Window-Based Distribution Shift Detection for Deep Neural Networks

Guy Bar-Shalom¹, Yonatan Geifman², Ran El-Yaniv^{1,2}

Technion¹, Deci Ai²

Introduction

The study introduces Coverage-Based Detection (CBD) for detecting distribution shifts in deep neural networks, focusing on continuous monitoring to identify deviations in input data during operational phases.

Scan for paper Scan for Repo.

We are given a pretrained model f , trained on a labeled set, $S_n\triangleq\{(x_1,y_1),\ldots,(x_n,y_n)\}\sim P^n.$ We are also given an u nlabeled and typically large detection-training set (or calibration set), denoted as $S_m \sim (P_X)^m$. The goal can be formulated as follows,

- 1. Given an unlabeled test sample, $W_k \sim Q^k$, where Q may be a different distribution from P_X , the task is to determine whether $Q \neq P_X$.
- 2. Achieve (1) while ensuring that the time and space complexity of each detection decision over a test window remains within $o(m)$ – avoiding continuously referencing S_m .

Problem formulation and goal

Selective prediction techniques aim to create models that make reliable predictions but can abstain under high uncertainty. We introduce key definitions and concepts for their use in detecting distribution shifts,

- $\kappa_f(x)$ a confidence-rate function.
- *g* $g_{\theta}(x|\kappa) \triangleq \mathbf{1}[\kappa_f(x) \geq \theta]$ a selection function.
- $\hat{c}(\theta, S_k) \triangleq \frac{1}{k}$ *k* $\sum_{i=1}^{k}$ $\frac{\kappa}{i=1}$ $g_{\theta}(x_i|\kappa)$ - the empirical coverage of S_k given $\theta.$
- $c(\theta, P_X) \triangleq \mathbf{E}_{P_X}[g_\theta(x|\kappa)]$ the coverage (or true coverage) of P_X given θ .

Contributions

- . A distribution shift detector, CBD, which can easily be integrated to any classification model, significantly outperforming earlier methods.
- 2. Given a test window of *k* samples, *Wk*, determine whether or not it is deviated from the original distribution, with $O(k)$ time and space complexities (independent of the size of S_m) – dramatic improvement to previous baselines.

SGC relies on Lemma 4.1 (see paper), which gets as input $\hat{c}(\theta, S_m)$, and returns b^* , such that,

 $\Pr_{S_m} \{ c(\theta, P_X) < b^*(m, m \cdot \hat{c}(\theta, S_m), \delta) \} < \delta$

i.e., returns a lower bound on the true coverage, $c(\theta, P_X)$.

- A detection-training set, $S_m \sim (P_X)^m$.
- A desired coverage (lower bound), *c* ∗ .
- Confidence parameter, *δ*.

And outputs:

- **The actual guaranteed coverage (true coverage** lower bound), b^* .
- The corresponding threshold, *θ*, for constructing the appropriate *g*^{*θ*}.

Theorem. Assume S_m is sampled i.i.d. from P_X , and consider an application of Algorithm [1.](#page-0-0) For $k = \lceil \log_2 m \rceil$, let b_i^* $\hat{c}_i^*(m,m\cdot\hat{c}_i(\theta_i,S_m),\frac{\delta}{k})$ $\frac{\delta}{k})$ and θ_i be the values obtained in the ith iteration of Algorithm [1.](#page-0-0) Then, \Pr_{S_m} { $\exists i : c(\theta_i, P_X) < b_i^*$ $\hat{c}_i^*(m,m\cdot\hat{c}_i(\theta_i,S_m),\frac{\delta}{k})$ *k* $)\}<\delta.$

Selective prediction

Our CBD technique employs SGC across multiple target coverages ($C_{\rm target}$) to identify the corresponding lower bounds and thresholds, $\{b_i^*\}$ $_{j}^{\ast},\theta_{j}\}$ *C*target *j*=1 , for the true coverage of the underlying distribution.

Selection with Guaranteed Coverage (SGC)

SGC gets as input:

Algorithm 1: *Selection with guaranteed coverage* (SGC)

Input: detection-training set: S_m , confidence-rate function: κ_f , confidence parameter *δ*, target coverage: *c* ∗ . Sort S_m according to $\kappa_f(x_i)$, $x_i \in S_m$ (and now assume w.l.o.g. that indices reflect this ordering). $z_{\text{min}} = 1$, $z_{\text{max}} = m$ for $i = 1$ to $k = \lceil \log_2 m \rceil$ do $|z = \lceil (z_{\min} + z_{\max})/2 \rceil$ $\theta_i = \kappa_f(x_z)$ C alculate $\hat{c}_i(\theta_i, S_m)$ Solve for b_i^* $\hat{c}_i(\theta_i,S_m),\frac{\delta}{k}$ *k*) {see Lemma 4.1 in the paper} if b_i^* $\hat{c}_i(\theta_i,S_m),\frac{\delta}{k}$ *k*) $≤ c$ ^{*} then $z_{\text{max}}^{\prime} = z$ end $|z_{\text{min}}=2$ end Output: bound: b_k^* $\frac{k}{k}(m, m \cdot \hat{c}_k(\theta_k, S_m), \frac{\delta}{k})$ $\frac{\delta}{k}$), threshold: θ_k .

Coverage-Based Detection (CBD)

 0.8 0.9

 0.5 0.6 Target coverage

Complexity analysis

training samples.

Experiments

We benchmark our method against a range of established benchmarks, including both population-based and singleinstance detection techniques; CBD excels in most combinations of architecture, window size, and evaluation metrics. Notably, when applied over the ViT-T architecture, CBD achieves remarkable results, registering over 86% in all thresholdindependent metrics (such as AUROC, AUPR-In, AUPR-Out), particularly across a window of 10 samples. This performance is significantly superior to its closest competitors, with CBD maintaining a substantial lead of approximately 20%.

My Email: guy.b@campus.technion.ac.il

