

Foundations of the Theory of Performance-Based Ranking

Sébastien Piérard, Anaïs Halin, Anthony Cioppa, Adrien Delière, and Marc Van Droogenbroeck
Montefiore Institute, University of Liège, Liège, Belgium

{S.Pierard, Anaïs.Halin, Anthony.Cioppa, Adrien.Deliege, M.VanDroogenbroeck}@uliege.be

Abstract

Ranking entities such as algorithms, devices, methods, or models based on their performances, while accounting for application-specific preferences, is a challenge. To address this challenge, we establish the foundations of a universal theory for performance-based ranking. First, we introduce a rigorous framework built on top of both the probability and order theories. Our new framework encompasses the elements necessary to (1) define and manipulate performances, (2) express which performances are worse than or equivalent to others, (3) model tasks through a variable called satisfaction, (4) consider properties of the evaluation, (5) define scores, and (6) specify application-specific preferences through a variable called importance. On top of this framework, we propose the first axiomatic definition of performance orderings and performance-based rankings. Then, we introduce a universal parametric family of scores, called ranking scores, that can be used to establish rankings satisfying our axioms, while considering application-specific preferences. Finally, we show, in the case of two-class classification, that the family of ranking scores encompasses well-known performance scores, including the accuracy, the true positive rate (recall), the positive predictive value (precision), Jaccard’s coefficient (intersection over union), and F_β scores. However, we also show that some other scores commonly used to compare classifiers are unsuitable to derive performance orderings satisfying the axioms. Therefore, this paper provides the computer vision and machine learning communities with a rigorous framework for evaluating and ranking entities.¹

¹Note to the reviewers: this paper is the first of a trilogy of papers submitted to CVPR. In a nutshell, this paper presents an axiomatic framework and an infinite family of scores for ranking classifiers. In paper B [19], we particularize this framework to binary classification and present the *Tile* that organizes these scores (among which the precision PPV , the true positive rate TPR , the false positive rate FPR , the score F_1 , and the accuracy A) in a single plot. Finally, paper C [10] provides a guide to using the *Tile* according to four practical scenarios. For that, we present different *Tile* flavors on a real example, analyzing and ranking 74 segmentation classifiers. Paper C [10] comes with Python code. To meet CVPR requirements, we provide the two other papers in supplementary material.




Figure 1. This work establishes the foundations of the theory of performance-based ranking. We do this in two steps. First, we introduce a new mathematical framework with 6 main elements, as depicted here by the pillars. Second, we build on top of it: (1) a set of three axioms for the ordering of performances and for the performance-based ranking of entities, (2) sufficient conditions for them when the performance ordering is induced by a score, and (3) a family of scores, named *ranking scores* that consider the application-specific preferences. This theory is universal in the sense that it is applicable to any task.

1. Introduction

Every day, millions of people are faced with choices to make. Often, these choices are between entities (*e.g.*, algorithms, devices, methods, models, options, procedures, solutions, strategies, *etc.*) considered to be interchangeable, although not necessarily equivalent. One of the main difficulties arises from the uncertainty that people have regarding the use that will be made of the entity to choose. A widespread approach to objectifying these choices is to (1) perform an evaluation to determine (*i.e.*, assume, calculate, estimate, predict, *etc.*) a *performance*, encompassing the necessary uncertainty, for each of these entities; (2) choose a way of comparing these performances with each other; and (3) assume that an entity is preferable to others if it has the best performance. A more general problem is to establish an order of preference between the entities: this is the *performance-based ranking*.

The approach of performance-based ranking is

widespread in many fields and has proved its undeniable usefulness, especially in scientific communities that organize themselves around competitions [2, 8, 14, 15] for the development of algorithms for specific tasks. Nevertheless, several studies [16, 17] have alerted the scientific community about the ranking methodology used in these competitions.

A critical analysis of common practices is presented in [16] for 150 biomedical image analysis challenges. Multiple problems are identified. It turns out that a justification of the scores that are used is provided in only 23% of the cases, and that the rank computation method is reported in only 36% of the cases. There are at least 10 different methods for determining the rank of an algorithm based on multiple scores. The properties of these methods are largely unknown.

There remains an obvious lack of theoretical foundations for the performance-based ranking. From our perspective, there is a common and detrimental confusion between the concept of performance and the numerical scores (also called metrics, measures, indicators, criteria, factors, and indices [1, 20]). Moreover, the way of comparing performances is often chosen by intuition [17] or by imitation of what has been chosen in the previously published related works. This inevitably leads to a drastic loss of diversity in the rankings that can be presented. From our perspective, considering the diversity of possible rankings is healthy, and also desirable for those who want to subsequently choose an entity based on their own application-specific preferences.

The lack of theoretical foundations is quite profound. Loosely speaking, the *performance* of a given entity can be defined as the information necessary to determine the degree of *satisfaction* one has with it, relatively to application-specific preferences tuned by the relative *importance* given to the various cases that can occur when the entity is used. Unfortunately, although such a definition sheds interesting light on the subject, it is of little interest, as it does not specify the mathematical nature of the performance, the space in which it is, or the operations that are permitted, particularly those that enable the various performances to be compared with one another.

The aim of this paper is to look at the performance-based ranking from a broader angle. As illustrated in Fig. 1, we aim at establishing mathematically rigorous theoretical foundations that can be applied to a wide range of problems, for example the one of ranking two-class classification.

Contributions. Our contributions are threefold and can be summarized as follows. (1) First, in Sec. 3, we present a new generic mathematical framework that encompasses the evaluation of entities, the performances, and the space in which they are, the notions of *satisfaction* and *importance*, the scores that characterize numerically the performances, and some operations permitted on performances

such as those for combining several performances and those for comparing performances with one another (*is equivalent to*, *is worse than*, *is better than*, *is incomparable with*, etc.). (2) Second, we introduce the foundations of the theory of performance-based ranking in Sec. 4. We innovate by proposing an *axiomatic definition for both the ordering of performances and the ranking of entities based on their performances*. We also present a new family of scores, named *ranking scores*, that can be used to induce performance orderings that satisfy our axioms. These scores are parameterized by some application-specific preferences, and are universal in the sense that they are applicable to any task. (3) Third, in Sec. 5, we study the particularization of the theory of performance-based ranking to the popular case of the two-class crisp classification.

2. Related Work

Mathematical foundations can be found in the probability theory, in the order theory, and in statistics. The probability theory [12, 13] provides the tools needed to consider the uncertainty that one has about how an entity will be used. However, to be rigorous, probability measures cannot be used without defining a measurable space. Surprisingly, after reviewing hundreds of papers that use the notion of performance, mainly in the fields of computer vision, medicine and physics, we found none that explicitly gives such a space and explains how to define, based on it, what the performances are and what operations are allowed on them. The order theory [4, 9] provides the basis for defining and manipulating homogeneous binary relations such as *is equivalent to*, *is worse than*, *is better than*, and *is incomparable with* that underpin rankings. Statistics provide tools to compare rankings through rank correlations, in particular Kendall’s τ and Spearman’s ρ .

In a recent attempt to formalize the notion of ranking, for basic vision tasks, Nguyen *et al.* [17] proposed to impose three properties for ranking: (1) reliability (“a small change in parameter values, should not result in a drastic change in rankings”), (2) meaningfulness (evaluated by humans), and (3) mathematical consistency (“use scores that satisfy certain properties”).

The mathematical framework introduced in this paper helps to clarify these three requirements. (1) Regarding the reliability, which is also a matter of concern in [16], we argue that one should distinguish between two types of parameters: those involved in the evaluation (*i.e.* the step in which the performance of an entity is determined) and those involved in the ranking of the entities based on their previously determined performances. The case actually discussed in [17] is of the first type. The second type of parameters can be useful to adapt the ranking to application-specific preferences: the *importance*. (2) Regarding the meaningfulness, in the absence of analytical means to en-

sure the meaningfulness of scores, Nguyen *et al.* [17] suggest testing the ranking procedure on sanity tests with pre-determined desired rankings. In contrast, we propose to start by modeling the task through a variable called *satisfaction* and then to derive meaningful ranking scores, by construction. (3) Concerning the mathematical consistency, we show that it is possible to impose it based on axioms, at a level just below the scores (see Fig. 1).

3. Mathematical Framework

We now present the mathematical framework in which the theory of performance-based rankings will be established in Sec. 4. This mathematical framework is universal in the sense that it is task-agnostic. To the best of our knowledge, it is the first time that a rigorous mathematical framework is conceived for the universal comparison of performances. All mathematical symbols used in this paper are defined where they first appear. For the reader’s convenience, we also provide a list of them in the supplementary material (see Appendix A.1).

3.1. The Probability Theory to Anchor Performances

We start by specifying the underlying space for performances. For us, a performance is not a real number or a collection of them, as sometimes assumed in the literature. Instead, we choose to conceive our mathematical framework specifically to compare performances that have a probabilistic meaning. For this reason, we ground our framework in the probability theory [12, 13] and consider that a component for building the theory of *performances*, denoted by P , is that of probability measures. For two performances to be comparable, they should be defined on a common measurable space (Ω, Σ) . The set Ω is the sample space, or universe, and the set Σ is a σ -algebra on Ω called event space. Without loss of generality, when Ω is finite, one can choose $\Sigma = 2^\Omega$. There are as many performance spaces as there are measurable spaces. A *performance space* is defined as the set of all probability measures on (Ω, Σ) , and is denoted by $\mathbb{P}_{(\Omega, \Sigma)}$.

Example 1. For the popular case of two-class crisp classification, several choices can be made for Ω . In the simplest setting, this set contains two elements interpreted as “correct result” and “incorrect result”. In this case, the performance analysis can only be based on the proportion of correct results, i.e., the accuracy. In another setting, one can choose to have three elements in Ω , making the distinction between the two types of incorrect results, namely false positive (a.k.a. type I error) and false negative (a.k.a. type II error). Finally, one could prefer having four elements in Ω , one for each pair of ground-truth and predicted classes (in the frequency-based approach, this corresponds to the

normalized contingency table or confusion matrix). This enlarges the flexibility in the analysis of performances.

3.2. The Preorder \lesssim

Our framework is not only grounded in the probability theory, as explained above, but also in the order theory [4, 9]. We aim at being able to decide if a performance is, e.g., worse than, equivalent, or better than another one. Mathematically, these comparisons are done thanks to binary, homogeneous, relations on $\mathbb{P}_{(\Omega, \Sigma)}$. Indeed, all binary relations used to compare performances should be coherent. In other words, they should all correspond to a common *performance ordering*. It turns out that, instead of defining as many relations as we need before proving that they are coherent, it is possible to derive all the desired relations from a single one. Following this path, in this paper, the binary relations \sim , $>$, $<$, and $\not\lesssim$ on $\mathbb{P}_{(\Omega, \Sigma)}$ will be implicitly considered as derived from a common binary relation \lesssim on $\mathbb{P}_{(\Omega, \Sigma)}$ as follows:

- $P_1 \sim P_2$ if and only if (iif) $P_1 \lesssim P_2 \wedge P_2 \lesssim P_1$;
- $P_1 > P_2$ iif $P_1 \not\lesssim P_2 \wedge P_2 \lesssim P_1$;
- $P_1 < P_2$ iif $P_1 \lesssim P_2 \wedge P_2 \not\lesssim P_1$; and
- $P_1 \not\lesssim P_2$ iif $P_1 \not\lesssim P_2 \wedge P_2 \not\lesssim P_1$.

With such a construction, if \lesssim is a preorder (i.e., reflexive and transitive), then \sim is an equivalence (i.e. reflexive, transitive, and symmetric), $>$ and $<$ are converse strict partial orders (i.e., irreflexive, asymmetric, and transitive), and $\not\lesssim$ is irreflexive and symmetric. For the proof, see supplementary material (Appendix A.2.4). These are the intuitively expected properties that justify to interpret \lesssim as *worse or equivalent*, $>$ as *better*, $<$ as *worse*, and $\not\lesssim$ as *incomparable*.

Example 1 (continued). In the particular case of two-class crisp classification, two common spaces are used to depict the performances as points, when the priors are fixed: the Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) space and the Precision-Recall (PR) space. On the one hand, ROC users will all intuitively agree that a performance P_1 is better than, equivalent to, or worse than a performance P_2 when both the values of TNR (true negative rate) and the TPR (true positive rate) of P_1 are greater, equal, or smaller than those of P_2 , respectively. Few of these users will risk deciding when one of the two scores is higher while the other is lower, as this depends on application-specific preferences. On the other hand, PR users will focus on the TPR (recall) and PPV (precision) and perform a similar intuitive reasoning based on these two scores. A careful comparison reveals that ROC and PR users do not intuitively make the same decisions. This is rather surprising since, when priors are fixed, both spaces show the same thing [5]. The theory presented in this paper clarifies what are the suitable performance orderings.

3.3. The Random Variable Satisfaction S to Characterize a Task

The existence of a random variable $S : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ interpreted as the *satisfaction* is what justifies the use of the term “performance” instead of “probability measure”, and also what makes the comparison of such objects meaningful. The satisfaction S is something specific to the task. It is the responsibility of the user of the theory to assign satisfaction values that are meaningful for the task in question. In fact, we argue that a task is ill-defined when the satisfaction is not specified, either explicitly or implicitly. In this paper, we pose $s_{min,\Omega} = \min_{\omega \in \Omega} S(\omega)$ and $s_{max,\Omega} = \max_{\omega \in \Omega} S(\omega)$.

