\mathbf{x})$.

Ensembles of neural networks

On diversity in ensembles

- Notation: f_θ is a network with weights θ , and $\ell(f_\theta(\mathbf{x}), y)$ is the loss for (\mathbf{x}, y) . Define the ensemble of M networks $f_{\theta_1}, \dots, f_{\theta_M}$ by $F(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M f_{\theta_i}(\mathbf{x})$.
- **Average base learner loss:** $\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \ell(f_{\theta_i}(\mathbf{x}), y)$.

Ensembles of neural networks

On diversity in ensembles

- Notation: f_θ is a network with weights θ , and $\ell(f_\theta(\mathbf{x}), y)$ is the loss for (\mathbf{x}, y) . Define the ensemble of M networks $f_{\theta_1}, \dots, f_{\theta_M}$ by $F(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M f_{\theta_i}(\mathbf{x})$.
- **Average base learner loss:** $\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \ell(f_{\theta_i}(\mathbf{x}), y)$.
- **Oracle ensemble:** given $f_{\theta_1}, \dots, f_{\theta_M}$, the oracle ensemble F_{OE} is defined as

$$F_{\text{OE}}(\mathbf{x}) = f_{\theta_k}(\mathbf{x}), \quad \text{where } k \in \underset{i}{\operatorname{argmin}} \ell(f_{\theta_i}(\mathbf{x}), y).$$

Ensembles of neural networks

On diversity in ensembles

- Notation: f_θ is a network with weights θ , and $\ell(f_\theta(\mathbf{x}), y)$ is the loss for (\mathbf{x}, y) . Define the ensemble of M networks $f_{\theta_1}, \dots, f_{\theta_M}$ by $F(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M f_{\theta_i}(\mathbf{x})$.
- **Average base learner loss:** $\frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \ell(f_{\theta_i}(\mathbf{x}), y)$.
- **Oracle ensemble:** given $f_{\theta_1}, \dots, f_{\theta_M}$, the oracle ensemble F_{OE} is defined as

$$F_{\text{OE}}(\mathbf{x}) = f_{\theta_k}(\mathbf{x}), \quad \text{where } k \in \underset{i}{\operatorname{argmin}} \ell(f_{\theta_i}(\mathbf{x}), y).$$

- As a rule of thumb, *small oracle ensemble loss indicates more diverse base learner predictions.*

Ensembles of neural networks

On diversity in ensembles

Proposition

Suppose ℓ is negative log-likelihood (NLL). Then, the oracle ensemble loss, ensemble loss, and average base learner loss satisfy the following inequality:

$$\ell(F_{OE}(\mathbf{x}), y) \leq \ell(F(\mathbf{x}), y) \leq \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M \ell(f_{\theta_i}(\mathbf{x}), y).$$

Proof.

Direct application of Jensen's inequality for the right inequality and definition of oracle ensemble for the left one. □

Ensembles of neural networks

Deep Ensembles

- For classification, ensembles are typically constructed as follows. This is referred to as *deep ensembles* (Lakshminarayanan et al., 2017).
 1. Independently train multiple copies of a *fixed* architecture with different random initializations.
 2. Create ensemble by averaging outputs, i.e. predicted distributions over the classes.

Ensembles of neural networks

Deep Ensembles

- For classification, ensembles are typically constructed as follows. This is referred to as *deep ensembles* (Lakshminarayanan et al., 2017).
 1. Independently train multiple copies of a *fixed* architecture with different random initializations.
 2. Create ensemble by averaging outputs, i.e. predicted distributions over the classes.
- The *fixed* architecture used for the base learners is usually a strong architecture which is hand-crafted or found using Neural Architecture Search (NAS).

Ensembles of neural networks

Deep Ensembles

- For classification, ensembles are typically constructed as follows. This is referred to as *deep ensembles* (Lakshminarayanan et al., 2017).
 1. Independently train multiple copies of a *fixed* architecture with different random initializations.
 2. Create ensemble by averaging outputs, i.e. predicted distributions over the classes.
- The *fixed* architecture used for the base learners is usually a strong architecture which is hand-crafted or found using Neural Architecture Search (NAS).
- **Our work:**
 - Varying the base learner architectures increases diversity → ensembles have better predictive performance and uncertainty, in-distribution and during shift.
 - Neural Ensemble Search (NES): we propose two algorithms for finding base learner architectures that combine to form strong ensembles.

