

# A Study of Cross-Validation and Bootstrap for Accuracy Estimation and Model Selection

Ron Kohavi

Computer Science Department

Stanford University

Stanford, CA. 94305

ronnyk@CS.Stanford.EDU

<http://robotics.stanford.edu/~ronnyk>

## Abstract

We review accuracy estimation methods and compare the two most common methods: cross-validation and bootstrap. Recent experimental results on artificial data and theoretical results in restricted settings have shown that for selecting a good classifier from a set of classifiers (model selection), ten-fold cross-validation may be better than the more expensive leave-one-out cross-validation. We report on a large-scale experiment—over half a million runs of C4.5 and a Naive-Bayes algorithm—to estimate the effects of different parameters on these algorithms on real-world datasets. For cross-validation, we vary the number of folds and whether the folds are stratified or not; for bootstrap, we vary the number of bootstrap samples. Our results indicate that for real-world datasets similar to ours, the best method to use for model selection is ten-fold stratified cross-validation, even if computation power allows using more folds.

## 1 Introduction

*It can not be emphasized enough that no claim whatsoever is being made in this paper that all algorithms are equivalent in practice, in the real world. In particular, no claim is being made that one should not use cross-validation in the real world.*  
—Wolpert (1994a)

Estimating the accuracy of a classifier induced by supervised learning algorithms is important not only to predict its future prediction accuracy, but also for choosing a classifier from a given set (model selection), or combining classifiers (Wolpert 1992). For estimating the final accuracy of a classifier, we would like an estimation method with low bias and low variance. To choose a classifier or to combine classifiers, the absolute accuracies are less important and we are willing to trade off bias

for low variance, assuming the bias affects all classifiers similarly (*e.g.*, estimates are 5% pessimistic).

In this paper we explain some of the assumptions made by the different estimation methods, and present concrete examples where each method fails. While it is known that no accuracy estimation can be correct all the time (Wolpert 1994b, Schaffer 1994), we are interested in identifying a method that is well suited for the biases and trends in typical real world datasets.

Recent results, both theoretical and experimental, have shown that it is not always the case that increasing the computational cost is beneficial, especially if the relative accuracies are more important than the exact values. For example, leave-one-out is almost unbiased, but it has high variance, leading to unreliable estimates (Efron 1983). For linear models, using leave-one-out cross-validation for model selection is asymptotically inconsistent in the sense that the probability of selecting the model with the best predictive power does not converge to one as the total number of observations approaches infinity (Zhang 1992, Shao 1993).

This paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes the common accuracy estimation methods and ways of computing confidence bounds that hold under some assumptions. Section 3 discusses related work comparing cross-validation variants and bootstrap variants. Section 4 discusses methodology underlying our experiment. The results of the experiments are given Section 5 with a discussion of important observations. We conclude with a summary in Section 6.

## 2 Methods for Accuracy Estimation

A **classifier** is a function that maps an unlabelled instance to a label using internal data structures. An **inducer**, or an induction algorithm, builds a classifier from a given dataset. CART and C4.5 (Breiman, Friedman, Olshen & Stone 1984, Quinlan 1993) are decision tree inducers that build decision tree classifiers. In this paper, we are not interested in the specific method for inducing classifiers, but assume access to a dataset and an inducer of interest.

Let  $\mathcal{V}$  be the space of unlabelled instances and  $\mathcal{Y}$  the

A longer version of the paper can be retrieved by anonymous ftp to [starry.stanford.edu/pub/ronnyk/accEst-long.ps](http://starry.stanford.edu/pub/ronnyk/accEst-long.ps)

set of possible labels. Let  $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{V} \times \mathcal{Y}$  be the space of labelled instances and  $\mathcal{D} = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n\}$  be a dataset (possibly a multiset) consisting of  $n$  labelled instances, where  $x_i = \langle v_i \in \mathcal{V}, y_i \in \mathcal{Y} \rangle$ . A classifier  $\mathcal{C}$  maps an unlabelled instance  $v \in \mathcal{V}$  to a label  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$  and an inducer  $\mathcal{I}$  maps a given dataset  $\mathcal{D}$  into a classifier  $\mathcal{C}$ . The notation  $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{D}, v)$  will denote the label assigned to an unlabelled instance  $v$  by the classifier built by inducer  $\mathcal{I}$  on dataset  $\mathcal{D}$ , *i.e.*,  $\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{D}, v) = (\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{D}))(v)$ . We assume that there exists a distribution on the set of labelled instances and that our dataset consists of i.i.d. (independently and identically distributed) instances. We consider equal misclassification costs using a 0/1 loss function, but the accuracy estimation methods can easily be extended to other loss functions.