Example 1 (continued). *In the particular case of two-class crisp classification, we expect that most people will agree on the facts that (1) the satisfaction takes the same value for all samples corresponding to incorrect results (e.g. $S = 0$), (2) the satisfaction takes the same value for all samples corresponding to correct results (e.g. $S = 1$), and that (3) the satisfaction is strictly greater for correct results than for incorrect results.*

3.4. The Evaluation and the Combinations Φ

We now have all the elements necessary to introduce the notion of *evaluation*. Let us denote, by \mathbb{E} , the set of entities of interest. In our framework, the evaluation is modeled by function $\text{eval} : \mathbb{E} \rightarrow \mathbb{P}(\Omega, \Sigma) : \epsilon \mapsto \text{eval}(\epsilon)$.

We find it convenient to think in terms of a (thought) random experiment involving an entity ϵ and having outcomes that allow to determine how satisfying the various realizations are, e.g., if the result is correct, how accurate it is, or how many resources are used. We define the performance $P = \text{eval}(\epsilon)$ of an entity ϵ as the distribution of these outcomes.

Example 1 (continued). *In the particular case of classification, a typical random experiment implicitly considered in the literature is in five steps. (1) Draw a sample s at random from a source. (2) Apply the oracle on s to obtain ground-truth class $y(s)$. (3) Apply a descriptor on s to obtain the features (a.k.a. attributes) $x(s)$. (4) Feed the classifier with $x(s)$ to obtain the predicted class $\hat{y}(x(s))$. (5) Set the outcome of the experiment to the pair (y, \hat{y}) .*

Our framework can be further enriched by integrating some knowledge about the function eval . By definition, a performance P is achievable when there exists an entity ϵ whose evaluation leads to it: $\exists \epsilon : \text{eval}(\epsilon) = P$. It often happens that, based solely on the performances of the evaluated entities, we can be sure that some other performances are also achievable, by combining and/or disrupting the entities we have at our disposal. To take this knowledge into account, we define the function $\Phi : 2^{\mathbb{P}(\Omega, \Sigma)} \rightarrow 2^{\mathbb{P}(\Omega, \Sigma)}$

that gives the set of performances that are achievable for sure, for some set of achievable performances given in input. Note that Φ is idempotent, i.e. $\Phi \circ \Phi = \Phi$.

Consider a random experiment using a black box entity ϵ only once (this is the knowledge we have about eval). Let $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n$ be positive values summing up to one. All other things remaining identical, if one can achieve the performances P_1, P_2, \dots, P_n with, respectively, the entities $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \dots, \epsilon_n$, then the performance $\sum_i \lambda_i P_i$ is achievable with a hybrid entity that randomly selects an entity among $\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \dots, \epsilon_n$ with the series of respective selection probabilities $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n$ before running the corresponding entity. In this case, denoting the set of all possible convex combinations by conv , we can take $\Phi = \text{conv}$.

Example 1 (continued). *In the particular case of two-class crisp classification, when the source of samples, the oracle, and the descriptor are kept unchanged, Fawcett’s interpolation [6] allows interpolating linearly between performances with a hybrid classifier. And, when the oracle, the descriptor, and the classifier are kept unchanged, Piérard’s summarization [18] allows interpolating linearly between performances with a hybrid source of samples.*

Note that the performance $\sum_i \lambda_i P_i \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega, \Sigma)$, where $\sum_i \lambda_i = 1$ and $\lambda_i \geq 0 \forall i$, takes various names in the literature. From an affine geometry perspective, it is a *convex combination*. From a statistical perspective, it is a *mixture*. From the perspective of metric spaces, it is the unique *Karcher mean* [11] that minimizes the *Fréchet variance* [7] with the metric $d : \mathbb{P}^2_{(\Omega, \Sigma)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} : P_1, P_2 \mapsto d(P_1; P_2) = (\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} (P_1(\{\omega\}) - P_2(\{\omega\}))^2)^{1/2}$.

3.5. The Scores X

In our framework, *scores*² (also called metrics, measures, indicators, criteria, factors, and indices in the literature [1, 20]) are functions associating a real value to performances, that is, $X : \text{dom}(X) \rightarrow \mathbb{R} : P \mapsto X(P)$ with $\text{dom}(X) \subseteq \mathbb{P}(\Omega, \Sigma)$. The set of all scores with a domain included in $\mathbb{P}(\Omega, \Sigma)$ is denoted by $\mathbb{X}_{(\Omega, \Sigma)}$. One can define different parametric families of scores:

- *Expected value scores* are parameterized by a random variable V . We define them as $X_V^E : \mathbb{P}(\Omega, \Sigma) \rightarrow [\min_{\omega \in \Omega} V(\omega), \max_{\omega \in \Omega} V(\omega)] : P \mapsto X_V^E(P) = \mathbf{E}_P[V]$, where \mathbf{E} denotes the mathematical expectation. The score X_S^E , that we call the *expected satisfaction*, is a universal score in the sense that it exists for all performance spaces. It will be further studied in Sec. 4.
- *Probabilistic scores* are parameterized by two events $E_1, E_2 \in \Sigma$ such that $\emptyset \subsetneq E_1 \subsetneq E_2 \subseteq \Omega$. We define them as $X_{E_1|E_2}^P : \{P \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega, \Sigma) : P(E_2) \neq 0\} \rightarrow [0, 1] :$

²We choose the term *score* to avoid any possible confusion with the mathematical meaning of the terms *metric*, *measure*, and *indicator*.

$P \mapsto X_{E_1|E_2}^P(P) = P(E_1|E_2)$. All probabilistic scores can be expressed as a ratio of two expected value scores.

Example 1 (continued). *In the particular case of two-class crisp classification, the expected satisfaction is both the expected value score X_S^E and the probabilistic score $X_{S=1}^P$. This is because S is a $\{0, 1\}$ -binary random variable. In this case, the expected satisfaction is called accuracy and denoted by A .*

3.6. The Random Variable Importance I to Characterize Application Preferences

It is well known that the ranking of entities does not only have to be specific for the task, but that it should also be sensitive to application-specific preferences. To encode these preferences, we propose to rely on a second random variable that we call *importance*: $I : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$. We require that $I \neq 0$, i.e. $\exists \omega : I(\omega) \neq 0$.

Further in this paper, we will describe a new family of scores, called *ranking scores*, which are parameterized by such a random variable. We would, however, like to draw the reader's attention to the fact that the importance is something that cannot, in general, be deduced from a score. In particular, the visual inspection of a formula for a given score could be misleading. Therefore, in this paper, we present a technique to analyze the behavior of any score by computing the rank correlations with the ranking scores for which the importances are well-defined.

Example 1 (continued). *In the particular case of two-class crisp classification, examples of misleading formulas are provided in supplementary material. In particular, we provide two equivalent formulas for the accuracy and two for the true positive rate. In both cases, by visually inspecting them, one would intuitively draw different conclusions about the importance given to the true negatives, false positives, false negatives, and true positives.*

4. Performance-Based Ranking Theory

In this section, we first present a universal axiomatic definition of the performance orderings and performance-based rankings of entities (Sec. 4.1). Then, we establish the bridge between these axioms and the scores, and give a sufficient condition per axiom (Sec. 4.2). Finally, we take the application-specific preferences into account and identify an infinite, diversified, and universal family of scores from which one can induce performance orderings satisfying our axioms (Sec. 4.3).

4.1. Axiomatic Definition

We propose an axiomatic definition of both the performance orderings and the performance-based rankings. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first time that an axiomatic

definition is proposed for it. The axioms do not involve any score. And, they do not involve I either.

4.1.1 Leveraging the Preorder \lesssim

We argue that if several entities, from a set \mathbb{E} , have been ranked, then removing or adding an entity should not affect the relative order of the previously present entities. To guarantee it, our first axiom imposes that the ranking function is based on a preorder \lesssim on $\mathbb{P}(\Omega, \Sigma)$. There is no consensus in the literature about the rank value to consider when several entities have equivalent performances. Therefore, instead of imposing an arbitrarily chosen value, our axiom specifies bounds for it.

Axiom 1. *The ranking function $\text{rank}_{\mathbb{E}} : \mathbb{E} \rightarrow [1, |\mathbb{E}|] : \epsilon \mapsto \text{rank}_{\mathbb{E}}(\epsilon)$ satisfies $|\{\epsilon' \in \mathbb{E} : \text{eval}(\epsilon) < \text{eval}(\epsilon')\}| + 1 \leq \text{rank}_{\mathbb{E}}(\epsilon) \leq |\{\epsilon' \in \mathbb{E} : \text{eval}(\epsilon) \lesssim \text{eval}(\epsilon')\}|$, where \lesssim is a preorder on $\mathbb{P}(\Omega, \Sigma)$.*

4.1.2 Leveraging the Satisfaction S

Let us now take a look at the case in which the degree of satisfaction that can be obtained with an entity ϵ_1 is for sure less or equal than the degree of satisfaction that can be obtained with an entity ϵ_2 . This is the case when there exists a value s such that $P_1(S \leq s) = 1$ and $P_2(S \geq s) = 1$. We argue that, in this case, the performance P_1 of ϵ_1 cannot be better than the performance P_2 of ϵ_2 , that is $P_1 \lesssim P_2$ or $P_1 \not\lesssim P_2$.

Axiom 2. *If two performances $P_1, P_2 \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega, \Sigma)$ are such that $P_1(S \leq s) = 1$ and $P_2(S \geq s) = 1$ for any s , then $P_1 \lesssim P_2$ or $P_1 \not\lesssim P_2$.*

The principle behind this second axiom is that, thanks to the random variable S , we can use the natural order \leq that exists on \mathbb{R} to obtain a preorder on Ω , and the axiom stipulates that the preorder on $\mathbb{P}(\Omega, \Sigma)$ is coherent with it.

Let us now take a look at three implications that are clearly intuitively expected.

Corollary 1. *For any s , all performances P such that $P(S = s) = 1$ are either equivalent or incomparable.*

Corollary 2. *We have $P(S = s_{\min, \Omega}) = 1 \Rightarrow \nexists P' : P' < P$. In other words, $P(S = s_{\min, \Omega}) = 1$ means that P belongs to the set of the worst performances, among $\mathbb{P}(\Omega, \Sigma)$.*

Corollary 3. *We have $P(S = s_{\max, \Omega}) = 1 \Rightarrow \nexists P' : P' > P$. In other words, $P(S = s_{\max, \Omega}) = 1$ means that P belongs to the set of the best performances, among $\mathbb{P}(\Omega, \Sigma)$.*

4.1.3 Leveraging the Combinations Φ

We argue that, for any set of achievable performances, it should not be possible to obtain a performance better than

the best of them, or worse than the worst of them, by combining the entities corresponding to them. Expressing this requirement in terms of \lesssim leads to our third and last axiom.

Axiom 3. Let P be a performance, and Π be a set of performances on $\mathbb{P}_{(\Omega, \Sigma)}$ such that $P' \lesssim P \vee P' \lesssim P' \vee P' \in \Pi$.

- $P' \lesssim P \vee P' \in \Pi \Rightarrow \overline{P} \lesssim P \vee \overline{P} \in \Phi(\Pi)$;
- $P' \not\lesssim P \vee P' \in \Pi \Rightarrow \overline{P} \not\lesssim P \vee \overline{P} \in \Phi(\Pi)$;
- $P \lesssim P' \vee P' \in \Pi \Rightarrow P \lesssim \overline{P} \vee \overline{P} \in \Phi(\Pi)$;
- and $P \not\lesssim P' \vee P' \in \Pi \Rightarrow P \not\lesssim \overline{P} \vee \overline{P} \in \Phi(\Pi)$.

With the definitions for $\sim, >, <, \not\lesssim$ given in Sec. 3.2, the following corollary can be derived.

Corollary 4. Let $P \in \mathbb{P}_{(\Omega, \Sigma)}$ and $\Pi \subseteq \mathbb{P}_{(\Omega, \Sigma)}$ such that $P' \lesssim P \vee P' \lesssim P' \vee P' \in \Pi$. We have:

- $P' \sim P \vee P' \in \Pi \Rightarrow \overline{P} \sim P \vee \overline{P} \in \Phi(\Pi)$;
- $P' > P \vee P' \in \Pi \Rightarrow \overline{P} > P \vee \overline{P} \in \Phi(\Pi)$;
- $P' < P \vee P' \in \Pi \Rightarrow \overline{P} < P \vee \overline{P} \in \Phi(\Pi)$;
- $P' \not\lesssim P \vee P' \in \Pi \Rightarrow \overline{P} \not\lesssim P \vee \overline{P} \in \Phi(\Pi)$.

4.1.4 Consistency

The three axioms are consistent in the sense that they do not contradict each others. A trivial preorder \lesssim for which all axioms are satisfied is the one such that all performances are equivalent, regardless of what S and Φ are.

4.2. Sufficient Conditions

In this section, we first establish a bridge between the axioms and scores and give sufficient conditions to satisfy our axioms. We do it for $\Phi = \text{conv}$. The proofs can be found in the supplementary material.

The 1st theorem explains how performance orderings \lesssim can be induced from scores X . It is a construction that allows to capitalize on the natural order \leq on \mathbb{R} to obtain a preorder \lesssim on $\mathbb{P}_{(\Omega, \Sigma)}$.

Theorem 1 (Sufficient condition for Axiom 1). *If a binary relation \lesssim_X on $\mathbb{P}_{(\Omega, \Sigma)}$ is induced by a score X as $P_1 \lesssim_X P_2$ iff either $P_1 = P_2$ or $P_1 \in \text{dom}(X)$ and $P_2 \in \text{dom}(X)$ and $X(P_1) \leq X(P_2)$, then \lesssim_X is a preorder, as required by Axiom 1.*

The 2nd theorem makes the connection between the properties of the scores X and the satisfaction S .

