

Four Facets of Forecast Felicity: Calibration, Predictiveness, Randomness and Regret

Rabanus Derr
University of Tübingen
rabanus.derr@uni-tuebingen.de

Robert C. Williamson
University of Tübingen
and Tübingen AI Centre
bob.williamson@uni-tuebingen.de

January 22, 2024

Abstract

Machine learning is about forecasting. Forecasts, however, obtain their usefulness only through their evaluation. Machine learning has traditionally focused on types of losses and their corresponding regret. Currently, the machine learning community regained interest in calibration. In this work, we show the conceptual equivalence of calibration and regret in evaluating forecasts. We frame the evaluation problem as a game between a forecaster, a gambler and nature. Putting intuitive restrictions on gambler and forecaster, calibration and regret naturally fall out of the framework. In addition, this game links evaluation of forecasts to randomness of outcomes. Random outcomes with respect to forecasts are equivalent to good forecasts with respect to outcomes. We call those dual aspects, calibration and regret, predictiveness and randomness, the four facets of forecast felicity.




Figure 1: The Four Facets of Forecast Felicity – The Game is a framework to relate the concepts of calibration, regret, predictiveness and randomness.

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Calibration versus Regret: Two ways of judging the quality of a forecast	4
2.1	Calibration – Testing Forecasts against Outcomes	6
2.2	Regret – Learning Compared to Experts	7
2.3	Calibration = Regret?	7
3	An Introductory Example	8
4	The Game	10
4.1	Why The Game?	10
4.2	The Playground	10
4.3	The Players	12
4.4	The Protocol	13
4.4.1	Sequentiality	14
4.4.2	Nature's Nature	15
4.4.3	More Gamblers	15
4.4.4	The Aggregation Functional	16
5	The Availability Criterion	16
5.1	Marginally Available Gambles – The Best Gambler Can Play	17
5.2	From Forecasting Sets to Available Gambles and Back	18
6	Forecasts Induced by Properties	22
6.1	Characterizing Available Gambles of Forecasts Induced by Identifiable Properties	24
6.1.1	From Gambles to Calibration	28
6.2	Characterizing Available Gambles of Forecasts Induced by Elicitable Properties	28
6.2.1	From Gambles to Regret	31
7	A Fundamental Duality – Calibration and Regret	32
7.1	Related Work: Linking Calibration and Loss	32
8	Recovery of Standard Evaluation Frameworks in Machine Learning	34
8.1	From The Game to Online Learning	34
8.2	From The Game to Batch Learning	34
9	Randomness and Predictiveness – Two Sides of the Same Coin	35
9.1	A Calibration-Definition of Randomness – Game-Randomness	37
9.2	Another Duality – Randomness and Predictiveness	39
9.3	A Regret-Definition of Randomness – Predictive Complexity	40
9.4	Randomness Through the Lens of Regret	42
10	Conclusion	43
10.1	Future Work	43
11	Acknowledgements	44
12	Appendix – Additional Results on Forecasting Sets and Available Gambles	45

13 Appendix – Game-Randomness and Martin-Löf-Randomness	45
13.1 A Note on Prequential Probabilities	45
14 Appendix – Von Mises’ and Church’s Randomness	46
15 Appendix – Why “The” Randomness?	47
15.1 No More Infinite Sequences	47
15.2 No More Computability	48
15.3 Free Randomness	48

1 Introduction

Forecasts are central to machine learning. Forecasts on their own are of limited value. When they come with an accompany felicity condition¹, a guide how to evaluate them, they become useful. The evaluation of predictions *make* the predictions. Two such general conditions are (external) consistency with observations, and (internal) non-contradiction. The test for consistency of forecasts with observations is what we call *evaluation*.²

Unsurprisingly, the evaluation of forecaster has always been part of debates since the beginning of machine learning [DeGroot and Fienberg, 1983, Schervish, 1989, Gneiting, 2011, Williamson and Cranko, 2023]. In fact, its discussion dates back at least to the evaluation of meteorological predictions [Brier, 1950, Murphy and Epstein, 1967]. The particular literature tries to characterize criteria which distinguish “bad” from “good” predictions.

Roughly, two regimen of evaluation criteria can be identified in current machine learning practice: regret and calibration. Regret, the comparison of the learners loss against the loss of an expert, relies on loss functions defining a measure of discrepancy between predictions and outcomes. Calibration, stripped of its standard conditionalization on the predictions, compares the average outcome to the average prediction on certain groups [Höltgen and Williamson, 2023]. In particular, the latter notion regained interest since the introduction of multi-calibration as fairness metric [Chouldechova, 2017]. Its intricate relationship to regret has been part of several studies (§ 7.1). In this work, we provide the first, to the best of our knowledge, exhaustive account of the equivalence of calibration and regret in their ability to evaluate forecasts.

Central to the analysis will be a game-theoretic framework (§ 4). In this three-player game, a gambler gambles against the forecasts of a forecaster with an outcome determined by nature. Besides the dual perspective on evaluating forecasts, we argue that the “goodness” of forecasts can equivalently be understood as the randomness of outcomes with respect to the forecasts (§ 9). This further facet complements the understanding of forecast evaluations.

In this work, we provide an analysis of evaluation criteria in empirical settings. We constrain ourselves to *single-instance-based evaluation criteria* (cf. [Sandroni, 2003, Fortnow and Vohra, 2009]). We do not propose any algorithmic solution to give predictions fulfilling an evaluation criterion. Even though we frame the evaluation in a game-theoretic setup, we do not give claims

¹We borrow the term “felicity condition” from the speech-act theory dating back to Austin [1975]. Felicity conditions describe how well a speech-act meets its aims. Transferred to our predictive machine learning setting (cf. [Franco, 2019]), how well predictions meet their aims in informing, guiding decisions, providing understanding and so on. Felicity conditions are admittedly more general than the evaluation criteria which we investigate in this work.

²This is what has been called “empirical evaluation” by Murphy and Epstein [1967]. The same authors name another type of evaluation, which they refer to as “operational”, concerned with the value of the prediction to the user. We consider external and internal consistency as necessary requirements for the usefulness, i.e. for any operational value.

about equilibria or convergences. The goal of this work is to relate and bring light into the current practice of evaluating forecasts in machine learning.

The contributions of this paper are summarized as:

Characterization of Calibration More general than [Dwork et al., 2021], we show that calibration dominates all *available*³ tests used to evaluate forecasts of identifiable properties (Theorem 6.6). Hence, calibration is the most stringent test for such forecasts.

Characterization of Regret Analogously, we show that regret approximately dominates all available tests for elicitable forecasts (Theorem 6.10).

Equivalence between Calibration and Regret We provide an equivalence-theorem for calibration and regret which shows that any kind of calibration-criterion can approximately be expressed as a regret criterion and vice-versa (Corollary 7.1).

Equivalence of Good Predictions and Randomness Randomness, despite its mostly marginal life, is as central to statistics as the evaluation of forecasts for machine learning. We argue that good forecasts, i.e. forecasts and outcomes match, are equivalent to random outcomes, i.e. outcomes and forecasts match (Propositions 9.7 and 9.11, Section 9).

The paper is structured as follows. First, we recap the notions calibration and regret. Then we consider a simple first example (§ 3). It is a binary prediction game in which calibration and regret are expressed in terms of gambles played by a gambler in order to prove forecaster wrong. Section 4 is devoted to generalize the simple setup. We highlight the versatility of our game-theoretic evaluation of forecasts. Central to the game is the “availability criterion” which defines the set of gambles a gambler is allowed to disprove forecaster’s adequacy (§ 5). In Section 6, so-called calibration and regret gambles naturally fall out as the best options a gambler should play given property-induced forecasts. We use these results to show that in case the forecasted property allows for a calibration-type and a regret-type gambling strategy, both are, up to approximation, equivalent (§ 7). Furthermore, we recover standard evaluation schemes from our game-theoretic setting in Section 8. Then, we shift the focus and reinterpret the evaluation of forecasts. By default, forecasts are considered to be adequate if they are not-gameable, i.e. gambler cannot gain within its restrictions of only using available gambles, on a certain realized sequence of outcomes. It is, however, a syntactically equivalent statement that the outcome sequence is not gamble-able against forecasts. This, in the literature on mathematical randomness, is called a random sequence with respect to forecasts. We elaborate on these two sides of the same coin via two definitions of randomness (§ 9). The first notion is related to calibration (§ 9.1), the second to regret (§ 9.3). Finally, we wrap up the results and project future research directions in Section 10. We provide a summary of the technical results in Figure 2.

2 Calibration versus Regret: Two ways of judging the quality of a forecast

The adequacy of predictions in machine learning is usually ensured by the use of loss functions, which sometimes explicitly, sometimes implicitly is equal to regret, or calibration. We provide a short summary of origin, definition and current research questions around regret and calibration.

³To be discussed in § 5.





Figure 2: Graphical Summary of the Results of the Paper.

2.1 Calibration – Testing Forecasts against Outcomes

The statistical calibration criterion transfers the idea of “calibration” from measurement science to statistics. In the most basic form, calibration demands that the average of observed outcomes equals (or is close to) the average of given predictions [Dawid, 1985, 2017]. The criterion is then refined by grouping outcomes and predictions via different schemes, most prominently prediction-based binning [Höltgen and Williamson, 2023]. Usually, machine learning states that a predictor is calibrated if the average of all outcomes for which the predictions are within a specific interval is itself inside the interval [Hébert-Johnson et al., 2018]. To avoid confusion, we use the term “calibration” for the comparison of arbitrary subgroup averages.⁴

The adequacy of calibration as a proper quality criterion of predictions has been subject to debates [Dawid, 1982, Seidenfeld, 1985, Schervish, 1989]. More current work however concentrates on the development of algorithms to provide calibrated predictions, e.g. [Jung et al., 2021, Gupta and Ramdas, 2022, Deng et al., 2023, Gupta and Ramdas, 2022]. In this work, we bring the evaluation criterion calibration itself back into the center of the discussion.

We propose the following simple formulation of calibration as a first starting point to an analysis of this felicity condition.

Definition 2.1 ((α, S) -Calibration). *Let $T = \{1, \dots, n\}$. For each $t \in T$ let forecaster $P_t \in [0, 1]$, i.e. Bernoulli probabilities on $\{0, 1\}$, and let nature $y_t \in \{0, 1\}$. We consider a subgroup $S \subseteq T$ of the entire population of instances and a slack $\alpha \geq 0$ and say that the forecasts are (α, S) -calibrated if and only if*

$$C(S, y, P) := \left| \frac{\sum_{t \in S} y_t}{|S|} - \frac{\sum_{t \in S} P_t}{|S|} \right| \leq \alpha.$$

We call $C(S, y, P)$ the group-wise calibration score.

In summary, calibration compares the average prediction with the average outcome on the subgroup S . Dwork et al. [2021] put forward a related interpretation: through the lens of the average on subgroup S , outcomes and predictions cannot be distinguished.

Usually, this definition is extended to a set of subgroups $\mathcal{S} \subseteq 2^\Omega$. The most common choice being $S_p := \{t \in T : P_t = p\}$ for some $p \in [0, 1]$, which amounts to the standard use of the term “calibration” in machine learning (see above). We skip the discussion how calibration scores are possibly aggregated among the subgroups. Our arguments are only concerned with a single subgroup.

Instead we make the following, trivial observation: re-scaled calibration scores can be dissected into sum of single comparisons of predictions and outcomes.⁵

$$C(S, y, P)|S| = \left| \sum_{t \in S} (y_t - P_t) \right| \tag{1}$$

$$= \left| \sum_{t \in T} \mathbb{I}[t \in S](y_t - P_t) \right| \tag{2}$$

We will observe that this formulation of calibration can be embedded in a very general game-theoretic framework to evaluate forecasts. Before, we take a look onto another, very prominent felicity condition used in machine learning.

⁴This is sometimes misleadingly called “multi-accuracy” [Hébert-Johnson et al., 2018].

⁵We use $\mathbb{I}[\dots]$ to denote the Iverson-brackets.

2.2 Regret – Learning Compared to Experts

A cornerstone of online (and reinforcement) learning is the *regret* [Kaelbling et al., 1996, Cesa-Bianchi and Lugosi, 2006]. The regret, loosely speaking, is the amount of how your predictor performed worse, in terms of accumulated loss, than an expert to which it is compared. The definition of regret presented here is close to the one given in [Cesa-Bianchi and Lugosi, 2006, §4.6].⁶

Definition 2.2 ((α, E) -Regret). *Let $T = \{1, \dots, n\}$. For each $t \in T$ let forecaster $P_t \in [0, 1]$, i.e. Bernoulli probabilities on $\{0, 1\}$, and let nature $y_t \in \{0, 1\}$. We consider an expert $E_t \in [0, 1]$ who provides predictions for every instance $t \in T$. Finally, let $\ell: [0, 1] \times \{0, 1\} \rightarrow [0, \infty)$ be a, usually proper, loss function. The forecasts fulfill (α, E) -Regret if and only if*

$$R(E, y, P) := \left| \sum_{t \in T} \ell(y_t, P_t) - \sum_{t \in T} \ell(E_t, y_t) \right| \leq \alpha.$$

We call $R(E, y, P)$ the expert-wise regret.

In words, a forecaster who nearly accumulates as much loss as an expert performs equally well. The comparison of the forecasters accumulated losses against the experts accumulated losses is usually pursued versus an entire set of experts. Then, often the best expert, i.e. with the smallest accumulated losses, is compared against the forecaster. Again, however, our argument in this work is only concerned with a single expert.

Crucial to the definition of regret is the choice of loss function. Specific properties such as convexity and mixability guarantee existence of (fast) learning algorithms [Vovk, 1990, 2001, Cesa-Bianchi and Lugosi, 2006].

Analogously, to the observation made for calibration, regret can be rewritten as a sum of single loss comparisons between forecaster and expert.

$$R(E, y, P) = \left| \sum_{t \in T} \ell(y_t, P_t) - \sum_{t \in T} \ell(E_t, y_t) \right| \tag{3}$$

$$= \left| \sum_{t \in T} \ell(y_t, P_t) - \ell(E_t, y_t) \right| \tag{4}$$

2.3 Calibration = Regret?

Calibration and regret are both felicity conditions for predictions. Both notions can be reformulated in terms of sums of single instance “comparisons” between prediction and outcome. In addition, the attentive reader might have already spotted the interesting correspondence between calibration on a group S and expert E in regret as parametrizations of the condition. What is the correspondence between S and E ?

Apparently, calibrating a predictor is a different process than minimizing the regret of a predictor. In this work, we provide further evidence that both processes are two sides of the same coin (§ 7). Both processes try to give indistinguishable predictions from outcomes by guaranteeing that a gambler with a series of available “counter-gambles” will fail to get rich.

⁶We generally neglect the probabilistic nature of observing specific outcomes as done in the book by Cesa-Bianchi and Lugosi [2006]. In addition, we ignore their “activation functions” here, which are of no relevance at this point.

We make this statement formal in the next section. To this end, we introduce a general game-theoretic framework to evaluate forecasts. We shortly summarize the roles of the involved agents to then provide a characterization of testing schemes for property-induced forecasts. The calibration criterion as well as the regret criterion will naturally fall out of this analysis. We use the result to show that there exists a non-constructive, but general correspondence between group S and expert E .

3 An Introductory Example

Let us take a look into a simple prediction game, which is close to standard online learning setups. There are three agents in this game: (a) Forecaster, who predicts a distribution on $\{0, 1\}$, i.e. $P_t \in [0, 1]$. (b) Gambler, who gambles on this prediction, to be specified later. (c) Nature, who reveals an outcome $y_t \in \{0, 1\}$. This game is played in sequential order for $t \in T := \{1, \dots, n\}$. The central quantity of this sequential full-information game is the capital of gambler $K_t \in \mathbb{R}$. Its initial value is set to $K_0 = 0$. The goal of gambler is to maximize its capital, the goal of forecaster is to minimize gambler's capital. Nature, for this moment, can be construed as a neutral agent.

Definition 3.1 (The Binary Online Prediction Game). *For $t \in T := \{1, \dots, n\}$ in sequential order: Forecaster announces the next prediction $P_t \in [0, 1]$. Gambler bets on the loss between prediction and nature, i.e. it chooses an available gamble, a function $g_t: \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$\mathbb{E}_{P_t}[g] := (1 - P_t)g(0) + P_tg(1) \leq 0.$$

Nature reveals outcome y_t . Capital of gambler is updated by $K_t := K_{t-1} + g_t(y_t)$.

This game shares several properties with standard online learning games [Cesa-Bianchi and Lugosi, 2006]. But there are at least two characteristics which distinguish this game from standard online learning games: first, there is a gambler involved in our setup. Second, in online learning nature usually is the adversary of forecaster. Why did we introduce gambler?

First, our presented game is designed to evaluate forecasts, but *not* to elicit forecasts. There is not a fixed evaluation criterion on which nature and forecaster compete. We consider the capital of gambler as the objective value, to be minimized by forecaster and to be maximized by gambler. Gambler is allowed to play gambles, which forecaster literally expects to incur loss to gambler. A capital-maximizing gambler hence tries to spill mistrust on the quality of forecaster's predictions. The forecaster meanwhile tries to prevent this from happening. Nature's intents are, for the time being, irrelevant. In this work, we present statements of a different perspective: *we show that gambler resembles two of the most widely used evaluation criteria, calibration and regret, meanwhile finely marking differences and equivalences of the two notions.*

For illustration, consider a single round. Hence, we ignore the round parameter $t \in T$. Let $P \in [0, 1]$. The set of available gambles is then given by a half-space in \mathbb{R}^2 . This is a consequence of the following reformulation of the availability condition as an inner product,

$$(1 - P)g(0) + Pg(1) = \langle (1 - P, P), (g(0), g(1)) \rangle \leq 0.$$

It is clear that the best gambles to play, since they dominate all other available gambles, are the gambles which lie on the dividing hyperplane. For illustration see Figure 3. We elaborate on this statement in § 5.1. For $P \in [0, 1]$, that is $g := \alpha(y - P)$ for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ (cf. Theorem 6.6). We call a gamble of such a structure *calibration gamble* which becomes clear by comparing to Equation 1 (cf. § 6.1.1). As an example, let $\alpha = 1$, hence $g = (-P, 1 - P)$ (cf. Figure 3).




Figure 3: Available Gambles in the Binary Prediction Game (Definition 3.1) – We fix forecaster to $P = 0.5$. The set of available gambles is shaded by light blue. The set of calibration gambles is given by the blue line, the exemplary “optimal” available gamble $g = (-P, 1 - P)$ is marked as a blue dot. The set of regret gambles for fixed $\beta = 1$ is drawn in purple. The approximation of g via rescaled regret gambles is shown in lighter purple.

Now, we consider the following gamble $g := \beta((y - P)^2 - (y - e)^2)$ with $\beta \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, $e \in [0, 1]$. We call this gamble *regret gamble* for obvious reasons (cf. Equation 3). Apart from the expert $e \in [0, 1]$ we introduced the parameter β as a scaling -sometimes called “activation” in regret literature [Cesa-Bianchi and Lugosi, 2006, p. 90]. Regret gambles are, that is easy to see, available. But do regret gambles lie on the hyperplane? For fixed $\beta = 1$ we draw the set of gambles in Figure 3. Only for $e = P$ the gamble is on the dividing hyperplane. But, for $e = P$ the gamble is $(0, 0)$, the origin. The origin is uninformative when betting against the forecaster. Can we upscale the regret gambles via β to set them on the hyperplane? Again, the answer is no (Example 6.11). Hence, calibration gambles seem to be advantageous in comparison to regret gambles. Gambler seems to be better off playing calibration gambles instead of regret gambles. But, and that covers large parts of the following section, up to some approximation calibration and regret gambles are equally powerful. For instance, consider the following approximation strategy of $g = (-P, 1 - P)$: let $\beta_q = \frac{1}{2(P-q)}$ and $e_q = q$.

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{q \rightarrow P} \beta_q ((y - P)^2 - (y - e_q)^2) &= \lim_{q \rightarrow P} \frac{1}{2(P - q)} (q^2 - P^2 + 2y(P - q)) \\ &= \lim_{q \rightarrow P} \frac{1}{2} (-q - P + 2y) = y - P. \end{aligned}$$

Sure, this limit cannot be achieved by regret gambles. But, it can be approximated arbitrarily close by them. Figure 3 provides some geometrical intuition for the statement.

We generalize the simple prediction-gambling game along several dimensions in the following. Then, we repeat and elaborate the argumentation for the approximate equivalence of calibration and regret in broad generality. Nevertheless, we reuse this simple game to illustrate the second type of duality detailed in this paper, randomness and predictiveness (see § 9).

First, the general game will allow for more arbitrary outcome sets. We introduce an input, i.e. a hint which nature reveals before forecaster forecasts. We allow forecaster’s forecast to be imprecise (cf. [Walley, 1991]), i.e. that forecaster announces sets of probability distributions on the outcome set. We strip off the sequential character of the presented game and generalize the corresponding updating procedure of the capital. We reinterpret the set of rounds $\{1, \dots, n\}$ as an abstract population.

Our setup has been inspired by a series of work on game-theoretic probability [Shafer and Vovk, 2019], algorithmic randomness [De Cooman and De Bock, 2021] and online learning [Vovk et al., 2005b, Zhao and Ermon, 2021].

4 The Game

“The Game” consists of three players: nature, forecaster and gambler. Roughly summarized, nature reveals a hint, then forecaster forecasts the next outcome of nature, gambler gambles against this forecast, and lastly nature reveals an outcome. The gamble is evaluated on the outcome. Finally, the gambles’ values are aggregated to gambler’s capital after all rounds were played. Forecaster’s goal is to keep gambler’s capital low, while gambler takes the opponent’s view in trying to increase its own gain. To make this game fair, gambler is only allowed to play certain gambles made available by forecaster. Available are the gambles which forecaster expects to not be disadvantageous to him. We generally assume that positive outcome values of gambles are “good” and negative are “bad”. Hence, we take on gambler’s perspective.

