

Theoretical Foundation of Co-Training and Disagreement-Based Algorithms

Wei Wang, Zhi-Hua Zhou*

*National Key Laboratory for Novel Software Technology,
Nanjing University, Nanjing 210023, China*

Abstract

Disagreement-based approaches generate multiple classifiers and exploit the disagreement among them with unlabeled data to improve learning performance. Co-training is a representative paradigm of them, which trains two classifiers separately on two sufficient and redundant views; while for the applications where there is only one view, several successful variants of co-training with two different classifiers on single-view data instead of two views have been proposed. For these disagreement-based approaches, there are several important issues which still are unsolved, in this article we present theoretical analyses to address these issues, which provides a theoretical foundation of co-training and disagreement-based approaches.

Keywords: machine learning, semi-supervised learning, disagreement-based learning, co-training, multi-view classification, combination

1. Introduction

Learning from labeled training data is well-established in traditional machine learning, but labeling the data is time-consuming, sometimes may be very expensive since it requires human efforts. In many practical applications, unlabeled data can be obtained abundantly and cheaply. For example, in the task of

*Corresponding author
Email address: zhouzh@nju.edu.cn (Zhi-Hua Zhou)

web page classification, it is easy to get abundant unlabeled web pages in the Internet, while a few labeled ones are available since obtaining the labels requires human interaction. Many semi-supervised learning approaches which exploit unlabeled data to complement labeled data for improving learning performance have been developed. Those approaches can be roughly categorized into four classes, i.e., generative approaches, S3VMs (Semi-Supervised Support Vector Machines), graph-based approaches and disagreement-based approaches. Generative approaches use a generative model and typically employ EM to model the label estimation or parameter estimation process [1, 2, 3]. S3VMs use unlabeled data to adjust the SVM decision boundary learned from labeled data such that it goes through the less dense region while keeping the labeled data classified correctly [4, 5, 6]. Graph-based approaches define a graph on the training data and enforce the label smoothness over the graph as a regularization term [7, 8, 9, 10]. Disagreement-based approaches generate multiple classifiers and exploit the disagreement among them with unlabeled data, i.e., letting the multiple classifiers label unlabeled instances to augment the training data [11, 12, 13, 14].

Research on disagreement-based approaches started from Blum and Mitchell's seminal work of co-training [11], which is a representative paradigm of disagreement-based approaches. When co-training was proposed, Blum and Mitchell assumed that there exist two *views* (i.e., two disjoint sets of features), each of which is sufficient for learning the target concept. For example, the web page classification task has two views, i.e., the text appearing on the page itself and the anchor text attached to hyper-links pointing to this page [11]; the speech recognition task also has two views, i.e., sound and lip motion [15]. Co-training learns two classifiers with initial labeled data on the two views respectively and lets them label unlabeled instances for each other to augment the training data. Unfortunately, in real-world applications, the requirement of two views is hard to satisfy. Although Nigam and Ghani [16] have shown that a feature split can be used to enable co-training to work when there are many redundant features, it is more desirable to develop algorithms that can be applied to single-view data.

Several successful variants of co-training have been proposed along this direction. For example, Goldman and Zhou [12] proposed a method which generates two classifiers by using two different learning algorithms that can partition the example space into a number of equivalence classes; Zhou and Li [17] proposed a semi-supervised regression method which generates two regressors by using different parameter configurations for the same learning algorithm. Different relevant algorithms have been developed with different names and the name disagreement-based semi-supervised learning was coined [14, 18] to reflect the fact that co-training and its variants are actually in the same family, and the key for the learning process to proceed is to maintain a large disagreement among the classifiers¹. Co-training [11] is the famous algorithm which relies on two views, while the algorithms which rely on multiple classifiers generated from single-view data is referred to as single-view disagreement-based approaches. In disagreement-based approaches, multiple classifiers are trained for the same task and the disagreement among them is exploited during the learning process. Here, unlabeled data serve as a kind of “platform” for information exchange. If one classifier is much more confident on a disagreed unlabeled instance than other classifier(s), then this classifier will teach other(s) with this instance². It does not matter where these classifiers come from, they can be trained on multi-view data with the same learning algorithm or on single-view data with different learning algorithms. The disagreement-based algorithms have achieved success in many domains such as natural language processing [19, 20, 21] and image retrieval [22, 23].

There is another famous semi-supervised learning approach called *co-regularization* [24, 25, 26], which also exploits unlabeled data with two views. It directly minimizes the error rate on labeled data and the disagreement on unlabeled data

¹If there is no disagreement among the classifiers, the learning process would degenerate into self-training.

²In real-world applications, the disagreement-based approaches may consist of more than two classifiers, in this article we mainly focus on the two-classifier setting.

over two views with the intuition that the optimal classifiers in the two views are compatible with each other. It is worth noting that co-training exploits unlabeled data very differently from co-regularization, and no pseudo-labels are assigned to unlabeled instances in co-regularization.

By comparing these discriminative semi-supervised learning approaches, it can be found that unlabeled data help in two distinct ways. One is starting with unlabeled data to generate a constraint (regularization) and then learning a classifier with labeled data and the constraint (regularization), i.e., S3VMs, graph-based approaches and co-regularization. In S3VMs, unlabeled data are exploited as a constraint such that the SVM decision boundary goes through the less dense region; in graph-based approaches, unlabeled data are exploited to construct a graph Laplacian regularization; while in co-regularization, unlabeled data are exploited to generate a regularization of disagreement over two views. Balcan and Blum [27] provided a unified framework for these approaches to interpret why and when unlabeled data can help, in which they defined a notion of compatibility and assumed that the target concept should have high compatibility with the underlying data distribution. Unlabeled data are exploited to estimate the compatibility of all hypotheses and the size of hypothesis space could be reduced by removing the hypotheses which have low compatibility. Then labeled data is used to find a good hypothesis within the reduced hypothesis space, which will lead to good sample-size bounds. The other is starting with labeled data to generate multiple weak classifiers and then letting them label unlabeled instances to augment the training data, i.e., disagreement-based approaches. There has been a long-term theoretical study on this. When Blum and Mitchell [11] proposed co-training, they proved that when the two views are conditionally independent, co-training can boost the performance of weak classifiers to arbitrarily high by exploiting unlabeled data. Dasgupta et al. [28] analyzed the generalization bound for co-training with two conditionally independent views and showed that the error rate of co-training is bounded by the disagreement between two co-trained classifiers. To relax the conditional independence assumption, Abney [29] found that weak dependence

can also lead to successful co-training. Later, Balcan et al. [30] pointed out that if a PAC classifier can be obtained on each view, the conditional independence assumption or even weak dependence assumption is unnecessary; a weaker assumption of “expansion” over the underlying data distribution is sufficient for co-training to succeed. However, all these results focus on co-training which relies on two views, there are several important issues on disagreement-based approaches which still are unsolved.

1.1. Our Focus and Main Results

We present a theoretical foundation of co-training and disagreement-based approaches to address the unsolved issues in this article. The issues and results can be summarized as follows. (1) One basic issue is why and when the disagreement-based approaches can improve learning performance by exploiting unlabeled data. We present a general analysis, which shows that if the two initial classifiers trained with the initial labeled data have large disagreement, the disagreement-based approaches can improve learning performance (Section 2.1); (2) it is often observed that the performance of the classifiers in disagreement-based approaches can not be improved further after a number of rounds in empirical studies. Up to now, there is no theoretical explanation to this. We prove that the disagreement and the error rates of the classifiers will converge after a number of rounds, which theoretically explains why the classifiers can not be improved further (Section 2.2); (3) all previous theoretical analyses focused on the sufficient condition, so a fundamental issue may arise: what is the sufficient and necessary condition for co-training to succeed? To the best of our knowledge, this has not been touched. We present a theoretical graph-based analysis on co-training, based on which we get the sufficient and necessary condition for co-training to succeed (Section 3); (4) all previous theoretical analyses assumed that each view is sufficient for learning the target concept. So another issue may arise: what can co-training do with insufficient views? We present a theoretical analysis on co-training with insufficient views which is much more challenging but practical, especially when the two views

provide diverse information (Section 4); (5) the classifiers in disagreement-based approaches are usually combined to make predictions, unfortunately, there is no theoretical analysis about this. We study margin-based classifiers and present a theoretical analysis to explain why and when the combination can be better than the individual classifiers (Section 5).

1.2. Organization

The rest of this article is organized as follows. We present a general analysis on disagreement-based approaches to explain why they can improve learning performance by exploiting unlabeled data in Section 2.1 and why the learning performance can not be improved further after a number of rounds in Section 2.2. In Section 3, we study the sufficient and necessary condition and give an interesting implication, such as combination of weight matrices. We analyze co-training with insufficient views in Section 4, and analyze when the combination can be better than the individual classifiers in Section 5. Finally, we make a conclusion in Section 6.

2. General Analysis on Disagreement-Based Approaches

Given the labeled data L , unlabeled data U and two hypothesis spaces \mathcal{H}_1 and \mathcal{H}_2 , in this section we consider the following disagreement-based process whose pseudo-codes are in Algorithm 1.

Disagreement-Based Process: *Given the labeled data L and unlabeled data U , at first, we train two initial classifiers $h_1^0 \in \mathcal{H}_1$ and $h_2^0 \in \mathcal{H}_2$ using L which contains l labeled examples with two different learning algorithms (if the data have two views, we can train two classifiers $h_1^0 \in \mathcal{H}_1$ and $h_2^0 \in \mathcal{H}_2$ using L in the two views with the same learning algorithm, respectively). Then, h_1^0 selects u unlabeled instances from U to label and puts these newly labeled examples into σ_2 which contains the initial labeled examples in L ; at the same time, h_2^0 selects u unlabeled instances from U to label and puts these newly labeled examples into σ_1 which contains the initial labeled examples in L . Then, $h_1^1 \in \mathcal{H}_1$ and $h_2^1 \in \mathcal{H}_2$ are*

Algorithm 1 Disagreement-Based Process

Input: Labeled data L , unlabeled data U , two hypothesis spaces \mathcal{H}_1 and \mathcal{H}_2 , and pre-set number of learning round s .

Output: h_1^s and h_2^s .

Initialize: Set $\sigma_1 = \sigma_2 = L$;

for $i = 0, 1, \dots, s$ **do**

Train a classifier $h_v^i \in \mathcal{H}_v$ ($v = 1, 2$) with σ_v by minimizing the empirical risk;

h_v^i selects u unlabeled instances from U to label, then add them into σ_{3-v} and delete them from U .

end for

trained with σ_1 and σ_2 , respectively. After that, h_1^1 selects u unlabeled instances to label and uses these newly labeled examples to update σ_2 ; while h_2^1 also selects u unlabeled instances to label and uses these newly labeled examples to update σ_1 . Such a process is repeated for a pre-set number of learning round.

It is easy to see that Algorithm 1 reassembles the main process of existing disagreement-based approaches including co-training³ [11] which requires that the data should have two views and single-view disagreement-based algorithms [12, 17, 31]. The key procedure is that one classifier labels some unlabeled instances for the other, it does not matter where the two classifiers come from. The two classifiers can be trained on two-view data with the same learning algorithm or on single-view data with two different learning algorithms.

³Algorithm 1 is almost the same as co-training in [11] except one place: Algorithm 1 uses L and the examples labeled by classifier h_v ($v = 1, 2$) to retrain classifier h_{3-v} , while co-training in [11] uses L and the examples labeled by both classifiers h_1 and h_2 to retrain each of them. To exclude the examples labeled by a classifier itself is helpful in reducing the risk of over-fitting and many recent algorithms use the paradigm described in Algorithm 1.

2.1. Upper Bounds on Error rates of Classifiers

Suppose that \mathcal{X} is the instance space, $\mathcal{Y} = \{-1, +1\}$ is the label space, $L = \{(x^1, y^1), \dots, (x^l, y^l)\} \subset \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ are the labeled data, $U = \{x^{l+1}, x^{l+2}, \dots, x^{l+|U|}\} \subset \mathcal{X}$ are the unlabeled data. Suppose that the labeled data L independently and identically come from some unknown distribution \mathcal{D} , whose marginal distribution on \mathcal{X} is $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}}$, and the unlabeled data U independently and identically come from $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}}$. $\mathcal{H}_v : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ ($v = 1, 2$) denotes the hypothesis space. Suppose that $|\mathcal{H}_v|$ is finite ⁴ and the target concept (ground truth) c which is perfectly consistent with the distribution \mathcal{D} belongs to \mathcal{H}_1 and \mathcal{H}_2 , and the error rate $\mathbf{err}(h_v)$ of $h_v \in \mathcal{H}_v$ and the disagreement $d(f, g)$ between two hypotheses f and g are defined as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{err}(h_v) &= P_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}}(h_v(x) \neq y); \\ d(f, g) &= P_{x \in \mathcal{X}}(f(x) \neq g(x)). \end{aligned}$$

In disagreement-based approaches shown in Algorithm 1, one classifier selects some unlabeled instances to label for the other. Here comes the question: how to select these unlabeled instances? In co-training [11], Blum and Mitchell did not specify how to select unlabeled instances (see Page 8, Table 1 in their paper), though in their experiments they selected the most confident unlabeled instances to label with the intuition that confident instances bring high label quality. Nevertheless, there is no guarantee that selecting confident instances is better than selecting random instances, and it needs strong assumptions to characterize the relationship between confidence and label quality. Sometimes, selecting confident instances may be no better than selecting random instances if the confidence is unreliable. Actually, if the learning paradigm believes that labeling confident instances is helpful, it can select confident instances to label;

⁴If \mathcal{H}_v is infinite hypothesis space with finite VC-dimension d_v , we can replace \mathcal{H}_v with its ϵ -cover \mathcal{H}_v^ϵ : a set of hypotheses $\mathcal{H}_v^\epsilon \subseteq \mathcal{H}_v$ such that for any $h_v \in \mathcal{H}_v$ there is a $h_v^\epsilon \in \mathcal{H}_v^\epsilon$ satisfying $P(h_v(x) \neq h_v^\epsilon(x)) \leq \epsilon$. It is well-known that such an \mathcal{H}_v^ϵ always exists with size $|\mathcal{H}_v^\epsilon| \leq 2(\frac{2\epsilon}{\epsilon} \ln \frac{2\epsilon}{\epsilon})^{d_v}$ [32].

otherwise, it can select random instances to label. Thus, selecting random instances to label can be thought of as the worst case. To make our theoretical analysis general and without any specific assumption on the learning process, we will prove upper bounds on the error rates of the classifiers by considering that each classifier selects random instances to label. In fact, these upper bounds also hold in the case where selecting confident instances helps; this is easy to understand: labeling confident instances may reduce label noise, according to the standard PAC learning theory, learning from the data with small label noise is no harder than learning from the data with large label noise.

Two classifiers trained with different views or different learning algorithms have different biases, it is the intuition why the disagreement-based approaches can work. Two classifiers having different biases implies that they classify some unlabeled instances with different labels. The disagreement $d(f, g)$ can be used to estimate the difference. In disagreement-based approaches, f selects some unlabeled instances from U to label and adds them into the training data of g . If these newly labeled examples are helpful in updating g , f should know some information that g does not know, i.e., f can correctly classify some unlabeled instances which are mistakenly classified by g . Obviously, this helpful information is a part of the disagreement between f and g . Unfortunately, sometimes f may provide some mistakenly classified examples to g due to its non-perfect performance, and these mistakenly classified examples from f would degrade the performance of g . So we must carefully characterize the newly labeled examples.

Let ε_v^i denote the error rate of h_v^i , i.e., $\varepsilon_v^i = \mathbf{err}(h_v^i)$ ($i = 0, \dots, s$ and $v = 1, 2$). In the beginning, two classifiers h_1^0 and h_2^0 are trained with the initial l labeled examples by minimizing the empirical risk. In real-world applications, it has been found that these initial labeled examples play an important role, i.e., when l is too large, h_1^0 and h_2^0 are so good that they could improve each other hardly; while l is too small, h_1^0 and h_2^0 are so weak that they may degenerate each other due to large noise in the newly labeled examples [33, 34]. In our analysis, we suppose that by minimizing the empirical risk on l labeled examples we can train two classifiers h_1^0 and h_2^0 with $\varepsilon_1^0 < \frac{1}{2}$ and $\varepsilon_2^0 < \frac{1}{2}$, and the value of l satisfies

the model of learning from noisy examples in [35] with noise rate η shown in Equation 1. The reason why we use this noise model to characterize l is that updating the classifiers is a process of learning from noisy examples.

$$l \geq \frac{2}{(\varepsilon_1^0)^2(1-2\eta)^2} \ln \frac{2|\mathcal{H}_1|}{\delta}, \quad l \geq \frac{2}{(\varepsilon_2^0)^2(1-2\eta)^2} \ln \frac{2|\mathcal{H}_2|}{\delta}. \quad (1)$$

Considering that the initial labeled examples are clean, i.e., $\eta = 0$, we get that l should be no less than

$$\max \left[\frac{2}{(\varepsilon_1^0)^2} \ln \frac{2|\mathcal{H}_1|}{\delta}, \frac{2}{(\varepsilon_2^0)^2} \ln \frac{2|\mathcal{H}_2|}{\delta} \right].$$

Let ξ_v^i denote the upper bound on the error rate of h_1^i , i.e., $\varepsilon_v^i \leq \xi_v^i$. In order to show whether the performance of the classifiers could be improved, we need to analyze the upper bounds ξ_1^i and ξ_2^i for $i \geq 1$. In detail, considering the i -th round, $h_v^i \in \mathcal{H}_v$ randomly selects u unlabeled instances from U to label and adds them into the training data σ_{3-v} , then h_{3-v}^{i+1} is trained with σ_{3-v} . The disagreement $d(h_v^i, h_{3-v}^{i+1})$ is a kind of “distance” between h_v^i and h_{3-v}^{i+1} , and can be estimated conveniently when there are a large amount of unlabeled instances. This “distance” will help us bound the performance of h_{3-v}^{i+1} with respect to the performance of h_v^i . Iteratively, we can bound the performance of h_v^i for $i \geq 1$. Based on this intuition, we give the following upper bounds for ξ_1^i and ξ_2^i , and discuss the insight we can get from the bounds.

