

LEAF: Unveiling Two Sides of the Same Coin in Semi-supervised Facial Expression Recognition

Fan Zhang^{1,4}, Zhi-Qi Cheng³, Jian Zhao^{2,5}, Xiaojiang Peng¹, Xuelong Li^{2,5}

¹College of Big Data and Internet, Shenzhen Technology University, Shenzhen, Guangdong, China

²Institute of Artificial Intelligence (TeleAI), China Telecom, Beijing, China

³Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, USA

⁴Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, Georgia, USA

⁵Northwestern Polytechnical University, Xi'an, Shaanxi, China

ABSTRACT

Semi-supervised learning has emerged as a promising approach to tackle the challenge of label scarcity in facial expression recognition (FER) task. However, current state-of-the-art methods primarily focus on one side of the coin, i.e., generating high-quality pseudo-labels, while overlooking the other side: enhancing expression-relevant representations. In this paper, we unveil both sides of the coin by proposing a unified framework termed hierarchical dEcoupling And Fusing (LEAF) to coordinate expression-relevant representations and pseudo-labels for semi-supervised FER. LEAF introduces a hierarchical expression-aware aggregation strategy that operates at three levels: semantic, instance, and category. (1) At the semantic and instance levels, LEAF decouples representations into expression-agnostic and expression-relevant components, and adaptively fuses them using learnable gating weights. (2) At the category level, LEAF assigns ambiguous pseudo-labels by decoupling predictions into positive and negative parts, and employs a consistency loss to ensure agreement between two augmented views of the same image. Extensive experiments on benchmark datasets demonstrate that by unveiling and harmonizing both sides of the coin, LEAF outperforms state-of-the-art semi-supervised FER methods, effectively leveraging both labeled and unlabeled data. Moreover, the proposed expression-aware aggregation strategy can be seamlessly integrated into existing semi-supervised frameworks, leading to significant performance gains. Our code is available at <https://anonymous.4open.science/r/LEAF-BC57/>.

CCS CONCEPTS

• Computing methodologies → Image representations.

KEYWORDS

Facial expression recognition; semi-supervised learning; Pseudo-labeling; representation learning; consistency regularization

F. Zhang, Z.-Q. Cheng, and J. Zhao made equal technical contributions. J. Zhao, X. Peng, and X. Li jointly supervised the project as corresponding authors.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from [permissions@acm.org](https://permissions.acm.org).
Conference acronym 'XX, June 03–05, 2018, Woodstock, NY

© 2018 Association for Computing Machinery.
ACM ISBN 978-x-xxxx-xxxx-x/YY/MM...\$15.00
<https://doi.org/XXXXXXXXXXXXXX>

ACM Reference Format:

Fan Zhang^{1,4}, Zhi-Qi Cheng³, Jian Zhao^{2,5}, Xiaojiang Peng¹, Xuelong Li^{2,5}. 2018. LEAF: Unveiling Two Sides of the Same Coin in Semi-supervised Facial Expression Recognition. In *Proceedings of Make sure to enter the correct conference title from your rights confirmation email (Conference acronym 'XX)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 11 pages. <https://doi.org/XXXXXXXXXXXXXX>

1 INTRODUCTION

Facial expressions are a critical component of human communication, serving as a primary means of conveying emotions. With the increasing influence of artificial intelligence-generated content, facial expression recognition (FER) has gained significant attention in recent years, finding applications in various domains such as human-machine interaction [7, 34, 37] and the development of digital humans [22, 41]. However, accurately detecting and interpreting facial expressions, particularly in uncontrolled settings, presents substantial challenges for emotion recognition systems.

The main hurdle in FER stems from the difficulty in obtaining a large volume of labeled facial expression data. This challenge is compounded by high inter-class similarities and the potential for errors, even among well-trained annotators. Consequently, FER under label scarcity has emerged as a practical yet under-explored problem. While most existing FER approaches [17, 20, 33, 48] exhibit a data-hungry nature, heavily relying on extensive labeled data, there is a pressing need for a semi-supervised FER approach [10, 12, 29, 36] that can effectively utilize a small amount of labeled data in conjunction with a large amount of unlabeled data to recognize facial expressions accurately.

Recent progress in semi-supervised FER methods [9, 18] and semi-supervised image classification approaches [5, 35, 44, 49] has primarily focused on one side of the coin: enhancing the quality or quantity of pseudo-labels. These methods aim to generate accurate and diverse pseudo-labels for unlabeled data, which can then be used to train the model in a supervised manner. However, they often overlook the other side of the coin: the potential improvement in representation quality stemming from the inherent minor inter-class differences in FER. Learning expression-relevant representations is crucial, as the differences between various facial expressions can be subtle. The model must be capable of capturing these nuances to accurately classify emotions. By focusing solely on pseudo-labels, existing methods [12, 36] may fail to learn discriminative representations that can effectively distinguish between different expressions.

In this paper, we propose a novel data-efficient framework called hierarchical dEcoupling And Fusing (LEAF) to address both sides




Figure 1: Our LEAF consistently outperforms state-of-the-art semi-supervised FER approaches across different settings.

of the same coin in semi-supervised FER. LEAF aims to improve the quality of representations as well as the quality and quantity of pseudo-labels from a hierarchical perspective. The core of LEAF lies in gradually teaching the network to distinguish facial expression representations and pseudo-labels into expression-agnostic and expression-relevant parts through decoupling strategies at different levels. The decoupled representations and pseudo-labels are then fused by automatically assigning different weights to them, enabling the model to focus on the parts more relevant to facial expressions, thereby achieving better recognition performance.

Specifically, LEAF introduces three levels of *Decoupling And Fusing (EAF) strategy*. At the semantic and instance levels, the EAF strategy draws inspiration from the Mixture-of-Experts (MoE) technique [6, 8, 32], allowing individual experts to learn and handle their respective specialized representations (i.e., expression-agnostic and expression-relevant parts). These representations are then automatically weighted and fused through a learnable gating network. At the category level, inspired by existing metric learning works [21, 28, 38, 42, 43], an ambiguous consistency loss is designed to minimize the distance between the prediction distributions obtained in two forward processes. Unlike traditional deterministic consistency losses, LEAF assigns several candidate pseudo-labels to each unlabeled sample, ambiguously labeling them as positive (expression-relevant) or negative (expression-agnostic). A margin is used to control the distance between the positive and negative categories, enhancing the consistency between the distributions.

By simultaneously addressing both sides of the coin, LEAF aims to learn a unified and coordinated representation space that captures the subtle differences between facial expressions while generating accurate and diverse pseudo-labels. This approach not only improves the quality of representations but also ensures that the pseudo-labels are consistent with the underlying expression-relevant information. Consequently, LEAF can effectively leverage both labeled and unlabeled data to enhance the performance of semi-supervised FER. The effectiveness of LEAF is demonstrated through extensive experiments on several public and widely-used

benchmark datasets, as shown in Fig. 1. Furthermore, as a plug-and-play module, the proposed EAF strategies are adaptive to other existing methods, showing improved performance when integrated.

The main contributions of this paper can be summarized as following three points:

- We explore a practical yet rarely investigated problem of FER under label scarcity and identify the shortcomings of existing semi-supervised approaches, which focus only on improving the quality or quantity of pseudo-labels while overlooking the enhancement of representation quality.
- We propose LEAF, a novel semi-supervised FER framework that automatically distinguishes between expression-agnostic and expression-relevant representations and pseudo-labels, and assigns them different weights in a hierarchical decoupling and fusing manner, effectively addressing both sides of the same coin in semi-supervised FER.
- Extensive experiments on several benchmark datasets demonstrate that LEAF consistently outperforms a series of state-of-the-art approaches, and the proposed EAF strategies can be integrated into existing methods to boost performance.