Theorem 2 (Sufficient condition for Axiom 2). *If a score X satisfies, for all events $E \in \Sigma$, the inequalities $\min_{\omega \in E} S(\omega) \leq X(P) \leq \max_{\omega \in E} S(\omega)$ for all performances $P \in \text{dom}(X)$ such that $P(E) = 1$, then the ordering \lesssim_X satisfies Axiom 2.*

The 3rd theorem makes the connection between the properties of the scores X and the combinations $\Phi = \text{conv}$.

Theorem 3 (Sufficient condition for Axiom 3). *If a score X is such that $\Pi \subseteq \text{dom}(X) \Rightarrow \text{conv}(\Pi) \subseteq \text{dom}(X)$, where $\text{conv}(\Pi)$ denotes the set of all convex combinations of the performances in Π , and if $\min_{P \in \Pi} X(P) \leq X(\overline{P}) \leq \max_{P \in \Pi} X(P)$ for all $\Pi \subseteq \text{dom}(X)$ and all $\overline{P} \in \text{conv}(\Pi)$, then the ordering \lesssim_X satisfies Axiom 3 for $\Phi = \text{conv}$.*

No matter the sample space, there always exists at least one performance ordering that satisfies axioms 1, 2, and 3: the ordering $\lesssim_{X_S^E}$ induced by the expected satisfaction. This is true, regardless of the sample space Ω .

4.3. The Ranking Scores: Universal Solutions

We now consider the application-specific preferences modeled by the random variable I . We introduce a new family of scores, the *ranking scores* R_I , that are parameterized by the *importance*, a non-negative random variable $I \neq 0$:

$$R_I : \text{dom}(R_I) \rightarrow [s_{\min, \Omega}, s_{\max, \Omega}] :$$

$$P \mapsto R_I(P) = \frac{\mathbf{E}_P[IS]}{\mathbf{E}_P[I]} = \frac{\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} I(\omega)S(\omega)P(\{\omega\})}{\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} I(\omega)P(\{\omega\})}$$

where $\text{dom}(R_I) = \{P \in \mathbb{P}_{(\Omega, \Sigma)} : \mathbf{E}_P[I] \neq 0\}$. The expected satisfaction X_S^E corresponds to R_I when all samples are equally important.

The scores R_I and the performance orderings \lesssim_{R_I} satisfy the conditions of Theorem 1, 2, and 3 (proofs are given in the supplementary material). Thus, the performance orderings \lesssim_{R_I} induced by the ranking scores satisfy all our axioms. Hence, the chosen name. What is really remarkable about these scores is their universality: they can be used for any performance-based ranking.

Properties. Let us now give some selected properties. Their proofs can be found in the supplementary material.

The first property sheds light on how the importance can be interpreted. Consider any random experiment for which the set of possible outcomes is Ω , their distribution being given by P . One can choose to *filter* the outcomes as follows: run the experiment, and if the outcome is ω , end the experiment with probability $I(\omega)$, otherwise restart everything. The new distribution of outcomes is given by the operation $\text{filter}_I(P)$.

Property 1. *The ranking scores can be decomposed into an operation on performances considering the importance I and a score (the expected satisfaction) considering the satisfaction S . We have $R_I = X_S^E \circ \text{filter}_I$, where filter_I denotes the operation*

$$\text{filter}_I : \text{dom}(R_I) \rightarrow \mathbb{P}_{(\Omega, \Sigma)} :$$

$$P \mapsto \left(\Sigma \rightarrow [0, 1] : E \mapsto \frac{\sum_{\omega \in E} P(\{\omega\})I(\omega)}{\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} P(\{\omega\})I(\omega)} \right).$$

Until now, we considered that the satisfaction was fixed. But what if one hesitates about the objective of the task, *i.e.* with its modeling through S ? The next property clarifies what really matters.

Property 2. *Linearly transforming the satisfaction results in the same linear transformation of the score. It is something that does not affect the ordering.*

The next property is about the scale invariance of I .

Property 3. $R_{kI} = R_I, \forall k \neq 0$. *We can thus restrict the study of ranking scores to the case in which the total importance $\sum_{\omega \in \Sigma} I(\omega)$ is constant.*

It is possible to go further in the particular case of a binary satisfaction.

Property 4. *For a binary satisfaction, the performance ordering induced by a ranking score is insensitive to the uniform scaling of the importance given to the unsatisfying or to the satisfying samples (*i.e.*, $S^{-1}(0)$ and $S^{-1}(1)$, respectively).*

Most of the scores obtained by averaging or integrating ranking scores are not themselves ranking scores, and are unsuited for ranking. Thanks to Theorem 2, we know that the performance orderings induced by them satisfy Axiom 2. However, most often, they do not satisfy Axiom 3. Nevertheless, two exceptions occur in the particular case of a binary satisfaction.

Property 5. *If I is the arithmetic mean of I_1 and I_2 , then R_I is the f -mean of R_{I_1} and R_{I_2} with $f : x \mapsto x^{-1}$, *i.e.*, the harmonic mean, when $S(\omega) = 1 \Rightarrow I_1(\omega) = I_2(\omega)$.*

Property 6. *If I is the arithmetic mean of I_1 and I_2 , then R_I is the f -mean of R_{I_1} and R_{I_2} with $f : x \mapsto (1 - x)^{-1}$, when $S(\omega) = 0 \Rightarrow I_1(\omega) = I_2(\omega)$.*

For any homogeneous binary relation \mathcal{R} (*e.g.* $\leq, <, =, >, \geq, \dots$) on \mathbb{R} , let us define the set $\phi_{\mathcal{R}}(P) = \{P' \in \mathbb{P}_{(\Omega, \Sigma)} : R_I(P') \mathcal{R} R_I(P)\}$. Based on these sets, the following property helps to understand why the ranking scores are suitable when $\Phi = \text{conv}$. This is indeed related to the fact that the scores R_I are pseudolinear functions.

Property 7. *For any given performance $P \in \mathbb{P}_{(\Omega, \Sigma)}$, the worse set $\phi_{<}(P)$ (*a.k.a.* the strictly lower contour set), the worse or equivalent set $\phi_{\leq}(P)$ (*a.k.a.* the lower contour set), the equivalent set $\phi_{=}(P)$, the better or equivalent set $\phi_{\geq}(P)$ (*a.k.a.* the upper contour set) and the better set $\phi_{>}(P)$ (*a.k.a.* the strict upper contour set) are all convex.*

5. Observations for Two-Class Classification

We now take a brief look at the particular case of two-class crisp classification.

5.1. How Can We Use our Framework?

Choice for the measurable space. We consider the sample space $\Omega = \{tn, fp, fn, tp\}$ and the event space $\Sigma = 2^\Omega$. The samples tn, fp, fn , and tp are interpreted as, respectively, a *true negative*, a *false positive* (type I error), a *false negative* (type II error), and a *true positive*.

Choice for the satisfaction. We consider that the satisfaction is such that $S(fp) = S(fn) = 0$ and $S(tn) = S(tp) = 1$. Thus, $|\{\omega \in \Omega : S(\omega) = 0\}| = 2$, and $|\{\omega \in \Omega : S(\omega) = 1\}| = 2$.

Supplementary and optional things. It is convenient to introduce a set $\mathbb{C} = \{c_-, c_+\}$ in which c_- and c_+ are named *negative class* and *positive class*. We also define the random variable $Y : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, named *ground truth*, such that $Y(tn) = Y(fp) = c_-$ and $Y(fn) = Y(tp) = c_+$, as well as the random variable $\hat{Y} : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, named *prediction*, such that $\hat{Y}(tn) = \hat{Y}(fn) = c_-$ and $\hat{Y}(fp) = \hat{Y}(tp) = c_+$. This terminology allows us to easily use the traditional notations for two-class classification problems.

5.2. What our ranking theory teaches us?

We now examine some common scores defined in the literature for two-class crisp classification, from the ranking standpoint. Methodologically, we choose the set of numerical quantities that have been listed in a recent review on the topic [1], and focus on those that are scores (this excludes the base measures and the 1st level measures as they are called in that paper).

We consider three sets of performances: (1) the set of all performances $\mathbb{P}_{(\Omega, \Sigma)}$; (2) all performances for fixed and unbalanced priors (we choose arbitrarily a positive prior of 0.2); (3) all performances for fixed and balanced priors.

For each score X and for each set of performances Π , we report in Tab. 1 the result of three tests on X as well as the minimum and maximum rank correlations X has with the ranking scores.

The tests are the following. The 1st test determines whether \lesssim_X satisfies Axiom 2 when the performance space is restricted to Π . The 2nd and 3rd tests are related to Theorem 3 (and thus to Axiom 3). The 2nd test determines whether, for any subset Π' of Π , $\max_{P' \in \Pi'} X(P')$ is greater or equal to $X(P)$ for all performances $P \in \text{conv}(\Pi')$. The 3rd test determines whether, for any subset Π' of Π , $\min_{P' \in \Pi'} X(P')$ is less or equal to $X(P)$ for all performances $P \in \text{conv}(\Pi')$.

For the rank correlations, we first try to determine analytically if the score is monotonically increasing or decreasing with one of the ranking scores. If it is the case, we report a maximum correlation of 1 or a minimum correlation of -1 , respectively. The proofs can be found in the supplementary

Table 1. Properties of some common scores defined in the literature for two-class crisp classification. The symbol † indicates a value that has been obtained theoretically, the others have been obtained empirically. Our conclusion is that, for the purpose of ranking, the scores in green can always be used, those in orange should only be used when the priors are fixed, and those in black cannot be used even when the priors are fixed. See Sec. 5 for the detailed description.

score	without any constraint: all performances					with constraint: positive prior = 0.2					with constraint: positive prior = 0.5				
	1 st test	2 nd test	3 rd test	τ_{min}	τ_{max}	1 st test	2 nd test	3 rd test	τ_{min}	τ_{max}	1 st test	2 nd test	3 rd test	τ_{min}	τ_{max}
Accuracy	V	V	V	0.469	1 [†]	V	V	V	0.157	1 [†]	V	V	V	0.505	1 [†]
F-score for $\beta = 0.5$	V	V	V	0.079	1 [†]	V	V	V	0.451	1 [†]	V	V	V	0.352	1 [†]
F-score for $\beta = 1.0$	V	V	V	0.161	1 [†]	V	V	V	0.352	1 [†]	V	V	V	0.194	1 [†]
F-score for $\beta = 2.0$	V	V	V	0.079	1 [†]	V	V	V	0.194	1 [†]	V	V	V	0.072	1 [†]
Negative Predictive Value (NPV)	V	V	V	0.000	1 [†]	V	V	V	0.503	1 [†]	V	V	V	0.503	1 [†]
Positive Predictive Value (PPV)	V	V	V	0.000	1 [†]	V	V	V	0.503	1 [†]	V	V	V	0.503	1 [†]
True Negative Rate (TNR)	V	V	V	0.000	1 [†]	V	V	V	0.000	1 [†]	V	V	V	0.000	1 [†]
True Positive Rate (TPR)	V	V	V	0.000	1 [†]	V	V	V	0.000	1 [†]	V	V	V	0.000	1 [†]
Balanced Accuracy	V	X	X	0.486	0.713	V	V	V	0.504	1 [†]	V	V	V	0.505	1 [†]
Cohen's κ	X	X	X	0.476	0.697	V	V	V	0.503	1 [†]	V	V	V	0.505	1 [†]
Informedness	V	X	X	0.486	0.713	V	V	V	0.504	1 [†]	V	V	V	0.505	1 [†]
Positive Likelihood Ratio (PLR)	V	X	X	0.420	0.677	V	V	V	0.491	1 [†]	V	V	V	0.491	1 [†]
Probability of True Negative (PTN)	X	V	V	-0.007	0.818	V	V	V	0.000	1 [†]	V	V	V	0.000	1 [†]
Probability of True Positive (PTP)	X	V	V	-0.006	0.818	V	V	V	0.000	1 [†]	V	V	V	0.000	1 [†]
Chance in Cohen's κ	X	X	X	0.194	0.498	X	V	V	-0.157	0.849	V	V	V	0 [†]	0 [†]
Error Rate	X	V	V	-1 [†]	-0.469	X	V	V	-1 [†]	-0.157	X	V	V	-1 [†]	-0.505
False Discovery Rate (FDR)	X	V	V	-1 [†]	0.000	X	V	V	-1 [†]	-0.503	X	V	V	-1 [†]	-0.503
False Negative Rate (FNR)	X	V	V	-1 [†]	0.000	X	V	V	-1 [†]	0.000	X	V	V	-1 [†]	0.000
False Omission Rate (FOR)	X	V	V	-1 [†]	0.000	X	V	V	-1 [†]	-0.503	X	V	V	-1 [†]	-0.503
False Positive Rate (FPR)	X	V	V	-1 [†]	0.000	X	V	V	-1 [†]	0.000	X	V	V	-1 [†]	0.000
Geometric mean of TNR and TPR	V	X	X	0.461	0.653	V	X	V	0.503	0.831	V	X	V	0.503	0.830
Markedness	V	X	X	0.486	0.713	V	X	X	0.418	0.887	V	X	X	0.503	0.913
Matthews Correlation Coefficient (MCC)	V	X	X	0.503	0.746	V	X	X	0.458	0.944	V	X	X	0.503	0.963
Negative Likelihood Ratio (NLR)	X	X	X	-0.677	-0.418	X	V	V	-1 [†]	-0.491	X	V	V	-1 [†]	-0.491
Odds Ratio (OR)	V	X	X	0.499	0.671	V	X	X	0.503	0.894	V	X	X	0.503	0.892
Rate of positive predictions	X	V	V	-0.469	0.469	X	V	V	-0.849	0.157	X	V	V	-0.504	0.505
Sensitivity Index Estimate (d')	V	X	X	0.502	0.786	V	X	X	0.503	0.926	V	X	X	0.503	0.924

material. Otherwise, we report empirical values obtained by optimizing Kendall's τ . We consider a uniform distribution of performances within Π . Kendall's τ is computed using a function provided in SCIPY [21], with its default parameters, and fed with the values of R_I and X for about 6550 performances regularly placed in Π . Note that Kendall's τ is not a continuous function of I when estimated on a finite set of performances. We designed a custom optimizer to circumvent the difficulties related to that.