Theorem 1 *In Algorithm 1, suppose one classifier randomly selects unlabeled instances to label for the other,*

$$\Theta_i = \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} (d(h_1^i, h_2^k) - \varepsilon_2^k), \quad \Delta_i = \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} (d(h_1^k, h_2^i) - \varepsilon_1^k),$$

$\xi_1^i = \frac{\varepsilon_1^0 \sqrt{l^2 + i \cdot u \cdot l}}{l} - \frac{u \cdot \Theta_i}{l}$ and $\xi_2^i = \frac{\varepsilon_2^0 \sqrt{l^2 + i \cdot u \cdot l}}{l} - \frac{u \cdot \Delta_i}{l}$, if $\Theta_i > \frac{i \cdot \varepsilon_1^0}{2}$ and $\Delta_i > \frac{i \cdot \varepsilon_2^0}{2}$, then $\xi_1^i < \varepsilon_1^0$, $\xi_2^i < \varepsilon_2^0$, and the following bounds on the error rates of h_1^i and h_2^i hold.

$$P(\text{err}(h_1^i) \leq \xi_1^i) \geq 1 - \delta, \quad (2)$$

$$P(\text{err}(h_2^i) \leq \xi_2^i) \geq 1 - \delta. \quad (3)$$

Proof. First, it is easy to verify that $\xi_1^i < \varepsilon_1^0$ and $\xi_2^i < \varepsilon_2^0$ for $\Theta_i > \frac{i \cdot \varepsilon_1^0}{2}$ and $\Delta_i > \frac{i \cdot \varepsilon_2^0}{2}$. In the proof, $SD1_i = \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} d(h_1^k, h_2^i)$ denotes the sum of disagreement and $SE1_i = \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} \varepsilon_1^k$ denotes the sum of error rate w.r.t. h_1 after i rounds; $SD2_i = \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} d(h_1^i, h_2^k)$ denotes the sum of disagreement and $SE2_i = \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} \varepsilon_2^k$ denotes the sum of error rate w.r.t. h_2 after i rounds.

After i rounds, both the training data σ_1 and σ_2 consist of l labeled examples and $u \cdot i$ newly labeled examples. First, we analyze the inconsistency between any $h_2 \in \mathcal{H}_2$ and σ_2 . Let $\{(x^1, y^1), \dots, (x^l, y^l), (x_0^1, y_0^1), \dots, (x_0^u, y_0^u), \dots, (x_{i-1}^1, y_{i-1}^1), \dots, (x_{i-1}^u, y_{i-1}^u)\}$ denote the $(l+u \cdot i)$ examples in σ_2 , where $\{(x_k^1, y_k^1), \dots, (x_k^u, y_k^u)\}$ denotes the u newly labeled examples labeled by h_1^k and y_k^u is the pseudo-label of x_k^u assigned by h_1^k ($k = 0, \dots, i-1$). Let X_1, \dots, X_{l+iu} be random variables taking on values 0 or 1, where $X_t = 1$ means that for $x^t \in \sigma_2$, h_2 makes a different prediction on x^t from its pseudo-label ($t = 1, \dots, l+iu$). Considering that $\{(x_k^1, y_k^1), \dots, (x_k^u, y_k^u)\}$ are randomly selected by h_1^k , so X_1, \dots, X_{l+iu} are independent random variables. We let $p_t = P(X_t = 1)$ and $X = \sum_{t=1}^{l+iu} X_t$. Obviously, X equals to the number of inconsistent examples between h_2 and σ_2 .

Since the initial l labeled examples $\{(x^1, y^1), \dots, (x^l, y^l)\}$ in σ_2 are independently and identically drawn from the distribution \mathcal{D} and the disagreement between $h_2 \in \mathcal{H}_2$ and the target concept c is $d(h_2, c)$, for any $x^t \in \{(x^1, y^1), \dots, (x^l, y^l)\}$, $p_t = d(h_2, c)$; since the newly labeled examples $\{(x_k^1, y_k^1), \dots, (x_k^u, y_k^u)\}$ ($k = 0, \dots, i-1$) are selected randomly by h_1^k and the disagreement between $h_2 \in \mathcal{H}_2$ and h_1^k is $d(h_2, h_1^k)$, for any $x^t \in \{(x_1^k, y_1^k), \dots, (x_u^k, y_u^k)\}$, $p_t = d(h_2, h_1^k)$. So we get the expectation $E(X)$ of X is:

$$E(X) = E\left(\sum_{t=1}^{l+iu} X_t\right) = \sum_{t=1}^{l+iu} p_t = l \cdot d(h_2, c) + u \cdot \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} d(h_2, h_1^k). \quad (4)$$

Then, we analyze the inconsistency between the target concept c and σ_2 . Let random variables X'_1, \dots, X'_{l+iu} be independent random variables taking on values 0 or 1, where $X'_t = 1$ ($t = 1, \dots, l+iu$) means that for $x^t \in \sigma_2$, the target concept c makes a different prediction on x^t from its pseudo-label. We let $q_t = P(X'_t = 1)$ and $X' = \sum_{t=1}^{l+iu} X'_t$. Obviously, X' equals to the number of inconsistent examples between c and σ_2 . Since the newly labeled

examples $\{(x_k^1, y_k^1), \dots, (x_k^u, y_k^u)\}$ ($k = 0, \dots, i-1$) are selected randomly by h_1^k and the disagreement between the target concept c and h_1^k is $d(c, h_1^k)$, similarly to Equation 4 we get the expectation $E(X')$ of X' is:

$$E(X') = E\left(\sum_{t=1}^{l+iu} X'_t\right) = \sum_{t=1}^{l+iu} q_t = u \cdot \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} d(c, h_1^k) = u \cdot \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} \varepsilon_1^k. \quad (5)$$

According to minimizing the empirical risk, the algorithm will search out the classifier which has the lowest observed inconsistent examples with the training data σ_2 . If we want to achieve a ‘good’ classifier whose error rate is no larger than ξ_2^i with probability at least $1-\delta$ by minimizing the empirical risk, σ_2 should be sufficient to guarantee that the classifier whose error rate is larger than ξ_2^i has a lower observed inconsistent examples with σ_2 than the target concept c with probability no larger than δ .

Thus, for $h_2^i \in \mathcal{H}_2$, if $d(h_2^i, c) > \xi_2^i$, from Equations 4 and 5 we get

$$\begin{aligned} E(X) - E(X') &> l \cdot \xi_2^i + u \cdot \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} d(h_2^i, h_1^k) - u \cdot \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} \varepsilon_1^k \\ &= \varepsilon_2^0 \sqrt{l^2 + i \cdot u \cdot l}. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

It means that if $d(h_2^i, c) > \xi_2^i$, the expected inconsistent examples between h_2^i and σ_2 is at least $\varepsilon_2^0 \sqrt{l^2 + i \cdot u \cdot l}$ larger than that between the target concept c and σ_2 . If h_2^i minimizes the empirical risk on σ_2 , the number of observed inconsistent examples between h_2^i and σ_2 is no larger than that between the target concept c and σ_2 , i.e., $X \leq X'$. In this case, either $X' \geq E(X') + \frac{\varepsilon_2^0 \sqrt{l^2 + i \cdot u \cdot l}}{2}$ or $X \leq E(X') + \frac{\varepsilon_2^0 \sqrt{l^2 + i \cdot u \cdot l}}{2}$ holds. Considering that there are at most $|\mathcal{H}_2| - 1$ classifiers whose error rates are larger than ξ_2^i , so if Equations 7 and 8 hold, it can be guaranteed that the classifier whose error rate is larger than ξ_2^i has a lower observed inconsistent examples with σ_2 than the target concept c with probability no larger than δ .

$$P(X' \geq E(X') + \frac{\varepsilon_2^0 \sqrt{l^2 + i \cdot u \cdot l}}{2}) \leq \frac{\delta}{2}; \quad (7)$$

$$P(X \leq E(X') + \frac{\varepsilon_2^0 \sqrt{l^2 + i \cdot u \cdot l}}{2}) \leq \frac{\delta}{2|\mathcal{H}_2|}. \quad (8)$$

So with Hoeffding bounds [36] we get

$$P(X' \geq E(X') + \frac{\varepsilon_2^0 \sqrt{l^2 + i \cdot u \cdot l}}{2}) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{(\varepsilon_2^0 \sqrt{l^2 + i \cdot u \cdot l})^2}{2(l + u \cdot i)}\right), \quad (9)$$

$$P(X \leq E(X') - \frac{\varepsilon_2^0 \sqrt{l^2 + i \cdot u \cdot l}}{2}) \leq \exp\left(-\frac{(\varepsilon_2^0 \sqrt{l^2 + i \cdot u \cdot l})^2}{2(l + u \cdot i)}\right). \quad (10)$$

Since $l \geq \frac{2}{(\varepsilon_2^0)^2} \ln \frac{2|\mathcal{H}_2|}{\delta}$, we get $\exp\left(-\frac{(\varepsilon_2^0 \sqrt{l^2 + i \cdot u \cdot l})^2}{2(l + u \cdot i)}\right) \leq \frac{\delta}{2|\mathcal{H}_2|}$. So with Equations 9 and 10 we find that Equations 7 and 8 hold. Thus we have that $P(\text{err}(h_2^i) \leq \xi_2^i) \geq 1 - \delta$ holds. Similarly, we have that $P(\text{err}(h_1^i) \leq \xi_1^i) \geq 1 - \delta$ holds. \square

Remark: The bounds in Theorem 1 seem somewhat complicated to understand, we give an explanation in the following comprehensive way: in the i -th round, the training data σ_1 for h_1^i contain the initial l labeled examples and $u \cdot i$ newly labeled examples from h_2^0, \dots, h_2^{i-1} . The classifier h_1^0 with error rate ε_1^0 can be trained with the initial l labeled examples, now we investigate the contribution that h_2^0, \dots, h_2^{i-1} make to retraining h_1^i . $d(h_1^i, h_2^k)$ measures the information that h_2^k ($k < i$) knows while h_1^i does not know. Wiping off the possibly wrong information from h_2^k bounded by its error rate ε_2^k , $d(h_1^i, h_2^k) - \varepsilon_2^k$ is an estimation of the helpful information that h_2^k offers to h_1^i . So $\Theta_i = \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} (d(h_1^i, h_2^k) - \varepsilon_2^k)$ measures the helpful information provided by h_2^0, \dots, h_2^{i-1} . This is the intuition why the bounds are meaningful. $d(h_1^k, h_2^i)$ and $d(h_1^i, h_2^k)$ can be estimated conveniently with unlabeled data, then we can calculate ξ_1^k and ξ_2^k according to Equations 2 and 3. Using them as the approximations of ε_1^k and ε_2^k , we can get $\varepsilon_1^i, \varepsilon_2^i, \Theta_i$ and Δ_i in an iterative way.

Generally, as the disagreement-based process goes on, the disagreement will decrease since h_v^{k+1} has u training examples from h_{3-v}^k . Here, we give Theorem 2 on the disagreement.

Theorem 2 *In Algorithm 1, Equation 11 on the disagreement between the classifiers holds.*

$$d(h_1^k, h_2^k) \geq d(h_1^k, h_2^{k+1}); \quad d(h_1^k, h_2^k) \geq d(h_1^{k+1}, h_2^k). \quad (11)$$

Proof. Let $D(h_1, \sigma_1)$ denote the number of inconsistent examples between h_1 and the training data σ_1 , and let σ_1^k denote σ_1 in the k -th round. $h_1^k \in \mathcal{H}_1$ is trained on σ_1^k by minimizing the empirical risk, so for any $h_1 \in \mathcal{H}_1$, we have

$$D(h_1^k, \sigma_1^k) \leq D(h_1, \sigma_1^k). \quad (12)$$

h_2^k randomly selects u unlabeled instances to label and adds them into σ_1^k to get σ_1^{k+1} . Let S_2^k denote these u newly labeled examples, i.e., $\sigma_1^{k+1} = \sigma_1^k \cup S_2^k$, the $h_1^{k+1} \in \mathcal{H}_1$ is trained on σ_1^{k+1} by minimizing the empirical risk, so for any $h_1^k \in \mathcal{H}_1$, we have

$$D(h_1^{k+1}, \sigma_1^{k+1}) \leq D(h_1^k, \sigma_1^{k+1}). \quad (13)$$

Let $D_{|S_2^k}(h_1^{k+1}, h_2^k)$ denote the number of inconsistent examples between h_1^{k+1} and h_2^k on S_2^k , from Equation 13 we get

$$D(h_1^{k+1}, \sigma_1^k) + D_{|S_2^k}(h_1^{k+1}, h_2^k) \leq D(h_1^k, \sigma_1^k) + D_{|S_2^k}(h_1^k, h_2^k). \quad (14)$$

With Equations 12 and 14 we have

$$D_{|S_2^k}(h_1^{k+1}, h_2^k) \leq D_{|S_2^k}(h_1^k, h_2^k). \quad (15)$$

Since the examples in S_2^k are drawn randomly from the distribution, with Equation 15 we get

$$\mathbb{E}\left(\frac{D_{|S_2^k}(h_1^{k+1}, h_2^k)}{|S_2^k|}\right) \leq \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{D_{|S_2^k}(h_1^k, h_2^k)}{|S_2^k|}\right), \quad (16)$$

i.e., $d(h_1^{k+1}, h_2^k) \leq d(h_1^k, h_2^k)$. Similarly, we get $d(h_1^k, h_2^{k+1}) \leq d(h_1^k, h_2^k)$. \square

Remark: Theorem 1 shows that when $\Theta_i > \frac{i \cdot \varepsilon_1^0}{2}$ and $\Delta_i > \frac{i \cdot \varepsilon_2^0}{2}$, the error rate of h_v^i ($v = 1, 2$) is smaller than that of h_v^0 . If we require $\xi_1^1 < \varepsilon_1^0$ and $\xi_2^1 < \varepsilon_2^0$, Θ_1 and Δ_1 should be larger than $\frac{\varepsilon_1^0}{2}$ and $\frac{\varepsilon_2^0}{2}$, respectively, i.e., $d(h_1^1, h_2^0) > \varepsilon_2^0 + \frac{\varepsilon_1^0}{2}$ and $d(h_1^0, h_2^1) > \varepsilon_1^0 + \frac{\varepsilon_2^0}{2}$. Now, Theorem 2 indicates that $d(h_1^0, h_2^0) \geq d(h_1^1, h_2^0)$ and $d(h_1^0, h_2^0) \geq d(h_1^0, h_2^1)$. It is easy to know that the disagreement $d(h_1^0, h_2^0)$ between the two initial classifiers h_1^0 and h_2^0 should be at least larger than

$\max[\varepsilon_1^0 + \frac{\varepsilon_2^0}{2}, \varepsilon_2^0 + \frac{\varepsilon_1^0}{2}]$. Therefore, it could be recognized that the two views used in co-training [11], the two different learning algorithms used in [12], and the two different parameter configurations used in [17] are actually exploited to make the two initial classifiers have large disagreement. It does not matter whether the disagreement comes from the two views or not. This explains why the disagreement-based approaches can work.

In the following parts of this section we will discuss whether the condition in Theorem 1 can be satisfied in the applications with or without two views.

2.1.1. Co-Training

In real-world applications, co-training can be implemented when there exist two views. First, we show that the condition in Theorem 1 could be satisfied in co-training. An extreme case is that the two views are exactly the same and the two-view setting degenerates into the single-view setting. To analyze co-training, we should know some prior knowledge about the two views. There have been some theoretical analyses on co-training, i.e., conditional independence analysis and expansion analysis.

Conditionally Independent Views. When Blum and Mitchell [11] proposed co-training, they assumed there exist two sufficient and redundant views in the data. If the two views are conditionally independent to each other, they proved that co-training can boost the performance of weak classifiers to arbitrarily high by using unlabeled data. Here, we give Theorem 3 for co-training with conditionally independent views.

Theorem 3 *Suppose $0 \leq \varepsilon_1^0, \varepsilon_2^0 \leq \zeta \leq \frac{1}{6}$ and the data have two conditionally independent views, the condition $\Theta_i > \frac{i \cdot \varepsilon_1^0}{2}$ and $\Delta_i > \frac{i \cdot \varepsilon_2^0}{2}$ in Theorem 1 could hold before ε_1^i (the error rate of h_1^i) and ε_2^i (the error rate of h_2^i) decrease to $\frac{1}{2(1-2\zeta)}\varepsilon_1^0$ and $\frac{1}{2(1-2\zeta)}\varepsilon_2^0$, respectively. Here $\frac{1}{2} \leq \frac{1}{2(1-2\zeta)} \leq \frac{3}{4}$.*

Proof. In the two-view setting, for an example (x, y) , let $h_1^i(x)$ denote the label predicted by the classifier in the i -th round of the first view and let $h_2^i(x)$ denote the label predicted by the classifier in the i -th round of the second

view. The two views are conditionally independent to each other means that the classifier in the first view is independent of the classifier in the second view to make predictions. So we have

$$\begin{aligned}
d(h_1^i, h_2^k) &= P(h_1^i(x) \neq h_2^k(x)) \\
&= P(h_1^i(x) = y)P(h_2^k(x) \neq y) + P(h_1^i(x) \neq y)P(h_2^k(x) = y) \\
&= (1 - \varepsilon_1^i)\varepsilon_2^k + \varepsilon_1^i(1 - \varepsilon_2^k) \\
&= \varepsilon_2^k + (1 - 2\zeta)\varepsilon_1^i \quad \text{w.r.t. } \varepsilon_2^k < \varepsilon_2^0
\end{aligned}$$

Thus, when $\varepsilon_1^i > \frac{1}{2(1-2\zeta)}\varepsilon_1^0$, we get $\Theta_i = \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} (d(h_1^i, h_2^k) - \varepsilon_2^k) > \frac{i \cdot \varepsilon_1^0}{2}$. Similarly, when $\varepsilon_2^i > \frac{1}{2(1-2\zeta)}\varepsilon_2^0$, we get $\Delta_i = \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} (d(h_1^k, h_2^i) - \varepsilon_1^k) > \frac{i \cdot \varepsilon_2^0}{2}$. \square

Remark: Theorem 3 shows that if the two views are conditionally independent, the condition in Theorem 1 holds in a number of learning rounds (before the error rates decrease to some degree). It could not guarantee that the condition in Theorem 1 always holds in the learning process, which is different from that co-training can boost the performance to arbitrarily high with the conditional independence condition. This is understandable because our theorem provides a general analysis and does not depend on any strong condition. In fact, we will prove that the performance could not always be improved as the learning process goes on in Section 2.2.