2 RELATED WORK

2.1 Facial Expression Recognition

There have been numerous approaches proposed for FER, which can be classified into two primary research categories: methods based on handcrafted features [14, 24, 27] and those based on deep learning techniques [17, 20, 33, 48]. In traditional research, the emphasis is on extracting texture information from datasets obtained in controlled laboratory settings, such as CK+ [23] and Oulu-CASIA [51]. With the advent of large-scale unconstrained FER datasets [1, 20, 26], deep facial expression recognition (DFER) algorithms have emerged, aiming to create effective neural networks or loss functions that can deliver superior performance. For instance, Zhang et al. [50] propose re-balanced attention maps and re-balanced smooth labels to mine extra knowledge from both major and minor classes for imbalanced FER. Wu et al. [45] leverage facial landmarks to mitigate the impact of label noise in FER.

Most of the existing FER methods are data-hungry. Although several semi-supervised FER approaches [9, 18] have been proposed to explore recognizing facial expressions under label scarcity and make some progress, they only concentrate on enhancing the quality or quantity of pseudo-labels, while ignoring that the representations of facial expressions can also be improved.

2.2 Semi-Supervised Learning

In recent years, there has been notable progress in applying semi-supervised learning methods to tackle challenging problems [35, 49]. These methods utilize various techniques such as consistency regularization [30, 46], entropy minimization [10, 16], and traditional regularization [3] to make effective use of unlabeled data. Among them, pseudo-labeling has emerged as a pioneering semi-supervised learning technique for obtaining hard labels from model predictions based. Notably, threshold-based pseudo-labeling approaches have been employed to select unlabeled samples with high-confidence predictions. For instance, some methods [35, 46] employ a fixed threshold to obtain pseudo-labels and incorporate both weak and




Figure 2: An overview of LEAF. The weak and strong augmented views of facial expressions are first mapped into the embedding space through a shared encoder. Then we conduct the semantic-level EAF and the instance-level EAF before and after the classifier to reorganize weights for expression-relevant and expression-agnostic representations, respectively. After getting the predictions, we adopt the category-level EAF to generate ambiguous pseudo-labels for consistency regularization.

strong augmentations to enforce consistency regularization. Other methods [47, 49] explore dynamic threshold strategies to adaptively determine which samples to assign pseudo-labels.

However, almost all the threshold-based pseudo-labeling methods inevitably result in some low-confidence samples not being fully utilized. To this end, LEAF employs EAF at the category level through an ambiguous pseudo-label selecting strategy to make full use of all the unlabeled data for consistency regularization.

3 PROBLEM DEFINITION

Facial expression recognition (FER) aims to classify human facial expressions into discrete categories. In real-world scenarios, labeled facial expression data is often scarce, while unlabeled data is abundant. Semi-supervised learning (SSL) methods leverage both labeled and unlabeled data to improve FER performance. Given an FER dataset $\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}^l \cup \mathcal{D}^u$, where $\mathcal{D}^l = \{(x_i^l, y_i)\}_{i=1}^{N_l}$ and $\mathcal{D}^u = \{(x_i^u)\}_{i=1}^{N_u}$ denote the labeled and unlabeled samples, respectively, the goal of semi-supervised FER is to learn the parameters θ of a model $F(x; \theta)$ by optimizing a loss function that combines supervised and unsupervised terms:

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{N_l} \sum_{i=1}^{N_l} \mathcal{L}^s(F(x_i^l; \theta), y_i) + \frac{\lambda}{N_u} \sum_{i=1}^{N_u} \mathcal{L}^u(F(x_i^u; \theta), \bar{y}_i), \quad (1)$$

where \mathcal{L}^s and \mathcal{L}^u represent the supervised classification loss and unsupervised consistency loss, respectively, and λ is a regularization coefficient to balance the two terms. Equation 1 encapsulates the core idea of semi-supervised learning: utilizing both labeled and unlabeled data to enhance model performance. The supervised loss \mathcal{L}^s ensures that the model learns from the annotated samples, while the unsupervised consistency loss \mathcal{L}^u encourages consistent predictions for unlabeled samples under different augmentations.

The state-of-the-art SSL approaches for FER [5, 18, 35, 44, 49] typically formulate the supervised loss as the cross-entropy loss

between the model prediction p_i and the label y_i , and the unsupervised loss as the consistency loss between the model prediction p_i and the pseudo-label \bar{y}_i . However, these methods suffer from two main limitations [9, 18, 35, 49]: (1) **Equal treatment of representations**: Existing methods fail to consider the varying discriminative power of different facial expression representations, treating all representations equally. This approach overlooks the fact that some representations may provide more valuable information for accurate recognition than others. (2) **Inappropriate pseudo-labeling**: The assignment of hard pseudo-labels to unlabeled samples can be problematic, especially when labeled data is scarce. The limited availability of labeled data hinders the model’s ability to make accurate predictions, leading to potentially unreliable pseudo-labels.

4 LEAF FRAMEWORK

Our strategy, illustrated in Fig. 2, involves implementing the EAF strategy at three distinct levels. First, augmented views of samples are encoded into deep features. (1) At the semantic level, these features are distributed among various experts and fused by a gating network before reaching the classifier (Sec. 4.1). (2) Next, at the instance level, predictions from the classifier are decoupled by additional experts and fused through another gating network (Sec. 4.2). (3) Finally, at the category level, pseudo-labels are assigned to predictions, and consistency between the two forward distributions is enhanced (Sec. 4.3). Notably, the pseudo-labels are dynamic, decoupled into positive and negative labels, and fused during consistency regularization. The following sections provide detailed explanations of each component.

4.1 Semantic-level Decoupling and Fusing

The semantic-level strategy, depicted in Fig. 2 (a), assumes that encoded deep features capture rich geometric or texture information. However, we argue that this information redundancy may hinder fine-grained expression recognition, as not all details contribute




Figure 3: The detailed structure of linear expert, bottleneck expert, and residual expert.

equally to the performance of final predictions. Inspired by the powerful Mixture-of-Experts (MoE) technique [6, 8, 32], we propose decoupling these features, allowing the network to autonomously determine the usefulness of each feature for expression recognition. As a result, the network learns to assign greater weights to more impactful features.

Specifically, at the semantic level, the deep features f_i are dispatched to several experts and fused by an additional gating network. The output of the semantic-level EAF can be formulated as:

$$f_i^r = \sum_{j=1}^n G(f_i) \cdot E_j(f_i), \quad (2)$$

where n refers to the number of experts E_j involved in processing the representations of expression information. The gating network $G(\cdot)$ is a feed-forward network (FFN) with learnable weights w^r . Additionally, we design three types of experts, whose structures are shown in Fig. 3. The performance of different experts will be further discussed in Sec. 5.5.1.

The gating network plays a crucial role in this process by learning to assign appropriate weights to the outputs of each expert. The use of a trainable FFN as the gating network provides the flexibility to learn complex mappings between the input features and the expert weights, allowing our model to dynamically adapt the fusion strategy based on the characteristics of the input data, enabling more effective utilization of the available information.

