

Spectral Clustering for Crowdsourcing with Inherently Distinct Task Types

SAPTARSHI MANDAL*, SEO TAEK KONG*, DIMITRIOS KATSELIS, and R. SRIKANT, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, USA

The Dawid-Skene model is the most widely assumed model in the analysis of crowdsourcing algorithms that estimate ground-truth labels from noisy worker responses. In this work, we are motivated by crowdsourcing applications where workers have distinct skill sets and their accuracy additionally depends on a task's type. While weighted majority vote (WMV) with a single weight vector for each worker achieves the optimal label estimation error in the Dawid-Skene model, we show that different weights for different types are necessary for a multi-type model. Focusing on the case where there are two types of tasks, we propose a spectral method to partition tasks into two groups that cluster tasks by type. Our analysis reveals that task types can be perfectly recovered if the number of workers n scales logarithmically with the number of tasks d . Any algorithm designed for the Dawid-Skene model can then be applied independently to each type to infer the labels. Numerical experiments show how clustering tasks by type before estimating ground-truth labels enhances the performance of crowdsourcing algorithms in practical applications.

CCS Concepts: • **Computing methodologies** → **Spectral methods**; • **Mathematics of computing** → *Probability and statistics; Probabilistic inference problems.*

Additional Key Words and Phrases: Crowdsourcing, Spectral Clustering, Matrix Perturbation

1 Introduction

Labeled datasets are required in many machine learning applications to either train classifiers using supervised learning or to evaluate their performance. Crowdsourcing is a popular way to label large datasets by collecting labels from a large number of workers at a low cost. The collected labels are often noisy due to many reasons including the difficulty of some labeling tasks, differing skill sets of the workers, etc. (Bonald and Combes [2], Gao et al. [8]). The crowdsourced labels are then used to infer ground-truth labels by aggregating the responses of the workers. To analyze the quality of the inferred labels, a statistical model for the workers' responses is often assumed.

A widely-studied model for crowdsourcing was first proposed by Dawid and Skene [5]. Their one-coin model assumes that workers have distinct skill sets, and each worker submits responses to a task independently of all other tasks and workers. Formally, each worker i is assumed to submit a response X_{ij} to a task j that correctly reflects the label y_j with an unknown but fixed probability p_i . Although the true labels are never observed, it is possible to estimate the unknown accuracy parameters $p = (p_1, \dots, p_n)$ by assuming that workers respond according to this statistical model. Once the accuracy parameters are estimated, labels can be estimated using the Nitzan-Paroush estimate (Nitzan and Paroush [17]). Despite the simplicity of this Dawid-Skene model, the optimal error rates of label estimation algorithms have only been understood relatively recently Berend and Kontorovich [1], Gao et al. [8].

In this paper, we are interested in modeling worker responses when crowdsourced tasks demand different levels of expertise. The considered model is motivated by expert behavior in radiology when labeling the presence of thoracic nodules can be more difficult because of their shape and size, or when they are imaged with different resolutions, resulting in labels that are more reliable

*Both authors contributed equally to this research.

for tasks with one type than the other He et al. [9], Shiraishi et al. [21]. The contributions of the paper are the following:

- (1) We consider a model for crowdsourcing that describes settings when workers label tasks that require different levels of expertise. To motivate the need for clustering tasks into different types, we first examine a scenario where the task types are known. For this model, we demonstrate that the type-agnostic weighted majority vote (WMV) algorithm, designed for Dawid-Skene models, performs worse than a WMV algorithm designed for each task type separately.
- (2) Next, we consider our main model where the task types are unknown. For this model, we design a spectral clustering algorithm to cluster the tasks into two types. Our main contribution is a result that the clustering algorithm correctly classifies all tasks if the number of workers is of the order of the log of the number of tasks. Specifically, we first show that the observation matrix whose spectral properties are used for clustering has a special structure, namely, a low-rank part plus a perturbation. We show that the perturbation is small and then adapt the ideas from Fan et al. [7] to show that perfect clustering is possible under conditions that are natural in crowdsourcing applications. The most common perturbation result used in the clustering literature is the Davis-Kahan theorem [24], which characterizes the perturbation in eigenvectors as a function of the perturbation in a matrix. However, the Davis-Kahan theorem does not exploit any special structure of the matrix that is being perturbed while the result in [7] allows us to exploit a low-rank structure that we have identified in the crowdsourcing observation matrix.
- (3) Once the tasks are clustered into two different types, any crowdsourcing algorithm designed for the DS model can then be applied to estimate labels corresponding to tasks of each type independently of the other. For concreteness, we focus on estimating the workers' reliabilities using the Triangular Estimation (TE) algorithm proposed by Bonald and Combes [2], followed by the Nitzan-Paroush (NP) decision rule (Nitzan and Paroush [17]) to estimate the labels. For this algorithm, we obtain an upper bound on the probability of task labeling error, and using this bound, we show that the probability of labeling error goes to zero exponentially fast in the number of workers. Further, we show that for the type-agnostic algorithm, this is not the case, i.e., there are problem parameters for which the asymptotic probability of labeling error does not go to zero exponentially fast.
- (4) Finally, we conduct experiments using publicly available datasets. We compared two classes of algorithms: one where we first performed task clustering by type and then applied an algorithm designed for the traditional DS model to label tasks separately for each type and the other where the labeling algorithm is directly applied to the dataset without any clustering. Our experimental results show that clustering followed by labeling outperforms direct labeling in most of the datasets we considered except in one dataset. We also compared our algorithm with other algorithms which also divide tasks into types. Again, we found that our algorithm outperforms other task type-dependent algorithms except in the case of one dataset. We also explain why we believe this to be the case.

2 Background

2.1 Problem Setting

Throughout this paper, the notation \log refers to the natural logarithm. For any positive integer m , denote by $[m]$ the set $\{1, \dots, m\}$. Let $n \geq 3$ be the number of workers labeling $d > 4$ tasks. Each task $j \in [d]$ is associated with deterministic but unknown ground-truth labels $y_1, y_2, \dots, y_d \in \{-1, +1\}$ following Gao et al. [8]. Each worker $i \in [n]$ independently submits a response $X_{ij} \in \{-1, +1\}$ to

each task j with X_{ij} being independent across task index j . The goal is to estimate the true label $y_j \in \{-1, +1\}$ for every task $j \in [d]$.

In our model, each task j is further associated with a type $k_j \in \{e, h\}$ indicating “easy” and “hard” types, respectively. The task types are also deterministic but unknown, and a task’s type k_j determines the accuracy parameter $p_{kji} = \mathbb{P}(X_{ij} = y_j)$ as the probability of worker i correctly labeling a task j for all workers $i \in [n]$. Using the accuracy vectors, we can define the reliability vectors $r_e, r_h \in [-1, 1]^n$ as $r_k = 2p_k - 1$, where we denote the i^{th} element of p_k by p_{ki} for all $k \in \{e, h\}$. Finally, we let the number of tasks of type k be d_k ; clearly, $d_e + d_h = d$. We assume that d_k is unknown. We consider the case when all workers label all tasks.

This *hard-easy model* is motivated by applications where certain tasks can inherently be more difficult than others. We characterize the collective potential of the crowd of workers for type k by the Euclidean norm of the corresponding reliability vectors $\|r_k\|$, where $r_k = (r_{k1}, \dots, r_{kn})$. In keeping with the motivation of studying problems with hard and easy tasks, we assume the following:

Assumption 2.1. The reliability vectors satisfy

$$\|r_e\| > \|r_h\|. \quad (1)$$

We also assume that the reliabilities are bounded away from -1 and $+1$:

Assumption 2.2. For some $\rho \in (0, 1/2)$ independent of (n, d, k) , the reliability vectors r_e, r_h satisfy

$$\rho \leq \frac{1 \pm r_{ki}}{2} \leq 1 - \rho \quad (2)$$

for all $i \in [n]$ and type $k \in \{e, h\}$.

Our hard-easy model can be considered an extension of the one-coin Dawid-Skene (DS) model to two types of tasks. Henceforth, when we refer to the DS model, we mean the one-coin DS model unless explicitly stated otherwise.

2.2 Related Work: Dawid-Skene Model

Crowdsourcing models differ in the assumed structure for the accuracy matrix P , where

$$P_{ij} = \mathbb{P}(X_{ij} = y_j). \quad (3)$$

In the one-coin DS model, P is a matrix with d identical columns. There is a vast literature on inferring labels from data under this model. These include the original EM algorithm proposed in Dawid and Skene [5], spectral-EM algorithm in Zhang et al. [25], message passing algorithm in Karger et al. [10, 11], label estimation from the principal eigenvector of the worker-similarity matrix studied in Dalvi et al. [4] to name a few.