Expanding Views. Balcan et al. [30] pointed out that “expansion” of the underlying data distribution is sufficient for co-training to succeed. Furthermore, they also assumed that the classifier in each view is never “confident but wrong”, which means that if the classifier makes a prediction, the prediction is correct. Here, we give Theorem 4 for co-training with expanding views.

Theorem 4 *Suppose the “expansion” assumption holds and the classifier in each view is never “confident but wrong”, the condition $\Theta_i > \frac{i \cdot \varepsilon_1^0}{2}$ and $\Delta_i > \frac{i \cdot \varepsilon_2^0}{2}$ in Theorem 1 holds.*

Proof. Let S_1 denote the examples predicted correctly by the first view and let S_2 denote the examples predicted correctly by the second view. $P(S_1 \oplus S_2)$

denotes the probability mass on the examples predicted correctly by just one view. The “expansion” assumption means that for some $\alpha > 0$ and any S_1, S_2 , $P(S_1 \oplus S_2) \geq \alpha \min [P(S_1 \wedge S_2), P(\overline{S_1} \wedge \overline{S_2})]$ holds. It implies that $P(S_1 \oplus S_2)$ has a lower bound, i.e., $P(S_1 \oplus S_2) > 0$. It is easy to find that $d(h_1^i, h_2^k) = P(S_1^i \oplus S_2^k) > 0$.

The classifier in each view is never “confident but wrong” means that if the classifier makes a prediction, the prediction is correct, i.e., $\varepsilon_1^0 = \varepsilon_2^k = 0$. Thus, we get $\Theta_i = \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} (d(h_1^i, h_2^k) - \varepsilon_2^k) > \frac{i \cdot \varepsilon_1^0}{2}$. Similarly, we get $\Delta_i = \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} (d(h_1^k, h_2^i) - \varepsilon_1^k) > \frac{i \cdot \varepsilon_2^0}{2}$. \square

Remark: Theorem 4 shows that if the two views meet the expansion condition, the condition in Theorem 1 holds. It implies that our result is more general. However, these previous results only focus on co-training, they can not explain why the single-view disagreement-based approaches can work.

2.1.2. Single-View Disagreement-Based Approaches

Secondly, we study the setting where there exists only one view and give Theorem 5 to show that there exist two hypotheses which have large disagreement.

Theorem 5 *For any real numbers $0 < a, b < \frac{1}{2}$, there exist two hypotheses h_1 and h_2 which satisfy the following conditions: $\mathbf{err}(h_1) = a$, $\mathbf{err}(h_2) = b$ and $|a - b| \leq d(h_1, h_2) \leq (a + b)$.*

Proof. Without loss of generality, we assume that $a \leq b$ and that h_1 is the hypothesis whose error rate is a , i.e., $\mathbf{err}(h_1) = a$. Now we show how to find the hypothesis h_2 which satisfies the conditions: $\mathbf{err}(h_2) = b$ and $|a - b| \leq d(h_1, h_2) \leq (a + b)$.

(i) When $d(h_1, h_2) = |a - b| = b - a$. Let $T_1 = \{x \in \mathcal{X} : h_1(x) \neq c(x)\}$. Select a set of size $(b - a)$ from $\mathcal{X} - T_1$ and let T_2 denote this set, i.e., $T_2 \subset \mathcal{X} - T_1$ and $P(T_2) = b - a$. Then, let h_2 be the hypothesis corresponding to the following

classification rule:

$$h_2(x) = \begin{cases} h_1(x) & \text{if } x \in T_1 \\ -h_1(x) & \text{if } x \in T_2 \\ h_1(x) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} . \quad (17)$$

(ii) When $(b-a) < d(h_1, h_2) \leq (a+b)$. Select a set of size $\frac{a+b-d(h_1, h_2)}{2}$ from T_1 and let T_3 denote this set, i.e., $T_3 \subset T_1$ and $P(T_3) = \frac{a+b-d(h_1, h_2)}{2}$; select a set of size $\frac{d(h_1, h_2)+b-a}{2}$ from $\mathcal{X} - T_1$ and let T_4 denote this set, i.e., $T_4 \subset \mathcal{X} - T_1$ and $P(T_4) = \frac{d(h_1, h_2)+b-a}{2}$. Then, let h_2 be the hypothesis corresponding to the following classification rule:

$$h_2(x) = \begin{cases} h_1(x) & \text{if } x \in T_3 \\ -h_1(x) & \text{if } x \in T_1 - T_3 \\ -h_1(x) & \text{if } x \in T_4 \\ h_1(x) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} . \quad (18)$$

□

Remark: Theorem 5 indicates that fixing the error rates of two hypotheses, the disagreement between them can vary from $|a-b|$ to $(a+b)$. For example, there exist hypotheses h_1^i and h_2^k which have large disagreement and satisfy the condition that $d(h_1^i, h_2^k) > \frac{2}{3}\varepsilon_1^i + \varepsilon_2^k$ and $d(h_1^k, h_2^i) > \varepsilon_1^k + \frac{2}{3}\varepsilon_2^i$, i.e., $\Theta_i = \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} (d(h_1^i, h_2^k) - \varepsilon_2^k) > \frac{2^i}{3}\varepsilon_1^i$ and $\Delta_i = \sum_{k=0}^{i-1} (d(h_1^k, h_2^i) - \varepsilon_1^k) > \frac{2^i}{3}\varepsilon_2^i$. Before the error rates ε_1^i and ε_2^i decrease to $\frac{3}{4}\varepsilon_1^0$ and $\frac{3}{4}\varepsilon_2^0$, respectively, the condition $\Theta_i > \frac{i}{2}\varepsilon_1^0$ and $\Delta_i > \frac{i}{2}\varepsilon_2^0$ in Theorem 1 holds.

2.2. Why There is No Further Improvement After a Number of Rounds

In the above section, we prove that the learning performance of the classifiers can be improved by exploiting unlabeled data. Can the classifiers be always improved as the learning process goes on? It is a very important and interesting problem. In fact, in some empirical studies such as the natural language processing community [33], it has been observed that the classifiers could not be improved further after a number of rounds in disagreement-based approaches,

and if the process is going on they would be degraded. This is very different from what has been disclosed by previous theoretical studies, e.g., the performance of the classifiers can be boosted to arbitrarily high [11, 30]. Our following theoretical analysis in this section will give an explanation to this.

Theorem 6 *In Algorithm 1, for any $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$, there exists some integer $N > 0$, for any integer $t \geq N$, the following inequalities hold ($v = 1, 2$):*

$$P(d(h_v^t, h_v^N) \leq \epsilon) \geq 1 - \delta, \quad (19)$$

$$P(|d(h_1^t, h_2^t) - d(h_1^N, h_2^N)| \leq \epsilon) \geq 1 - \delta. \quad (20)$$

Proof. Let σ_v^k denote the training data σ_v in the k -th round, let \mathcal{D}_v denote the distribution of examples in σ_v^k when $k \rightarrow +\infty$ and let h'_v denote the hypothesis which is perfectly consistent with \mathcal{D}_v . Considering that h_v^k is trained with σ_v^k which contain $l + u \cdot k$ examples from \mathcal{D}_v , according to the standard PAC learning theory, there exists some integer $N > 0$, for any integer $t \geq N$, $P(d(h_v^t, h'_v) \leq \epsilon/8) \geq 1 - \delta/2$. Considering that $d(h_v^t, h_v^N) \leq d(h_v^t, h'_v) + d(h_v^N, h'_v)$, we get $P(d(h_v^t, h_v^N) \leq \epsilon) \geq 1 - \delta$. Since

$$\begin{aligned} |d(h_1^t, h_2^t) - d(h'_1, h'_2)| &= |d(h_1^t, h_2^t) - d(h_1^t, h'_2) + d(h_1^t, h'_2) - d(h'_1, h'_2) \\ &\quad + d(h_1^t, h'_2) - d(h'_1, h'_2) + d(h'_1, h'_2) - d(h'_1, h_2^t)| \\ &\leq |d(h_1^t, h_2^t) - d(h_1^t, h'_2)| + |d(h_1^t, h'_2) - d(h'_1, h'_2)| \\ &\quad + |d(h_1^t, h'_2) - d(h'_1, h'_2)| + |d(h'_1, h'_2) - d(h'_1, h_2^t)| \\ &\leq d(h_1^t, h'_1) + 3 \cdot d(h_2^t, h'_2), \end{aligned}$$

we have

$$\begin{aligned} |d(h_1^t, h_2^t) - d(h_1^N, h_2^N)| &\leq |d(h_1^t, h_2^t) - d(h'_1, h'_2)| + |d(h_1^N, h_2^N) - d(h'_1, h'_2)| \\ &\leq 2 \cdot d(h_1^t, h'_1) + 6 \cdot d(h_2^t, h'_2). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we get $P(|d(h_1^t, h_2^t) - d(h_1^N, h_2^N)| \leq \epsilon) \geq 1 - \delta$. \square

Remark: Equation 19 indicates that the error rates of the classifiers will converge, which implies that the classifiers could not be improved further after a

number of learning rounds. Actually, the training data for one classifier may contain noisy examples mistakenly labeled by the other classifier, so the surrogate distribution \mathcal{D}_v ($v = 1, 2$) is different from the underlying distribution \mathcal{D} . Without strong assumptions, e.g., *two views are conditionally independent* or *the classifier is never “confident but wrong”*, it is very hard to find a good approximation of the target concept c with \mathcal{D}_v . Equation 20 indicates that the disagreement between the classifiers will converge. As the classifiers label more and more unlabeled instances for each other, they will become more and more similar and the disagreement between them will decrease closely to 0. In this case, the disagreement-based process degenerates into self-training. If we continue it, the risk of over-fitting will be great and the performance will be degraded as observed in the empirical study of [33].

2.3. Empirical Studies

In this section, we provide empirical studies to verify our theoretical analyses, i.e., whether the disagreement and error rates of the classifiers will converge, and whether larger disagreement will lead to better improvement.

We use the *course* data set [11] and three UCI data sets, i.e. *kr-vs-kp*, *mushroom* and *tic-tac-toe* [37]. The *course* data set has two views (i.e., *pages* view and *links* view) and contains 1,051 examples, among which there are 230 positive examples (roughly 22%). The UCI data sets do not have two views. *kr-vs-kp* contains 3,196 examples, among which there are 1,527 positive examples (roughly 48%); *mushroom* contains 8,124 examples, among which there are 3,916 positive examples (roughly 48%); *tic-tac-toe* contains 958 examples, among which there are 332 positive examples (roughly 35%). On each data set, we randomly select 25% data as the test set while using the remaining 75% data to generate a labeled data L whose size will be mentioned in Figures 1, 2 and 3, and the rest of the 75% data are used to generate the unlabeled data U .

In the experiments, we let each classifier label its most confident unlabeled instances for the other in each round to reduce label noise. However, this way will cause a problem that the training set is not an i.i.d. sample from the

underlying distribution. To reduce the influence of non-i.i.d. sample, we create a small pool U' of size 75 by drawing instances randomly from the large unlabeled data U and select the confident instances from U' to label, as that in [11]. They reported that using a small pool can get better results than selecting confident instances directly from U , because it forces the classifiers to select more representative instances. The number of newly labeled positive and negative examples is in proportion to the positive and negative examples in the data set. In our experiments, in order to study the convergence of disagreement and error rates, the disagreement-based process proceeds until no unlabeled instance in U' is labeled as the positive class. The size of L plays an important role in disagreement-based approaches, we run experiments with different L on each data set. Each experiment is repeated for 100 runs and the average performance is recorded. We run the experiments with various base classifiers including SMO, J48, MultilayerPerceptron and NaiveBayes in WEKA [38].

2.3.1. Convergence of Disagreement and Error rates

We run co-training on the *course* data set by using NaiveBayes, and run the single-view disagreement-based approach on the UCI data sets by using two different classifiers, i.e., SMO and J48 on the *kr-vs-kp* data set, SMO and NaiveBayes on the *mushroom* data set, and SMO and MultilayerPerceptron on the *tic-tac-toe* data set. The error rates, the disagreement between the two classifiers are depicted in Figures 1 and 2.

In Figure 1(a), the disagreement between the classifiers increases in the first several rounds and then decreases. This is because in *course-3-9-1-3* the initial labeled training data set L is too small, the two initial classifiers h_1^0 and h_2^0 are simple and only learn small part of the task. After co-training is executed, the amount of training examples for each classifier increases. Then each retrained classifier learns more about the task from its own perspective and the disagreement between the classifiers increases. As the two classifiers label more and more unlabeled instances for each other, they become more and more similar and the disagreement between them decreases.




Figure 1: Experimental results of co-training. NaiveBayes is used to train the classifiers. $C1$ and $C2$ denote the two classifiers trained in the two views, respectively. $Disagreement$ denotes the disagreement of the two classifiers. $data-a-b-c-d$ means that on the data set $data$, the initial labeled example set contains a positive examples and b negative examples, and in each round each classifier labels c positive and d negative examples for the other classifier.

In general, Figures 1 and 2 show that except the first several rounds, the disagreement between the classifiers decreases or converges as the process goes on. If the disagreement does not converge, the error rates of the classifiers seem to decrease as the disagreement decreases, e.g., Figures 2(g) to (i). If the disagreement converges, the error rates of the classifiers also seem to converge, e.g., Figure 2(d) to (f). This validates that our Theorem 6 which shows that the disagreement and error rates of the classifiers in disagreement-based approaches will converge is meaningful.

2.3.2. Larger Disagreement Leading to Better Improvement

In order to study the disagreement further, more experiments are conducted. We run the disagreement-based approach with two different groups of classifiers on the *pages* view of *course* data set. The first group is SMO and MultilayerPerceptron, and the second group is SMO and NaiveBayes. With this experiment, it is clearer whether the classifiers with larger disagreement could lead to better improvement. The results are depicted in Figure 3. Note that Figures 3(a) to (c) use the same group of classifiers under different sizes of L , while Figures 3(d) to (e) use another group of classifiers under different sizes of L .

By comparing Figures 3(a) with (d), (b) with (e) and (c) with (f), it can be found that the disagreement between the two classifiers trained by the second




Figure 2: Experimental results of single-view disagreement-based approach. *SMO* and *J48* (or *SMO* and *NaiveBayes*, *SMO* and *MultilayerPerceptron*) denote the two classifiers, respectively. *Disagreement* denotes the disagreement of the two classifiers. *data-a-b-c-d* means that on the data set *data*, the initial labeled example set contains *a* positive examples and *b* negative examples, and in each round each classifier labels *c* positive and *d* negative examples for the other classifier.

group is larger than that trained by the first group. Note that, *SMO* appears in both groups, and its improvement is larger in Figures 3(d) to (f) than that in Figures 3(a) to (c), respectively. This validates that our result in Section 2.1 is meaningful.




Figure 3: Comparing the performance by using two different groups of classifiers on the *pages* view of *course* data set. *SMO* and *MultilayerPerceptron* (or *SMO* and *NaiveBayes*) denote the two classifiers, respectively. *Disagreement* denotes the disagreement of the two classifiers. *data-a-b-c-d* means that on the data set *data*, the initial labeled example set contains *a* positive examples and *b* negative examples, and in each round each classifier labels *c* positive and *d* negative examples for the other classifier.

3. Sufficient and Necessary Condition

All previous theoretical analyses on co-training focus on the sufficient condition, i.e., under what condition co-training could work, so a fundamental issue may arise: what is the sufficient and necessary condition for co-training to succeed? In this section we will study what the sufficient and necessary condition is. For the convenience of description, we first suppose that the data have two views and then discuss how to generalize it to the case where the data have only one view.

Let $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2$ denote the instance space, where \mathcal{X}_1 and \mathcal{X}_2 correspond to the two views, respectively. $\mathcal{Y} = \{-1, +1\}$ is the label space, $L = \{(\langle x_1^1, x_2^1 \rangle, y^1), \dots, (\langle x_1^l, x_2^l \rangle, y^l)\} \subset \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ are the labeled data, $U = \{\langle x_1^{l+1}, x_2^{l+1} \rangle, \dots, \langle x_1^{l+|U|}, x_2^{l+|U|} \rangle\} \subset \mathcal{X}$ are the unlabeled data. The labeled data L indepen-

dently and identically come from some unknown distribution \mathcal{D} , whose marginal distribution on \mathcal{X} is $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}}$, and the unlabeled data U independently and identically come from $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}}$. $c = (c_1, c_2)$ is the target concept, where c_1 and c_2 are the target concepts in the two views, respectively, i.e., $c_1(x_1) = c_2(x_2) = y$ for any example $\langle x_1, x_2 \rangle, y$.

3.1. Graph View of Co-Training

When Blum and Mitchell [11] proposed co-training, they gave a bipartite graph over two views for intuition. The left-hand side of the bipartite graph has one node for each instance in view \mathcal{X}_1 and the right-hand side has one node for each instance in view \mathcal{X}_2 . Since each instance $x = \langle x_1, x_2 \rangle$ has two views, there is an undirected edge between the left-hand x_1 and the right-hand x_2 . Considering that each view \mathcal{X}_v ($v = 1, 2$) corresponds to a graph where each node is one instance and there is an undirected edge between two nodes if they have the same class label, it naturally inspires us to study co-training with the graphs over two views.

