

# Don't fear the unlabelled: safe deep semi-supervised learning via simple debiasing

**Hugo Schmutz**

HUGO.SCHMUTZ@INRIA.FR

*Université Côte d'Azur*

*TIRO-MATOS, UMR CEA E4320*

*Inria, Maasai project-team*

*Laboratoire J.A. Dieudonné, UMR CNRS 7351*

*Nice, France*

**Olivier Humbert**

OLIVIER.HUMBERT@UNIV-COTEDAZUR.FR

*Université Côte d'Azur*

*TIRO-MATOS, UMR CEA E4320*

*Centre Antoine Lacassagne*

*Nice, France*

**Pierre-Alexandre Mattei**

PIERRE-ALEXANDRE.MATTEI@INRIA.FR

*Université Côte d'Azur*

*Inria, Maasai project-team*

*Laboratoire J.A. Dieudonné, UMR CNRS 7351*

*Nice, France*

## Abstract

Semi supervised learning (SSL) provides an effective means of leveraging unlabelled data to improve a model's performance. Even though the domain has received a considerable amount of attention in the past years, most methods present the common drawback of being unsafe. By safeness we mean the quality of not degrading a fully supervised model when including unlabelled data. Our starting point is to notice that the estimate of the risk that most discriminative SSL methods minimise is biased, even asymptotically. This bias makes these techniques untrustable without a proper validation set, but we propose a simple way of removing the bias. Our debiasing approach is straightforward to implement, and applicable to most deep SSL methods. We provide simple theoretical guarantees on the safeness of these modified methods, without having to rely on the strong assumptions on the data distribution that SSL theory usually requires. We evaluate debiased versions of different existing SSL methods and show that debiasing can compete with classic deep SSL techniques in various classic settings and even performs well when traditional SSL fails.

## 1. Introduction

The promise of semi-supervised learning (SSL) is to be able to learn powerful predictive models using partially labelled data. In turn, this would allow machine learning to be less dependent on the often costly and sometimes dangerously biased task of labelling data.

Early SSL approaches—e.g. Scudder's (1965) untaught pattern recognition machine—simply replaced unknown labels by predictions made by some estimate of the predictive model and used the obtained *pseudo-labels* to refine their initial estimate. Other more

complex branches of SSL have been explored since, notably using generative models (from McLachlan, 1977, to Kingma et al., 2014) or graphs (notably following Zhu et al., 2003).

Deep neural networks, which are state-of-the-art supervised predictors, have been trained successfully using SSL. Somewhat surprisingly, the main ingredient of their success is still the notion of pseudo-labels (or one of its variants), combined with a systematic use of data augmentation (e.g. Xie et al., 2019; Sohn et al., 2020; Rizve et al., 2021).

An obvious SSL baseline is to simply throw away the unlabelled data. We will call such a baseline the *complete case*, following the missing data literature (e.g. Tsiatis, 2006). As reported in van Engelen and Hoos (2020), the main risk of SSL is the potential degradation caused by the introduction of unlabelled data. Indeed, semi-supervised learning outperforms the complete case baseline only in specific cases (Singh et al., 2008; Schölkopf et al., 2012; Li and Zhou, 2014). The degradation risk for generative models has been analysed in Chapelle et al. (2006, Chapter 4). To overcome this issue, previous works introduced the notion *safe* semi-supervised learning for techniques which never reduce predictive performance by introducing unlabelled data (Li and Zhou, 2014; Kawakita and Takeuchi, 2014; Li et al., 2016; Gan et al., 2017; Trapp et al., 2017; Guo et al., 2020). Our loose definition of safeness is as follows: *a SSL algorithm is safe if it has theoretical guarantees that are similar or stronger to the complete case baseline.* The “theoretical” part of the definition is motivated by the fact that any empirical assessment of generalisation performances of an SSL algorithm is jeopardised by the scarcity of labels. Indeed, with few labels, it is risky to rely too much on a very small validation set.

There is a growing interest for safe semi-supervised learning in the SSL community. First, Guo et al. (2020) introduced a double optimisation process assigning individual weights to the contribution of unlabelled data in the SSL algorithms (Guo et al., 2020). The process can assign null weights to unlabelled data, therefore the optimal solution is at least better than the complete case. Sakai et al. (2017) focus on binary classification problem. Inspired by positive unlabelled classification, a framework where we do not have labelled data for the negative class, they proposed an unbiased modification of the risk estimate. The idea is to use unlabelled data to better evaluate the risk for both negative and positive samples in order to reduce its variance. In follow-up work (Tsuchiya et al., 2021) proposed a similar approach based on an unbiased risk estimate for ordinal regression, and demonstrated the Fisher consistency of their method, as well as other theoretical properties. Older works have already proposed safe methods. For instance, Sokolovska et al. (2008) use unlabelled data to weight the contribution of labelled data in the risk estimator. S4VM (safe semi-supervised support vector machine) is another discriminative model which is not degrading the complete case, proposed by (Li and Zhou, 2014). The S4VM comes with theoretical guarantees on the inclusion of unlabelled data, indeed they show that if the true model is accessible, the accuracy of S4VM is never worse than the complete case SVM. However, if the distributional assumptions are not satisfied, no improvement or degeneration is expected.

Unfortunately, popular deep SSL techniques are generally not safe. Indeed, they rely on strong and essentially untestable assumptions on the data distribution:

- the smoothness assumption: small perturbations on the features  $x$  do not cause large modification in the labels,  $p(y|\text{pert}(x)) \approx p(y|x)$ ;




Figure 1: Neural net trained using SSL methods on a 1D dataset drawn from two uniform laws. (Left) Data histogram. (Right) Posterior probabilities  $p(1|x)$  of the same model trained following either complete case (only labelled data), Pseudo-label or our DePseudo-label.

- the manifold assumption: data distribution support is a manifold lower dimension than the input space then knowledge on  $p(x)$  improves the understanding of  $p(x, y)$  or  $p(y|x)$ ;
- the cluster assumption: data points are distributed on discrete clusters and points in the same cluster are likely to share the same label.

Most of semi-supervised methods rely on these distributional assumptions to ensure performance in entropy minimisation, pseudo-labelling and consistency-based methods. However, no proof is given that guarantees the effectiveness of state-of-the-art methods (Tarvainen and Valpola, 2017; Miyato et al., 2018; Sohn et al., 2020; Pham et al., 2021). To illustrate that SSL requires specific assumptions, we show in a toy example that pseudo-labelling fails at learning on a simple dataset on a simple setting. To do so, we draw samples from two uniform distributions with a small overlap. Both supervised and semi-supervised neural networks are trained using the same labelled dataset. While the supervised algorithm learns perfectly the true distribution of  $p(1|x)$ , the semi-supervised learning methods (both entropy minimisation and pseudo-label) underestimate  $p(1|x)$  for  $x \in [1, 3]$  (see Figure 1). We also tested our proposed method (DeSSL) on this dataset and show that the unbiased version of each SSL technique learns the true distribution perfectly. See Appendix A for the results with Entropy Minimisation.

## 1.1 Contributions

Rather than relying on the strong geometric assumptions usually used in SSL theory, we simply use the *missing completely at random (MCAR)* assumption, a standard assumption from the missing data literature (see e.g. Little and Rubin, 2019). With this only assumption on the data distribution, we propose a new safe SSL method derived from simply debiasing common SSL risk estimates. Our main contributions are:

- We introduce debiased SSL (DeSSL), a safe method that can be applied to most deep SSL algorithms;

- We propose a theoretical explanation of the intuition of the popular SSL methods. We provide theoretical guarantees on the safeness of using DeSSL both on consistency and calibration of the method. We also provide a generalisation error bound;
- We show how simple it is to apply DeSSL to existing methods and show empirically that DeSSL leads to models that are never worse than their classical counterparts, generally better calibrated and sometimes much more accurate.

## 2. Semi-supervised learning

### 2.1 Learning with labelled data

The ultimate objective of most of the learning frameworks is to minimise a risk  $\mathcal{R}$ , defined as the expectation of a particular loss function  $L$  over a data distribution  $p(x, y)$ , on a set of models  $f_\theta(x)$ , parametrised by  $\theta \in \Theta$ . Thus, the learning task is finding  $\theta^*$  that minimises the risk:

$$\mathcal{R}(\theta) = \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim p(x,y)} [L(\theta; X, Y)]. \quad (1)$$

The distribution  $p(x, y)$  being unknown, we generally minimise an approximation of the risk, the empirical risk  $\hat{\mathcal{R}}(\theta)$  computed on a samples of  $n$  i.i.d points drawn from  $p(x, y)$ .

$\hat{\mathcal{R}}(\theta)$  is an unbiased and consistent estimate of  $\mathcal{R}(\theta)$  under mild assumptions. Its unbiased nature is one of the basic properties that is used for the development of traditional learning theory and asymptotic statistics (van der Vaart, 2000; Shalev-Shwartz and Ben-David, 2014).

### 2.2 Learning with both labelled and unlabelled data

The success of deep learning is contingent with the access to a large training dataset. In fact, Hestness et al. (2017) argue that deep learning model accuracy grows as a power law of the training set size. However, large labelled datasets come with a cost since labelling must be done by an expert and can be very time-consuming in the case of lung tumour segmentation for instance. Fortunately, unlabelled data can be acquired at a significantly lower cost and then may be used to improve the performance of a fully supervised model. This is the idea behind semi-supervised learning: leveraging both labelled and unlabelled data to improve the model’s performance and generalisation. Indeed, having further information on the distribution  $p(x)$  provides a better understanding of the distributions  $p(x, y)$  and also  $p(y|x)$ . Indeed,  $p(x)$  may contain information on  $p(y|x)$  (Schölkopf et al. 2012, Goodfellow et al. 2016, Chapter 7.6, van Engelen and Hoos 2020).

In the following, we have access to  $n$  samples drawn from the distribution  $p(x, y)$  where some of the labels are missing. We introduce a new random variable  $r \in \{0, 1\}$  that governs whether or not a data point is labelled ( $r = 0$  missing,  $r = 1$  observed). The MCAR assumption states that the missingness of a label  $y$  is independent of its features and the value of the label:  $p(x, y, r) = p(x, y)p(r)$ . This is the case when nor features nor label carry information about the potential missingness of the labels. This description of semi-supervised learning as a missing data problem has already been done in multiple works (Seeger, 2000; Grandvalet and Bengio, 2004; Ji et al., 2012; Ahfock and McLachlan, 2019; Liu and Goldberg, 2020) and in a reference book Chapelle et al. (2006, Chapters 5, 8 and 9). Moreover, the

MCAR assumption is implicitly made in most of the SSL works to design the experiments, indeed, missing labels are drawn completely as random in datasets such as MNIST, CIFAR or SVHN (Tarvainen and Valpola, 2017; Miyato et al., 2018; Xie et al., 2019; Sohn et al., 2020).

### 2.2.1 COMPLETE CASE: THROWING THE UNLABELLED DATA AWAY

In missing data theory, the complete case is the learning scheme that only uses fully observed instances, namely labelled data. The natural estimator of the risk is then simply the empirical risk computed on the labelled data. Fortunately, in the MCAR setting, the complete case risk estimate keeps the same good properties of the traditional supervised one: it is unbiased and converges pointwisely to  $\mathcal{R}(\theta)$ . Therefore, traditional learning theory holds for the complete case under MCAR. While these observations are hardly new (see e.g. Liu and Goldberg, 2020), they can be seen as particular cases of the theory that we develop below. The risk to minimise is

$$\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{CC}(\theta) = \frac{1}{n_l} \sum_{i=1}^{n_l} L(\theta; x_i, y_i). \quad (2)$$

As discussed in the introduction, SSL faces the risk of performance degradation when distributional assumptions are not satisfied (Singh et al., 2008; Schölkopf et al., 2012; Li and Zhou, 2014) and specifically in settings where the MCAR assumption does not hold anymore (Oliver et al., 2018; Guo et al., 2020). In particular, in (Zhu et al., 2022), the authors show disparate impacts of pseudo-labelling on the different sub-classes of the population. Indeed, sub-classes with a higher baseline accuracy would tend to benefit more from SSL than the others. Moreover, sub-classes with poor baseline accuracy can even observe a performance drop. "The rich get richer, the poor get poorer". To mitigate these problems, previous works introduced the notion *safe* semi-supervised learning for techniques which never reduce learning performance by introducing unlabelled data (Li and Zhou, 2014; Kawakita and Takeuchi, 2014; Li et al., 2016; Gan et al., 2017; Trapp et al., 2017; Guo et al., 2020). In real-world applications, validation sets are not large enough to ensure the generalisation of the trained model and therefore, the introduction of unlabelled data may come at the risk of degrading performances. Then, theoretical guarantees are required to use safely SSL algorithms. For this reason, in our work, we consider as *safe* a SSL algorithm that has theoretical guarantees that are similar or stronger than those of the complete case baseline.