The result of our review is given in Tab. 1, where the scores have been grouped in three categories: in green are the scores satisfying the three tests in all cases. In orange are those that satisfy the three tests only for fixed priors. In black are the others. We draw 4 conclusions. (1) Performance orderings satisfying our axioms can be induced by several classical scores for two-class classification (in green). (2) There exist scores that are commonly used in the literature (in orange) that cannot be used for ranking classifiers, unless the priors are fixed. (3) There exist scores that are often used to compare classifiers (e.g., the geometric mean of TNR and TPR, the markedness, Matthews Correlation Coefficient, the Odds Ratio) but that cannot be used to rank, even when the priors are fixed. (4) In all studied cases where our axioms are satisfied, there is a perfect correlation with a ranking score. This shows that our family of scores covers at least a broad part of the needs. Only one exception occurred (in gray): the accuracy achievable by chance, as considered by Cohen in the definition of his

κ [3], when the classes are balanced. In this case, the score takes a constant value, that is why it satisfies our axioms.

6. Conclusion

The choice of a performance score for ranking turns out to have a considerable impact on the development of a field of research. Therefore, we have established rigorous theoretical foundations for comparing and ranking entities based on their performances. Usually, benchmarks rely on a single, arbitrarily chosen performance score. However, the choice of the score presents several challenges. Firstly, not all scores lead to a meaningful order. Secondly, one usually does not have a clear, global overview of the suitable scores for ranking. Finally, the absence of consensus among experts further complicates the choice of the best score. Our paper addresses these challenges by providing the following solutions: (i) An *axiomatic definition of the performance-based rankings* that can be used to validate a choice; (ii) The *ranking scores*, an infinite family of diversified scores universally suitable for ranking, that allow the users to specify their preferences numerically through a random variable called *importance*; the inherent subjectivity can be introduced thanks to it.

Acknowledgments. The work by S. Piérard and A. Halin was supported by the Walloon Region (Service Public de Wallonie Recherche, Belgium) under grant n°2010235 (ARIAC by [DIGITALWALLONIA4.AI](#)). A. Deliège is funded by the [F.R.S.-FNRS](#) under project grant T.0065.22.

A. Cioppa is funded by the [F.R.S.-FNRS](#).

References

- [1] Gurol Canbek, Seref Sagiroglu, Tugba Taskaya Temizel, and Nazife Baykal. Binary classification performance measures/metrics: A comprehensive visualized roadmap to gain new insights. In *Int. Conf. Comput. Sci. Eng. (UBMK)*, pages 821–826, Antalya, Turkey, 2017. [2](#), [4](#), [7](#)
- [2] Anthony Cioppa, Silvio Giancola, Vladimir Somers, Floriane Magera, Xin Zhou, Hassan Mkhallati, Adrien Delière, Jan Held, Carlos Hinojosa, Amir M. Mansourian, Pierre Miralles, Olivier Barnich, Christophe De Vleeschouwer, Alexandre Alahi, Bernard Ghanem, Marc Van Droogenbroeck, Abdullah Kamal, Adrien Maglo, Albert Clapés, Amr Abdelaziz, Artur Xarles, Astrid Orcesi, Atom Scott, Bin Liu, Byoungkwon Lim, Chen Chen, Fabian Deuser, Feng Yan, Fufu Yu, Gal Shitrit, Guanshuo Wang, Gyusik Choi, Hankyul Kim, Hao Guo, Hasby Fahrudin, Hidenari Koguchi, Håkan Ardö, Ibrahim Salah, Ido Yerushalmy, Iftikar Muhammad, Ikuma Uchida, Ishay Be’ery, Jaonary Rabarisoa, Jeongae Lee, Jiajun Fu, Jianqin Yin, Jinghang Xu, Jongho Nang, Julien Denize, Junjie Li, Junpei Zhang, Juntae Kim, Kamil Synowiec, Kenji Kobayashi, Kexin Zhang, Konrad Habel, Kota Nakajima, Licheng Jiao, Lin Ma, Lizhi Wang, Luping Wang, Menglong Li, Mengying Zhou, Mohamed Nasr, Mohamed Abdelwahed, Mykola Liashuha, Nikolay Falaleev, Norbert Oswald, Qiong Jia, Quoc-Cuong Pham, Ran Song, Romain Hérault, Rui Peng, Ruilong Chen, Ruixuan Liu, Ruslan Baikulov, Ryuto Fukushima, Sergio Escalera, Seungcheon Lee, Shimin Chen, Shouhong Ding, Taiga Someya, Thomas B. Moeslund, Tianjiao Li, Wei Shen, Wei Zhang, Wei Li, Wei Dai, Weixin Luo, Wending Zhao, Wenjie Zhang, Xinquan Yang, Yanbiao Ma, Yeeun Joo, Yingsen Zeng, Yiyang Gan, Yongqiang Zhu, Yujie Zhong, Zheng Ruan, Zhiheng Li, Zhijian Huang, and Ziyu Meng. SoccerNet 2023 challenges results. *Sports Eng.*, 27(2):1–18, 2024. [2](#)
- [3] Jacob Cohen. A coefficient of agreement for nominal scales. *Educ. Psychol. Meas.*, 20(1):37–46, 1960. [8](#)
- [4] Brooke A. Davey and Hilary A. Priestley. *Introduction to Lattices and Order*. Camb. Univ. Press, second edition, 2002. [2](#), [3](#)
- [5] Jesse Davis and Mark Goadrich. The relationship between precision-recall and ROC curves. In *Int. Conf. Mach. Learn. (ICML)*, pages 233–240, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, 2006. [3](#)
- [6] Tom Fawcett. An introduction to ROC analysis. *Pattern Recognit. Lett.*, 27(8):861–874, 2006. [4](#)
- [7] Maurice Fréchet. Sur diverses définitions de la moyenne d’un élément aléatoire de nature quelconque. *Giornale dell’Istituto Italiano degli Attuari*, 19:1–15, 1956. [4](#)
- [8] Nil Goyette, Pierre-Marc Jodoin, Fatih Porikli, Janusz Konrad, and Prakash Ishwar. A novel video dataset for change detection benchmarking. *IEEE Trans. Image Process.*, 23(11):4663–4679, 2014. [2](#)
- [9] George Grätzer. *General Lattice Theory*. Birkhäuser Basel, second edition, 2003. [2](#), [3](#)
- [10] Anaïs Halin, Sébastien Piérard, Anthony Cioppa, and Marc Van Droogenbroeck. A hitchhiker’s guide to understanding performances of two-class classifiers. *arXiv*, 2024. [1](#)
- [11] Hermann Karcher. Riemannian center of mass and mollifier smoothing. *Commun. Pure Appl. Math.*, 30(5):509–541, 1977. [4](#)
- [12] Andrey Nikolaevich Kolmogorov. Grundbegriffe der wahrscheinlichkeitsrechnung. In *Grundbegriffe der Wahrscheinlichkeitsrechnung*, page 62 pages. Springer Berl. Heidelb., 1933. [2](#), [3](#)
- [13] Andrey Nikolaevich Kolmogorov. *Foundations of the theory of probability*. Chelsea Publishing Company, 1950. [2](#), [3](#)
- [14] Matej Kristan, Jiri Matas, Ale Leonardis, Michael Felsberg, Luka Cehovin, Gustavo Fernandez, Toma Vojir, Gustav Hager, Georg Nebehay, Roman Pflugfelder, Abhinav Gupta, Adel Bibi, Alan Lukezic, Alvaro Garcia-Martin, Amir Safari, Alfredo Petrosino, and Andrés Solis Montero. The visual object tracking VOT2015 challenge results. In *IEEE Int. Conf. Comput. Vis. Work. (ICCV Work.)*, pages 564–586, Santiago, Chile, 2015. [2](#)
- [15] Matej Kristan, Jiri Matas, Pavel Tokmakov, Michael Felsberg, Luka Čehovin Zajc, Alan Lukežič, Khanh-Tung Tran, Xuan-Son Vu, Johanna Bjorklund, Hyung Jin Chang, and Gustavo Fernandez. The second visual object tracking segmentation VOTS2024 challenge results. In *Eur. Conf. Comput. Vis. Work. (ECCV Work.)*, Milan, Italy, 2024. [2](#)
- [16] Lena Maier-Hein, Matthias Eisenmann, Annika Reinke, Sinan Onogur, Marko Stankovic, Patrick Scholz, Tal Arbel, Hrvoje Bogunovic, Andrew P. Bradley, Aaron Carass, Carolin Feldmann, Alejandro F. Frangi, Peter M. Full, Bram van Ginneken, Allan Hanbury, Katrin Honauer, Michal Kozubek, Bennett A. Landman, Keno März, Oskar Maier, Klaus Maier-Hein, Bjoern H. Menze, Henning Müller, Peter F. Neher, Wiro Niessen, Nasir Rajpoot, Gregory C. Sharp, Korsuk Sirinukunwattana, Stefanie Speidel, Christian Stock, Danail Stoyanov, Abdel Aziz Taha, Fons van der Sommen, Ching-Wei Wang, Marc-André Weber, Guoyan Zheng, Pierre Janin, and Annette Kopp-Schneider. Why rankings of biomedical image analysis competitions should be interpreted with care. *Nat. Commun.*, 9(1):1–13, 2018. [2](#)
- [17] Tran Thien Dat Nguyen, Hamid Reza Tofighi, Ba-Ngu Vo, Ba-Tuong Vo, Silvio Savarese, and Ian Reid. How trustworthy are performance evaluations for basic vision tasks? *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, 45(7):8538–8552, 2023. [2](#), [3](#)
- [18] Sébastien Piérard and Marc Van Droogenbroeck. Summarizing the performances of a background subtraction algorithm measured on several videos. In *IEEE Int. Conf. Image Process. (ICIP)*, pages 3234–3238, Abu Dhabi, United Arab Emirates, 2020. [4](#)
- [19] Sébastien Piérard, Anaïs Halin, Anthony Cioppa, Adrien Delière, and Marc Van Droogenbroeck. The Tile: A 2D map of ranking scores for two-class classification. *arXiv*, 2024. [1](#)
- [20] Putnam P. Texel. Measure, metric, and indicator: An object-oriented approach for consistent terminology. *Proc. IEEE Southeastcon*, pages 1–5, 2013. [2](#), [4](#)
- [21] Pauli Virtanen, Ralf Gommers, Travis E. Oliphant, Matt Haberland, Tyler Reddy, David Cournapeau, Evgeni

Burovski, Pearu Peterson, Warren Weckesser, Jonathan Bright, Stéfan J. van der Walt, Matthew Brett, Joshua Wilson, K. Jarrod Millman, Nikolay Mayorov, Andrew R. J. Nelson, Eric Jones, Robert Kern, Eric Larson, C. J. Carey, İlhan Polat, Yu Feng, Eric W. Moore, Jake VanderPlas, Denis Laxalde, Josef Perktold, Robert Cimrman, Ian Henriksen, E. A. Quintero, Charles R. Harris, Anne M. Archibald, Antônio H. Ribeiro, Fabian Pedregosa, Paul van Mulbregt, Aditya Vijaykumar, Alessandro Pietro Bardelli, Alex Rothberg, Andreas Hilboll, Andreas Kloeckner, Anthony Scopatz, Antony Lee, Ariel Rokem, C. Nathan Woods, Chad Fulton, Charles Masson, Christian Häggström, Clark Fitzgerald, David A. Nicholson, David R. Hagen, Dmitrii V. Pasechnik, Emanuele Olivetti, Eric Martin, Eric Wieser, Fabrice Silva, Felix Lenders, Florian Wilhelm, G. Young, Gavin A. Price, Gert-Ludwig Ingold, Gregory E. Allen, Gregory R. Lee, Hervé Audren, Irvin Probst, Jörg P. Dietrich, Jacob Silterra, James T. Webber, Janko Slavič, Joel Nothman, Johannes Buchner, Johannes Kulick, Johannes L. Schönberger, José Vinícius de Miranda Cardoso, Joscha Reimer, Joseph Harrington, Juan Luis Cano Rodríguez, Juan Nunez-Iglesias, Justin Kuczynski, Kevin Tritz, Martin Thoma, Matthew Newville, Matthias Kümmerer, Maximilian Bolingbroke, Michael Tartre, Mikhail Pak, Nathaniel J. Smith, Nikolai Nowaczyk, Nikolay Shebanov, Oleksandr Pavlyk, Per A. Brodtkorb, Perry Lee, Robert T. McGibbon, Roman Feldbauer, Sam Lewis, Sam Tygier, Scott Sievert, Sebastiano Vigna, Stefan Peterson, Surhud More, Tadeusz Pudlik, Takuya Oshima, Thomas J. Pingel, Thomas P. Robitaille, Thomas Spura, Thouis R. Jones, Tim Cera, Tim Leslie, Tiziano Zito, Tom Krauss, Utkarsh Upadhyay, Yaroslav O. Halchenko, and Yoshiki Vázquez-Baeza. SciPy 1.0: fundamental algorithms for scientific computing in Python. *Nat. Methods*, 17(3):261–272, 2020. 8

A. Supplementary Material

Contents

A.1 List of symbols	12
A.1.1 Mathematical symbols	12
A.1.2 Symbols related to our mathematical framework	12
A.1.3 Symbols used for operations on performances	13
A.1.4 Symbols used in the performance ordering and performance-based ranking theory	13
A.1.5 Symbols used for the particular case of two-class crisp classifications	13
A.2 Supplementary material about Sec. 3.2	14
A.2.1 Reminders of classical definitions.	14
A.2.2 The 4 cases in the comparison of two performances with a preorder \lesssim	14
A.2.3 Implications of the transitivity of \lesssim	14
A.2.4 Properties of \sim , $>$, $<$, $\not\lesssim$, \lesssim , and \gtrsim	15
A.3 Supplementary material about Sec. 3.6	17
A.4 Supplementary material about Sec. 4.2	18
A.4.1 Proof of Theorem 1.	18
A.4.2 Proof of Theorem 2	18
A.4.3 Proof of Theorem 3	19
A.5 Supplementary material about Sec. 4.3	20
A.5.1 All ranking scores can be used to rank performances	20
A.5.2 On the properties of ranking scores.	22
A.6 Supplementary material about Sec. 5.2	25
A.6.1 Scores perfectly correlated with a ranking score, for all performances	25
A.6.2 Scores perfectly correlated with a ranking score, for the performances corresponding to given class priors $\pi_- \neq 0$ and $\pi_+ \neq 0$	25

A.1. List of symbols

A.1.1 Mathematical symbols

- $\mathbf{1}_U$: the 0-1 indicator function of subset U
- \mathbb{R} : the real numbers
- \mathcal{R} : a relation
- conv : the set of convex combinations
- \vee : the *inclusive disjunction* (i.e., logical or)
- \wedge : the *conjunction* (i.e., logical and)
- \circ : the composition of functions, i.e. $(g \circ f)(x) = g(f(x))$
- \mathbf{E} : the mathematical expectation

A.1.2 Symbols related to our mathematical framework

We organize these symbols according to the 6 pillars depicted in Fig. 1, which correspond to the 6 subsections of Sec. 3.