To direct experts' attention towards expression-relevant features, we aim to limit the number of experts with non-zero weights, specifically for handling expression-relevant features in distinct scenarios. The weights of the remaining experts are omitted in the calculation process. We achieve this by sampling the top K outputs of the experts and aggregating them through gating:

$$G(f_i) = \delta(\text{Top}K(\sigma(w^r \cdot f_i))), \quad (3)$$

where δ and σ denote softmax activation and softplus activation, respectively. For experts whose outputs are not within the $\text{Top}K$ values, their representation values are set to $-\infty$. These values will become zero after applying the softmax function.

This top- K gating mechanism is a key innovation that enables our model to focus on the most relevant experts for each input sample. By dynamically selecting the top K experts based on their activation values, we ensure that only the most informative features are used for the final prediction. This contrasts with traditional approaches that either use all experts equally or rely on fixed, hand-crafted rules for expert selection.

4.2 Instance-level Decoupling and Fusing

Building upon the semantic-level strategy, we employ a classifier $C(\cdot)$ to project the deep features into a low-dimensional space,

yielding the final predictions $p_i = C(f_i^r)$. We argue that the high inter-class similarity characteristic of facial expressions persists not only in the high-dimensional feature space but also in the low-dimensional category distribution space (Fig. 2 (b)). Therefore, extending the EAF strategy to the instance level, as defined in Eqn. 4, is expected to enhance recognition performance.

$$p_i^i = \sum_{j=1}^n G(p_i) \cdot E_j(p_i). \quad (4)$$

Similarly, the gating network can be described as:

$$G(p_i) = \delta(\text{Top}K(\sigma(w^i \cdot p_i))). \quad (5)$$

It is worth noting that the gating networks $G(\cdot)$ of the semantic-level and instance-level share the same architecture but have different parameters. The weights w^r and w^i are distinct and can be simultaneously optimized during the learning process.

By applying the EAF strategy at the instance level, our approach enables the model to leverage the complementary information captured by different experts to improve the final predictions. The gating network learns to assign appropriate weights to the outputs of each expert, effectively combining their predictions based on their relative importance for each input instance.

The use of top- K gating at the instance level serves a similar purpose as in the semantic level, encouraging the model to focus on the most relevant experts for each input sample. This helps to mitigate the impact of noisy or ambiguous predictions that may arise due to the high inter-class similarity of facial expressions. Another key advantage of the instance-level EAF strategy is that it allows the model to adaptively refine the predictions based on the specific characteristics of each input sample. By learning to assign different weights to the experts for different instances, our approach can effectively capture the subtle variations in facial expressions that may be crucial for accurate recognition.

4.3 Category-level Decoupling and Fusing

Several approaches [35, 46, 47, 49] assign hard pseudo-labels to unlabeled data, aiming to convert unsupervised learning scenarios into supervised ones. However, most of these methods employ a threshold to filter out low-confidence pseudo-labels, utilizing only a portion of unlabeled samples while discarding the rest. Moreover, considering the subtle inter-class differences in FER, fixed pseudo-labels may encounter challenges such as incorrect assignments and discarding useful information from highly similar negative classes.

To address these challenges, we introduce the EAF strategy at the category level, as shown in Fig. 2 (c). This involves decoupling the probability distribution of expression categories into positive and negative classes and subsequently fusing them for consistency regularization. First, we employ the softmax function to convert the prediction of a strong augmented sample p_i^i into a soft label distribution y_i . Assuming there are k classes in total, we decouple these label distributions and maintain a positive set Y_{sa}^p and a negative set Y_{sa}^n for each strong augmented sample:

$$Y_{sa}^p = \{y_{sa}^1, y_{sa}^2, \dots, y_{sa}^m\}, \quad (6)$$

$$Y_{sa}^n = \{y_{sa}^{m+1}, y_{sa}^{m+2}, \dots, y_{sa}^k\}, \quad (7)$$

where m denotes the number of positive labels, and the remaining ones are considered as negative labels. We use the cumulative probability of the sorted prediction to determine the value of m :

$$\sum_{j=1}^m \psi(y_{sa}^j) \geq T, \quad (8)$$

where ψ denotes the sort process, and T is a threshold set to 0.9 empirically. Inspired by metric learning works [21, 28, 38, 42, 43], we force the prediction of weak augmented sample to be consistent with the above partition of the strong augmented sample with a learning objective as:

$$\min(Y_{wa}^p) - \max(Y_{wa}^n) > \epsilon \geq 0, \quad (9)$$

where $\epsilon \geq 0$ is a margin to control the distance between the two sets, and we set $\epsilon = 0$ by default. Eqn. 9 ensures all the candidate labels in the positive set have higher scores than the others in the negative set. Next, we fuse these label distributions by taking the negative form of Eqn. 9 as the loss function:

$$\mathcal{L}^U = \eta(\max(Y_{wa}^n) - \min(Y_{wa}^p)), \quad (10)$$

where η denotes the *ReLU* activation.

However, the *max* and *min* functions are non-differentiable, so we approximate them into differentiable formats:

$$\min(Y_{wa}^p) \approx -\log\left(\sum_{i=1}^m e^{-y^i}\right), \quad (11)$$

$$\max(Y_{wa}^n) \approx \log\left(\sum_{j=m+1}^k e^{y^j}\right), \quad (12)$$

$$\eta(Y) = \max(Y, 0) \approx \log(1 + e^Y). \quad (13)$$

Based on these approximations, the overall consistency regularization loss is converted to:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}^U &= \max(\max(Y_{wa}^n) - \min(Y_{wa}^p), 0) \\ &= \log(1 + e^{\max(Y_{wa}^n) - \min(Y_{wa}^p)}) \\ &= \log(1 + e^{\log(\sum_{i=1}^m e^{-y^i}) + \log(\sum_{j=m+1}^k e^{y^j})}) \\ &= \log(1 + \sum_{i \in Y_{wa}^p} e^{-y^i} \times \sum_{j \in Y_{wa}^n} e^{y^j}). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

The step-by-step training algorithm of LEAF is listed in Alg. 1.

5 EXPERIMENTS

5.1 Datasets and Evaluation Metrics

We conduct extensive experiments on several widely used benchmark datasets that vary in granularity and size. **RAFDB** [20] consists of facial images from seven distinct expressions. It is divided into a training set containing 12,271 images and a testing set with 3,068 images. **FERplus** [1] comprises eight facial expressions, with a total of 24,941 training images, 3,589 validation images, and 3,589 test images. **AffectNet** [26] is a large-scale dataset containing 286,564 training images and 4,000 test images, all manually annotated with eight expression labels. We consider two versions of AffectNet: **AffectNet7** and **AffectNet8**. AffectNet7 excludes the expression category of contempt, which consists of 3,667 training images and 500 test images.