### 2.2.2 INCORPORATING UNLABELLED DATA

A major drawback of the complete case framework is that a lot of data ends up not being exploited. A class of SSL approaches, mainly inductive methods with respect to the taxonomy of van Engelen and Hoos (2020), generally aim to minimise a modified estimator of the risk by including unlabelled data. Therefore, the optimisation problem generally becomes finding  $\hat{\theta}$  that minimises the SSL risk,

$$\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{SSL}(\theta) = \frac{1}{n_l} \sum_{i=1}^{n_l} L(\theta; x_i, y_i) + \frac{\lambda}{n_u} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} H(\theta; x_i). \quad (3)$$

where  $H$  is a term that does not depend on the labels and  $\lambda$  is a scalar weight which balances the labelled and unlabelled terms. In the literature,  $H$  can generally be seen as a surrogate of  $L$ . Indeed, it looks like the intuitive choices of  $H$  are equal or equivalent to a form of expectation of  $L$  on a distribution given by the model. Our theory will indicate that it is desirable, indeed, that  $H$  is positively correlated with  $L$ .

### 2.2.3 SOME EXAMPLES OF SURROGATES

A recent overview of the recent SSL techniques has been proposed by van Engelen and Hoos (2020). Most of the methods considered here are suited for a discriminative probabilistic model  $p_\theta(y|x)$  that approximates the conditional  $p(y|x)$ . Methods can be categorised into two distinct sections, the entropy and the consistency-based methods. The former aim to minimise a form of entropy of the model predictions, the latter will enforce stability on model predictions given modifications of the input (data augmentation) or perturbations of the model.

**Entropy-based methods:** Entropy-based methods aim to minimise a term of entropy of the predictions computed on unlabelled data. Thus, they encourage the model to be confident on unlabelled data, implicitly using the cluster assumption. As we detail in Appendix B, entropy-based methods can all be described as an expectation of  $L$  under a distribution  $\pi_x$  computed at the datapoint  $x$ :

$$H(\theta; x) = \mathbb{E}_{\pi_x(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})}[L(\theta; \tilde{x}, \tilde{y})]. \quad (4)$$

#### *Entropy Minisation (EntMin)*

Grandvalet and Bengio (2004) simply use the Shannon entropy as  $H(\theta; x)$ . This penalisation can be interpreted as favouring parameters inducing small class overlap (Chapelle et al., 2006, Chapter 9). This Shannon entropy can be rewritten as equation (4) with  $\pi_x(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) = \delta_x(\tilde{x})p_\theta(\tilde{y}|\tilde{x})$ . We note that entropy minimisation is the only method for which,  $\pi_x(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})$  does also depend of  $\theta$ .

#### *Pseudo-label*

Pseudo-labelling consists in picking the class with the maximum predicted probability as a pseudo-label for the unlabelled data (Scudder, 1965). Commonly, pseudo-labels are selected only if the predicted probability is above a predefined threshold  $\tau > 0$ . Again, this objective can be rewritten in the form of Equation 4 (see Appendix B). Recently, (Rizve et al., 2021) proposed an improved selection of pseudo-labels using uncertainty estimation methods on the predicted probability.

#### *Pseudo-label and data augmentation*

Recently, several methods based on data-augmentation have been proposed and proven to perform well on a large spectrum of SSL tasks. The idea is to have a model resilient to strong data-augmentation of the input by predicting pseudo-labels for unlabelled data using a augmented version of the input (Berthelot et al., 2019, 2020; Xie et al., 2019; Sohn et al., 2020; Zhang et al., 2021). These method rely both on the cluster assumption and the

smoothness assumption and are at the border between entropy-based and consistency-based methods. See Appendix B.

**Consistency-based methods** Another range of SSL methods minimise a consistency objective that encourages invariant prediction for perturbations either on the data either on the model. These methods rely on the smoothness assumption. In particular, consistency-based method aim to smooth the decision function of the models or have more stable predictions. These objectives  $H$  are not directly a form of expectation of  $L$  but are equivalent to an expectation of  $L$  (see Appendix B). The general form of the unsupervised objective can be written as

$$H(\theta; x) = \mathbf{Div}(f_{\hat{\theta}}(x, \cdot), \text{pert}(f_{\theta}(x, \cdot))), \quad (5)$$

where the  $\mathbf{Div}$  is a non-negative function that measures the divergence between two distributions, the cross-entropy, the KL divergence or the  $L^2$ -norm for instance and  $\hat{\theta}$  is a fixed copy of the current parameter  $\theta$  (the gradient is not propagated through  $\hat{\theta}$ ).

In this category, we cite  $\Pi$ -model from (Sajjadi et al., 2016), temporal ensembling from (Laine and Aila, 2017), Mean-teacher proposed by (Tarvainen and Valpola, 2017), virtual adversarial training (VAT) from (Miyato et al., 2018) and interpolation consistent training (ICT) from (Verma et al., 2019).

Intuitively, for entropy-based methods  $H$  should be applied only on unlabelled data. Indeed, entropy minimisation aims to enforce the confidence of the model on unlabelled datapoints and therefore, applying also  $H$  on labelled data will increase the confidence of the model on labelled datapoints and this may degrade the calibration. Whereas, for consistency-based method,  $H$  can be applied to any subset of data points. Our theory and proposed method remain the same whether  $H$  is applied on all the available data or not (see Appendix H).

### 2.3 Theoretical guarantees

As explained previously, the main risk of SSL is the potential degradation caused by the introduction of unlabelled data. At the moment, SSL performances are enabled by leveraging large validation sets. Indeed, SSL performances rely on extensive hyperparameter finetuning using a labelled validation set significantly larger than the labelled training set (Oliver et al., 2018). In real-world applications of SSL, it is reasonable to assume that the validation set would be smaller than the labelled dataset used for training. Oliver et al. (2018) show that for realistic validation set size ( $\leq 20\%$  of training data) it is impossible to differentiate different SSL models. Therefore, for a real-world applications of SSL, theoretical guarantees should ensure good performances.

Even though the methods presented above produce good performances in a variety of SSL benchmarks, they generally do not benefit from theoretical guarantees, even elementary. Assumptions such as the cluster or the smoothness assumptions are invoked by the literature to identify cases where SSL methods would work. However, these assumptions are strong and restrictive and, above all, difficult to test in practice. For instance, Schölkopf et al. (2012) show that depending on the causal relation between the features  $x$  and the target  $y$ , SSL may systematically fail, even if classic SSL assumptions hold. With our toy example of

Figure 1, we show that classic SSL may fail to generalise in a very benign setting without restrictive distributional assumptions. This example also shows that SSL fails even with a large number of labelled data. Indeed, the risk estimate is not necessarily asymptotically consistent meaning that even with an infinite amount of data the estimator would not give the correct value of the risk  $\mathcal{R}$ . Therefore models may fail to generalise even with an infinite number of labelled datapoints, as we show in Figure 1. For these reasons, classic SSL assumptions do not afford enough guarantees on the introduction of unlabelled data in the learning scheme in real-world applications. To sum up, the performance of these methods are evaluated empirically in particular scenarios chosen by the authors. Even if it is quite straightforward to understand the motivation behind the methods, they present no theoretical guarantees and may fail in real-world situations.

Presented methods minimise a biased version of the risk under the MCAR assumption and therefore classical learning theory does not apply anymore,

$$\mathbb{E}[\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{SSL}(\theta)] = \mathbb{E}[L(\theta; x, y)] + \lambda \mathbb{E}[H(\theta; x, y)] \neq \mathcal{R}(\theta). \quad (6)$$

Indeed, the unbiased nature of the risk estimate is crucial in the development of learning theory. This bias on the risk estimate may look like the one of a regularisation, such as the ridge regularisation. However, SSL and regularisation are intrinsically different for several reasons:

- Regularisers have a vanishing impact in the limit of infinite data whereas SSL usually do not in the proposed methods, see Equation 6. A solution would be to choose  $\lambda$  with respect of the number of data points and make it vanish when  $n$  goes to infinity. However, in most works, the choice of  $\lambda$  is independent of the number of  $n$  or  $n_l$  (Oliver et al., 2018; Sohn et al., 2020).
- One of the main advantages of regularisation is to turn the learning problem into a “more convex” problem, see Shalev-Shwartz and Ben-David (2014, Chapter 13). Indeed, ridge regularisation will often turn a convex problem into a strongly-convex problem. However, SSL faces the danger to turn the learning problem as non-convex as previously noted by Sokolovska et al. (2008).
- The objective of a regulariser is to bias the risk towards optimum with smooth decision functions whereas entropy-based SSL will lead to sharp decision functions.
- Regularisation usually does not depend on the data whereas  $H$  does in the SSL framework.

A entropy bias has been actually used by Pereyra et al. (2017) as a regulariser but as entropy *maximisation* which should has an effect that is the opposite of the SSL method introduced by Grandvalet and Bengio (2004), the entropy minimisation.

Previous works already proposed safe SSL methods with theoretical guarantees. Unfortunately, so far these methods come with either strong assumptions or important computational burden. Li and Zhou (2014) introduced a safe semi-supervised SVM and showed that the



accuracy of their method is never worse than SVMs trained with only labelled data. Sakai et al. (2017) proposed an unbiased estimate of the risk for binary classification by including unlabelled data. The key idea is to use unlabelled data (knowledge about the data distribution) to better evaluate in one hand the risk of positive class samples and on the other hand the risk of negative samples. They provided theoretical guarantees on its variance and a generalisation error bound. The method is designed only for binary classification and has not been tested in a deep learning setting. It has extended to ordinal regression in a follow-up work (Tsuchiya et al., 2021). In the context of kernel machines, Liu and Goldberg (2020) used an unbiased estimate of risk, similar to ours, for a specific choice of  $H$ . Guo et al. (2020) proposed  $DS^3L$ , a method safe that needs to approximately solve a bi-level optimisation problem. In particular, the method is designed for a different setting, not under the MCAR assumption, where there is a class mismatch between labelled and unlabelled data. The resolution of the optimisation problem provides a solution not worse than the complete case but comes with approximations. They provide a generalisation error bound. Also the method does not outperform classic SSL methods in the MCAR setting as it is designed for non-MCAR situations. Sokolovska et al. (2008) proposed a safe method with strong assumptions such that the feature space is finite and the marginal probability distribution of  $x$  is fully known. The idea is to use an infinite number of unlabelled data, so a full knowledge of  $p(x)$  to better approximate the joint density  $\hat{p}(x, y)$  in the risk estimator  $\mathbb{E}_{\hat{p}(x,y)}[L(\theta; x, y)]$ .

### 3. DeSSL: Unbiased semi-supervised learning

In order to overcome the issues introduced by the second term in the approximation of the risk for the semi-supervised learning approach, we propose DeSSL, an unbiased version of the SSL estimator using labelled data to annul the bias. The idea here is to retrieve the properties of classical learning theory. Fortunately, we will see that the proposed method can eventually have better properties than the complete case, in particular with regards to the variance of the estimate. The proposed DeSSL objective is

$$\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{DeSSL}(\theta) = \frac{1}{n_l} \sum_{i=1}^{n_l} L(\theta; x_i, y_i) + \frac{\lambda}{n_u} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} H(\theta; x_i) - \frac{\lambda}{n_l} \sum_{i=1}^{n_l} H(\theta; x_i). \quad (7)$$

Under the MCAR assumption, this estimator is unbiased for any value of the parameter  $\lambda$ . For a proof of this result see Appendix C. This way of debiasing is closely related to the method of control variates (Owen, 2013, Chapter 8) which is a common variance reduction technique. The idea is to add an additional term to a Monte-Carlo estimator with a null expectation in order to reduce the variance of the estimator without modifying the expectation.