4.1 Why The Game?

The Game is a powerful, yet very abstract, evaluation framework for predictions. As we show in § 8 most empirical evaluation frameworks in machine learning can be recovered from The Game for appropriate choices of nature, aggregation and played available gambles.

What is the merit of the abstract formulation of evaluation of forecasts? It uncovers the simple, neat condition for reasonable evaluation criteria: the availability condition. The availability conditions gives bounds to the behavior of gambler to which extent it is allowed to play against forecaster. In particular, if gambler is successful, then by the availability condition we have reason to mistrust the predictions, i.e. forecaster expects gambler to not be successful, but gambler is. We first define the agents and the protocol of the game formally before we zoom in “The Game”.

4.2 The Playground

The Game is played in rounds. The rounds are indexed by a finite set $T := \{1, \dots, n\}$.⁷ Let \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{Y} be input and outcome sets. Let $(\mathcal{Y}, \Sigma(\mathcal{Y}), \mu)$ be a probability space, e.g. the standard probability space $([0, 1], \mathcal{B}([0, 1]), \lambda)$, $\mathcal{B}([0, 1])$ being the Borel- σ -algebra on $[0, 1]$ and λ being the Lebesgue-measure.

For a Σ -measurable $f: \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ we define the p -norm $\|f\|_p := \left(\int_{\mathcal{Y}} |f(y)|^p d\mu(y)\right)^{\frac{1}{p}}$ for $1 \leq p < \infty$ and $\|f\|_{\infty} := \inf\{c \geq 0: |f| \leq c, \mu\text{-almost everywhere}\}$ for $p = \infty$. The ∞ -norm is closely related to the essential supremum $\text{ess sup } f := \inf\{c \in \mathbb{R}: \mu(\{y \in \mathcal{Y}: f(y) > c\}) = 0\}$. In fact, $\|f\|_{\infty} = \text{ess sup } |f|$ (cf. [Schechter, 1997, Definition 21.42, 22.28]). The essential infimum is defined analogously $\text{ess inf } f := \sup\{c \in \mathbb{R}: \mu(\{y \in \mathcal{Y}: f(y) < c\}) = 0\}$.

⁷In Example 3.1 we allow T to be countably infinite. This does not change the game dynamics.

The space of all $\Sigma(\mathcal{Y})$ -measurable functions on \mathcal{Y} with finite p -norm is defined as $\mathcal{L}^p(\mathcal{Y}, \mu)$. We consider the quotient space $L^p(\mathcal{Y}, \mu) := \mathcal{L}^p(\mathcal{Y}, \mu) / \mathcal{N}$ with $\mathcal{N} := \{f: f = 0, \mu\text{-almost everywhere}\}$. For the sake of readability, we write and treat elements of the quotient space $f \in L^p(\mathcal{Y}, \mu)$ as functions, even though the elements are actually equivalence classes. To simplify the notation, $=_{\mu}, \leq_{\mu}, \geq_{\mu}$ denote equality (respectively inequality) μ -almost everywhere. We shorten $L^p(\mathcal{Y}, \mu) = L^p$.

The space L^1 is isomorphic to the set of all signed, countable additive measures on \mathcal{Y} with bounded variation which are absolutely continuous with respect to μ . [Aliprantis and Border, 2006, Theorem 13.19]. For this reason, we introduce the following notational convention: $f, g \in L^p$ are gambles, comparable to random variables, $\phi, \psi \in L^q$ correspond to densities of measures via the Radon-Nikodym theorem.

For $1 \leq p < \infty$ the space L^p is naturally paired with its (norm) dual space L^q with q such that $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$. The link between the two spaces is given by bilinear map [Aliprantis and Border, 2006, Theorem 13.26 & 13.28],

$$\langle f, \phi \rangle := \mathbb{E}_{\phi}[f] = \int_{\mathcal{Y}} f(y)\phi(y)d\mu(y).$$

The case of $p = \infty$ is more involved, but common practice is to pair it with $q = 1$ [Toland, 2020]. In fact, the space L^{∞} of all real-valued, bounded, measurable functions on \mathcal{Y} is particularly interesting to us.

The space L^p can be equipped with the $\sigma(L^p, L^q)$ topology, i.e. the topology which makes all evaluation functionals, i.e. for all $f \in L^p, f^*: L^q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, \phi \mapsto \langle f, \phi \rangle$: continuous. Analogously, the space L^q allows for the $\sigma(L^q, L^p)$ topology, i.e. the topology which makes all evaluation functionals, i.e. for all $\phi \in L^q, \phi^*: L^p \rightarrow \mathbb{R}, f \mapsto \langle f, \phi \rangle$ continuous. The topologies $\sigma(L^p, L^q)$ and $\sigma(L^q, L^p)$ are weak topologies in the sense of [Schechter, 1997, p. 758]. Besides these topologies the Banach spaces additionally possess the norm-induced topology.

In some cases these topologies relate to each other. If $1 \leq p < \infty$, then L^p and $(L^p)^* = L^q$ (isometrically isomorph)⁸, hence, the $\sigma(L^p, L^q)$ topology is the weak^{*} topology [Schechter, 1997, p. 763]. In this case, the norm-induced topology contains the weak^{*} topology. In particular, the set of closed, convex sets is equivalent for both topologies [Aliprantis and Border, 2006, Theorem 5.98]. Lemma 4.1 summarizes those statements.

Lemma 4.1 (A Hierarchy of Topologies on L^p). *Let L^p be a Banach space defined by the p -norm for $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ and L^q the paired space such that $\frac{1}{p} + \frac{1}{q} = 1$. We have the following containment structure*

$$\sigma(L^p, L^q) \subseteq \sigma(L^p, (L^p)^*) \subseteq \sigma(\|\cdot\|_p).$$

Proof. For any $1 \leq p \leq \infty$ we have $L^q \subseteq (L^p)^*$ which gives the first set inclusion.⁹ The second set containment resembles the general idea that a weak topology is weaker than a strong topology [Aliprantis and Border, 2006, p. 24]. Here, the weak topology is contained in the norm topology of the Banach space [Schechter, 1997, 28.16]. \square

Set containment of topologies can be understood as fine-graining or strengthening a topology. If topology \mathcal{T}_1 is contained in another topology \mathcal{T}_2 , then all open sets of \mathcal{T}_1 are open sets in \mathcal{T}_2 [Aliprantis and Border, 2006, p. 24].

At some points we refer to the set of all non-negative gambles. Thus, we introduce the notation $L_{\leq 0}^p := \{f \in L^p: f \leq_{\mu} 0\} = \{f \in L^p: \text{ess sup } f \leq 0\}$ for the negative orthant. For the convex, closed

⁸The notation $(L^p)^*$ denotes the topological dual vector space of L^p .

⁹This set inclusion actually is the containment of the weak^{*} topology in the weak topology. [Schechter, 1997, 28.22 (a)]

Δ^q	$\{\phi \in L^q : \phi \geq_\mu 0, \ \phi\ _1 = 1\}$
Forecasting set	$P \subseteq \Delta^q$, Definition 4.2
Available gamble	$g \in L^P$ such that $\sup_{\phi \in P} \mathbb{E}_\phi[g] \leq 0$, Definition 4.3
Strategy	$S: T \rightarrow L^P$ with $S(t)$ available for all $t \in T$, Definition 4.4
Marginal available gamble	$g \in L^P$ such that $\sup_{\phi \in P} \mathbb{E}_\phi[g] = 0$, Definition 5.1
Offer	$\mathcal{G} \subseteq L^P$ additivity, positive homogeneity, coherence, default availability and closure hold, Definition 5.3
Credal set	closed and convex $P \subseteq \Delta^q$, Definition 5.6
Property of distribution	$\Gamma: \Delta^q \rightarrow C$, Definition 6.1
Level set of property	$\Gamma^{-1}(\gamma) := \{\phi \in \Delta^q : \Gamma(\phi) = \gamma\}$, Definition 6.2
Identification function for property Γ	$\nu: \mathcal{Y} \times C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ s.t. $\mathbb{E}_\phi[\nu(Y, \gamma)] = 0 \Leftrightarrow \Gamma(\phi) = \gamma$, short $\nu_\gamma := y \mapsto \nu(\gamma, y)$, Definition 6.3
Strictly consistent scoring function for property Γ	$\ell: \mathcal{Y} \times C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ s.t. $\Gamma(\phi) = \arg \min_{c \in C} \mathbb{E}_\phi[\ell(Y, c)]$, short $\ell_\gamma := y \mapsto \ell(\gamma, y)$, Definition 6.4
Superprediction set for scoring function ℓ	$\text{spr}(\ell) := \{g \in L^P : \exists c \in C, \ell_c \leq_\mu g\}$, Definition 6.9

Table 1: Summary of important, used definitions. Part I.

subset of “probability densities” (μ -absolutely continuous) in L^q we write $\Delta^q := \{\phi \in L^q : \phi \geq_\mu 0, \|\phi\|_1 = 1\}$. For notational convenience we introduce the following shortcut for A being a subset of L^P or L^q ,

$$\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}A := \{ra : r \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, a \in A\},$$

which is called the *cone* generated by A . It is closed under multiplication with a positive scalar. If A is convex, i.e. closed under convex combinations, then $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}A$ is a *convex cone* (Lemma 12.1).

We note that the playground we chose, i.e. the pairing of L^P and L^q spaces, is not the most general framework in which our statements hold. We conjecture that a more general pairing of locally convex topological vector spaces would lead to the same results, given meaningful definitions for properties of distributions (cf. Definition 6.1) exist. The reason for this is that the crucial Bipolar Theorem P3 holds in those more general cases. However, since those general spaces might include the often unfamiliar finitely additive probability measures we decided to simplify statements by restricting us to the L^P and L^q pairing. Having prepared these notations, we are ready for defining the three players of the game.

We have summarized the most important definitions which we encounter in the first part of the paper in Table 1.

4.3 The Players

Revealing What to Predict – Nature has two moves in the game, it reveals the hint $x_t \in \mathcal{X}$ and the outcome $y_t \in \mathcal{Y}$ which is to be predicted. Nature’s behavior is not necessarily constrained by any rules. Hence, nature can, in the face of forecaster, behave adversarially, randomly or friendly. In particular, we do not necessarily assume an underlying probabilistic source of the realized outcomes y_t nor of input x_t .

The Model of Probability – Forecaster forecasts the outcome y_t by providing a set of probability distributions $P_t \subseteq \Delta^q$. In other words, forecaster is allowed to express its uncertainty about

the upcoming event not only in a single distribution, but in a non-empty set of distributions. We call such sets *forecasting sets*.

Definition 4.2 (Forecasting Set). *A non-empty set $P \subseteq \Delta^q$ is called forecasting set.*

If the forecasting set is a singleton we abuse notation and write $P \in \Delta^q$. We consider the more general case of forecasting sets instead of single distribution forecasts because (a) the follow-up introduction of the *availability criterion* ties together forecasting sets and gamblers' actions via the theory of imprecise probability and (b) it shows that our framework is powerful enough to demarcate the space of reasonable evaluation criteria of imprecise forecasts which still needs to be developed in the future.

The Judge – Gambler 's job is to cast doubt that the forecasts appropriately describe the real outcomes seen in nature. Gambler specifies gambles it plays. If the forecasts don't fit the outcomes then gambler can exploit this misalignment by gaining "money", i.e. increase its capital, by strategically choosing the gambles.

However, if gambler would be allowed to play any gambles, it would be a rather easy deal to increase its capital, e.g. by playing gambles which only give positive outcomes. Hence, gambler is restricted to a certain set of gambles, which we will call *available gambles*.

Definition 4.3 (Availability). *Let $P \subseteq \Delta^q$ be a forecasting set. A gamble $g \in L^p$ is called available if and only if $\sup_{\phi \in P} \mathbb{E}_\phi[g] \leq 0$.*

Intuitively, this definition states that a gamble is available if and only if the forecaster (literally) expects the gamble to incur a loss to gambler for all probabilities in the forecasting set. In other words, forecaster allows gambler play all gambles which forecaster assumes to be not desirable.¹⁰ We borrow the concept of availability from [Shafer and Vovk, 2019, Protocol 6.11 / 6.12] (cf. [Shafer and Vovk, 2019, Proposition 7.2]).

Since gambler usually does not play a single gamble, we introduce the notion of a strategy which is a function from the round index to an available gamble.

Definition 4.4 (Strategy). *A strategy $S: T \rightarrow L^p$ assigns an available gamble $g_t \in L^p$ to every round $t \in T$. This assignment, depending on the exact protocol, can depend on hints by nature x_t or as well transcripts of other played rounds (cf. Proposition 9.4). We hide this notational overhead.¹¹*

4.4 The Protocol

The presented game is a played in potentially concurrent rounds. The protocol given is indexed by the round parameter $t \in T := \{1, \dots, n\}$. The set T can be interpreted as an abstract population. For each individual $t \in T$ a full-information round of the game specified below is played, i.e. within a single round of the game the agents have access to all past information. The rounds are not necessarily ordered.

¹⁰Availability is negative "desirability" [Shafer and Vovk, 2019, p. 131], a concept used in the literature on imprecise probability [Walley, 2000]. Desirable gambles are all gambles for which the forecaster assumes that playing those will not lead to a loss, i.e. choosing a desirable gamble and evaluating this gamble at an outcome of nature will lead to a "benign" outcome.

¹¹For instance, in online learning settings gambling strategies are sequential, i.e. there exist functions $\phi_t: \mathcal{X}^t \times (\Delta^q)^t \times \mathcal{Y}^{t-1} \rightarrow L^p$ such that $\phi((x_1, \dots, x_n), (P_1, \dots, P_n), (y_1, \dots, y_{t-1})) = g_t$, (cf. § 4.4.1, § 9.1). The strategy is then $S(t) = g_t$.




Figure 4: The Game – The Game is played in rounds, for every $t \in T$. In a single round nature (lightblue) first reveals a hint, then forecaster (orange) provides a forecasting set, gambler (green) reacts with an available and finally nature reveals the outcome. The realized values of the gambles are aggregated along the axis of all played rounds.

Definition 4.5 (The Game). *Let $t \in T$. For every $t \in T$.*

- 1) *Nature reveals $x_t \in \mathcal{X}$.*
- 2) *Forecaster announces the next forecasting set $P_t \subseteq \Delta^q$ based on the observed input x_t .*
- 3) *Gambler bets on the loss between forecast and nature. It chooses an available gamble $g_t \in L^p$ based on the observed input x_t and the forecast P_t , i.e. $\sup_{\phi \in P_t} \mathbb{E}_\phi[g_t] \leq 0$.*
- 4) *Nature reveals outcome $y_t \in \mathcal{Y}$.*

When all rounds $t \in T$ are played, an aggregation function $\mathbf{A}: \mathbb{R}^{|T|} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ aggregates the realized values of the gambles as the capital $K := \mathbf{A}[\{g_t(y_t)\}_{t \in T}]$.

Apart from the agents the protocol of The Game itself can be varied according to the learning setup. For instance, our game is defined such that nature always first reveals an input x_t . This step is not a strict requirement to the game. Nature can potentially skip this step.

4.4.1 Sequentiality

The vanilla version of The Game assumes independent and potentially even concurrent played rounds of the protocol. However, if the index set of the rounds has some order, e.g. the standard order on the finite set $T := \{1, \dots, n\}$, then the protocol can be restricted to this order. We call such a protocol of The Game sequential. In particular, we assume full-information across the rounds for all involved agents, i.e. every agent has access to the transcript of the played moves by all agents, nature, gambler and forecaster. If the rounds are played simultaneously or in an arbitrary order, we call the protocol non-sequential. Obviously, there exist intermediate partially order setups. Sequentiality of the protocol, however, is most of the times *irrelevant* to the results we give.

4.4.2 Nature's Nature

We considered nature to be a neutral agent in The Game so far. Its agency, however, depends largely on the learning setup in which we apply The Game. In online learning nature is usually considered to be adversarially against forecaster. In our case this amounts to nature trying to increase, potentially in corporation with gambler, the capital of gambler.

Likewise a distribution-free nature can be assumed to behave “forecaster-friendly”. A nature, who tries to decrease, potentially in corporation with forecaster, the capital of gambler, seems to be an irrational assumption at first glance. This situation, however, relates to what has been called “performativity” in machine learning literature [Perdomo et al., 2020, Hardt et al., 2022]. Nature behaves according to forecasts, because the forecasts influence nature.

Finally, nature can be modeled as a stochastic source. In other words, we can assume an underlying probability distribution which describes the observed instances $x \in \mathcal{X}$ and $y \in \mathcal{Y}$. This assumption, standard in supervised machine learning, entails that there is a data distribution \mathcal{D} on $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ from which the samples are drawn independent and identically. In § 8.2 we elaborate on this setting in more detail. The important observation is that the forecasted distributions by the predictor are not necessarily in any relationship to the data distribution. Different to default supervised learning setups where it is the goal to recover a conditional distribution, often the conditional distribution of the outcome y_t given the hint x_t , from an unknown but existing data distribution, the goal of the predictor in our setting is *only* to keep gambler’s capital small, even when nature samples from a distribution.

Some authors model nature as a two-step process, where first nature picks a probability distribution on \mathcal{Y} and then a random sample following this distribution “occurs” [Fierens, 2009, Dwork et al., 2021, Zhao and Ermon, 2021]. The authors then distinguish between these random (two-step process) versus our deterministic sources (one-step process). Formally, the intermediate step potentially simplifies the analysis and can be thought of being more general. In summary, the evaluation framework presented here is independent of the type of nature, or better said the data model which describes data obtained revealed by nature.

4.4.3 More Gamblers

Hitherto, a single gambler faced the challenge to make money within the limitations given by forecaster. Such a single gambler surely cannot express all the more complex felicity conditions in current machine learning. For instance, calibration, as understood in machine learning, requires the average of outcomes to be close to the average of predictions for all groups of similar predictions. Each such group can be expressed by a gambler. But several gamblers are needed to cover the entire notion. Multicalibration increases the complexity even more and demands for even more gamblers. The same holds for regret notions as we see later. Regret is usually not expressed against a single other agent. For each agent to which we compare the incurred loss induces another gambler.

More gamblers can seamlessly be integrated in our setup. We replace the single gambler g by a set of gamblers $\{g^j\}_{j \in J}$, each specifying their gambles simultaneously. We assume no interaction between the gamblers. Crucial for the definition of an overall criterion of quality is then the type of aggregation, along the axis $t \in T$ and among the gamblers $j \in J$. In this work, we focus on a single gambler. The arguments, however, naturally extend to multi-gambler settings.

4.4.4 The Aggregation Functional

The aggregation of the realized values of the gambles usually depends on the assumption of nature’s nature and the assumption of sequentiality. In a sequentially played The Game recursive definitions of aggregations are often helpful, e.g. $K_{t+1} := K_t + g_{t+1}(y_{t+1})$ with start capital K_0 often set to zero. For a stochastic nature, in contrast, it is a reasonable choice to aggregate weighted by the probability of the appearance of the outcomes $\mathbf{A}[\{g_t(y_t)\}_{t \in T}] = \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[g_t(y_t)]$ (cf. § 8.2). There are possibly many more choices, e.g. [Cabrera Pacheco et al. \[2024\]](#) provide an axiomatizatonal account to loss aggregation. Most of this work is independent of the chosen aggregation function, we use them merely as a tool to recover known, standard evaluation criteria in machine learning (§ 8).

5 The Availability Criterion

The abstract evaluation game we presented above basically revolves around the so-called *availability criterion*. The availability condition possesses an intuitive interpretation: only non-advantageous, in the eyes of forecaster, gambles are allowed to be played by gambler.

A gambler which violates the availability criterion has an unfair advantage in increasing its capital against forecaster. Hence, if we interpret the gambler as an evaluation test, this test would not serve the purpose to guarantee “good” forecasts, since the resulting capital would most likely not relate to a quality of the predictions.

The availability criterion is a necessary, but not sufficient meta-criterion for reasonable forecast evaluators. A gambler which does not fulfill the availability criterion cannot guarantee the quality of predictions. However, a gambler which fulfills the availability criterion does not guarantee the quality of predictions either. Bad predictions are still possible when those predictions passed several tests which fulfill the availability criterion. For instance, the forecaster who predicts the entire set of all distributions on \mathcal{Y} will lead to non-positive outcome for a gambler who only plays available gambles (Lemma 12.2). The forecasts, however, might not necessarily be “good”, in terms of describing the outcomes by nature appropriately. Availability is necessary, but not sufficient to guarantee “good” forecasts.

This problem alludes to the big question: what are “good” forecasts? This question for precise forecasts has been part of debates for decades [[Schervish, 1989](#), [Schervish et al., 2009](#), [Gneiting and Raftery, 2007](#), [Gneiting, 2011](#), [Zhao and Ermon, 2021](#), [Zhao et al., 2021](#)]. The more general, “what are “good” imprecise forecasts?”, however, regains focus just recently [[Zhao and Ermon, 2021](#), [Gupta and Ramdas, 2022](#), [Konek, 2023](#)]¹². The question’s answer has not been settled yet. We hope our work can contribute by clarifying the problem setup.

In this paper, we circumvent the “vacuity problem” by demanding the forecaster to give property-based forecasts. We introduce their exact definition in § 6. For the moment, it is enough to know that those predictions cannot be arbitrarily vacuous. Interestingly, these forecast allows to recover the widely used notions of calibration and regret in machine learning (§ 6).

Beyond machine learning, the availability condition is central to the currently emerging topic “Testing by Betting” in statistics [[Shafer, 2021](#), [Ramdas et al., 2023](#)]. Non-negative supermartingales, the workhorses of this literature, are sums of available gambles.