Symbols related to the 1st pillar (Sec. 3.1)

- Ω : the sample space (universe)
- ω : a sample (i.e., an element of Ω)
- Σ : the event space (a σ -algebra on Ω , e.g. 2^Ω)
- E : an event (i.e., an element of Σ)
- (Ω, Σ) : the measurable space
- $\mathbb{P}_{(\Omega, \Sigma)}$: all performances on (Ω, Σ)
- Π : a set of performances ($\Pi \subseteq \mathbb{P}_{(\Omega, \Sigma)}$)
- P : a performance (i.e., an element of $\mathbb{P}_{(\Omega, \Sigma)}$)

Symbols related to the 2nd pillar (Sec. 3.2)

- \lesssim : binary relation *worse or equivalent* on $\mathbb{P}_{(\Omega, \Sigma)}$
- \gtrsim : binary relation *better or equivalent* on $\mathbb{P}_{(\Omega, \Sigma)}$
- \sim : binary relation *equivalent* on $\mathbb{P}_{(\Omega, \Sigma)}$
- $>$: binary relation *better* on $\mathbb{P}_{(\Omega, \Sigma)}$
- $<$: binary relation *worse* on $\mathbb{P}_{(\Omega, \Sigma)}$
- $\not\sim$: binary relation *incomparable* on $\mathbb{P}_{(\Omega, \Sigma)}$

Symbols related to the 3rd pillar (Sec. 3.3)

- S : the random variable *Satisfaction*
- $s_{\min, \Omega}$: the minimum satisfaction value
- $s_{\max, \Omega}$: the maximum satisfaction value

Symbols related to the 4th pillar (Sec. 3.4)

- \mathbb{E} : the set of entities to rank
- ϵ : an entity, i.e. an element of \mathbb{E}
- eval : the performance *evaluation* function
- Φ : some performances that are for sure achievable

Symbols related to the 5th pillar (Sec. 3.5)

- $\mathbb{X}_{(\Omega, \Sigma)}$: all scores on (Ω, Σ)
- X : a score
- $\text{dom}(X)$: the domain of the score X
- X_V^E : the *expected value score* parameterized by the random variable V
- $X_{E_1|E_2}^P$: the *probabilistic score* parameterized by the events E_1 and E_2

Symbols related to the 6th pillar (Sec. 3.6)

- I : the random variable *Importance*

A.1.3 Symbols used for operations on performances

- filter_I : the *filtering* operation

A.1.4 Symbols used in the performance ordering and performance-based ranking theory

- $\text{rank}_{\mathbb{E}}$: the *ranking* function, w.r.t. the set of entities \mathbb{E}
- \lesssim_X : the ordering induced by the score X (*cf.* Theorem 1)
- R_I : the *ranking score* parameterized by the importance I
- τ : the rank correlation coefficient of Kendall

A.1.5 Symbols used for the particular case of two-class crisp classifications

Particularization of the mathematical framework

- tn : the sample *true negative*
- fp : the sample *false positive*, *a.k.a.* type I error
- fn : the sample *false negative*, *a.k.a.* type II error
- tp : the sample *true positive*

Extensions to the mathematical framework

- ROC: the *Receiver Operating Characteristic* space, *i.e.* $FPR \times TPR$
- PR: the *Precision-Recall* space, *i.e.* $TPR \times PPV$
- Y : the random variable for the ground truth
- \hat{Y} : the random variable for the prediction
- \mathbb{C} : the set of classes
- c : a class (*i.e.*, an element of \mathbb{C})
- c_- : the negative class
- c_+ : the positive class

Scores

- A : the *accuracy*
- TNR : the *true negative rate*
- FPR : the *false positive rate*
- TPR : the *true positive rate*
- PPV : the *positive predictive value*
- F_{β} : the F-scores
- π_+ : the *prior of the positive class*
- π_- : the *prior of the negative class*

A.2. Supplementary material about Sec. 3.2

This section is devoted to reminders about the order theory.

A.2.1 Reminders of classical definitions.

Let \mathcal{R} be a homogeneous binary relation on $\mathbb{P}_{(\Omega, \Sigma)}$. It is said:

- *reflexive* iif $P\mathcal{R}P \forall P$;
- *irreflexive* iif $\nexists P : P\mathcal{R}P$;
- *transitive* iif $P_1\mathcal{R}P_2 \wedge P_2\mathcal{R}P_3 \Rightarrow P_1\mathcal{R}P_3 \forall P_1, P_2, P_3$;
- *symmetric* iif $P_1\mathcal{R}P_2 \Leftrightarrow P_2\mathcal{R}P_1 \forall P_1, P_2$;
- *asymmetric* iif $\nexists (P_1, P_2) : P_1\mathcal{R}P_2 \wedge P_2\mathcal{R}P_1$;
- and *antisymmetric* iif $P_1\mathcal{R}P_2 \wedge P_2\mathcal{R}P_1 \Rightarrow P_1 = P_2$.

Two homogeneous binary relations \mathcal{R}_a and \mathcal{R}_b on $\mathbb{P}_{(\Omega, \Sigma)}$ are said *converse* iif $P_1\mathcal{R}_aP_2 \Leftrightarrow P_2\mathcal{R}_bP_1 \forall P_1, P_2$.

A relation \mathcal{R} is:

- an *equivalence* iif it is reflexive, transitive, and symmetric;
- a *preorder* iif it is reflexive and transitive;
- and an *order* iif it is reflexive, transitive, and antisymmetric.

An order \mathcal{R} is said *total* iif $\nexists (P_1, P_2) : P_1 \not\mathcal{R}P_2 \wedge P_2 \not\mathcal{R}P_1$. It is said *partial* otherwise.

A.2.2 The 4 cases in the comparison of two performances with a preorder \lesssim .

Let us now consider a preorder \lesssim and derive the homogeneous binary relations $\sim, >, <, \not\lesssim$ as follows:

$$P_1 \sim P_2 \Leftrightarrow P_1 \lesssim P_2 \wedge P_2 \lesssim P_1 \quad (1)$$

$$P_1 > P_2 \Leftrightarrow P_1 \not\lesssim P_2 \wedge P_2 \lesssim P_1 \quad (2)$$

$$P_1 < P_2 \Leftrightarrow P_1 \lesssim P_2 \wedge P_2 \not\lesssim P_1 \quad (3)$$

$$P_1 \not\lesssim P_2 \Leftrightarrow P_1 \not\lesssim P_2 \wedge P_2 \not\lesssim P_1. \quad (4)$$

Indeed, we have:

$$P_1 \lesssim P_2 \Leftrightarrow P_1 < P_2 \vee P_1 \sim P_2. \quad (5)$$

Similarly, one can derive other binary relations taking unions of $\sim, >, <$, or $\not\lesssim$. For example,

$$P_1 \gtrsim P_2 \Leftrightarrow P_1 > P_2 \vee P_1 \sim P_2. \quad (6)$$

A.2.3 Implications of the transitivity of \lesssim .

We can easily check, for each $\mathcal{R}_{ab} \in \{\lesssim, \not\lesssim\}$, each $\mathcal{R}_{ba} \in \{\lesssim, \not\lesssim\}$, each $\mathcal{R}_{bc} \in \{\lesssim, \not\lesssim\}$, each $\mathcal{R}_{cb} \in \{\lesssim, \not\lesssim\}$, each $\mathcal{R}_{ca} \in \{\lesssim, \not\lesssim\}$, and each $\mathcal{R}_{ac} \in \{\lesssim, \not\lesssim\}$, if there exists (P_a, P_b, P_c) such that $P_a\mathcal{R}_{ab}P_b, P_b\mathcal{R}_{ba}P_a, P_b\mathcal{R}_{bc}P_c, P_c\mathcal{R}_{cb}P_b, P_c\mathcal{R}_{ca}P_a$, and $P_a\mathcal{R}_{ac}P_c$. Because of the assumed transitivity of \lesssim , there are only 29 possible cases out of the 2^6 :

1. $P_a \lesssim P_b, P_b \lesssim P_c, P_a \lesssim P_c$
2. $P_a \lesssim P_b, P_b \not\lesssim P_c, P_a > P_c$
3. $P_a \lesssim P_b, P_b \not\lesssim P_c, P_a < P_c$
4. $P_a \lesssim P_b, P_b \not\lesssim P_c, P_a \sim P_c$
5. $P_a \lesssim P_b, P_b > P_c, P_a \not\lesssim P_c$
6. $P_a \lesssim P_b, P_b > P_c, P_a > P_c$
7. $P_a \lesssim P_b, P_b < P_c, P_a \not\lesssim P_c$

8. $P_a \not\lesssim P_b, P_b < P_c, P_a < P_c$
9. $P_a \not\lesssim P_b, P_b \sim P_c, P_a \not\lesssim P_c$
10. $P_a > P_b, P_b \not\lesssim P_c, P_a \not\lesssim P_c$
11. $P_a > P_b, P_b \not\lesssim P_c, P_a > P_c$
12. $P_a > P_b, P_b > P_c, P_a > P_c$
13. $P_a > P_b, P_b < P_c, P_a \not\lesssim P_c$
14. $P_a > P_b, P_b < P_c, P_a > P_c$
15. $P_a > P_b, P_b < P_c, P_a < P_c$

- | | |
|---|--|
| 16. $P_a > P_b, P_b < P_c, P_a \sim P_c$ | 23. $P_a < P_b, P_b > P_c, P_a \sim P_c$ |
| 17. $P_a > P_b, P_b \sim P_c, P_a > P_c$ | 24. $P_a < P_b, P_b < P_c, P_a < P_c$ |
| 18. $P_a < P_b, P_b \not\sim P_c, P_a \not\sim P_c$ | 25. $P_a < P_b, P_b \sim P_c, P_a < P_c$ |
| 19. $P_a < P_b, P_b \not\sim P_c, P_a < P_c$ | 26. $P_a \sim P_b, P_b \not\sim P_c, P_a \not\sim P_c$ |
| 20. $P_a < P_b, P_b > P_c, P_a \not\sim P_c$ | 27. $P_a \sim P_b, P_b > P_c, P_a > P_c$ |
| 21. $P_a < P_b, P_b > P_c, P_a > P_c$ | 28. $P_a \sim P_b, P_b < P_c, P_a < P_c$ |
| 22. $P_a < P_b, P_b > P_c, P_a < P_c$ | 29. $P_a \sim P_b, P_b \sim P_c, P_a \sim P_c$ |

From this list, we can derive some rules for manipulating the binary relations \sim , $>$, $<$, and $\not\sim$. First, we can see that \sim , $>$, and $<$ are transitive:

$$P_1 \sim P_2 \wedge P_2 \sim P_3 \Rightarrow P_1 \sim P_3 \quad (7)$$

$$P_1 > P_2 \wedge P_2 > P_3 \Rightarrow P_1 > P_3 \quad (8)$$

$$P_1 < P_2 \wedge P_2 < P_3 \Rightarrow P_1 < P_3. \quad (9)$$

Second, we can also see how \sim can be combined with the other 3 relations:

$$(P_1 \sim P_2 \wedge P_2 > P_3) \vee (P_1 > P_2 \wedge P_2 \sim P_3) \Rightarrow P_1 > P_3 \quad (10)$$

$$(P_1 \sim P_2 \wedge P_2 < P_3) \vee (P_1 < P_2 \wedge P_2 \sim P_3) \Rightarrow P_1 < P_3 \quad (11)$$

$$(P_1 \sim P_2 \wedge P_2 \not\sim P_3) \vee (P_1 \not\sim P_2 \wedge P_2 \sim P_3) \Rightarrow P_1 \not\sim P_3. \quad (12)$$

And, third, we can see how $\not\sim$ can be combined with $>$ and $<$:

$$(P_1 \not\sim P_2 \wedge P_2 > P_3) \vee (P_1 > P_2 \wedge P_2 \not\sim P_3) \Rightarrow P_1 > P_3 \vee P_1 \not\sim P_3 \quad (13)$$

$$(P_1 \not\sim P_2 \wedge P_2 < P_3) \vee (P_1 < P_2 \wedge P_2 \not\sim P_3) \Rightarrow P_1 < P_3 \vee P_1 \not\sim P_3. \quad (14)$$

A.2.4 Properties of \sim , $>$, $<$, $\not\sim$, \lesssim , and \gtrsim .