#### 3.1 Does the DeSSL risk estimator make sense?

There are different ways to interpret the DeSSL method. The most intuitive interpretation is that by debiasing the risk estimator, we get back to the basics of learning theory. As

mentioned above, there is also a close relationship with the method of control variates. Moreover, DeSSL can also be interpreted as a control variate on the risk’s gradient itself in order to reduce its variance and improve the optimisation scheme. This idea is close to the optimisation schemes introduced by Johnson and Zhang (2013) and Defazio et al. (2014) which reduce the variance of the gradients’ estimate to improve optimisation performance.

Another interesting way to interpret DeSSL is as a constrained optimisation problem. Indeed, minimising  $\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{DeSSL}$  is equivalent to minimising the Lagrangian of the following optimisation problem:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\theta} \quad & \hat{\mathcal{R}}_{CC}(\theta) \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & \frac{1}{n_u} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} H(\theta; x_i) = \frac{1}{n_l} \sum_{i=1}^{n_l} H(\theta; x_i). \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

The idea of this optimisation problem is to minimise the complete case risk estimator by assessing that some properties represented by  $H$  are on average equal for the labelled data and the unlabelled data. For example, if we consider entropy-minimisation, this program encourages the model to have the same confidence on the unlabelled examples as on the labelled ones.

The debiasing term of our objective will penalise the confidence of the model on the labelled data. Pereyra et al. (2017) actually show that penalising the entropy in a supervised context acts as a strong regulator for supervised model and improves on the state-of-the-art on common benchmarks. This comforts us in the idea of debiasing using labelled data in the case of entropy-minimisation.

Our objective also resembles doubly-robust risk estimates used for SSL in the context of kernel machines by Liu and Goldberg (2020) and for deep learning in a recent preprint (Hu et al., 2022a). In both cases, their focus is quite different, as they consider weaker conditions than MCAR, but very specific choices of  $H$ .

### 3.2 Is $\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{DeSSL}(\theta)$ an accurate risk estimate?

Because of the connections between our debiased estimate and variance reduction techniques, we have a natural interest in the variance of the estimate. Having a lower-variance estimate of the risk would mean estimating it more accurately, leading to better models.

Similarly to traditional control variates (Owen, 2013), the variance can in fact be computed, and optimised in  $\lambda$ :

**Theorem 1** *The function  $\lambda \mapsto \mathbb{V}(\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{DeSSL}(\theta))$  reaches its minimum for:*

$$\lambda_{opt} = \frac{n_u}{n} \frac{\text{Cov}(L(\theta; x, y), H(\theta; x))}{\mathbb{V}(H(\theta; x))}, \tag{9}$$

and at  $\lambda_{opt}$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}(\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{DeSSL}(\theta))|_{\lambda_{opt}} &= \left(1 - \frac{n_u}{n} \rho_{L,H}^2\right) \mathbb{V}(\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{CC}(\theta)) \\ &\leq \mathbb{V}(\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{CC}(\theta)), \end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

where  $\rho_{L,H} = \text{Corr}(L(\theta; x, y), H(\theta; x))$ .

A proof of this theorem is available as Appendix D. This theorem provides a formal justification to the heuristic idea that  $H$  should be a surrogate of  $L$ . Indeed, DeSSL is a more accurate risk estimate when  $H$  is strongly positively correlated with  $L$ , which is likely to be the case when  $H$  is equal or equivalent to an expectation of  $L$ .

A natural application of this theorem would be to tune  $\lambda$  automatically by estimating  $\lambda_{opt}$ . Again, this is common practice when dealing with control variates. In our case however, this is a rather difficult task, since the covariance  $\text{Cov}(L(\theta; x, y), H(\theta; x))$  is hard to estimate with few labels. In practice, using simple estimates of  $\lambda_{opt}$  was extremely unstable, and led to unsatisfactory results. The theorem still has a *quantitative* merit when it comes to choosing  $\lambda$ , by telling that the sign of  $\lambda$  is positive when  $H$  and  $L$  are positively correlated which will generally be the case with the examples mentioned above. We give in Appendix D a proof that  $L$  and  $H$  are positively correlated when  $L$  is the negative likelihood and  $H$  is the entropy. Furthermore, with the form of  $H$  given in the equation (4), it is intuitive to think that  $L$  and  $H$  are positively correlated. Therefore, a positive  $\lambda$  is a natural choice. Also, it is natural to think that unlabelled data points should not have individually more weight ( $\frac{\lambda}{n_u}$ ) than labelled data points ( $\frac{1}{n_l}$ ) in the risk estimate. To do so,  $\lambda$  should remain lower than  $\frac{n_u}{n_l}$ . Other SSL methods have variance reduction guarantees and already has shown great promises in SSL, see Sakai et al. (2017). In a purely supervised context, Chen et al. (2020) show that the effectiveness of data augmentation techniques lays partially on the variance reduction of the risk estimate.

### 3.3 Calibration

The calibration of a model is its capacity of predicting probability estimates that are representative of the true distribution. This property is determinant in real-world application when we need reliable predictions. In this section we first introduce scoring rules and their relationship to well-calibrated models.

A scoring rule  $\mathcal{S}$  is a function assigning a score to the predictive distribution  $p_\theta(y|x)$  relative to the event  $y|x \sim p(y|x)$ ,  $\mathcal{S}(p_\theta, (x, y))$ , where  $p(x, y)$  is the true distribution (see e.g. Gneiting and Raftery, 2007). A scoring rule measures both the accuracy and the quality of predictive uncertainty, meaning that better calibration is rewarded. The expected scoring rule is defined as  $\mathcal{S}(p_\theta, p) = \mathbb{E}_p[\mathcal{S}(p_\theta, (x, y))]$ . A proper scoring rule is defined as a scoring rule such that  $\mathcal{S}(p_\theta, p) \leq \mathcal{S}(p, p)$  (Gneiting and Raftery, 2007).

The motivation behind having proper scoring rules comes from the following: suppose that the true data distribution  $p$  is accessible by our set of models. Then, the scoring rule encourages to predict  $p_\theta = p$ . The opposite of a proper scoring rule can then be used to train a model to encourage the calibration of predictive uncertainty:  $L(\theta; x, y) = -\mathcal{S}(p_\theta, (x, y))$ . Most common losses used to train models are proper scorings rule such as log-likelihood.

**Theorem 2** *If  $\mathcal{S}(p_\theta, (x, y)) = -L(\theta; x, y)$  is a proper scoring rule, then  $\mathcal{S}'(p_\theta, (x, y, r)) = -(\frac{rn}{n_l}L(\theta; x, y) + \lambda n(\frac{1-r}{n_u} - \frac{r}{n_l})H(\theta; x))$  is also a proper scoring rule.*

The proof is available in Appendix E, and follows directly from unbiasedness and the MCAR assumption. The main interpretation of this theorem is that we can expect DeSSL to be as well-calibrated as the complete case.

### 3.4 Consistency

We say that  $\hat{\theta}$  is consistent if  $d(\hat{\theta}, \theta^*) \xrightarrow{p} 0$  when  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , where  $d$  is a distance on  $\Theta$ . The asymptotic properties of  $\hat{\theta}$  depend on the behaviours of the functions  $L$  and  $H$ . We will thus require the following standard assumptions.

**Assumption 3** *The minimum  $\theta^*$  of  $\mathcal{R}$  is well-separated:*

$$\inf_{\theta: d(\theta^*, \theta) \geq \epsilon} \mathcal{R}(\theta) > \mathcal{R}(\theta^*). \quad (11)$$

**Assumption 4** *The uniform weak law of large number holds for a function  $L$  if:*

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n L(\theta, x_i, y_i) - \mathbb{E}[L(\theta, x, y)] \right| \xrightarrow{p} 0. \quad (12)$$

We assume that the uniform weak law of large number holds for both  $L$  and  $H$ .

**Theorem 5** *Under the MCAR assumption, Assumption 3 and Assumption 4,  $\hat{\theta} = \arg \min \hat{\mathcal{R}}_{DeSSL}$  is consistent.*

For a proof of this theorem see Appendix E. This theorem is a simple application of van der Vaart's (2000) Theorem 5.7 proving the consistency of a M-estimator. Also, this results holds for the complete case, with  $\lambda = 0$  which prove that the complete case is a solid baseline under the MCAR assumption.

**Coupling of  $n_l$  and  $n_u$  under the MCAR assumption** Under the MCAR assumption,  $n_l$  and  $n_u$  are random variables. We have that  $r \sim \mathcal{B}(\pi)$  (i.e. any  $x$  has the probability  $\pi$  of being labelled). Then, with  $n$  growing to infinity, we have  $\frac{n_l}{n} = \frac{n_l}{n_l + n_u} \rightarrow \pi$ . Therefore, both  $n_l$  and  $n_u$  grow to infinity and  $\frac{n_l}{n_u} \rightarrow \frac{\pi-1}{\pi}$ . This implies  $n_u = \mathcal{O}(n_l)$  and then when  $n$  goes to infinity, both  $n_u$  and  $n_l$  go to infinity too and even if  $n_u \gg n_l$ .

### 3.5 Rademacher complexity and generalisation bounds

In this section, we prove an upper bound for the generalisation error of DeSSL. The unbiasedness of  $\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{DeSSL}$  can directly be used to derive generalisation bounds based on the Rademacher complexity (Bartlett and Mendelson, 2002), defined in our case as

where  $\varepsilon_i$  are i.i.d. Rademacher variables independent of the data. In the particular case of  $\lambda = 0$ , we recover the standard Rademacher complexity of the complete case.

We can then now bound the generalisation error of a model trained using our new loss function.

**Theorem 6** *We assume that labels are MCAR and that both  $L$  and  $H$  are bounded. Then, there exists a constant  $\kappa > 0$ , that depends on  $\lambda$ ,  $L$ ,  $H$ , and the ratio of observed labels, such that, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for all  $\theta \in \Theta$ ,*

$$\mathcal{R}(\theta) \leq \hat{\mathcal{R}}_{DeSSL}(\theta) + 2R_n + \kappa \sqrt{\frac{\log(4/\delta)}{n}}. \quad (13)$$

The proof follows Shalev-Shwartz and Ben-David (2014, Chapter 26), and is available in Appendix G.

## 4. Experiments

We evaluate the performance of DeSSL against different classic methods. In the experiments, our goal is not to produce state-of-the-art results, but instead to compare DeSSL methods and their original counterparts. In particular, we perform experiments with simple SSL methods such as pseudo-label (PseudoLabel) and entropy minimisation (EntMIN) with varying  $\lambda$  on MNIST (LeCun and Cortes, 2010) and CIFAR-10 (Krizhevsky, 2009) and compare them to the debiased method, respectively DeEntMin and DePseudoLabel. For a more challenging version of MNIST, we decide to add 20% label noise in order to break the cluster assumption. We also compare PseudoLabel and DePseudoLabel on five small datasets of MedMNIST (Yang et al., 2021a,b) with a fixed  $\lambda$ . The results of these experiments are reported below. In our figures, the error bars represent the size of the 95% confidence interval (CI).

In addition, we also compare DeEntMin and DePseudoLabel to the biased version on a large range of tabular datasets commonly used in SSL benchmarks (Chapelle et al., 2006; Guo et al., 2010). We do not observe differences between the performance, see Appendix L. Finally, we show how simple it is to debias an existing implementation, by demonstrating it on the consistency-based models benchmarked by (Oliver et al., 2018), namely VAT,  $\Pi$ -model and MeanTeacher. We observe similar performances between the debiased and biased version for the different methods, both in terms of loss and accuracy. Moreover, these results have been obtained using the hyperparameters finetuned for the biased versions. Therefore, it is likely that optimising the hyperparameters for DeSSL will yield even better with the right hyperparameters, see Appendix K.