Finally, the availability condition ties together definitions of algorithmic randomness and evaluation criteria in machine learning (see § 9). Poetically speaking, unpredictability and predictability

¹²Arguably, [Schervish et al. \[2009\]](#) started this project during the search for a generalization of de Finetti’s coherence type II. The first generalization of de Finetti’s coherence type I already led to the development of the field of imprecise probability [[Walley, 1991](#), [Williams, 2007](#)].

give each other their hands in The Game.

The availability criterion gives a frame what gambler is allowed to play. But, we can ask which gambles among the available gambles are the ones which gambler should prefer. The idea is the following, gambler should preferably play gambles which, no matter what outcome is revealed by nature, gives higher outcomes than other available gambles.

5.1 Marginally Available Gambles – The Best Gambler Can Play

The availability criterion gives a natural idea what a gambler should be allowed to play to discredit forecaster. However, there is a subset of available gambles which is advantageous for gambler to increase its capital. We call those gambles *marginally available*.

Definition 5.1 (Marginal Availability). *Let $P \subseteq \Delta^q$ be a forecasting set. A gamble $g \in L^p$ is called marginally available if and only if $\sup_{\phi \in P} \mathbb{E}_\phi[g] = 0$.*

Marginally available gambles are beneficial for gambler. They dominate all available gambles.

Proposition 5.2 (Marginal Availability Characterizes Availability). *Let $g \in L^p$ such that $\sup_{\phi \in P} \mathbb{E}_\phi[g] \leq 0$. There exists $f \in L^p$ such that $\sup_{\phi \in P} \mathbb{E}_\phi[f] = 0$ and $g \leq_\mu f$. In particular,*

$$\left\{ g \in L^p : \sup_{\phi \in P} \mathbb{E}_\phi[g] \leq 0 \right\} = \left\{ g \in L^p : g \leq_\mu f - \sup_{\phi \in P} \mathbb{E}_\phi[f] \text{ for some } f \in L^p \right\}.$$

Proof. We first prove the existence statement: we define $f := g - \sup_{\phi \in P} \mathbb{E}_\phi[g]$. It is easy to see that,

$$\sup_{\phi \in P} \mathbb{E}_\phi[f] = \sup_{\phi \in P} \langle \phi, f \rangle = \sup_{\phi \in P} \langle \phi, g - \sup_{\phi \in P} \mathbb{E}_\phi[g] \rangle = 0.$$

And clearly, $g \leq_\mu f$, because $\sup_{\phi \in P} \mathbb{E}_\phi[g] \leq 0$ by assumption.

This argument already provides the left-to-right set inclusion of the above. The right-to-left set inclusion follows by the simple observation that given there exists $f \in L^p$ such that $g \leq_\mu f - \sup_{\phi \in P} \mathbb{E}_\phi[f]$,

$$\sup_{\phi \in P} \mathbb{E}_\phi[g] \leq \sup_{\phi \in P} \mathbb{E}_\phi[f - \sup_{\phi \in P} \mathbb{E}_\phi[f]] \leq 0.$$

□

Hence, gambler can only benefit by playing marginally available gambles. Marginally available gambles are the edge cases in which forecaster expects gambler to neither win nor gain. Marginally available gambles are the ones which in the eyes of the forecaster have the highest potential to lead to a positive outcome for gambler.

Imagine gambler only plays marginally available gambles and forecaster still guarantees that gambler achieves small capital. Playing marginally available gambles ensures that gambler won't fare better than choosing from the dominated available gambles.

In fact, it is easy to construct marginally available gambles. For any $g \in L^p$ the gamble $f := g - \sup_{\phi \in P} \mathbb{E}_\phi[g]$ is marginally available. Ideally, we can leverage this construction to identify marginally available gambles without referring to the potentially, computationally hard problem of calculating $\sup_{\phi \in P} \mathbb{E}_\phi[g]$. It turns out, as we see later, it is often much simpler to characterize the set of available gambles. The reason for this is that sets of available gambles are necessarily convex, sets of marginally available gambles are not (cf. [Augustin et al., 2014, p. 22]).

5.2 From Forecasting Sets to Available Gambles and Back

The set of all available gambles possess a very specific structure lent from convex analysis. We first introduce, what we call an *offer*. An offer is a set of gambles which fulfill the properties a set of all available gambles has. The choice of definition already suggests a further result which we obtain afterwards: for any offer there is a corresponding forecasting set.

Definition 5.3 (Offer). *We call a set $\mathcal{G} \subseteq L^p$ an offer if all of the following conditions are fulfilled*

- 01.** *If $g, f \in \mathcal{G}$, then $g + f \in \mathcal{G}$. (Additivity)*
- 02.** *If $f \in \mathcal{G}$ and $\alpha \geq 0$, then $\alpha f \in \mathcal{G}$. (Positive Homogeneity)*
- 03.** *If $g \in \mathcal{G}$, then $\text{ess inf } g \leq 0$. (Prohibiting Sure Gains)*
- 04.** *Let $g \in L^p$, if $\text{ess sup } g \leq 0$, then $g \in \mathcal{G}$. (Default Availability)*
- 05.** *The set \mathcal{G} is closed with respect to the $\sigma(L^p, L^q)$ topology. (Closure)*

Closure, additivity and positive homogeneity demand that an offer \mathcal{G} is a closed, convex cone containing the zero element in L^p . Default availability then implies that all non-positive gambles are available. “Prohibiting Sure Gains” prohibits gambler to definitely make profit, i.e. increase capital via a gamble, in the eyes of forecaster.¹³

It is now a matter of checking the axioms of an offer to give the following result.

Theorem 5.4 (Available Gambles Form Offer). *Let $P \subseteq \Delta^q$ be a forecasting set. Then*

$$\mathcal{G}_P := \left\{ g \in L^p : \sup_{\phi \in P} \mathbb{E}_\phi[g] \leq 0 \right\} \subseteq L^p,$$

is an offer.

In order to provide the proof, we introduce so-called *upper expectations* which are closely related to forecasting sets.

Definition 5.5 (Upper Expectation). *A functional $\bar{\mathbb{E}}: L^p \rightarrow (-\infty, \infty]$ for which the following axioms hold is called upper expectation.*

- UE1.** *For $f_1, f_2 \in L^p$ we have $\bar{\mathbb{E}}[f_1 + f_2] \leq \bar{\mathbb{E}}[f_1] + \bar{\mathbb{E}}[f_2]$. (Subadditivity)*
- UE2.** *For $f \in L^p$ and $c \in [0, \infty)$ we have $\bar{\mathbb{E}}[cf] \leq c\bar{\mathbb{E}}[f]$. (Positive Homogeneity)*
- UE3.** *For $f_1, f_2 \in L^p$ such that $f_1 \leq_\mu f_2$ it holds $\bar{\mathbb{E}}[f_1] \leq \bar{\mathbb{E}}[f_2]$. (Monotonicity)*
- UE4.** *For $c \in \mathbb{R}$ it holds $\bar{\mathbb{E}}[c] = c$. (Translation Equivariance)*
- UE5.** *For $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ the set $\{f \in L^p : \bar{\mathbb{E}}[f] \leq \alpha\}$ is $\sigma(L^p, L^q)$ -closed. (Lower Semicontinuity)*

We first show that $\bar{\mathbb{E}}_P[g] := \sup_{\phi \in P} \mathbb{E}_\phi[g]$ for all $g \in L^p$ is an upper expectation. Then, the set of all gambles with non-positive upper expectation form an offer.

¹³There are subtle differences between our notion of “Prohibiting Sure Gains” and the pendant “avoiding sure loss” in imprecise probability, e.g. [Walley, 1991, Section 3.7.3]. Mainly, our definition contains a sign flip.

Proof. Let $\bar{\mathbb{E}}_P[g] := \sup_{\phi \in P} \mathbb{E}_\phi[g]$. We observe that [Aliprantis and Border, 2006, p. 251]

$$\bar{\mathbb{E}}_P[g] := \sup_{\phi \in P} \mathbb{E}_\phi[g] = \sup_{\phi \in \bar{\text{co}}P} \mathbb{E}_\phi[g],$$

where $\bar{\text{co}}$ is the convex $\sigma(L^q, L^p)$ -closure of P .

Hence, we can apply the fundamental representation result for support functions and closed convex sets [Aliprantis and Border, 2006, Theorem 7.51]. It guarantees that $\bar{\mathbb{E}}_P$ satisfies axioms **UE1**, **UE2** and **UE5**. Since, $P \subseteq \Delta^q$ it trivially follows $\bar{\text{co}}P \subseteq \Delta^q$. Hence, Propositions 3.2 and 3.3 in [Fröhlich and Williamson, 2022] show that $\bar{\mathbb{E}}_P$ satisfies axioms **UE3** and **UE4** respectively.

It remains to show that the set of gambles for which the upper expectation is non-positive form an offer. Let

$$\mathcal{G}_P := \{g \in L^p : \bar{\mathbb{E}}_P[g] \leq 0\}.$$

We step-by-step prove all axioms that \mathcal{G}_P has to fulfill to be an offer. Axiom **O1** follows from axiom **UE1**. Axiom **O2** follows from axiom **UE2**. Axiom **O3** is given, because if $\text{ess\,inf } g > 0$, then $\bar{\mathbb{E}}[g] \geq \bar{\mathbb{E}}[\text{ess\,inf } g] > 0$ by axiom **UE3** and axiom **UE4**, from which follows that $g \notin \{g \in L^p : \bar{\mathbb{E}}[g] \leq 0\}$. Axiom **O4** follows from axiom **UE3** and axiom **UE4**. Let $g \in L^p$ with $\text{ess\,sup } g \leq 0$. Then $\bar{\mathbb{E}}[g] \leq \bar{\mathbb{E}}[\text{ess\,sup } g] \leq 0$ implies $g \in \mathcal{G}_P$. Axiom **O5** directly follows from axiom **UE5**. This concludes the proof. \square

The set of all available gambles is an offer. This reformulation, in fact, is not a one-way street. Given an arbitrary offer we can provide a forecasting set whose set of available gambles is exactly the offer (Theorem 5.8). This forecasting set even fulfills additional properties. We call such forecasting sets *credal*.

Definition 5.6 (Credal Set). *We call a non-empty set $P \subseteq \Delta^q$ a credal set if all of the following conditions are fulfilled*

CS1. *Let $p_1, \dots, p_n \in P$ and $\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ such $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i = 1$, then $\sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i p_i \in P$. (Convexity)*

CS2. *The set P is closed with respect to the $\sigma(L^q, L^p)$ -topology. (Closure)*

Credal sets are forecasting sets which are closed and convex. The term “credal set” is borrowed from the literature on imprecise probability [Augustin et al., 2014]. We emphasize that a credal set is not necessarily linked to any kind of a belief of forecaster. We use the term here to describe a forecasting set with a particular structure. Note that $\bar{\text{co}}P$ is a credal set for every forecasting set $P \subseteq \Delta^q$.

To formally state the theorem we furthermore introduce polar sets.

Definition 5.7 (Polar Set). *We define the polar set for non-empty $W \subseteq L^p$ and non-empty $V \subseteq L^q$ as*

$$W^\circ := \{\phi \in L^q : \langle \phi, g \rangle \leq 1, \forall g \in W\},$$

respectively

$$V^\circ := \{g \in L^p : \langle \phi, g \rangle \leq 1, \forall \phi \in V\}.$$

Finally, we are able to spell out a one-to-one correspondence between credal sets and offers.

Theorem 5.8 (Representation: Credal Sets – Offers). *Let $\mathcal{G} \subseteq L^p$ be an offer. The set*

$$P_{\mathcal{G}} := \mathcal{G}^\circ \cap \Delta^q \subseteq L^q$$

is a credal set, such that

$$\mathcal{G} = \left\{ g \in L^p : \sup_{\phi \in P_{\mathcal{G}}} \mathbb{E}_\phi[g] \leq 0 \right\} = (\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} P_{\mathcal{G}})^\circ.$$

Reversely, let $P \subseteq L^q$ be a credal set. The set

$$\mathcal{G}_P := (\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} P)^\circ \subseteq L^p$$

is an offer, such that

$$P := \mathcal{G}_P^\circ \cap \Delta^q.$$

In particular, every offer \mathcal{G} is in one-to-one correspondence to a credal set P .

In order to show Theorem 5.8, we first introduce several helpful properties of polar sets.

Proposition 5.9 (Properties of Polar Set). *For non-empty $W_1, W_2 \subseteq L^p$ we have:*

P1. *If $W_1 \subseteq W_2$, then $W_2^\circ \subseteq W_1^\circ$.*

P2. *The set W_1° is non-empty, convex, $\sigma(L^q, L^p)$ -closed and contains the zero element.*

P3. *If W_1 is non-empty, convex, $\sigma(L^p, L^q)$ -closed and contains the zero element, then $W_1 = (W_1^\circ)^\circ$.*

P4. *If W_1 is a convex cone, then $W_1^\circ = \{\phi \in L^q : \langle \phi, g \rangle \leq 0, \forall g \in W_1\}$, which is a convex cone.*

P5. *It holds $(L_{\leq 0}^p)^\circ = L_{\geq 0}^q$.*

Analogous results hold for $V_1, V_2 \subseteq L^q$.

Proof. Statement **P1** and **P2** follow from Lemma 5.102 in [Aliprantis and Border, 2006]. Statement **P3** is the famous Bipolar Theorem [Aliprantis and Border, 2006, Theorem 5.103]. The Statement **P4** can be found on p. 215 in the same book. It remains to show Statement **P5**.

Since $L_{\leq 0}^p$ is a convex cone, we leverage Property **P4** to get:

$$(L_{\leq 0}^p)^\circ = \{\phi \in L^q : \langle \phi, g \rangle \leq 0, \forall g \in L_{\leq 0}^p\}.$$

We can easily see that for every $\phi \in L_{\geq 0}^q$, $\langle \phi, g \rangle \leq 0$ for all $g \in L_{\leq 0}^p$. For the reverse direction, consider any $\phi \in L^q$ such that ϕ is negative on a non-measure zero set A with respect to μ . We show that such $\phi \notin (L_{\leq 0}^p)^\circ$. Let $g(y) := -\mathbb{1}_{y \in A}$. Obviously, $g \in L_{\leq 0}^p$ for all $1 \leq p \leq \infty$. Furthermore,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \phi, g \rangle &= \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \phi(y) g(y) d\mu(y) \\ &= \int_A \phi(y) g(y) d\mu(y) + \int_{\mathcal{Y} \setminus A} \phi(y) g(y) d\mu(y) \\ &= - \int_A \phi(y) d\mu(y) > 0. \end{aligned}$$

It follows that $\phi \notin (L_{\leq 0}^p)^\circ$. Hence, $(L_{\leq 0}^p)^\circ \subseteq L_{\geq 0}^q$. □

Furthermore, we guarantee that the polar of an offer is non-trivial.

Lemma 5.10 (Polar of Offer is Non-Trivial). *Let $\mathcal{G} \subseteq L^p$ be an offer. Then, $\mathcal{G}^\circ \neq \{0\}$.*

Proof. If $\mathcal{G}^\circ = \{0\}$, then $\mathcal{G} = \mathcal{G}^{\circ\circ} = \{0\}^\circ = L^p$ (Proposition 5.9). But this offer \mathcal{G} is not legitimate, since it violates Axiom O3. \square

The proof of Theorem 5.8 is then given in five steps. First, we show that $P_{\mathcal{G}}$ is a credal set by going through the axioms. Then, we argue that $\mathcal{G} = \left\{g \in L^p : \sup_{\phi \in P_{\mathcal{G}}} \mathbb{E}_\phi[g] \leq 0\right\} = (\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} P_{\mathcal{G}})^\circ$. Thirdly, \mathcal{G}_P is shown to be an offer. After that, we prove $P := \mathcal{G}_P^\circ \cap \Delta^q$. Finally, we argue that the mapping between offers and credal sets is bijective.

Proof. 1. Let $\mathcal{G} \subseteq L^p$ be an offer. We show that $\mathcal{G}^\circ \cap \Delta^q \subseteq L^q$ is a credal set. Clearly, $L_{\leq 0}^p \subseteq \mathcal{G}$ (Condition O4). Thus, $\mathcal{G}^\circ \subseteq L_{\geq 0}^q$ by Proposition 5.9, Statement P1 and Statement P5. Furthermore, \mathcal{G}° is $\sigma(L^q, L^p)$ -closed and convex (Proposition 5.9, Statement P2). In particular, \mathcal{G}° contains at least one element $\phi \in L_{\geq 0}^q$, such that $\|\phi\|_q = 1$. We can easily see this fact, because if $\phi \in \mathcal{G}^\circ$ is not equal to zero, then $\phi' := \frac{\phi}{\|\phi\|_q} \in \mathcal{G}^\circ$ (Proposition 5.9 Statement P4) and $\|\phi'\|_q = 1$. Importantly, such a non-zero $\phi \in \mathcal{G}^\circ$ exists (Lemma 5.10). From all these considerations follows that the intersection $\mathcal{G}^\circ \cap \Delta^q$ is non-empty. Furthermore, it is $\sigma(L^q, L^p)$ -closed and convex, because both \mathcal{G}° and Δ^q fulfill those intersection-stable properties.

2. It holds,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\{g \in L^p : \sup_{\phi \in P_{\mathcal{G}}} \mathbb{E}_\phi[g] \leq 0\right\} &= \{g \in L^p : \langle \phi, g \rangle \leq 0, \forall \phi \in P_{\mathcal{G}}\} \\
&= \{g \in L^p : \langle r\phi, g \rangle \leq 0, \forall \phi \in P_{\mathcal{G}}, \forall r \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\} \\
&= \{g \in L^p : \langle t, g \rangle \leq 0, \forall t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} P_{\mathcal{G}}\} \\
&\stackrel{P4}{=} (\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} P_{\mathcal{G}})^\circ \\
&= (\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} (\mathcal{G}^\circ \cap \Delta^q))^\circ \\
&= (\{r\phi : r \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \phi \in \mathcal{G}^\circ, \phi \in \Delta^q\})^\circ \\
&= (\{r\phi : r \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \phi \in \mathcal{G}^\circ\} \cap \{r\phi : r \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, \phi \in \Delta^q\})^\circ \\
&= (\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \mathcal{G}^\circ \cap \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \Delta^q)^\circ \\
&\stackrel{P3}{=} (\mathcal{G}^\circ \cap \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} \Delta^q)^\circ \\
&= (\mathcal{G}^\circ \cap L_{\geq 0}^q)^\circ \\
&\stackrel{O4}{=} (\mathcal{G}^\circ)^\circ \\
&\stackrel{P3}{=} \mathcal{G}.
\end{aligned}$$

3. Let $P \subseteq L^q$ be a credal set. We show that $\mathcal{G}_P = (\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} P)^\circ$ is an offer. Clearly, \mathcal{G}_P is $\sigma(L^p, L^q)$ -closed (Condition O5), a convex cone (Condition O2 and O1) that contains the zero element (Proposition 5.9, Statement P2 and P4). Furthermore, $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} P \subseteq L_{\geq 0}^q$ implies $(\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} P)^\circ \supseteq L_{\leq 0}^p$ which is Condition O4 (Proposition 5.9, Statement P1 and P5). For any $g \in (\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} P)^\circ$ we have

that $\text{ess\,inf } g \leq 0$, otherwise $c := \text{ess\,inf } g > 0$, hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \phi, g \rangle &= \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \phi(y) g(y) d\mu(y) \\ &\geq \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \phi(y) c d\mu(y) \\ &= c \int_{\mathcal{Y}} \phi(y) d\mu(y) > 0,\end{aligned}$$

for some $\phi \in P$ (Axiom O3).

4. It holds,

$$\begin{aligned}P_{\mathcal{G}} &= \mathcal{G}^\circ \cap \Delta^q \\ &= ((\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0} P)^\circ)^\circ \cap \Delta^q \\ &= P.\end{aligned}$$

5. For the bijectivity of the mapping, note that we have shown $\tilde{\mathcal{G}} = \mathcal{G}_{P_{\tilde{\mathcal{G}}}}$ for any offer $\tilde{\mathcal{G}}$ and $\tilde{P} = P_{\mathcal{G}_{\tilde{P}}}$ for any credal set \tilde{P} . Hence, the mapping between offers and credal sets has a left and a right inverse, hence is a bijection. □

Concluding, we went in a circle, from a forecasting set to an offer, and from an offer to a forecasting set. Mathematically, we observe an instantiation of a polar duality. The proof ideas are not new. We use known techniques from the literature on imprecise probability. We adapt them to our setup in the L^p - L^q -duality. The bijection elaborated here in Theorem 5.8 is the work-horse for the characterization of available gambles in the following section.

6 Forecasts Induced by Properties

We enable forecaster to provide a *set* of probability distributions instead of single distributions. From a machine learning perspective this generalization might seem odd. It is more common to predict single probability distributions, e.g. in class probability estimation, or even only single properties of distributions such as means or quantiles, e.g. linear regression and quantile regression. The latter case, however, can be interpreted as predicting a set of distributions which share the specified property.

We use this perspective to argue that for so-called elicitable (or identifiable) properties of distributions, a natural choice of evaluation criterion is regret (respectively generalized calibration).

Let us first introduce a very general definition of a property of a probability distribution.

Definition 6.1 (Property of Distribution). *Let C be some property value set. A property is a mapping $\Gamma: \Delta^q \rightarrow C$.*

Literature on properties of distributions often assumes that $C = \mathbb{R}$ [Gneiting, 2011], sometimes as well $C = \mathbb{R}^d$. We allow general sets of property values, e.g. $C = \Delta^q$.¹⁴

As we stated already, we can interpret a forecasted property value as the set of probability distributions which possess the announced property value. This is easily captured by the pre-image of a property value.

¹⁴Some authors allow property functions to map to sets in C [Gneiting, 2011, §2.2]. These properties correspond to non-strictly consistent scoring functions (cf. Definition 6.4).