Lemma 1. When \lesssim is a preorder, \sim is reflexive.

Proof. This results from the reflexivity of \lesssim and from Eq. (1): $P \sim P \Leftrightarrow P \lesssim P \wedge P \lesssim P \Leftrightarrow true$. □

Lemma 2. When \lesssim is a preorder, \sim is transitive.

Proof. This results from the transitivity of \lesssim (cf. Eq. (7)). □

Lemma 3. When \lesssim is a preorder, \sim is symmetric.

Proof. This results from the fact that the conjunction is symmetric and from Eq. (1): $P_1 \sim P_2 \Leftrightarrow P_1 \lesssim P_2 \wedge P_2 \lesssim P_1 \Leftrightarrow P_2 \lesssim P_1 \wedge P_1 \lesssim P_2 \Leftrightarrow P_2 \sim P_1$. □

Lemma 4. When \lesssim is a preorder, $>$ and $<$ are converse.

Proof. This results from the fact that the conjunction is symmetric and from Eqs. (2) and (3): $P_1 > P_2 \Leftrightarrow P_1 \not\lesssim P_2 \wedge P_2 \lesssim P_1 \Leftrightarrow P_2 \lesssim P_1 \wedge P_1 \not\lesssim P_2 \Leftrightarrow P_2 < P_1$. □

Lemma 5. When \lesssim is a preorder, $>$ and $<$ are irreflexive.

Proof. For $>$, this results from the reflexivity of \lesssim and from Eq. (2): $P > P \Leftrightarrow P \not\lesssim P \wedge P \lesssim P \Leftrightarrow false \wedge true = false$. For $<$, the proof is similar. □

Lemma 6. When \lesssim is a preorder, $>$ and $<$ are asymmetric.

Proof. For $>$, this is because $P_1 > P_2 \wedge P_2 > P_1 \Leftrightarrow (P_1 \not\lesssim P_2 \wedge P_2 \lesssim P_1) \wedge (P_2 \not\lesssim P_1 \wedge P_1 \lesssim P_2) \Leftrightarrow (P_1 \not\lesssim P_2 \wedge P_1 \lesssim P_2) \wedge (P_2 \not\lesssim P_1 \wedge P_2 \lesssim P_1) \Leftrightarrow false \wedge false \Leftrightarrow false$. For $<$, the proof is similar. □

Lemma 7. When \lesssim is a preorder, $>$ and $<$ are transitive.

Proof. This results from the transitivity of \lesssim (cf. Eqs. (8) and (9)). \square

Lemma 8. When \lesssim is a preorder, $\not\lesssim$ is irreflexive.

Proof. This results from the reflexivity of \lesssim and from Eq. (4): $P \not\lesssim P \Leftrightarrow P \not\lesssim P \wedge P \not\lesssim P \Leftrightarrow \text{false} \wedge \text{false} \Leftrightarrow \text{false}$. \square

Lemma 9. When \lesssim is a preorder, $\not\lesssim$ is symmetric.

Proof. This results from the fact that the conjunction is symmetric and from Eq. (4): $P_1 \not\lesssim P_2 \Leftrightarrow P_1 \not\lesssim P_2 \wedge P_2 \not\lesssim P_1 \Leftrightarrow P_2 \not\lesssim P_1 \wedge P_1 \not\lesssim P_2 \Leftrightarrow P_2 \not\lesssim P_1$. \square

Lemma 10. When \lesssim is a preorder, \lesssim and \gtrsim are converse.

Proof. From Eqs. (5) and (6), as $>$ and $<$ are converse, we have $P_1 \gtrsim P_2 \Leftrightarrow P_1 > P_2 \vee P_1 \sim P_2 \Leftrightarrow P_2 < P_1 \vee P_2 \sim P_1 \Leftrightarrow P_2 \lesssim P_1$. \square

Lemma 11. When \lesssim is a preorder, \lesssim and \gtrsim are reflexive.

Proof. For \lesssim , it is by definition of preorders. For \gtrsim , from Eqs. (1), (2) and (6), we have $P \gtrsim P \Leftrightarrow P > P \vee P \sim P \Leftrightarrow (P \not\lesssim P \wedge P \lesssim P) \vee (P \lesssim P \wedge P \lesssim P) \Leftrightarrow (\text{false} \wedge \text{true}) \vee (\text{true} \wedge \text{true}) \Leftrightarrow \text{true}$. \square

Lemma 12. When \lesssim is a preorder, \lesssim and \gtrsim are transitive.

Proof. For \lesssim , it is by definition of preorders. For \gtrsim , as \lesssim and \gtrsim are converse, $P_1 \gtrsim P_2 \wedge P_2 \gtrsim P_3 \Leftrightarrow P_3 \lesssim P_2 \wedge P_2 \lesssim P_1 \Leftrightarrow P_3 \lesssim P_1 \Leftrightarrow P_1 \gtrsim P_3$. \square

A.3. Supplementary material about Sec. 3.6

Let us consider the example of two-class classification, with $P(\{tn\})$, $P(\{fp\})$, $P(\{fn\})$, and $P(\{tp\})$ denoting, respectively, the probability (or proportion) of true negatives, false positives, false negatives, and true positives. Here are two classical scores, the accuracy and the true positive rate:

$$A = P(\{tn\}) + P(\{tp\}) \quad TPR = \frac{P(\{tp\})}{P(\{fn\}) + P(\{tp\})}$$

The formula for the accuracy gives the illusion that the same importance is given to $\{tn\}$ and $\{tp\}$ and that no importance at all is given to $\{fp\}$ and $\{fn\}$. For the true positive rate, the formula might give the impression that the same importance is given to $\{fn\}$ and $\{tp\}$ and that no importance at all is given to $\{tn\}$ and $\{fp\}$. In fact, the visual inspection of formulas like these is not reliable at all to judge of the importance given by a score to the various events. To see it, consider rewriting the previous equations as

$$A = (1 - \alpha)P(\{tn\}) - \alpha P(\{fp\}) - \alpha P(\{fn\}) + (1 - \alpha)P(\{tp\}) + \alpha \quad \forall \alpha$$

$$TPR = \frac{-\alpha P(\{tn\}) - \alpha P(\{fp\}) - \alpha P(\{fn\}) + (1 - \alpha)P(\{tp\}) + \alpha}{-\beta P(\{tn\}) - \beta P(\{fp\}) + (1 - \beta)P(\{fn\}) + (1 - \beta)P(\{tp\}) + \beta} \quad \forall \alpha, \beta$$

A visual inspection of such formulas would lead, indeed, to other illusions about the events that have no importance. This observation, however, should not stop us from thinking in terms of importance. In fact, we do it in this paper, but we do it in a mathematical framework that allows to do it rigorously.

A.4. Supplementary material about Sec. 4.2

A.4.1 Proof of Theorem 1.

For convenience, we provide a reminder of Theorem 1 and Axiom 1 below.

Theorem 1 (Sufficient condition for Axiom 1). *If a binary relation \lesssim_X on $\mathbb{P}(\Omega, \Sigma)$ is induced by a score X as $P_1 \lesssim_X P_2$ iff either $P_1 = P_2$ or $P_1 \in \text{dom}(X)$ and $P_2 \in \text{dom}(X)$ and $X(P_1) \leq X(P_2)$, then \lesssim_X is a preorder, as required by Axiom 1.*

Axiom 1. *The ranking function $\text{rank}_{\mathbb{E}} : \mathbb{E} \rightarrow [1, |\mathbb{E}|] : \epsilon \mapsto \text{rank}_{\mathbb{E}}(\epsilon)$ satisfies $|\{\epsilon' \in \mathbb{E} : \text{eval}(\epsilon) < \text{eval}(\epsilon')\}| + 1 \leq \text{rank}_{\mathbb{E}}(\epsilon) \leq |\{\epsilon' \in \mathbb{E} : \text{eval}(\epsilon) \lesssim \text{eval}(\epsilon')\}|$, where \lesssim is a preorder on $\mathbb{P}(\Omega, \Sigma)$.*

Proof. To establish that \lesssim_X is a preorder, we have to show that it is (1) reflexive and (2) transitive.

(1) The reflexivity of \lesssim_X is trivial to establish, since $P_1 = P_2 \Rightarrow P_1 \lesssim_X P_2$.

(2) The transitivity of \lesssim_X can be shown as follows. $P_1 \lesssim_X P_2 \wedge P_2 \lesssim_X P_3$ implies that:

- either $P_1 \in \text{dom}(X)$, $P_2 \in \text{dom}(X)$, $P_3 \in \text{dom}(X)$, and $X(P_1) \leq X(P_2) \wedge X(P_2) \leq X(P_3) \Rightarrow X(P_1) \leq X(P_3) \Rightarrow P_1 \lesssim_X P_3$;
- or $P_1 \notin \text{dom}(X)$, $P_2 \notin \text{dom}(X)$, $P_3 \notin \text{dom}(X)$, and $P_1 = P_2 \wedge P_2 = P_3 \Rightarrow P_1 = P_3 \Rightarrow P_1 \lesssim_X P_3$.

We conclude that, in all cases, $P \lesssim_X P$ and $P_1 \lesssim_X P_2 \wedge P_2 \lesssim_X P_3 \Rightarrow P_1 \lesssim_X P_3$. The orderings \lesssim_X induced by scores X are thus preorders. \square

Summary. If the homogeneous binary relations \sim , $>$, $<$, and $\not\lesssim$ on $\mathbb{P}(\Omega, \Sigma)$ are derived from the ordering \lesssim_X as explained above, and if the \lesssim_X is derived from the score X , then the comparison between performances P_1 and P_2 can be summarized as follows.

	$P_1 \in \text{dom}(X)$	$P_1 \notin \text{dom}(X)$
$P_2 \in \text{dom}(X)$	$X(P_1) < X(P_2) \Leftrightarrow P_1 < P_2$ $X(P_1) = X(P_2) \Leftrightarrow P_1 \sim P_2$ $X(P_1) > X(P_2) \Leftrightarrow P_1 > P_2$	$P_1 \not\lesssim P_2$
$P_2 \notin \text{dom}(X)$	$P_1 \not\lesssim P_2$	$P_1 = P_2 \Leftrightarrow P_1 \sim P_2$ $P_1 \neq P_2 \Leftrightarrow P_1 \not\lesssim P_2$

A.4.2 Proof of Theorem 2

For convenience, we provide a reminder of Theorem 2 and Axiom 2 below.

Theorem 2 (Sufficient condition for Axiom 2). *If a score X satisfies, for all events $E \in \Sigma$, the inequalities $\min_{\omega \in E} S(\omega) \leq X(P) \leq \max_{\omega \in E} S(\omega)$ for all performances $P \in \text{dom}(X)$ such that $P(E) = 1$, then the ordering \lesssim_X satisfies Axiom 2.*

Axiom 2. *If two performances $P_1, P_2 \in \mathbb{P}(\Omega, \Sigma)$ are such that $P_1(S \leq s) = 1$ and $P_2(S \geq s) = 1$ for any s , then $P_1 \lesssim P_2$ or $P_1 \not\lesssim P_2$.*

Proof. Axiom 2 is satisfied when $P_1 \notin \text{dom}(X)$ or $P_2 \notin \text{dom}(X)$.

- Either $P_1 = P_2 \Leftrightarrow P_1 \sim P_2 \Rightarrow P_1 \lesssim P_2$,
- or $P_1 \neq P_2 \Leftrightarrow P_1 \not\lesssim P_2$.

Axiom 2 is also satisfied when $P_1 \in \text{dom}(X)$ and $P_2 \in \text{dom}(X)$.

- On the one hand, the axiom stipulates that the event $E_1 = \{\omega \in \Omega : S(\omega) \leq s\}$ and the performance P_1 are such that $P_1(E_1) = 1$. Trivially, we have $\max_{\omega \in E_1} S(\omega) \leq s$. On the other hand, the theorem stipulates that, as $P_1(E_1) = 1$, $X(P_1) \leq \max_{\omega \in E_1} S(\omega)$. Putting all together, we have $X(P_1) \leq s$.
- On the one hand, the axiom stipulates that the event $E_2 = \{\omega \in \Omega : S(\omega) \geq s\}$ and the performance P_2 are such that $P_2(E_2) = 1$. Trivially, we have $s \leq \min_{\omega \in E_2} S(\omega)$. On the other hand, the theorem stipulates that, as $P_2(E_2) = 1$, $\min_{\omega \in E_2} S(\omega) \leq X(P_2)$. Putting all together, we have $s \leq X(P_2)$.
- As we have established that $X(P_1) \leq s$ and $s \leq X(P_2)$, we have $X(P_1) \leq X(P_2) \Leftrightarrow P_1 \lesssim P_2$.

\square

A.4.3 Proof of Theorem 3

For convenience, we provide a reminder of Theorem 3 and Axiom 3 below.