### 4.1 MNIST

MNIST is an advantageous dataset for SSL as the cluster assumption holds. We compare PseudoLabel and DePseudoLabel for a LeNet-like architecture using  $n_l = 1000$  labelled data on 10 different splits of the training dataset into a labelled and unlabelled set. Models are then evaluated using the standard 10,000 test samples. We used 10% of  $n_l$  as the validation set. We test the influence of the hyperparameter  $\lambda$  and report the accuracy, the loss and the expected calibration error (ECE, Guo et al., 2017) at the epoch of best validation accuracy, see Figure 2 and Appendix I.




Figure 2: The influence of  $\lambda$  on Pseudo-label and DePseudo-label for a LeNet trained on MNIST with  $n_l = 1000$ : (Left) Mean test accuracy; (Right) Mean test loss, with 95% CI.




Figure 3: The influence of  $\lambda$  on Pseudo-label and DePseudo-label for a Lenet trained on MNIST with label noise with  $n_l = 1000$ : (Left) Mean test accuracy; (Right) Mean test loss, with 95% CI.

In this example SSL and DeSSL have the almost the same accuracy for all  $\lambda$ , however, DeSSL seems to be always better calibrated. In order to break the cluster assumption, we reproduced the same experiment on a modified MNIST. Indeed, we had label noise by replacing the true label for 20% of the dataset by a randomly sampled label, see Figure 3. In this setting, DeSSL performs better for large  $\lambda$  in term of accuracy and also provides a better calibration.

## 4.2 MedMNIST

We compare PseudoLabel and DePseudoLabel on different datasets of MedMNIST, a large-scale MNIST-like collection of biomedical images. We selected the five smallest 2D datasets of the collection, for these dataset it is likely that the cluster assumption no longer holds. We trained a 5-layer CNN with a fixed  $\lambda = 1$  and  $n_l$  at 10% of the training data. We report in Table 1 the mean accuracy on 5 different split of the labelled and unlabelled data and the number of labelled data used. The mean loss is reported in Table 2. We report the AUC in Appendix I.

DePseudoLabel compete with PseudoLabel in terms of accuracy and even success when PseudoLabel’s accuracy is less than the complete case. Moreover, DePseudoLabel is always better in term of loss, so calibration, whereas PseudoLabel is always worse than the complete case.

Table 1: Test accuracy of Complete Case , PseudoLabel and DePseudoLabel on five datasets of MedMNIST.

DATASET	$n_l$	CC	PL	DEPL
DERMA	1000	68.99± 1.20	68.88± 1.03	<b>69.30± 0.85</b>
PNEUMONIA	585	83.94± 2.40	<b>85.83± 2.13</b>	84.36 ± 3.79
RETINA	160	48.30± 3.06	47.75± 2.50	<b>49.40 ± 2.62</b>
BREAST	78	76.15± 0.75	74.74± 1.04	<b>76.67 ± 1.32</b>
BLOOD	1700	<b>84.13± 0.83</b>	84.09± 1.17	83.68 ± 0.59

Table 2: Test loss of Complete Case (CC), PseudoLabel (PL) and DePseudoLabel (DePL) on five datasets of MedMNIST.

DATASET	CC	PL	DEPL
DERMA	$1.95 \pm 0.09$	$2.51 \pm 0.20$	<b><math>1.88 \pm 0.12</math></b>
PNEUMONIA	$1.47 \pm 0.04$	$2.04 \pm 0.04$	<b><math>1.40 \pm 0.06</math></b>
RETINA	$1.68 \pm 0.03$	$1.80 \pm 0.18$	<b><math>1.67 \pm 0.06</math></b>
BREAST	$0.80 \pm 0.04$	$1.00 \pm 0.26$	<b><math>0.70 \pm 0.03</math></b>
BLOOD	<b><math>6.11 \pm 0.17</math></b>	$6.61 \pm 0.22$	$6.53 \pm 0.30$


### 4.3 CIFAR

We compare PseudoLabel and DePseudoLabel on CIFAR-10. We trained a CNN-13 from Tarvainen and Valpola (2017) on 5 different splits of the training dataset into a labelled and unlabelled set. For this experiment, we use  $n_l = 4000$  and use the rest of the dataset as unlabelled. Models are then evaluated using the standard 10,000 test samples. For a more realistic validation set, we used 10% of  $n_l$  as the validation set. We test the influence of the hyperparameter  $\lambda$  and report the accuracy and the loss at the epoch of best validation accuracy, see Figure 4. We report the ECE in Appendix J.

We observe DeSSL provides both a better loss and ECE with the same accuracy for small  $\lambda$ . For larger  $\lambda$ , DeSSL performs better in all the reported metrics. We performed a paired Student’s t-test to ensure that our results are significant and reported the p-values in Appendix J. The p-values indicates that for  $\lambda$  close to 10, DeSSL is often significantly better in all the metrics. Moreover, DeSSL for large  $\lambda$  provides a better loss and ECE than the complete case whereas SSL never does.

## 5. Conclusion

Motivated by the remarks of van Engelen and Hoos (2020) and Oliver et al. (2018) on the missingness of theoretical guarantees about the use of unlabelled data in SSL, we proposed a simple modification of SSL frameworks. We consider frameworks based on the inclusion of unlabelled data in the computation of the risk estimator and debias them using labelled

Figure 4: The influence of  $\lambda$  on Pseudo-label and DePseudo-label for a CNN trained on CIFAR with  $n_l = 4000$ : (Left) Mean test accuracy; (Right) Mean test loss, with 95% CI.

data. We show theoretically that this debiasing comes with several theoretical guarantees. We demonstrate these theoretical results experimentally on several common SSL datasets and some more challenging ones such as MNIST with label noise. DeSSL shows competitive performance in term of accuracy compared to its biased version but improves significantly the calibration. Moreover, we attest that the modification of the existing SSL methods to make them unbiased is simple. There are several future directions open to us. First, there should be continued investigation of state-of-the-art methods such as Sohn et al. (2020) and Rizve et al. (2021) to debias them and make them safe. We showed that  $\lambda_{opt}$  exists (Theorem 1) and therefore our formula provides guidelines for the optimisation of  $\lambda$ . Finally, an interesting improvement would be to go beyond the MCAR assumption by considering settings with a distribution mismatch between labelled and unlabelled data (Guo et al., 2020; Cao et al., 2021; Hu et al., 2022b).

## Acknowledgements

This work has been supported by the French government, through the 3IA Côte d’Azur Investments in the Future project managed by the National Research Agency (ANR) with the reference number ANR-19-P3IA-0002.

## References

- Daniel Ahfock and Geoffrey J McLachlan. On missing label patterns in semi-supervised learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.02883*, 2019.
- Peter L Bartlett and Shahar Mendelson. Rademacher and Gaussian complexities: Risk bounds and structural results. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 3(Nov):463–482, 2002.
- David Berthelot, Nicholas Carlini, Ian Goodfellow, Nicolas Papernot, Avital Oliver, and Colin A Raffel. Mixmatch: A holistic approach to semi-supervised learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2019.
- David Berthelot, Nicholas Carlini, Ekin D. Cubuk, Alex Kurakin, Kihyuk Sohn, Han Zhang, and Colin Raffel. ReMixMatch: Semi-supervised learning with distribution matching and augmentation anchoring. *International conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- Kaidi Cao, Maria Brbic, and Jure Leskovec. Open-world semi-supervised learning, 2021.
- Olivier Chapelle, Bernhard Scholkopf, and Alexander Zien. Semi-supervised learning. *MIT Press*, 2006.
- Shuxiao Chen, Edgar Dobriban, and Jane H Lee. A group-theoretic framework for data augmentation. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 21(245):1–71, 2020.
- Aaron Defazio, Francis Bach, and Simon Lacoste-Julien. SAGA: A fast incremental gradient method with support for non-strongly convex composite objectives. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2014.



- Haitao Gan, Zhenhua Li, Yingle Fan, and Zhizeng Luo. Dual learning-based safe semi-supervised learning. *IEEE Access*, 6:2615–2621, 2017.
- Tilmann Gneiting and Adrian E Raftery. Strictly proper scoring rules, prediction, and estimation. *Journal of the American statistical Association*, 102(477):359–378, 2007.
- Ian Goodfellow, Jean Pouget-Abadie, Mehdi Mirza, Bing Xu, David Warde-Farley, Sherjil Ozair, Aaron Courville, and Yoshua Bengio. Generative adversarial nets. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2014.
- Ian Goodfellow, Yoshua Bengio, and Aaron Courville. *Deep Learning*. MIT Press, 2016.
- Yves Grandvalet and Yoshua Bengio. Semi-supervised learning by entropy minimization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2004.
- Chuan Guo, Geoff Pleiss, Yu Sun, and Kilian Q Weinberger. On calibration of modern neural networks. *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2017.
- Lan-Zhe Guo, Zhen-Yu Zhang, Yuan Jiang, Yu-Feng Li, and Zhi-Hua Zhou. Safe deep semi-supervised learning for unseen-class unlabeled data. *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2020.
- Yuanyuan Guo, Xiaoda Niu, and Harry Zhang. An extensive empirical study on semi-supervised learning. *IEEE International Conference on Data Mining*, 2010.
- Joel Hestness, Sharan Narang, Newsha Ardalani, Gregory F. Diamos, Heewoo Jun, Hassan Kianinejad, Md. Mostofa Ali Patwary, Yang Yang, and Yanqi Zhou. Deep learning scaling is predictable, empirically. *CoRR*, 2017.
- Xinting Hu, Yulei Niu, Chunyan Miao, Xian-Sheng Hua, and Hanwang Zhang. On non-random missing labels in semi-supervised learning. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022a.
- Xinting Hu, Yulei Niu, Chunyan Miao, Xian-Sheng Hua, and Hanwang Zhang. On non-random missing labels in semi-supervised learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022b.
- Ming Ji, Tianbao Yang, Binbin Lin, Rong Jin, and Jiawei Han. A simple algorithm for semi-supervised learning with improved generalization error bound. *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2012.
- Rie Johnson and Tong Zhang. Accelerating stochastic gradient descent using predictive variance reduction. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2013.
- Masanori Kawakita and Jun'ichi Takeuchi. Safe semi-supervised learning based on weighted likelihood. *Neural Networks*, 53:146–164, 2014.
- Diederik P Kingma, Shakir Mohamed, Danilo Jimenez Rezende, and Max Welling. Semi-supervised learning with deep generative models. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 3581–3589, 2014.

- Alex Krizhevsky. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. Technical report, MIT, NYU, 2009.
- Samuli Laine and Timo Aila. Temporal ensembling for semi-supervised learning. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2017.
- Yann LeCun and Corinna Cortes. MNIST handwritten digit database. 2010. URL <http://yann.lecun.com/exdb/mnist/>.
- Dong-Hyun Lee. Pseudo-Label : The simple and efficient semi-supervised learning method for deep neural networks. *Workshop on challenges in representation learning, International conference on machine learning*, 2013.
- Yu-Feng Li and Zhi-Hua Zhou. Towards making unlabeled data never hurt. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 37:175–188, 2014.
- Yu-Feng Li, James T Kwok, and Zhi-Hua Zhou. Towards safe semi-supervised learning for multivariate performance measures. *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2016.
- Roderick JA Little and Donald B Rubin. *Statistical Analysis with Missing Data*. John Wiley & Sons, 2019.
- Tiantian Liu and Yair Goldberg. Kernel machines with missing responses. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 14:3766–3820, 2020.
- Geoffrey John McLachlan. Estimating the linear discriminant function from initial samples containing a small number of unclassified observations. *Journal of the American statistical association*, 72:403–406, 1977.
- Takeru Miyato, Shin-ichi Maeda, Masanori Koyama, and Shin Ishii. Virtual adversarial training: A regularization method for supervised and semi-supervised learning. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 41:1979–1993, 2018.
- Whitney K Newey and Daniel McFadden. Large sample estimation and hypothesis testing. *Handbook of econometrics*, 4:2111–2245, 1994.
- Avital Oliver, Augustus Odena, Colin Raffel, Ekin D Cubuk, and Ian J Goodfellow. Realistic evaluation of deep semi-supervised learning algorithms. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2018.
- Art B. Owen. *Monte Carlo theory, methods and examples*. 2013.
- Gabriel Pereyra, George Tucker, Jan Chorowski, Lukasz Kaiser, and Geoffrey Hinton. Regularizing neural networks by penalizing confident output distributions. *Workshop track, International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2017.
- Hieu Pham, Zihang Dai, Qizhe Xie, and Quoc V Le. Meta pseudo labels. *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2021.