The **accuracy** of a classifier  $\mathcal{C}$  is the probability of correctly classifying a randomly selected instance, *i.e.*,  $\text{acc} = \Pr(\mathcal{C}(v) = y)$  for a randomly selected instance  $\langle v, y \rangle \in \mathcal{X}$ , where the probability distribution over the instance space is the same as the distribution that was used to select instances for the inducer’s training set. Given a finite dataset, we would like to *estimate* the future performance of a classifier induced by the given inducer and dataset. A single accuracy estimate is usually meaningless without a confidence interval; thus we will consider how to approximate such an interval when possible. In order to identify weaknesses, we also attempt to identify cases where the estimates fail.

## 2.1 Holdout

The holdout method, sometimes called test sample estimation, partitions the data into two mutually exclusive subsets called a training set and a test set, or holdout set. It is common to designate 2/3 of the data as the training set and the remaining 1/3 as the test set. The training set is given to the inducer, and the induced classifier is tested on the test set. Formally, let  $\mathcal{D}_h$ , the holdout set, be a subset of  $\mathcal{D}$  of size  $h$ , and let  $\mathcal{D}_t$  be  $\mathcal{D} \setminus \mathcal{D}_h$ . The holdout estimated accuracy is defined as

$$\text{acc}_h = \frac{1}{h} \sum_{\langle v_i, y_i \rangle \in \mathcal{D}_h} \delta(\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{D}_t, v_i), y_i), \quad (1)$$

where  $\delta(i, j) = 1$  if  $i = j$  and 0 otherwise. Assuming that the inducer’s accuracy increases as more instances are seen, the holdout method is a pessimistic estimator because only a portion of the data is given to the inducer for training. The more instances we leave for the test set, the higher the bias of our estimate; however, fewer test set instances means that the confidence interval for the accuracy will be wider as shown below.

Each test instance can be viewed as a Bernoulli trial: correct or incorrect prediction. Let  $S$  be the number of correct classifications on the test set, then  $S$  is distributed binomially (sum of Bernoulli trials). For reasonably large holdout sets, the distribution of  $S/h$  is approximately normal with mean  $\text{acc}$  (the true accuracy of

the classifier) and a variance of  $\text{acc} * (1 - \text{acc})/h$ . Thus, by De Moivre-Laplace limit theorem, we have

$$\Pr \left\{ -z < \frac{\text{acc}_h - \text{acc}}{\sqrt{\text{acc}(1 - \text{acc})/h}} < z \right\} \approx \gamma \quad (2)$$

where  $z$  is the  $(1+\gamma)/2$ -th quantile point of the standard normal distribution. To get a  $100\gamma$  percent confidence interval, one determines  $z$  and inverts the inequalities. Inversion of the inequalities leads to a quadratic equation in  $\text{acc}$ , the roots of which are the low and high confidence points:

$$\frac{2h \cdot \text{acc}_h + z^2 \pm z \cdot \sqrt{4h \cdot \text{acc}_h + z^2 - 4h \cdot \text{acc}_h^2}}{2(h + z^2)}. \quad (3)$$

The above equation is not conditioned on the dataset  $\mathcal{D}$ ; if more information is available about the probability of the given dataset, it must be taken into account.

The holdout estimate is a random number that depends on the division into a training set and a test set. In **random subsampling**, the holdout method is repeated  $k$  times, and the estimated accuracy is derived by averaging the runs. The standard deviation can be estimated as the standard deviation of the accuracy estimations from each holdout run.

The main assumption that is violated in random subsampling is the independence of instances in the test set from those in the training set. If the training and test set are formed by a split of an original dataset, then an over-represented class in one subset will be a under-represented in the other. To demonstrate the issue, we simulated a 2/3, 1/3 split of Fisher’s famous iris dataset and used a majority inducer that builds a classifier predicting the prevalent class in the training set. The iris dataset describes iris plants using four continuous features, and the task is to classify each instance (an iris) as Iris Setosa, Iris Versicolour, or Iris Virginica. For each class label, there are exactly one third of the instances with that label (50 instances of each class from a total of 150 instances); thus we expect 33.3% prediction accuracy. However, because the test set will always contain less than 1/3 of the instances of the class that was prevalent in the training set, the accuracy predicted by the holdout method is 27.68% with a standard deviation of 0.13% (estimated by averaging 500 holdouts).