Varying vs. fixed base learner architectures

Visualizing base learner predictions using t-SNE on CIFAR-10




Figure: **Left:** Predictions of 5 different archs, each trained with 20 different inits. **Right:** Predictions of base learners in an ensemble with varying archs (found using NES) vs. fixed arch (deep ensemble of optimized arch).

Neural Ensemble Search

General approach

- Our approach for finding base learner architectures that optimize ensemble performance consists of two steps. Let $f_{\theta, \alpha}$ denote a network with arch α and weights θ . Computational budget denoted by K and ensemble size by M .

Neural Ensemble Search

General approach

- Our approach for finding base learner architectures that optimize ensemble performance consists of two steps. Let $f_{\theta, \alpha}$ denote a network with arch α and weights θ . Computational budget denoted by K and ensemble size by M .
 1. **Pool building:** build a *pool* $\mathcal{P} = \{f_{\theta_1, \alpha_1}, \dots, f_{\theta_K, \alpha_K}\}$ of size K consisting of potential base learners, where each f_{θ_i, α_i} is a network trained independently on $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$.

Neural Ensemble Search

General approach

- Our approach for finding base learner architectures that optimize ensemble performance consists of two steps. Let $f_{\theta, \alpha}$ denote a network with arch α and weights θ . Computational budget denoted by K and ensemble size by M .
 1. **Pool building:** build a *pool* $\mathcal{P} = \{f_{\theta_1, \alpha_1}, \dots, f_{\theta_K, \alpha_K}\}$ of size K consisting of potential base learners, where each f_{θ_i, α_i} is a network trained independently on $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$.
 2. **Ensemble selection:** select M base learners $f_{\theta_1^*, \alpha_1^*}, \dots, f_{\theta_M^*, \alpha_M^*}$ from \mathcal{P} to form an ensemble which minimizes loss on \mathcal{D}_{val} . (We assume $K \geq M$.)

Neural Ensemble Search

General approach

- Our approach for finding base learner architectures that optimize ensemble performance consists of two steps. Let $f_{\theta, \alpha}$ denote a network with arch α and weights θ . Computational budget denoted by K and ensemble size by M .
 1. **Pool building:** build a *pool* $\mathcal{P} = \{f_{\theta_1, \alpha_1}, \dots, f_{\theta_K, \alpha_K}\}$ of size K consisting of potential base learners, where each f_{θ_i, α_i} is a network trained independently on $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$.
 2. **Ensemble selection:** select M base learners $f_{\theta_1^*, \alpha_1^*}, \dots, f_{\theta_M^*, \alpha_M^*}$ from \mathcal{P} to form an ensemble which minimizes loss on \mathcal{D}_{val} . (We assume $K \geq M$.)
- For step 2, we use forward step-wise selection without replacement: given pool \mathcal{P} , start with an empty ensemble and add to it the network from \mathcal{P} which minimizes ensemble loss on \mathcal{D}_{val} . We repeat this without replacement until the ensemble is of size M . (Caruana et al., 2004)

Neural Ensemble Search

General approach

- Our approach for finding base learner architectures that optimize ensemble performance consists of two steps. Let $f_{\theta, \alpha}$ denote a network with arch α and weights θ . Computational budget denoted by K and ensemble size by M .
 1. **Pool building:** build a *pool* $\mathcal{P} = \{f_{\theta_1, \alpha_1}, \dots, f_{\theta_K, \alpha_K}\}$ of size K consisting of potential base learners, where each f_{θ_i, α_i} is a network trained independently on $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$.
 2. **Ensemble selection:** select M base learners $f_{\theta_1^*, \alpha_1^*}, \dots, f_{\theta_M^*, \alpha_M^*}$ from \mathcal{P} to form an ensemble which minimizes loss on \mathcal{D}_{val} . (We assume $K \geq M$.)
- For step 2, we use forward step-wise selection without replacement: given pool \mathcal{P} , start with an empty ensemble and add to it the network from \mathcal{P} which minimizes ensemble loss on \mathcal{D}_{val} . We repeat this without replacement until the ensemble is of size M . (Caruana et al., 2004)
- Next, we discuss two options for pool building in step 1.