For our experiments, we will use the following DS algorithm: first estimate reliabilities and then use a weighted majority vote algorithm for estimating task tasks. We will review the WMV algorithm first. Consider the Dawid-Skene model so that the distribution of the binary worker response matrix $X \in \{-1, +1\}^{n \times d}$ is determined by a single reliability vector $r \in [-1, +1]^n$, i.e. all tasks are of same type. Given *known* reliabilities r and focusing on a single task with worker responses $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$, the maximum likelihood decision rule for a given task j is then given by the map

$$g^*(x) = \operatorname{sgn} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n w_i x_i \right), \quad (4)$$

with (possibly infinite) weights

$$w_i = \log \frac{1 + r_i}{1 - r_i}. \quad (5)$$

Based on this observation, a common approach is to estimate the reliability vector r from the responses X , denoted as \hat{r} , and use the Nitzan-Paroush decision rule (Nitzan and Paroush [17]) to infer the labels as

$$\hat{y}_j^{NP} = \text{sgn} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \log \frac{1 + \hat{r}_i}{1 - \hat{r}_i} X_{ij} \right), \forall j \in [d]. \quad (6)$$

Equation (6) corresponds to a *weighted majority vote* of the form (4) with weights $w_i = \log \frac{1 + \hat{r}_i}{1 - \hat{r}_i}$.

Next, we review the TE algorithm for estimating reliabilities proposed in Bonald and Combes [2], which we will use in our theoretical results. The reason we focus on this algorithm is that it has been compared to other algorithms and shown to perform better in real datasets. Additionally, by comparing the probability of labeling error expression derived from Bonald and Combes [2] with the lower bounds in Gao et al. [8], it can be seen that the algorithm is provably asymptotically optimal. We give a brief description of the TE algorithm for completeness. The TE algorithm designed for estimating a reliability vector for the DS model first computes the worker-covariance matrix

$$W_{ab} = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^d X_{aj} X_{bj}, \forall a, b \in [n]. \quad (7)$$

For every worker $i \in [n]$, the most informative pair of co-workers $\arg \max_{a,b \in [n]: a \neq b \neq i} |W_{ab}|$ denoted by (a_i, b_i) is computed, and the magnitude of the i th worker's reliability is estimated as

$$|\hat{r}_i| = \begin{cases} \left[\sqrt{\frac{W_{a_i i} W_{b_i i}}{W_{a_i b_i}}} \right]_{[2\rho-1, 1-2\rho]}, & \text{if } |W_{a_i b_i}| > 0 \\ 0, & \text{else} \end{cases}. \quad (8)$$

The sign of \hat{r}_i is estimated by letting

$$i^* = \arg \max_{i \in [n]} \left| \hat{r}_i^2 + \sum_{j \in [n]: j \neq i} W_{ji} \right|.$$

and by setting the sign of \hat{r} according to

$$\text{sgn}(\hat{r}_i) = \begin{cases} \text{sgn}(\hat{r}_{i^*}^2 + \sum_{j \in [n]: j \neq i^*} W_{ji^*}), & \text{if } i = i^* \\ \text{sgn}(\hat{r}_{i^*} W_{i i^*}), & \text{else} \end{cases}.$$

This concludes our discussion of the TE algorithm.

2.3 Related Work: Task-Specific Reliability Models

Having reviewed the DS model and associated algorithms in the previous subsection, we note that the key feature of all these models is that a worker has the same reliability for all tasks although different workers may have different reliabilities. The basic DS model has been extended to consider the case where the same worker can have different reliabilities for different tasks, we review these models in the next subsection.

A rank-1 model studied in Khetan and Oh [13] assumes that P is an outer product of the accuracy of the workers and a vector parametrizing the easiness of all tasks. A more general model was studied in Shah et al. [20], where P is assumed to satisfy strong stochastic transitivity (Shah et al. [19]). In the context of crowdsourcing, this assumption implies that workers can be ranked from most to least accurate, and that this ranking does not change across tasks. The P that they consider

can be associated with a rank as large as $\min(n, d)$. Lastly, the model in Kim et al. [14], Shah and Lee [18] assumes an accuracy matrix P that exhibits a low-rank structure with a fixed number of distinct entries. they call it a k -type specialization model which is close to a stochastic block model with k communities. In their model, each worker and task can be of k different types with type assignment being independent among tasks and workers. The accuracy parameter P_{ij} with worker i and task j having a matched type is relatively higher than any other mismatched pair. The algorithms designed for this model in Kim et al. [14], Shah and Lee [18] have a two-step approach. The first step involves clustering workers according to their types. The second step is estimating labels for each task j using a weighted majority vote where significant weight is given to workers that match the type of task j and negligible weight is given to all other workers.

We now compare our model to the above models. As pointed out in Kim et al. [14], both Khetan and Oh [13] and Shah et al. [20] consider the following: if worker A is better than worker B for any task, then this same ordering holds for all other tasks. Such a monotonicity is not assumed in our model. The k -type specialization model in Kim et al. [14], Shah and Lee [18] somewhat similar in spirit to our model in the sense it attempts to cluster tasks according to types. However, they also cluster workers according to types and their algorithm uses a simple majority vote or a majority vote with two weights. Such a voting scheme is not optimal when different workers have different reliabilities [17].

It is worth noting that our model assumes all workers respond to all tasks, as it is motivated by applications where an institution contracts professionals to label a dataset. This does not model applications that use platforms such as Amazon Mechanical Turk, in which workers independently select a sparse subset of tasks to label. Our model can be extended to accommodate such a sparsity in the dataset, where a sparsity parameter would be integrated in the performance bounds. But given our motivation, we have chosen not to do so in this paper.

3 Main Results

3.1 Limitations of Type-Agnostic Weighted Majority Vote

In our hard-easy model, the response matrix X is drawn from a distribution depending on two reliability vectors r_e and r_h . Suppose these parameters are known, while the task types k_1, \dots, k_d are unknown. This motivates the study of all algorithms of the form (4), which we call type agnostic weighted majority vote (TA-WMV), that use a single weight vector w as a function of r_e and r_h . The average error rate for this label estimate $\hat{y}^{WMV}(w)$ is defined as

$$\mathbb{P}_{av}(w) = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{P} \left(\hat{y}_j^{WMV}(w) \neq y_j \right), \quad (9)$$

where the dependence on weights w is emphasized. For the case of one-coin model DS model, the error rate (9) is invariant to the true labels y_1, \dots, y_d , and can therefore be equivalently expressed as

$$\mathbb{P}_{av}(w) = \frac{d_e}{d} \mathbb{P}_e \left(\hat{y}^{WMV}(w) \neq y \right) + \frac{d_h}{d} \mathbb{P}_h \left(\hat{y}^{WMV}(w) \neq y \right), \quad (10)$$

where \mathbb{P}_k is the probability measure parametrized by task type $k \in \{e, h\}$. The following two propositions characterize the error rate of all TA-WMV algorithms with access to the reliability vectors but use a single weight vector for both task types. The proof of the Proposition 3.1 is a straightforward application of Chernoff bound and is given in the Appendix B for completeness.

Proposition 3.1 (upper-bound on expected labeling error: TA-WMV). *Suppose X is drawn from the hard-easy model, and that the reliability vectors r_e, r_h are known. For any weight vector $w = w(r_e, r_h)$,*

the probability of error on task j of type $k \in \{e, h\}$ satisfies

$$\mathbb{P}_k \left(\hat{y}_j^{WMV}(\mathbf{w}) \neq y_j \right) \leq \exp(-n\varphi_n(\mathbf{w}, r_k)), \quad (11)$$

where the error exponent $\varphi_n(\mathbf{w}, r_k)$ is given by

$$\varphi_n(\mathbf{w}, r_k) = -\inf_{t \geq 0} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log \left(e^{t w_i} \frac{1 - r_{ki}}{2} + e^{-t w_i} \frac{1 + r_{ki}}{2} \right). \quad (12)$$

Next, the Proposition 3.2 shows that the error rate is tight up to multiplicative factors:

Proposition 3.2 (lower-bound on expected labeling error: TA-WMV). *Let $0 < w_l \leq w_u < \infty$ be positive constants such that the weights of a TA-WMV algorithm satisfy $w_l \leq w_i \leq w_u$ for all workers i . For any $\mathbf{y} \in \{-1, +1\}^d$, the average error rate $\mathbb{P}_{av}(\mathbf{w})$ of any TA-WMV with that uses a single weight vector across all tasks for label estimation satisfies*

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \min_{\mathbf{w}} P_{av}(\mathbf{w}) \geq -\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_{\mathbf{w}} \min_k \varphi_n(\mathbf{w}, r_k), \quad (13)$$

for any ground-truth vector $\mathbf{y} \in \{-1, +1\}^d$.