Definition 6.2 (Level Set of Property). *Let $\gamma \in C$. The level set of a property Γ is defined as*

$$\Gamma^{-1}(\gamma) := \{\phi \in \Delta^q : \Gamma(\phi) = \gamma\}.$$

We assume level sets to be non-empty in the following, i.e. $\Gamma(\Delta^q) = C$.

Hence, given a forecaster which outputs property values, we can simply derive the corresponding forecasting set. We call this forecasting set a property-induced forecasting set.

Hitherto, properties of probability distributions were broadly framed. Scholarship in economics, probability theory and statistics is mainly concerned about two important properties of distributional properties, which are *elicitability* and *identifiability*. Elicitability guarantees that the property is the solution of an expected loss minimization problem. A property which is identifiable can be characterized by a so-called identification function, which has been shown to relate to a generalized calibration function [Noarov and Roth, 2023]. Given $C = \mathbb{R}$, elicitable properties are, neglecting technicalities, identifiable and vice-versa [Steinwart et al., 2014]. Elicitability is considered to be a desirable characteristic of a distributional property. In our analysis, elicitability and identifiability correspond to evaluation criteria for forecasts (cf. Figure 2). Let us get concrete. We build upon the definitions given in [Steinwart et al., 2014].

Definition 6.3 (Identifiability and Identification Function). *Let Γ be a property. A function $v: \mathcal{Y} \times C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called identification function of Γ if*

$$\mathbb{E}_\phi[v(Y, \gamma)] = 0 \Leftrightarrow \Gamma(\phi) = \gamma,$$

for all $\phi \in \Delta^q$ and $v_\gamma := y \mapsto v(y, \gamma) \in L^p$ for all $\gamma \in C$. A property which has an identification function is called identifiable.

Definition 6.4 (Elicitability and Strictly Consistent Scoring Function). *Let Γ be a property. A function $\ell: \mathcal{Y} \times C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called strictly consistent scoring function for Γ if*

$$\mathbb{E}_\phi[\ell(Y, \Gamma(\phi))] \leq \mathbb{E}_\phi[\ell(Y, c)]$$

for all $\phi \in \Delta^q, c \in C$ with equality only if $c = \gamma$ and $\ell_\gamma := y \mapsto \ell(y, \gamma) \in L^p$ for all $\gamma \in C$. We can equivalently write

$$\Gamma(\phi) = \underset{c \in C}{\operatorname{argmin}} \mathbb{E}_\phi[\ell(Y, c)].$$

A property which has a strictly consistent scoring function is called elicitable.

The prototypical example of an elicitable and identifiable property is the mean. The corresponding scoring function is $\ell(y, \gamma) = (y - \gamma)^2$. The identification function is $v(y, \gamma) = y - \gamma$. Another standard example is the τ -pinball loss which elicits the τ -quantile. In our definition of property, strictly proper scoring rules as well are elicitation functions. They elicit the entire distribution [Savage, 1971]. The corresponding property is the identity function.

It is now a matter of simple computations to show that identifiable, as well as, elicitable properties have convex level sets. This result is known. It goes back at least to [Osband, 1985]. We combine it with a closure property of those level sets to conclude that a forecaster who leverages elicitable or identifiable properties reveals forecasting sets which are credal. If forecaster provides a property value $\gamma \in C$, then implicitly this corresponds to the credal set $P = \Gamma^{-1}(\gamma)$.

Proposition 6.5 (Identifiable or Elicitable Property Give Credal Level Sets). *For all $\gamma \in C$ the level set $\Gamma^{-1}(\gamma)$ of an identifiable or elicitable property are credal, i.e. convex and $\sigma(L^q, L^p)$ -closed.*

Proof. Note that $\Gamma^{-1}(\gamma) \neq \emptyset$. The convexity of the level sets of an identifiable property is trivial. For elicitable properties see [Steinwart et al., 2014, Appendix B Theorem 13], which applies as well in the case where $C \neq \mathbb{R}$.

For an identifiable property,

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma^{-1}(\gamma) &:= \{\phi \in \Delta^q : \Gamma(\phi) = \gamma\} \\ &= \{\phi \in \Delta^q : \langle \phi, v_\gamma \rangle = 0\} \\ &= \{\phi \in L^q : \langle \phi, v_\gamma \rangle = 0\} \cap \Delta^q \\ &= \{\phi \in L^q : \langle \phi, v_\gamma \rangle \leq 0\} \cap \{\phi \in L^q : \langle \phi, v_\gamma \rangle \geq 0\} \cap \Delta^q,\end{aligned}$$

is $\sigma(L^q, L^p)$ -closed. Analogously, for an elicitable property,

$$\begin{aligned}\Gamma^{-1}(\gamma) &:= \{\phi \in \Delta^q : \Gamma(\phi) = \gamma\} = \{\phi \in \Delta^q : \mathbb{E}_\phi[\ell(Y, \gamma)] \leq \mathbb{E}_\phi[\ell(Y, c)], \forall c \in C\} \\ &= \{\phi \in \Delta^q : \langle \phi, \ell_\gamma - \ell_c \rangle \leq 0, \forall c \in C\} \\ &= \{\phi \in L^q : \langle \phi, \ell_\gamma - \ell_c \rangle \leq 0, \forall c \in C\} \cap \Delta^q \\ &= \bigcap_{c \in C} \{\phi \in L^q : \langle \phi, \ell_\gamma - \ell_c \rangle \leq 0\} \cap \Delta^q,\end{aligned}$$

is $\sigma(L^q, L^p)$ -closed – any intersection of closed sets is closed. \square

Proposition 6.5, as well as the example of the mean, suggest that elicibility and identifiability are equivalent concepts. This is, under some technical assumptions, indeed true. Steinwart et al. [2014] show that for real-valued, norm-continuous properties on Δ^∞ , which are strictly locally non-constant, elicibility and identifiability are equivalent. Since our further argumentation only touches upon this characterization, we do not give a detailed statement here.

In § 5.1 we argued that the set of marginally available gambles is enough for gambler to discredit forecaster. We even gave a universal construction method for marginally available gambles given a forecaster's forecasting set. Unfortunately, this construction required the computation of the supremum expectation over the forecasting set for a gamble. For property-induced forecasting sets, as well as most others, this is a non-trivial undertaking. Hence, we would ideally characterize the set of marginally available gambles in a different way. It turns out it is more fruitful to commit to a different but related goal: can we characterize the set of all available gambles? Can we then identify the best, so the marginally available, gambles among them?¹⁵

6.1 Characterizing Available Gambles of Forecasts Induced by Identifiable Properties

The set of available gambles is convex; the set of marginally available gambles is not. This fact is crucial for the following result: for an identifiable property with identification function $v: \mathcal{Y} \times C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the set of available gambles for the property-induced forecasting set is uniquely given by all gambles $g \leq \alpha v_\gamma$ for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ where γ is the forecasted property, or it can be approximated by such g .

¹⁵A similar route has been taken by Zhao and Ermon [2021] in their Lemma 1, which characterizes the set of available gambles for arbitrary forecasting sets in the binary classification setting.

Theorem 6.6 (Characterization of Available Gambles of Identifiable Property-Forecasts). *Let $\Gamma: \Delta^q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be an identifiable property with identification function $v: \mathcal{Y} \times C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. For a fixed $\gamma \in C$ such that $\Gamma^{-1}(\gamma) \neq \emptyset$, we define¹⁶*

$$\mathcal{H}_{v_\gamma} := \text{cl}\{g \in L^P: g \leq_\mu \alpha v_\gamma \text{ for some } \alpha \in \mathbb{R}\}. \quad (5)$$

It holds

$$\mathcal{H}_{v_\gamma} = \left\{ g \in L^P: \sup_{\phi \in \Gamma^{-1}(\gamma)} \mathbb{E}_\phi[g] \leq 0 \right\} = \mathcal{G}_{\Gamma^{-1}(\gamma)}.$$

Proof. First, we show that \mathcal{H}_{v_γ} is an offer following Definition 5.3:

- **O1:** Let $g, f \in \mathcal{H}_{v_\gamma}$, then $f + g \leq_\mu \alpha_f v_\gamma + \alpha_g v_\gamma = (\alpha_f + \alpha_g) v_\gamma$, with $(\alpha_f + \alpha_g) \in \mathbb{R}$.
- **O2:** Let $g \in \mathcal{H}_{v_\gamma}$ and $c \geq 0$. Then $cg \leq_\mu c\alpha v_\gamma$ with $c\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$.
- **O3:** Let $g \in \mathcal{H}_{v_\gamma}$, then there is $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $g \leq_\mu \alpha v_\gamma$. In particular, $\text{essinf } g \leq \text{essinf } \alpha v_\gamma$. Hence, we require that $\text{essinf } \alpha v_\gamma \leq 0$ for every $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. To see this we remind the reader that $\Gamma^{-1}(\gamma)$ is non-empty (by assumption), i.e. there exist $\phi \in \Delta^q$ such that $\langle \phi, v_\gamma \rangle = 0$. Thus, Lemma 6.7 applies for v_γ and $-v_\gamma$, which gives the desired result.
- **O4:** Let $g \in L^P$ with $\text{esssup } g \leq 0$, then $g \leq_\mu \alpha v_\gamma$ for $\alpha = 0$. Thus, $g \in \mathcal{H}_{v_\gamma}$.
- **O5:** By definition of \mathcal{H}_{v_γ} (5).

Then, we compute

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_{v_\gamma}^\circ \cap \Delta^q &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \{g \in L^P: g \leq_\mu \alpha v_\gamma \text{ for some } \alpha \in \mathbb{R}\}^\circ \cap \Delta^q \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} \{\phi \in L^q: \langle \phi, g \rangle \leq 0, \forall g \in L^P \text{ such that } g \leq_\mu \alpha v_\gamma \text{ for some } \alpha \in \mathbb{R}\} \cap \Delta^q \\ &= \{\phi \in \Delta^q: \langle \phi, g \rangle \leq 0, \forall g \in L^P \text{ such that } g \leq_\mu \alpha v_\gamma \text{ for some } \alpha \in \mathbb{R}\} \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{=} \{\phi \in \Delta^q: \langle \phi, \alpha v_\gamma \rangle \leq 0, \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{R}\} \\ &= \{\phi \in \Delta^q: \alpha \langle \phi, v_\gamma \rangle \leq 0, \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{R}\} \\ &= \{\phi \in \Delta^q: \langle \phi, v_\gamma \rangle = 0\} \\ &= \{\phi \in \Delta^q: \Gamma(\phi) = \gamma\} \\ &= \Gamma^{-1}(\gamma). \end{aligned}$$

- (a) For convex sets containing zero, such as $A := \{g \in L^P: g \leq_\mu \alpha v_\gamma \text{ for some } \alpha \in \mathbb{R}\}$, we have $\text{cl } A = A^\circ$, which implies $A^{\circ\circ} = A^\circ = (\text{cl } A)^\circ$ (Proposition 5.9).
- (b) We have shown that $\{g \in L^P: g \leq_\mu \alpha v_\gamma \text{ for some } \alpha \in \mathbb{R}\}$ is a cone in the first part of the proof. Thus, Proposition 5.9 Statement P4 applies.
- (c) The top to bottom inclusion is trivial. Since we consider all $g \in L^P$ such that $g \leq_\mu \alpha v_\gamma$, we in particular consider all αv_γ for $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$. For the reverse set inclusion, we know that for every $g \in L^P$ there is $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $g \leq_\mu \alpha v_\gamma$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \phi, g \rangle &= \langle \phi, \alpha v_\gamma + g - \alpha v_\gamma \rangle \\ &= \langle \phi, \alpha v_\gamma \rangle + \langle \phi, g - \alpha v_\gamma \rangle \\ &\leq \langle \phi, \alpha v_\gamma \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

¹⁶Closure is taken with respect to $\sigma(L^P, L^q)$ -topology.

because $\phi \geq_{\mu} 0$ and $g - v_{\gamma} \leq_{\mu} 0$. Hence, we can simply focus on all αv_{γ} functions, instead of the previously specified g .

We shortly remind the reader that we have already proven that $\Gamma^{-1}(\gamma)$ is a credal set for all γ (Proposition 6.5). Furthermore, credal sets and offers are in one-to-one correspondence (Theorem 5.8). It follows that $\mathcal{G}_{\Gamma^{-1}(\gamma)}$ is equal to $\mathcal{H}_{v_{\gamma}}$. The remaining equality,

$$\mathcal{G}_{\Gamma^{-1}(\gamma)} = \left\{ g \in L^p : \sup_{\phi \in \Gamma^{-1}(\gamma)} \mathbb{E}_{\phi}[g] \leq 0 \right\}, \quad (6)$$

as well directly follows from Theorem 5.8. \square

Lemma 6.7. *Let $f \in L^p$. If there exists $\phi \in \Delta^q$ such that $\langle \phi, f \rangle \leq 0$, then $\text{ess inf } \alpha f \leq 0$ for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.*

Proof. We show this rather technical statement in two steps. First, we show by contraposition that if there exists $\phi \in \Delta^q$ such that $\langle \phi, f \rangle \leq 0$, then it is not true that $f >_{\mu} 0$. Then, we use this statement to show that the essential infimum is upper bounded by zero.

Assume $f >_{\mu} 0$, i.e. $\mu(\{y \in \mathcal{Y} : f(y) > 0\}) = 1$. Furthermore, let $\phi \in \Delta^q$. Hence, $\int \phi d\mu = 1$ and $\phi \geq_{\mu} 0$, from which follows that $\mu(\{y \in \mathcal{Y} : \phi(y) > 0\}) =: \epsilon > 0$ [Halmos, 2013, p. 104, Theorem B]. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu(\{y \in \mathcal{Y} : f(y)\phi(y) > 0\}) &= \mu(\{y \in \mathcal{Y} : \phi(y) > 0\} \cap \{y \in \mathcal{Y} : f(y) > 0\}) \\ &\geq \mu(\{y \in \mathcal{Y} : \phi(y) > 0\}) + \mu(\{y \in \mathcal{Y} : f(y) > 0\}) - 1 \\ &= \epsilon > 0, \end{aligned}$$

by Fréchet's inequality. Another application of [Halmos, 2013, p. 104, Theorem B] gives $\langle \phi, f \rangle = \int f \phi d\mu > 0$. Reversely, given that there exists $\phi \in \Delta^q$ such that $\langle \phi, f \rangle \leq 0$, it is not true that $f >_{\mu} 0$.

Second, since it is not true that $f >_{\mu} 0$, there exist $A \in \Sigma$ ¹⁷ such that $\mu(A) > 0$ and $f(y) \leq 0, \forall y \in A$. Hence, for any choice of $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$, $A \subseteq \{y \in \mathcal{Y} : \alpha f(y) < c\}$ for every $c > 0$. Thus, $\mu(\{y \in \mathcal{Y} : \alpha f < c\}) \geq \mu(A) > 0$, which implies $\text{ess inf } \alpha f := \sup\{c \in \mathbb{R} : \mu(\{y \in \mathcal{Y} : \alpha f < c\}) = 0\} \leq 0$. \square

To remind the reader, we characterized the set of available gambles to obtain insights about marginally available gambles (Theorem 6.6). All gambles which gambler is allowed to play are upper bounded by a gamble of the form αv_{γ} for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ or can be approximated by such gambles. We call these gambles *calibration gambles*, whose naming convention becomes obvious in Section 6.1.1. It is not true that for every choice of an available gamble there exists a calibration gamble which upper bounds the original, but $\{\alpha v_{\gamma} : \alpha \in \mathbb{R}\}$ almost exhaustively, up to approximation in $\sigma(L^p, L^q)$ -topology, spans the set of favourable gambles for gambler.

We can simplify the statement in finite dimensions. More concretely, we can show that $\mathcal{H}_{v_{\gamma}}$ is closed. Hence, all available gambles are upper bounded by calibration gambles. In other words, given that forecaster provides a value for an identifiable property of a distribution, gambler should play a calibration gamble.

Corollary 6.8 (Characterization of Available Gambles of Identifiable Property-Forecasts in Finite Dimensions). *Let \mathcal{Y} be finite and the probability measure $\mu : 2^{\mathcal{Y}} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is uniform. Let $\Gamma : \Delta^q \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be an identifiable property with identification function $v : \mathcal{Y} \times C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. For a fixed $\gamma \in C$, we have*

$$\mathcal{H}_{v_{\gamma}} = \mathcal{G}_{\Gamma^{-1}(\gamma)} = \left\{ g \in L^p : \sup_{\phi \in \Gamma^{-1}(\gamma)} \mathbb{E}_{\phi}[g] \leq 0 \right\} = \{g \in L^p : g \leq_{\mu} \alpha v_{\gamma} \text{ for some } \alpha \in \mathbb{R}\}$$

¹⁷Remember, Σ is the σ -algebra of the underlying probability space (cf. Section 4.2)

Proof. This corollary only requires to show that

$$\mathcal{F}_{v_\gamma} := \{g \in L^p : g \leq_\mu \alpha v_\gamma \text{ for some } \alpha \in \mathbb{R}\},$$

is $\sigma(L^q, L^p)$ -closed in a finite dimensional L^q -space, i.e. $\mathcal{F}_{v_\gamma} = \mathcal{H}_{v_\gamma}$

Given that \mathcal{Y} is finite and μ is a uniform distribution, L^q reduces to the \mathbb{R}^d for $d = |\mathcal{Y}|$ with q -norm $\|g\|_q = \left(\frac{1}{d} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} |g(y)|^q\right)^{\frac{1}{q}}$ (cf. [Schechter, 1997, p. 591]). On finite dimensional spaces the $\sigma(L^q, L^p)$ -topology is equal to the norm topology [Schechter, 1997, 28.17 (e)]. Furthermore, the topologies induced by $\|\cdot\|_q$ are equivalent for all $q \in (1, \infty]$ [Schechter, 1997, p. 580]. In short, we can use the standard topology on finite dimensional Euclidean spaces to express the next results. In particular, we can simplify \leq_μ to the standard coordinate-wise inequality \leq .

First, we observe that we can write \mathcal{F}_{v_γ} in terms of a Minkowski-sum

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_{v_\gamma} &= \{g \in L^p : g - \alpha v_\gamma \leq 0 \text{ for some } \alpha \in \mathbb{R}\} \\ &= \{\alpha v_\gamma : \alpha \in \mathbb{R}\} + \{g \in L^p : g \leq 0\}. \end{aligned}$$

Let us introduce the shorthands $V_\gamma := \{\alpha v_\gamma : \alpha \in \mathbb{R}\}$ for the line and $L_{\leq 0}^p := \{g \in L^p : g \leq 0\}$ for the negative orthant.

We distinguish between two simple cases:

Case 1 Assume that $v_\gamma \geq 0$ or $-v_\gamma \geq 0$. Axiom **O3** guarantees that there exist at least one $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ such that $\pm v_\gamma(y) = 0$. We denote the subset of those y 's in which v_γ is zero $\mathcal{Y}_0 \subseteq \mathcal{Y}$. It is relatively easy to see that

$$\mathcal{F}_{v_\gamma} = \{g \in L^p : g(y) \leq 0, \forall y \in \mathcal{Y}_0\}.$$

The left to right set inclusion is clear by definition of \mathcal{F}_{v_γ} . For the right to left set inclusion choose $\alpha_g := \max_{y \in \mathcal{Y} \setminus \mathcal{Y}_0} \left(\frac{g(y)}{v_\gamma(y)}\right)$ for arbitrary $g \in L^p$ such that $g(y) \leq 0$ for all $y \in \mathcal{Y}_0$. Then, $g \leq \alpha_g v_\gamma$. Concluding, the obtained set is closed in the Euclidean topology.

Case 2 In the other case, we have to leverage a result on the closedness of Minkowski-sums going back to Debreu [1959]. A Minkowski-sum is closed if V_γ and $L_{\leq 0}^p$ are closed and the asymptotic cones of V_γ and $L_{\leq 0}^p$ positively semi-independent [Border, 2019-2020, Theorem 20.2.3] or [Debreu, 1959, p. 23 (9)].

Asymptotic cones, roughly stated, form the set of directions in which a set is unbounded. Positively semi-independent requires that for $v \in V_\gamma$ and $o \in L_{\leq 0}^p$, $v + o = 0$ implies $v = o = 0$. In our case, V_γ and $L_{\leq 0}^p$ are closed cones, i.e. for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ and elements $v \in V_\gamma$ and $o \in L_{\leq 0}^p$ it holds $\alpha v \in V_\gamma$ respectively $\alpha o \in L_{\leq 0}^p$. Hence, trivially the asymptotic cones of V_γ and $L_{\leq 0}^p$ are the sets themselves [Border, 2019-2020, Theorem 20.2.2 f) i)].

It remains to show that the two sets are positively semi-independent, which trivially follows from the following observation. If $a + o = 0$ for $a \in L^p$ and $o \in L_{\leq 0}^p$, then $a \in L_{\geq 0}^p$ where $L_{\geq 0}^p := \{g \in L^p : g \geq 0\}$. Now, $V_\gamma \cap L_{\geq 0}^p = \{0\}$ because there exist $y, y' \in \mathcal{Y}$ such that $v_\gamma(y) < 0$ and $v_\gamma(y') > 0$. Hence, $a = 0$, which implies $o = 0$.

□

At the beginning of this subsection, we asked whether we can characterize the set of all available gambles in order to identify the marginally available gambles. The marginally available gambles are,

as we argued in § 5.1, the most promising and reasonable gambles gambler should play to spill as much mistrust on the forecaster as possible. Theorem 6.6 provides a first insight on this question. Gambler should pick a gamble from the set of calibration gambles $V_\gamma := \{\alpha v_\gamma : \alpha \in \mathbb{R}\}$. However, this ignores the closure which, from a practical perspective, might be negligible. In finite dimensions, Corollary 6.8 entirely pins down the set of gambles gambler should play. It is the set of calibration gambles. But why do we call those “calibration gambles”?

