

# Neural Ensemble Search for Performant and Calibrated Predictions

**Sheheryar Zaidi**<sup>1\*</sup>

Chris Holmes<sup>1</sup>

**Arber Zela**<sup>2\*</sup>

Frank Hutter<sup>2,3</sup>

Thomas Elsken<sup>2</sup>

Yee Whye Teh<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Oxford

<sup>2</sup>University of Freiburg

<sup>3</sup>Bosch 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:  $f_{\theta}$  is a network with weights  $\theta$ , 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:  $f_\theta$  is a network with weights  $\theta$ , 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:  $f_\theta$  is a network with weights  $\theta$ , 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  $F_{\text{OE}}$  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:  $f_\theta$  is a network with weights  $\theta$ , 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  $F_{\text{OE}}$  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  $\ell$  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  $\alpha$  and weights  $\theta$ . 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  $\alpha$  and weights  $\theta$ . 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  $f_{\theta_i, \alpha_i}$  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  $\alpha$  and weights  $\theta$ . 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  $f_{\theta_i, \alpha_i}$  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  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{val}}$ . (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  $\alpha$  and weights  $\theta$ . 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  $f_{\theta_i, \alpha_i}$  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  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{val}}$ . (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  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{val}}$ . 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  $\alpha$  and weights  $\theta$ . 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  $f_{\theta_i, \alpha_i}$  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  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{val}}$ . (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  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{val}}$ . 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  $\alpha_i$  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*  $\theta$  and *architecture*  $\alpha$ .

## 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*  $\theta$  and *architecture*  $\alpha$ .

---

## 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*  $\theta$  and *architecture*  $\alpha$ .

---

## 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  $\alpha_i$  using  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$ , and initialize  $\mathbf{p} = \mathcal{P} = \{f_{\theta_1, \alpha_1}, \dots, f_{\theta_P, \alpha_P}\}$ .

# Neural Ensemble Search

NES-RE: with Regularized Evolution

---

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

---

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

# Neural Ensemble Search

NES-RE: with Regularized Evolution

---

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

---

## 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  $\alpha_i$  using  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$ , and initialize  $\mathbf{p} = \mathcal{P} = \{f_{\theta_1, \alpha_1}, \dots, f_{\theta_P, \alpha_P}\}$ .
  - 3 **while**  $|\mathcal{P}| < K$  **do**
  - 4     Select  $m$  parent candidates  $\{f_{\tilde{\theta}_1, \tilde{\alpha}_1}, \dots, f_{\tilde{\theta}_m, \tilde{\alpha}_m}\} = \text{ForwardSelect}(\mathbf{p}, \mathcal{D}_{\text{val}}, m)$ .
  - 5     Sample uniformly a parent architecture  $\alpha$  from  $\{\tilde{\alpha}_1, \dots, \tilde{\alpha}_m\}$ . // parent stays in  $\mathbf{p}$ .
  - 6     Apply mutation to  $\alpha$ , yielding child architecture  $\beta$ .
  - 7     Train  $\beta$  using  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}}$  and add the trained network  $f_{\theta, \beta}$  to  $\mathbf{p}$  and  $\mathcal{P}$ .
  - 8     Remove the oldest member in  $\mathbf{p}$ . // 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  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{val}}$  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  $\mathcal{D}_{\text{val}}$  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	<b>0.098</b> $\pm$ 0.001	<b>0.098</b> $\pm$ 0.002	0.112 $\pm$ 0.002	0.101	<b>0.098</b>	<b>0.012</b> $\pm$ 0.001	<b>0.013</b> $\pm$ 0.002	<b>0.011</b> $\pm$ 0.002	0.015	0.016
	10	<b>0.094</b> $\pm$ 0.001	<b>0.094</b> $\pm$ 0.002	0.108 $\pm$ 0.002	0.100	0.097	<b>0.012</b> $\pm$ 0.001	0.013 $\pm$ 0.001	<b>0.011</b> $\pm$ 0.001	<b>0.011</b>	0.013
	30	<b>0.092</b> $\pm$ 0.001	<b>0.092</b> $\pm$ 0.001	0.105 $\pm$ 0.002	0.095	0.094	0.012 $\pm$ 0.001	0.012 $\pm$ 0.001	0.012 $\pm$ 0.001	<b>0.011</b>	0.012
3	5	0.238 $\pm$ 0.002	<b>0.233</b> $\pm$ 0.003	0.255 $\pm$ 0.007	0.266	0.267	<b>0.045</b> $\pm$ 0.002	<b>0.044</b> $\pm$ 0.002	0.062 $\pm$ 0.002	0.075	0.085
	10	0.232 $\pm$ 0.002	<b>0.229</b> $\pm$ 0.002	0.251 $\pm$ 0.007	0.263	0.256	<b>0.034</b> $\pm$ 0.001	<b>0.033</b> $\pm$ 0.002	0.052 $\pm$ 0.002	0.067	0.064
	30	0.231 $\pm$ 0.001	<b>0.228</b> $\pm$ 0.002	0.249 $\pm$ 0.007	0.258	0.252	<b>0.029</b> $\pm$ 0.001	<b>0.028</b> $\pm$ 0.002	0.049 $\pm$ 0.002	0.057	0.054
5	5	0.387 $\pm$ 0.003	<b>0.376</b> $\pm$ 0.003	0.415 $\pm$ 0.011	0.429	0.438	<b>0.117</b> $\pm$ 0.004	<b>0.115</b> $\pm$ 0.008	0.152 $\pm$ 0.002	0.177	0.199
	10	0.380 $\pm$ 0.002	<b>0.374</b> $\pm$ 0.004	0.411 $\pm$ 0.009	0.429	0.427	<b>0.104</b> $\pm$ 0.004	<b>0.105</b> $\pm$ 0.007	0.144 $\pm$ 0.002	0.168	0.174
	30	0.382 $\pm$ 0.002	<b>0.375</b> $\pm$ 0.003	0.408 $\pm$ 0.009	0.427	0.422	<b>0.103</b> $\pm$ 0.002	<b>0.102</b> $\pm$ 0.006	0.136 $\pm$ 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.