Algorithm 1 Training Algorithm of LEAF

Input: Labeled dataset \mathcal{D}^l , unlabeled dataset \mathcal{D}^u , number of training epochs E
Output: Learned model parameters θ

- 1: Initialize the model parameters θ
- 2: **for** $e = 1$ to E **do**
- 3: **repeat**
- 4: Sample mini-batch of labeled data $\{(x_i^l, y_i)\}$ from \mathcal{D}^l
- 5: Sample mini-batch of unlabeled data $\{x_i^u\}$ from \mathcal{D}^u
- 6: **for** each labeled sample (x_i^l, y_i) **do**
- 7: Compute semantic-level features f_i^l using the model $F(\theta)$
- 8: Apply semantic-level EAF to obtain fused features f_i^{lr} (Eqn. 2)
- 9: Compute instance-level predictions p_i^l using the classifier C
- 10: Apply instance-level EAF to obtain fused predictions p_i^{li} (Eqn. 4)
- 11: Compute supervised loss \mathcal{L}_i^s using p_i^{li} and y_i
- 12: **end for**
- 13: **for** each unlabeled sample x_i^u **do**
- 14: Compute semantic-level features f_i^u using the model $F(\theta)$
- 15: Apply semantic-level EAF to obtain fused features f_i^{ur} (Eqn. 2)
- 16: Compute instance-level predictions p_i^u using the classifier C
- 17: Apply instance-level EAF to obtain fused predictions p_i^{ui} (Eqn. 4)
- 18: Apply category-level EAF to obtain positive and negative sets Y_i^p, Y_i^n
- 19: Compute consistency loss \mathcal{L}_i^c using Y_i^p, Y_i^n (Eqn. 14)
- 20: **end for**
- 21: Compute total loss $\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{N_l} \sum_i \mathcal{L}_i^s + \frac{\lambda}{N_u} \sum_i \mathcal{L}_i^c$
- 22: Update model parameters θ by minimizing \mathcal{L}
- 23: **until** end of epoch
- 24: **end for**

Considering the imbalanced nature of the datasets, we argue that balanced accuracy is a more appropriate evaluation metric for the FER task than overall accuracy. Balanced accuracy takes into account the successful recognition of both major and minor classes [50], providing a more comprehensive assessment of the model's performance. Unless otherwise specified, all reported results in this paper are based on balanced accuracy.

5.2 Implementation Details


We implement our proposed LEAF using the PyTorch framework and conduct all experiments on NVIDIA Tesla A100 GPUs. The facial images are aligned and resized to 224×224 pixels. We employ the Adam optimizer with a learning rate of $5e - 4$, a batch size of 64, and train the models for 20 epochs. For a fair comparison, we select ResNet-18 [13] pre-trained on MS-Celeb-1M [11] as the backbone network for all baselines and our proposed method. The hyperparameters of each baseline are set according to their respective papers, and we extend these methods to the FER domain. It is important to note that we do not compare our LEAF with fully supervised FER methods, as these approaches require large amounts of labeled data and are unable to utilize unlabeled facial expression samples to improve recognition performance.

5.3 Quantitative Comparison

Tab. 1 presents a comprehensive quantitative comparison of our proposed LEAF with state-of-the-art semi-supervised learning methods on four widely used FER benchmark datasets. From these results, we can draw several key observations. **Firstly**, it is evident that semi-supervised FER methods, such as AdaCM [18] and our LEAF, outperform semi-supervised image classification methods in most cases. This can be attributed to the fact that these FER-specific

Table 1: Comparison with state-of-the-art methods with varying numbers of labels on four benchmark datasets. The best results are shown in boldface and the second best results are underlined.

| Dataset | RAFDB | | | FERPlus | | | AffectNet7 | | | AffectNet8 | | |
|-------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Label | 100 | 200 | 400 | 100 | 200 | 400 | 500 | 1000 | 2000 | 500 | 1000 | 2000 |
| Pi Model [15] | 43.39 | 52.92 | 60.29 | 42.62 | 48.18 | 58.06 | 44.76 | 50.34 | 53.26 | 39.71 | 44.26 | 46.88 |
| Pseudo-Label [16] | 44.36 | 52.04 | 59.61 | 39.75 | 48.03 | 55.19 | 44.85 | 48.28 | 52.28 | 40.70 | 43.03 | 47.49 |
| VAT [25] | 33.28 | 48.21 | 57.14 | 40.07 | 48.40 | 51.95 | 43.46 | 47.68 | 51.79 | 38.02 | 43.13 | 47.54 |
| UDA [46] | 49.22 | 59.96 | 65.80 | 44.36 | 52.48 | <u>62.80</u> | 47.69 | 51.49 | 55.48 | 42.74 | 46.38 | 48.73 |
| MeanTeacher [39] | 39.50 | 52.26 | 62.71 | 37.86 | 47.43 | <u>58.40</u> | 46.98 | 50.47 | 54.09 | 41.76 | 45.87 | 49.57 |
| MixMatch [3] | 40.40 | 54.77 | 62.62 | 43.72 | 51.06 | 56.64 | 45.20 | 49.12 | 53.82 | 41.12 | 44.07 | 49.05 |
| ReMixMatch [2] | 39.52 | 54.22 | 60.93 | 40.63 | 48.30 | 58.15 | 43.63 | 50.80 | 54.02 | 42.66 | 45.34 | 50.17 |
| FixMatch [35] | 48.13 | 60.23 | 65.04 | 48.05 | 52.77 | 60.38 | 47.83 | 51.39 | 54.75 | 42.69 | 46.04 | 49.50 |
| DeFixMatch [31] | 50.37 | 59.21 | 65.81 | 45.08 | 53.01 | 62.14 | 47.51 | 51.32 | 55.00 | 43.28 | 46.49 | 48.49 |
| Dash [47] | 49.95 | 59.27 | 66.44 | 43.10 | 55.56 | 62.74 | 48.03 | 51.65 | 54.49 | 42.33 | 45.69 | 50.06 |
| CoMatch [19] | 49.09 | 60.81 | 65.18 | 41.24 | 49.32 | 59.74 | 47.97 | 51.88 | 55.07 | 43.94 | 46.47 | 49.03 |
| SimMatch [52] | 50.47 | 58.56 | 66.83 | 45.93 | 49.07 | 60.61 | <u>48.06</u> | 52.04 | <u>56.09</u> | 43.71 | <u>47.40</u> | 50.38 |
| AdaMatch [4] | 48.35 | 57.10 | 63.61 | 43.87 | 50.48 | 59.92 | 47.03 | 51.13 | 54.23 | 41.69 | 45.43 | 49.12 |
| FlexMatch [49] | 48.79 | 53.24 | 61.16 | 43.75 | 47.90 | 58.23 | 48.00 | 52.23 | 54.76 | 42.98 | 46.45 | 49.02 |
| FreeMatch [44] | 48.89 | 55.26 | 62.09 | 41.85 | 45.57 | 58.39 | 46.74 | 50.77 | 54.46 | 41.98 | 45.96 | 49.44 |
| SoftMatch [5] | 49.95 | 56.13 | 63.45 | 42.97 | 49.97 | 57.58 | 47.65 | 50.71 | 54.56 | 42.06 | 46.73 | 49.26 |
| AdaCM [18] | <u>56.15</u> | <u>62.82</u> | <u>67.52</u> | <u>52.11</u> | <u>58.94</u> | 60.12 | 47.78 | <u>52.94</u> | 56.00 | <u>44.29</u> | 46.05 | <u>51.24</u> |
| LEAF | 56.83 | 63.43 | 69.00 | 52.20 | 61.00 | 62.92 | 50.21 | 53.87 | 56.84 | 45.37 | 49.53 | 52.34 |

**Figure 4: Performance comparison about overall accuracy and balanced accuracy with respect to different numbers of labels.**

approaches address the unique challenges of subtle inter-class differences among facial expressions. By effectively utilizing unlabeled data through techniques like contrastive learning for low-confidence samples and hierarchical integration of EAF modules, these methods can extract more discriminative representations and improve overall performance. **Secondly**, we observe that the recognition of seven emotions generally yields better results compared

to the recognition of eight emotions in the semi-supervised setting. This can be explained by the subtle distinction between the newly added emotion of contempt and the existing basic emotions of anger and disgust. Distinguishing between these emotions when limited labeled data is available poses a significant challenge, as the nuances can be difficult to capture without sufficient training examples. **Finally**, and most importantly, our proposed LEAF consistently outperforms all other approaches across various settings