Generally, assigning a label to an unlabeled instance x_v^t ($v = 1, 2$) based on a labeled example x_v^s can be viewed as estimating the conditional probability $P(y(x_v^t) = y(x_v^s) | x_v^t, x_v^s)$. For controlling the confidence, we can set a threshold $\eta_v > 0$ (generally $\eta_v = 1/2$). If $P(y(x_v^t) = y(x_v^s) | x_v^t, x_v^s) < \eta_v$, we set $P(y(x_v^t) = y(x_v^s) | x_v^t, x_v^s) = 0$. Note that $P(y(x_v^t) = y(x_v^s) | x_v^t, x_v^s) = 0$ does not mean that x_v^s and x_v^t must have different labels, since the data may not provide any helpful information for estimating the similarity between x_v^s and x_v^t . We can assign a label to x_v^t according to $P(y(x_v^t) = y(x_v^s) | x_v^t, x_v^s)$ and the label of x_v^s . For two labeled examples x_v^w and x_v^q , if they have the same label, we set $P(y(x_v^w) = y(x_v^q) | x_v^w, x_v^q) = 1$ and otherwise $P(y(x_v^w) = y(x_v^q) | x_v^w, x_v^q) = 0$. Let each entry P_v^{ij} of the matrix P_v correspond to $P(y(x_v^i) = y(x_v^j) | x_v^i, x_v^j)$ ($1 \leq i, j \leq l + |U|$) and $f_v = \begin{bmatrix} f_v^L \\ f_v^U \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} Y^L \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$. Without loss of generality, P_v can be normalized to a probabilistic transition matrix according to Equation 21.

$$P_v^{ij} \leftarrow P_v^{ij} / \sum_{t=1}^{l+|U|} P_v^{it} \quad (21)$$

Then the labels can be propagated from labeled examples to unlabeled instances according to the process [39]: 1) Propagate $f_v = P_v f_v$; 2) Clamp the labeled data $f_v^L = Y^L$; 3) Repeat from step 1 until f_v converges. The labels of unlabeled instances in U can be assigned according to $\text{sign}(f_v^U)$. For some unlabeled instance x_v^t if $f_v^t = 0$, it means that label propagation on graph P_v has no idea on x_v^t . So in each view the classifier can be viewed as label propagation from labeled examples to unlabeled instances on graph P_v . The error rate $\text{err}(f_v^U)$, the accuracy $\text{acc}(f_v^U)$ and the uncertainty $\perp(f_v^U)$ of this graph-based approach can be counted on U as $\text{acc}(f_v^U) = P_{x_v^t \in U}[f_v^U(x_v^t) \cdot c_v(x_v^t) > 0]$, $\text{err}(f_v^U) = P_{x_v^t \in U}[f_v^U(x_v^t) \cdot c_v(x_v^t) < 0]$ and $\perp(f_v^U) = P_{x_v^t \in U}[f_v^U(x_v^t) = 0]$. In one view, the labels can be propagated from initial labeled examples to some unlabeled instances in U and these newly labeled examples can be added into the other view. Then the other view can propagate the labels of initial labeled examples and these newly labeled examples to the remaining unlabeled instances in U . This process can be repeated until the stopping condition is met. Thus, co-training can be re-described as the combinative label propagation process over two views in Algorithm 2, where $S_1^k \oplus S_2^k = (S_1^k - S_2^k) \cup (S_2^k - S_1^k)$.

Label propagation needs a graph which is represented by the matrix P . In this section, we focus on co-training with two graphs P_1 and P_2 constructed from the two views. How to construct a graph is an important issue studied in graph-based approaches [40, 41] and is beyond the scope of this article.

3.2. Co-Training with Perfect Graphs

First, we assume that P_v ($v = 1, 2$) is *perfect graph*, i.e., if $P(y(x_v^t) = y(x_v^s) | x_v^t, x_v^s) > 0$, x_v^s and x_v^t must have the same label. It means that the classifier is either “confident of labeling” or “having no idea”. Before showing the sufficient and necessary condition for co-training with perfect graphs to succeed, we need Lemma 1 to indicate the relationship between label propagation and connectivity.

Lemma 1 *Suppose that P is perfect graph. Unlabeled instance x^{t_0} can be labeled by label propagation on graph P if and only if it can be connected with*

Algorithm 2 Graph-based description of co-training

Input: Labeled data L , unlabeled data U and probabilistic transition matrices P_1 and P_2 .

Output: f_v^U corresponding to S_v^k ($v = 1, 2$).

Initialize: Perform label propagation from labeled data L to unlabeled data U on graph P_v and get the labeled examples set S_v^0 ;

for $k = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ **do**

if $S_1^k \oplus S_2^k \neq \emptyset$ **then**

 Perform label propagation from labeled examples set $S_{3-v}^k \cap (U - S_v^k)$ to unlabeled data $U - S_v^k$ on graph P_v and get the labeled examples set T_v^k ;

$S_v^{k+1} = S_v^k \cup T_v^k$;

else

break;

end if

end for

some labeled example x^{t_r} in graph P through a path R in the form of $V_R = \{t_0, t_1, \dots, t_r\}$, where $P^{t_\rho t_{\rho+1}} > 0$ ($\rho = 0, \dots, r-1$).

Proof. It is well known [39] that the label propagation process has the following closed form solution for each connected component in graph P .

$$f^{U_\theta} = (I - P^{U_\theta U_\theta})^{-1} P^{U_\theta L_\theta} Y^{L_\theta}. \quad (22)$$

Here $U_\theta \cup L_\theta$ is a connected component π_θ in graph P , where $U_\theta \subseteq U$ and $L_\theta \subseteq L$.

If an unlabeled instance x^t cannot be connected with any labeled example, with respect to Equation 22, we know that $f^t = 0$. If x^{t_0} can be connected with some labeled example x^{t_r} through a path R in the form of $V_R = \{t_0, t_1, \dots, t_r\}$, considering that P is a perfect graph we get $|f^{t_0}| \geq \prod_{\rho=0}^{r-1} P^{t_\rho t_{\rho+1}} |y^{t_r}|$. Thus, x^{t_0} can be labeled with label $\text{sign}(f^{t_0})$ by label propagation. \square

Lemma 1 indicates that when every unlabeled instance can be connected

with some labeled example through a path in perfect graph P , label propagation on graph P is successful. Now we give Theorem 7.

Theorem 7 *Suppose P_v ($v = 1, 2$) is perfect graph. $f_v^U(x_v^t) \cdot c_v(x_v^t) > 0$ for all unlabeled instance $x^t \in U$ ($t = l + 1, \dots, l + |U|$) if and only if $S_1^k \oplus S_2^k$ is not \emptyset in Algorithm 2 until $S_v^k = L \cup U$.*

Proof. Here we give a proof by contradiction. Suppose that for any unlabeled instance $x^t \in U$ ($t = l + 1, \dots, l + |U|$), $f_v^U(x_v^t) \cdot c_v(x_v^t) > 0$. From Lemma 1 and the process in Algorithm 2 we know that for any unlabeled instance $x^{t_0} \in U$, x^{t_0} can be connected with some labeled example $x^{t_r} \in L$ through a path R in the form of $V_R = \{t_0, t_1, \dots, t_r\}$, where $P_1^{t_\rho t_{\rho+1}} > 0$ or $P_2^{t_\rho t_{\rho+1}} > 0$ ($\rho = 0, \dots, r - 1$). If $S_1^k \oplus S_2^k = \emptyset$ while $S_v^k \neq L \cup U$, there must exist some unlabeled instances in $U - S_v^k$. Considering that S_v^k are obtained by label propagation on graph P_v , so from Lemma 1 we know that for any unlabeled instance $x^h \in U - S_v^k$, there is no path between x^h and any labeled example $x^d \in S_v^k$ in graph P_v , i.e., $P_v^{hd} = 0$. It is in contradiction with that any unlabeled instance in U can be connected with some labeled example in L through a path R . Therefore, if $f_v^U(x_v^t) \cdot c_v(x_v^t) > 0$ for all unlabeled instance x^t , $S_1^k \oplus S_2^k$ is not \emptyset until $S_v^k = L \cup U$.

Suppose the graph P_v contains λ_v connected components. If one example in some connected component is labeled, from Lemma 1 we know that all unlabeled instances in this connected component can be labeled by label propagation. If $S_1^k \oplus S_2^k$ is not \emptyset until $S_v^k = L \cup U$, in the k -th iteration of Algorithm 2, the unlabeled instances in at least one connected component of either P_1 or P_2 will be labeled by label propagation. Thus, after at most $\lambda_1 + \lambda_2$ iterations all unlabeled instances in U can be assigned with labels by the process in Algorithm 2. Considering that P_v in each view is perfect graph, we get that for any unlabeled instance $x^t \in U$, $f_v^U(x_v^t) \cdot c_v(x_v^t) > 0$. \square

Remark: Theorem 7 provides the sufficient and necessary condition for co-training with perfect graphs to succeed. With this theorem, for tasks with two views, if two perfect graphs can be constructed from the two views, we can

decide whether co-training will be successful.

3.3. Co-Training with Non-perfect Graphs

In many real-world applications, it is generally hard to construct a perfect graph. We will discuss the case when the perfect graph assumption is waived in this section.

In label propagation on *non-perfect graph*, an unlabeled instance may be connected with labeled examples belonging to different classes. As discussed in the proof of Lemma 1, the label propagation for each connected component π_θ in graph P has the closed form of $f^{U_\theta} = (I - P^{U_\theta U_\theta})^{-1} P^{U_\theta L_\theta} Y^{L_\theta}$. Let $A = (I - P^{U_\theta U_\theta})^{-1}$, we can get Equation 23 from Equation 22.

$$f^t = \sum_{s \in L_\theta} \sum_{j \in U_\theta} A^{tj} P^{js} Y^s \quad (t \in U_\theta) \quad (23)$$

From Equation 23 we know that in each connected component the contribution of the labeled example x^s ($s \in L_\theta$) to the unlabeled instance x^t ($t \in U_\theta$) is $\sum_{j \in U_\theta} A^{tj} P^{js}$. Now we define the *positive contribution* and *negative contribution* to an unlabeled instance.

Definition 1 Let L_θ denote the labeled examples and U_θ denote the unlabeled instances belonging to the connected component π_θ in graph P . For an unlabeled instance x^t ($t \in U_\theta$), the positive contribution to x^t is

$$\sum_{Y^s=y^t} \sum_{j \in U_\theta} A^{tj} P^{js} |Y^s| \quad (24)$$

and the negative contribution to x^t is

$$\sum_{Y^s \neq y^t} \sum_{j \in U_\theta} A^{tj} P^{js} |Y^s|. \quad (25)$$

If the positive contribution is larger than the negative contribution, the unlabeled instance x^t will be labeled correctly by label propagation⁵. Now we give Theorem 8 for co-training with non-perfect graphs.

⁵We neglect the probability mass on the instances for which the non-zero positive contribution is equal to the non-zero negative contribution in this article.

Theorem 8 Suppose P_v ($v = 1, 2$) is non-perfect graph. $f_v^U(x_v^t) \cdot c_v(x_v^t) > 0$ for all unlabeled instance $x^t \in U$ ($t = l + 1, \dots, l + |U|$) if and only if both (1) and (2) hold in Algorithm 2: (1) $S_1^k \oplus S_2^k$ is not \emptyset until $S_v^k = L \cup U$; (2) For any unlabeled instance in the connected component $\pi_v^{\theta_k}$, where $\pi_v^{\theta_k} \subseteq (U - S_v^k)$ and $\pi_v^{\theta_k} \cap S_{3-v}^k \neq \emptyset$, its positive contribution is larger than its negative contribution.

Proof. Here we give a proof by contradiction. Suppose for any unlabeled instance $x^t \in U$, $f_v^U(x_v^t) \cdot c_v(x_v^t) > 0$. If $S_1^k \oplus S_2^k$ is equal to \emptyset while $S_v^k \neq L \cup U$, for any unlabeled instance $x = \langle x_1, x_2 \rangle$ in $U - S_v^k$, $f_v^U(x_v) = 0$. It is in contradiction with $f_v^U(x_v) \cdot c_v(x_v) > 0$. If for some unlabeled instance x in the connected component $\pi_v^{\theta_k}$, where $\pi_v^{\theta_k} \subseteq (U - S_v^k)$ and $\pi_v^{\theta_k} \cap S_{3-v}^k \neq \emptyset$, its positive contribution is no larger than negative contribution, $f_v^U(x_v) \cdot c_v(x_v) \leq 0$. It is also in contradiction with $f_v^U(x_v) \cdot c_v(x_v) > 0$.

If the conditions (1) and (2) hold, with Definition 1 it is easy to get that for any unlabeled instance $x^t \in U$, $f_v^U(x_v^t) \cdot c_v(x_v^t) > 0$. \square

Remark: Theorem 8 provides the sufficient and necessary condition for co-training with non-perfect graphs to succeed. Note that in both Theorem 7 and Theorem 8, it is the necessary condition that $S_1^k \oplus S_2^k$ is not \emptyset until $S_v^k = L \cup U$ ($v = 1, 2$). In the following part we will further study what this necessary condition means and how to verify it before co-training.

First, we introduce the combinative graph P_c in Equation 26 which aggregates graphs P_1 and P_2 .

$$P_c^{ij} = \max[P_1^{ij}, P_2^{ij}] \quad (26)$$

Then we give Theorem 9 to indicate the necessary condition, i.e., each unlabeled instance can be connected with some labeled example in graph P_c .

Theorem 9 $S_1^k \oplus S_2^k$ is not \emptyset in Algorithm 2 until $S_v^k = L \cup U$ ($v = 1, 2$) if and only if each unlabeled instance $x^{t_0} \in U$ can be connected with some labeled example $x^{t_r} \in L$ in graph P_c through a path R_c in the form of $V_{R_c} = \{t_0, t_1, \dots, t_r\}$, where $P_c^{t_\rho t_{\rho+1}} > 0$ ($\rho = 0, \dots, r - 1$).

Proof. If we neglect the probability mass on the instances for which the non-zero positive contribution is equal to the non-zero negative contribution in this article, similarly to the proof of Lemma 1 we get that: unlabeled instance can be labeled by label propagation on graph P if and only if it can be connected with some labeled example in graph P through a path.

If $S_1^k \oplus S_2^k$ is not \emptyset until $S_v^k = L \cup U$, any unlabeled instance $x^t \in U$ can be labeled by the process in Algorithm 2. So x^t must belong to one of S_1^0, S_2^0, T_1^k or T_2^k for some $k \geq 0$. Considering Equation 26, the above discussions and the fact that S_1^0, S_2^0, T_1^k and T_2^k have been obtained in previous iterations by label propagation and will be used as labeled examples in next iteration, we can get that x^{t_0} can be connected with some labeled example $x^{t_r} \in L$ in graph P_c through a path R_c .

If each unlabeled instance $x^{t_0} \in U$ can be connected with some labeled example $x^{t_r} \in L$ through a path R_c , with respect to Equation 26, we can get that either $P_1^{t_\rho t_{\rho+1}}$ or $P_2^{t_\rho t_{\rho+1}}$ is larger than 0 for $\rho = 0, \dots, r-1$. Because x^{t_r} is a labeled example, with the above discussions and the process in Algorithm 2 we know that x^{t_ρ} ($\rho = 0, \dots, r-1$) can be labeled by label propagation on either P_1 or P_2 . Therefore, finally $S_v^k = L \cup U$. \square

3.4. Co-Training with ϵ -Good Graphs

It is overly optimistic to expect to learn the target concept using co-training with non-perfect graphs. While learning the approximately correct concept using co-training with approximately perfect graphs is more reasonable. In perfect graph, all edges between the instances are reliable; while in non-perfect graph, it is hard to know which and how many edges are reliable. Restricting the reliability and allowing an ϵ -fraction exception is more feasible in real-world applications. In this section, we focus on the approximately perfect graph and provide sufficient condition for co-training the approximately correct concept.

Let $\pi_v^1, \dots, \pi_v^{\lambda_v}$ ($v = 1, 2$) denote the λ_v connected components in graph P_v , the definitions of *purity* and ϵ -good graph are given as follows.

Definition 2 Let $\text{pur}(\pi_v^\theta)$ denote the purity of the connected component π_v^θ in graph P_v , then

$$\text{pur}(\pi_v^\theta) = \max \left[\frac{|\{x_v : x_v \in \pi_v^\theta \wedge c_v(x_v) = 1\}|}{|\pi_v^\theta|}, \frac{|\{x_v : x_v \in \pi_v^\theta \wedge c_v(x_v) = -1\}|}{|\pi_v^\theta|} \right]$$

If $\text{pur}(\pi_v^\theta) \geq 1 - \epsilon$ for all $1 \leq \theta \leq \lambda_v$, we say that P_v is an ϵ -good graph.

The purity of the connected component reflects the reliability of the graph.

With the purity, we can define the label of π_v^θ as $c_v(\pi_v^\theta)$.

$$c_v(\pi_v^\theta) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } |\{x_v : x_v \in \pi_v^\theta \wedge c_v(x_v) = 1\}| > |\{x_v : x_v \in \pi_v^\theta \wedge c_v(x_v) = -1\}| \\ -1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

With ϵ -good graph, predicting the labels of all π_v^θ correctly is sufficient to get a classifier whose error rate is no larger than ϵ . From Definition 1 we know that the *contribution* is related to the number of labeled examples in the connected component. In a connected component, if the labeled examples with label y ($y \in \{-1, 1\}$) is much more than that with label $-y$, the unlabeled instances belonging to this connected component may be labeled with y . Based on this, we assume graph P_v satisfies the following condition: in the connected component $\pi_v^{\theta_k}$ of graph P_v where $\pi_v^{\theta_k} \subseteq (U - S_v^k)$ and $\pi_v^{\theta_k} \cap S_{3-v}^k \neq \emptyset$, let f_v^k correspond to S_v^k , if $|\{x^t : x^t \in \pi_v^{\theta_k} \cap S_{3-v}^k \wedge f_{3-v}^k(x^t) \cdot y > 0\}| / |\pi_v^{\theta_k}| > |\{x^t : x^t \in \pi_v^{\theta_k} \cap S_{3-v}^k \wedge f_{3-v}^k(x^t) \cdot y < 0\}| / |\pi_v^{\theta_k}| + \gamma$, the unlabeled instances belonging to $\pi_v^{\theta_k}$ can be labeled with y by label propagation on graph P_v . Here $\gamma \in [0, 1)$ can be thought of as a form of *margin* which controls the confidence in label propagation. With this assumption, we get Theorem 10 which provides a margin-like sufficient condition for co-training the approximately correct concept with ϵ -good graphs.

