

A method to evaluate the reliability of prediction

Ken'ichiro Yamashina[1]

[1] Earthq. Res. Inst., Univ. Tokyo

In 2x2 contingency table, Molchan or ROC diagrams are used frequently to indicate the significance of the prediction. Here, the former and the latter usually represent the failures-to-predict($n_{21}/(n_{11}+n_{21})$) vs. rate-of-alarms($(n_{11}+n_{12})/n$) and the hit-rate($n_{11}/(n_{11}+n_{21})$) vs. false-alarms-against-fraction-of-no-events($n_{12}/(n_{12}+n_{22})$), respectively. Notations of the numbers are as follows. n :total($n=n_{11}+n_{12}+n_{21}+n_{22}$), n_{11} :successful alarm, n_{12} :false alarm, n_{21} :incorrect alarmless(occurrence of events without alarm), n_{22} :correct alarmless(no events with no alarm).

Those diagrams might be impressive visually. However, it is somewhat subjective and difficult to represent the probabilistic exact distance from a random process unless all of the respective numbers are very large. In addition, the rate-of-successful-alarm($n_{11}/(n_{11}+n_{12})$) will be the most requested information to think about the reliability of the prediction. Consequently, confidence-level vs. rate-of-successful-alarm will be useful to plot the results of the predictions. The confidence level for the finite numbers of n_{ij} is able to be obtained by simulation using the maximum likelihood estimation of the parameters of random process, i.e. $p_{ij}=(n_{i1}+n_{i2})(n_{1j}+n_{2j})/n$. Here, $\{ \text{expectation of } n_{ij} \} = n p_{ij}$, and $p_{11}+p_{12}+p_{21}+p_{22}=1$.