- Mamshad Nayeem Rizve, Kevin Duarte, Yogesh S Rawat, and Mubarak Shah. In Defense of Pseudo-Labeling: An Uncertainty-Aware Pseudo-label Selection Framework for Semi-Supervised Learning. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- Mehdi Sajjadi, Mehran Javanmardi, and Tolga Tasdizen. Regularization with stochastic transformations and perturbations for deep semi-supervised learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2016.
- Tomoya Sakai, Marthinus Christoffel Plessis, Gang Niu, and Masashi Sugiyama. Semi-supervised classification based on classification from positive and unlabeled data. *International conference on machine learning*, 2017.
- Bernhard Schölkopf, Dominik Janzing, Jonas Peters, Eleni Sgouritsa, Kun Zhang, and Joris Mooij. On causal and anticausal learning. *International conference on machine learning*, 2012.
- Henry Scudder. Probability of error of some adaptive pattern-recognition machines. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 11:363–371, 1965.
- Matthias Seeger. Learning with labeled and unlabeled data. *Technical report*, 2000.
- Shai Shalev-Shwartz and Shai Ben-David. *Understanding Machine Learning: From Theory to Algorithms*. Cambridge university press, 2014.
- Aarti Singh, Robert Nowak, and Jerry Zhu. Unlabeled data: Now it helps, now it doesn't. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2008.
- Kihyuk Sohn, David Berthelot, Chun-Liang Li, Zizhao Zhang, Nicholas Carlini, Ekin D Cubuk, Alex Kurakin, Han Zhang, and Colin Raffel. FixMatch: Simplifying semi-supervised learning with consistency and confidence. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2020.
- Nataliya Sokolovska, Olivier Cappé, and François Yvon. The asymptotics of semi-supervised learning in discriminative probabilistic models. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2008.
- Antti Tarvainen and Harri Valpola. Mean teachers are better role models: Weight-averaged consistency targets improve semi-supervised deep learning results. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2017.
- Martin Trapp, Tamas Madl, Robert Peharz, Franz Pernkopf, and Robert Trappl. Safe semi-supervised learning of sum-product networks. *Conference on Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence*, 2017.
- Anastasios A Tsiatis. *Semiparametric theory and missing data*. Springer, 2006.
- Taira Tsuchiya, Nontawat Charoenphakdee, Issei Sato, and Masashi Sugiyama. Semisupervised ordinal regression based on empirical risk minimization. *Neural Computation*, 33: 3361–3412, 2021.

- Aad W van der Vaart. *Asymptotic statistics*. Cambridge university press, 2000.
- Jesper E van Engelen and Holger H Hoos. A survey on semi-supervised learning. *Machine Learning*, 109:373–440, 2020.
- Vikas Verma, Kenji Kawaguchi, Alex Lamb, Juho Kannala, Yoshua Bengio, and David Lopez-Paz. Interpolation consistency training for semi-supervised learning. *International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2019.
- Qizhe Xie, Zihang Dai, Eduard Hovy, Minh-Thang Luong, and Quoc V Le. Unsupervised data augmentation for consistency training. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2019.
- Jiancheng Yang, Rui Shi, and Bingbing Ni. MedMNIST classification decathlon: A lightweight AutoML benchmark for medical image analysis. In *IEEE 18th International Symposium on Biomedical Imaging (ISBI)*, pages 191–195, 2021a.
- Jiancheng Yang, Rui Shi, Donglai Wei, Zequan Liu, Lin Zhao, Bilian Ke, Hanspeter Pfister, and Bingbing Ni. MedMNIST v2: A large-scale lightweight benchmark for 2D and 3D biomedical image classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.14795*, 2021b.
- Bowen Zhang, Yidong Wang, Wenxin Hou, Hao Wu, Jindong Wang, Manabu Okumura, and Takahiro Shinozaki. FlexMatch: Boosting semi-supervised learning with curriculum pseudo labeling. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2021.
- Hongyi Zhang, Moustapha Cisse, Yann N Dauphin, and David Lopez-Paz. mixup: Beyond empirical risk minimization. *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2017.
- Xiaojin Zhu, Zoubin Ghahramani, and John D Lafferty. Semi-supervised learning using Gaussian fields and harmonic functions. *International conference on machine learning*, 2003.
- Zhaowei Zhu, Tianyi Luo, and Yang Liu. The rich get richer: Disparate impact of semi-supervised learning. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2022.

## Appendix A. Toy example

We trained a 4 layer neural network (1/20/100/20/1) with ReLU activation function using 25,000 labelled and 25,000 unlabelled points draw from two 1D uniform laws with an overlap. We used  $\lambda = 1$  and a confidence threshold for Pseudo-label  $\tau = 0.70$ . We optimised the model's weights using a stochastic gradient descent (SGD) optimiser with a learning rate of 0.1.




Figure 5: Data histogram




Figure 6: 4 layer neural net trained using SSL methods on a 1D dataset drawn from two uniform laws. (Top-left) Posterior probabilities  $p(1|x)$  of the same model trained following either complete case (only labelled data), Pseudo-label or our DePseudo-label. (Top-right) Same for EntMin and DeEntMin (Bottom-left) Training losses for Pseudo-label and DePseudo-label (Bottom-right) Same for EntMin and DeEntMin

## Appendix B. Details on surrogates and more examples

### B.1 Entropy-based

**Pseudo-label:** As presented in the core article, the unsupervised objective of pseudo-label can be written as an expectation of  $L$  on the distribution  $\pi_x(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) = \delta_x(\tilde{x})p_\theta(\tilde{y}|\tilde{x})$ . Recently, Lee (2013) encouraged the pseudo-labels method for deep semi-supervised learning. Then, Rizve et al. (2021) recently improved the pseudo-label selection by introducing an uncertainty-aware mechanism on the confidence of the model concerning the predicted probabilities. Pham et al. (2021) reaches state-of-the-art on the Imagenet challenge using pseudo-labels on a large dataset of additional images.

### B.2 Pseudo-label and data augmentation

Recently, several methods based on data-augmentation have been proposed and proven to perform well on a large spectrum of SSL tasks. The idea is to have a model resilient to strong data-augmentation of the input (Berthelot et al., 2019, 2020; Sohn et al., 2020; Xie et al., 2019; Zhang et al., 2021). These methods rely both on the cluster assumption and the smoothness assumption and are at the border between entropy-based and consistency-based methods. The idea is to have same prediction for an input and a augmented version of it. For instance, in Sohn et al. (2020), we first compute pseudo-labels predicted using a weakly-augmented version of  $x$  (flip-and-shift data augmentation) and then minimise the likelihood with the predictions of the model on a strongly augmented version of  $x$ . In Xie et al. (2019), the method is a little bit different as we minimise the cross entropy between the prediction of the model on  $x$  and the predictions of a augmented version. In both case, the unsupervised part of the risk estimator can be reformulated as Equation 4.

**Fixmatch:** In Fixmatch, Sohn et al. (2020), the unsupervised objective can be written as:

$$H(\theta; x) = \mathbb{1}[\max_y p_{\hat{\theta}}(y|x_1) > \tau]L(\theta; x_2, \arg \max_y p_{\hat{\theta}}(y|x_1)) \quad (14)$$

where  $\hat{\theta}$  is a fixed copy of the current parameters  $\theta$  indicating that the gradient is not propagated through it,  $x_1$  is a weakly-augmented version of  $x$  and  $x_2$  a strongly-augmented one. Therefore, we write  $H$  as an expectation of  $L$  on the distribution  $\pi_x(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) = \delta_{x_2}(\tilde{x})\delta_{\arg \max_y p_{\hat{\theta}}(y|x_1)}(\tilde{y})\mathbb{1}[\max_y p_{\hat{\theta}}(y|x_1) > \tau]$ .

**UDA:** In UDA, Xie et al. (2019), the unsupervised objective can be written as:

$$H(\theta; x) = \sum_y p_{\hat{\theta}}(y|x)L(\theta; x_1, y) \quad (15)$$

where  $\hat{\theta}$  is a fixed copy of the current parameters  $\theta$  indicating that the gradient is not propagated through it and  $x_1$  is an augmented version of  $x$ . Therefore, we write  $H$  as an expectation of  $L$  on the distribution  $\pi_x(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) = \delta_{x_1}(\tilde{x})p_{\hat{\theta}}(\tilde{y}|\tilde{x})$ .

**Other:** Recently, have been proposed in the literature Zhang et al. (2021) and Rizve et al. (2021). The former is an improved version of Fixmatch with a variable threshold  $\tau$  with respect to the class and the training stage. The latter introduces a measurement of uncertainty in the pseudo-labelling step to improve the selection. They also introduce negative pseudo-labels to improve the single-label classification.

### B.3 VAT

The virtual adversarial training method proposed by (Miyato et al., 2018) generates the most impactful perturbation  $r_{adv}$  to add to  $x$ . The objective is to train a model robust to input perturbations. This method is closely related to adversarial training introduced by Goodfellow et al. (2014).

$$H(\theta; x) = \mathbf{Div}(f_{\hat{\theta}}(x, \cdot), f_{\theta}(x + r_{adv}, \cdot))$$

where the  $\mathbf{Div}$  is a non-negative function that measures the divergence between two distributions, the cross-entropy or the KL divergence for instance. If the divergence function is the cross-entropy, it is straightforward to write the unlabelled objective as Equation 4. If the objective function is the KL divergence, we can write the objective as

$$H(\theta; x) = \mathbb{E}_{\pi_x(\tilde{x}+r, \tilde{y})}[L(\theta; \tilde{x}, \tilde{y})] - \mathbb{E}_{\pi_x(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})}[L(\hat{\theta}; \tilde{x}, \tilde{y})] \quad (16)$$

with  $\pi_x(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y}) = \delta_x(\tilde{x})p_{\hat{\theta}}(y|x)$ . Therefore, variation of  $H$  with respect to  $\theta$  are the same as  $\mathbb{E}_{\pi_x(\tilde{x}+r, \tilde{y})}[L(\theta; \tilde{x}, \tilde{y})]$ . VAT is also a method between consistency-based and entropy-based method as long as we use the KL-divergence or the cross-entropy as the measure of divergence.

### B.4 Consistency-based

Consistency-based method aim to smooth the decision function of the models or have more stable predictions. These objectives  $H$  are not directly a form of expectation of  $L$  but are equivalent to an expectation of  $L$ . For all the following methods we are able to write the unsupervised objective  $H$  such that:

$$C_1 \mathbb{E}_{\pi_x(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})}[L(\theta; \tilde{x}, \tilde{y})] \leq H(\theta; x) \leq C_2 \mathbb{E}_{\pi_x(\tilde{x}, \tilde{y})}[L(\theta; \tilde{x}, \tilde{y})], \quad (17)$$

with  $0 \leq C_1 \leq C_2$ .

Indeed, consistency-based method minimise an unsupervised objective that is a divergence between the model predictions and a modified version of the input (data augmentation) or a perturbation of the model. Using the fact that all norms are equivalent in a finite dimensional space such as the space of the labels, we have the equivalence between a consistency-based  $H$  and an expectation of  $L$ .

**Mean-Teacher** A different form of pseudo-labelling is the Mean-Teacher approach proposed by (Tarvainen and Valpola, 2017) where pseudo-labels are generated by a teacher model for a student model. The parameters of the student model are updated, while the teacher's are a moving average of the student's parameters from the previous training steps. The idea is to have a more stable pseudo-labelling using the teacher than in the classic

Pseudo-label. Final predictions are made by the student model. A generic form of the unsupervised part of the risk estimator is then

$$H(\theta; x) = \sum_y (p_\theta(y|x) - p_{\hat{\theta}}(y|x))^2,$$

where  $\hat{\theta}$  are the fixed parameters of the teacher.