Neural Ensemble Search

NES-RS: with random search

- NES-RS is a simple random search (RS) based approach: we build the pool by sampling K architectures uniformly at random.
- Motivation: in NAS, RS is a competitive baseline on well-designed architecture search spaces. Applying ensemble selection to the pool of randomly sampled archs is then a simple way to exploit diversity among varying archs.

Neural Ensemble Search

NES-RS: with random search

Algorithm 1: NES with Random Search

Data: Search space \mathcal{A} ; ensemble size M ; comp. budget K ; $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{val}}$.

- 1 Sample K architectures $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_K$ independently and uniformly from \mathcal{A} .
 - 2 Train each architecture α_i using $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$, yielding a pool of networks
 $\mathcal{P} = \{f_{\theta_1, \alpha_1}, \dots, f_{\theta_K, \alpha_K}\}$.
 - 3 Select base learners $\{f_{\theta_1^*, \alpha_1^*}, \dots, f_{\theta_M^*, \alpha_M^*}\} = \text{ForwardSelect}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{val}}, M)$ by forward step-wise selection without replacement.
 - 4 **return** ensemble $\text{Ensemble}(f_{\theta_1^*, \alpha_1^*}, \dots, f_{\theta_M^*, \alpha_M^*})$
-

Figure: NES-RS. $f_{\theta, \alpha}$ is a network with *weights* θ and *architecture* α .

Neural Ensemble Search

NES-RE: with Regularized Evolution

- NES-RE uses another approach for pool building inspired by regularized evolution (Real et al., 2018). The arch search space is explored by *evolving a population of architectures*.




Figure: One iteration of NES-RE. Network architectures are represented as colored bars of different lengths illustrating different layers and widths. The pool returned is the set of *all architectures evaluated*.

Neural Ensemble Search

NES-RE: with Regularized Evolution

Figure: NES-RE. $f_{\theta, \alpha}$ is a network with *weights* θ and *architecture* α .

Algorithm 2: NES with Regularized Evolution

Data: Search space \mathcal{A} ; ensemble size M ; comp. budget K ; $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{val}}$; population size P ; number of parent candidates m .

Neural Ensemble Search

NES-RE: with Regularized Evolution

Figure: NES-RE. $f_{\theta, \alpha}$ is a network with *weights* θ and *architecture* α .

Algorithm 2: NES with Regularized Evolution

Data: Search space \mathcal{A} ; ensemble size M ; comp. budget K ; $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{val}}$; population size P ; number of parent candidates m .

- 1 Sample P architectures $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_P$ independently and uniformly from \mathcal{A} .
- 2 Train each architecture α_i using $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$, and initialize $\mathfrak{p} = \mathcal{P} = \{f_{\theta_1, \alpha_1}, \dots, f_{\theta_P, \alpha_P}\}$.

Neural Ensemble Search

NES-RE: with Regularized Evolution

Figure: NES-RE. $f_{\theta,\alpha}$ is a network with *weights* θ and *architecture* α .

Algorithm 2: NES with Regularized Evolution

Data: Search space \mathcal{A} ; ensemble size M ; comp. budget K ; $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{val}}$; population size P ; number of parent candidates m .

- 1 Sample P architectures $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_P$ independently and uniformly from \mathcal{A} .
- 2 Train each architecture α_i using $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$, and initialize $\mathfrak{p} = \mathcal{P} = \{f_{\theta_1, \alpha_1}, \dots, f_{\theta_P, \alpha_P}\}$.
- 3 **while** $|\mathcal{P}| < K$ **do**
- 4 Select m parent candidates $\{f_{\tilde{\theta}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_1}, \dots, f_{\tilde{\theta}_m, \tilde{\alpha}_m}\} = \text{ForwardSelect}(\mathfrak{p}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{val}}, m)$.
- 5 Sample uniformly a parent architecture α from $\{\tilde{\alpha}_1, \dots, \tilde{\alpha}_m\}$. // parent stays in \mathfrak{p} .
- 6 Apply mutation to α , yielding child architecture β .
- 7 Train β using $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$ and add the trained network $f_{\theta, \beta}$ to \mathfrak{p} and \mathcal{P} .
- 8 Remove the oldest member in \mathfrak{p} . // as done in RE [44].