The above result is similar to Theorem 5.1 in Gao et al. [8]; however, our proposition uses weighted majority voting for arbitrary weights for a type k , whereas their result is for majority voting. While the techniques are similar, the generalization is important to study the role of having two task types as compared to the single task-type DS model. The requirement that the norm of the weights \mathbf{w} is bounded excludes pathological constructions where, for example, weights are all zeros. The proof of Proposition 3.2 is given in Appendix C.

To understand the limitation of TA-WMV algorithms, it is instructive to compare the error rates in Proposition 3.2 with the achievable rates by an algorithm that accounts for type difference among different tasks under the setting when task types are known but the reliability vectors (r_e, r_h) are unknown. For this purpose, we assume the following condition, which is also used in Bonald and Combes [2]:

Assumption 3.3. There exists a positive constant \bar{r} such that $\frac{1}{n} \sum_i r_{ki} > \bar{r}$ for all types $k \in \{e, h\}$. Further, the co-reliability of workers is non-zero: For every k ,

$$V_k = \min_i \max_{a, b \neq i} \sqrt{|r_{ka} r_{kb}|} > 0. \quad (14)$$

Proposition 3.4. *Suppose the number of workers n satisfies*

$$n \geq \sqrt{3\rho/\bar{r}}, \quad (15)$$

the number of tasks per type satisfies

$$d_k \geq C_1 \frac{n^2}{V_k^4 \min(\rho^2, \bar{r}^2)} (n\Phi(r_k) + \log(6n^2)). \quad (16)$$

for some universal constant C_1 . Then, the TE algorithm to estimate the reliability vectors followed by NP-WMV for label estimation separately for each type achieves a label error rate

$$\frac{1}{d} \sum_j P(\hat{y}_j \neq y_j) \leq 3 \sum_{k \in \{e, h\}} \frac{d_k}{d} \exp(-n\Phi(r_k)), \quad (17)$$

where \hat{y}_j and y_j are the estimated and true labels of task j , respectively, and

$$\Phi(r_k) = -\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \log \left(\sqrt{(1 + r_{ki})(1 - r_{ki})} \right). \quad (18)$$

Algorithm 1 Clustering tasks into hard and easy types

Input: Worker responses $X \in \{-1, +1\}^{n \times d}$.

Compute the principal eigenvector \hat{v} of the task-similarity matrix $T = n^{-1}X^T X$.

Set threshold $\hat{\mu} = \frac{1}{d} \sum_j |\hat{v}_j|$.

Classify task types by thresholding: $\hat{k}_j = \begin{cases} e & \text{if } |\hat{v}_j| \geq \hat{\mu} \\ h & \text{if } |\hat{v}_j| < \hat{\mu}. \end{cases}$

Return: Task type estimates $\hat{k}_1, \dots, \hat{k}_d$.

The error exponent (18)¹ for type-dependent weighted majority voting can be related to the error exponent for the type-agnostic weighted majority voting in (12) through the identity

$$\Phi(r_k) = \max_w \varphi_n(w, r_k), \quad (19)$$

where the maximizing weights are given by the maximum likelihood weights w in (5). Recall from Proposition 3.2, the lower bound on the error exponent for type-agnostic Weighted Majority Vote is $\max_w \min_k \varphi(w, r_k)$ and from the definition of $\Phi(r_k)$, it is clear that $\max_w \min_k \varphi(w, r_k) \leq \Phi(r_k), \forall k$. This suggests that knowing the type of a task can be helpful. In fact, it is easy to come up with examples where the error rates for the known and unknown task types are dramatically different.

Consider the case that for $r_{ei} = \beta$ for all i and that $r_{hi} = -\beta$ for all i for some $\beta : 0 < \beta < 1$. Then,

$$\max_w \min_k (\varphi(w, r_k)) = \min_k (\varphi(0, r_k)) = 0,$$

whereas $\Phi(r_k) = -\log(\sqrt{\beta(1-\beta)}) > 0$. In fact, $\Phi(r_k)$ is always positive for a non-zero reliability vector r_k . This shows that, while separating tasks by type always leads to an exponentially decaying probability of error, not doing so does not.

Our analysis in this section suggests that if we have an algorithm that can perfectly cluster tasks by type, then it can be useful to cluster tasks before the label estimation. With this motivation, we now study a spectral clustering algorithm for separating tasks into different types.

3.2 Spectral Clustering

When task types are not known, we propose a spectral algorithm that clusters tasks into two groups. Crowdsourcing algorithms designed for the Dawid-Skene model can then be applied separately to each group. We assume that the number of tasks per type is in the same order. Otherwise, the task types are almost homogeneous, and it is difficult to cluster tasks by type.

Assumption 3.5. There exists $\alpha \in (0, 1)$ such that $d_e = \alpha d$ and $d_h = (1 - \alpha)d$.

The proposed spectral algorithm is described in Algorithm 1. We adopt the convention that any eigenvector has unit norm in this paper. We note that our clustering algorithm only needs to classify tasks into two groups, as long as all the easy tasks fall into one group and all the hard tasks fall into the other group. Later, we will apply the TE-WMV algorithm separately to each cluster and hence, it does not matter which group we call hard and which group we call easy. Therefore, the clustering error associated with Algorithm 1 can be defined as

$$\eta := \min_{\pi: \{e, h\} \rightarrow \{e, h\}} \frac{1}{d} \sum_j \mathbf{1} \left\{ \pi(\hat{k}_j) \neq k_j \right\} \quad (20)$$

¹This error exponent also serves as the asymptotic lower bound for the labeling error for a one-coin DS model corresponding to a reliability type r_k (Gao et al. [8]).

We show that the probability of the event of perfect clustering, that is, $\{\eta = 0\}$ goes to 1 with a rate exponentially fast in n . This is precisely stated and shown in Theorem 3.12.

We give an outline of the key ideas involved in proving Theorem 3.12 here:

- (1) Let the expected task similarity matrix be $\mathbb{E}[T] := \mathbb{E}[n^{-1}X^T X]$. We first note that $\mathbb{E}[T]$ can be written in the form $n^{-1}R_y + S$ where $n^{-1}R_y$ is a low-rank matrix and S is a diagonal matrix. The expressions for these matrices are provided in Lemma 3.6.
- (2) Then, we show that the principal eigenvector $v(n^{-1}R_y)$ of $n^{-1}R_y$ has a special structure: all the elements corresponding to easy tasks take on the same value in magnitude and all the elements corresponding to hard tasks take on the same value in magnitude. Further, these magnitudes are sufficiently separated under our model for hard and easy tasks under an additional assumption (see Assumption 3.8) which holds outside a set of measure zero. The precise version of this result is stated in Lemma 3.7. This lemma suggests that, if we had access to $v(n^{-1}R_y)$, then we can cluster tasks by using a threshold to differentiate the magnitudes of the elements of $v(n^{-1}R_y)$. But we do not have access to this eigenvector, therefore the rest of the proof shows that the eigenvector we have access to is a small perturbation of $v(n^{-1}R_y)$.
- (3) Next, we note that

$$T = n^{-1}R_y + S + N,$$

where N is a random matrix noise term given by $N = T - \mathbb{E}[T]$. We use matrix Hoeffding inequality to show that this noise term is small in the infinity-norm sense. This is shown in Lemma 3.10.

- (4) Since S is a diagonal matrix, it can be easily shown that its spectral norm is sufficiently small when the number of tasks is large, which is the case in crowdsourcing models. This implies that the spectral norm of $S + N$ is sufficiently small with high probability. Then, using the result of Fan et al. [7], we show that the principal eigenvector of the matrix T which is denoted as \hat{v} has a structure similar to that of $v(n^{-1}R_y)$, i.e., \hat{v} is a perturbed version of $v(n^{-1}R_y)$, in the l_∞ norm sense, where the perturbation is small under our hard-easy model. This is shown in Lemma 3.11 under the assumption that the vectors r_e and r_h are not collinear, which again holds outside a set of measure zero.
- (5) Now, putting these results together yields our main result in Theorem 3.12, which shows that our spectral clustering algorithm works due to the structure of $v(n^{-1}R_y)$. In other words, if an appropriate threshold is chosen to differentiate the magnitudes of the elements of \hat{v} , then this would lead to perfect clustering with high probability.