Theorem 3 (Sufficient condition for Axiom 3). *If a score X is such that $\Pi \subseteq \text{dom}(X) \Rightarrow \text{conv}(\Pi) \subseteq \text{dom}(X)$, where $\text{conv}(\Pi)$ denotes the set of all convex combinations of the performances in Π , and if $\min_{P \in \Pi} X(P) \leq X(\bar{P}) \leq \max_{P \in \Pi} X(P)$ for all $\Pi \subseteq \text{dom}(X)$ and all $\bar{P} \in \text{conv}(\Pi)$, then the ordering \lesssim_X satisfies Axiom 3 for $\Phi = \text{conv}$.*

Axiom 3. *Let P be a performance, and Π be a set of performances on $\mathbb{P}_{(\Omega, \Sigma)}$ such that $P' \lesssim P \vee P \lesssim P' \forall P' \in \Pi$.*

- $P' \lesssim P \forall P' \in \Pi \Rightarrow \bar{P} \lesssim P \forall \bar{P} \in \Phi(\Pi)$;
- $P' \not\lesssim P \forall P' \in \Pi \Rightarrow \bar{P} \not\lesssim P \forall \bar{P} \in \Phi(\Pi)$;
- $P \lesssim P' \forall P' \in \Pi \Rightarrow P \lesssim \bar{P} \forall \bar{P} \in \Phi(\Pi)$;
- and $P \not\lesssim P' \forall P' \in \Pi \Rightarrow P \not\lesssim \bar{P} \forall \bar{P} \in \Phi(\Pi)$.

Proof. Since P' is comparable with P (i.e., $P' \lesssim P \vee P \lesssim P'$) for all $P' \in \Pi$, we know that $P \in \text{dom}(X)$ and $\Pi \subseteq \text{dom}(X)$. If X is such that $\Pi \subseteq \text{dom}(X) \Rightarrow \text{conv}(\Pi) \subseteq \text{dom}(X)$, then $\bar{P} \in \text{dom}(X) \forall \bar{P} \in \text{conv}(\Pi)$.

- Let us consider the case in which $P' \lesssim P \forall P' \in \Pi$. We have $X(P') \leq X(P) \forall P' \in \Pi$, which can be rewritten as $\max_{P' \in \Pi} X(P') \leq X(P)$. Taking into account the condition of the theorem, for any convex combination \bar{P} we have $X(\bar{P}) \leq \max_{P' \in \Pi} X(P') \leq X(P)$, and thus $X(\bar{P}) \leq X(P) \Leftrightarrow \bar{P} \lesssim P$.
- Let us consider the case in which $P' \not\lesssim P \forall P' \in \Pi$. We have $X(P') > X(P) \forall P' \in \Pi$, which can be rewritten as $X(P) < \min_{P' \in \Pi} X(P')$. Taking into account the condition of the theorem, for any convex combination \bar{P} we have $X(P) < \min_{P' \in \Pi} X(P') \leq X(\bar{P})$, and thus $X(P) < X(\bar{P}) \Rightarrow \bar{P} \not\lesssim P$.
- Let us consider the case in which $P \lesssim P' \forall P' \in \Pi$. We have $X(P) \leq X(P') \forall P' \in \Pi$, which can be rewritten as $X(P) \leq \min_{P' \in \Pi} X(P')$. Taking into account the condition of the theorem, for any convex combination \bar{P} we have $X(P) \leq \min_{P' \in \Pi} X(P') \leq X(\bar{P})$, and thus $X(P) \leq X(\bar{P}) \Rightarrow P \lesssim \bar{P}$.
- Let us consider the case in which $P \not\lesssim P' \forall P' \in \Pi$. We have $X(P) > X(P') \forall P' \in \Pi$, which can be rewritten as $\max_{P' \in \Pi} X(P') < X(P)$. Taking into account the condition of the theorem, for any convex combination \bar{P} we have $X(\bar{P}) \leq \max_{P' \in \Pi} X(P') < X(P)$, and thus $X(\bar{P}) < X(P) \Rightarrow P \not\lesssim \bar{P}$.

□

A.5. Supplementary material about Sec. 4.3

A.5.1 All ranking scores can be used to rank performances

All ranking scores satisfy the conditions of Theorem 1, and thus Axiom 1. For convenience, we provide a reminder of Theorem 1 and Axiom 1 below.

Theorem 1 (Sufficient condition for Axiom 1). *If a binary relation \lesssim_X on $\mathbb{P}_{(\Omega, \Sigma)}$ is induced by a score X as $P_1 \lesssim_X P_2$ iff either $P_1 = P_2$ or $P_1 \in \text{dom}(X)$ and $P_2 \in \text{dom}(X)$ and $X(P_1) \leq X(P_2)$, then \lesssim_X is a preorder, as required by Axiom 1.*

Axiom 1. *The ranking function $\text{rank}_{\mathbb{E}} : \mathbb{E} \rightarrow [1, |\mathbb{E}|] : \epsilon \mapsto \text{rank}_{\mathbb{E}}(\epsilon)$ satisfies $|\{\epsilon' \in \mathbb{E} : \text{eval}(\epsilon) < \text{eval}(\epsilon')\}| + 1 \leq \text{rank}_{\mathbb{E}}(\epsilon) \leq |\{\epsilon' \in \mathbb{E} : \text{eval}(\epsilon) \lesssim \text{eval}(\epsilon')\}|$, where \lesssim is a preorder on $\mathbb{P}_{(\Omega, \Sigma)}$.*

Theorem 4. *All ranking scores satisfy the conditions of Theorem 1.*

Proof. For all ranking scores R_I , it is possible to induce an ordering \lesssim_{R_I} satisfying the requirements of Theorem 1. \square

All ranking scores satisfy the conditions of Theorem 2, and thus Axiom 2. For convenience, we provide a reminder of Theorem 2 and Axiom 2 below.

Theorem 2 (Sufficient condition for Axiom 2). *If a score X satisfies, for all events $E \in \Sigma$, the inequalities $\min_{\omega \in E} S(\omega) \leq X(P) \leq \max_{\omega \in E} S(\omega)$ for all performances $P \in \text{dom}(X)$ such that $P(E) = 1$, then the ordering \lesssim_X satisfies Axiom 2.*

Axiom 2. *If two performances $P_1, P_2 \in \mathbb{P}_{(\Omega, \Sigma)}$ are such that $P_1(S \leq s) = 1$ and $P_2(S \geq s) = 1$ for any s , then $P_1 \lesssim P_2$ or $P_1 \not\lesssim P_2$.*

Theorem 5. *All ranking scores satisfy the conditions of Theorem 2.*

Proof. We take $X = R_I$. When $P(E) = 1$, we have

$$R_I(P) = \frac{\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} I(\omega) S(\omega) P(\{\omega\})}{\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} I(\omega) P(\{\omega\})} = \frac{\sum_{\omega \in E} I(\omega) S(\omega) P(\{\omega\})}{\sum_{\omega \in E} I(\omega) P(\{\omega\})}$$

with $\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} I(\omega) P(\{\omega\}) > 0$ when $P \in \text{dom}(R_I)$.

• Let $M = \max_{\omega \in E} S(\omega)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & S(\omega) \leq M \quad \forall \omega \in E \\ \Leftrightarrow & S(\omega) - M \leq 0 \quad \forall \omega \in E \\ \Rightarrow & \sum_{\omega \in E} I(\omega) [S(\omega) - M] P(\{\omega\}) \leq 0 \quad \text{as } I(\omega) \geq 0 \text{ and } P(\{\omega\}) \geq 0 \\ \Leftrightarrow & \sum_{\omega \in E} I(\omega) S(\omega) P(\{\omega\}) \leq \sum_{\omega \in E} I(\omega) M P(\{\omega\}) \\ \Leftrightarrow & \sum_{\omega \in E} I(\omega) S(\omega) P(\{\omega\}) \leq M \underbrace{\sum_{\omega \in E} I(\omega) P(\{\omega\})}_{>0} \\ \Leftrightarrow & \frac{\sum_{\omega \in E} I(\omega) S(\omega) P(\{\omega\})}{\sum_{\omega \in E} I(\omega) P(\{\omega\})} \leq M \\ \Leftrightarrow & R_I(P) \leq M \end{aligned}$$

- Let $m = \min_{\omega \in E} S(\omega)$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
& S(\omega) \geq m \quad \forall \omega \in E \\
& \Leftrightarrow S(\omega) - m \geq 0 \quad \forall \omega \in E \\
& \Rightarrow \sum_{\omega \in E} I(\omega) [S(\omega) - m] P(\{\omega\}) \geq 0 \quad \text{as } I(\omega) \geq 0 \text{ and } P(\{\omega\}) \geq 0 \\
& \Leftrightarrow \sum_{\omega \in E} I(\omega) S(\omega) P(\{\omega\}) \geq \sum_{\omega \in E} I(\omega) m P(\{\omega\}) \\
& \Leftrightarrow \sum_{\omega \in E} I(\omega) S(\omega) P(\{\omega\}) \geq m \underbrace{\sum_{\omega \in E} I(\omega) P(\{\omega\})}_{>0} \\
& \Leftrightarrow \frac{\sum_{\omega \in E} I(\omega) S(\omega) P(\{\omega\})}{\sum_{\omega \in E} I(\omega) P(\{\omega\})} \geq m \\
& \Leftrightarrow R_I(P) \geq m
\end{aligned}$$

- Putting all together, when $P(E) = 1$, we have $m \leq R_I(P) \leq M$, and so,

$$\min_{\omega \in E} S(\omega) \leq R_I(P) \leq \max_{\omega \in E} S(\omega). \quad (15)$$

□

All ranking scores satisfy the conditions of Theorem 3, and thus Axiom 3. For convenience, we provide a reminder of Theorem 3 and Axiom 3 below.

Theorem 3 (Sufficient condition for Axiom 3). *If a score X is such that $\Pi \subseteq \text{dom}(X) \Rightarrow \text{conv}(\Pi) \subseteq \text{dom}(X)$, where $\text{conv}(\Pi)$ denotes the set of all convex combinations of the performances in Π , and if $\min_{P \in \Pi} X(P) \leq X(\bar{P}) \leq \max_{P \in \Pi} X(P)$ for all $\Pi \subseteq \text{dom}(X)$ and all $\bar{P} \in \text{conv}(\Pi)$, then the ordering \lesssim_X satisfies Axiom 3 for $\Phi = \text{conv}$.*

Axiom 3. *Let P be a performance, and Π be a set of performances on $\mathbb{P}_{(\Omega, \Sigma)}$ such that $P' \lesssim P \vee P \lesssim P' \forall P' \in \Pi$.*

- $P' \lesssim P \forall P' \in \Pi \Rightarrow \bar{P} \lesssim P \forall \bar{P} \in \Phi(\Pi)$;
- $P' \not\lesssim P \forall P' \in \Pi \Rightarrow \bar{P} \not\lesssim P \forall \bar{P} \in \Phi(\Pi)$;
- $P \lesssim P' \forall P' \in \Pi \Rightarrow P \lesssim \bar{P} \forall \bar{P} \in \Phi(\Pi)$;
- and $P \not\lesssim P' \forall P' \in \Pi \Rightarrow P \not\lesssim \bar{P} \forall \bar{P} \in \Phi(\Pi)$.

Theorem 6. *All ranking scores satisfy the conditions of Theorem 3.*

Proof. The proof is in two parts.

- First, let us show that $\Pi \subseteq \text{dom}(R_I) \Rightarrow \text{conv}(\Pi) \subseteq \text{dom}(R_I)$. For any $\bar{P} \in \text{conv}(\Pi)$ there exists a weighting function $\lambda_{\Pi, \bar{P}} : \Pi \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} : P \mapsto \lambda_{\Pi, \bar{P}}(P)$ such that $\sum_{P \in \Pi} \lambda_{\Pi, \bar{P}}(P) = 1$ and $\sum_{P \in \Pi} \lambda_{\Pi, \bar{P}}(P) P = \bar{P}$. For all $\bar{P} \in \text{conv}(\Pi)$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Pi \subseteq \text{dom}(R_I) & \Leftrightarrow \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} I(\omega) P(\{\omega\}) \neq 0 \quad \forall P \in \Pi \\
& \Rightarrow \sum_{P \in \Pi} \lambda_{\Pi, \bar{P}}(P) \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} I(\omega) P(\{\omega\}) \neq 0 \\
& \Leftrightarrow \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} I(\omega) \sum_{P \in \Pi} \lambda_{\Pi, \bar{P}}(P) P(\{\omega\}) \neq 0 \\
& \Leftrightarrow \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} I(\omega) \bar{P}(\{\omega\}) \neq 0 \\
& \Leftrightarrow \bar{P} \in \text{dom}(R_I).
\end{aligned}$$

- Second, let us show that, for all $\bar{P} \in \text{conv}(\Pi)$, $\min_{P \in \Pi} R_I(P) \leq R_I(\bar{P}) \leq \max_{P \in \Pi} R_I(P)$. Let us pose $l = \min_{P \in \Pi} R_I(P)$ and $u = \max_{P \in \Pi} R_I(P)$. We have:

$$\begin{aligned}
& l \leq R_I(P) \leq u \quad \forall P \in \Pi \\
\Leftrightarrow & l \leq \frac{\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} I(\omega)S(\omega)P(\{\omega\})}{\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} I(\omega)P(\{\omega\})} \leq u \quad \forall P \in \Pi \\
\Leftrightarrow & l \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} I(\omega)P(\{\omega\}) \leq \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} I(\omega)S(\omega)P(\{\omega\}) \leq u \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} I(\omega)P(\{\omega\}) \quad \forall P \in \Pi \\
\Rightarrow & l \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} I(\omega)\bar{P}(\{\omega\}) \leq \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} I(\omega)S(\omega)\bar{P}(\{\omega\}) \leq u \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} I(\omega)\bar{P}(\{\omega\}) \\
\Leftrightarrow & l \leq \frac{\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} I(\omega)S(\omega)\bar{P}(\{\omega\})}{\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} I(\omega)\bar{P}(\{\omega\})} \leq u \\
\Leftrightarrow & l \leq R_I(\bar{P}) \leq u
\end{aligned}$$

□

A.5.2 On the properties of ranking scores.