Table 2: Ablation on the structure of experts across various scenarios. The best results are shown in boldface.

| Dataset | RAFDB | | | FERPlus | | | AffectNet7 | | | AffectNet8 | | |
|-------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| Label | 100 | 200 | 400 | 100 | 200 | 400 | 500 | 1000 | 2000 | 500 | 1000 | 2000 |
| Linear Expert | 56.01 | 60.35 | 67.18 | 51.79 | 58.72 | 62.25 | 49.19 | 52.99 | 56.71 | 44.62 | 47.84 | 52.03 |
| Bottleneck Expert | 56.23 | 62.91 | 67.44 | 51.81 | 57.22 | 62.85 | 48.89 | 53.86 | 56.80 | 45.26 | 48.10 | 52.27 |
| Residual Expert | 56.83 | 63.43 | 69.00 | 52.20 | 61.00 | 62.92 | 50.21 | 53.87 | 56.84 | 45.37 | 49.53 | 52.34 |

Table 3: Ablation on proposed components on AffectNet7 with different settings. The best results are shown in boldface.

| Model Variants | LEAF | | | Consistency Loss | | Overall Accuracy | | Balanced Accuracy | |
|---------------------------|---------|---------|---------|------------------|----|------------------|--------------|-------------------|--------------|
| | S-level | I-level | C-level | Ambiguous | CE | 500 Labels | 1000 Labels | 500 Labels | 1000 Labels |
| LEAF w/o S-EAF | | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | 49.76 | 53.53 | 49.71 | 53.51 |
| LEAF w/o I-EAF | ✓ | | ✓ | ✓ | | 48.82 | 52.36 | 48.76 | 52.33 |
| LEAF w/o C-EAF | ✓ | ✓ | | | | 46.53 | 50.94 | 46.47 | 50.90 |
| LEAF w \mathcal{L}^{CE} | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | ✓ | 49.27 | 52.60 | 49.21 | 52.58 |
| LEAF (Full Model) | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | ✓ | | 50.27 | 53.90 | 50.21 | 53.87 |

on the four benchmark datasets. This impressive performance can be attributed to several key components of our method. The semantic-level and instance-level EAF modules play a crucial role in extracting expression-relevant representations, while the category-level EAF strategy enables the assignment of proper pseudo-labels to ambiguous samples. The synergistic combination of these modules allows LEAF to effectively leverage both labeled and unlabeled data, resulting in robust and superior performance. A more detailed analysis of each module is provided in Sec. 5.5.2.

5.4 Qualitative Analysis

We conduct a qualitative analysis to gain further insights under varying degrees of label scarcity. Fig. 4 presents a visual comparison of LEAF and three state-of-the-art methods, showcasing their performance as the number of labeled samples increases. On the RAFDB and FERPlus datasets, we gradually increase the label quantity from 100 to 500. Across this range, LEAF consistently outperforms the other methods, demonstrating its ability to effectively leverage limited labeled data. The performance gap between LEAF and the competing methods remains significant even as the number of labeled samples increases, highlighting the robustness of our approach. Given the larger scale of the AffectNet dataset, we evaluate the methods with label quantities ranging from 500 to 1000 on both AffectNet7 and AffectNet8. The results on these datasets are consistent with our observations on RAFDB and FERPlus, with LEAF maintaining its superior performance across the entire range of label quantities. Notably, the balanced accuracy of LEAF exhibits stable improvements over the other methods, indicating its effectiveness in handling class imbalance. The qualitative analysis in Fig. 4 provides a clear visual representation of the superiority of LEAF compared to state-of-the-art methods. As the number of labeled samples increases, all methods show improved performance, which is expected given the increased availability of annotated data. However, LEAF consistently maintains a clear advantage over the competing methods across all datasets and label quantities. This

can be attributed to our approach’s ability to effectively utilize unlabeled samples through the proposed EAF modules, which enable the extraction of expression-relevant representations and the assignment of accurate pseudo-labels to ambiguous samples.

5.5 Ablation Studies and Analysis

5.5.1 Impact of Expert Structure. To investigate the impact of the expert structure on the performance of LEAF, we design and evaluate three different types of experts: linear expert, bottleneck expert, and residual expert (Fig. 3). The results are presented in Tab. 2. We observe that the bottleneck expert, which introduces non-linear structures, enables the model to capture more complex facial expression representations compared to the linear expert, resulting in improved performance. Furthermore, the residual expert, which incorporates residual connections on top of the bottleneck structure, effectively mitigates the potential overfitting of similar facial expressions, leading to further performance gains. These findings are consistent across different settings on all four datasets, validating the effectiveness of the residual expert structure in LEAF.

5.5.2 Contribution of Proposed Components. To assess the individual contributions of the proposed components in LEAF, we conduct an ablation study by evaluating several model variants, as shown in Tab. 3. LEAF w/o S-EAF, LEAF w/o I-EAF, and LEAF w/o C-EAF denote the variants where we remove the EAF strategy at the semantic level, instance level, and category level, respectively. Additionally, LEAF w \mathcal{L}^{CE} represents the variant where we replace the proposed consistency loss with the standard cross-entropy loss. The results demonstrate that removing the EAF strategies at any level leads to a performance decline, with the category-level EAF having the most significant impact. This highlights the importance of utilizing consistency regularization with ambiguous pseudo-labels for handling ambiguous facial expressions. Moreover, by comparing the third and fourth rows of Tab. 3, we observe that the ambiguous consistency loss is more suitable for the semi-supervised FER task




Figure 5: The t-SNE visualization with 1600 labeled samples on RAFDB and FERPlus.




Figure 6: Sensitivity analysis of the number of experts with 100 labeled samples on RAFDB and FERPlus.




Figure 7: Performance before and after integrating our EAF strategies into other methods on RAFDB.

compared to the standard cross-entropy loss. Finally, the full model, which integrates all the proposed components, achieves the best performance across all settings.

5.5.3 Sensitivity to the Number of Experts. We analyze the sensitivity of LEAF to the number of experts, as shown in Fig. 6. When the number of experts is set to 1, the performance of EAF degenerates to that of a single projection network. As the number of experts increases, we observe performance improvements in most cases compared to the single expert scenario, with the exception of the specific case when the number of experts is 6 on RAFDB. The optimal results are achieved with 2 experts on RAFDB and 4 experts on FERPlus, suggesting that the choice of the number of experts may depend on the characteristics of the dataset.

5.5.4 Integration with Other Semi-Supervised Methods. To demonstrate the flexibility and effectiveness of our proposed EAF strategies, we integrate them with two state-of-the-art semi-supervised methods, FixMatch [35] and FlexMatch [49]. The results, presented in Fig. 7, show that our EAF strategies consistently bring improvements when the label quantity varies from 100 to 300. Notably, when the number of labels is extremely small (i.e., 100 labels), the

EAF strategies provide even greater improvements, highlighting their effectiveness in scenarios with severely limited labeled data.