Now, we will present the lemmas leading up to the main result in the same order as in the outline above. To do this, we suppose for analysis that the tasks are arranged so that easy tasks are in the first d_e columns of X and hard tasks are in the remaining columns. Knowing the arrangement of columns implies knowledge of task types, but we only use this to simplify exposition and note that this is not used by our algorithm and does not affect our analysis.

The following Lemma 3.6 presents the decomposition of the expected task similarity matrix $\mathbb{E}[T]$. The proof is straightforward and can be obtained by expressing the expectation of the entries of the task-similarity matrix T .

Lemma 3.6. *The expected task-similarity matrix $\mathbb{E}[T]$ can be written as a perturbation of a low-rank signal $n^{-1}R_y := n^{-1}\text{diag}(y) \begin{pmatrix} \|r_e\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{d_e \times d_e} & r_e^T r_h \mathbf{1}_{d_e \times d_h} \\ r_h^T r_e \mathbf{1}_{d_h \times d_e} & \|r_h\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{d_h \times d_h} \end{pmatrix} \text{diag}(y)$.*

$$\mathbb{E}[T] = \underbrace{\frac{1}{n} \text{diag}(y) \begin{pmatrix} \|r_e\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{d_e \times d_e} & r_e^T r_h \mathbf{1}_{d_e \times d_h} \\ r_h^T r_e \mathbf{1}_{d_h \times d_e} & \|r_h\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{d_h \times d_h} \end{pmatrix} \text{diag}(y)}_{n^{-1}R_y} + \underbrace{I_d - \frac{1}{n} \text{diag} \left([\|r_e\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{1 \times d_e}, \|r_h\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{1 \times d_h}]^T \right)}_S \quad (21)$$

Here, I_d is the $d \times d$ identity matrix and for any natural numbers a and b , $\mathbf{1}_{a \times b}$ is the all ones matrix of size $a \times b$. The perturbation matrix S in this context is a diagonal matrix.

The spectral properties of the signal matrix $n^{-1}R_y$ are presented in the next lemma. As previously mentioned in the outline, we observe in Lemma 3.7 that the magnitude of the entries of $v(n^{-1}R_y)$ are the same for tasks of the same type but are different for different types of tasks. The proof of Lemma 3.7 follows from the eigendecomposition of matrix $n^{-1}R_y$ and is presented in Appendix E.

Lemma 3.7. *Consider $d_e \geq 1$ and $d_h \geq 1$. The principal eigenvector of the matrix $n^{-1}R_y$ has the following form:*

$$v(n^{-1}R_y) = \begin{cases} \text{diag}(y) \begin{bmatrix} \frac{s}{\sqrt{s^2 d_e + d_h}} \mathbf{1}_{d_e \times 1} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{s^2 d_e + d_h}} \mathbf{1}_{d_h \times 1} \end{bmatrix}, & \text{when } r_e^T r_h \neq 0 \\ \text{diag}(y) \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{d_e}} \mathbf{1}_{d_e \times 1} \\ 0_{d_h \times 1} \end{bmatrix} & \text{when } r_e^T r_h = 0 \end{cases} \quad (22)$$

where

$$s = \frac{d_e \|r_e\|_2^2 - d_h \|r_h\|_2^2 + \sqrt{[d_e \|r_e\|_2^2 - d_h \|r_h\|_2^2]^2 + 4d_e d_h (r_e^T r_h)^2}}{2d_e r_e^T r_h}. \quad (23)$$

The matrix $n^{-1}R_y$ is a rank- ℓ matrix with $\ell \leq 2$. Let the two largest eigenvalues of the matrix $n^{-1}R_y$ be $\lambda_1(n^{-1}R_y)$ and $\lambda_2(n^{-1}R_y)$ defined in non-decreasing order. They can be expressed as below:

$$\lambda_1(n^{-1}R_y) = \frac{d_e \|r_e\|_2^2 + d_h \|r_h\|_2^2 + \sqrt{[d_e \|r_e\|_2^2 - d_h \|r_h\|_2^2]^2 + 4d_e d_h (r_e^T r_h)^2}}{2n}. \quad (24)$$

$$\lambda_2(n^{-1}R_y) = \frac{d_e \|r_e\|_2^2 + d_h \|r_h\|_2^2 - \sqrt{[d_e \|r_e\|_2^2 - d_h \|r_h\|_2^2]^2 + 4d_e d_h (r_e^T r_h)^2}}{2n}. \quad (25)$$

Clearly when r_e and r_h are collinear, $\lambda_2(n^{-1}R_y) = 0$ from definition.

Let the magnitude of the entries of $v(n^{-1}R_y)$ corresponding to the easy and hard tasks be denoted as $\mu_e(n^{-1}R_y)$ and $\mu_h(n^{-1}R_y)$ respectively. Clearly, from Lemma 3.7, we can write $\mu_e(n^{-1}R_y)$ and $\mu_h(n^{-1}R_y)$ as :

$$\mu_e(n^{-1}R_y) = \begin{cases} \left| \frac{s}{\sqrt{s^2 d_e + d_h}} \right|, & \text{when } r_e^T r_h \neq 0 \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{d_e}}, & \text{when } r_e^T r_h = 0 \end{cases} \quad (26)$$

$$\mu_h(n^{-1}R_y) = \begin{cases} \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{s^2 d_e + d_h}} \right|, & \text{when } r_e^\top r_h \neq 0 \\ 0, & \text{when } r_e^\top r_h = 0 \end{cases} \quad (27)$$

We see when the following assumption is satisfied, $\mu_e(n^{-1}R_y)$ and $\mu_h(n^{-1}R_y)$ are distinct, that is $\mu_e(n^{-1}R_y) \neq \mu_h(n^{-1}R_y)$.

Assumption 3.8. When $d_e \neq d_h$,

$$|r_e^\top r_h| \neq \left| \frac{d_e \|r_e\|_2^2 - d_h \|r_h\|_2^2}{d_e - d_h} \right|.$$

Hence, under the Assumption 3.8, if we have access to the signal matrix $n^{-1}R_y$, we can differentiate tasks of one type from another using the entries of the vector $v(n^{-1}R_y)$. Specifically, by using the average of the magnitude of the entries of $v(n^{-1}R_y)$ as a threshold, we can separate the elements of this eigenvector into two clusters. Clearly, the threshold is given by

$$\mu(n^{-1}R_y) = \frac{d_e}{d} \mu_e(n^{-1}R_y) + \frac{d_h}{d} \mu_h(n^{-1}R_y).$$

The rest of the lemmas show that such a clustering can be performed with just access to \hat{v} . In particular, we show that each entry of \hat{v} is a perturbed version of the corresponding entry of $v(n^{-1}R_y)$ where the magnitude of the perturbation is, with high probability, at most $\frac{1}{2} \min(m_e(n^{-1}R_y), m_h(n^{-1}R_y))$, where $m_e(n^{-1}R_y) = |\mu_e(n^{-1}R_y) - \mu|$ and $m_h(n^{-1}R_y) = |\mu - \mu_h(n^{-1}R_y)|$. A little thought shows that this would imply that all tasks are clustered perfectly.

Before proceeding further, we define the normalized spectral gap of $n^{-1}R_y$ as

$$\nu(n^{-1}R_y) = d^{-1} \min \{ \lambda_1(n^{-1}R_y) - \lambda_2(n^{-1}R_y), \lambda_2(n^{-1}R_y) \}. \quad (28)$$

$\nu(n^{-1}R_y)$ would be an important quantity to characterize the performance of our clustering algorithm later. For using the matrix perturbation result in Fan et al. [7] in the following parts, it is required that the normalized spectral gap $\nu(n^{-1}R_y) \neq 0$ which holds when the following assumption is satisfied (see the last statement of Lemma 3.7):

Assumption 3.9. The reliability vectors r_e and r_h are not collinear.

From Lemma 3.6, we can view the matrix T as a perturbation of the signal matrix $n^{-1}R_y$ as follows:

$$T = \mathbb{E}[T] + N = n^{-1}R_y + S + N. \quad (29)$$

Let the infinity norm of a square matrix M be $\|M\|_\infty = \max_i \sum_j |M_{ij}|$. The following matrix concentration inequality shows how the noise matrix N is small in the infinity-norm sense for sufficiently large n ; the proof can be found in subsection 5.1.