6.1.1 From Gambles to Calibration

In their work, [Noarov and Roth \[2023\]](#) identified the set of calibratable properties by the set of elicitable respectively identifiable properties. Similar to [\[Gopalan et al., 2022, Deng et al., 2023\]](#) they observe that standard calibration, as we introduced in § 2.1, largely is based on a very specific instance-wise comparison between observation and prediction, namely $y - P$. This comparison is the identification function of the mean.

Let us reconsider the set of calibration gambles V_γ in The Game played on the instances $T := \{1, \dots, n\}$. Our findings suggest that in each of the instances $t \in T$, gambler is best off picking a calibration gamble $g_t = \alpha_t v_\gamma$, $\alpha_t \in \mathbb{R}$. Given that we use summation as aggregation functional, the capital is given by

$$K := \sum_{t \in T} \alpha_t v(y_t, \gamma).$$

Inserting the identification function for the mean, we recover the signed standard calibration score (cf. § 2.1). We emphasize that in every case gambler’s job reduces to choosing stakes $\alpha_t \in \mathbb{R}$. The structure of the identification function is not under its control. The stakes can be depend on everything except the outcome y_t . For instance, the stakes can express group belonging by choosing the stakes to be in $\{0, 1\}$ (cf. Definition 2.1). A single gambler can express a single group. In summary, identification functions generalize the standard calibration notion [\[Noarov and Roth, 2023\]](#). The α_t -parameter for different $t \in T$ generalizes the group belonging. That is why we call αv_γ calibration gambles.

6.2 Characterizing Available Gambles of Forecasts Induced by Elicitable Properties

Identifiable properties are closely related to elicitable properties. Hence, we pursue the natural follow-up question of the previous section: can we characterize the set of available gambles in the case that the forecasts are property-induced where the property is elicitable? We give a (mostly) positive answer. The argumentation is analogous to the given one for identifiable properties.

To shortly recap the setup, elicitable properties of probability distributions are properties which are the (unique) solution to an expected loss minimization problem. The loss in this case is a strictly consistent scoring function (cf. Definition 6.4). In order to give a proper characterization of available gambles we have to introduce the concept of a superprediction set, which originates from the literature on proper scoring rules [\[Kalnishkan and Vyugin, 2002, Kalnishkan et al., 2004, Dawid, 2007\]](#).

Definition 6.9 (Superprediction Set). *Let $\ell : \mathcal{Y} \times C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a scoring function. We call*

$$\text{spr}(\ell) := \{g \in L^P : \exists c \in C, \ell_c \leq_\mu g\},$$

the superprediction set of ℓ .

The superprediction set consists of all gambles which incur no less loss than for some $c \in C$. Positive values have to be interpreted as “bad” here. Superprediction sets largely describe the behavior of loss functions [Williamson and Cranko, 2023], but are usually considered in the context of proper scoring rules and not the more general strictly consistent scoring functions as we put forward here (cf. Definition 6.4). However, superprediction sets are a helpful tool for our further investigations.

For a more detailed characterization along the lines of Theorem 6.6, we require convexity of the superprediction set. Convexity of the superprediction set is not a strong assumption for strictly consistent scoring functions. Every strictly consistent scoring function induces a proper scoring rule [Grünwald and Dawid, 2004, Dawid, 2007] which, in finite dimensions, has a surrogate proper scoring rule with a convex superprediction set with same conditional Bayes risk [Williamson and Cranko, 2023, Section 3.4]. The proper scoring rule and its surrogate are equivalent almost everywhere [Williamson et al., 2016, Proposition 8].

The characterization of available gambles for forecasts induced by an elicitable property is then a matter of computations which resemble the argumentation for identifiable properties (Theorem 6.6).

Theorem 6.10 (Characterization of Available Gambles of Elicitable Property-Forecasts). *Let $\Gamma: \Delta^q \rightarrow C$ be an elicitable property with scoring function $\ell: \mathcal{Y} \times C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which has a convex superprediction set. For a fixed $\gamma \in C$ such that $\Gamma^{-1}(\gamma) \neq \emptyset$, we define*

$$\mathcal{H}_{\ell_\gamma} := \text{cl}\{g \in L^p: g \leq_\mu \alpha(\ell_\gamma - \ell_c) \text{ for some } \alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, c \in C\}. \quad (7)$$

It holds,

$$\mathcal{H}_{\ell_\gamma} = \left\{ g \in L^p: \sup_{\phi \in \Gamma^{-1}(\gamma)} \mathbb{E}_\phi[g] \leq 0 \right\} = \mathcal{G}_{\Gamma^{-1}(\gamma)}.$$

Proof. First, we show that $\mathcal{H}_{\ell_\gamma}$ is an offer following Definition 5.3:

- **O1:** Let $g, f \in \mathcal{H}_{\ell_\gamma}$, then,

$$\begin{aligned} f + g &\leq_\mu \alpha_f(\ell_\gamma - \ell_{c_f}) + \alpha_g(\ell_\gamma - \ell_{c_g}) \\ &= (\alpha_f + \alpha_g) \left(\ell_\gamma - \left(\frac{\alpha_f}{\alpha_f + \alpha_g} \ell_{c_f} + \frac{\alpha_g}{\alpha_f + \alpha_g} \ell_{c_g} \right) \right) \\ &\leq (\alpha_f + \alpha_g) (\ell_\gamma - \ell_{c'}) \end{aligned}$$

with $(\alpha_f + \alpha_g) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and $c' \in C$. Such a c' exists because $\ell_{c_f}, \ell_{c_g} \in \text{spr}(\ell)$ and the superprediction set $\text{spr}(\ell)$ is convex by assumption.

- **O2:** Let $g \in \mathcal{H}_{\ell_\gamma}$ and $r \geq 0$. Then $rg \leq_\mu r\alpha(\ell_\gamma - \ell_c)$ with $r\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$.
- **O3:** Let $g \in \mathcal{H}_{\ell_\gamma}$, then there is $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and $c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $g \leq_\mu \alpha(\ell_\gamma - \ell_c)$. In particular, $\text{essinf} g \leq \text{essinf} \alpha(\ell_\gamma - \ell_c)$. Hence, we require that $\text{essinf} \alpha(\ell_\gamma - \ell_c) \leq 0$ for every $\alpha \geq 0$. This is guaranteed since there exist $\phi \in \Gamma^{-1}(\gamma) \neq \emptyset$ such that $\langle \phi, \ell_\gamma - \ell_c \rangle \leq 0$ by consistency of the scoring function. Thus, Lemma 6.7 applies.
- **O4:** Let $g \in L^p$ with $\text{esssup} g \leq 0$, then $g \leq_\mu \alpha(\ell_\gamma - \ell_c)$ for $\alpha = 0$. Thus, $g \in \mathcal{H}_{\ell_\gamma}$.
- **O5:** By definition of $\mathcal{H}_{\ell_\gamma}$ (7).

Then, we compute

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{H}_{\ell_\gamma}^\circ \cap \Delta^q &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \{g \in L^p : g \leq_\mu \alpha(\ell_\gamma - \ell_c) \text{ for some } \alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, c \in C\}^\circ \cap \Delta^q \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{=} \{\phi \in L^q : \langle \phi, g \rangle \leq 0, \forall g \in L^p \text{ such that } g \leq_\mu \alpha(\ell_\gamma - \ell_c) \text{ for some } \alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, c \in C\} \cap \Delta^q \\
&= \{\phi \in \Delta^q : \langle \phi, g \rangle \leq 0, \forall g \in L^p \text{ such that } g \leq_\mu \alpha(\ell_\gamma - \ell_c) \text{ for some } \alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, c \in C\} \\
&\stackrel{(c)}{=} \{\phi \in \Delta^q : \langle \phi, \alpha(\ell_\gamma - \ell_c) \rangle \leq 0, \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, c \in C\} \\
&= \{\phi \in \Delta^q : \alpha(\langle \phi, \ell_\gamma \rangle - \langle \phi, \ell_c \rangle) \leq 0, \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, c \in C\} \\
&= \{\phi \in \Delta^q : \langle \phi, \ell_\gamma \rangle \leq \langle \phi, \ell_c \rangle, \forall c \in C\} \\
&= \left\{ \phi \in \Delta^q : \arg \min_{c \in C} \langle \phi, \ell_c \rangle = \gamma \right\} \\
&= \{\phi \in \Delta^q : \Gamma(\phi) = \gamma\} \\
&= \Gamma^{-1}(\gamma).
\end{aligned}$$

- (a) For convex sets containing zero, such as $A := \{g \in L^p : g \leq_\mu \alpha v_\gamma \text{ for some } \alpha \in \mathbb{R}\}$, we have $\text{cl} A = A^\circ$, which implies $A^{\circ\circ} = A^\circ = (\text{cl} A)^\circ$ (Proposition 5.9).
- (b) We have shown that $\{g \in L^p : g \leq_\mu \alpha(\ell_\gamma - \ell_c) \text{ for some } \alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, c \in C\}$ is a cone in the first part of the proof. Thus, Proposition 5.9 Statement P4 applies.
- (c) We know that for every $g \in L^p$ such that $g \leq_\mu \alpha(\ell_\gamma - \ell_c)$ for some $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and $c \in C$ it holds,

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \phi, g \rangle &= \langle \phi, \alpha(\ell_\gamma - \ell_c) + g - \alpha(\ell_\gamma - \ell_c) \rangle \\
&= \langle \phi, \alpha(\ell_\gamma - \ell_c) \rangle + \langle \phi, g - \alpha(\ell_\gamma - \ell_c) \rangle \\
&\leq \langle \phi, \alpha(\ell_\gamma - \ell_c) \rangle,
\end{aligned}$$

because $\phi \geq_\mu 0$ and $g - \alpha(\ell_\gamma - \ell_c) \leq_\mu 0$.

Note, we have already proven that $\Gamma^{-1}(\gamma)$ is a credal set for all γ (Proposition 6.5). Furthermore, credal sets and offers are in one-to-one correspondence (Theorem 5.8). It follows that $\mathcal{G}_{\Gamma^{-1}(\gamma)}$ is equal to $\mathcal{H}_{\ell_\gamma}$. Finally, (6) in the last part of the proof of Theorem 6.6 completes the argumentation. \square

Again, the set of available gambles can be, up to approximation in $\sigma(L^p, L^q)$ -topology, expressed as all gambles which are upper bounded by some gamble in the set $S_\gamma := \{\alpha(\ell_\gamma - \ell_c) : \alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, c \in C\}$. It turns out that the closure is crucial here. Even in the finite dimensional case in a simple example, it is easy to show that $\{g \in L^p : g \leq_\mu \alpha(\ell_\gamma - \ell_c) \text{ for some } \alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, c \in C\}$ is not closed.

Example 6.11. *Let us consider a simple binary classification task with $\mathcal{Y} := \{0, 1\}$, μ the uniform distribution on \mathcal{Y} and the strictly consistent scoring function $\ell(y, \gamma) := (y - \gamma)^2$ for the mean. In this simple setup, the mean identifies the distribution. For simplification we assume that forecaster states $P = \gamma = 0.5$, i.e. the forecasting set consists of the uniform distribution on \mathcal{Y} .*

First, we observe that in our simplified setup $L^p \equiv \mathbb{R}^2, L^q \equiv \mathbb{R}^2, \leq_\mu$ is the coordinate-wise order \leq and the considered topology is the Euclidean topology. For a detailed discussion of those simplifications see the proof of Corollary 6.8. We further leverage an analogous representation of the set

$$\{g \in L^p : g \leq_\mu \alpha(\ell_\gamma - \ell_c) \text{ for some } \alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}, c \in C\} = S_\gamma + L_{\leq 0}^p,$$

where $L_{\leq 0}^P := \{g \in \mathbb{R}^2: g \leq 0\}$ is the negative orthant. We show that S_γ is open and argue that this implies $S_\gamma + L_{\leq 0}^P$ is open.

Some tedious calculations give

$$S_{0.5} = \{\alpha(0.25 - c^2, 0.25 - (1 - c)^2): c \in [0, 1], \alpha \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}\}.$$

Furthermore, solving for $c \in [0, 1]$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}$ one notices $(-1, 1) \notin S_{0.5}$. It would require $c = 0.5$ with $\alpha = \infty$, which we exploit to show that $S_{0.5}$ is open. For every $\epsilon > 0$, we can give a point $\ell_\epsilon \in S_{0.5}$ such that $\|(-1, 1) - \ell_\epsilon\|_2 \leq \epsilon$. This point is given by

$$\ell_\epsilon := \alpha_\epsilon(0.25 - c_\epsilon^2, 0.25 - (1 - c_\epsilon)^2)$$

for $c_\epsilon := 0.5 - \frac{\epsilon}{2-\epsilon}$ and $\alpha_\epsilon := \frac{-1}{0.25 - c_\epsilon^2}$. Concluding, the set S_γ is arbitrarily close to $(-1, 1)$ but $(-1, 1)$ is not included. The Minkowski-sum with $L_{\leq 0}^P$ does not change this fact, since it only adds points which are smaller. The points we gave, however, are approximating $(-1, 1)$ from below. See Figure 3 for a rough illustration.

Hence, the nice property that we can neglect the closure for finite dimensions does not hold for regret gambles. Nevertheless, Theorem 6.10 guarantees us that playing gambles from S_γ is almost the best gambler can do. Analogous to calibration gambles, we call elements of S_γ *regret gambles*. The reason for this is relatively easy to see.

6.2.1 From Gambles to Regret

Given that a forecaster plays an elicitable property on $t \in T = \{1, \dots, n\}$ instances, we argued that the approximately best option for gambler is to play gambles from S_{P_t} , i.e. $g_t = \alpha_t(\ell_{P_t} - \ell_{c_t})$ for $\alpha_t \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and $c_t \in L$. Hence, after having played The Game, for the simple sum-aggregation we obtain

$$K = \sum_{t \in T} \alpha_t(\ell(y_t, P_t) - \ell(y_t, c_t)),$$

which is the weighted signed regret for a gambler who specified weights α_t and the expert prediction c_t . The weights α_t are, in case of $\alpha_t \in [0, 1]$, called “activation function” [Cesa-Bianchi and Lugosi, 2006, p. 90] for reasons beyond the scope of this work. Again, weights and expert prediction are not allowed to depend on y_t , since then availability is not guaranteed anymore.

As a short side note, we conjecture that new insights on mixability, a property of scoring rules guaranteeing fast learning [Erven et al., 2012, Mehta and Williamson, 2014] in distributional setups respectively constant regret [Vovk, 1990, 2001] in learning under expert advice, can be gained via our newly established link to the set of available gambles. Cabrera Pacheco and Williamson [2023] characterized mixability in terms of sliding freely superprediction sets. In rough terms, a continuous proper scoring rule ℓ is mixable if and only if there exists α , the mixability constant, and $k \in \mathbb{R}$, the translation, such that $\text{spr}(\alpha\ell + k) \subseteq \text{spr}(\log)$. It is an open question how availability relates to the guarantee of the set containment of superprediction sets.

Some properties of distributions are elicited by different loss functions, e.g. the mean is elicited by all Bregmann-divergences [Gneiting, 2011]. For our analysis this does not make a difference, the set of available gambles is equivalent. It can be approximated by regret gambles. But, the regret gambles are not necessarily the same.

The set of available gambles for elicitable property-induced forecasting sets is approximately captured by the set of regret gambles. The analogous statement for identifiable properties and calibration gambles is true as well. Furthermore, elicitable properties are, under technical conditions, identifiable and vice-versa [Steinwart et al., 2014]. This observation suggests to compare the set of available gambles for such properties.

7 A Fundamental Duality – Calibration and Regret

Literature in statistics and machine learning has considered both calibration and regret for measuring the quality of predictions. Cases are made advocating calibration over regret [Foster and Vohra, 1998, Zhao et al., 2021, Kleinberg et al., 2023] other cases are made arguing for the advantages of regret over calibration [Schervish, 1985, Seidenfeld, 1985, Dawid, 1985]. Importantly, the close relationship between the two notions becomes apparent time and again e.g. [DeGroot and Fienberg, 1983, Dawid, 1985, Foster and Vohra, 1998]. Just recently, scholarship in machine learning regained interest in linking notions of calibration to notions of regret thereby freeing from dust fundamental relationships between the two measures of quality [Globus-Harris et al., 2023, Gopalan et al., 2023, Kleinberg et al., 2023]. Particularly, it has been shown in different ways that calibrated predictors achieve a certain low regret, respectively low-regret predictors achieve a certain low calibration score [Globus-Harris et al., 2023, Zhao et al., 2021, Kleinberg et al., 2023, Noarov et al., 2023]. We strengthen this link on a qualitative scale on a new fundamental level. We show that the gambler’s abilities to prove forecasts to be wrong is approximately equivalent when using calibration or regret gambles.

Corollary 7.1 (Duality of Calibration and Regret). *Let $\Gamma: \Delta^q \rightarrow C$ be an identifiable and elicitable property with identification function $v: \mathcal{Y} \times C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ and scoring function $\ell: \mathcal{Y} \times C \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ which has a convex superprediction set. Let $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\Gamma^{-1}(\gamma) \neq \emptyset$. It holds*

$$\mathcal{H}_{\ell_\gamma} = \mathcal{H}_{v_\gamma}.$$

Proof. The statement is a simple consequence of Theorem 6.6 together with Theorem 6.10. \square

Corollary 7.1 is another expression of a fundamental relationship between consistency criteria of probability assignments, which dates back at least to [De Finetti, 1970/2017]. By consistency criterion we explicitly mean both, internal consistency, i.e. the probability assignments on a single happening are not contradicting, and external consistency, i.e. the probability assignments match empirical observations.

7.1 Related Work: Linking Calibration and Loss

Internal consistency, better called *coherence*, was introduced by de Finetti as a fundamental minimal criterion for reasonable and rational probability assignments [De Finetti, 1970/2017]. De Finetti suggested two different definitions. One is based on calibration gambles. One is based on scoring rules. Both lead to the insight that probabilities should follow the standard rules of probability, e.g. sum to one, disjoint additivity. Thus, already de Finetti showed the equivalence of those definitions.¹⁸

External consistency, i.e. the appropriateness of predictions against the background of observed instances, led to equivalence statements between calibration scores and realized regret. Foster and Vohra [1998] showed that quadratic scoring function swap regret, i.e. the regret against experts which predict based on fixed mappings from the forecaster’s predictions, is approximately equivalent to their definition of calibration score, which involves an l_2 -aggregation over groups respectively

¹⁸Schervish et al. [2009] trace back accounts for coherence of probabilistic statements and show limits when it comes to their generalization to imprecise probabilities. This has been done for the approach via calibration gambles in the seminal works of Walley [1991] and Williams [2007]. An analogous generalized theory for losses is still under development [Konek, 2023].

gamblers. The statement is detailed in [Foster and Vohra, 1999]. Even before that, Dawid [1985, Theorem 8.1] showed that a (computably) calibrated (computable) forecast has lower proper scoring loss than any compared computable forecast for infinite time horizon.

More recently, equivalences between regret and calibration criteria of forecast regained interest. The reason for this is that multi-calibration, a generalization of calibration, was introduced as a possible candidate to guarantee fair predictions [Chouldechova, 2017, Hébert-Johnson et al., 2018]. For instance, Globus-Harris et al. [2023, Theorem 3.2] provide a characterization for multicalibration as kind of a “swap-regret”. Closely related Gopalan et al. [2023] showed the equivalence of “swap-regret” omnipredictor and multicalibrated predictor. [Kleinberg et al., 2023, Noarov et al., 2023] give results which imply low swap-regret for multicalibrated predictors. Some parts of those more recent statements have been proved in a slightly different framework already in [DeGroot and Fienberg, 1983, Theorem 4].

In Corollary 7.1, we assume that the considered property is elicitable and identifiable. If only one of both statements is true, then there exists no corresponding regret to calibration, respectively no corresponding calibration to regret. But, the fundamental result by Steinwart et al. [2014] shows a very general equivalence of elicitable and identifiable properties. In particular, the relationship between identification function and strictly consistent scoring function guarantees our Corollary 7.1 to naturally hold in many cases. The identification function, very roughly stated, is the derivative of the strictly consistent scoring function [Steinwart et al., 2014, Theorem 5]. We merely exploit this correspondence to map it to the known evaluation criteria calibration and regret. In particular, we have to credit Noarov and Roth [2023] to link identification functions to calibration.

Finally, in [Casgrain et al., 2022] the authors construct any-time valid, sequential, statistical tests for properties. Their tests are supermartingales which are based on the null hypothesis which is equivalent, modulo time dependence, to our level sets. Hence unsurprisingly, their tests can be interpreted, and the authors do so, as regret criteria. It seems that the authors were not aware of the relation between identification functions and calibration via [Noarov and Roth, 2023]. Furthermore, our Theorems 6.6 and 6.10 assure that their specified supermartingales are, neglecting some details about reweightings, indeed the best to test for the elicitable properties.¹⁹ Summarizing, identification functions and strictly consistent scoring functions are tools to guarantee the external consistency of probability assignments. They are in one-to-one correspondence to calibration and regret (Figure 2).

Our work ties several of those threads together. Corollary 7.1 shows the conceptual equivalence of regret and calibration given a correspondence for the elicited property exists. For instance, this is naturally the case for the property being the distribution itself. However, our result is qualitative, in that sense that it does not guarantee a specific calibration score to guarantee a certain regret or vice-versa. Nevertheless, our results state that for any gambler choosing among calibration gambles there is another gambler who can choose among regret gambles certifying (approximately) the same quality criterion. Unfortunately, we have no constructive method to go from stakes in calibration gambles (cf. § 6.1.1) to experts and weightings in regret gambles gambles or vice-versa. This suggests further future investigations on concrete mappings between stakes and expert and weightings. We conjecture that several of the equivalence relationships given above, e.g. [DeGroot and Fienberg, 1983, Gopalan et al., 2023, Globus-Harris et al., 2023] can be stripped of their formalization load to give a clean, parsimonious correspondence.