In practice, the dataset size is always finite, and usually smaller than we would like it to be. The holdout method makes inefficient use of the data: a third of dataset is not used for training the inducer.

## 2.2 Cross-Validation, Leave-one-out, and Stratification

In  $k$ -fold cross-validation, sometimes called rotation estimation, the dataset  $\mathcal{D}$  is randomly split into  $k$  mutually exclusive subsets (the folds)  $\mathcal{D}_1, \mathcal{D}_2, \dots, \mathcal{D}_k$  of approximately equal size. The inducer is trained and tested

$k$  times; each time  $t \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$ , it is trained on  $\mathcal{D} \setminus \mathcal{D}_t$  and tested on  $\mathcal{D}_t$ . The cross-validation estimate of accuracy is the overall number of correct classifications, divided by the number of instances in the dataset. Formally, let  $\mathcal{D}_{(i)}$  be the test set that includes instance  $x_i = \langle v_i, y_i \rangle$ , then the cross-validation estimate of accuracy

$$\text{acc}_{\text{CV}} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{\langle v_i, y_i \rangle \in \mathcal{D}} \delta(\mathcal{I}(\mathcal{D} \setminus \mathcal{D}_{(i)}, v_i), y_i). \quad (4)$$

The cross-validation estimate is a random number that depends on the division into folds. **Complete cross-validation** is the average of all  $\binom{m}{m/k}$  possibilities for choosing  $m/k$  instances out of  $m$ , but it is usually too expensive. Except for leave-one-one ( $n$ -fold cross-validation), which is always complete,  $k$ -fold cross-validation is estimating complete  $k$ -fold cross-validation using a single split of the data into the folds. Repeating cross-validation multiple times using different splits into folds provides a better Monte-Carlo estimate to the complete cross-validation at an added cost. In **stratified cross-validation**, the folds are stratified so that they contain approximately the same proportions of labels as the original dataset.

An inducer is **stable** for a given dataset and a set of perturbations, if it induces classifiers that make the same predictions when it is given the perturbed datasets.

**Proposition 1 (Variance in  $k$ -fold CV)**

*Given a dataset and an inducer. If the inducer is stable under the perturbations caused by deleting the instances for the folds in  $k$ -fold cross-validation, the cross-validation estimate will be unbiased and the variance of the estimated accuracy will be approximately  $\text{acc}_{\text{CV}} \cdot (1 - \text{acc}_{\text{CV}}) / n$ , where  $n$  is the number of instances in the dataset.*

*Proof:* If we assume that the  $k$  classifiers produced make the same predictions, then the estimated accuracy has a binomial distribution with  $n$  trials and probability of success equal to the accuracy of the classifier. ■

For large enough  $n$ , a confidence interval may be computed using Equation 3 with  $h$  equal to  $n$ , the number of instances.

In reality, a complex inducer is unlikely to be stable for large perturbations, unless it has reached its maximal learning capacity. We expect the perturbations induced by leave-one-out to be small and therefore the classifier should be very stable. As we increase the size of the perturbations, stability is less likely to hold: we expect stability to hold more in 20-fold cross-validation than in 10-fold cross-validation and both should be more stable than holdout of 1/3. The proposition does not apply to the resubstitution estimate because it requires the inducer to be stable when no instances are given in the dataset.

The above proposition helps understand one possible assumption that is made when using cross-validation: if an inducer is unstable for a particular dataset under a set of perturbations introduced by cross-validation, the accuracy estimate is likely to be unreliable. If the inducer is almost stable on a given dataset, we should expect a reliable estimate. The next corollary takes the idea slightly further and shows a result that we have observed empirically: there is almost no change in the variance of the cross-validation estimate when the number of folds is varied.