Lemma 3.10. For any $t > 0$ and any positive values of n and d , the task-similarity matrix T concentrates around its expectation as follows:

$$\mathbb{P}(\|N\|_\infty \geq t) \leq 2d^2 \exp\left(-\frac{nt^2}{2d^2}\right). \quad (30)$$

On the other hand, the matrix S is a diagonal matrix with each diagonal entry belonging to the following set: $\{1 - n^{-1}\|r_e\|, 1 - n^{-1}\|r_h\|\}$. Hence, $\|S\|_\infty = 1 - n^{-1}\|r_h\| \leq 1$. Observe that the normalized spectral gap $\nu(n^{-1}R_y)$ of the low-rank signal matrix $n^{-1}R_y$ given in equation (28) is of the order of $O(1)$. These observations along with Lemma 3.10 show that the perturbation matrix $S + N$ to the signal $n^{-1}R_y$ in equation (29) is small in the infinity norm sense, compared to the spectral gap $d\nu(n^{-1}R_y)$ of the matrix $n^{-1}R_y$ for sufficiently large n . This motivates us to use a

matrix perturbation result for a low-rank signal matrix derived in Fan et al. [7] (see Theorem 3 in Fan et al. [7]) to show that the principal eigenvector of the task-similarity matrix is a perturbed version of $v(n^{-1}R_y)$ in the following sense. See subsection 5.2 for the proof.

Lemma 3.11. *Under the assumption 3.9, if $\lambda_2(n^{-1}R_y)$ satisfies $:C_2(\min(\alpha, 1-\alpha))^2 v(n^{-1}R_y)d-1 > 0$, then, for every $0 < \epsilon < (C_2(\min(\alpha, 1-\alpha))^2 v(n^{-1}R)d-1)$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\min_{\theta \in \{-1, +1\}} \|\theta \hat{v} - v(n^{-1}R_y)\|_\infty \geq C_3 \frac{(\epsilon + 1)}{(\min(\alpha, 1-\alpha))^2 v(n^{-1}R_y)d\sqrt{d}}\right) \leq 2d^2 \exp\left(-n \frac{\epsilon^2}{2d^2}\right), \quad (31)$$

where C_2 and C_3 are universal constants.

Putting all the above lemmas together yields the main result in Theorem 3.12. The proof of this theorem essentially is based on the following fact: using the Lemma 3.11 we show that each element of $v(n^{-1}R_y)$ is perturbed by an amount at most $\frac{1}{2} \min(\mu_h(n^{-1}R_y), \mu_e(n^{-1}R_y))$. The detailed proof is given in Appendix 5.4.

Theorem 3.12. *Under the stated assumptions, if the number of tasks d satisfies*

$$d \geq \frac{C_4}{\sqrt{D(r_e, r_h, \alpha, d)}}, \quad (32)$$

then, Algorithm 1 satisfies

$$P(\eta = 0) \geq 1 - 2d^2 \exp(-C_5 n D(r_e, r_h, \alpha, d)), \quad (33)$$

where the problem-dependent quantity $D(r_e, r_h, \alpha, d)$ characterizing the error exponent and the requirement on d is given by

$$D(r_e, r_h, \alpha, d) = \begin{cases} \left((\min(\alpha, 1-\alpha))^3 \frac{v(n^{-1}R_y) \|\hat{s}\|^{-1}}{\sqrt{s^2+1}} \right)^2 & \text{when, } r_e^\top r_h \neq 0, \\ \left((\min(\alpha, 1-\alpha))^3 v(n^{-1}R_y) \right)^2 & \text{when, } r_e^\top r_h = 0, \end{cases} \quad (34)$$

and C_4 and C_5 are universal constants, independent of the problem parameters.

3.3 Label Estimation for Hard-Easy Tasks

After having divided the tasks into two clusters, we are now set to estimate the true labels $y \in \{-1, +1\}^d$ of the tasks. In practice, one can simply apply a DS algorithm, such as TE, to each task type separately. However, analyzing such an algorithm is difficult because the clustering step and label estimation steps are correlated due to the fact that we use the same dataset for both. Therefore, as is common in the literature (see Shah et al. [20], for example), we split the n workers into two disjoint groups and use the responses of one group for clustering and the other group for label estimation. We present these details next.

For the following analysis, let \mathcal{N}_{cl} be the set of workers used for clustering, and define $\mathcal{N}_{rl} = [n] - \mathcal{N}_{cl}$ to be the set of workers that will be used for reliability estimation as well as label estimation. Let the responses of the workers in the set \mathcal{N}_{cl} be denoted by

$$X_{cl} := (X_{ij} : (i, j) \in \mathcal{N}_{cl} \times [d]),$$

and the worker responses of the set \mathcal{N}_{rl} be

$$X_{rl} := (X_{ij} : (i, j) \in \mathcal{N}_{rl} \times [d]).$$

We use Algorithm 1 to cluster the tasks in X_{cl} using Algorithm 1 (with $X = X_{cl}$) resulting in the following type assignment for all task $j \in [d]$:

$$\mathcal{T}_k = \left\{ j \in [d] : \hat{k}_j = k \right\}, k \in \{e, h\}.$$

We then use the TE algorithm to estimate reliabilities $\hat{r}_k = (\hat{r}_{ki} : i \in \mathcal{N}_{rl})$ from the responses $(X_{ij} : (i, j) \in \mathcal{N}_{rl} \times \mathcal{T}_k)$ for each k . Lastly, the labels y_j are estimated using the NP decision rule

$$\hat{y}_j^{TE} = \text{sgn} \left(\sum_{i \in \mathcal{N}_{rl}} \log \frac{1 + \hat{r}_{k_j i}}{1 - \hat{r}_{k_j i}} X_{ij} \right). \quad (35)$$

Now we are ready to present the theorem characterizing the accuracy of our combined clustering and label estimation algorithm. Let n_{cl} and n_{rl} be the number of workers in the sets \mathcal{N}_{cl} and \mathcal{N}_{rl} , respectively. Let $r_k(\mathcal{N}_{cl})$ and $r_k(\mathcal{N}_{rl})$ be the reliability vector associated with each task type k for the set of workers \mathcal{N}_{cl} and \mathcal{N}_{rl} , respectively.

Theorem 3.13. *Suppose $(n_{rl}, d_e, d_h, r_k(\mathcal{N}_{rl}))$ satisfy the conditions stated in Proposition 3.4 and $(n_{cl}, d_e, d_h, r_k(\mathcal{N}_{cl}))$ satisfy the conditions from Theorem 3.12. Then, for the hard-easy crowdsourcing model under the stated assumptions, the labels \hat{y} estimated using (35) satisfy*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{d} \sum_j \mathbf{1}(\hat{y}_j \neq y_j) \right) \\ & \leq 3 \left[\sum_{k \in \{e, h\}} \frac{d_k}{d} \exp(-n_{rl} \Phi_{k, \mathcal{N}_{rl}}) \right] + 2d^2 \exp(-C_5 n_{cl} D(r_e(\mathcal{N}_{cl}), r_h(\mathcal{N}_{cl}), \alpha, d)) \end{aligned}$$

where $\Phi_{k, \mathcal{N}_{rl}} := \Phi(r_k(\mathcal{N}_{rl}))$ and $D(r_e(\mathcal{N}_{cl}), r_h(\mathcal{N}_{cl}), \alpha, d)$ is defined similarly to $D(r_e, r_h, \alpha, d)$ in equation (34), with the obvious changes to account for the fact that we are only using the reduced dataset X_{cl} for clustering.

The proof of the Theorem 3.13 is an immediate application of the Theorem 3.12 and is provided in Appendix G.

4 Discussion

In the previous sections, we proposed the clustering Algorithm 1 and showed that for a hard-easy model, we can cluster tasks by type with a reasonable number of workers and tasks. Recall that Theorem 3.12, which characterizes the performance of Algorithm 1, requires the reliability vectors r_e and r_h to be not collinear (Assumption 3.9). Even though this is a zero measure set, an interesting technical question is whether this assumption is needed for our algorithm to work. In what follows, we show that a large fraction of tasks will be clustered correctly with high probability even when this assumption is not satisfied.

We notice from Lemma 3.7 that even when r_e and r_h are collinear, the principal eigenvector $v(n^{-1}R_y)$ retains the structure that reveals the type information for each task. A similar structure is observed for the principal eigenvector of $\mathbb{E}[T]$ too. Specifically, we can cluster tasks by type by clustering the magnitude of entries of $v(\mathbb{E}[T])$ into two groups even when r_e and r_h are collinear. The properties of $v(\mathbb{E}[T])$ is established in the appendix E.2. We exploit this property to show in the following Theorem 4.1 that the Algorithm 1 achieves arbitrarily small clustering error η with high probability even without the assumption 3.9.

Let $\lambda_1(\mathbb{E}[T])$ and $\lambda_2(\mathbb{E}[T])$ be the first and second largest eigen values of $\mathbb{E}[T]$ and the normalized Eigen-gap of the expected task similarity matrix $\mathbb{E}(T)$ be $\sigma(\mathbb{E}[T]) = d^{-1}(\lambda_1(\mathbb{E}[T]) - \lambda_2(\mathbb{E}[T]))$.