Theorem 10 Suppose P_v ($v = 1, 2$) is ϵ -good graph. $\text{acc}(f_v^U) \geq 1 - \epsilon$ if both (1) and (2) hold in Algorithm 2: (1) $S_1^k \oplus S_2^k$ is not \emptyset until $S_v^k = L \cup U$; (2) In the connected component $\pi_v^{\theta_k}$, where $\pi_v^{\theta_k} \subseteq (U - S_v^k)$ and $\pi_v^{\theta_k} \cap S_{3-v}^k \neq \emptyset$, $|\{x^t : x^t \in \pi_v^{\theta_k} \cap S_{3-v}^k \wedge f_{3-v}^k(x^t) \cdot c_v(\pi_v^{\theta_k}) > 0\}| / |\pi_v^{\theta_k}| > |\{x^t : x^t \in \pi_v^{\theta_k} \cap S_{3-v}^k \wedge f_{3-v}^k(x^t) \cdot c_v(\pi_v^{\theta_k}) < 0\}| / |\pi_v^{\theta_k}| + \gamma$.

3.5. Relationship to Previous Results

As mentioned in Section 1, there are several theoretical analyses indicating that co-training can succeed if some conditions about the two views hold, i.e., *conditional independence*, *weak dependence* and α -*expansion*. Co-training is a representative paradigm of disagreement-based approaches, and we provide a *large disagreement* analysis for disagreement-based approaches in Section 2 which is also applicable to co-training. Now we will discuss the relationship between the graph-based analysis and previous results on co-training.

3.5.1. Conditional Independence

Blum and Mitchell [11] proved that when the two sufficient views are conditionally independent to each other, co-training can be successful. The *conditional independence* means that for the connected components $\pi_1^{\theta_i}$ of P_1 and $\pi_2^{\theta_j}$ of P_2 , $P(\pi_1^{\theta_i} \cap \pi_2^{\theta_j}) = P(\pi_1^{\theta_i})P(\pi_2^{\theta_j})$. Since S_v^k ($v = 1, 2$) is the union of some connected components of P_v , we have $P(S_1^k \cap S_2^k) = P(S_1^k)P(S_2^k)$. It means that $P(S_1^k \oplus S_2^k) = P(S_1^k)(1 - P(S_2^k)) + P(S_2^k)(1 - P(S_1^k))$, which implies that the condition (1) in Theorem 10 holds. In addition, Equations 27 and 28 can be obtained for ϵ -good graphs.

$$P(\pi_v^{\theta_k} \cap S_{3-v}^k \wedge f_{3-v}^k(x^t) \cdot c_v(\pi_v^{\theta_k}) > 0) \geq P(\pi_v^{\theta_k})P(S_{3-v}^k)(1 - \epsilon) \quad (27)$$

$$P(\pi_v^{\theta_k} \cap S_{3-v}^k \wedge f_{3-v}^k(x^t) \cdot c_v(\pi_v^{\theta_k}) < 0) < P(\pi_v^{\theta_k})P(S_{3-v}^k)\epsilon \quad (28)$$

Thus, we get that the condition (2) in Theorem 10 holds with $\gamma = P(S_{3-v}^k)(1 - 2\epsilon)$.

3.5.2. Weak Dependence

Abney [29] found that *weak dependence* can lead to successful co-training. The *weak dependence* means that for the connected components $\pi_1^{\theta_i}$ of P_1 and $\pi_2^{\theta_j}$ of P_2 , $P(\pi_1^{\theta_i} \cap \pi_2^{\theta_j}) \leq \tau P(\pi_1^{\theta_i})P(\pi_2^{\theta_j})$ for some $\tau > 0$. It implies that the number of examples in $S_1^k \oplus S_2^k$ is not very small. So the condition (1) in Theorem 10 holds. For ϵ -good graphs, without loss of generality, assume that

$P(\pi_v^{\theta_k} \cap S_{3-v}^k) = \tau_1 P(\pi_v^{\theta_k}) P(S_{3-v}^k)$ and that

$$P(\pi_v^{\theta_k} \cap S_{3-v}^k \wedge f_{3-v}^k(x^t) \cdot c_v(\pi_v^{\theta_k}) < 0) \leq \tau_2 P(\pi_v^{\theta_k}) P(S_{3-v}^k) \epsilon \quad (29)$$

for some $\tau_1 > 0$ and $\tau_2 > 0$, we can have

$$\begin{aligned} P(\pi_v^{\theta_k} \cap S_{3-v}^k \wedge f_{3-v}^k(x^t) \cdot c_v(\pi_v^{\theta_k}) > 0) &\geq P(\pi_v^{\theta_k} \cap S_{3-v}^k) - \tau_2 P(\pi_v^{\theta_k}) P(S_{3-v}^k) \epsilon \\ &= P(\pi_v^{\theta_k}) P(S_{3-v}^k) (\tau_1 - \tau_2 \epsilon). \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Thus, we get that the condition (2) in Theorem 10 holds with $\gamma = P(S_{3-v}^k) (\tau_1 - 2\tau_2 \epsilon)$.

3.5.3. α -Expansion

Balcan et al. [30] proposed α -expansion and proved that it can guarantee the success of co-training. They assumed that the classifier in each view is never “confident but wrong”, which corresponds to the case with perfect graphs in Theorem 7. The α -expansion means that S_1^k and S_2^k satisfy the condition that $P(S_1^k \oplus S_2^k) \geq \alpha \min[P(S_1^k \cap S_2^k), P(\overline{S_1^k} \cap \overline{S_2^k})]$. When α -expansion holds, it is easy to know that the condition in Theorem 7 holds. Note that $S_1^k \oplus S_2^k \neq \emptyset$ is weaker than α -expansion, since $P(S_1^k \oplus S_2^k)$ does not need to have a lower bound with respect to some positive α .

3.5.4. Large Disagreement

Our result in Section 2.1 shows that when the classifiers have large disagreement, the performance can be improved. Since the classifiers may have both error and uncertainty with non-perfect graphs, it is complicated to define the disagreement. Therefore, we only discuss co-training with perfect graphs here. For perfect graphs, the classifiers are “confident of labeling”, so the error rate is 0. It implies that the condition in Theorem 7 holds (see Section 6 for more discussions about the results in Section 2.1 and Section 3).

3.5.5. Other Implication and Discussions

From the above discussions it can be found if any previous condition holds, our condition in the graph-based analysis also holds; this means that our result

is more general and tighter. Furthermore, this graph-based analysis also has other interesting implication. There were some works which combine the weight matrices or Laplacians for each graph and then classify unlabeled instances according to the combination [26, 42, 43, 44], the underlying principle is not clear. To some extent, Theorem 9 can provide some theoretical supports to these methods, i.e., these methods are developed to satisfy the necessary condition for co-training with graphs to succeed as much as possible. Note that, the graph-based analysis on co-training in this section only cares the two graphs rather than where these graphs come from, and therefore it is also applicable to single-view disagreement-based approaches when there is only one view but two graphs can be obtained in different distance matrices.

4. Analysis on Co-Training with Insufficient Views

All previous theoretical analyses on co-training are based on the assumption that each view can provide sufficient information to learn the target concept. However, in many real-world applications, due to feature corruption or various feature noise, neither view can provide sufficient information to learn the target concept. There exist some examples $(\langle x_1, x_2 \rangle, y)$, on which the posterior probability $P(y = +1|x_v)$ or $P(y = -1|x_v)$ ($v = 1, 2$) is not equal to 1 due to the insufficient information provided by x_v for predicting the label. In this section, we will present the theoretical analysis on co-training with insufficient views which is much more challenging but practical, especially when the two views provide diverse information.

4.1. View Insufficiency

Let $\mathcal{X} = \mathcal{X}_1 \times \mathcal{X}_2$ denote the instance space, where \mathcal{X}_1 and \mathcal{X}_2 are the two views. $\mathcal{Y} = \{-1, +1\}$ are the label space, $L = \{(\langle x_1^1, x_2^1 \rangle, y^1), \dots, (\langle x_1^l, x_2^l \rangle, y^l)\} \subset \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ are the labeled data, $U = \{\langle x_1^{l+1}, x_2^{l+1} \rangle, \dots, \langle x_1^{l+|U|}, x_2^{l+|U|} \rangle\} \subset \mathcal{X}$ is the unlabeled data. The labeled data L independently and identically come from some unknown distribution \mathcal{D} , whose marginal distribution on \mathcal{X} is $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}}$, and the

unlabeled data U independently and identically come from $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}}$. $c = (c_1, c_2)$ is the target concept, where c_1 and c_2 are the target concept in the two views, respectively, i.e., $c_1(x_1) = c_2(x_2) = y$ for any $(\langle x_1, x_2 \rangle, y)$. Since neither view can provide sufficient information to learn the target concept, we may never achieve the target concept with the insufficient views. For an example $(\langle x_1, x_2 \rangle, y)$, let $\varphi_v(x_v) = P(y = +1|x_v)$. If $\varphi_v(x_v)$ is 0 or 1, it implies that the features of x_v provide sufficient information to correctly determine its label y ; while if $\varphi_v(x_v) = \frac{1}{2}$, it implies that the features of x_v provide no helpful information to correctly predict its label y . It is easy to understand that $|2\varphi_v(x_v) - 1|$ is a measurement of the information provided by x_v for predicting its label y . Now we give the definition of view insufficiency.

Definition 3 (View Insufficiency) *Let \mathcal{D} denote the unknown distribution over $\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$. For $(x, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, $\varphi(x) = P(y = +1|x)$. The insufficiency $\Upsilon(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{D})$ of view \mathcal{X} for the learning task with respect to the distribution \mathcal{D} is defined as*

$$\Upsilon(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{D}) = 1 - \int_{\mathcal{D}} |2\varphi(x) - 1| P(x) dx.$$

$\Upsilon(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{D}) \in [0, 1]$ measures the insufficiency of view \mathcal{X} for correctly learning \mathcal{Y} over the distribution \mathcal{D} . When $|2\varphi(x) - 1| = 1$ for all examples, the view insufficiency $\Upsilon(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{D}) = 0$, i.e., view \mathcal{X} provides sufficient information to correctly classify all examples; while $\varphi(x) = \frac{1}{2}$ for all examples, the view insufficiency $\Upsilon(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{D}) = 1$, i.e., view \mathcal{X} provides no information to correctly classify any example. With Definition 3, we let $\Upsilon_v = \Upsilon(\mathcal{X}_v, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{D})$ denote the insufficiency of view \mathcal{X}_v .

Let $\mathcal{F}_v: \mathcal{X}_v \rightarrow [-1, +1]$ denote the hypothesis space for learning the task with view \mathcal{X}_v ($v = 1, 2$) and d_v denote the finite VC-dimension of \mathcal{F}_v . The classification rule induced by a hypothesis $f_v \in \mathcal{F}_v$ on an instance $x = \langle x_1, x_2 \rangle$ is $\text{sign}(f_v(x_v))$. The error rate of a hypothesis f_v with the distribution \mathcal{D} is $\mathbf{err}(f_v) = P_{(\langle x_1, x_2 \rangle, y) \in \mathcal{D}}(\text{sign}(f_v(x_v)) \neq y)$ and let $\mathbf{err}(F_v) = \max_{f_v \in F_v} \mathbf{err}(f_v)$ for $F_v \subseteq \mathcal{F}_v$. Let $f_v^*(x_v) = 2\varphi_v(x_v) - 1$, $\text{sign}(f_v^*(x_v)) = +1$ if $\varphi_v(x_v) > \frac{1}{2}$

and $\text{sign}(f_v^*(x_v)) = -1$ otherwise. Suppose f_v^* belongs to \mathcal{F}_v , and it is well-known that [45] f_1^* and f_2^* are the optimal Bayes classifiers in the two views, respectively. Generally, the two views may provide different information, i.e., there exist some instances $x = \langle x_1, x_2 \rangle$ on which $P(y = +1|x_1)$ is very different from $P(y = +1|x_2)$. Thus, f_1^* is not perfectly compatible with f_2^* and $d(f_1^*, f_2^*)$ denotes the difference between f_1^* and f_2^* .

$$d(f_1^*, f_2^*) = P_{\langle x_1, x_2 \rangle \in \mathcal{X}}(\text{sign}(f_1^*(x_1)) \neq \text{sign}(f_2^*(x_2)))$$

Let $\eta_v = \text{err}(f_v^*)$ denote the error rate of the optimal classifier f_v^* , we have the following Proposition 1.

Proposition 1 $\Upsilon_v = 2\eta_v$. ($v = 1, 2$)

Proof. Given an example $(\langle x_1, x_2 \rangle, y)$,

$$\begin{aligned} & P(\text{sign}(f_v^*(x_v)) \neq y|x_v) \\ &= 1 - P(\text{sign}(f_v^*(x_v)) = 1, y = 1|x_v) - P(\text{sign}(f_v^*(x_v)) = -1, y = -1|x_v) \\ &= 1 - \mathbb{I}\{\text{sign}(f_v^*(x_v)) = 1\}P(y = 1|x_v) - \mathbb{I}\{\text{sign}(f_v^*(x_v)) = -1\}P(y = -1|x_v) \\ &= 1 - \mathbb{I}\{\varphi_v(x_v) > 1/2\}\varphi_v(x_v) - \mathbb{I}\{\varphi_v(x_v) \leq 1/2\}(1 - \varphi_v(x_v)) \end{aligned}$$

So we get

$$\begin{aligned} \eta_v &= \mathbb{E}(1 - \mathbb{I}\{\varphi_v(x_v) > 1/2\}\varphi_v(x_v) - \mathbb{I}\{\varphi_v(x_v) \leq 1/2\}(1 - \varphi_v(x_v))) \\ &= \mathbb{E}(1/2 - |\varphi_v(x_v) - 1/2|) = \frac{1}{2}\Upsilon_v. \end{aligned}$$

□

Remark: Proposition 1 states that when the view is insufficient, the optimal classifier trained on this view will mistakenly classify some instances. The larger the insufficiency is, the worse the performance of the optimal classifier will be.

4.2. Learning Approximation of Optimal Classifier with Complementary Views

Usually, co-training allows one classifier to label unlabeled instances for the other. For insufficient views, in each view there are some instances which can

Algorithm 3 Margin-based co-training with insufficient views

Input: Labeled data L , unlabeled data U , and two hypothesis spaces \mathcal{F}_1 and \mathcal{F}_2 .

Output: \mathcal{F}_1^C and \mathcal{F}_2^C .

Initialize: Set $\varrho_0 = L$;

for $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ **do**

 Get $\mathcal{F}_v^i \subseteq \mathcal{F}_v$ ($v = 1, 2$) by minimizing the empirical risk on ϱ_i with respect to view \mathcal{X}_v and set $T_i = \emptyset$;

for $x = \langle x_1, x_2 \rangle \in U$ **do**

for $f_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1^i, f_2 \in \mathcal{F}_2^i$ **do**

if $|f_1(x_1)| \geq \gamma_1$ **then**

$T_i = T_i \cup (x, \text{sign}(f_1(x_1)))$ and delete x from U ;

break;

end if

if $|f_2(x_2)| \geq \gamma_2$ **then**

$T_i = T_i \cup (x, \text{sign}(f_2(x_2)))$ and delete x from U ;

break;

end if

end for

end for

if $T_i = \emptyset$ **then**

return $\mathcal{F}_1^C = \mathcal{F}_1^i$ and $\mathcal{F}_2^C = \mathcal{F}_2^i$;

end if

$\varrho_{i+1} = \varrho_i \cup T_i$;

end for

not provide sufficient information for predicting the label. So we should check how much information each instance can provide. We use the confidence of the prediction on an instance to measure the information. When the confidence is no less than some preset threshold, we use the predicted label as its pseudo-label and add it into the training set. Since each view is insufficient and only provides

partial information, we use the newly labeled unlabeled instances which are labeled by both classifiers as the retraining data, and the process is described in Algorithm 3. However, as mentioned in Section 2 if there is no prior knowledge about the relationship between hypothesis space and unlabeled data, it is hard to guarantee that selecting confident instances to label is helpful. In margin-based algorithms, margin can be used to measure the confidence. Intuitively, it is likely that similar hypotheses tend to have similar margin outputs, i.e., two hypotheses with small error difference should have small margin difference. With this intuition, we give the following Definition 4.

Definition 4 (Margin Lipschitz) *Let \mathcal{F}_v ($v = 1, 2$) denote the hypothesis space, for $x = \langle x_1, x_2 \rangle$ and $f_v \in \mathcal{F}_v$, there exists some constant $C_v^{\mathcal{L}}$ to satisfy $|f_v(x_v) - f_v^*(x_v)| \leq C_v^{\mathcal{L}}(\text{err}(f_v) - \text{err}(f_v^*))$.*

Definition 4 states that the label predicted by weak classifiers with large margin is likely to be the same as the label predicted by the optimal classifier. Thus, the confident instances would help find the optimal classifier. Here we give two examples that satisfy the Margin Lipschitz definition.