5.6 Visualization Analysis

To gain further insights into the learned feature representations, we perform t-SNE [40] visualization of the features extracted from the encoder. Fig. 5 presents the visualization results, where each facial expression is represented with a different color. The visualization results demonstrate that even under label scarcity, both AdaCM [18] and our LEAF are able to maintain good discriminability between different expressions. This indicates that these methods are capable of learning meaningful and separable feature representations for facial expressions, despite the limited availability of labeled data. It is important to note that AdaCM [18] achieves this discriminability by employing a contrastive learning objective, which aims to increase the distances between different expressions in the feature space. In contrast, our LEAF utilizes EAF strategies to focus the network’s attention on expression-related information. These two distinct representation learning strategies demonstrate the effectiveness of different approaches in tackling the FER task. Upon closer inspection of the visualization results, we observe that our approach slightly outperforms AdaCM [18] in terms of the compactness and separability of the learned feature representations. This suggests that the hierarchical decoupling and fusing strategy employed by LEAF, along with the ambiguous pseudo-label generation strategy, enables the model to capture more discriminative and expression-relevant representations.

6 CONCLUSION

This paper investigates a rarely explored yet practical problem of FER under label scarcity and proposes a novel semi-supervised FER approach dubbed LEAF. By decoupling and fusing the features and predictions of expressions, LEAF enables the model to focus more on expression-relevant representations automatically. Moreover, LEAF introduces an ambiguous pseudo-label generation strategy to assign expression-relevant pseudo-labels to samples, further enhancing the model’s ability to learn from unlabeled data. Extensive experiments on benchmark datasets demonstrate the effectiveness and robustness of our approach. The quantitative and qualitative results consistently show that LEAF outperforms state-of-the-art methods under various label scarcity scenarios, highlighting its potential for real-world applications. Looking ahead, we plan to extend our approach to more challenging scenarios, such as dynamic video-based FER and multimodal emotion recognition.

7 SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

This section contains supplementary materials for the study "LEAF: Unveiling Two Sides of the Same Coin in Semi-supervised Facial Expression Recognition". These materials provide extended discussions and additional details supporting the research presented in the main paper. Below is an overview of the contents of this supplementary material:

- (1) **More Explanation of Motivations:** This section delves into the necessity of adopting semi-supervised learning approaches specifically tailored for Facial Expression Recognition (FER). It highlights the unique challenges in FER, such as high inter-class similarity and class imbalance, which differentiate it from general image classification tasks. Figures illustrating these challenges and the motivation behind our proposed methods are discussed in detail.
- (2) **More Details of Datasets:** Detailed descriptions of the datasets employed in this study are provided here. The relevance of each dataset and its specific contribution to the study are outlined, including RAFDB, FERplus, and Affect-Net. The section emphasizes the scale, diversity, and annotation specifics of each dataset, which are critical for the robust evaluation of semi-supervised learning methods in the context of FER.
- (3) **More Details of Baselines:** This section describes the baseline methods against which our proposed approach was benchmarked. A comprehensive overview of each baseline method is presented, including Pi Model, Pseudo-Label, VAT, UDA, Mean Teacher, MixMatch, ReMixMatch, FixMatch, DeFixMatch, Dash, CoMatch, SimMatch, AdaMatch, FlexMatch, FreeMatch, SoftMatch, and AdaCM. The methodologies and innovations introduced by each method are discussed to contextualize their performance and implications in the field of semi-supervised learning.

7.1 Explanation of Motivations

This section explains the necessity of developing semi-supervised learning approaches specifically tailored for Facial Expression Recognition (FER), rather than simply adapting existing semi-supervised image classification algorithms. The inherent complexities of FER primarily stem from its nuanced category distinctions and class imbalance. In contrast to general image classification tasks, where categories such as 'Horse' and 'Automobile' are distinctly separate (Figure 8a), facial expressions like 'Happiness' and 'Neutral' often exhibit minimal differences, making them challenging to distinguish, even for the human eye. Moreover, the occurrence frequencies of various facial expressions in natural settings are not uniform—certain expressions are significantly rarer than others, reflecting a natural cognitive bias in human emotional expression. This phenomenon is exemplified by comparing the uniform class distribution of the CIFAR-10 dataset to the varied distribution in the RAFDB dataset (Figure 8b).

Given these challenges, the direct application of generic semi-supervised image classification strategies to FER often proves inadequate. The nuances of facial expressions necessitate a more refined approach, where different regions of a face are evaluated with varying importance, reflecting their relevance to specific emotions. For

instance, certain facial regions might be more expressive and thus hold greater significance in determining the overall emotional state depicted in an image. To address these intricacies, we propose a hierarchical decoupling and fusing strategy, designed to learn and automatically assign different weights to representations from various facial regions (Figure 9). This approach not only accommodates the fine-grained nature of facial expressions but also adapts to the imbalanced distribution of emotional expressions within training data, thereby enhancing the effectiveness and accuracy of FER in semi-supervised settings.




Figure 8: Comparative challenges in semi-supervised learning for facial expression recognition (FER) versus general image classification. Panel (a) illustrates the higher similarity between different facial expression categories compared to the distinct categories seen in general image classification, such as 'Horse' and 'Automobile'. Panel (b) highlights the issue of imbalanced class distribution within FER datasets, exemplified by the differences in sample counts across emotional categories.

7.2 Details of Datasets

This section provides more details of datasets employed in this study, highlighting their unique characteristics and the rationale behind their selection for evaluating our semi-supervised learning approaches in the context of Facial Expression Recognition (FER). **RAFDB** [20] is a dataset consisting of approximately 30,000 facial images, each annotated by 40 trained human coders, categorizing them into basic and compound expressions. Our analysis primarily focuses on the subset of images depicting the seven basic expressions: neutral, happiness, surprise, sadness, anger, disgust, and fear, which includes 12,271 images for training and 3,068 for testing. The diverse range of facial expressions in this dataset makes it an ideal choice for assessing the robustness and accuracy of FER systems.



Figure 9: Conceptual motivation of the LEAF method, illustrating the decomposition of facial expression representations into two categories: expression-agnostic and expression-relevant representations. This figure demonstrates how our approach differentiates and assigns varying degrees of importance to facial regions based on their relevance to the expressed emotion.

FERPlus [1] is an enhanced version of the FER2013 dataset, which was originally used in the ICML 2013 Challenges. It comprises 28,709 training images, 3,589 validation images, and 3,589 testing images, all collected via Google search. A notable improvement over its predecessor is the introduction of an additional emotion category, contempt, expanding the conventional set of emotional categories to a total of eight. This extension provides a broader spectrum of emotional expressions for analysis, enriching the training and evaluation process.

AffectNet [26] is the largest dataset utilized in our study, boasting both categorical and Valence-Arousal annotations across more than one million images. These images were harvested from the Internet using expression-related keywords through three different search engines. Among these, 450,000 images have been manually annotated with eight expression labels, mirroring those in FERPlus. The scale and annotation richness of AffectNet are crucial for training models to effectively understand and classify a wide range of human emotions. To accommodate different class settings and reflect real-world class imbalances in facial expression data, AffectNet is divided into AffectNet7 and AffectNet8, with AffectNet7 omitting the category of contempt and including 3,667 training images and 500 test images. This division enables tailored model training and benchmarking under varied class settings.

7.3 Details of Baselines

This section provides a comprehensive overview of the baseline methods employed to evaluate the effectiveness of our proposed semi-supervised learning strategies for Facial Expression Recognition (FER). Each method offers a unique perspective on semi-supervised learning (SSL), providing a thorough comparison.

Pi Model [15] introduces the concept of self-ensembling, where consensus predictions for unknown labels are generated by leveraging the outputs of the network across various training epochs under differing conditions of regularization and input augmentation.