Proof of Property 1. Let us demonstrate that we have $R_I(P) = X_S^E(P')$ with $P' = \text{filter}_I(P)$. For all $\omega \in \Omega$, we have:

$$P'(\{\omega\}) = \frac{P(\{\omega\})I(\omega)}{\sum_{\omega' \in \Omega} P(\{\omega'\})I(\omega')}$$

Thus,

$$\begin{aligned}
X_S^E(P') &= \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} P'(\{\omega\})S(\omega) \\
&= \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} \frac{P(\{\omega\})I(\omega)}{\sum_{\omega' \in \Omega} P(\{\omega'\})I(\omega')} S(\omega) \\
&= \frac{\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} P(\{\omega\})I(\omega)S(\omega)}{\sum_{\omega' \in \Omega} P(\{\omega'\})I(\omega')} \\
&= R_I(P)
\end{aligned}$$

□

Proof of Property 2. Let $S' = \alpha S + \beta$ with $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$.

$$\frac{\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} P(\{\omega\})S'(\omega)I(\omega)}{\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} P(\{\omega\})I(\omega)} = \alpha \frac{\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} P(\{\omega\})S(\omega)I(\omega)}{\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} P(\{\omega\})I(\omega)} + \beta$$

□

Proof of Property 3. $R_{kI} = \frac{\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} kI(\omega)S(\omega)P(\{\omega\})}{\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} kI(\omega)P(\{\omega\})} = \frac{\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} I(\omega)S(\omega)P(\{\omega\})}{\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} I(\omega)P(\{\omega\})} = R_I$

□

Proof of Property 4. Let us consider a binary satisfaction, that is $S(\omega) \in \{0, 1\} \forall \omega \in \Omega$. Let us define the events $E_0 = \{\omega \in \Omega : S(\omega) = 0\}$ and $E_1 = \{\omega \in \Omega : S(\omega) = 1\}$. If $I' = (\mathbf{1}_{S=0}\alpha_0 + \mathbf{1}_{S=1}\alpha_1)I$ with $\alpha_0 > 0$ and $\alpha_1 > 0$, then

$$\begin{aligned}
R_I(P) &= \frac{\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} I(\omega)S(\omega)P(\{\omega\})}{\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} I(\omega)P(\{\omega\})} \\
&= \frac{\sum_{\omega \in E_1} I(\omega)P(\{\omega\})}{\sum_{\omega \in E_0} I(\omega)P(\{\omega\}) + \sum_{\omega \in E_1} I(\omega)P(\{\omega\})}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
R_{I'}(P) &= \frac{\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} I'(\omega) S(\omega) P(\{\omega\})}{\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} I'(\omega) P(\{\omega\})} \\
&= \frac{\sum_{\omega \in E_1} I'(\omega) P(\{\omega\})}{\sum_{\omega \in E_0} I'(\omega) P(\{\omega\}) + \sum_{\omega \in E_1} I'(\omega) P(\{\omega\})} \\
&= \frac{\sum_{\omega \in E_1} \alpha_1 I(\omega) P(\{\omega\})}{\sum_{\omega \in E_0} \alpha_0 I(\omega) P(\{\omega\}) + \sum_{\omega \in E_1} \alpha_1 I(\omega) P(\{\omega\})} \\
&= \frac{\alpha_1 \sum_{\omega \in E_1} I(\omega) P(\{\omega\})}{\alpha_0 \sum_{\omega \in E_0} I(\omega) P(\{\omega\}) + \alpha_1 \sum_{\omega \in E_1} I(\omega) P(\{\omega\})}
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, $R_{I'} = \frac{\alpha_1 R_I}{\alpha_0(1-R_I)\alpha_1 R_I}$ and $\frac{\partial R_{I'}}{\partial R_I} = \frac{\alpha_0 \alpha_1}{(\alpha_0(1-R_I)\alpha_1 R_I)^2} > 0$. This leads immediately to the conclusion that $\lesssim_{R_{I'}} = \lesssim_{R_I}$. \square

Proof of Properties 5 and 6. Let us consider a binary satisfaction and the events $E_0 = \{\omega \in \Omega : S(\omega) = 0\}$ and $E_1 = \{\omega \in \Omega : S(\omega) = 1\}$. Let I_1 and I_2 be two random variables and $I = \lambda_1 I_1 + \lambda_2 I_2$ with $\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2 = 1$.

- When the random variables I_1 and I_2 are such that $I_1(\omega) = I_2(\omega) = I(\omega) \forall \omega \in E_1$, if we take $f : x \mapsto x^{-1}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lambda_1 f(R_{I_1}(P)) + \lambda_2 f(R_{I_2}(P)) \\
&= \lambda_1 \left(1 + \frac{\sum_{\omega \in E_0} I_1(\omega) P(\{\omega\})}{\sum_{\omega \in E_1} I_1(\omega) P(\{\omega\})} \right) + \lambda_2 \left(1 + \frac{\sum_{\omega \in E_0} I_2(\omega) P(\{\omega\})}{\sum_{\omega \in E_1} I_2(\omega) P(\{\omega\})} \right) \\
&= \lambda_1 \left(1 + \frac{\sum_{\omega \in E_0} I_1(\omega) P(\{\omega\})}{\sum_{\omega \in E_1} I(\omega) P(\{\omega\})} \right) + \lambda_2 \left(1 + \frac{\sum_{\omega \in E_0} I_2(\omega) P(\{\omega\})}{\sum_{\omega \in E_1} I(\omega) P(\{\omega\})} \right) \\
&= (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2) + \frac{\lambda_1 \sum_{\omega \in E_0} I_1(\omega) P(\{\omega\}) + \lambda_2 \sum_{\omega \in E_0} I_2(\omega) P(\{\omega\})}{\sum_{\omega \in E_1} I(\omega) P(\{\omega\})} \\
&= 1 + \frac{\sum_{\omega \in E_0} (\lambda_1 I_1 + \lambda_2 I_2)(\omega) P(\{\omega\})}{\sum_{\omega \in E_1} I(\omega) P(\{\omega\})} \\
&= 1 + \frac{\sum_{\omega \in E_0} I(\omega) P(\{\omega\})}{\sum_{\omega \in E_1} I(\omega) P(\{\omega\})} \\
&= f(R_I(P))
\end{aligned}$$

- When the random variables I_1 and I_2 are such that $I_1(\omega) = I_2(\omega) = I(\omega) \forall \omega \in E_0$, if we take $f : x \mapsto (1-x)^{-1}$,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\lambda_1 f(R_{I_1}(P)) + \lambda_2 f(R_{I_2}(P)) \\
&= \lambda_1 \left(1 + \frac{\sum_{\omega \in E_1} I_1(\omega) P(\{\omega\})}{\sum_{\omega \in E_0} I_1(\omega) P(\{\omega\})} \right) + \lambda_2 \left(1 + \frac{\sum_{\omega \in E_1} I_2(\omega) P(\{\omega\})}{\sum_{\omega \in E_0} I_2(\omega) P(\{\omega\})} \right) \\
&= \lambda_1 \left(1 + \frac{\sum_{\omega \in E_1} I_1(\omega) P(\{\omega\})}{\sum_{\omega \in E_0} I(\omega) P(\{\omega\})} \right) + \lambda_2 \left(1 + \frac{\sum_{\omega \in E_1} I_2(\omega) P(\{\omega\})}{\sum_{\omega \in E_0} I(\omega) P(\{\omega\})} \right) \\
&= (\lambda_1 + \lambda_2) + \frac{\lambda_1 \sum_{\omega \in E_1} I_1(\omega) P(\{\omega\}) + \lambda_2 \sum_{\omega \in E_1} I_2(\omega) P(\{\omega\})}{\sum_{\omega \in E_0} I(\omega) P(\{\omega\})} \\
&= 1 + \frac{\sum_{\omega \in E_1} (\lambda_1 I_1 + \lambda_2 I_2)(\omega) P(\{\omega\})}{\sum_{\omega \in E_0} I(\omega) P(\{\omega\})} \\
&= 1 + \frac{\sum_{\omega \in E_1} I(\omega) P(\{\omega\})}{\sum_{\omega \in E_0} I(\omega) P(\{\omega\})} \\
&= f(R_I(P))
\end{aligned}$$

\square

Proof of Property 7. Let $\mathcal{R} \in \{<, \leq, =, \geq, >\}$ and $v = R_I(P)$. For all $P' \in \mathbb{P}_{(\Omega, \Sigma)}$, we have:

$$R_I(P') \mathcal{R} R_I(P) \tag{16}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow R_I(P') \mathcal{R} v \tag{17}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \frac{\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} I(\omega) S(\omega) P'(\{\omega\})}{\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} I(\omega) P'(\{\omega\})} \mathcal{R} v \tag{18}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \left[\sum_{\omega \in \Omega} I(\omega) S(\omega) P'(\{\omega\}) \right] \mathcal{R} \left[v \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} I(\omega) P'(\{\omega\}) \right] \tag{19}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} I(\omega) [S(\omega) - v] P'(\{\omega\}) \mathcal{R} 0 \tag{20}$$

This is either a linear equality or a linear inequality constraint. Thus,

$$\phi_{\mathcal{R}}(P) = \{P' \in \mathbb{P}_{(\Omega, \Sigma)} : R_I(P') \mathcal{R} R_I(P)\} \tag{21}$$

$$= \left\{ P' \in \mathbb{P}_{(\Omega, \Sigma)} : \sum_{\omega \in \Omega} I(\omega) [S(\omega) - v] P'(\{\omega\}) \mathcal{R} 0 \right\} \tag{22}$$

is a convex subset of $\mathbb{P}_{(\Omega, \Sigma)}$. □

A.6. Supplementary material about Sec. 5.2

A.6.1 Scores perfectly correlated with a ranking score, for all performances

The accuracy, A . One can show that $A = R_I$ with $I(tn) = 1/2$, $I(fp) = 1/2$, $I(fn) = 1/2$, and $I(tp) = 1/2$.

The score F_β with $\beta = 0.5$. One can show that $F_{0.5} = R_I$ with $I(tn) = 0$, $I(fp) = 4/5$, $I(fn) = 1/5$, and $I(tp) = 1$.

The score F_β with $\beta = 1.0$. One can show that $F_1 = R_I$ with $I(tn) = 0$, $I(fp) = 1/2$, $I(fn) = 1/2$, and $I(tp) = 1$.

The score F_β with $\beta = 2.0$. One can show that $F_2 = R_I$ with $I(tn) = 0$, $I(fp) = 1/5$, $I(fn) = 4/5$, and $I(tp) = 1$.

The negative predictive value, NPV . One can show that $NPV = R_I$ with $I(tn) = 1$, $I(fp) = 0$, $I(fn) = 1$, and $I(tp) = 0$.

The positive predictive value, PPV . One can show that $PPV = R_I$ with $I(tn) = 0$, $I(fp) = 1$, $I(fn) = 0$, and $I(tp) = 1$.

The true negative rate, TNR . One can show that $TNR = R_I$ with $I(tn) = 1$, $I(fp) = 1$, $I(fn) = 0$, and $I(tp) = 0$.

The true positive rate, TPR . One can show that $TPR = R_I$ with $I(tn) = 0$, $I(fp) = 0$, $I(fn) = 1$, and $I(tp) = 1$.

A.6.2 Scores perfectly correlated with a ranking score, for the performances corresponding to given class priors $\pi_- \neq 0$ and $\pi_+ \neq 0$

The balanced accuracy, BA . One can show that $BA = R_I$ with $I(tn) = \pi_+$, $I(fp) = \pi_+$, $I(fn) = \pi_-$, and $I(tp) = \pi_-$.

Cohen's kappa, κ . One can show that $\kappa = \frac{R_I - 2\pi_- \pi_+}{\pi_-^2 + \pi_+^2}$ with $I(tn) = \frac{\pi_+^2}{\pi_-^2 + \pi_+^2}$, $I(fp) = \frac{1}{2}$, $I(fn) = \frac{1}{2}$, and $I(tp) = \frac{\pi_-^2}{\pi_-^2 + \pi_+^2}$. Thus, $\frac{\partial \kappa}{\partial R_I} > 0$.

The informedness (a.k.a. Youden's J), J_Y . One can show that $J_Y = 2R_I - 1$ with $I(tn) = \pi_+$, $I(fp) = \pi_+$, $I(fn) = \pi_-$, and $I(tp) = \pi_-$. Thus, $\frac{\partial J_Y}{\partial R_I} > 0$.

The negative likelihood ratio, NLR . One can show that $NLR = \frac{1 - R_I}{R_I}$ with $I(tn) = 1$, $I(fp) = 0$, $I(fn) = 1$, and $I(tp) = 0$. Thus, $\frac{\partial NLR}{\partial R_I} < 0$.

The positive likelihood ratio, PLR . One can show that $PLR = \frac{R_I}{1 - R_I}$ with $I(tn) = 0$, $I(fp) = 1$, $I(fn) = 0$, and $I(tp) = 1$. Thus, $\frac{\partial PLR}{\partial R_I} > 0$.

The probability of the elementary event *true negative*, PTN . One can show that $PTN = \pi_- R_I$ with $I(tn) = 1$, $I(fp) = 1$, $I(fn) = 0$, and $I(tp) = 0$. Thus, $\frac{\partial PTN}{\partial R_I} > 0$.

The probability of the elementary event *true positive*, PTP . One can show that $PTP = \pi_+ R_I$ with $I(tn) = 0$, $I(fp) = 0$, $I(fn) = 1$, and $I(tp) = 1$. Thus, $\frac{\partial PTP}{\partial R_I} > 0$.