Example 1 *Imagine that the instances in \mathcal{X}_v are distributed uniformly over the unit ball in \mathbb{R}^{d_v} and that the underground labels are determined by a linear hyperplane w_v^* going through the origin, i.e., $y = \text{sign}(w_v^* \cdot x_v)$ for any (x_v, y) . It can be verified that Definition 4 holds with the constant $C_v^{\mathcal{L}} \geq \pi$.*

Example 2 *Imagine that the instances in \mathcal{X}_v are distributed uniformly over the unit ball in \mathbb{R}^{d_v} and that the underground labels are determined by a random variable β ($\beta = +1$ with probability $1 - \eta$ and $\beta = -1$ with probability η) and a linear hyperplane w_v^* going through the origin, i.e., $y = \beta \cdot \text{sign}(w_v^* \cdot x_v)$ for any (x_v, y) . Here the variable β is exploited to simulate the instances with insufficient features due to feature noise. It can be verified that Definition 4 also holds with the constant $C_v^{\mathcal{L}} \geq \pi$.*

To quantify the amount of the confident instances, we give the following Definition 5.

Definition 5 Let $x = \langle x_1, x_2 \rangle$,

$$\mu_1(\gamma_1, \mathcal{F}_1) = P\{x \in U : \exists f_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1 \text{ s.t. } |f_1(x_1)| \geq \gamma_1\},$$

$$\mu_2(\gamma_2, \mathcal{F}_2) = P\{x \in U : \exists f_2 \in \mathcal{F}_2 \text{ s.t. } |f_2(x_2)| \geq \gamma_2\},$$

$$\mu(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2) = P\{x \in U : \exists f_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1, f_2 \in \mathcal{F}_2 \text{ s.t. } |f_1(x_1)| \geq \gamma_1 \text{ or } |f_2(x_2)| \geq \gamma_2\},$$

and let $\nu(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2)$ denote the probability mass on the instances which are labeled with large margin just by one view, then

$$\mu(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2) = \frac{\nu(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2) + \mu_1(\gamma_1, \mathcal{F}_1) + \mu_2(\gamma_2, \mathcal{F}_2)}{2}.$$

$\nu(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2)$ measures the disagreement between two views with respect to margins γ_1 and γ_2 , we call it *margin-based disagreement*. When $\nu(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2)$ is large, the two views could help each other strongly by providing diverse confident information; while when $\nu(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2)$ is small, the two views only help each other little since they provide almost the same information. $\mu(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2)$ denotes the probability mass on the instances which are labeled with large margin by one of the two views. If the two views have large margin-based disagreement $\nu(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2)$, $\mu(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2)$ is large. For the extreme case that $\mu(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \mathcal{F}_1, \mathcal{F}_2) = 1$, i.e., each unlabeled instance can be labeled with large margin by one of the two views, we say that the two views are *complementary views*, since they provide complementary information. For this extreme case, we have the following Theorem 11.

Theorem 11 Suppose the hypothesis space \mathcal{F}_v ($v = 1, 2$) satisfies Definition 4, let $\mathcal{F}_v^L \subseteq \mathcal{F}_v$ denote the hypotheses minimizing the empirical risk on the initial labeled data L , $R_v = \max_{f_v \in \mathcal{F}_v^L} \mathbf{err}(f_v)$ and $\gamma_v = C_v^{\mathcal{L}}(R_v - \eta_v)$. For $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$, if $|U| = O(\frac{d_v \ln \frac{1}{\delta}}{\epsilon^2})$ and $\mu(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \mathcal{F}_1^L, \mathcal{F}_2^L) = 1$, with probability $1 - \delta$ the outputs \mathcal{F}_1^C and \mathcal{F}_2^C in Algorithm 3 satisfy $\mathbf{err}(\mathcal{F}_v^C) = \max_{f_v \in \mathcal{F}_v^C} \mathbf{err}(f_v) \leq \eta_1/2 + \eta_2/2 + d(f_1^*, f_2^*)/2 + \epsilon$.

Proof. Since $\mu(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \mathcal{F}_1^L, \mathcal{F}_2^L) = 1$, after 1 round all unlabeled instances in U are assigned with pseudo-labels and added into the data set ϱ_1 . Then classifier set \mathcal{F}_v^1 is got by minimizing the empirical risk on ϱ_1 with view \mathcal{X}_v . For $x = \langle x_1, x_2 \rangle$, \hat{y} denotes its pseudo-label. If $|f_v(x_v)| \geq \gamma_v = C_v^{\mathcal{L}}(R_v - \eta_v)$, with Definition 4 we know that f_v and f_v^* make the same prediction on x_v . So for any example $(\langle x_1, x_2 \rangle, \hat{y}) \in \varrho_1$, either $\hat{y} = \text{sign}(f_1^*(x_1))$ or $\hat{y} = \text{sign}(f_2^*(x_2))$ holds. Here we consider the worst case that

$$\hat{y} = \begin{cases} y & \text{if } \text{sign}(f_1^*(x_1)) = \text{sign}(f_2^*(x_2)) = y \\ -y & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Let f_v^{com} denote the hypothesis that $\text{sign}(f_v^{com}(x_v)) = y$ if $\text{sign}(f_1^*(x_1)) = \text{sign}(f_2^*(x_2)) = y$, and $\text{sign}(f_v^{com}(x_v)) = -y$ otherwise. It is easy to find that f_v^{com} is consistent with the examples in ϱ_1 for the worst case and $\mathbf{err}(f_v^{com}) = \eta_1/2 + \eta_2/2 + d(f_1^*, f_2^*)/2$. $\mathbf{err}(f_v^{com})$ is larger than $\mathbf{err}(f_v^*)$, so learning a classifier with error rate no larger than $\mathbf{err}(f_v^{com}) + \epsilon$ is no harder than learning a classifier with error rate no larger than $\mathbf{err}(f_v^*) + \epsilon$. Now we regard f_v^{com} as the optimal classifier in \mathcal{F}_v and neglect the probability mass on the hypothesis whose error rate is less than $\mathbf{err}(f_v^{com})$. Since the classifiers in \mathcal{F}_v^C minimize the empirical risk on ϱ_1 which is an i.i.d sample with size of $|L| + |U|$ and $|U| = O\left(\frac{d_v \ln \frac{1}{\delta}}{\epsilon^2}\right)$, we get $\max_{f_v \in \mathcal{F}_v^C} \mathbf{err}(f_v) \leq \mathbf{err}(f_v^{com}) + \epsilon$ with probability $1 - \delta$. \square

Remark: Theorem 11 states that if the two views are complementary views, i.e., every unlabeled instance in U can be labeled with large margin by one of the two views, co-training could output the nearly good hypothesis set \mathcal{F}_1^C and \mathcal{F}_2^C . Sometimes the pseudo-label which is the same as the prediction of the optimal classifier in view \mathcal{X}_v is not helpful in achieving the optimal classifier in view \mathcal{X}_{3-v} , since there exists the difference $d(f_1^*, f_2^*)$ between the two optimal classifiers in the two views. Thus, the hypothesis in \mathcal{F}_v^C is not very close to the optimal classifier f_v^* .

To achieve the good approximation of the optimal classifier, some prior

knowledge about the optimal classifier needs to be known, which is shown as follows.

Definition 6 (Information Assumption) For $(\langle x_1, x_2 \rangle, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$, if view \mathcal{X}_v provides much information about it, i.e., $|P(y = +1|x_v) - \frac{1}{2}| \geq \gamma'_v/2$, then the optimal classifier f_v^* in view \mathcal{X}_v classifies it correctly, i.e., $\text{sign}(f_v^*(x_v)) = y$.

Definition 6 states that for an example if one view can provide much information about it, it will be correctly classified by the optimal classifier in this view. Thus, we give the following Theorem 12.

Theorem 12 Suppose the hypothesis space \mathcal{F}_v ($v = 1, 2$) satisfies Definition 4, let $\mathcal{F}_v^L \subseteq \mathcal{F}_v$ denote the hypotheses minimizing the empirical risk on the initial labeled data L , $R_v = \max_{f_v \in \mathcal{F}_v^L} \text{err}(f_v)$ and $\gamma_v = C_v^{\mathcal{L}}(R_v - \eta_v) + \gamma'_v$. For $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$, if Definition 6 holds, $|U| = O(\frac{d_v \ln \frac{1}{\epsilon}}{\epsilon^2})$ and $\mu(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \mathcal{F}_1^L, \mathcal{F}_2^L) = 1$, with probability $1 - \delta$ the outputs \mathcal{F}_1^C and \mathcal{F}_2^C in Algorithm 3 satisfy $\text{err}(\mathcal{F}_v^C) = \max_{f_v \in \mathcal{F}_v^C} \text{err}(f_v) \leq \eta_v + \epsilon$.

Proof. For $x = \langle x_1, x_2 \rangle$, \hat{y} denotes its pseudo-label. If $|f_v(x_v)| \geq \gamma_v = C_v^{\mathcal{L}}(R_v - \eta_v) + \gamma'_v$, with Definition 4 we know that f_v and f_v^* make the same prediction on x_v and $|f_v^*(x_v)| \geq \gamma'_v$. So we get $|P(y = +1|x_v) - \frac{1}{2}| \geq \gamma'_v/2$. Then with Definition 6 we know that $\hat{y} = \text{sign}(f_v(x_v)) = \text{sign}(f_v^*(x_v)) = y$. So we get that the pseudo-label of any example in ϱ_1 is the same as its underground label. Since $\mu(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \mathcal{F}_1^L, \mathcal{F}_2^L) = 1$, we know that all unlabeled instances in U are assigned with underground labels and added into ϱ_1 . So ϱ_1 is an i.i.d sample with size of $|L| + |U|$. Considering that $|U| = O(\frac{d_v \ln \frac{1}{\epsilon}}{\epsilon^2})$, we get $\max_{f_v \in \mathcal{F}_v^C} \text{err}(f_v) \leq \eta_v + \epsilon$ with probability $1 - \delta$. \square

Remark: Theorem 12 states that if the two views are complementary views with respect to larger margins γ_1 and γ_2 , co-training could output the ϵ -approximation of the optimal classifier.

4.3. Learning Approximation of Optimal Classifier with Non-Complementary Views

However, in real-world applications not all insufficient views are complementary, i.e., $\mu(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \mathcal{F}_1^L, \mathcal{F}_2^L)$ is smaller than 1. With Definition 4 we know that the threshold γ_v ($v = 1, 2$) which guarantees the quality of the confident instances is related to the error rates of weak hypotheses. An intuitive way to get more confident instances to augment the training data is updating the weak hypotheses with newly labeled confident instances and adaptively decreasing the margin threshold, which is shown in Algorithm 4. When $\mu(\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \mathcal{F}_1^L, \mathcal{F}_2^L)$ is smaller than 1, it will make co-training suffer from the sampling bias, since the training set in each view might not be an i.i.d sample from the marginal distribution \mathcal{D}_X . Now we give the following definition to approximately bound the difference between two training samples.

Definition 7 (Approximate KL Divergence) *Let Ω be a large example set i.i.d sampled from the unknown distribution \mathcal{D} and $\Lambda \subseteq \Omega$ be a set of examples, define the following $D_{AKL}(\Lambda \parallel \Omega)$ as an approximate KL divergence from the distribution generating Λ to the distribution \mathcal{D} .*

$$\begin{aligned} D_{AKL}(\Lambda \parallel \Omega) &= \sum_{x^j \in \Omega} P(\mathbb{I}\{x^j \in \Lambda\}) \ln \frac{P(\mathbb{I}\{x^j \in \Lambda\})}{P(\mathbb{I}\{x^j \in \Omega\})} \\ &= \sum_{x^j \in \Lambda} \frac{1}{|\Lambda|} \ln \frac{1/|\Lambda|}{1/|\Omega|} + 0 = \ln \frac{|\Omega|}{|\Lambda|}. \end{aligned}$$

Let us interpret Definition 7 intuitively. Ω is a large example set i.i.d sampled from the unknown distribution \mathcal{D} , so we use the uniform distribution over Ω as an approximation of \mathcal{D} . In this way we use the uniform distribution over Λ as an approximation of the distribution generating Λ and define $D_{AKL}(\Lambda \parallel \Omega)$ as an approximate KL divergence from the distribution generating Λ to the distribution \mathcal{D} . We give the following assumption to bound the influence of sampling bias.

Definition 8 (Sampling Bias Assumption) *Let Ω be a large example set i.i.d sampled from the unknown distribution \mathcal{D} and $\Lambda \subseteq \Omega$ be a set of examples.*

Algorithm 4 Adaptive margin-based co-training with insufficient views

Input: Labeled data L , unlabeled data U , two hypothesis spaces \mathcal{F}_1 and \mathcal{F}_2 ,

$m_0 = |L|$, $n = |L| + |U|$, $\gamma_v^0 = C_v^{\mathcal{L}}(R_v - \eta_v) + \gamma'_v$, and $\varrho_0 = L$.

Output: \mathcal{F}_1^C and \mathcal{F}_2^C .

for $i = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ **do**

Get $\mathcal{F}_v^i \subseteq \mathcal{F}_v$ by minimizing the empirical risk on ϱ_i with respect to view \mathcal{X}_v and set $T_i = \emptyset$;

for $x = \langle x_1, x_2 \rangle \in U$ **do**

for $f_1 \in \mathcal{F}_1^i$, $f_2 \in \mathcal{F}_2^i$ **do**

if $|f_1(x_1)| \geq \gamma_1^i$ **then**

$T_i = T_i \cup (x, \text{sign}(f_1(x_1)))$ and delete x from U ;

break;

end if

if $|f_2(x_2)| \geq \gamma_2^i$ **then**

$T_i = T_i \cup (x, \text{sign}(f_2(x_2)))$ and delete x from U ;

break;

end if

end for

end for

if $i = 0$ and $|T_0| > \sqrt[3]{n^2 m_0} - m_0$ **then**

$\gamma_v^1 = \gamma_v^0 - C_v^{\mathcal{L}}(R_v - \eta_v)(1 - \frac{n\sqrt{m_0}}{(m_0 + |T_0|)^{3/2}})$, $\varrho_1 = \varrho_0 \cup T_0$, $m_1 = m_0 + |T_0|$;

end if

if $|T_0| \leq \sqrt[3]{n^2 m_0} - m_0$ or $T_i = \emptyset$ **then**

return $\mathcal{F}_1^C = \mathcal{F}_1^i$ and $\mathcal{F}_2^C = \mathcal{F}_2^i$;

end if

if $i \geq 1$ **then**

$\gamma_v^{i+1} = \gamma_v^0 - C_v^{\mathcal{L}}(R_v - \eta_v)(1 - \frac{n\sqrt{m_0}}{(m_i + |T_i|)^{3/2}})$, $\varrho_{i+1} = \varrho_i \cup T_i$, $m_{i+1} = m_i + |T_i|$;

end if

end for

Let f_Λ denote the hypothesis minimizing the empirical risk on Λ , R^* be the error rate of the optimal classifier and R' be the upper bound on the error rate of the hypothesis minimizing the empirical risk on an i.i.d. sample with size of $|\Lambda|$ from the distribution \mathcal{D} , then $\mathbf{err}(f_\Lambda) - R^* \leq (R' - R^*) \cdot \exp(D_{AKL}(\Lambda \parallel \Omega))$.

Definition 8 states that the error difference between the classifier trained with possibly biased sample and the optimal classifier can be bounded by that between the classifier trained with unbiased sample and the optimal classifier times an exponential function of the approximate KL divergence. Here we give an example to show when the sampling bias assumption holds in co-training.

Example 3 Suppose that the two views are conditionally independent to each other, then Definition 8 holds. In Algorithm 4, the training set ϱ_i is a subset of $L \cup U$ and consists of the instances whose margins are no less than the threshold. That the two views are conditionally independent means the hypothesis in the first view is independent of the hypothesis in the second view to make predictions, i.e., $f_1(x_1)$ is independent of $f_2(x_2)$ for any $x = \langle x_1, x_2 \rangle$. So it can be regarded that the instances in ϱ_i are randomly drawn from $L \cup U$, i.e., ϱ_i is an i.i.d sample. Thus, $\mathbf{err}(f_{\varrho_i}) - R^* \leq R' - R^* \leq (R' - R^*) \cdot \exp(n/|\varrho_i|)$. This example can be relaxed to the case that the two views are weakly dependent if the prior knowledge about the margin outputs over the two views is known.

Let Ω be an i.i.d sample size of m , it is well-known that [46] there exists an universal constant C such that for $\delta \in (0, 1)$ we have $\mathbf{err}(f_v) - \mathbf{err}(f_v^*) \leq \sqrt{\frac{C}{m}(d_v + \ln(\frac{1}{\delta}))}$ with probability $1 - \delta$ for any f_v minimizing the empirical risk on Ω . Generally, there may exist more than one hypothesis which have the same empirical risk. Let H_v^Ω denote the set of hypotheses which have the same minimum empirical risk on Ω , it is reasonable to assume that $\max_{f_v \in \mathcal{F}_v^\Omega} \mathbf{err}(f_v) - \mathbf{err}(f_v^*) = \sqrt{\frac{C}{m}(d_v + \ln(\frac{1}{\delta}))}$, which means the PAC-bound is tight and the maximum error rate of the hypotheses which minimize the empirical risk on Ω is proportional to $\frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}$. We are now ready to give the theorem on co-training with insufficient views.

Theorem 13 Suppose the hypothesis space \mathcal{F}_v ($v = 1, 2$) satisfies Definition 4, let ϱ_i denote the training set in the i -th round of Algorithm 4, $\mathcal{F}_v^i \subseteq \mathcal{F}_v$ denote the set of hypotheses minimizing the empirical risk on ϱ_i , $n = |L| + |U|$ and $R_v = \max_{f_v^0 \in \mathcal{F}_v^0} \mathbf{err}(f_v^0)$. For $\epsilon \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ and $\delta \in (0, 1)$, if Definitions 6 and 7 hold, $|U| = O(\frac{d_v \ln \frac{1}{\delta}}{\epsilon^2})$, $\mu(\gamma_1^0, \gamma_2^0, \mathcal{F}_1^0, \mathcal{F}_2^0) > \frac{\sqrt[3]{n^2|L| - |L|}}{n - |L|}$ and $|T_i| > 0$ for $i \geq 1$ until $|\varrho_i| = n$, with probability $1 - \delta$ the outputs \mathcal{F}_1^C and \mathcal{F}_2^C in Algorithm 4 satisfy $\mathbf{err}(\mathcal{F}_v^C) = \max_{f_v \in \mathcal{F}_v^C} \mathbf{err}(f_v) \leq \eta_v + \epsilon$.