Similar to the case of $n^{-1}R_y$ in Lemma 5.2, let us denote the ratio between the entries of the principal eigenvector of $\mathbb{E}[T]$ corresponding to easy and hard tasks by γ .

Theorem 4.1 (Imperfect Clustering). *Assume $\min(d_e, d_h) \geq 2$. Then, for the Hard-Easy crowdsourcing model, under Assumptions 2.1, 2.2, 3.3, 3.5, and if the following is satisfied : when $d_e \neq d_h$,*

$$|r_e^T r_h| \neq \left| \frac{(d_e - 1)\|r_e\|_2^2 - (d_h - 1)\|r_h\|_2^2}{d_e - d_h} \right|,$$

Algorithm 1 returns cluster membership with the following confidence on the clustering error: we have for every $t \in [0, 1)$

$$\mathbb{P}(\eta > t) \leq \begin{cases} 4d \exp\left(-C_6 \left(\sigma(\mathbb{E}[T]) \min\{\alpha, 1 - \alpha\} \frac{\|y\|_1 - 1}{\sqrt{Y^2 + 1}}\right)^2 nt\right) & \text{when } r_e^T r_h \neq 0 \\ 4d \exp\left(-C_6 (\sigma(\mathbb{E}[T]) \min\{\alpha, 1 - \alpha\})^2 nt\right) & \text{when } r_e^T r_h = 0 \end{cases} \quad (36)$$

where C_6 is an absolute constant.

The proof of the above theorem is given in the Appendix section H. A proof sketch is given here:

- (1) We show that the entries principal eigenvector of $\mathbb{E}[T]$ contain task type information (see Appendix E.2 for the proof).
- (2) Unlike the proof of Theorem 3.12, we treat $\mathbb{E}[T]$ as the signal matrix for this proof. We apply Davis-Kahan perturbation result (Yu et al. [24]) to show the principal eigenvector of T , \hat{v} is a small perturbation of the eigenvector of the signal $\mathbb{E}[T]$ in the l_2 -norm sense. A concentration of the noise matrix $N = T - \mathbb{E}[T]$ in the l_2 norm is used for this purpose (see Appendix H).
- (3) Finally, we relate the event $\eta \leq t$ for some $t \in [0, 1]$ to the concentration of principal eigenvectors in the l_2 -norm sense (again see Appendix H).

While the above result shows that a large fraction of tasks will be clustered correctly even without the non-collinearity assumption on r_e and r_h , the result does not show that perfect clustering is possible with high probability. As a result, one cannot use the above theorem to establish a result like Theorem 3.12. Nevertheless, the above theorem raises the interesting possibility that the non-collinearity assumption may not be necessary for good performance. Establishing such a result would be an interesting direction for future work.

5 Proof of Theorem 3.12: Perfect Clustering

This section proves the clustering Theorem 3.12. As discussed in the proof sketch of the Theorem, the first step is to show that the principal eigenvector $v(n^{-1}R_y)$ of the signal matrix $n^{-1}R_y$ reveals the type information for each task. This is discussed in detail in Lemma 3.7 and proved in Appendix E.1. Building upon the Lemma 3.7, the rest of the proof of Theorem 3.12 is given in this section as enlisted below.

- (1) First, we prove the Lemma 3.10 in the subsection 5.1.
- (2) Then we Show that the principal eigenvector \hat{v} of the task-similarity matrix T is a small perturbation of $v(n^{-1}R_y)$ in the l_∞ sense. This is stated in Lemma 3.11 and proved in the following subsection 5.2.
- (3) Next, we relate the event of perfect clustering, that is $\{\eta = 0\}$ with a sufficient condition on the concentration of \hat{v} with respect to $v(n^{-1}R_y)$. (see Proposition 5.2 in the subsection 5.3).
- (4) Finally, we prove that the condition described in The Proposition 5.2 is satisfied with high probability. See section 5.4 for this final step.

5.1 Concentration of the Noise Matrix N

The proof of the Lemma 3.10 stating the concentration of N is given as:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(\|N\|_\infty \geq \epsilon) &= \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{i \in [d]} \sum_{j=1}^d |T_{ij} - \mathbb{E}[T_{ij}]| \geq \epsilon\right) \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{P}\left(\sum_{j=1}^d |T_{ij} - \mathbb{E}[T_{ij}]| \geq \epsilon\right) \\
&\leq \sum_{i=1}^d \mathbb{P}\left(\max_{j \in [d]} |T_{ij} - \mathbb{E}[T_{ij}]| \geq \frac{\epsilon}{d}\right) \stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{P}\left(|T_{ij} - \mathbb{E}[T_{ij}]| \geq \frac{\epsilon}{d}\right) \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{P}\left(\left|\frac{1}{n} \sum_{l=1}^n (X_{li}X_{lj} - \mathbb{E}[X_{li}X_{lj}])\right| \geq \frac{\epsilon}{d}\right) \\
&\stackrel{(c)}{\leq} 2d^2 \exp\left(-n \frac{\epsilon^2}{2d^2}\right) \tag{37}
\end{aligned}$$

In (a) and (b) we use the union bound, and in (c) we employ Hoeffding's inequality for the independent bounded random variables $X_{li}X_{lj} \in \{\pm 1\}$.

5.2 l_∞ Concentration of the Principal Eigenvector

We prove the Lemma 3.11 here.

First, we need to define a quantity called the coherence of the signal matrix $n^{-1}R_y$. Writing the modal matrix of $n^{-1}R_y$ which is of size $d \times \ell$ as V so that its columns correspond to the unit-norm eigenvectors of $n^{-1}R_y$, the coherence M of matrix $n^{-1}R_y$ is defined as

$$M = \frac{d}{\ell} \max_{i \in [d]} \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} V_{ij}^2. \tag{38}$$

Recall the low-rank decomposition $T = n^{-1}R_y + S + N$ in (21), where $N = T - \mathbb{E}[T]$ and $S = -\frac{1}{n} \text{diag}([\|r_e\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{1 \times d_e}, \|r_h\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{1 \times d_h}]^T) + I_d$. Here we are interested in the distance between \hat{v} which is the principal eigenvector of T and $v(n^{-1}R_y)$ induced by the infinity norm. We utilize the following result by Fan et al. [7], cf. Theorem 3.²

Lemma 5.1. *Consider a rank-2 symmetric matrix A and its eigen-decomposition*

$$A = \sum_{g=1}^2 \lambda_g(A) v_g(A) v_g(A)^T. \tag{39}$$

Denote by $\nu(A) = d^{-1} \min(\lambda_1(A) - \lambda_2(A), \lambda_2(A))$, $M(A)$, $\nu(A)$ to be the normalized spectral gap, coherence, and principal eigenvector of A . For a symmetric matrix \hat{A} , if the second eigenvalue of A satisfies

$$|\lambda_2(A)| \geq \max\left\{3, 8M(A)(1 + 4\sqrt{2M(A)}), 2^8(1 + 2M(A))M(A)\right\} \|A - \hat{A}\|_\infty, \tag{40}$$

and the normalized spectral gap $\nu(A)$ satisfies

$$\nu(A) > \|A - \hat{A}\|_\infty \tag{41}$$

²The theorem in Fan et al. [7] is for a matrix of rank ℓ where ℓ can take any finite value, we simplified it for our purpose when $\ell = 2$.

then

$$\min_{\theta \in \{-1, +1\}} \|v_1(A) - \theta v_1(\hat{A})\| \leq 3 \cdot 2^7 \frac{(1 + 2M(A))M(A)\|A - \hat{A}\|_\infty}{\lambda_2(A)\sqrt{d}} + 2^{7/2} \frac{\sqrt{M(A)}\|A - \hat{A}\|_2}{v(A)d\sqrt{d}}, \quad (42)$$

where, $v_1(\hat{A})$ denotes the principal eigenvector of the matrix \hat{A} .

The coherence M of $n^{-1}R_y$ by definition is necessarily $M \geq 2^{-1}$, and so

$$\max \left\{ 3, 8M(1 + 4\sqrt{2M}), 2^8(1 + 2M)M \right\} \leq 2^{10}M^2.$$

To apply the above result, we substitute the matrix A with $n^{-1}R_y$ and the perturbation $\hat{A} - A$ with $S + N$.