Neural Ensemble Search

NES-RE: with Regularized Evolution

Figure: NES-RE. $f_{\theta,\alpha}$ is a network with *weights* θ and *architecture* α .

Algorithm 2: NES with Regularized Evolution

Data: Search space \mathcal{A} ; ensemble size M ; comp. budget K ; $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{val}}$; population size P ; number of parent candidates m .

- 1 Sample P architectures $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_P$ independently and uniformly from \mathcal{A} .
 - 2 Train each architecture α_i using $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$, and initialize $\mathfrak{p} = \mathcal{P} = \{f_{\theta_1, \alpha_1}, \dots, f_{\theta_P, \alpha_P}\}$.
 - 3 **while** $|\mathcal{P}| < K$ **do**
 - 4 Select m parent candidates $\{f_{\tilde{\theta}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_1}, \dots, f_{\tilde{\theta}_m, \tilde{\alpha}_m}\} = \text{ForwardSelect}(\mathfrak{p}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{val}}, m)$.
 - 5 Sample uniformly a parent architecture α from $\{\tilde{\alpha}_1, \dots, \tilde{\alpha}_m\}$. // parent stays in \mathfrak{p} .
 - 6 Apply mutation to α , yielding child architecture β .
 - 7 Train β using $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$ and add the trained network $f_{\theta, \beta}$ to \mathfrak{p} and \mathcal{P} .
 - 8 Remove the oldest member in \mathfrak{p} . // as done in RE [44].
 - 9 Select base learners $\{f_{\theta_1^*, \alpha_1^*}, \dots, f_{\theta_M^*, \alpha_M^*}\} = \text{ForwardSelect}(\mathcal{P}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{val}}, M)$ by forward step-wise selection without replacement.
 - 10 **return** ensemble $\text{Ensemble}(f_{\theta_1^*, \alpha_1^*}, \dots, f_{\theta_M^*, \alpha_M^*})$
-

Experimental results

On Fashion-MNIST

- We compare ensembles found by NES with the baseline of deep ensembles composed of a fixed, optimized architecture; the optimized arch is either DARTS, AmoebaNet or optimized by RS.




Figure: Negative log-likelihood achieved by ensembles on test data. Note that AmoebaNet arch is deeper than all other methods shown. M is ensemble size.

Ensemble Adaptation to Dataset Shift

- We assume that at test time, the data will contain a distributional shift(s) wrt training data. The shift(s) is assumed to be unknown at training time.

Ensemble Adaptation to Dataset Shift

- We assume that at test time, the data will contain a distributional shift(s) wrt training data. The shift(s) is assumed to be unknown at training time.
- We consider the case where a validation dataset with *validation* shift(s) is available.

Ensemble Adaptation to Dataset Shift

- We assume that at test time, the data will contain a distributional shift(s) wrt training data. The shift(s) is assumed to be unknown at training time.
- We consider the case where a validation dataset with *validation* shift(s) is available.
- To adapt the ensembles to shift, simply replace \mathcal{D}_{val} with the shifted validation dataset $\mathcal{D}_{\text{val}}^{\text{shift}}$.

Ensemble Adaptation to Dataset Shift

- We assume that at test time, the data will contain a distributional shift(s) wrt training data. The shift(s) is assumed to be unknown at training time.
- We consider the case where a validation dataset with *validation* shift(s) is available.
- To adapt the ensembles to shift, simply replace \mathcal{D}_{val} with the shifted validation dataset $\mathcal{D}_{\text{val}}^{\text{shift}}$.
- Roughly (and heuristically), diversity in ensembles is particularly useful during shift, because baselearners can make different predictions during uncertainty. Using a shifted validation allows NES algorithms to “consider” what happens to baselearners when they’re used during shift (and are likely to fail).

Experimental results

On CIFAR-10-C (Hendrycks & Dietterich, 2019)




Figure: Test NLL of ensembles. Top row involves no distributional shifts. Bottom row involves shift with maximum severity available in CIFAR-10-C.