Proof. Since L is an i.i.d sample and $m_0 = |L|$, for the hypothesis set $\mathcal{F}_v^{r_i}$ minimizing the empirical risk on an i.i.d sample with size of $m_i = |\varrho_i|$, with the assumption that the maximum error rate of the hypotheses minimizing the empirical risk on the i.i.d sample Ω is proportional to $\frac{1}{\sqrt{|\Omega|}}$, we have

$$\max_{f_v^{r_i} \in \mathcal{F}_v^{r_i}} \mathbf{err}(f_v^{r_i}) - \mathbf{err}(f_v^*) = \frac{\sqrt{m_0}}{\sqrt{m_i}} \left(\max_{f_v^0 \in \mathcal{F}_v^0} \mathbf{err}(f_v^0) - \mathbf{err}(f_v^*) \right) = \frac{\sqrt{m_0}}{\sqrt{m_i}} (R_v - \eta_v).$$

If $\gamma_v^0 = C_v^\Sigma (R_v - \eta_v) + \gamma_v'$, with the proof in Theorem 12 we know that the pseudo-label of any example in ϱ_1 is the same as the underground label. Since $L \cup U$ is a large i.i.d sample from the marginal distribution $\mathcal{D}_{\mathcal{X}}$, so with Definition 8 we get

$$\max_{f_v^1 \in \mathcal{F}_v^1} \mathbf{err}(f_v^1) - \mathbf{err}(f_v^*) \leq \frac{\sqrt{m_0}}{\sqrt{m_1}} (R_v - \eta_v) \cdot \exp\left(\ln \frac{n}{m_1}\right).$$

For $f_v^1 \in \mathcal{F}_v^1$, if

$$|f_v^1(x_v)| \geq \gamma_v^1 = \gamma_v^0 - C_v^\Sigma (R_v - \eta_v) \left(1 - \frac{n\sqrt{m_0}}{m_1\sqrt{m_1}}\right),$$

with Definition 4 we get $|f_v^*(x_v)| \geq \gamma_v'$ and $\mathit{sign}(f_v^1(x_v)) = \mathit{sign}(f_v^*(x_v))$. With Definition 6 we know $\mathit{sign}(f_v^*(x_v)) = y$. Thus, the pseudo-label of any example in ϱ_2 is the same as the underground label. Similarly, for $f_v^i \in \mathcal{F}_v^i$, if

$$|f_v^i(x_v)| \geq \gamma_v^i = \gamma_v^0 - C_v^\Sigma (R_v - \eta_v) \left(1 - \frac{n\sqrt{m_0}}{m_i\sqrt{m_i}}\right),$$

we get $\mathit{sign}(f_v^i(x_v)) = y$. If $T_i \neq \emptyset$ until $|\varrho_i| = |L| + |U|$, all instances in U are labeled with underground labels. So ϱ_i is an i.i.d sample with size of $|L| + |U|$. Since $|U| = O(\frac{d_v \ln \frac{1}{\delta}}{\epsilon^2})$, we get $\max_{f_v \in \mathcal{F}_v^C} \mathbf{err}(f_v) \leq \eta_v + \epsilon$ with

probability $1 - \delta$. If we want $\gamma_v^1 < \gamma_v^0$, $1 - \frac{n\sqrt{m_0}}{m_1\sqrt{m_1}}$ must be larger than 0, i.e., $m_1 > \sqrt[3]{n^2 m_0}$. It implies that $m_0 + \mu(\gamma_1^0, \gamma_2^0, \mathcal{F}_1^0, \mathcal{F}_2^0)|U| > \sqrt[3]{n^2 m_0}$, so we get $\mu(\gamma_1^0, \gamma_2^0, \mathcal{H}_1^0, \mathcal{H}_2^0) > \frac{\sqrt[3]{n^2|L|-|L|}}{n-|L|}$. \square

Remark: Theorem 13 states that if the two views provide diverse information, i.e., $\mu(\gamma_1^0, \gamma_2^0, \mathcal{F}_1^0, \mathcal{F}_2^0) > \frac{\sqrt[3]{n^2|L|-|L|}}{n-|L|}$ ($\mathcal{F}_1^0 = \mathcal{F}_1^L$, $\mathcal{F}_2^0 = \mathcal{F}_2^L$), co-training could improve the performance of weak hypotheses by exploiting unlabeled data. This result tells that the diverse information between the two views plays an important role in co-training with insufficient views.

4.4. Assumption Relaxation and Discussions

Our result is based on a little bit strong *Margin Lipschitz* assumption, which is caused by the fact that the learning task with insufficient views for semi-supervised learning is very difficult. In this section, we try to give a heuristic analysis for the case where the *Margin Lipschitz* assumption is relaxed. Instead, we give the following *Probabilistic Margin* assumption: for $\frac{1}{2} \leq \gamma_v \leq 1$ ($v = 1, 2$),

$$P_{(x_1, x_2) \in \mathcal{X}} \{x_v : |h_v(x_v)| \geq \gamma_v \wedge \text{sign}(h_v(x_v)) \neq y\} \leq \phi(\gamma_v).$$

Here $\phi : [\frac{1}{2}, 1] \rightarrow [0, 1]$ is a monotonically decreasing function, e.g., $\phi(\gamma) = \beta \ln(\frac{1}{\gamma})$ for some parameter β . *Probabilistic Margin* assumption allows for small label noise in the examples labeled with large margin. Considering the worst case of the influence of label noise, i.e., the examples with noisy labels are completely inconsistent with the optimal classifier, it can be found that when the two views provide diverse information, co-training could output the hypotheses whose error rate are close to $\eta_v + \beta \ln(\frac{1}{\gamma_v})$, which is smaller than the error rate of the classifier trained only on the small initial labeled data set L . This shows that co-training could improve learning performance by exploiting unlabeled data even with insufficient views.

Now we discuss what influence the view insufficiency will bring to the learning process. Since we could not know the distribution and the posterior probability $\varphi_v(x_v)$ ($v = 1, 2$) of the example space in advance, it is difficult to analyze

the general case. We focus on the famous Tsybakov condition [47] case that for some finite $C_v^0 > 0$, $k > 0$ and $0 < t \leq 1/2$,

$$P_{\langle x_1, x_2 \rangle \in \mathcal{X}} (|\varphi_v(x_v) - 1/2| \leq t) \leq C_v^0 t^k,$$

where small k implies large view insufficiency Υ , and give a heuristic analysis to illuminate the relationship between view insufficiency and diversity. Considering the worst case of Tsybakov condition for the fixed parameter k , i.e., $P(|\varphi_v(x_v) - 1/2| \leq t) = C_v^0 t^k$, we get $P(|2\varphi_v(x_v) - 1| > \gamma) = 1 - C_v^0 (\frac{\gamma}{2})^k$ for $0 < \gamma \leq 1$. $|2\varphi_v(x_v) - 1|$ is the output margin of the optimal classifier f_v^* , with the intuition that similar hypotheses tend to have similar margin outputs, the magnitude of the instances with margin larger than γ in view \mathcal{X}_v is probably $\alpha(1 - C_v^0 (\frac{\gamma}{2})^k)$ for some parameter α . $\mu_\nu \approx \alpha(1 - C_v^0 (\frac{\gamma_\nu}{2})^k)$ quantifies the amount of instances labeled with large margin by view \mathcal{X}_v . Considering that $\mu = \frac{\nu + \mu_1 + \mu_2}{2}$, when ν is fixed, if the view insufficiency increases, the confident information μ provided by the two views decreases; when μ_1 and μ_2 are fixed, if the two views have large margin-based disagreement ν , the confident information μ provided by the two views increases, which shows that the margin-based disagreement ν is important to co-training. For understanding the magnitude of μ better, we give the following example. There are adequate unlabeled instances in real-world semi-supervised applications, suppose we have $n = |L| + |U| = 1000$ and $L = 12$, similarly to the empirical study on co-training in [11], $\mu = \frac{\sqrt[3]{n^2|L| - |L|}}{n - |L|}$ at the first step in Theorem 13 should be 22%. With respect to $\mu = \frac{\nu + \mu_1 + \mu_2}{2}$, if the two views provide diverse information (ν is large), the weak hypothesis in each view predicting about 18% (even less) of the unlabeled instances with large margin might be enough to guarantee that $\mu \geq 22\%$, which is common in real-world applications.

In our result, the margin threshold $\gamma_v = C_v^{\mathcal{L}}(R_v - \eta_v) + \gamma'_v$ depends on several parameters. Generally, the optimal classifier would make mistakes only when the instances are close to the boundary, i.e., $P(y = +1|x)$ is close to $1/2$. So γ'_v is close to 0. $(R_v - \eta_v)$ depends on the number of initial labeled data L and is proportional to $1/\sqrt{|L|}$. So when $|L| \approx 4(C_v^{\mathcal{L}})^2 C(d_v + \ln(\frac{1}{\delta}))$, $C_v^{\mathcal{L}}(R_v - \eta_v)$ is

close to 1/2. Thus, γ_v is close to 1/2.

4.4.1. Connection to Co-Regularization

In semi-supervised learning, co-regularization allows for views with partial insufficiency, but it assumes that the two views provide almost the same information. Unfortunately, in real-world applications each view may be corrupted by different kinds of noise, it is unreasonable to assume that the two views provide almost the same information. When the two views are corrupted by different noise or provide diverse information, the two optimal classifiers are no longer compatible with each other and the performance of co-regularization will be influenced since it strongly encourages the agreement between two views.

Sridharan and Kakade [48] used the conditional mutual information $I(A : B|C)$ to measure how much knowing A reduces the uncertainty of B conditionally on already knowing C, they assumed that $I(\mathcal{Y} : \mathcal{X}_v | \mathcal{X}_{3-v}) \leq \epsilon_{info}$ ($v = 1, 2$) holds for some small $\epsilon_{info} > 0$, and provided an information theoretic framework for co-regularization which minimizes the following co-regularized loss for the pair (f_1, f_2) ($f_v \in \mathcal{F}_v$).

$$Loss_{co}(f_1, f_2) = \frac{1}{2}(\widehat{R}_L(f_1) + \widehat{R}_L(f_2)) + \alpha_1 \|f_1\| + \alpha_2 \|f_2\| + \alpha_3 \widehat{D}_U(f_1, f_2)$$

\widehat{R}_L is the empirical risk with respect to the labeled data L and \widehat{D}_U is the empirical disagreement with respect to the unlabeled data U . Note that $I(\mathcal{Y} : \mathcal{X}_v | \mathcal{X}_{3-v}) \leq \epsilon_{info}$ means that if we already knew view \mathcal{X}_v then there is little more information that we could get from view \mathcal{X}_{3-v} about \mathcal{Y} , i.e., the two views provide almost the same information. Sridharan and Kakade [48] showed that the excess error between the output hypothesis of co-regularization and the optimal classifier is punished by the term $\sqrt{\epsilon_{info}}$. This implies that it is hard for co-regularization to find the ϵ -approximation of the optimal classifier when the two views are insufficient and provide diverse information. Now we give the following Proposition 2 to show that co-regularization may never output the approximations of the optimal classifier.

Proposition 2 *Suppose $\|f_v\| = 1$ for $f_v \in \mathcal{F}_v$ ($v = 1, 2$). Let $\mathcal{F}_v^L \subset \mathcal{F}_v$ denote the hypotheses minimizing the empirical risk on the labeled data L and $(g_1, g_2) = \arg \min_{f_v \in \mathcal{F}_v^L} d(f_1, f_2)$. If $|U|$ is sufficiently large, $Loss_{co}(g_1, g_2)$ is no larger than $Loss_{co}(f_1^*, f_2^*)$.*

Proof. Considering that $\widehat{R}_L(g_v) = \widehat{R}_L(f_v^*)$ and that $\widehat{D}_U(g_1, g_2) \leq \widehat{D}_U(f_1^*, f_2^*)$ holds for sufficiently large $|U|$, it is easy to get Proposition 2 proved. \square

Remark: Let us give an intuitive explanation to Proposition 2. It states that co-regularization prefers to output a pair of hypotheses which minimizes the disagreement on the unlabeled data rather than the optimal classifier. Its performance will be influenced by the incompatibility between the two views, especially when the unlabeled data are very large while the labeled data are small. It might contribute to understanding the difference between co-regularization and co-training. For two views which provide almost the same information, the optimal classifiers in the two views are compatible with each other, and co-regularization could find the optimal classifiers by minimizing the error rate on labeled data and the disagreement on unlabeled data over two views; for two views which provide diverse information, we show that co-regularization may fail, while co-training which iteratively utilizes the confident information in one view to help the other is a good learning strategy.

5. Why Combination of Classifiers is Good

Usually, the two classifiers in disagreement-based approaches are combined to make predictions in practice, e.g., the two classifiers in co-training [11] are combined by multiplying the posterior probabilities and the empirical results showed that the combination is better than the individual classifiers. However, there is no theoretical study to explain why and when the combination can be better than the individual classifiers.

Let h_{com} denote the combination of the individual classifiers h_1 and h_2 , then the combination h_{com} by multiplying the posterior probabilities in [11] is

formulated as

$$h_{com}(x) = \begin{cases} +1 & \text{if } P(h_1 = +1|x)P(h_2 = +1|x) \\ & > P(h_1 = -1|x)P(h_2 = -1|x) \\ -1 & \text{if } P(h_1 = +1|x)P(h_2 = +1|x) \\ & < P(h_1 = -1|x)P(h_2 = -1|x) \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} . \quad (31)$$

Actually, this combination strategy can be generalized to any margin-based classifiers. Let $\mathcal{F}: \mathcal{X} \rightarrow [-1, +1]$ denote the hypothesis space, the classification rule on $x \in \mathcal{X}$ induced by a hypothesis $f \in \mathcal{F}$ is $sign(f(x))$ and $|f(x)|$ is the margin of f on x . Let $P(y = +1|x) = \frac{1+f(x)}{2}$, the classification rule $sign(f(x))$ is equal to maximizing the posterior probability $P(y = +1|x)$, i.e., $f(x) > 0 \Leftrightarrow P(y = +1|x) > \frac{1}{2}$. So the combination strategy in Equation 31 for f_1 and f_2 is formulated as

$$f_{com}(x) = \begin{cases} +1 & \text{if } f_1(x) + f_2(x) > 0 \\ -1 & \text{if } f_1(x) + f_2(x) < 0 , \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} , \quad (32)$$

i.e., $f_{com}(x) = sign(f_1(x) + f_2(x))$. It implies that f_{com} follows the decision of the hypothesis which has larger margin and the error rate of f_{com} is:

$$\mathbf{err}(f_{com}) = P_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{D}}(f_{com}(x) \neq y) = P((f_1(x) + f_2(x)) \cdot y \leq 0). \quad (33)$$

Considering the construction of f_{com} , it is easy to find that when $f_1(x)$ and $f_2(x)$ make the same prediction on x , f_{com} will follow the both's decision. Let $DIS(f_1, f_2) = \{x \in \mathcal{X} : sign(f_1(x)) \neq sign(f_2(x))\}$, i.e., the disagreed instance set by f_1 and f_2 , the error rate of f_{com} depends on its performance on $DIS(f_1, f_2)$ and the following Proposition 3 holds for f_{com} .

Proposition 3 *The error rate of f_{com} satisfies the following lower bound:*

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{err}(f_{com}) &\geq P_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{D}}(sign(f_1(x)) \neq y \wedge sign(f_2(x)) \neq y) \\ &= \frac{\mathbf{err}(f_1) + \mathbf{err}(f_2) - d(f_1, f_2)}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. The worst case of f_{com} is making incorrect predictions for all instances in $DIS(f_1, f_2)$, it is easy to get Proposition 3 proved. \square

Remark: Proposition 3 states that larger disagreement will lead to better lower bound for the combination of the individual classifiers.

Now we study the performance of f_{com} on $DIS(f_1, f_2)$. For any $x \in DIS(f_1, f_2)$, f_1 and f_2 make different predictions on x . Let $f_G(x)$ denote the output of the hypothesis which makes the correct prediction and let $f_R(x)$ denote the output of the hypothesis which makes the incorrect prediction, i.e.,

$$f_G(x) = \begin{cases} f_1(x) & \text{if } f_1(x) \cdot y > 0 \\ f_2(x) & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad f_R(x) = \begin{cases} f_1(x) & \text{if } f_1(x) \cdot y < 0 \\ f_2(x) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

When $|f_G(x)|$ is larger than $|f_R(x)|$, the combination f_{com} gives the correct prediction on x . Intuitively, f_{com} works in the following way: if the margin (the confidence) is reliable, i.e., large margin implies high label quality, the incorrect prediction happens on the instance which has small margin, i.e., $|f_R(x)|$ is small. If f_1 and f_2 are not very related to each other, the probability that both hypotheses have small margin on x is small, i.e., $|f_G(x)|$ is large with great probability. Thus, $|f_G(x)| > |f_R(x)|$ holds with great probability and f_{com} gives the correct prediction on x . Define the following confidence gain $C_G(f_1, f_2)$ and confidence risk $C_R(f_1, f_2)$:

$$C_G(f_1, f_2) = \int_{x \in DIS(f_1, f_2)} |f_G(x)| p(x) dx, \quad (34)$$

$$C_R(f_1, f_2) = \int_{x \in DIS(f_1, f_2)} |f_R(x)| p(x) dx. \quad (35)$$

$C_G(f_1, f_2)$ is the integral correct margin of f_1 and f_2 over $DIS(f_1, f_2)$, while $C_R(f_1, f_2)$ is the integral incorrect margin of f_1 and f_2 over $DIS(f_1, f_2)$. If $C_G(f_1, f_2)$ is much larger than $C_R(f_1, f_2)$, $|f_G(x)| > |f_R(x)|$ may hold with great probability for $x \in DIS(f_1, f_2)$.