**Corollary 2 (Variance in cross-validation)**

*Given a dataset and an inducer. If the inducer is stable under the perturbations caused by deleting the test instances for the folds in  $k$ -fold cross-validation for various values of  $k$ , then the variance of the estimates will be the same.*

*Proof:* The variance of  $k$ -fold cross-validation in Proposition 1 does not depend on  $k$ . ■

While some inducers are likely to be inherently more stable, the following example shows that one must also take into account the dataset and the actual perturbations.

**Example 1 (Failure of leave-one-out)**

Fisher’s iris dataset contains 50 instances of each class, leading one to expect that a majority inducer should have accuracy about 33%. However, the combination of this dataset with a majority inducer is unstable for the small perturbations performed by leave-one-out. When an instance is deleted from the dataset, its label is a minority in the training set; thus the majority inducer predicts one of the other two classes and always errs in classifying the test instance. The leave-one-out estimated accuracy for a majority inducer on the iris dataset is therefore 0%. Moreover, all folds have this estimated accuracy; thus the standard deviation of the folds is again 0%, giving the unjustified assurance that the estimate is stable. ■

The example shows an inherent problem with cross-validation that applies to more than just a majority inducer. In a no-information dataset, where the label values are completely random, the best an induction algorithm can do is predict majority. Leave-one-out on such a dataset with 50% of the labels for each class and a majority inducer (the best possible inducer) would still predict 0% accuracy.

**2.3 Bootstrap**

The bootstrap family was introduced by Efron and is fully described in Efron & Tibshirani (1993). Given a dataset of size  $n$ , a **bootstrap sample** is created by sampling  $n$  instances uniformly from the data (with replacement). Since the dataset is sampled with replacement, the probability of any given instance not being chosen after  $n$  samples is  $(1 - 1/n)^n \approx e^{-1} \approx 0.368$ ; the

expected number of distinct instances from the original dataset appearing in the test set is thus  $0.632n$ . The  $\epsilon_0$  accuracy estimate is derived by using the bootstrap sample for training and the rest of the instances for testing. Given a number  $b$ , the number of bootstrap samples, let  $\epsilon_0_i$  be the accuracy estimate for bootstrap sample  $i$ . The .632 bootstrap estimate is defined as

$$\text{acc}_{\text{boot}} = \frac{1}{b} \sum_{i=1}^b (0.632 \cdot \epsilon_0_i + .368 \cdot \text{acc}_s) \quad (5)$$

where  $\text{acc}_s$  is the resubstitution accuracy estimate on the full dataset (*i.e.*, the accuracy on the training set). The variance of the estimate can be determined by computing the variance of the estimates for the samples.

The assumptions made by bootstrap are basically the same as that of cross-validation, *i.e.*, stability of the algorithm on the dataset: the “bootstrap world” should closely approximate the real world. The .632 bootstrap fails to give the expected result when the classifier is a perfect memorizer (*e.g.*, an unpruned decision tree or a one nearest neighbor classifier) and the dataset is completely random, say with two classes. The resubstitution accuracy is 100%, and the  $\epsilon_0$  accuracy is about 50%. Plugging these into the bootstrap formula, one gets an estimated accuracy of about 68.4%, far from the real accuracy of 50%. Bootstrap can be shown to fail if we add a memorizer module to any given inducer and adjust its predictions. If the memorizer remembers the training set and makes the predictions when the test instance was a training instances, adjusting its predictions can make the resubstitution accuracy change from 0% to 100% and can thus bias the overall estimated accuracy in any direction we want.

### 3 Related Work

Some experimental studies comparing different accuracy estimation methods have been previously done, but most of them were on artificial or small datasets. We now describe some of these efforts.

Efron (1983) conducted five sampling experiments and compared leave-one-out cross-validation, several variants of bootstrap, and several other methods. The purpose of the experiments was to “investigate some related estimators, which seem to offer considerably improved estimation in small samples.” The results indicate that leave-one-out cross-validation gives nearly unbiased estimates of the accuracy, but often with unacceptably high variability, particularly for small samples; and that the .632 bootstrap performed best.

Breiman et al. (1984) conducted experiments using cross-validation for decision tree pruning. They chose ten-fold cross-validation for the CART program and claimed it was satisfactory for choosing the correct tree. They claimed that “the difference in the cross-validation estimates of the risks of two rules tends to be much more accurate than the two estimates themselves.”