Pseudo-Label [16] proposes a straightforward approach in which the network is trained in a semi-supervised manner by assigning the most probable class to unlabeled data during training.

Virtual Adversarial Training (VAT) [25] enhances SSL through a regularization method that ensures the robustness of label distribution against local perturbations around each input data point.

Unsupervised Data Augmentation (UDA) [46] emphasizes the critical role of data augmentation quality in SSL, focusing on how effectively noised examples can enhance learning.

Mean Teacher [39] builds upon temporal ensembling by averaging model weights instead of predictions, thereby improving test accuracy and reducing dependency on large labeled datasets.

MixMatch [3] takes a novel approach by guessing low-entropy labels for unlabeled data augmented via MixUp, blending supervised and unsupervised data.

ReMixMatch [2] extends MixMatch by incorporating distribution alignment and augmentation anchoring to further refine the handling of unlabeled data.

FixMatch [35] simplifies the process by using weakly augmented images to generate pseudo-labels, which are then used to train the model on strongly augmented versions of the same images.

DeFixMatch [31] offers a debiased take on FixMatch, providing bounds on generalization errors and enhancing model reliability.

Dash [47] optimizes the selection of training examples from unlabeled data, focusing only on those that closely relate to labeled data, thus enhancing the efficiency of SSL methods.

CoMatch [19] introduces a dual learning approach where class probabilities and low-dimensional embeddings evolve together, using graph-based contrastive learning to improve pseudo-label quality.

SimMatch [52] integrates semantic and instance similarities into SSL, applying consistency regularization at both the semantic and instance levels.

AdaMatch [4] addresses domain-specific challenges in SSL by adapting batch normalization and pseudo-label thresholds dynamically to effectively manage distribution shifts.

FlexMatch [49] proposes a curriculum learning approach, dynamically adjusting the confidence of pseudo-labels based on the model's learning status to better leverage unlabeled data.

FreeMatch [44] further refines this by adjusting the confidence threshold in a self-adaptive manner, enhancing the model's responsiveness to its learning progress.

SoftMatch [5] employs a truncated Gaussian function to dynamically weight the confidence of samples, balancing quantity and quality in pseudo-label generation.

AdaCM [18] divides unlabeled samples into subsets based on an adaptively learned confidence margin, optimizing the use of unlabeled data throughout training epochs.

REFERENCES

- [1] Emad Barsoum, Cha Zhang, Cristian Canton Ferrer, and Zhengyou Zhang. 2016. Training deep networks for facial expression recognition with crowd-sourced label distribution. In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM international conference on multimodal interaction*. 279–283.
- [2] David Berthelot, Nicholas Carlini, Ekin D Cubuk, Alex Kurakin, Kihyuk Sohn, Han Zhang, and Colin Raffel. 2019. Remixmatch: Semi-supervised learning with distribution alignment and augmentation anchoring. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.09785* (2019).
- [3] David Berthelot, Nicholas Carlini, Ian Goodfellow, Nicolas Papernot, Avital Oliver, and Colin A Raffel. 2019. Mixmatch: A holistic approach to semi-supervised learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 32 (2019).
- [4] David Berthelot, Rebecca Roelofs, Kihyuk Sohn, Nicholas Carlini, and Alex Kurakin. 2021. Adamatch: A unified approach to semi-supervised learning and domain adaptation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.04732* (2021).
- [5] Hao Chen, Ran Tao, Yue Fan, Yidong Wang, Jindong Wang, Bernt Schiele, Xing Xie, Bhiksha Raj, and Marios Savvides. 2023. Softmatch: Addressing the quantity-quality trade-off in semi-supervised learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.10921* (2023).
- [6] David Eigen, Marc'Aurelio Ranzato, and Ilya Sutskever. 2013. Learning factored representations in a deep mixture of experts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.4314* (2013).