**$\Pi$ -Model** The  $\Pi$ -Models are intrinsically stochastic models (for example a model with dropout) encouraged to make consistent prediction through several passes of the same  $x$  in the model. The SSL loss is using the stochastic behavior of the model where the model  $f_\theta$  and penalises different predictions for the same  $x$  (Sajjadi et al., 2016). Let's note  $f_\theta(x, \cdot)_1$  and  $f_\theta(x, \cdot)_2$  two passes of  $x$  through the model  $f_\theta$ . A generic form of the unsupervised part of the risk estimator is then

$$H(\theta; x) = \mathbf{Div}(f_\theta(x, \cdot)_1, f_{\hat{\theta}}(x, \cdot)_2), \quad (18)$$

where  $\mathbf{Div}$  is a measure of divergence between two distributions (often the Kullback-Leibler divergence).

**Temporal ensembling** Temporal ensembling (Laine and Aila, 2017) is a form of  $\Pi$ -Model where we compare the current prediction of the model on the input  $x$  with an accumulation of the previous passes through the model. Then, the training is faster as the network is evaluated only once per input on each epoch and the perturbation is expected to be less noisy than for  $\Pi$ -models.

**ICT** Interpolation consistency training (Verma et al., 2019) is a SSL method based on the mixup operation (Zhang et al., 2017). The model trained is then consistent to predictions at interpolations. The unsupervised term of the objective is then computed on two terms:

$$H(\theta; x_1, x_2) = \mathbf{Div}(f_\theta(\alpha x_1 + (1 - \alpha)x_2, \cdot), \alpha f_{\hat{\theta}}(x_1, \cdot) + (1 - \alpha)f_{\hat{\theta}}(x_2, \cdot)), \quad (19)$$

with  $\alpha$  drawn with from a distribution  $\mathcal{B}(a, a)$ . With the exact same transformation, we will be able to show that this objective is equivalent to a form of expectation of  $L$ .



### Appendix C. Proof that $\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{DeSSL}(\theta)$ is unbiased under MCAR

**Theorem 7** *Under the MCAR assumption,  $\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{DeSSL}(\theta)$  is an unbiased estimator of  $\mathcal{R}(\theta)$ .*

As a consequence of the theorem, under the MCAR assumption,  $\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{CC}(\theta)$  is also unbiased as a special case of  $\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{DeSSL}(\theta)$  for  $\lambda = 0$

**Proof:** We first recall that the DeSSL risk estimator  $\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{DeSSL}(\theta)$  is defined for any  $\lambda$  by

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{DeSSL}(\theta) &= \frac{1}{n_l} \sum_{i=1}^{n_l} L(\theta; x_i, y_i) + \frac{\lambda}{n_u} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} H(\theta; x_i) - \frac{\lambda}{n_l} \sum_{i=1}^{n_l} H(\theta; x_i) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \frac{r_i}{n_l} L(\theta; x_i, y_i) + \lambda \left( \frac{1-r_i}{n_u} - \frac{r_i}{n_l} \right) H(\theta; x_i) \right).\end{aligned}\tag{20}$$

By the law of total expectation:

$$\mathbb{E}[\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{DeSSL}(\theta)] = \mathbb{E}_r \left[ \mathbb{E}_{x,y}[\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{DeSSL}(\theta)|r] \right].$$

As far as we are under the MCAR assumption, the data  $(x, y)$  and the missingness variable  $r$  are independent thus,  $\mathbb{E}_r \left[ \mathbb{E}_{x,y}[\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{DeSSL}(\theta)|r] \right] = \mathbb{E}_r \left[ \mathbb{E}_{x,y}[\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{DeSSL}(\theta)] \right]$ .

We focus on  $\mathbb{E}_{x,y}[\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{DeSSL}(\theta)]$ . First, we replace  $\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{DeSSL}(\theta)$  by its definition and then use the linearity of the expectation. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{x,y}[\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{DeSSL}(\theta)] &= \mathbb{E} \left[ \frac{1}{n_l} \sum_{i=1}^{n_l} L(\theta; x_i, y_i) + \frac{\lambda}{n_u} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} H(\theta; x_i) - \frac{\lambda}{n_l} \sum_{i=1}^{n_l} H(\theta; x_i) \right] && \text{by definition} \\ &= \frac{1}{n_l} \sum_{i=1}^{n_l} \mathbb{E} [L(\theta; x_i, y_i)] + \frac{\lambda}{n_u} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \mathbb{E} [H(\theta; x_i)] - \frac{\lambda}{n_l} \sum_{i=1}^{n_l} \mathbb{E} [H(\theta; x_i)] && \text{by linearity}\end{aligned}$$

The couples  $(x_i, y_i)$  are i.i.d. samples following the same distribution. Then, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{E}_{x,y}[\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{DeSSL}(\theta)] &= \frac{1}{n_l} \sum_{i=1}^{n_l} \mathbb{E} [L(\theta; x, y)] + \frac{\lambda}{n_u} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \mathbb{E} [H(\theta; x)] - \frac{\lambda}{n_l} \sum_{i=1}^{n_l} \mathbb{E} [H(\theta; x)] \quad \text{i.i.d samples} \\ &= \mathbb{E} [L(\theta; x, y)] \\ &= \mathcal{R}(\theta).\end{aligned}$$

Finally, we have the results that ,  $\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{DeSSL}(\theta)$  is unbiased as  $\mathcal{R}(\theta)$  is a constant,

$$\mathbb{E}[\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{DeSSL}(\theta)] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \mathbb{E}_{x,y}[\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{DeSSL}(\theta)|r] \right] = \mathbb{E}_r [\mathcal{R}(\theta)] = \mathcal{R}(\theta).\tag{21}$$

**Appendix D. Proof and comments about Theorem 1**

**Theorem 1** *The function  $\lambda \mapsto \mathbb{V}(\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{DeSSL}(\theta)|r)$  reaches its minimum for:*

$$\lambda_{opt} = \frac{n_u}{n} \frac{\text{Cov}(L(\theta; x, y), H(\theta; x))}{\mathbb{V}(H(\theta; x))} \quad (22)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}(\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{DeSSL}(\theta)|r)|_{\lambda_{opt}} &= \left(1 - \frac{n_u}{n} \rho_{L,H}^2\right) \mathbb{V}(\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{CC}(\theta)) \\ &\leq \mathbb{V}(\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{CC}(\theta)), \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where  $\rho_{L,H} = \text{Corr}(L(\theta; x, y), H(\theta; x))$ .

**Proof:** For any  $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ , we want to compute the variance:

$$\mathbb{V}(\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{DeSSL}(\theta)|r).$$

Under the MCAR assumption,  $x$  and  $y$  are both jointly independent of  $r$ . Also, the couples  $(x_i, y_i, r_i)$  are independent. Therefore, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}(\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{DeSSL}(\theta)|r) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{V}_{(x_i, y_i) \sim p(x, y|r)} \left( \frac{r_i}{n_l} L(\theta, x_i, y_i) + \lambda \left( \frac{1-r_i}{n_u} - \frac{r_i}{n_l} \right) H(\theta, x_i) \right) \quad \text{i.i.d samples} \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{V}_{(x_i, y_i) \sim p(x, y)} \left( \frac{r_i}{n_l} L(\theta, x_i, y_i) + \lambda \left( \frac{1-r_i}{n_u} - \frac{r_i}{n_l} \right) H(\theta, x_i) \right) \quad (x, y) \text{ and } r \text{ independent} \end{aligned}$$

Using the fact that the couples  $(x_i, y_i)$  are i.i.d. samples following the same distribution, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}(\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{DeSSL}(\theta)|r) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{V}_{(x, y) \sim p(x, y)} \left( \frac{r_i}{n_l} L(\theta, x, y) + \lambda \left( \frac{1-r_i}{n_u} - \frac{r_i}{n_l} \right) H(\theta, x) \right) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{r_i^2}{n_l^2} \mathbb{V}(L(\theta, x, y)) + \lambda^2 \left( \frac{1-r_i}{n_u} - \frac{r_i}{n_l} \right)^2 \mathbb{V}(H(\theta, x)) \quad \text{using covariance} \\ &\quad + 2\lambda \frac{r_i}{n_l} \left( \frac{1-r_i}{n_u} - \frac{r_i}{n_l} \right) \text{Cov}(L(\theta, x, y), H(\theta, x)) \end{aligned}$$

Now, we remark that the variable  $r$  is binary and therefore  $r^2 = r$ ,  $(1-r)^2 = 1-r$  and  $r(1-r) = 0$ . Using that and simplifying, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}(\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{DeSSL}(\theta)|r) &= \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{r_i}{n_l^2} \mathbb{V}(L(\theta, x, y)) + \lambda^2 \frac{(1-r_i)n_l^2 + r_i n_u^2}{n_l^2 n_u^2} \mathbb{V}(H(\theta, x)) \\ &\quad - 2\lambda \frac{r_i}{n_l^2} \text{Cov}(L(\theta, x, y), H(\theta, x)) \end{aligned}$$

Finally, by summing and simplifying the expression (note that  $n_l + n_u = n$ ), we compute the expression variance,

$$\mathbb{V}(\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{DeSSL}(\theta)|r) = \frac{1}{n_l} \mathbb{V}(L(\theta, x, y)) + \lambda^2 \frac{n}{n_l n_u} \mathbb{V}(H(\theta, x)) - \frac{2\lambda}{n_l} \text{Cov}(L(\theta, x, y), H(\theta, x))$$

So  $\mathbb{V}(\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{DeSSL}(\theta)|r)$  is a quadratic function in  $\lambda$  and reaches its minimum for  $\lambda_{opt}$  such that:

$$\lambda_{opt} = \frac{n_u \text{Cov}(L(\theta, x, y), H(\theta, x))}{n \mathbb{V}(H(\theta, x))}$$

And, at  $\lambda_{opt}$ , the variance of  $\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{DeSSL}(\theta)|r$  becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}(\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{DeSSL}(\theta)|r) &= \frac{1}{n_l} \mathbb{V}(L(\theta, x, y)) \left( 1 - \frac{n_u \text{Cov}(L(\theta, x, y), H(\theta, x))^2}{n \mathbb{V}(H(\theta, x)) \mathbb{V}(L(\theta, x, y))} \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{n_l} \mathbb{V}(L(\theta, x, y)) \left( 1 - \frac{n_u}{n} \text{Corr}(L(\theta, x, y), H(\theta, x))^2 \right) \\ &= \left( 1 - \frac{n_u}{n} \rho_{L,H}^2 \right) \frac{1}{n_l} \mathbb{V}(L(\theta, x, y)) \end{aligned}$$

**Remark 8** *If  $H$  is perfectly correlated with  $L$  ( $\rho_{L,H} = 1$ ), then the variance of the DeSSL estimator is equal to the variance of the estimator with no missing labels.*

**Remark 9** *Is it possible to estimate  $\lambda_{opt}$  in practice ? The data distribution  $p(x, y)$  being unknown, the computation of  $\lambda_{opt}$  is not possible directly. Therefore, we need to use an estimator of the covariance  $\text{Cov}(L(\theta; x, y), H(\theta; x))$  and the variance  $\mathbb{V}(H(\theta; x))$  (See Equation 24). Also, we have to be careful not to introduce a new bias with the computation of  $\lambda_{opt}$ , indeed, if we compute it using the training set,  $\lambda_{opt}$  becomes dependent of  $x$  and  $y$  and therefore  $\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{DeSSL}(\theta)|r$  becomes biased. A solution would be to use a validation dataset for its computation. Another approach is to compute it using the splitting method (Owen, 2013). Moreover, the computation of  $\lambda_{opt}$  is tiresome and time-consuming in practice as it has to be updated for every different value of  $\theta$ , so at each gradient step.*

$$\hat{\lambda}_{opt} = \frac{\frac{1}{n_l} \sum_{i=1}^{n_l} (L(\theta; x_i, y_i) - \bar{L}(\theta))(H(\theta; x_i) - \bar{H}(\theta))}{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n (H(\theta; x_i) - \bar{H}(\theta))^2} \quad (24)$$

where  $\bar{H}(\theta) = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n H(\theta; x_i)$  and  $\bar{L}(\theta) = \frac{1}{n_l} \sum_{i=1}^{n_l} L(\theta; x_i, y_i)$