Jain, Dubes & Chen (1987) compared the performance of the  $\epsilon_0$  bootstrap and leave-one-out cross-validation on nearest neighbor classifiers using artificial data and claimed that the confidence interval of the bootstrap estimator is smaller than that of leave-one-out. Weiss (1991) followed similar lines and compared stratified cross-validation and two bootstrap methods with nearest neighbor classifiers. His results were that stratified two-fold cross validation is relatively low variance and superior to leave-one-out.

Breiman & Spector (1992) conducted a feature subset selection experiments for regression, and compared leave-one-out cross-validation,  $k$ -fold cross-validation for various  $k$ , stratified  $k$ -fold cross-validation, bias-corrected bootstrap, and partial cross-validation (not discussed here). Tests were done on artificial datasets with 60 and 160 instances. The behavior observed was: (1) the leave-one-out has low bias and RMS (root mean square) error, whereas two-fold and five-fold cross-validation have larger bias and RMS error only at models with many features; (2) the pessimistic bias of ten-fold cross-validation at small samples was significantly reduced for the samples of size 160; (3) for model selection, ten-fold cross-validation is better than leave-one-out.

Bailey & Elkan (1993) compared leave-one-out cross-validation to .632 bootstrap using the FOIL inducer and four synthetic datasets involving Boolean concepts. They observed high variability and little bias in the leave-one-out estimates, and low variability but large bias in the .632 estimates.

Weiss and Indurkya (Weiss & Indurkya 1994) conducted experiments on real-world data to determine the applicability of cross-validation to decision tree pruning. Their results were that for samples at least of size 200, using stratified ten-fold cross-validation to choose the amount of pruning yields unbiased trees (with respect to their optimal size).

### 4 Methodology

In order to conduct a large-scale experiment we decided to use C4.5 and a Naive-Bayesian classifier. The C4.5 algorithm (Quinlan 1993) is a descendent of ID3 that builds decision trees top-down. The Naive-Bayesian classifier (Langley, Iba & Thompson 1992) used was the one implemented in *MCC++* (Kohavi, John, Long, Manley & Pflieger 1994) that uses the observed ratios for nominal features and assumes a Gaussian distribution for continuous features. The exact details are not crucial for this paper because we are interested in the behavior of the accuracy estimation methods more than the internals of the induction algorithms. The underlying hypothesis spaces—decision trees for C4.5 and summary statistics for Naive-Bayes—are different enough that we hope conclusions based on these two induction algorithms will apply to other induction algorithms.

Because the target concept is unknown for real-world

concepts, we used the holdout method to estimate the quality of the cross-validation and bootstrap estimates. To choose a set of datasets, we looked at the learning curves for C4.5 and Naive-Bayes for most of the supervised classification datasets at the UC Irvine repository (Murphy & Aha 1995) that contained more than 500 instances (about 25 such datasets). We felt that a minimum of 500 instances were required for testing. While the true accuracies of a real dataset cannot be computed because we do not know the target concept, we can estimate the true accuracies using the holdout method. The “true” accuracy estimates in Table 1 were computed by taking a random sample of the given size, computing the accuracy using the rest of the dataset as a test set, and repeating 500 times.

We chose six datasets from a wide variety of domains, such that the learning curve for both algorithms did not flatten out too early, that is, before one hundred instances. We also added a *no information dataset*, rand, with 20 Boolean features and a Boolean random label. On one dataset, vehicle, the generalization accuracy of the Naive-Bayes algorithm deteriorated by more than 4% as more instances were given. A similar phenomenon was observed on the shuttle dataset. Such a phenomenon was predicted by Schaffer and Wolpert (Schaffer 1994, Wolpert 1994b), but we were surprised that it was observed on two real-world datasets.

To see how well an accuracy estimation method performs, we sampled instances from the dataset (uniformly without replacement), and created a training set of the desired size. We then ran the induction algorithm on the training set and tested the classifier on the rest of the instances in the dataset. This was repeated 50 times at points where the *learning curve was sloping up*. The same folds in cross-validation and the same samples in bootstrap were used for both algorithms compared.

## 5 Results and Discussion

We now show the experimental results and discuss their significance. We begin with a discussion of the bias in the estimation methods and follow with a discussion of the variance. Due to lack of space, we omit some graphs for the Naive-Bayes algorithm when the behavior is approximately the same as that of C4.5.