Next, we define an event E_N on the random noise matrix N to ensure the conditions (40) and (41). Specifically, the conditions (40) and (41) are satisfied when we have

$$v(n^{-1}R_y)d \geq 2^{10}M^2\|T - n^{-1}R_y\|_\infty = 2^{10}M^2\|S + N\|_\infty, \quad (43)$$

or equivalently

$$\|S + N\|_\infty \leq 2^{-10}M^{-2}v(n^{-1}R_y)d$$

Define the event E_N as:

$$E_N := \left\{ \|N\|_\infty \leq C_2 \frac{v(n^{-1}R_y)d}{4M^2} - 1 \right\}$$

where $C_2 = 2^{-8}$. Clearly, on the event E_N the conditions (40) and (41) are satisfied by the use of the triangle inequality with the fact that $\|S\|_\infty = 1 - n^{-1}\|r_h\|_2^2$ for the diagonal matrix S .

Now conditioning on the event E_N we can use the Lemma 5.1 as:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\theta \in \{-1, +1\}} \|v(n^{-1}R_y) - \theta \hat{\theta}\|_\infty &\leq \frac{3 \cdot 2^7(1 + 2M)M\|S + N\|_\infty}{\lambda_2(n^{-1}R_y)\sqrt{d}} + \frac{2^{7/2}\sqrt{M}\|S + N\|_2}{v(n^{-1}R_y)d\sqrt{d}} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \frac{3 \cdot 2^7(1 + 2M)M\|S + N\|_\infty}{v(n^{-1}R_y)d\sqrt{d}} + \frac{2^{7/2}\sqrt{M}\|S + N\|_\infty}{v(n^{-1}R_y)d\sqrt{d}} \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \left[\frac{3 \cdot 2^{10}M^2}{v(n^{-1}R_y)d\sqrt{d}} \right] [\|N\|_\infty + 1] \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

In (a), we use the fact that $v(n^{-1}R_y)d \leq \lambda_2(n^{-1}R_y)$, in (b), we use $\|S\|_\infty \leq 1$ and $M \geq \frac{1}{2}$.

We are interested the event $E_N \cap \{\|N\|_\infty \leq \epsilon\}$ for some ϵ such that, $0 < \epsilon \leq 2^{-2}C_2M^{-2}\lambda_2(n^{-1}R_y) - 1$. On the event $E_N \cap \{\|N\|_\infty \leq \epsilon\}$, the following is satisfied using (44):

$$\min_{\theta \in \{-1, +1\}} \|v(n^{-1}R_y) - \theta \hat{\theta}\|_\infty \leq C_3 \frac{4M^2}{v(n^{-1}R_y)d\sqrt{d}} (\epsilon + 1). \quad (45)$$

where $C_3 = 3 \cdot 2^8$. It remains to show that the event $E_N \cap \{\|N\|_\infty \leq \epsilon\}$ for some ϵ in the range $(0, 2^{-2}C_2M^{-2}\lambda_2(n^{-1}R_y) - 1]$ occurs with high probability:

$$\mathbb{P}(E_N \cap \{\|N\|_\infty \leq \epsilon\}) \stackrel{(c)}{=} 1 - \mathbb{P}(\{\|N\|_\infty \leq \epsilon\}^c) \geq 1 - 2d^2 \exp\left(\frac{-n\epsilon^2}{2d^2}\right)$$

where in (c) we use the fact that the event $\{\|N\|_\infty \leq \epsilon\}$ is a subset of the event E_N .

Lastly, we want to give an upper bound on the coherence parameter M to arrive at the final form as in Lemma 3.11. For non-collinear r_e and r_h , the two non-zero eigenvectors for the signal matrix $n^{-1}R_y$ can be written as $\text{diag}(y)[s\mathbf{1}_{1 \times d_e}, \mathbf{1}_{1 \times d_h}]^T$ and $\text{diag}(y)[\bar{s}\mathbf{1}_{1 \times d_e}, \mathbf{1}_{1 \times d_h}]^T$ where s and \bar{s} takes the following values:

$$s, \bar{s} = \frac{d_e \|r_e\|_2^2 - d_h \|r_h\|_2^2 \pm \sqrt{[d_e \|r_e\|_2^2 - d_h \|r_h\|_2^2]^2 + 4d_e d_h (r_e^T r_h)^2}}{2d_e r_e^T r_h}. \quad (46)$$

The above statement is proved in the Appendix E.1. From Lemma 3.7, the elements of $v(n^{-1}R_y)$ corresponding to easy and hard tasks are as $\frac{s^2}{d_e s^2 + d_h}$ and $\frac{1}{d_e \bar{s}^2 + d_h}$, respectively. Similarly, the corresponding entries of the second eigenvector of $n^{-1}R_y$ would be $\frac{\bar{s}^2}{d_e \bar{s}^2 + d_h}$ and $\frac{1}{d_e s^2 + d_h}$. From the expressions obtained above, we can write the coherence defined in the equation (38) as

$$M = \frac{d}{\ell} \max_{i \in [d]} \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} V_{ij}^2 = \frac{d}{2} \max \left\{ \frac{s^2}{d_e s^2 + d_h} + \frac{\bar{s}^2}{d_e \bar{s}^2 + d_h}, \frac{1}{d_e s^2 + d_h} + \frac{1}{d_e \bar{s}^2 + d_h} \right\}$$

Hence, we can upper bound the coherence term M as:

$$M \leq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{ds^2 + d}{d_e s^2 + d_h} + \frac{d\bar{s}^2 + d}{d_e \bar{s}^2 + d_h} \right) \underbrace{\leq}_{(e)} \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{s^2 + 1}{\alpha s^2 + (1 - \alpha)} + \frac{\bar{s}^2 + 1}{\alpha \bar{s}^2 + (1 - \alpha)} \right) \leq \frac{1}{\min(\alpha, 1 - \alpha)}$$

where in (e), we use the Assumption 3.5. Using this upper bound in the equation (45) proves the Lemma 3.11.

5.3 Sufficient Condition for Perfect Clustering

Here, we relate the event of perfect clustering with the concentration of the principal eigenvector \hat{v} with respect to $v(n^{-1}R_y)$.

Proposition 5.2. *Under the stated assumptions, Algorithm 1 achieves perfect clustering, that is $\eta = 0$ when the following event occurs :*

$$E_{l_\infty} = \left\{ \min_{\theta \in \{-1, +1\}} \|v(n^{-1}R_y) - \theta \hat{v}\|_\infty < \frac{1}{2} \min \{m_e(n^{-1}R_y), m_h(n^{-1}R_y)\} \right\}, \quad (47)$$

The proof of the above proposition is given in Appendix F.2

5.4 Proof of Theorem 3.12: Perfect Clustering

Now we complete the proof of the clustering Theorem 3.12. From Proposition 5.2, we know that,

$$\mathbb{P}(\eta = 0) \geq \mathbb{P} \left(\min_{\theta \in \{-1, +1\}} \|v(n^{-1}R_y) - \theta \hat{v}\|_\infty < \frac{1}{2} \min \{m_e(n^{-1}R_y), m_h(n^{-1}R_y)\} \right). \quad (48)$$

Now we show that right hand side of the above equation is close to 1 for large values of n using Lemma 3.11. We also derive the corresponding necessary conditions on the problem parameters n and d .

One requirement of Lemma 3.11 is that $C_2(\min(\alpha, 1 - \alpha))^2 v(n^{-1}R_y)d - 1 > 0$. This leads to the following requirement on d :

$$d > \frac{1}{C_2(\min(\alpha, 1 - \alpha))^2 v(n^{-1}R_y)} \quad (49)$$

Under (49), we have from Lemma 3.11, for every $0 < \epsilon < (C_2(\min(\alpha, 1 - \alpha))^2 \nu(n^{-1}R_y)d - 1)$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\min_{\theta \in \{-1, +1\}} \|\theta \hat{\theta} - v(n^{-1}R_y)\|_\infty \geq C_3 \frac{(\epsilon + 1)}{(\min(\alpha, 1 - \alpha))^2 \nu(n^{-1}R_y)d \sqrt{d}} \right) \leq 2d^2 \exp \left(-n \frac{\epsilon^2}{2d^2} \right), \quad (50)$$

Next, we choose ϵ with $0 < \epsilon < (C_2(\min(\alpha, 1 - \alpha))^2 \nu(n^{-1}R_y)d - 1)$ such that

$$C_3 \frac{(\epsilon + 1)}{(\min(\alpha, 1 - \alpha))^2 \nu(n^{-1}R_y)d \sqrt{d}} \leq \frac{1}{2} \min \{m_e(n^{-1}R_y), m_h(n^{-1}R_y)\}$$