**Remark 10** *About the sign of  $\lambda$  As explained in the article, the theorem still has a quantitative merit when it comes to choosing  $\lambda$ , by telling that the sign of  $\lambda$  is positive when  $H$  and  $L$  are positively correlated which will generally be the case with the examples mentioned in the article. For instance, concerning the entropy minimisation technique, the following proposition proves that the log-likelihood is negatively correlated with its entropy and therefore it justifies the choice of  $\lambda > 0$  in the entropy minimisation.*

**Proposition 11** *The log-likelihood of the true distribution  $\log p(y|x)$  is negatively correlated with its entropy  $\mathbb{H}_{\tilde{y}}(p(\tilde{y}|x)) = -\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{y} \sim p(\cdot|x)}[\log p(\tilde{y}|x)]$ .*

$$\text{Cov}(\log p(y|x), \mathbb{H}_{\tilde{y}}(p(\tilde{y}|x))) < 0 \quad (25)$$

**Proof**

$$\text{Cov}(\log p(y|x), \mathbb{H}_{\tilde{y}}(p(\tilde{y}|x))) = \mathbb{E}_{x,y}[\log p(y|x)\mathbb{H}_{\tilde{y}}(p(\tilde{y}|x))] - \mathbb{E}_{x,y}[\log p(y|x)]\mathbb{E}_x[\mathbb{H}_{\tilde{y}}(p(\tilde{y}|x))] \quad (26)$$

$$= -\mathbb{E}_{x,y}[\log p(y|x)\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{y}|x}[\log p(\tilde{y}|x)]] + \mathbb{E}_{x,y}[\log p(y|x)]\mathbb{E}_x[\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{y}|x}[\log p(\tilde{y}|x)]] \quad (27)$$

$$(28)$$

By the law of total expectation, we have that  $\mathbb{E}_x[\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{y}|x}[\log p(\tilde{y}|x)]] = \mathbb{E}_{x,\tilde{y}}[\log p(\tilde{y}|x)]$ , then

$$\text{Cov}(\log p(y|x), \mathbb{H}_{\tilde{y}}(p(\tilde{y}|x))) = -\mathbb{E}_{x,y}[\log p(y|x)\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{y}|x}[\log p(\tilde{y}|x)]] + \mathbb{E}_{x,y}[\log p(y|x)]^2 \quad (29)$$

$$= \mathbb{E}_{x,y}[\log p(y|x)]^2 - \mathbb{E}_{x,y}[\log p(y|x)\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{y}|x}[\log p(\tilde{y}|x)]] \quad (30)$$

$$(31)$$

On the other hand, also with the law of total expectation,  $\mathbb{E}_{x,y}[\log p(y|x)\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{y}|x}[\log p(\tilde{y}|x)]] = \mathbb{E}_x[\mathbb{E}_{y|x}[\log p(y|x)]\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{y}|x}[\log p(\tilde{y}|x)]]$ , so

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{x,y}[\log p(y|x)\mathbb{E}_{\tilde{y}|x}[\log p(\tilde{y}|x)]] &= \mathbb{E}_x[\mathbb{E}_{y|x}[\log p(y|x)]^2] \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}_x[\mathbb{E}_{y|x}[\log p(y|x)]]^2 && \text{Jensen's inequality} \\ &\geq \mathbb{E}_{x,y}[\log p(y|x)]^2 && \text{total expectation law} \end{aligned}$$

Finally, we have the results,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cov}(\log p(y|x), \mathbb{H}_{\tilde{y}}(p(\tilde{y}|x))) &\leq \mathbb{E}_{x,y}[\log p(y|x)]^2 - \mathbb{E}_{x,y}[\log p(y|x)]^2 \\ &\leq 0 \end{aligned}$$

■

**Remark 12** *We can also see the Pseudo-label as a form of entropy. Indeed, modulo the confidence selection on the predicted probability, the Pseudo-label objective is the inverse of the Rényi min-entropy:*

$$\mathbb{H}_\infty(x) = -\max_y \log p(y|x)$$

## Appendix E. Proof of Theorem 2

**Theorem 2** If  $\mathcal{S}(p_\theta, (x, y)) = -L(\theta; x, y)$  is a proper scoring rule, then

$$\mathcal{S}'(p_\theta, (x, y, r)) = -\left(\frac{rn}{n_l}L(\theta; x, y) + \lambda n\left(\frac{1-r}{n_u} - \frac{r}{n_l}\right)H(\theta; x)\right) \quad (32)$$

is also a proper scoring rule.

**Proof** The scoring rule considered in our SSL framework is:

$$\mathcal{S}'(p_\theta, (x, y, r)) = -\left(\frac{rn}{n_l}L(\theta; x, y) + \lambda n\left(\frac{1-r}{n_u} - \frac{r}{n_l}\right)H(\theta; x)\right)$$

. The proper scoring rule of the fully supervised problem is

$$\mathcal{S}(p_\theta, (x, y, r)) = -L(\theta; x, y)$$

. Let  $p$  be the true distribution of the data  $(x, y, r)$ . Under MCAR,  $r$  is independent of  $x$  and  $y$ , then  $p(x, y, r) = p(r)p(x, y)$ .

$$\mathcal{S}'(p_\theta, p) = \int p(x, y, r)\mathcal{S}'(p_\theta, (x, y, r)) dx dy dr \quad (33)$$

$$= \int p(x, y)p(r)\mathcal{S}'(p_\theta, (x, y, r)) dx dy dr \quad \text{by independence} \quad (34)$$

$$= -\int p(x, y)p(r)\frac{rn}{n_l}L(\theta; x, y) + \lambda n\left(\frac{1-r}{n_u} - \frac{r}{n_l}\right)H(\theta; x) dx dy dr \quad (35)$$

$$= -\int_{x,y} p(x, y) \underbrace{\left(\int_r p(r)\frac{rn}{n_l} dr\right)}_{=1} L(\theta; x, y) dx dy \quad (36)$$

$$- \lambda n \int_{x,y} p(x, y) \underbrace{\left(\int_r p(r) \left(\frac{1-r}{n_u} - \frac{r}{n_l}\right) dr\right)}_{=0} H(\theta; x) dx dy \quad (37)$$

$$= -\int_{x,y} p(x, y)L(\theta; x, y) dx dy \quad (38)$$

$$= \mathcal{S}(p_\theta, p) \quad (39)$$

Therefore, if  $\mathcal{S}(p_\theta, (x, y)) = -L(\theta; x, y)$  is a proper scoring rule, then

$\mathcal{S}'(p_\theta, (x, y, r)) = -\left(\frac{rn}{n_l}L(\theta; x, y) + \lambda n\left(\frac{1-r}{n_u} - \frac{r}{n_l}\right)H(\theta; x)\right)$  is also a proper scoring rule. ■

## Appendix F. Proof of Theorem 5

Assumption 3: the minimum  $\theta^*$  of  $\mathcal{R}$  is well-separated.

$$\inf_{\theta: d(\theta^*, \theta) \geq \epsilon} \mathcal{R}(\theta) > \mathcal{R}(\theta^*) \quad (40)$$

Assumption 4: uniform weak law of large numbers holds for a function  $L$  if:

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n L(\theta, x_i, y_i) - \mathbb{E}[L(\theta, x, y)] \right| \xrightarrow{p} 0 \quad (41)$$

**Theorem 5.** *Under assumption A and assumption B for both  $L$  and  $H$ ,  $\hat{\theta} = \arg \min \hat{\mathcal{R}}_{DeSSL}$  is asymptotically consistent with respect to  $n$ .*

This result is a direct application of Theorem 5.7 from van der Vaart (2000, Chapter 5) that states that under assumption A and B for  $L$ ,  $\hat{\theta} = \arg \min \hat{\mathcal{R}}$  is asymptotically consistent with respect to  $n$ . Assumption A remains unchanged as we have M-estimators of the same  $\mathcal{R}$ . We now aim to prove that under assumption B for both  $L$  and  $H$ , we have the assumption B on  $\theta \rightarrow \frac{rn}{n_l} L(\theta; x, y) + \lambda(1 - \frac{rn}{n_l}) H(\theta; x)$ .

**Lemma 13** *If the uniform law of large number holds for both  $L$  and  $H$ , then it holds for  $\theta \rightarrow \frac{rn}{n_l} L(\theta; x, y) + \lambda(1 - \frac{rn}{n_l}) H(\theta; x)$ .*

**Proof** Suppose assumption B for  $L$ , then the same result holds if we replace  $n$  with  $n_l$  as  $n$  and  $n_l$  are coupled by the law of  $r$ . Indeed, when  $n$  grows to infinity,  $n_l$  too and inversely. Therefore,

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \frac{1}{n_l} \sum_{i=1}^{n_l} L(\theta; x_i, y_i) - \mathbb{E}[L(\theta; x, y)] \right| \xrightarrow{p} 0$$

Now, suppose we have assumption B for  $H$ , then we can make the same remark than for  $L$ . Now, we have to show that:

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{rn}{n_l} L(\theta; x, y) + \lambda n \left( \frac{1-r}{n_u} - \frac{r}{n_l} \right) H(\theta; x) - \mathbb{E}[L(\theta; x, y)] \right| \xrightarrow{p} 0$$

We first split the absolute value and the sup operator as

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{rn}{n_l} L(\theta; x, y) + \lambda n \left( \frac{1-r}{n_u} - \frac{r}{n_l} \right) H(\theta; x) - \mathbb{E}[L(\theta; x, y)] \right| \\ & \leq \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{rn}{n_l} L(\theta; x, y) - \mathbb{E}[L(\theta; x, y)] \right| + \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda n \left( \frac{1-r}{n_u} - \frac{r}{n_l} \right) H(\theta; x) \right| \\ & \leq \underbrace{\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \frac{1}{n_l} \sum_{i=1}^{n_l} L(\theta; x, y) - \mathbb{E}[L(\theta; x, y)] \right|}_{\xrightarrow{p} 0} + \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda n \left( \frac{1-r}{n_u} - \frac{r}{n_l} \right) H(\theta; x) \right|. \end{aligned}$$

So we now have to prove that the second term is also converging to 0 in probability. Again by splitting the absolute value and the sup, we have

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \lambda n \left( \frac{1-r}{n_u} - \frac{r}{n_l} \right) H(\theta; x) \right| = \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \frac{\lambda}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{(1-r)n}{n_u} H(\theta; x) - \frac{\lambda}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{rn}{n_l} H(\theta; x) \right|$$

Then we have that,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \frac{\lambda}{n_u} \sum_{i=1}^n (1-r)H(\theta; x) - \frac{\lambda}{n_l} \sum_{i=1}^n rH(\theta; x) \right| \\ &= \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \frac{\lambda}{n_u} \sum_{i=1}^n (1-r)H(\theta; x) - \mathbb{E}[H(\theta; x, y)] - \left( \frac{\lambda}{n_l} \sum_{i=1}^n rH(\theta; x) - \mathbb{E}[H(\theta; x, y)] \right) \right| \\ &= \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \frac{\lambda}{n_u} \sum_{i=n_l+1}^{n_l+n_u} H(\theta; x) - \mathbb{E}[H(\theta; x, y)] - \left( \frac{\lambda}{n_l} \sum_{i=1}^{n_l} H(\theta; x) - \mathbb{E}[H(\theta; x, y)] \right) \right| \\ &\leq \underbrace{\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \frac{\lambda}{n_u} \sum_{i=n-l+1}^{n_l+n_u} H(\theta; x) - \mathbb{E}[H(\theta; x, y)] \right|}_{\xrightarrow{\frac{p}{n}} 0} + \underbrace{\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \left( \frac{\lambda}{n_l} \sum_{i=1}^{n_l} H(\theta; x) - \mathbb{E}[H(\theta; x, y)] \right) \right|}_{\xrightarrow{\frac{p}{n}} 0} \end{aligned}$$

Thus,

$$\sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left| \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{rn}{n_l} L(\theta; x, y) + \lambda n \left( \frac{1-r}{n_u} - \frac{r}{n_l} \right) H(\theta; x) - \mathbb{E}[L(\theta; x, y)] \right| \xrightarrow{\frac{p}{n}} 0$$

And we now just have to apply the results of van der Vaart (2000, Theorem 5.7) to have the asymptotic consistent of  $\hat{\theta} = \arg \min \hat{\mathcal{R}}_{DeSSL}$ . ■

**Remark 14** *A sufficient condition on the function  $H$  to verify assumption B, the uniform weak law of large numbers, is to be bounded (Newey and McFadden, 1994, Lemma 2.4). For instance, the entropy  $H = -\sum_y p_\theta(y|x) \log(p_\theta(y|x))$  is bounded and therefore, the entropy minimisation is asymptotically consistent.*

## Appendix G. Proof of Theorem 6

Our proof will be based on the following result from Shalev-Shwartz and Ben-David (2014, Theorem 26.5).