### 5.1 The Bias

The **bias** of a method to estimate a parameter  $\theta$  is defined as the expected value minus the estimated value. An unbiased estimation method is a method that has zero bias. Figure 1 shows the bias and variance of  $k$ -fold cross-validation on several datasets (the breast cancer dataset is not shown).

The diagrams clearly show that  $k$ -fold cross-validation is pessimistically biased, especially for two and five folds. For the learning curves that have a large derivative at the measurement point, the pessimism in  $k$ -fold cross-




Figure 1: C4.5: The bias of cross-validation with varying folds. A negative  $k$  folds stands for leave- $k$ -out. Error bars are 95% confidence intervals for the mean. The gray regions indicate 95% confidence intervals for the true accuracies. Note the different ranges for the accuracy axis.

validation for small  $k$ 's is apparent. Most of the estimates are reasonably good at 10 folds and at 20 folds they are almost unbiased.

Stratified cross-validation (not shown) had similar behavior, except for lower pessimism. The estimated accuracy for soybean at 2-fold was 7% higher and at five-fold, 4.7% higher; for vehicle at 2-fold, the accuracy was 2.8% higher and at five-fold, 1.9% higher. Thus stratification seems to be a less biased estimation method.

Figure 2 shows the bias and variance for the .632 bootstrap accuracy estimation method. Although the .632 bootstrap is almost unbiased for chess, hypothyroid, and mushroom for both inducers, it is highly biased for soybean with C4.5, vehicle with both inducers, and rand with both inducers. The bias with C4.5 and vehicle is 9.8%.

### 5.2 The Variance

While a given method may have low bias, its performance (accuracy estimation in our case) may be poor due to high variance. In the experiments above, we have formed confidence intervals by using the standard deviation of the *mean accuracy*. We now switch to the standard deviation of the population, *i.e.*, the expected standard deviation of a single accuracy estimation run. In practice, if one does a single cross-validation run, the expected accuracy will be the mean reported above, but the standard deviation will be higher by a factor of  $\sqrt{50}$ , the number of runs we averaged in the experiments.

Dataset	no. of attr.	sample-size / total size	no. of categories	duplicate instances	C4.5	Naive-Bayes
Breast cancer	10	50/699	2	8	91.37±0.10	94.22±0.10
Chess	36	900/3196	2	0	98.19±0.03	86.80±0.07
Hypothyroid	25	400/3163	2	77	98.52±0.03	97.63±0.02
Mushroom	22	800/8124	2	0	99.36±0.02	94.54±0.03
Soybean large	35	100/683	19	52	70.49±0.22	79.76±0.14
Vehicle	18	100/846	4	0	60.11±0.16	46.80±0.16
Rand	20	100/3000	2	9	49.96±0.04	49.90±0.04

Table 1: True accuracy estimates for the datasets using C4.5 and Naive-Bayes classifiers at the chosen sample sizes.




Figure 2: C4.5: The bias of bootstrap with varying samples. Estimates are good for mushroom, hypothyroid, and chess, but are extremely biased (optimistically) for vehicle and rand, and somewhat biased for soybean.

In what follows, all figures for standard deviation will be drawn with the same range for the standard deviation: 0 to 7.5%. Figure 3 shows the standard deviations for C4.5 and Naive Bayes using varying number of folds for cross-validation. The results for stratified cross-validation were similar with slightly lower variance. Figure 4 shows the same information for .632 bootstrap.

Cross-validation has high variance at 2-folds on both C4.5 and Naive-Bayes. On C4.5, there is high variance at the high-ends too—at leave-one-out and leave-two-out—for three files out of the seven datasets. Stratification reduces the variance slightly, and thus seems to be uniformly better than cross-validation, both for bias and variance.




Figure 3: Cross-validation: standard deviation of accuracy (population). Different line styles are used to help differentiate between curves.

## 6 Summary

We reviewed common accuracy estimation methods including holdout, cross-validation, and bootstrap, and showed examples where each one fails to produce a good estimate. We have compared the latter two approaches on a variety of real-world datasets with differing characteristics.