- [7] Berat A Erol, Abhijit Majumdar, Patrick Benavidez, Paul Rad, Kim-Kwang Raymond Choo, and Mo Jamshidi. 2019. Toward artificial emotional intelligence for cooperative social human-machine interaction. *IEEE Transactions on Computational Social Systems* 7, 1 (2019), 234–246.
- [8] William Fedus, Barret Zoph, and Noam Shazeer. 2022. Switch transformers: Scaling to trillion parameter models with simple and efficient sparsity. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research* 23, 1 (2022), 5232–5270.
- [9] Corneliu Florea, Mihai Badea, Laura Florea, Andrei Racoviteanu, and Constantin Vertan. 2020. Margin-mix: Semi-supervised learning for face expression recognition. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2020: 16th European Conference, Glasgow, UK, August 23–28, 2020, Proceedings, Part XXIII* 16. Springer, 1–17.
- [10] Yves Grandvalet and Yoshua Bengio. 2004. Semi-supervised learning by entropy minimization. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 17 (2004).
- [11] Yandong Guo, Lei Zhang, Yuxiao Hu, Xiaodong He, and Jianfeng Gao. 2016. Ms-celeb-1m: A dataset and benchmark for large-scale face recognition. In *Computer Vision—ECCV 2016: 14th European Conference, Amsterdam, The Netherlands, October 11–14, 2016, Proceedings, Part III* 14. Springer, 87–102.
- [12] Raia Hadsell, Sumit Chopra, and Yann LeCun. 2006. Dimensionality reduction by learning an invariant mapping. In *2006 IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR'06)*, Vol. 2. IEEE, 1735–1742.
- [13] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. 2016. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 770–778.
- [14] Yuxiao Hu, Zhihong Zeng, Lijun Yin, Xiaozhou Wei, Xi Zhou, and Thomas S Huang. 2008. Multi-view facial expression recognition. In *2008 8th IEEE International Conference on Automatic Face & Gesture Recognition*. IEEE, 1–6.
- [15] Samuli Laine and Timo Aila. 2016. Temporal ensembling for semi-supervised learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.02242* (2016).
- [16] Dong-Hyun Lee et al. 2013. Pseudo-label: The simple and efficient semi-supervised learning method for deep neural networks. In *Workshop on challenges in representation learning, ICML*, Vol. 3. Atlanta, 896.
- [17] Hangyu Li, Nannan Wang, Xinpeng Ding, Xi Yang, and Xinbo Gao. 2021. Adaptively learning facial expression representation via cf labels and distillation. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing* 30 (2021), 2016–2028.
- [18] Hangyu Li, Nannan Wang, Xi Yang, Xiaoyu Wang, and Xinbo Gao. 2022. Towards semi-supervised deep facial expression recognition with an adaptive confidence margin. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 4166–4175.
- [19] Junnan Li, Caiming Xiong, and Steven CH Hoi. 2021. Comatch: Semi-supervised learning with contrastive graph regularization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*. 9475–9484.
- [20] Shan Li, Weihong Deng, and JunPing Du. 2017. Reliable crowdsourcing and deep locality-preserving learning for expression recognition in the wild. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 2852–2861.
- [21] Weiyang Liu, Yandong Wen, Zhiding Yu, Ming Li, Bhiksha Raj, and Le Song. 2017. SpheroFace: Deep hypersphere embedding for face recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 212–220.
- [22] Kate Loveys, Mark Sagar, Xueyuan Zhang, Gregory Fricchione, and Elizabeth Broadbent. 2021. Effects of emotional expressiveness of a female digital human on loneliness, stress, perceived support, and closeness across genders: randomized controlled trial. *Journal of medical Internet research* 23, 11 (2021), e30624.
- [23] Patrick Lucey, Jeffrey F Cohn, Takeo Kanade, Jason Saragih, Zara Ambadar, and Iain Matthews. 2010. The extended cohn-kanade dataset (ck+): A complete dataset for action unit and emotion-specified expression. In *2010 IEEE computer society conference on computer vision and pattern recognition-workshops*. IEEE, 94–101.
- [24] Yuan Luo, Cai-ming Wu, and Yi Zhang. 2013. Facial expression recognition based on fusion feature of PCA and LBP with SVM. *Optik-International Journal for Light and Electron Optics* 124, 17 (2013), 2767–2770.
- [25] Takeru Miyato, Shin-ichi Maeda, Masanori Koyama, and Shin Ishii. 2018. Virtual adversarial training: a regularization method for supervised and semi-supervised learning. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence* 41, 8 (2018), 1979–1993.
- [26] Ali Mollahosseini, Behzad Hasani, and Mohammad H Mahoor. 2017. Affectnet: A database for facial expression, valence, and arousal computing in the wild. *IEEE Transactions on Affective Computing* 10, 1 (2017), 18–31.
- [27] Matti Pietikäinen, Abdenour Hadid, Guoying Zhao, and Timo Ahonen. 2011. *Computer vision using local binary patterns*. Vol. 40. Springer Science & Business Media.
- [28] Pengchong Qiao, Zhidan Wei, Yu Wang, Zhennan Wang, Guoli Song, Fan Xu, Xiangyang Ji, Chang Liu, and Jie Chen. 2023. Fuzzy Positive Learning for Semi-Supervised Semantic Segmentation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 15465–15474.
- [29] Chuck Rosenberg, Martial Hebert, and Henry Schneiderman. 2005. Semi-supervised self-training of object detection models. (2005).
- [30] Mehdi Sajjadi, Mehran Javanmardi, and Tolga Tasdizen. 2016. Regularization with stochastic transformations and perturbations for deep semi-supervised learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 29 (2016).
- [31] Hugo Schmutz, Olivier Humbert, and Pierre-Alexandre Mattei. 2022. Don't fear the unlabelled: safe semi-supervised learning via debiasing. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations*.
- [32] Noam Shazeer, Azalia Mirhoseini, Krzysztof Maziarz, Andy Davis, Quoc Le, Geoffrey Hinton, and Jeff Dean. 2017. Outrageously large neural networks: The sparsely-gated mixture-of-experts layer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1701.06538* (2017).
- [33] Jiahui She, Yibo Hu, Hailin Shi, Jun Wang, Qiu Shen, and Tao Mei. 2021. Dive into ambiguity: Latent distribution mining and pairwise uncertainty and confidence for facial expression recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 6248–6257.
- [34] Takanori Shibata, Makoto Yoshida, and Junji Yamato. 1997. Artificial emotional creature for human-machine interaction. In *1997 IEEE international conference on systems, man, and cybernetics. Computational cybernetics and simulation*, Vol. 3. IEEE, 2269–2274.
- [35] Kihyuk Sohn, David Berthelot, Nicholas Carlini, Zizhao Zhang, Han Zhang, Colin A Raffel, Ekin Dogus Cubuk, Alexey Kurakin, and Chun-Liang Li. 2020. Fixmatch: Simplifying semi-supervised learning with consistency and confidence. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020), 596–608.
- [36] Shuran Song, Fisher Yu, Andy Zeng, Angel X Chang, Manolis Savva, and Thomas Funkhouser. 2017. Semantic scene completion from a single depth image. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 1746–1754.
- [37] Xiao Sun, Zhengmeng Pei, Chen Zhang, Guoqiang Li, and Jianhua Tao. 2019. Design and analysis of a human-machine interaction system for researching human's dynamic emotion. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems* 51, 10 (2019), 6111–6121.
- [38] Yifan Sun, Changmao Cheng, Yuhang Zhang, Chi Zhang, Liang Zheng, Zhongdao Wang, and Yichen Wei. 2020. Circle loss: A unified perspective of pair similarity optimization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 6398–6407.
- [39] Antti Tarvainen and Harri Valpola. 2017. Mean teachers are better role models: Weight-averaged consistency targets improve semi-supervised deep learning results. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 30 (2017).
- [40] Laurens Van der Maaten and Geoffrey Hinton. 2008. Visualizing data using t-SNE. *JMLR* 9, 11 (2008).
- [41] Matias Volonte, Chang-Chun Wang, Elham Ebrahimi, Yu-Chun Hsu, Kuan-Yu Liu, Sai-Keung Wong, and Sabarish V Babu. 2021. Effects of language familiarity in simulated natural dialogue with a virtual crowd of digital humans on emotion contagion in virtual reality. In *2021 IEEE Virtual Reality and 3D User Interfaces (VR)*. IEEE, 188–197.
- [42] Feng Wang, Jian Cheng, Weiyang Liu, and Haijun Liu. 2018. Additive margin softmax for face verification. *IEEE Signal Processing Letters* 25, 7 (2018), 926–930.
- [43] Hao Wang, Yitong Wang, Zheng Zhou, Xing Ji, Dihong Gong, Jingchao Zhou, Zhifeng Li, and Wei Liu. 2018. Cosface: Large margin cosine loss for deep face recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 5265–5274.
- [44] Yidong Wang, Hao Chen, Qiang Heng, Wenxin Hou, Yue Fan, Zhen Wu, Jindong Wang, Marios Savvides, Takahiro Shinozaki, Bhiksha Raj, et al. 2022. Freematch: Self-adaptive thresholding for semi-supervised learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.07246* (2022).
- [45] Zhiyu Wu and Jinshi Cui. 2023. LA-Net: Landmark-Aware Learning for Reliable Facial Expression Recognition under Label Noise. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*. 20698–20707.
- [46] Qizhe Xie, Zihang Dai, Eduard Hovy, Thang Luong, and Quoc Le. 2020. Unsupervised data augmentation for consistency training. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 33 (2020), 6256–6268.
- [47] Yi Xu, Lei Shang, Jinxing Ye, Qi Qian, Yu-Feng Li, Baigui Sun, Hao Li, and Rong Jin. 2021. Dash: Semi-supervised learning with dynamic thresholding. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 11525–11536.
- [48] Fanglei Xue, Qiangchang Wang, and Guodong Guo. 2021. Transfer: Learning relation-aware facial expression representations with transformers. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*. 3601–3610.
- [49] Bowen Zhang, Yidong Wang, Wenxin Hou, Hao Wu, Jindong Wang, Manabu Okumura, and Takahiro Shinozaki. 2021. Flexmatch: Boosting semi-supervised learning with curriculum pseudo labeling. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 34 (2021), 18408–18419.
- [50] Yuhang Zhang, Yaqi Li, Xuannan Liu, Weihong Deng, et al. 2024. Leave No Stone Unturned: Mine Extra Knowledge for Imbalanced Facial Expression Recognition. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* 36 (2024).
- [51] Guoying Zhao, Xiaohua Huang, Matti Taini, Stan Z Li, and Matti Pietikäinen. 2011. Facial expression recognition from near-infrared videos. *Image and vision computing* 29, 9 (2011), 607–619.
- [52] Mingkai Zheng, Shan You, Lang Huang, Fei Wang, Chen Qian, and Chang Xu. 2022. Simmatch: Semi-supervised learning with similarity matching. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 14471–14481.