Experimental results: predictive uncertainty calibration and classification error

On CIFAR-10-C (Hendrycks & Dietterich, 2019)


Shift Severity	M	Classification Error (out of 1)					Expected Calibration Error (ECE)				
		NES-RS	NES-RE	DeepEns (RS)	DeepEns (DARTS)	DeepEns (AmoebaNet)	NES-RS	NES-RE	DeepEns (RS)	DeepEns (DARTS)	DeepEns (AmoebaNet)
0 (no shift)	5	0.098 ± 0.001	0.098 ± 0.002	0.112 ± 0.002	0.101	0.098	0.012 ± 0.001	0.013 ± 0.002	0.011 ± 0.002	0.015	0.016
	10	0.094 ± 0.001	0.094 ± 0.002	0.108 ± 0.002	0.100	0.097	0.012 ± 0.001	0.013 ± 0.001	0.011 ± 0.001	0.011	0.013
	30	0.092 ± 0.001	0.092 ± 0.001	0.105 ± 0.002	0.095	0.094	0.012 ± 0.001	0.012 ± 0.001	0.012 ± 0.001	0.011	0.012
3	5	0.238 ± 0.002	0.233 ± 0.003	0.255 ± 0.007	0.266	0.267	0.045 ± 0.002	0.044 ± 0.002	0.062 ± 0.002	0.075	0.085
	10	0.232 ± 0.002	0.229 ± 0.002	0.251 ± 0.007	0.263	0.256	0.034 ± 0.001	0.033 ± 0.002	0.052 ± 0.002	0.067	0.064
	30	0.231 ± 0.001	0.228 ± 0.002	0.249 ± 0.007	0.258	0.252	0.029 ± 0.001	0.028 ± 0.002	0.049 ± 0.002	0.057	0.054
5	5	0.387 ± 0.003	0.376 ± 0.003	0.415 ± 0.011	0.429	0.438	0.117 ± 0.004	0.115 ± 0.008	0.152 ± 0.002	0.177	0.199
	10	0.380 ± 0.002	0.374 ± 0.004	0.411 ± 0.009	0.429	0.427	0.104 ± 0.004	0.105 ± 0.007	0.144 ± 0.002	0.168	0.174
	30	0.382 ± 0.002	0.375 ± 0.003	0.408 ± 0.009	0.427	0.422	0.103 ± 0.002	0.102 ± 0.006	0.136 ± 0.003	0.160	0.160

Figure: Classification error and ECE of ensembles on test data. ECE measures uncertainty calibration, that is, the mismatch between the model's confidence and accuracy. Smaller ECE is better.

Experimental results: diversity vs. average base learner strength

On CIFAR-10-C (Hendrycks & Dietterich, 2019)

- Strong ensembles require not only strong base learners but also diverse ones.
- One measurement of diversity is the *oracle ensemble loss*. Recall: **small oracle ensemble loss corresponds to high diversity**.



Summary

- Recent interest in ensembles has been due to their strong *predictive uncertainty estimation* and *robustness to distributional shift*. Deep Ensembles are a strong baseline.

Summary

- Recent interest in ensembles has been due to their strong *predictive uncertainty estimation* and *robustness to distributional shift*. Deep Ensembles are a strong baseline.
- Varying architectures of base learners improves diversity.

Summary

- Recent interest in ensembles has been due to their strong *predictive uncertainty estimation* and *robustness to distributional shift*. Deep Ensembles are a strong baseline.
- Varying architectures of base learners improves diversity.
- We propose ways to effectively search for these architectures.

Summary

- Recent interest in ensembles has been due to their strong *predictive uncertainty estimation* and *robustness to distributional shift*. Deep Ensembles are a strong baseline.
- Varying architectures of base learners improves diversity.
- We propose ways to effectively search for these architectures.
- NES searches for more diverse ensembles without ever explicitly defining diversity.

Summary

- Recent interest in ensembles has been due to their strong *predictive uncertainty estimation* and *robustness to distributional shift*. Deep Ensembles are a strong baseline.
- Varying architectures of base learners improves diversity.
- We propose ways to effectively search for these architectures.
- NES searches for more diverse ensembles without ever explicitly defining diversity.
- We show improved performance and better calibration for in-distribution and shifted data.