Proposition 1 shows that if the induction algorithm is stable for a given dataset, the variance of the cross-validation estimates should be approximately the same, independent of the number of folds. Although the induction algorithms are not stable, they are approximately stable.  $k$ -fold cross-validation with moderate  $k$  values (10-20) reduces the variance while increasing the bias. As  $k$  decreases (2-5) and the sample sizes get smaller, there is variance due to the instability of the training




Figure 4: .632 Bootstrap: standard deviation in accuracy (population).

sets themselves, leading to an increase in variance. This is most apparent for datasets with many categories, such as soybean. In these situations, stratification seems to help, but repeated runs may be a better approach.

Our results indicate that stratification is generally a better scheme, both in terms of bias and variance, when compared to regular cross-validation. Bootstrap has low variance, but extremely large bias on some problems. We recommend using stratified ten-fold cross-validation for model selection.

**Acknowledgments** We thank David Wolpert for a thorough reading of this paper and many interesting discussions. We thank Wray Buntine, Tom Bylander, Brad Efron, Jerry Friedman, Rob Holte, George John, Pat Langley, Rob Tibshirani, and Sholom Weiss for their helpful comments and suggestions. Dan Sommerfield implemented the bootstrap method in *MCC++*. All experiments were conducted using *MCC++*, partly partly funded by ONR grant N00014-94-1-0448 and NSF grants IRI-9116399 and IRI-9411306.

## References

- Bailey, T. L. & Elkan, C. (1993), Estimating the accuracy of learned concepts, in “Proceedings of International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence”, Morgan Kaufmann Publishers, pp. 895–900.
- Breiman, L. & Spector, P. (1992), “Submodel selection and evaluation in regression. the x-random case”, *International Statistical Review* **60**(3), 291–319.
- Breiman, L., Friedman, J. H., Olshen, R. A. & Stone, C. J. (1984), *Classification and Regression Trees*, Wadsworth International Group.
- Efron, B. (1983), “Estimating the error rate of a prediction rule: improvement on cross-validation”, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **78**(382), 316–330.
- Efron, B. & Tibshirani, R. (1993), *An introduction to the bootstrap*, Chapman & Hall.
- Jain, A. K., Dubes, R. C. & Chen, C. (1987), “Bootstrap techniques for error estimation”, *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence* **PAMI-9**(5), 628–633.
- Kohavi, R., John, G., Long, R., Manley, D. & Pflieger, K. (1994), *MLC++: A machine learning library in C++*, in “Tools with Artificial Intelligence”, IEEE Computer Society Press, pp. 740–743. Available by anonymous ftp from: [starry.Stanford.EDU:pub/ronnyk/mlc/toolsmlc.ps](http://starry.Stanford.EDU:pub/ronnyk/mlc/toolsmlc.ps).
- Langley, P., Iba, W. & Thompson, K. (1992), An analysis of bayesian classifiers, in “Proceedings of the tenth national conference on artificial intelligence”, AAAI Press and MIT Press, pp. 223–228.
- Murphy, P. M. & Aha, D. W. (1995), UCI repository of machine learning databases, <http://www.ics.uci.edu/~mllearn/MLRepository.html>.
- Quinlan, J. R. (1993), *C4.5: Programs for Machine Learning*, Morgan Kaufmann, Los Altos, California.
- Schaffer, C. (1994), A conservation law for generalization performance, in “Machine Learning: Proceedings of the Eleventh International Conference”, Morgan Kaufmann, pp. 259–265.
- Shao, J. (1993), “Linear model selection via cross-validation”, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **88**(422), 486–494.
- Weiss, S. M. (1991), “Small sample error rate estimation for k-nearest neighbor classifiers”, *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* **13**(3), 285–289.
- Weiss, S. M. & Indurkha, N. (1994), Decision tree pruning : Biased or optimal, in “Proceedings of the twelfth national conference on artificial intelligence”, AAAI Press and MIT Press, pp. 626–632.
- Wolpert, D. H. (1992), “Stacked generalization”, *Neural Networks* **5**, 241–259.
- Wolpert, D. H. (1994a), Off-training set error and a priori distinctions between learning algorithms, Technical Report SFI TR 94-12-123, The Santa Fe Institute.
- Wolpert, D. H. (1994b), The relationship between PAC, the statistical physics framework, the Bayesian framework, and the VC framework, Technical report, The Santa Fe Institute, Santa Fe, NM.
- Zhang, P. (1992), “On the distributional properties of model selection criteria”, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* **87**(419), 732–737.