The margin-based classifiers try to classify instances correctly with large margins, however, there may exist some instances on which the margins are small, e.g., the instances close to the boundary. Intuitively, these instances with

small margins are not too many, maybe bounded by some function. Suppose that the distribution of $|f_G(x)|$ over $DIS(f_1, f_2)$ satisfies the condition: for $C_T > 0$, $k \geq 0$ and all $0 < t < 1$ such that

$$P_{x \in DIS(f_1, f_2)}(|f_G(x)| < t) \leq C_T \cdot t^k. \quad (36)$$

It indicates that the amount of correctly classified instances with small margins is bounded by a polynomial function, and larger k will lead to less small margins. This condition is inspired by the famous Tsybakov condition [47] for characterizing the distribution of underlying small margins. For the instances in the disagreed region $DIS(f_1, f_2)$, the individual classifiers make different predictions on them, it is reasonable to assume that the individual classifiers make predictions on these disagreed instances independently. Now we provide an upper bound on the error rate of the combination.

Theorem 14 *Suppose the individual classifiers make predictions on the instances in the disagreed region $DIS(f_1, f_2)$ independently and the Tsybakov condition in Equation 36 holds, the following bound on the error rate of f_{com} holds.*

$$\begin{aligned} P_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{D}}(f_{com}(x) \neq y) &\leq \frac{err(f_1) + err(f_2) - d(f_1, f_2)}{2} \\ &\quad + C_T \cdot \int_{x \in DIS(f_1, f_2)} |f_R(x)|^k p(x) dx. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. For $x \in DIS(f_1, f_2)$, without loss of generality, we assume that f_1 gives the correct prediction while f_2 gives the incorrect prediction, with the assumption that f_1 and f_2 make predictions on it independently and the condition in Equation 36 we get

$$\begin{aligned} P(\mathbb{I}(f_{com}(x) \neq y)) &= P(\mathbb{I}(|f_1(x)| < |f_2(x)|)) \\ &= P(\mathbb{I}(|f_G(x)| < |f_R(x)|)) \\ &\leq C_T \cdot |f_R(x)|^k. \end{aligned}$$

Then, we get

$$P_{x \in DIS(f_1, f_2)}(f_{com}(x) \neq y) = \int_{x \in DIS(f_1, f_2)} P(\mathbb{I}(f_{com}(x) \neq y)) p(x) dx$$

$$\leq C_T \cdot \int_{x \in DIS(f_1, f_2)} |f_R(x)|^k p(x) dx.$$

It is easy to find that

$$\begin{aligned} & P_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{D}}(f_{com}(x) \neq y) \\ &= P_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{D}}(\text{sign}(f_1(x)) \neq y \wedge \text{sign}(f_2(x)) \neq y) + P_{x \in DIS(f_1, f_2)}(f_{com}(x) \neq y) \\ &\leq \frac{\text{err}(f_1) + \text{err}(f_2) - d(f_1, f_2)}{2} + C_T \cdot \int_{x \in DIS(f_1, f_2)} |f_R(x)|^k p(x) dx. \end{aligned}$$

□

Remark: Let us give a comprehensive explanation to Theorem 14: for $k = 1$, $\int_{x \in DIS(f_1, f_2)} |f_R(x)|^k p(x) dx = C_R(f_1, f_2)$, it indicates that if the individual classifiers have large disagreement $d(f_1, f_2)$ and small confidence risk $C_R(f_1, f_2)$, the combination will have low error rate. It implies that for good combination, incorrect predictions should have small margins. The following Corollary 1 shows when the combination is better than the individual classifiers.

Corollary 1 *Suppose the individual classifiers make predictions on the instances in the disagreed region $DIS(f_1, f_2)$ independently, the condition in Equation 36 holds and $\text{err}(f_1) \leq \text{err}(f_2)$, if*

$$C_T \cdot \int_{x \in DIS(f_1, f_2)} |f_R(x)|^k p(x) dx < \frac{\text{err}(f_1) - \text{err}(f_2) + d(f_1, f_2)}{2},$$

$\text{err}(f_{com})$ is smaller than $\text{err}(f_1)$.

Remark: Corollary 1 states that if the confidence risk $C_R(f_1, f_2)$ is small (depending on the disagreement between the individual classifiers), i.e., incorrect predictions have small margins, the combination is better than the individual classifiers.

6. Discussion and Conclusion

The disagreement-based semi-supervised learning [14, 18] was named to assemble the approaches which generate multiple weak classifiers and let them

label unlabeled instances to augment the training data, including co-training and single-view disagreement-based algorithms. In these approaches, unlabeled data serve as a kind of “platform” for information exchange and the disagreement among multiple weak classifiers is exploited during the learning process. If there is no disagreement, the learning process will degenerate into self-training. In this article, we aim at presenting a theoretical foundation of disagreement-based approaches.

One basic issue of the theoretical foundation is why and when the disagreement-based approaches could improve learning performance by exploiting unlabeled data. In Section 2.1, we provide the theoretical analysis on disagreement-based approaches and give bounds on the error rates of the classifiers in the learning process. Furthermore, we prove that the disagreement will decrease after the disagreement-based process is initiated. Based on these results, it can be found that the disagreement-based approaches could improve learning performance given that the two initial classifiers trained with the initial labeled data have large disagreement. The empirical results in Section 2.3.2 verify that larger disagreement will lead to better performance improvement.

For disagreement-based approaches, it is often observed that the performance of the classifiers cannot be improved further after a number of rounds in empirical studies. We prove that the disagreement and error rates of the classifiers will converge after a number of rounds in Section 2.2, which provides the theoretical explanation to the observation. The empirical results in Section 2.3.1 validate that the disagreement between the classifiers will decrease or converge as the learning process goes on. When the disagreement converges, the error rates of the classifiers also seem to converge, e.g., Figure 2(d) to (f); while when the disagreement does not converge, the error rates of the classifiers seem to decrease as the disagreement decreases, e.g., Figures 2(g) to (i).

It will be an impressive result if the sufficient and necessary condition for disagreement-based approaches can be found. Toward this direction, we present a theoretical graph-based analysis on co-training in Section 3, in which the classifier in each view is viewed as label propagation and thus co-training is viewed

as a combinative label propagation over two views. Based on this analysis, we get the sufficient and necessary condition for co-training. Note that such graph-based analysis on co-training only cares the two graphs rather than where these graphs come from, and therefore it is also applicable to single-view disagreement-based approaches when there is only one view but two graphs can be obtained in different distance matrices. Recall that the analysis in Section 2.1 provides a sufficient condition for disagreement-based approaches, however, it is different from the analysis in Section 3. The analysis in Section 3 focuses on the transductive setting, since studying the sufficient and necessary condition is a very hard problem; while the analysis in Section 2.1 focuses on the non-transductive setting, which is applicable to general learning process.

All previous theoretical analyses on co-training assumed that each view is sufficient to learn the target concept, however, in many real-world applications, due to feature corruption or various feature noise, neither view can provide sufficient information. So we present a theoretical analysis on co-training with insufficient views which is much more challenging but practical in Section 4, especially when the two views provide diverse information. We prove that if the two views have large margin-based disagreement, co-training could succeed in outputting the approximation of the optimal classifier by exploiting unlabeled data even with insufficient views. We also give some implications for understanding the difference between co-training and co-regularization. In the analysis of Section 4, we focus on the margin-based classifiers and assume that large margin leads to high label quality, since co-training with insufficient views is a much harder problem, we need some prior knowledge about how much information each instance can provide to learn the target concept.

Since the two classifiers in disagreement-based approaches are usually combined to make predictions, we present a theoretical analysis to explain why and when the combination can be better than the individual classifiers in Section 5. We focus on the margin-based classifiers and prove that when the individual classifiers have large disagreement, diverse margin output and small confidence risk, i.e., incorrect predictions have small margins, the combination would have

low error rate.

Our theoretical result in Section 2 indicates that data with two views are not necessary to improve learning performance by exploiting unlabeled data, but it does not mean that we do not need two views at all. When the data have two views, we can get better result. For example, if the data have two conditionally independent views, a single labeled example is sufficient to find the target concept [27, 49]. It is noteworthy that in previous semi-supervised learning studies, the disagreement-based and graph-based approaches were developed separately. While our theoretical result in Section 3 provides a possibility of bringing them into a unified framework, which will be an interesting research direction.

References

- [1] D. J. Miller, H. S. Uyar, A mixture of experts classifier with learning based on both labelled and unlabelled data, in: M. Mozer, M. I. Jordan, T. Petsche (Eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 9*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1997, pp. 571–577.
- [2] K. Nigam, A. McCallum, S. Thrun, T. Mitchell, Text classification from labeled and unlabeled documents using EM, *Machine Learning* 39 (2/3) (2000) 103–134.
- [3] B. Shahshahani, D. Landgrebe, The effect of unlabeled samples in reducing the small sample size problem and mitigating the hughes phenomenon, *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing* 32 (5) (1994) 1087–1095.
- [4] O. Chapelle, A. Zien, Semi-supervised learning by low density separation, in: *Proceedings of the 10th International Workshop on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, Barbados, 2005, pp. 57–64.
- [5] T. Joachims, Transductive inference for text classification using support vector machines., in: *Proceedings of the 16th International Conference on Machine Learning*, Bled, Slovenia, 1999, pp. 200–209.

- [6] V. Sindhwani, S. S. Keerthi, Large scale semi-supervised linear SVMs, in: Proceedings of the 29th Annual International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, Seattle, WA, 2006, pp. 477–484.
- [7] M. Belkin, P. Niyogi, V. Sindhwani, Manifold regularization: A geometric framework for learning from labeled and unlabeled examples, *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 7 (2006) 2399–2434.
- [8] A. Blum, S. Chawla, Learning from labeled and unlabeled data using graph mincuts, in: Proceedings of the 18th International Conference on Machine Learning, Williamston, MA, 2001, pp. 19–26.
- [9] D. Zhou, O. Bousquet, T. N. Lal, J. Weston, B. Schölkopf, Learning with local and global consistency, in: S. Thrun, L. Saul, B. Schölkopf (Eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 16*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2004.
- [10] X. Zhu, Z. Ghahramani, J. Lafferty, Semi-supervised learning using Gaussian fields and harmonic functions, in: Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Machine Learning, Washington, DC, 2003, pp. 912–919.
- [11] A. Blum, T. Mitchell, Combining labeled and unlabeled data with co-training, in: Proceedings of the 11th Annual Conference on Computational Learning Theory, Madison, WI, 1998, pp. 92–100.
- [12] S. Goldman, Y. Zhou, Enhancing supervised learning with unlabeled data, in: Proceedings of the 17th International Conference on Machine Learning, San Francisco, CA, 2000, pp. 327–334.
- [13] Z.-H. Zhou, M. Li, Tri-training: exploiting unlabeled data using three classifiers, *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* 17(11) (2005) 1529–1541.
- [14] Z.-H. Zhou, M. Li, Semi-supervised learning by disagreement, *Knowledge and Information Systems* 24 (3) (2009) 415–439.

- [15] V. R. de Sa, D. H. Ballard, Category learning through multi-modality sensing, *Neural Computation* 10 (5) (1998) 1097–1117.
- [16] K. Nigam, R. Ghani, Analyzing the effectiveness and applicability of co-training, in: *Proceedings of the 9th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management*, Washington, DC, 2000, pp. 86–93.
- [17] Z.-H. Zhou, M. Li, Semisupervised regression with co-training style algorithms, *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering* 19 (11) (2007) 1479–1493.
- [18] Z.-H. Zhou, Semi-supervised learning by disagreement, in: *Proceedings of the 4th IEEE International Conference on Granular Computing*, Hangzhou, China, 2008.
- [19] R. Hwa, M. Osborne, A. Sarkar, M. Steedman, Corrected co-training for statistical parsers, in: *Working Notes of the ICML'03 Workshop on the Continuum from Labeled to Unlabeled Data in Machine Learning and Data Mining*, Washington, DC, 2003.
- [20] A. Sarkar, Applying co-training methods to statistical parsing, in: *Proceedings of the 2nd Annual Meeting of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, Pittsburgh, PA, 2001, pp. 95–102.
- [21] M. Steedman, M. Osborne, A. Sarkar, S. Clark, R. Hwa, J. Hockenmaier, P. Ruhlen, S. Baker, J. Crim, Bootstrapping statistical parsers from small data sets, in: *Proceedings of the 11th Conference on the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, Budapest, Hungary, 2003, pp. 331–338.
- [22] Z.-H. Zhou, K.-J. Chen, H.-B. Dai, Enhancing relevance feedback in image retrieval using unlabeled data, *ACM Transactions on Information Systems* 24 (2) (2006) 219–244.

- [23] W. Wang, Z.-H. Zhou, On multi-view active learning and the combination with semi-supervised learning, in: Proceedings of the 25th International Conference on Machine Learning, Helsinki, Finland, 2008, pp. 1152–1159.
- [24] U. Brefeld, T. Gärtner, T. Scheffer, S. Wrobel, Efficient co-regularised least squares regression, in: Proceedings of the the 23th International Conference on Machine Learning, Pittsburgh, PA, 2006, pp. 137–144.
- [25] J. Farquhar, D. R. Hardoon, H. Meng, J. Shawe-Taylor, S. Szedmák, Two view learning: Svm-2k, theory and practice, in: Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 18, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2006.
- [26] V. Sindhwani, P. Niyogi, M. Belkin, A co-regularization approach to semi-supervised learning with multiple views, in: Proceedings of the ICML Workshop on Learning with Multiple Views, Bonn, Germany, 2005.
- [27] M.-F. Balcan, A. Blum, A discriminative model for semi-supervised learning, *Journal of the ACM* 57 (3) (2010) 19:1–19:46.
- [28] S. Dasgupta, M. Littman, D. McAllester, PAC generalization bounds for co-training, in: T. G. Dietterich, S. Becker, Z. Ghahramani (Eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 14*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2002, pp. 375–382.
- [29] S. Abney, Bootstrapping, in: Proceedings of the 40th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, Philadelphia, PA, 2002, pp. 360–367.
- [30] M.-F. Balcan, A. Blum, K. Yang, Co-training and expansion: Towards bridging theory and practice, in: L. K. Saul, Y. Weiss, L. Bottou (Eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 17*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2005, pp. 89–96.
- [31] N. V. Chawla, G. J. Karakoulas, Learning from labeled and unlabeled data: An empirical study across techniques and domains, *Journal of Artificial Intelligence Research* 23 (2005) 331–366.

- [32] D. Haussler, Decision-theoretic generalizations of the pac model for neural net and other learning applications, *Information and Computation* 100 (1) (1992) 78–150.
- [33] D. Pierce, C. Cardie, Limitations of co-training for natural language learning from large datasets, in: *Proceedings of the 2001 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, Pittsburgh, PA, 2001, pp. 1–9.
- [34] M. Krogel, T. Scheffer, Effectiveness of information extraction, multi-relational, and semi-supervised learning for predicting functional properties of genes, in: *Proceedings of the 3rd IEEE International Conference on Data Mining*, Melbourne, FL, 2003, pp. 569–572.
- [35] D. Angluin, P. Laird, Learning from noisy examples, *Machine Learning* 2 (1988) 343–370.
- [36] W. Hoeffding, Probability inequalities for sums of bounded random variables, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 58 (301) (1963) 13–30.
- [37] C. Blake, E. Keogh, C. J. Merz, UCI repository of machine learning databases, [<http://www.ics.uci.edu/~mlearn/MLRepository.html>], Department of Information and Computer Science, University of California, Irvine, CA (1998).
- [38] I. H. Witten, E. Frank, *Data Mining: Practical Machine Learning Tools and Techniques*, 2nd ed., Morgan Kaufmann, San Francisco, CA, 2005.
- [39] X. Zhu, *Semi-supervised learning with graphs*, Ph.D. thesis, CS School, CMU (2005).
- [40] T. Jebara, J. Wang, S.-F. Chang, Graph construction and b -matching for semi-supervised learning, in: *Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on Machine Learning*, Quebec, Canada, 2009, pp. 441–448.

- [41] M. Maier, U. von Luxburg, M. Hein, Influence of graph construction on graph-based clustering measures, in: D. Koller, D. Schuurmans, Y. Bengio, L. Bottou (Eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 21*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2009, pp. 1025–1032.
- [42] A. Argyriou, M. Herbster, M. Pontil, Combining graph laplacians for semi-supervised learning, in: Y. Weiss, B. Scholkopf, J. Platt (Eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 18*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 2006, pp. 67–74.
- [43] T. Zhang, A. Popescul, B. Dom, Linear prediction models with graph regularization for web-page categorization, in: *Proceedings of the 12th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, Philadelphia, PA, 2006, pp. 821–826.
- [44] D. Zhou, C. Burges, Spectral clustering and transductive learning with multiple views, in: *Proceedings of the 24th International conference on Machine Learning*, Corvallis, OR, 2007, pp. 1159–1166.
- [45] L. Devroye, L. Györfi, G. Lugosi (Eds.), *A Probabilistic Theory of Pattern Recognition*, Springer, New York, 1996.
- [46] M. Anthony, P. Bartlett (Eds.), *Neural Network Learning: Theoretical Foundations*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1999.
- [47] A. Tsybakov, Optimal aggregation of classifiers in statistical learning, *The Annals of Statistics* 32 (1) (2004) 135–166.
- [48] K. Sridharan, S. M. Kakade, An information theoretic framework for multi-view learning, in: *Proceedings of the 21st Annual Conference on Learning Theory*, Helsinki, Finland, 2008, pp. 403–414.
- [49] Z.-H. Zhou, D.-C. Zhan, Q. Yang, Semi-supervised learning with very few labeled training examples, in: *Proceedings of the 22nd AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, Vancouver, Canada, 2007, pp. 675–680.