¹⁹The presumably fruitful discussion of the relation between growth rate optimality [Grünwald et al., 2020] and marginal availability is left to future work.

8 Recovery of Standard Evaluation Frameworks in Machine Learning

In the last sections we might have left the reader with the impression that the recovered evaluation criteria are specifically matching to notions in online learning. In particular, regret is tightly linked to online settings. However, The Game is an evaluation framework which is abstract enough to be embedded in several machine learning paradigms. More concretely, nature's nature, the type of aggregation functional and the concurrency of the protocol might be adapted to fit many learning frameworks in machine learning, among them the classical adversarial, online setting but as well the distributional, empirical offline learning.

8.1 From The Game to Online Learning

The formulation of The Game has been inspired by a strand of work in the realm of online learning e.g. [Vovk et al., 2005b, Shafer and Vovk, 2019, Zhao and Ermon, 2021]. That is why the protocol only requires little modification to resemble this paradigm. The following aspects are definitional to online learning:

- (a) Online learning usually is distribution-free. In other words, nature arbitrarily reveals hints x_t and outcomes y . There is no underlying distribution. The forecaster has to assume adversarial behavior of nature.
- (b) The Game is played in a sequential order, often with the assumption of full-information of the agents about the past.
- (c) The aggregation functional is commonly set to the sum. This allows for per round accumulation of the evaluated gambles.

The notions of calibration and regret directly fall out of our evaluation framework, see § 6.1.1 and § 6.2.1.

8.2 From The Game to Batch Learning

The assumption of an underlying distribution is characteristic of the offline learning problem. This assumption comes with several further standard choices.

- (a) We assume an underlying distribution, i.e. x_t and y_t are sampled independent and identically distributed (i.i.d.) from a distribution on $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$.
- (b) In the vanilla offline setting the rounds are played in parallel. The order within a round, however, remains. None of the involved agents has access to actions played in other rounds. Forecaster and gambler only exploit the statistical relationship between hint x and output y .
- (c) Given there exists a distribution, it is a default choice to aggregate the losses of a predictor by the expectation corresponding to the distribution. Empirically speaking, the aggregation is “take the average”.
- (d) Specific to regret, there is a standard choice of expert to which the predictions are compared. It is the Bayes' predictor, i.e. the expected output given the input, defined by the underlying distribution.

Let us consider a simple binary classification problem to exemplify the modifications to The Game.

Example 8.1. Let $\mathcal{Y} := \{0, 1\}$ denote the outcome set. The input space is defined as $\mathcal{X} := \mathbb{R}^d$ for some $d \in \mathbb{N}$. We assume that $(x_t, y_t) \sim \mathcal{D}$ are sampled i.i.d. from a distribution \mathcal{D} on $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ for every $t \in T := \{1, \dots, n\}$. The Bayes' optimal predictor is defined as $\eta(x) := \mathbb{E}_{\mathcal{D}}[y_t | x_t = x]$. The forecaster is a class probability estimator for the class 1 given $x_t \in X$ which is independent of the played round, i.e. $P: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [0, 1]$. Gambler only considers the available gambles $g_t(y) := \ell(y, P(x(t))) - \ell(y, \eta(x(t)))$ for ℓ being a proper scoring rule. The game is run for every instance $t \in T$. The average aggregation is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A}[\{g_t(y)\}_{t \in T}] &:= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t \in T} \ell(y_t, P(x(t))) - \ell(y_t, \eta(x(t))) \\ &:= \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\mathcal{D}}}[\ell(y_t, P(x(t)))] - \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\mathcal{D}}}[\ell(y, \eta(x(t)))], \end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{\mathcal{D}}$ is the empirical distribution according to the samples drawn from \mathcal{D} .

This short example directly shows that regret gambles lead to the standard empirical risk minimization framework. Extensions for this setup exists in various ways. For instance, in robust machine learning the aggregation operation of offline learning is generalized to non-linear generalized averages (cf. [Fröhlich and Williamson, 2022]). In agnostic learning the comparison expert is not the Bayes' predictor, but the best predictor in a hypothesis class [Kearns et al., 1992]. In multi-distribution learning points are drawn from several distributions, e.g. [Haghtalab et al., 2022, 2023]. The Game encompass all those setups.

Obviously, we can as well recover empirical batch calibration [Hébert-Johnson et al., 2018], the other side of the coin.

Example 8.2. Nature and forecaster are as defined above. Gambler now considers the available gambles $g_t(y) := \mathbb{I}[P(x_t) = p](y - p)$ for ℓ being a proper scoring rule and a fixed $p \in [0, 1]$. The game is run for every instance $t \in T$. The average aggregation is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A}[\{g_t(y)\}_{t \in T}] &:= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{t \in T} \mathbb{I}[P(x_t) = p](y_t - p) \\ &= \mathbb{E}_{\hat{\mathcal{D}}|P(x_t)=p}[y_t - p], \end{aligned}$$

where $\hat{\mathcal{D}}|P(x_t) = p$ is the empirical distribution according to the samples drawn from \mathcal{D} conditional that the forecaster forecasts p .

Corollary 7.1 shows that batch calibration and empirical risk minimization (with squared loss) are testing for the same property. This, however, does not imply that the corresponding group $\mathbb{I}[P(x_t) = p]$ is in one-to-one relationship with the Bayes' optimal predictor η from above.

In the next section, we complete the picture on felicity conditions of forecasts by further facets somewhat orthogonal to the two we have been focussing so far.

9 Randomness and Predictiveness – Two Sides of the Same Coin

Hitherto, gambler's job was to cast doubt on the predictions of the forecaster. Gambler *tested* the predictions and was successful, i.e. increased its capital, in the cases where the forecasts were badly adapted to the actual outcomes. Gambler guaranteed that the predictions resemble the outcomes (cf. [Dwork et al., 2021]).

Now, we turn this perspective upside down. Instead of asking whether the predictions match the outcomes, we ask whether the outcomes match the predictions. At first sight this perspective seems odd, but in fact it is intrinsic to an entire field of research: algorithmic randomness. Outcomes which match the predictions are random with respect to the predictions. We do not claim this observation to be new (cf. [Vovk and Shen, 2010, Vovk, 2020, Dwork et al., 2023]). However, we have not seen our argument detailed explicitly in literature.

But let's start from the beginning. Mathematical literature on randomness, algorithmic randomness, started with the groundbreaking, frequentist axiomatization of probability by von Mises [von Mises, 1919]. Instead of using randomness as an ascription to a source of outcomes, algorithmic randomness tries to capture whether a realized sequence of outcomes is random or not. This distinction is sometimes called “process” versus “product” randomness [Eagle, 2021].

In a nutshell, von Mises' random sequences (called “collective” by von Mises [1919]) are defined as sequences for which there is no gambling strategy to gain an advantage. Historically, that has been called the “law of the excluded gambling strategy” [von Mises, 1919]. In the universality, i.e. *all* gambling strategies, no sequence would be random, thus the abilities of gambler have to be restricted.

The arguably standard approach faces this definitional question via tools of computation. For instance, gambler has access to all “computable” gambling strategies, opposing randomness and computability, i.e. a random sequence is a sequence revealed by nature which cannot be gamed by any computable gambling strategy. This idea culminated in the theory of algorithmic randomness, e.g. [Martin-Löf, 1966, Uspenskii et al., 1990, Bienvenu et al., 2009, Eagle, 2021].

For the sake of simplicity, scholars analyze the randomness of infinite sequences of 0's and 1's. Essential to the problem statement is a probability model with respect to which such a sequence is called random or not. The probability model is concerned with the probabilities of observing one specific $\{0, 1\}$ -sequence, i.e. the probability model is a distribution on $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$. A simple and often used model is the i.i.d. 1/2-Bernoulli trial model, i.e. every element in an infinite $\{0, 1\}$ -sequence is drawn independently and identically from a 1/2-Bernoulli distribution.

Now, definitions of algorithmic randomness try to define which sequences drawn from this distribution are considered random and which not. Roughly stated, algorithmic randomness sorts out specific “computably structured” sequences such as e.g. 0101010101.... The arguably standard notion of randomness in this literature is the so-called Martin-Löf randomness [Uspenskii et al., 1990]. This notion, introduced by Per Martin-Löf, defines a sequence to be random if it passes all computable, statistical tests with respect to a distribution [Martin-Löf, 1966].

Martin-Löf randomness is motivated by typicality, i.e. a random sequence is a sequence which is typical. Interestingly, Martin-Löf randomness has been shown to be equivalent to definitions of randomness motivated by the algorithmic complexity of sequences, i.e. a random sequence is not compressible [Kolmogorov, 1965, Chaitin, 1966, Levin, 1973, Schnorr, 1972], independence, i.e. a random sequence is independent to other sequences [Bienvenu et al., 2009, p. 9], and unpredictability, i.e. a random sequence is unpredictable [Muchnik et al., 1998, Vovk and Shen, 2010, De Cooman and De Bock, 2021]. This last approach can be made rigorous within our introduced game.

We sketch the argument provided by Vovk and Shen [2010], who give a definition of randomness via The Game and show that the obtained notion is, under some conditions, equivalent to Martin-Löf randomness. First, this justifies our earlier statement: it is mathematically equivalent to state that predictions fit outcomes or outcomes fit predictions, but the semantic changes. Predictions which match outcomes are “good”. Outcomes which match predictions are “random” with respect to those predictions. Second, this lets us question the two pillars of algorithmic randomness: computability and countably infinite sequences, elaborated in Appendix 15.

Situation set	$(\{0, 1\}, [0, 1])^* := \bigcup_{t \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 0}} (\{0, 1\}, [0, 1])^t$, Definition 9.2
Situation	$s \in (\{0, 1\}, [0, 1])^*$, $s = (y_t, P_t)_{t \in \{1, \dots, \tau\}}$ for $\tau \in \mathbb{N}$, Definition 9.2
Outcome situation set	$\{0, 1\}^* := \bigcup_{t \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 0}} \{0, 1\}^t$, Definition 9.2
Outcome situation	$o \in \{0, 1\}^*$, $o = (y_t)_{t \in \{1, \dots, \tau\}}$ for some $\tau \in \mathbb{N}$, Definition 9.2
Set of infinite outcome situations with common prefix o	$\Omega_o \subseteq (\{0, 1\})^{\mathbb{N}}$, Definition 9.2
n -th prefix of situation s	$s^{\leq n} \in (\{0, 1\}, [0, 1])^*$, Definition 9.2
Superfarthingale	$T: (\{0, 1\}, [0, 1])^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ s.t. $\mathbb{E}_P[T(s \smallfrown (P, y))] \leq T(s)$ for all $P \in [0, 1]$ and $s \in (\{0, 1\}, [0, 1])^*$, Definition 9.3
Strategy	$S: (\{0, 1\}, [0, 1])^* \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\{0, 1\}}$ such that $S(s, P)$ is available under $P \in [0, 1]$, Definition 4.4
Universal superfarthingale	T_U , Proposition 9.5
Loss process	$\text{Loss}(s) := \sum_{t=1}^{\tau} \ell(s_t)$
Superloss process	$L: \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ s.t. $\forall o \in \{0, 1\}^*, \exists P \in [0, 1], \forall y \in \{0, 1\}, L(o \smallfrown (y)) \geq L(o) + \ell(y, P)$, Definition 9.8
Predictive complexity	L_U , Proposition 9.9
Randomness deficiency	$D: (\{0, 1\}, [0, 1])^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $D(s) := \text{Loss}(s) - L_U(o)$, Definition 9.10

Table 2: Summary of important, used definitions. Part II.

9.1 A Calibration-Definition of Randomness – Game-Randomness

For the sake of simplicity, we focus on the binary online prediction protocol (cf. Definition 3.1).

Example 9.1 (The Binary Online Prediction Protocol). *We play the protocol for every time step $t \in T := \mathbb{N}$ in the standard order. First, forecaster defines a precise probability distribution on $\{0, 1\}$ via $P_t \in [0, 1]$ at every time step, based on the history of nature and its predictions. We write $\mathbb{E}_{P_t}[g] := (1 - P_t)g(0) + P_tg(1)$ for the expectation of an arbitrary gamble $g: \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Gambler chooses an available gamble $g_t: \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $\mathbb{E}_{P_t}[g_t] \leq 0$. Then, nature reveals an outcome from the binary set $y_t \in \{0, 1\}$. The capital of gambler is updated according to $K_t := K_{t-1} + g_t(y_t)$, where $K_0 = C \geq 0$.*

Clearly, this binary prediction protocol is a special case of the more general game defined in Definition 4.5. Additional to the protocol of the game, we need some further definitions. We provide a list of notations, which we encounter in this section, in Table 2.

Definition 9.2 (Situation). *We define the situation set $(\{0, 1\}, [0, 1])^* := \bigcup_{t \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 0}} (\{0, 1\}, [0, 1])^t$ ²⁰. An element $s \in (\{0, 1\}, [0, 1])^*$ with $s = (y_t, P_t)_{t \in \{1, \dots, \tau\}}$ for some $\tau \in \mathbb{N}$ is a situation. Analogous to the situation set we define the set of realized outcomes as $\{0, 1\}^* := \bigcup_{t \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 0}} \{0, 1\}^t$. An element $o \in \{0, 1\}^*$ with $o = (y_t)_{t \in \{1, \dots, \tau\}}$ for some $\tau \in \mathbb{N}$ is an outcome situation. For a situation $s \in (\{0, 1\}, [0, 1])^*$ the situation of the first n symbols is denoted $s^{\leq n}$. The n -th tuple in a situation is denoted s_n . For concatenation of situations we use \smallfrown . (Analogously for outcome situations.) We use $\Omega_o \subseteq (\{0, 1\})^{\mathbb{N}}$ to denote the subset of infinite outcome situations with prefix o .*

Situations are transcripts of the history of predictions and outcomes. Randomness is a property of such a transcript, in fact an infinite situation. Central to the definition of randomness in the binary online prediction protocol is the capital of gambler. To describe the capital over time in Example 9.1, we introduce superfarthingales.

²⁰We set $(\{0, 1\}, [0, 1])^0 = \{\square\}$, where \square denotes the empty sequence.

Definition 9.3 (Superfarthingale). [Vovk and Shen, 2010, Equation (1)] Let $T: (\{0, 1\}, [0, 1])^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. We call T a superfarthingale if

$$\mathbb{E}_P[T(s \frown (P, y))] \leq T(s),$$

for all $P \in [0, 1]$ and $s \in (\{0, 1\}, [0, 1])^*$. A superfarthingale which is non-negative and has initial value $T(\square) = 1$ is called a test-superfarthingale.

Already Ville [1939] observed that the strategy of a sequential gambler can be identified by the capital over time of gambler, i.e. the superfarthingale. For recapitulation, a strategy is a sequence of available gambles (cf. Definition 4.4). The attentive reader might have spotted the similarity of the definition of superfarthingales with the definition of availability.

We exploit this in our reformulation of Ville's idea. We note that a strategy might depend on the outcomes of other played rounds. In the case here, because of the sequentiality, we assume that the strategy maps from all transcripts and the given forecast to the next available gamble, i.e. $S: (\{0, 1\}, [0, 1])^* \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\{0,1\}}$.

Proposition 9.4 (Strategy and Superfarthingales). A strategy defines a superfarthingale. A superfarthingale defines a strategy. Apart from the starting capital of the superfarthingale $T(\square)$ this is a one-to-one correspondence.

Proof. Let $S: (\{0, 1\}, [0, 1])^* \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\{0,1\}}$ be a strategy. Then, $T_S(\square) \in \mathbb{R}$ and $T_S(s \frown (P, y)) := T_S(s) + S(s, P)(y)$, for $s \in (\{0, 1\}, [0, 1])^*$ is a superfarthingale

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_P[T_S(s \frown (P, y))] &= \mathbb{E}_P[T_S(s) + S(s, P)(y)] \\ &= T_S(s) + \mathbb{E}_P[S(s, P)(y)] \\ &\leq T_S(s), \end{aligned}$$

by availability of the gamble $S(s, P)$.

Let $T: (\{0, 1\}, [0, 1])^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a superfarthingale. Then $S_T(s, P)(y) := T(s \frown (P, y)) - T(s)$, for $s \in (\{0, 1\}, [0, 1])^*$ is a strategy

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_P[S_T(s, P)(y)] &= \mathbb{E}_P[T(s \frown (P, y)) - T(s)] \\ &= \mathbb{E}_P[T(s \frown (P, y))] - T(s) \\ &\leq 0, \end{aligned}$$

by definition of superfarthingales. The one-to-one correspondence follows from the construction of the superfarthingale respectively the strategy. \square

To be precise, in the following we concentrate on test-superfarthingales. Test-superfarthingales are “normalized”. They start with the same initial capital one. In addition, their non-negativity guarantees that the corresponding strategy is not borrowing at any time.

Let us finally introduce some notions of computability. Computability is central to algorithmic randomness. A function $f: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ is called *lower semicomputable*, if there exists an algorithm which decides whether $f(x) > r$ is true, for all $x \in X$ and $r \in \mathbb{R}$. A function $f: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ is *upper semicomputable* if $-f$ is lower semicomputable. A computable function $f: X \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \cup \{\infty\}$ is both lower and upper semicomputable. For a comprehensible and more detailed introduction we refer to the Appendix “Effective Topology” in [Vovk and Shen, 2010].

With those tools at hand, we can introduce universal superfarthingales. Universal superfarthingales are the largest lower semicomputable test-superfarthingales.

Proposition 9.5 (Universal Superfarthingale). [*Vovk and Shen, 2010, Lemma 1*] Let \mathcal{S} denote the set of all lower semicomputable test-superfarthingales. There exists a test-superfarthingale $T_U \in \mathcal{S}$ such that, for every test-superfarthingale $T' \in \mathcal{S}$, there exists $C > 0$ such that, for any $s \in (\{0, 1\}, [0, 1])^*$ $CT_U(s) > T'(s)$. We call any such T_U universal superfarthingale.

With the proof that universal superfarthingales exist, it is easy to define randomness.

Definition 9.6 (Game-Randomness). [*Vovk and Shen, 2010, Definition 1*] We pick any universal superfarthingale T_U . An infinite situation $s \in (\{0, 1\}, [0, 1])^{\mathbb{N}}$ is game-random if and only if there exists $C \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} T_U(s^{\leq n}) < C$.

Note that this definition states whether a pair of forecast-sequence and outcome-sequence is called random. This statement, however, can well be interpreted as the outcome-sequence being random with respect to the forecast-sequence. An outcome sequence, relative to the forecasts, is game-random if every lower semicomputable test-superfarthingale is bounded. Or, informally, every capital process of a computable gambler is bounded (cf. Proposition 9.4).

This definition, yet only framed in the sequential game setting, is equivalent to the arguably standard of mathematical randomness: Martin-Löf randomness. Martin-Löf randomness, however, requires a specifically defined forecaster. For this reason we defer this detour to Appendix 13.

9.2 Another Duality – Randomness and Predictiveness

Proposition 9.4 allows us to understand superfarthingales, i.e. capital processes, and strategies, as equivalent concepts. So in particular, there exists a strategy corresponding to the universal superfarthingales T_U picked in Definition 9.6. This strategy consists of available gambles, but not necessarily marginally available gambles.

But, we can leverage the characterization result of available gambles for forecasts induced by identifiable properties, Corollary 6.8. Since we are in a binary outcome setup the mean identifies the Bernoulli distribution. Hence, the forecaster in Example 9.1 outputs a mean. In addition, the mean's identification function $(y - P)$ corresponds to standard calibration (§ 6.1.1). Concluding, we can relate superfarthingales in the binary online prediction game to standard calibration.

Proposition 9.7 (Super-Calibration Strategy). Let $T: (\{0, 1\}, [0, 1])^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a superfarthingale. There exists a strategy $S: (\{0, 1\}, [0, 1])^* \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{\{0,1\}}$ with $S(s, P): y \mapsto \alpha_s(y - P)$ with $\alpha_s \in \mathbb{R}$ such that for every $s \in (\{0, 1\}, [0, 1])^*$,

$$T(s) - T(\square) \leq \sum_{t=1}^{\tau} \alpha_s(y_t - P_t).$$

We call S the super-calibration strategy corresponding to superfarthingale T .

Proof. Follows directly from an application of Proposition 9.4 and Corollary 6.8. □

Superfarthingales are bounded above by the capital process of a calibration gambler, the super-calibration strategy. Note, a super-calibration strategy is in fact a mapping from situations to stakes $\alpha_s \in \mathbb{R}$. The result particularly holds for universal superfarthingales. Let us call the super-calibration strategy corresponding to the universal superfarthingale picked in Definition 9.6 *universal super-calibration strategy*. Note, the existence of the super-calibration strategy is non-constructive.

The definition of game-randomness and Proposition 9.7 now yield the following insight: if forecasts are approximately calibrated on an infinite sequence with respect to a universal super-calibration strategy, then the outcome sequence to which the forecasts are calibrated is game-random. By “approximately calibrated on an infinite sequence” we mean $\sum_{t=1}^{\tau} \alpha_s (y_t - P_t) < C$ for some $C \in \mathbb{R}$. In words, the calibration score is finite on an infinite sequence. Concluding, a forecaster who is “well adapted” to the outcomes makes the outcome “random” with respect to the forecaster.

Conversely, is a random nature one for which forecaster and nature are well adapted? So far, this statement should be taken cum grano salis. Universal superfarthingales are not necessarily series of calibration gambles.²¹ But, universal superfarthingales are the *largest* lower semicomputable test-superfarthingale, i.e. the universal superfarthingale gambler dominates all other “computable” gamblers in terms of achieved capital. Hence, forecaster *is* well adapted to nature against the gambler playing “the largest computable available gambles”, which might be well interpreted as a series of only slightly slackened calibration gambles. Hence, a random nature is one for which forecaster and nature are well adapted.