**Theorem 15** *Let  $\mathcal{H}$  be a set of parameters,  $z \sim \mathcal{D}$  a random variable living in a space  $\mathcal{Z}$ ,  $c > 0$ , and  $\ell : \mathcal{H} \times \mathcal{Z} \rightarrow [-c, c]$ . We denote*

$$L_{\mathcal{D}}(h) = \mathbb{E}_z[\ell(h, z)], \text{ and } L_S(h) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \ell(h, z_i), \quad (42)$$

where  $z_1, \dots, z_m$  are i.i.d. samples from  $\mathcal{D}$ . For any  $\delta > 0$ , with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , we have

$$L_{\mathcal{D}}(h) \leq L_S(h) + 2\mathbb{E}_{(\varepsilon_i)_{i \leq m}} \left[ \sup_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \left( \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^m \varepsilon_i \ell(h, z_i) \right) \right] + 4c\sqrt{\frac{2 \log(4/\delta)}{m}}, \quad (43)$$

where  $\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_m$  are i.i.d. Rademacher variables independent from  $z_1, \dots, z_m$ .

We can now restate and prove our generalisation bound.

**Theorem 6.** *We assume that both  $L$  and  $H$  are bounded and that the labels are MCAR. Then, there exists a constant  $\kappa > 0$ , that depends on  $\lambda$ ,  $L$ ,  $H$ , and the ratio of observed labels, such that, with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ , for all  $\theta \in \Theta$ ,*

$$\mathcal{R}(\theta) \leq \hat{\mathcal{R}}_{DeSSL}(\theta) + 2R_n + \kappa\sqrt{\frac{\log(4/\delta)}{n}}, \quad (44)$$

where  $R_n$  is the Rademacher complexity

$$R_n = \mathbb{E}_{(\varepsilon_i)_{i \leq n}} \left[ \sup_{\theta \in \Theta} \left( \frac{1}{n_l} \sum_{i=1}^{n_l} \varepsilon_i L(\theta; x_i, y_i) - \frac{\lambda}{n_l} \sum_{i=1}^{n_l} \varepsilon_i H(\theta; x_i) + \frac{\lambda}{n_u} \sum_{i=1}^{n_u} \varepsilon_i H(\theta; x_i) \right) \right], \quad (45)$$

with  $\varepsilon_1, \dots, \varepsilon_m$  i.i.d. Rademacher variables independent from the data.

**Proof** We use Theorem 15 with  $z = (x, y, r)$ ,  $\mathcal{H} = \Theta$ ,  $m = n$ , and

$$\ell(h, z) = \frac{nr_i}{n_l} L(\theta; x_i, y_i) + \lambda \left( \frac{n(1-r_i)}{n_u} - \frac{nr_i}{n_l} \right) H(\theta; x_i). \quad (46)$$

The unbiasedness of our estimate under the MCAR assumption, proven in Appendix C, ensures that the condition of Equation (42) is satisfied with  $L_{\mathcal{D}}(h) = \mathcal{R}(\theta)$  and  $L_S(h) = \hat{\mathcal{R}}_{DeSSL}(\theta)$ . Now, since  $L$  and  $H$  are bounded, there exists  $M > 0$  such that  $|L| < M$  and  $|H| < M$ . We can then bound  $\ell$ :

$$|\ell(h, z)| \leq \frac{n}{n_l} M + \lambda \max \left\{ \frac{n}{n_u}, \frac{n}{n_l} \right\} M = c. \quad (47)$$

Now that we have chosen a  $c$  that bounds  $\ell$ , we can use Theorem 15 and finally get Equation (44) with  $\kappa = 4c\sqrt{2}$ . ■



## Appendix H. DeSSL with $H$ applied on all available data

For consistency-based SSL methods it is common to use all the available data for the consistency term:

$$\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{SSL}(\theta) = \frac{1}{n_l} \sum_{i=1}^{n_l} L(\theta; x_i, y_i) + \frac{\lambda}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n H(\theta; x_i). \quad (48)$$

With the same idea, we debias the risk estimate with the labelled data:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathcal{R}}_{DeSSL}(\theta) = \frac{1}{n_l} \sum_{i=1}^{n_l} L(\theta; x_i, y_i) &+ \frac{\lambda}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n H(\theta; x_i) \\ &- \frac{\lambda}{n_l} \sum_{i=1}^{n_l} H(\theta; x_i). \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

Under MCAR, this risk estimate is unbiased and the main theorem of the article hold with minor modifications. In Theorem 1,  $\lambda_{opt}$  is slightly different and the expression of the variance at  $\lambda_{opt}$  remains the same. The scoring rule in Theorem 2 is different but the theorem remains the same. Both Theorem 5 and 6 remain the same with very similar proofs.

**Theorem 16** *The function  $\lambda \mapsto \mathbb{V}(\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{DeSSL}(\theta))$  reaches its minimum for:*

$$\lambda_{opt} = \frac{\text{Cov}(L(\theta; x, y), H(\theta; x))}{\mathbb{V}(H(\theta; x))} \quad (50)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}(\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{DeSSL}(\theta))|_{\lambda_{opt}} &= (1 - \frac{n_u}{n} \rho_{L,H}^2) \mathbb{V}(\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{CC}(\theta)) \\ &\leq \mathbb{V}(\hat{\mathcal{R}}_{CC}(\theta)) \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

where  $\rho_{L,H} = \text{Corr}(L(\theta; x, y), H(\theta; x))$ .

When  $H$  is applied on all labelled and unlabelled data, the scoring rule used in the learning process is then  $\mathcal{S}'(p_\theta, (x, y, r)) = -(\frac{rn}{n_l} L(\theta; x, y) + \lambda(1 - \frac{rn}{n_l}) H(\theta; x))$  and we have  $\mathcal{S}'$  is a proper scoring rule.

## Appendix I. MNIST and MedMNIST

### I.1 MNIST




Figure 7: The influence of  $\lambda$  on Pseudo-label and DePseudo-label for a Lenet trained on MNIST with  $n_l = 1000$ : (Left) Test accuracy; (Middle) Mean test loss; (Right) Mean test ECE, with 95% CI

### I.2 MNIST label noise




Figure 8: The influence of  $\lambda$  on Pseudo-label and DePseudo-label for a Lenet trained on MNIST with label noise with  $n_l = 1000$ : (Left) Mean test accuracy; (Middle) Mean test loss; (Right) Test ECE, with 95% CI.

### I.3 MedMNIST

Table 3: Test AUC of Complete Case , PseudoLabel and DePseudoLabel on five datasets of MedMNIST.

DATASET	COMPLETE CASE	PSEUDOLABEL	DEPSEUDOLABEL
DERMA	$84.26 \pm 0.50$	$82.64 \pm 1.19$	$83.82 \pm 0.95$
PNEUMONIA	$94.28 \pm 0.46$	$94.34 \pm 0.91$	$94.15 \pm 0.33$
RETINA	$70.70 \pm 0.74$	$70.12 \pm 1.01$	$69.97 \pm 1.44$
BREAST	$74.67 \pm 3.68$	$74.86 \pm 3.18$	$75.33 \pm 3.05$
BLOOD	$97.83 \pm 0.23$	$97.83 \pm 0.23$	$97.72 \pm 0.15$

Appendix J. PseudoLabel and DePseudoLabel on CIFAR: p-values




Figure 9: The influence of  $\lambda$  on Pseudo-label and DePseudo-label on CIFAR with  $n_l=4000$ : (Left) Mean test accuracy; (Middle) Mean test loss; (Right) Test ECE, with 95% CI.




Figure 10: p-values of a paired student test between PseudoLabel and DePseudoLabel (Right) DePseudoLabel is better than PseudoLabel; (Left) DePseudoLabel is worse than PseudoLabel.

## Appendix K. CIFAR and SVHN: Oliver et al. (2018) mplementation of consistency-based model.

In this section we present the results on CIFAR and SVHN by debiasing the (Oliver et al., 2018) implementation of Pseudo-label, II-Model, Mean-Teacher and VAT <sup>1</sup>. We mimic the experiments of Oliver et al. (2018, figure-4) with the same configuration and the exact same hyperparameters (Oliver et al., 2018, Appendix B and C). We perform an early stopping independently on both loss and accuracy. As reported below, we reach almost the same results as (Oliver et al., 2018) by using all the data.

### K.1 CIFAR-10




Figure 11: Test loss for each SSL approaches on CIFAR-10 with various amounts of labelled data  $n_l$ . (Left) II-model and DeII-model. (Middle) VAT+EntMin and VAT+DeEntMin. (Right) Mean-teacher and DeMean-teacher. Shadows represent 95% CI.

1. <https://github.com/brain-research/realistic-ssl-evaluation>




Figure 12: Test loss for each SSL approaches on CIFAR-10 with various amounts of labelled data  $n_l$ . (Left)  $\Pi$ -model and De $\Pi$ -model. (Middle) VAT+EntMin and VAT+DeEntMin. (Right) Mean-teacher and DeMean-teacher. Shadows represent 95% CI.

## K.2 SVHN




Figure 13: Test accuracy for each SSL approaches on SVHN with various amounts of labelled data  $n_l$ . (Left)  $\Pi$ -model and De $\Pi$ -model. (Middle) VAT+EntMin and VAT+DeEntMin. (Right) Mean-teacher and DeMean-teacher. Shadows represent 95% CI.

# DON'T FEAR THE UNLABELLED




Figure 14: Test loss for each SSL approaches on CIFAR-10 with various amounts of labelled data  $n_l$ . (Left) II-model and DeII-model. (Middle) VAT+EntMin and VAT+DeEntMin. (Right) Mean-teacher and DeMean-teacher. Shadows represent 95% CI.

## Appendix L. Tabular benchmarks

In this section, we tested these methods against the benchmarks of Chapelle et al., 2006, Chapter 21 and UCI datasets already used in a SSL context in (Guo et al., 2010). We trained a logistic regression for the case of 100 labelled datapoints and finetune  $\lambda$  with a very small validation set, 20 datapoints. We evaluated the performance in accuracy and loss of PseudoLabel, EntMin, DePseudoLabel and DeEntMin

### L.1 SSL Benchmark




Figure 15: Mean accuracy and loss for each SSL datasets (Chapelle et al., 2006) on a logistic regression. (Top-Left) PseudoLabel and DePseudoLabel accuracy (Top-Right) PseudoLabel and DePseudoLabel loss (Bottom-Left) EntMin and DeEntMin accuracy (Bottom-Right) EntMin and DeEntMin loss.



## L.2 UCI datasets




Figure 16: Mean accuracy and loss for each UCI datasets (Guo et al., 2010) on a logistic regression. (Top-Left) PseudoLabel and DePseudoLabel accuracy (Top-Right) PseudoLabel and DePseudoLabel loss (Bottom-Left) EntMin and DeEntMin accuracy (Bottom-Right) EntMin and DeEntMin loss.