For an older definition of randomness the correspondence is perfect. Von Mises’ , roughly, defines a sequence of outcomes to be random if, for a set of pre-defined gamblers, the average capital of those gamblers, which only play calibration gambles, converges to zero [von Mises, 1919]. In this definition outcomes being random with respect to predictions is equivalent to predictions being on average calibrated with respect to the outcomes (Appendix 14).

Concluding, predictiveness via calibration and randomness are two sides of the same coin. Is there an analogous statement for regret?

9.3 A Regret-Definition of Randomness – Predictive Complexity

In a series of work starting with [Vovk and Watkins, 1998], Vladimir Vovk and collaborators elaborated a definition of predictive complexity which captures the unpredictability of a sequence.²² Predictive complexity is roughly the accumulated loss the best computable expert would incur on a sequence. Interestingly, randomness can be defined in terms of a bounded regret against predictive complexity, what we call *predictive-complexity-randomness*.

We provide the definitions in the following and emphasize analogies to the previous discussion. Our definitions neglect the “signal space”, comparable to our hint $x \in \mathcal{X}$, which was part of the original formulation [Vovk and Watkins, 1998]. However, the authors already remark in their work that the signal is often of minor importance.

For the sake of simplicity, we adopt the binary online prediction protocol as in the previous section (Example 9.1). Furthermore, we make use of a fixed loss function $\ell: \{0, 1\} \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. The performance of realized forecasts on a realized sequence is summarized by the accumulated loss,

$$\text{Loss}(s) := \sum_{t=1}^{\tau} \ell(s_t) = \sum_{t=1}^{\tau} \ell(y_t, P_t),$$

for $s \in (\{0, 1\}, [0, 1])^*$.

The accumulated loss here is analogous to the capital of gambler before. So unsurprisingly, since the capital process, i.e. superfarthingale, was so central to the previous discussion, a generalization of accumulated loss, the superloss process, is central to this regret-type definition of randomness.

²¹General superfarthingales, live in a convex realm, i.e. convex combinations of superfarthingales are superfarthingales. In contrast, convex combinations of superfarthingales corresponding to calibration-gamble strategies are not necessarily superfarthingales of calibration-gamble strategies. The convexity, however, is crucial to prove the existence of universal superfarthingales.

²²For a nice summary see the PhD-thesis by Yuri Kalnishkan [Kalnishkan, 2002].

Definition 9.8 (Superloss Process). [Kalnishkan, 2002, Equation 5.1] Let $o \in \{0, 1\}^*$. A function $L: \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, such that for all outcomes situations $o \frown (y)$ there exists $P \in [0, 1]$ for which for all $y \in \{0, 1\}$,

$$L(o \frown (y)) \geq L(o) + \ell(y, P),$$

is called a superloss process. A superloss process which is non-negative and has initial value $L(\square) = 0$ is called a test-superloss process.

Note, every sequentially accumulated loss is a superloss process. This definition is the analogue to Definition 9.3. The analogy might seem surprising, since there are no expectation operators involved. But, we will see that superloss process take on the role of superfarthingales.

Analogous to universal superfarthingales, i.e. largest lower semicomputable test-superfarthingales, there exist “universal superloss processes” which we call *predictive complexity* (Proposition 9.5). Predictive complexity is defined as smallest upper semicomputable superloss process. In informal terms, predictive complexity is the smallest loss any computable predictor can achieve on a sequence. It turns out that the loss function has to fulfill several properties, above all *mixability*, to guarantee the existence of predictive complexity. Any further discussion of those properties are beyond the scope of this work. For a more detailed introduction see Kalnishkan [2002].

Proposition 9.9 (Predictive Complexity). [Kalnishkan, 2002, Proposition 10][Vovk and Watkins, 1998, Lemma 6] Let $\ell: \{0, 1\} \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a mixable²³ loss function such that $\text{spr}(\ell)$ is regular²⁴. Let \mathcal{L} denote the set of all upper semicomputable test-superloss processes with respect to ℓ . There exists a test-superloss process $L_U \in \mathcal{L}$ such that, for every test-superloss $L' \in \mathcal{L}$, there exists $C > 0$ such that for any $o \in \{0, 1\}^*$, $L_U \leq L' + C$. We call L_U predictive complexity.

What universal superfarthingales are to the definition of game-randomness, predictive complexities are to the definition of predictive-complexity-randomness (cf. Definition 9.6).

Definition 9.10 (Predictive-Complexity-Randomness). [Vovk, 2015] Let ℓ be a mixable loss such that $\text{spr}(\ell)$ is regular. Pick any predictive complexity L_U . An infinite situation $s \in (\{0, 1\}, [0, 1])^{\mathbb{N}}$ with the corresponding infinite outcome situation $o \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ is predictive-complexity-random if and only if there exists $C \in \mathbb{R}$ such that $\sup_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \text{Loss}(s^{\leq n}) - L_U(o^n) < C$.

Following [Vovk, 2015] we call $D(s^{\leq n}) := \text{Loss}(s^{\leq n}) - L_U(o^n)$ randomness deficiency. Very roughly, a predictive-complexity-random situation a sequence of outcomes on which a sequence of predictions performed at least as good as the best computable expert. In particular, the randomness deficiency resembles a regret term in which the accumulated loss of the forecasts is compared to the smallest upper semicomputable superloss process.

Predictive-complexity-randomness not only completes the picture in terms of giving a regret-type definition of randomness, as we detail in short. Vovk and Watkins [1998] argue that predictive complexity with respect to the logarithmic-loss, sometimes called cross-entropy-loss, is equivalent to Levin’s semimeasures [Zvonkin and Levin, 1970] and hence its predictive-complexity-randomness is equivalent to Martin-Löf-randomness. We already encountered Martin-Löf-randomness, a standard of algorithmic randomness, since game-randomness is equivalent to it, too (Theorem 13.3).

²³A loss function is mixable if the exponential projection $E_\eta: \mathbb{R}^2 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^2, (x, y) \mapsto (e^{-\eta x}, e^{-\eta y})$ of the superprediction set, i.e. $E_\eta(\text{spr}(\ell))$ is convex for some $\eta \in (0, \infty)$ [Vovk, 2015].

²⁴The superprediction set is regular if all the following conditions are fulfilled (a) $\text{spr}(\ell) \subseteq [0, \infty]^2$, (b) $(0, 0) \notin \text{spr}(\ell)$, (c) $\text{spr}(\ell)$ is closed and (d) $\text{spr}(\ell) \neq \emptyset$ [Kalnishkan, 2002, p. 41]

Concluding, predictive-complexity-randomness is at least as useful and powerful as game-randomness (cf. Lemma 1 in [Vovk, 2015]), but it carries a flavor of regret, in contrast to game-randomness' taste of calibration.

9.4 Randomness Through the Lens of Regret

Randomness deficiency is the difference of the accumulated losses of a forecaster and a superloss process, i.e. a process which grows at least as fast as an accumulation of losses of a forecaster. Every such randomness deficiency, even neglecting the computability of the superloss process, is upper bounded by the capital of a gambler playing regret gambles (cf. Proposition 9.7).

Proposition 9.11 (Super-Regret Strategy). *Fix a loss function $\ell: \{0, 1\} \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Let $s \in (\{0, 1\}, [0, 1])^*$ be a situation with outcome situation $o \in \{0, 1\}^*$. Let L be a superloss process and $D: (\{0, 1\}, [0, 1])^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $D(s) := \text{Loss}(s) - L(o)$ the corresponding randomness deficiency. There exists a strategy $S: (\{0, 1\}, [0, 1])^* \times [0, 1] \rightarrow \{g: \{0, 1\} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}\}$ with $S(s, P) : y \mapsto \ell(y, P) - \ell(y, E_s)$ with $E_s \in [0, 1]$ such that for every $s \in (\{0, 1\}, [0, 1])^*$,*

$$D(s) - L(\square) \leq \sum_{t=1}^{\tau} \ell(s_t) - \ell(y_t, E_{s^{\leq t}}).$$

We call S the super-regret strategy corresponding to randomness deficiency D .

Proof. We can easily rewrite,

$$\begin{aligned} D(s) - L(\square) &= \sum_{t=1}^{\tau} \ell(s_t) - L(s) - L(\square) \\ &\leq \sum_{t=1}^{\tau} \ell(s_t) - \sum_{t=1}^{\tau} \ell(y_t, E_{s^{\leq t}}), \end{aligned}$$

where the last inequality holds by Definition 9.8. This definition as well guarantees the existence of such $E_{s^{\leq t}}$. \square

From Proposition 9.11 follows that, analogous to the universal superfarthingales and their corresponding super-calibration strategy, there exists a super-regret strategy to every randomness deficiency. The super-regret strategy essentially only defines the expert's forecast E_{s^t} in every situation.

If the superloss process is a predictive complexity, we can interpret the corresponding expert in the super-regret strategy to be “the best, computable” expert. Thus, the predictions on an outcome sequence are not predictive-complexity-random if the predictions perform poorly, in terms of accumulated loss, compared to “the best, computable” expert. We claimed the analogous statement to hold for calibration through Proposition 9.7.

Most importantly, we can repeat the same argumentation about the link between regret and randomness, which we have spelled out for calibration and randomness already. A non-random, in terms of predictive complexity, situation is one on which the forecaster's regret against “the best, computable” expert is infinitely large. On the other hand, a random situation is one on which the forecaster's regret against the *smallest* upper semicomputable superloss process is bounded. This we interpret as the forecaster performs almost as good, or even better, than “the best, computable” expert. Again, predictiveness and randomness are two different semantics for the same condition.

Regret-type definitions of randomness are still a largely unexploited field. To the best of our knowledge, only the insightful work by [Frongillo and Nobel \[2017, 2020\]](#) complements the literature on predictive complexity.

In short, the calibration and the regret perspective offer two, under certain circumstances equivalent, approaches to define randomness of an outcome sequence. Our general duality result (Corollary 7.1) suggests that even if we let slip the computability aspect of randomness such correspondences persist. Their exact (quantified) relationship is then part of further research.

The felicity conditions of forecasts we consider in this work always embrace some comparison between nature and forecaster. Hence, these felicity conditions are felicity conditions of outcomes, too. Syntactically, there is no difference, semantically there is.

10 Conclusion

Felicity conditions, e.g. calibration or regret, make predictions useful. In this work, we concentrated on felicity conditions which ensure the consistency of forecasts and outcomes. To this end, we introduced a game-theoretic framework in which, shortly summarized, a gambler gambled against a forecaster in order to disprove the adequacy of the forecasts. Crucially, the aggregated realized values of the gambles, determined by the outcomes of a third player, nature, described the “amount of consistency” between forecaster’s forecasts and nature’s outcomes. First, we noted that, under restrictions on the type of forecasts, calibration and regret are two special cases for the most stringent gambling tests available to gambler. It turns out that calibration and regret are even approximately equivalent in their ability to test forecasts. Second, we demonstrated that the “amount of consistency” between forecasts and outcomes does not only allow for the interpretation as “predictiveness of forecasts with respect to the outcomes” but as well as “randomness of outcomes with respect to the forecasts”. Hence, we cut four facets of the "Forecast Felicity"-gemstone. The relation between calibration and regret, randomness and predictiveness now shine in a new light.

10.1 Future Work

Nevertheless, a large set of open questions remains to be answered in future work.

Characterization of the Set of Available Gamble Can we characterize the set of available gambles for a forecasting set induced by an identifiable and elicitable property by a criterion beyond calibration or regret? Or, is there a way to characterize the set of available gambles for other forecasting sets than the ones induced by identifiable respectively elicitable properties? For instance, let the forecasting set be induced by several elicitable (or even conditionally elicitable [[Emmer et al., 2015](#)]) properties, e.g. $P \subseteq \Delta^q$ is the set of distributions for which the mean is equal to μ and the variance equal to σ . Can we still characterize the set of available gambles?

Evaluation Criteria for Imprecise Forecasts The characterization question is tightly linked to the problem of evaluating imprecise forecasts. How can it be guaranteed that a forecasting set, which we only demand to be credal, adequately describes nature’s outcome? In Section 5 we already alluded to first steps on this journey. We believe that the availability criterion is a necessary, but not sufficient, meta-criterion to this end. In other words, a gambler playing arbitrary gambles cannot prove anything about forecaster. A gambler playing available gambles can prove the forecasts to be wrong, but not to be right. This remaining bit hopefully finds an answer in future work.

Making Predictions From a practitioner’s point of view the most urgent question might be: How can a forecaster make “good” predictions against a gambler?

For forecasting sets induced by identifiable or elicitable properties this question has been answered by calibrated predictors and no-regret algorithms [Cesa-Bianchi and Lugosi, 2006]. Essentially, large parts of the current project of machine learning pursue this goal of “good” predictions. Surprisingly, however, gambler is usually equipped with the same standard abilities such as playing calibration or regret gambles. Research for predicting more general forecasting sets is still in its infancy. [Zhao and Ermon, 2021] and [Gupta and Ramdas, 2022] being unusual exceptions for binary classification.²⁵ Note, as well the work on defensive forecasting which takes the question literally: for an a priori parametrized gambler, what are the best forecasts to prevent the gambler from getting rich [Vovk et al., 2005b, Vovk, 2005]. This approach might be extended to more arbitrary forecasting sets.

Evaluating Forecasts and Actions Forecasters usually don’t forecast for the forecasting’s sake. Forecasts inform. Forecasts inform actions. Often the felicity of forecasts is tightly linked to the satisfaction of agents using the forecasts to inform their actions. Just recently, this link between qualitative forecasts and their corresponding informed “good” actions regained (cf. [Foster and Vohra, 1999]) interest in the creation and evaluation of forecasts, e.g. [Zhao et al., 2021, Noarov et al., 2023] and under the title “loss function design”. These works usually concentrate on precise forecasts. Imprecise, forecasted credal sets potentially carry even more information. Furthermore, there exists a large variety of decision mechanisms which action to take under the given credal sets [Troffaes, 2007]. First, it would generally be interesting to see how availability relates to those decision principles. Second, can we construct reasonable evaluation criteria by considering the final utility of the actions taken based on the decision principles?

Relative Randomness - Adaptive Data Models A major shortcoming of algorithmic randomness is its strong focus on computability and infinite sequences. This might be one reason why its impact on statistics is small. Our dualistic perspective on predictiveness and randomness opens the door to more flexible definitions of randomness (cf. Appendix 15). We conjecture that an entire landscape of adaptive randomness models is still waiting to be discovered.

11 Acknowledgements

The authors are very grateful to Christian Fröhlich, Benedikt Höltgen and Aaron Roth for insightful discussions. Thanks as well for the feedback of the audience attending the talk “Four Facets of Evaluating Predictions” at Harvard University, USA, November 2023.

The authors appreciate and thank the International Max Planck Research School for Intelligent System (IMPRS-IS) for supporting Rabanus Derr.

This work was funded in part by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) under Germany’s Excellence Strategy — EXC number 2064/1 — Project number 390727645; it was also supported by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF): Tübingen AI Center.

²⁵Zhao and Ermon [2021], to the end of producing “good” forecasts, even characterize the set of available gambles for arbitrary credal sets in the binary outcome setting.

12 Appendix – Additional Results on Forecasting Sets and Available Gambles

Lemma 12.1 (Convex Cone). *If $A \subseteq L^P$ or $A \subseteq L^Q$ is convex, then $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}A$ is a convex cone,*

Proof. Obviously, $\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}A$ is closed under positive scalar multiplication. It remains to show that for $r_1 a_1, r_2 a_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}A$ the sum $r_1 a_1 + r_2 a_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}A$. To this end, we choose $r' := r_1 + r_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}$ and $a' := \frac{r_1}{r_1+r_2} a_1 + \frac{r_2}{r_1+r_2} a_2 \in A$ by convexity. We observe $r' a' \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}A$ and $r' a' = r_1 a_1 + r_2 a_2$. \square

Lemma 12.2 (Vacuous Forecasts Only Make Non-Positive Gambles Available). *Let $P = \Delta^Q$. Then,*

$$\{g \in L^P, \sup_{\phi \in P} \mathbb{E}_{\phi}[g] \leq 0\} = L_{\leq 0}^P.$$

Proof. Note that P is credal, i.e. $\sigma(L^Q, L^P)$ -closed and convex. Theorem 5.8 and Proposition P5 give

$$\begin{aligned} \{g \in L^P, \sup_{\phi \in P} \mathbb{E}_{\phi}[g] \leq 0\} &= \mathcal{G}_P \\ &= (\mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}P)^{\circ} \\ &= (L_{\geq 0}^Q)^{\circ} \\ &= L_{\leq 0}^P. \end{aligned}$$

\square

13 Appendix – Game-Randomness and Martin-Löf-Randomness

The definition of game-randomness is equivalent to the arguable standard of mathematical randomness: Martin-Löf randomness. Martin-Löf randomness, however, requires a specifically defined forecaster. For this reason, we shortly detour to the nature of forecaster.

13.1 A Note on Prequential Probabilities

Forecaster’s forecast in the binary online prediction protocol (cf. Example 9.1) are given based on the observed instances and previous predictions. The forecasts of forecaster can be interpreted as a sequential conditional probabilities. Conditioned on the observed instances the forecaster makes a new prediction. This situation is comparable to a weather forecaster that produces weather forecasts based on the observed instance. But, forecaster does not include theoretical forecasts in counterfactual worlds which we could have observed.

This kind of probabilistic model constructed by forecaster is called prequential. The term “prequential” fuses PProbability and sSEQUENTIAL. It originates from the idea of probability in sequential forecasting [Dawid, 1984]. Central to this approach to probability theory and statistics are the prequential principles. The prequential principles [Dawid, 1984, Dawid and Vovk, 1999, Vovk and Shen, 2010] demand that forecasts and outcome are the only entities to conclude about the quality of the probabilistic model, “without any attention to other aspects of any purported comprehensive probability distribution.” [Shafer, 2021].

Prequential forecasts are opposed to *global probability models*. Global probability models are probability distributions on the set of all possible outcome sequences $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$. A global probability model uniquely specifies the prequential forecast in a given situation. A sequence of prequential forecasts, however, does not specify a global probability model.

To bridge this gap we introduce forecasting systems.

Definition 13.1 (Forecasting System). *A function $\phi: \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is called a forecasting system.*

Forecasting systems, different than an arbitrary forecaster, fully define all conditional probability distributions, no matter whether a sequence has been observed or not. Clearly, forecasting systems can define prequential forecasters. More importantly however, forecasting systems uniquely define a global probability model. In order to give the next proposition, we require the shorthand $\Omega_o \subseteq \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ to denote the set of all sequences with prefix $o \in \{0, 1\}^*$.

Proposition 13.2 (Forecasting Systems and Global Probability Model). *[[Vovk and Shen, 2010, p. 2634]] Let P_ϕ be the distribution which is defined as $P_\phi(\Omega_{o-1}) = \phi(x)P(\Omega_o)$ for all $o \in \{0, 1\}^*$. The global probability model P_ϕ and the forecasting system ϕ are in one-to-one correspondence if $\phi: \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow (0, 1)$.*

A simple, yet illustrative, example of a forecasting system and its corresponding global probability is the forecaster, who in every outcome situation forecasts 0.5. This forecaster amounts to the global probability model of infinitely many i.i.d. 1/2-Bernoulli trials. Furthermore, it provides a helpful distribution on the set of all possible sequences of nature $\{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$. This set can be bijectively mapped to the $[0, 1]$ -interval. The i.i.d. 1/2-Bernoulli trial model gives the uniform distribution on $[0, 1]$.

The link between forecasts and global probability models has been mentioned e.g. in [Dawid and Vovk, 1999, §3.1.1], or in [Lehrer, 2001], who refer to Kolmogorov’s Extension theorem to guarantee the existence of a probabilistic model on entire sequences [Lehrer, 2001, Remark 1]. More appropriately [Shafer and Vovk, 2019, p. 193], Shafer and Vovk [2019, p. 177] leverage Ionescu Tulcea’s theorem for a similar statement.

With those remarks we finish the detour to the nature of forecaster. The following theorem now rigorously links together the definition of randomness given before with Martin-Löf randomness.

Theorem 13.3 (Corollary 1 [Vovk and Shen, 2010]). *Let $\phi: \{0, 1\}^* \rightarrow (0, 1)$ be a lower semicomputable forecasting system. A binary sequence $(x_1, x_2, \dots) \in \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ is random with respect to P_ϕ in the sense of Martin-Löf if and only if the infinite situation $((p_1, x_1), (p_2, x_2), \dots) \in (\{0, 1\}, [0, 1])^{\mathbb{N}}$ for $p_i := \phi((x_1, \dots, x_i))$ is game-random.*

Under some restrictions on the forecaster, game-randomness is equivalent to Martin-Löf randomness. In fact, game-randomness is more versatile than the classical Martin-Löf definition. Important to us, a central definition of randomness can be expressed in terms of The Game with a “computable” forecaster and a “computable” gambler. Generalized definitions and analogous equivalence theorems for forecasts on non-compact domains \mathcal{Y} or forecaster which play forecasting sets can be found in [Gács, 2005] and [De Cooman and De Bock, 2021].²⁶ With this theorem we can give calibration semantics to the involved “computable” gambler.

14 Appendix – Von Mises’ and Church’s Randomness

When von Mises [1919] presented his frequentist theory of probability his definition of randomness turned into a central point of conflicting opinions [Bienvenu et al., 2009, Porter, 2012]. Von Mises defined a sequence of outcomes to be random if the relative frequencies of the involved outcomes converge on the entire sequence and a set of subsequences. Such a “collective”, as von Mises called it, can be expressed in game-theoretic terms.

²⁶In their definition, forecaster is recursive rational instead of lower semicomputable. Lower semicomputable forecasts can be approximated by recursive rational forecasts.

Definition 14.1 (Game-theoretic Collective). *We play the binary online prediction protocol Example 9.1 with a fixed forecast $P \in [0, 1]$, binary outcomes and a set of gamblers. Let $\mathcal{R} \subseteq \{0, 1\}^{\mathbb{N}}$ be a countable set of sequences, each having infinitely many 1s, including the sequence of only 1s. We call $r \in \mathcal{R}$ selection rule. The gamblers are defined per selection rule $g_t^r : y \mapsto r_t(y - P)$. An outcome situation $o \in \{0, 1\}^*$ is a collective with respect to \mathcal{R} if the capital $K_t^r := K_{t-1}^r + g_t^r(y_t)$ divided by the sum of stakes converges to zero, i.e. $\lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \frac{K_\tau^r}{\sum_{t=1}^\tau r_t} = 0$, for all gamblers indexed by the selection rule $r \in \mathcal{R}$.*

It is easy to see that our game-theoretic definition is equivalent to von Mises' original presentation [von Mises, 1919],

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \frac{K_\tau^r}{\sum_{t=1}^\tau r_t} &= \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{\sum_{t=1}^\tau r_t} \sum_{t=1}^\tau r_t(y_t - P) \\ &= \lim_{\tau \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{t=1}^\tau r_t y_t}{\sum_{t=1}^\tau r_t} - P = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Von Mises called the asymptotic limitation of the gamblers' capitals "excluding gambling strategies", and is usually interpreted as a criterion of randomness. A collective is a sequence which is random with respect to the set of selection rules \mathcal{R} . The relative and non-constructive approach to define randomness yield a lot of critique [Porter, 2012, Chapter 8]. Wald [1937] responded in showing the consistency, i.e. the existence, of collectives in their relative form and Church [1940] later proposed a universal choice of selection rules, the set of all computable (see § 9) selection rules, which paved the way to modern algorithmic randomness.

Our main observation is simple: the strategies of the involved gamblers are purely calibration-gamble strategies. The asymptotic limitation criterion on the calibration-gamblers is a definition of an approximately calibrated forecaster on an infinite sequence. Hence, a collective is a sequence of outcomes on which the constant forecast is calibrated with respect to the set of selection rules, i.e. the set of gamblers. Randomness and a specific type of approximate calibration are equivalent through the lens of von Mises' theory of probability.

15 Appendix – Why “The” Randomness?

Algorithmic randomness is in the search for *the* randomness. From a high-level perspective, algorithmic randomness defines sieves to sort out a countably infinite set of sequences from an uncountably infinite set of sequences. The remaining uncountable set of sequences then is called “random”. Clearly, a natural candidate to formalize the sortition is computability. Computability is able to universally define countable sets. But why should randomness be a concept which only occurs in infinite sequences in the first place? And then why should randomness be universally captured by a notion of anti-computability?

15.1 No More Infinite Sequences

We are not the first to notice that infinite sequences as only object able to be classified as random is unsatisfactory. The restrictive character of sequences has been part of discussions at least dating back to the work by [Putnam, 1950/2013] and [Kolmogorov, 1965]. In particular, scholarship tried to find reasonable definitions of randomness for finite sequences. Infinite sequences are not observable. Finite sequences, in contrast, are. The dualistic correspondence between forecaster and nature,

we put forward in the previous § 9.1, suggests that there is no need for infinite sequences. Informally, we understand random nature to be “nature’s outcome match the forecast in the light of gambler”. This passes the capital of gambler the role of “amount of randomness”. If one assumes an ex ante specified set of possible gambling strategies, the capital of the strategy is a measure of randomness of a finite sequence with respect to gambler and forecaster. Randomness is unpredictability relative to an unsuccessful gambler. But, then what is gambler?

15.2 No More Computability

Gambler is the judge of randomness. It “ensures” the nature sequence to be random with respect to the forecasts. As long as gambler’s capital remains limited, a (infinite) sequence can be considered random. In Definition 9.6 gambler was equipped with the full power of all computable algorithms - at least in rough words. If the outcome-forecast pairs passed all those many computable tests by gambler, the outcomes were random with respect to the forecaster. Computability might be a nice worst-case scenario for randomness. But, it is a loose upper bound. It as well serves the mere technical issue to reduce the uncountable set of sequences by countably many. From a statistical point of view computability might well be very uninteresting. In particular in the light of modern practical computations in which polynomial-time algorithms are often already at the boundary of the tractable, computability loses its usefulness as a model.

Potentially its abilities should be restricted or modified. For instance, as done in [Frongillo and Nobel, 2020] building upon [Frongillo and Nobel, 2017]. Therein the authors define randomness of a sequence with respect to a gambler playing regret gambles with fixed, constant experts. The capital of gambler is the average regret. If smaller than zero, then a sequence is random, respectively “memoryless” the authors call it.

15.3 Free Randomness

We shortly outlined arguments to free randomness from the corset of computability and countable sequentiality. The title of this subsection should be understood as a demand to let the concept of randomness grow. We think about randomness as a concept whose core is given through the intuitions which led the formalization of randomness: typicality, incompressibility, independence and in particular unpredictability. When we strip off computability and countably infinite sequences from algorithmic randomness, we start to identify randomness’ essential elements. Its theoretical and practical merit then starts to appear [Vovk et al., 2005a, Vovk, 2020]. We conjecture that in the conjunction of those works, finite outcome sequences plus non-computable gamblers, there is realm with potential significance to statistical predictive problems. Here, well-adapted forecasts to nature is equivalent to random outcomes with respect to forecasts. We remain with this explorative statement on the future of the provocative claim that “randomness should be liberated”.

References

- Charalambos D. Aliprantis and Kim C. Border. *Infinite dimensional analysis: a hitchhiker’s guide*. Springer, 3rd edition, 2006.
- Thomas Augustin, Frank P. A. Coolen, Gert De Cooman, and Matthias C. M. Troffaes. *Introduction to imprecise probabilities*. John Wiley & Sons, 2014.
- John Langshaw Austin. *How to do things with words*. Oxford university press, 1975.

- Laurent Bienvenu, Glenn Shafer, and Alexander Shen. On the history of martingales in the study of randomness. *Electronic Journal for History of Probability and Statistics*, 5(1):1–40, 2009.
- Kim C. Border. Lecture notes on convex analysis and economic theory, topic 20: When are sums closed?, 2019-2020.
- Glenn W. Brier. Verification of forecasts expressed in terms of probability. *Monthly weather review*, 78(1):1–3, 1950.
- Armando J. Cabrera Pacheco and Robert C. Williamson. The geometry of mixability. *Transactions on Machine Learning Research*, 2023. ISSN 2835-8856.
- Armando J. Cabrera Pacheco, Rabanus Derr, and Robert C. Williamson. Loss-aggregation in learning under expert advice. *Forthcoming*, 2024.
- Philippe Casgrain, Martin Larsson, and Johanna Ziegel. Anytime-valid sequential testing for elicitable functionals via supermartingales. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.05680*, 2022.
- Nicolo Cesa-Bianchi and Gábor Lugosi. *Prediction, learning, and games*. Cambridge university press, 2006.
- Gregory J. Chaitin. On the length of programs for computing finite binary sequences. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 13(4):547–569, 1966.
- Alexandra Chouldechova. Fair prediction with disparate impact: A study of bias in recidivism prediction instruments. *Big data*, 5(2):153–163, 2017.
- Alonzo Church. On the concept of a random sequence. *Bulletin of the American Mathematical Society*, 46(2):130–135, 1940.
- A. Philip Dawid. The well-calibrated Bayesian. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 77(379):605–610, 1982.
- A. Philip Dawid. Statistical theory: The prequential approach (with discussion and rejoinder). *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Ser. A*, 147:278–292, 1984.
- A. Philip Dawid. Calibration-based empirical probability. *The Annals of Statistics*, 13(4):1251–1274, 1985.
- A. Philip Dawid. The geometry of proper scoring rules. *Annals of the Institute of Statistical Mathematics*, 59:77–93, 2007.
- A. Philip Dawid. On individual risk. *Synthese*, 194(9):3445–3474, 2017.
- A. Philip Dawid and Vladimir G. Vovk. Prequential probability: principles and properties. *Bernoulli*, pages 125–162, 1999.
- Gert De Cooman and Jasper De Bock. Randomness and imprecision: a discussion of recent results. In *International Symposium on Imprecise Probability: Theories and Applications*, pages 110–121. PMLR, 2021.
- Bruno De Finetti. *Theory of probability: A critical introductory treatment*, volume 6. John Wiley & Sons, 1970/2017. Previous edition first published in 1970, Giulio Einaudi, Teoria Delle Probabilità – Bruno de Finetti.

- Gerard Debreu. *Theory of value: An axiomatic analysis of economic equilibrium*. Yale University Press, 1959.
- Morris H. DeGroot and Stephen E. Fienberg. The comparison and evaluation of forecasters. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series D (The Statistician)*, 32(1-2):12–22, 1983.
- Zhun Deng, Cynthia Dwork, and Linjun Zhang. Happymap: A generalized multicalibration method. In Yael Tauman Kalai, editor, *14th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference, ITCS 2023*, Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics, LIPIcs, Germany, January 2023. Schloss Dagstuhl- Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik GmbH, Dagstuhl Publishing.
- Cynthia Dwork, Michael P. Kim, Omer Reingold, Guy N. Rothblum, and Gal Yona. Outcome indistinguishability. In *Proceedings of the 53rd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 1095–1108, 2021.
- Cynthia Dwork, Daniel Lee, Huijia Lin, and Pranay Tankala. From pseudorandomness to multi-group fairness and back. In *The Thirty Sixth Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 3566–3614. PMLR, 2023.
- Antony Eagle. Chance versus Randomness. In Edward N. Zalta, editor, *The Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. Metaphysics Research Lab, Stanford University, Spring 2021 edition, 2021.
- Susanne Emmer, Marie Kratz, and Dirk Tasche. What is the best risk measure in practice? a comparison of standard measures. *Journal of Risk*, 18(2):31–60, 2015.
- Tim Erven, Peter Grünwald, Mark D. Reid, and Robert C. Williamson. Mixability in statistical learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 25, 2012.
- Pablo I. Fierens. An extension of chaotic probability models to real-valued variables. *International journal of approximate reasoning*, 50(4):627–641, 2009.
- Lance Fortnow and Rakesh V. Vohra. The complexity of forecast testing. *Econometrica*, 77(1):93–105, 2009.
- Dean P. Foster and Rakesh V. Vohra. Asymptotic calibration. *Biometrika*, 85(2):379–390, 1998.
- Dean P. Foster and Rakesh V. Vohra. Regret in the on-line decision problem. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 29(1-2):7–35, 1999.
- Paul L. Franco. Speech act theory and the multiple aims of science. *Philosophy of Science*, 86(5): 1005–1015, 2019.
- Christian Fröhlich and Robert C. Williamson. Risk measures and upper probabilities: Coherence and stratification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.03183*, 2022.
- Rafael Frongillo and Andrew Nobel. Memoryless sequences for differentiable losses. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 925–939. PMLR, 2017.
- Rafael Frongillo and Andrew Nobel. Memoryless sequences for general losses. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(1):3070–3097, 2020.
- Peter Gács. Uniform test of algorithmic randomness over a general space. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 341(1-3):91–137, 2005.

- Ira Globus-Harris, Declan Harrison, Michael Kearns, Aaron Roth, and Jessica Sorrell. Multicalibration as boosting for regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.13767*, 2023.
- Tilmann Gneiting. Making and evaluating point forecasts. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 106(494):746–762, 2011.
- Tilmann Gneiting and Adrian E. Raftery. Strictly proper scoring rules, prediction, and estimation. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 102(477):359–378, 2007.
- Parikshit Gopalan, Michael P. Kim, Mihir A. Singhal, and Shengjia Zhao. Low-degree multicalibration. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 3193–3234. PMLR, 2022.
- Parikshit Gopalan, Michael P. Kim, and Omer Reingold. Swap agnostic learning, or characterizing omniprediction via multicalibration. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023.
- Peter Grünwald, Rianne de Heide, and Wouter M. Koolen. Safe testing. In *2020 Information Theory and Applications Workshop (ITA)*, pages 1–54. IEEE, 2020.
- Peter D. Grünwald and A. Philip Dawid. Game theory, maximum entropy, minimum discrepancy and robust Bayesian decision theory. *The Annals of Statistics*, 32(4):1367 – 1433, 2004.
- Chirag Gupta and Aaditya Ramdas. Faster online calibration without randomization: interval forecasts and the power of two choices. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 4283–4309. PMLR, 2022.
- Nika Haghtalab, Michael Jordan, and Eric Zhao. On-demand sampling: Learning optimally from multiple distributions. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:406–419, 2022.
- Nika Haghtalab, Michael Jordan, and Eric Zhao. A unifying perspective on multi-calibration: Game dynamics for multi-objective learning. In *Thirty-seventh Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2023.
- Paul R. Halmos. *Measure theory*. Springer, 2013.
- Moritz Hardt, Meena Jagadeesan, and Celestine Mendler-Dünner. Performative power. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:22969–22981, 2022.
- Ursula Hébert-Johnson, Michael Kim, Omer Reingold, and Guy N. Rothblum. Multicalibration: Calibration for the (computationally-identifiable) masses. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1939–1948. PMLR, 2018.
- Benedikt Höltingen and Robert C. Williamson. On the richness of calibration. In *Proceedings of the 2023 ACM Conference on Fairness, Accountability, and Transparency*, pages 1124–1138, 2023.
- Christopher Jung, Changhwa Lee, Mallesh Pai, Aaron Roth, and Rakesh V. Vohra. Moment multicalibration for uncertainty estimation. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 2634–2678. PMLR, 2021.
- Leslie Pack Kaelbling, Michael L. Littman, and Andrew W. Moore. Reinforcement learning: A survey. *Journal of artificial intelligence research*, 4:237–285, 1996.

- Yuri Kalnishkan. *The Aggregating Algorithm and Predictive Complexity*. PhD thesis, Department of Computer Science, Royal Holloway, University of London, Egham, 2002.
- Yuri Kalnishkan and Michael V. Vyugin. Mixability and the existence of weak complexities. In *International Conference on Computational Learning Theory*, pages 105–120. Springer, 2002.
- Yuri Kalnishkan, Vladimir Vovk, and Michael V. Vyugin. A criterion for the existence of predictive complexity for binary games. In *Algorithmic Learning Theory: 15th International Conference, ALT 2004, Padova, Italy, October 2-5, 2004. Proceedings*, pages 249–263. Springer, 2004.
- Michael J. Kearns, Robert E. Schapire, and Linda M. Sellie. Toward efficient agnostic learning. In *Proceedings of the fifth annual workshop on Computational learning theory*, pages 341–352, 1992.
- Bobby Kleinberg, Renato Paes Leme, Jon Schneider, and Yifeng Teng. U-calibration: Forecasting for an unknown agent. In *The Thirty Sixth Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 5143–5145. PMLR, 2023.
- Andrei Nikolaevich Kolmogorov. Three approaches to the quantitative definition of information. *Problems of information transmission*, 1(1):1–7, 1965.
- Jason Konek. Evaluating imprecise forecasts. In *International Symposium on Imprecise Probability: Theories and Applications*, pages 270–279. PMLR, 2023.
- Ehud Lehrer. Any inspection is manipulable. *Econometrica*, 69(5):1333–1347, 2001.
- Leonid Anatolevich Levin. The concept of a random sequence. *Doklady Akademii Nauk*, 212(3): 548–550, 1973.
- Per Martin-Löf. The definition of random sequences. *Information and control*, 9(6):602–619, 1966.
- Nishant A. Mehta and Robert C. Williamson. From stochastic mixability to fast rates. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 27, 2014.
- Andrei A. Muchnik, Alexei L. Semenov, and Vladimir A. Uspensky. Mathematical metaphysics of randomness. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 207(2):263–317, 1998.
- Allan H. Murphy and Edward S. Epstein. Verification of probabilistic predictions: A brief review. *Journal of Applied Meteorology and Climatology*, 6(5):748–755, 1967.
- Georgy Noarov and Aaron Roth. The statistical scope of multicalibration. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 26283–26310. PMLR, 2023.
- Georgy Noarov, Ramya Ramalingam, Aaron Roth, and Stephan Xie. High-dimensional prediction for sequential decision making. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.17651*, 2023.
- Kent Harold Osband. *Providing Incentives for Better Cost Forecasting*. PhD thesis, University of California, Berkeley, 1985.
- Juan Perdomo, Tijana Zrnic, Celestine Mendler-Dünner, and Moritz Hardt. Performative prediction. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 7599–7609. PMLR, 2020.
- Christopher P. Porter. *Mathematical and philosophical perspectives on algorithmic randomness*. University of Notre Dame, 2012.

- Hilary Putnam. *The Meaning of the Concept of Probability in Application to Finite Sequences (Routledge Revivals)*. Routledge, 1950/2013. reprint of Hilary Putnam's dissertation thesis, 1950.
- Aaditya Ramdas, Peter Grünwald, Vladimir Vovk, and Glenn Shafer. Game-theoretic statistics and safe anytime-valid inference. *Statistical Science*, 38(4):576–601, 2023.
- Alvaro Sandroni. The reproducible properties of correct forecasts. *International Journal of Game Theory*, 32(1):151–159, 2003.
- Leonard J. Savage. Elicitation of personal probabilities and expectations. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 66(336):783–801, 1971.
- Eric Schechter. *Handbook of Analysis and its Foundations*. Academic Press, 1997.
- Mark J. Schervish. Self-calibrating priors do not exist: Comment. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 80(390):341–342, 1985.
- Mark J. Schervish. A general method for comparing probability assessors. *The annals of statistics*, 17(4):1856–1879, 1989.
- Mark J. Schervish, Teddy Seidenfeld, and Joseph B. Kadane. Proper scoring rules, dominated forecasts, and coherence. *Decision Analysis*, 6(4):202–221, 2009.
- Claus-Peter Schnorr. The process complexity and effective random tests. In *Proceedings of the fourth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 168–176, 1972.
- Teddy Seidenfeld. Calibration, coherence, and scoring rules. *Philosophy of Science*, 52(2):274–294, 1985.
- Glenn Shafer. Testing by betting: A strategy for statistical and scientific communication. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series A (Statistics in Society)*, 184(2):407–431, 2021.
- Glenn Shafer and Vladimir Vovk. *Game-theoretic foundations for probability and finance*. John Wiley & Sons, 2019.
- Ingo Steinwart, Chloé Pasin, Robert Williamson, and Siyu Zhang. Elicitation and identification of properties. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 482–526. PMLR, 2014.
- John Toland. *L-infinity and Its Dual*, pages 27–29. Springer International Publishing, 2020.
- Matthias C. M. Troffaes. Decision making under uncertainty using imprecise probabilities. *International journal of approximate reasoning*, 45(1):17–29, 2007.
- Vladimir A. Uspenskii, Alexei L. Semenov, and A. Kh. Shen. Can an individual sequence of zeros and ones be random? *Russian Mathematical Surveys*, 45(1):121, 1990.
- Jean Ville. *Étude critique de la notion de collectif*. Gauthier-Villars, 1939.
- Richard von Mises. Grundlagen der Wahrscheinlichkeitsrechnung. *Mathematische Zeitschrift*, 5(1): 52–99, 1919.
- Vladimir Vovk. Aggregating strategies. In *Proceedings of 3rd Annu. Workshop on Comput. Learning Theory*, pages 371–383, 1990.

- Vladimir Vovk. Defensive prediction with expert advice. In *International Conference on Algorithmic Learning Theory*, pages 444–458. Springer, 2005.
- Vladimir Vovk. The fundamental nature of the log loss function. *arXiv, February 2015 Version*, 2015.
- Vladimir Vovk. Non-algorithmic theory of randomness. In *Fields of Logic and Computation III: Essays Dedicated to Yuri Gurevich on the Occasion of His 80th Birthday*, pages 323–340. Springer, 2020.
- Vladimir Vovk and Alexander Shen. Prequential randomness and probability. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 411(29-30):2632–2646, 2010.
- Vladimir Vovk, Alexander Gammerman, and Glenn Shafer. *Algorithmic learning in a random world*. Springer, 2005a.
- Vladimir Vovk, Akimichi Takemura, and Glenn Shafer. Defensive forecasting. In *International Workshop on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 365–372. PMLR, 2005b.
- Volodya Vovk. Competitive on-line statistics. *International Statistical Review*, 69(2):213–248, 2001.
- Volodya Vovk and Chris Watkins. Universal portfolio selection. In *Proceedings of the eleventh annual conference on Computational learning theory*, pages 12–23, 1998.
- Abraham Wald. Die Widerspruchsfreiheit des Kollektivbegriffs. *Ergebnisse eines mathematischen Kolloquiums*, 8:38–72, 1937.
- Peter Walley. *Statistical reasoning with imprecise probabilities*. Chapman and Hall, 1991.
- Peter Walley. Towards a unified theory of imprecise probability. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning*, 24(2-3):125–148, 2000.
- Peter M. Williams. Notes on conditional previsions. *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning*, 44(3):366–383, 2007. revised version of: Notes on conditional previsions. Research Report, School of Math. and Phys. Science, University of Sussex, 1975.
- Robert C. Williamson and Zac Cranko. The geometry and calculus of losses. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 24(342):1–72, 2023.
- Robert C. Williamson, Elodie Vernet, and Mark D. Reid. Composite multiclass losses. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 17(222):1–52, 2016.
- Shengjia Zhao and Stefano Ermon. Right decisions from wrong predictions: A mechanism design alternative to individual calibration. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 2683–2691. PMLR, 2021.
- Shengjia Zhao, Michael P. Kim, Roshni Sahoo, Tengyu Ma, and Stefano Ermon. Calibrating predictions to decisions: A novel approach to multi-class calibration. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:22313–22324, 2021.
- Alexander K. Zvonkin and Leonid A. Levin. The complexity of finite objects and the development of the concepts of information and randomness by means of the theory of algorithms. *Russian Mathematical Surveys*, 25(6):83, 1970.