As, $C_2 = 2^{-8}$ and $C_3 = 3 \cdot 2^8$, the following value of ϵ satisfies the above requirement :

$$\epsilon = \frac{1}{4C_3} (\min(\alpha, 1 - \alpha))^2 \nu(n^{-1}R_y)d \min(m_e(n^{-1}R_y)d^{\frac{1}{2}}, m_h(n^{-1}R_y)d^{\frac{1}{2}}, 1)$$

when we impose :

$$d > \frac{4C_3}{(\min(\alpha, 1 - \alpha))^2 \nu(n^{-1}R_y) \min \{m_e(n^{-1}R_y)d^{1/2}, m_h(n^{-1}R_y)d^{1/2}, 1\}} \quad (51)$$

Notice that the requirement on d in equation (51) is stronger than the requirement in equation (49). Putting it together, we get, when d satisfies equation (51) the perfect clustering is guaranteed as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\eta = 0) &\geq \mathbb{P} \left(\min_{\theta \in \{-1, +1\}} \|v(n^{-1}R_y) - \theta \hat{\theta}\|_\infty < \frac{1}{2} \min \{m_e(n^{-1}R_y), m_h(n^{-1}R_y)\} \right) \\ &\geq 1 - 4d^2 \exp \left(-C_5 n \left((\min(\alpha, 1 - \alpha))^2 \nu(n^{-1}R_y) \min \{m_e(n^{-1}R_y)d^{1/2}, m_h(n^{-1}R_y)d^{1/2}, 1\} \right)^2 \right) \end{aligned}$$

where, $C_4 = 4C_3$ and $C_5 = 2^{-4}C_3^{-2}$

When $r_e^\top r_h = 0$, we have $\min \{m_e(n^{-1}R_y)d^{1/2}, m_h(n^{-1}R_y)d^{1/2}, 1\} \geq \min(\alpha, 1 - \alpha)$ from the analysis of Appendix E.1. On the other hand when, $r_e^\top r_h \neq 0$, it is convenient to express the absolute margins $m_e(n^{-1}R_y)$ and $m_h(n^{-1}R_y)$ as a function of the ratio $s = \mu_e(n^{-1}R_y)/\mu_h(n^{-1}R_y)$ between the easy and hard magnitudes $\mu_e(n^{-1}R_y), \mu_h(n^{-1}R_y)$ so that

$$m_e(n^{-1}R_y) = \mu_e(n^{-1}R_y) - \mu(n^{-1}R_y) = \frac{d_h}{d} (\mu_e(n^{-1}R_y) - \mu_h(n^{-1}R_y)) = \frac{d_h}{d} \frac{||s| - 1|}{\sqrt{d_e s^2 + d_h}} \quad (52)$$

$$m_h(n^{-1}R_y) = \mu(n^{-1}R_y) - \mu_h(n^{-1}R_y) = \frac{d_e}{d} (\mu_e(n^{-1}R_y) - \mu_h(n^{-1}R_y)) = \frac{d_e}{d} \frac{||s| - 1|}{\sqrt{d_e s^2 + d_h}}. \quad (53)$$

Hence, we can lower bound the term $\min\{m_e(n^{-1}R_y)d^{1/2}, m_h(n^{-1}R_y)d^{1/2}, 1\}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \min\{m_e(n^{-1}R_y)d^{1/2}, m_h(n^{-1}R_y)d^{1/2}, 1\} &= \min \left\{ \frac{d_h}{d} \frac{||s| - 1|}{\sqrt{d_e s^2 + d_h}} d^{1/2}, \frac{d_e}{d} \frac{||s| - 1|}{\sqrt{d_e s^2 + d_h}} d^{1/2}, 1 \right\} \\ &= \min \left\{ \frac{\alpha ||s| - 1|}{\sqrt{\alpha s^2 + (1 - \alpha)}}, \frac{(1 - \alpha) ||s| - 1|}{\sqrt{\alpha s^2 + (1 - \alpha)}}, 1 \right\} \stackrel{(a)}{\geq} \min \{ \alpha, 1 - \alpha \} \frac{||s| - 1|}{\sqrt{s^2 + 1}} \end{aligned}$$

where in (a), we use the fact that $\min \{ \alpha, 1 - \alpha \} \frac{||s| - 1|}{\sqrt{s^2 + 1}} \leq 1$. From the above bounds on M and $\min\{m_e(n^{-1}R_y)d^{1/2}, m_h(n^{-1}R_y)d^{1/2}, 1\}$, we can write the sufficient number of tasks required for perfect clustering as:

$$d \geq \frac{C_4}{\sqrt{D(r_e, r_h, \alpha, d)}} \quad (54)$$

and the probability guarantee on perfect clustering as

$$\mathbb{P}(\eta = 0) \geq 1 - 2d^2 \exp(-C_5 n D(r_e, r_h, \alpha, d)), \quad (55)$$

where the problem-dependent quantity $D(r_e, r_h, \alpha, d)$ characterizing the error exponent and the requirement on d is given by

$$D(r_e, r_h, \alpha, d) = \begin{cases} \left((\min(\alpha, 1 - \alpha))^3 \frac{v(n^{-1}R_y) \|\|s\|-1\|}{\sqrt{s^2+1}} \right)^2 & \text{when, } r_e^\top r_h \neq 0, \\ \left((\min(\alpha, 1 - \alpha))^3 v(n^{-1}R_y) \right)^2 & \text{when, } r_e^\top r_h = 0, \end{cases} \quad (56)$$

6 Experiments

In this paper, we present experiments with real-world datasets, psuedo-real datasets and synthetic datasets to supplement the theory presented in the previous sections. By pseudo-real datasets, we mean the following: some real-world sets do not contain all the information we need to run our experiments and therefore, we generate some of the data we need using the available data in the datasets. In such cases, we will explain how we filled in the required data. Our experiments are presented in three subsections, with each subsection focusing on a different aspect of our model and theory:

- (1) First, we compare our two-step algorithm (clustering tasks and then applying a DS algorithm to each type of task) with a single-step DS algorithm (i.e., applying a DS algorithm to all the tasks). Our experiments clearly show the benefit of clustering. Although our theoretical analysis primarily employs TE followed by WMV with NP-weights as the Dawid-Skene (DS) algorithm, we also compare DS algorithms with and without clustering across various other DS algorithms to demonstrate the benefits of clustering.
- (2) Next, we compare our algorithm with other algorithms that also consider tasks of different types. We demonstrate that our algorithm performs better on most of the datasets considered.

The datasets we used for our experiments are the following:

- (1) Two of the real-world datasets we used called the ‘‘Bluebird’’ (Welinder et al. [23]) and ‘‘HC-TREC’’ (Buckley et al. [3]) are complete datasets i.e., they have all the information we need such as worker-task responses for all worker-task pairs and the responses are binary-valued. So we used the data in these two datasets without any modification.
- (2) Four other real-world datasets, ‘‘Dog’’ (Deng et al. [6]), ‘‘Duck’’ (Welinder et al. [23]), ‘‘Temp’’ (Snow et al. [22]) and ‘‘RTE’’ (Snow et al. [22]) are sparse datasets which do not provide responses corresponding to all worker-task pairs as in our motivating example in the introduction. To handle this, for the ‘‘Dog’’ dataset that contains 4 classes, we converted it to binary groups $\{0, 2\}$ vs. $\{1, 3\}$ following Bonald and Combes [2]. Then we calculate the fraction of correct labels (given by workers) for each task based on the ground truth and the available responses and classify half of them (the half with the most accurate worker responses) as easy tasks and the rest as hard tasks. Then, we estimate the empirical reliabilities of the workers for each type of task and use this to generate synthetic entries for the missing worker-task pairs in the response matrix. Similar treatments for the no-response entries is done for ‘‘Duck’’, ‘‘RTE’’ and ‘‘Temp’’, each of which contains binary truth values. Thus, the actual datasets that we use for ‘‘Dog’’, ‘‘temp’’ and ‘‘RTE’’ are pseudo-real datasets. The number of workers and tasks for all six datasets (‘‘Bluebird’’, ‘‘HC-TREC’’, ‘‘Dog’’, ‘‘Temp’’, ‘‘Duck’’, and ‘‘RTE’’) are provided in Table 1.
- (3) Obtaining real world crowdsourcing datasets for healthcare examples that we mention in the Introduction is difficult due to privacy reasons. With the limited information available from a radiology dataset, we created a synthetic dataset and we report the results from the dataset in the appendix A

6.1 Comparison with Traditional DS Algorithms

Since the literature on crowdsourcing is vast, there are many algorithms available in the literature for the original DS model. From these algorithms, we select a few algorithms which we choose as the baseline for our experiments.

Baseline Algorithms: We consider the following Dawid-Skene algorithms in our experiments: unweighted majority vote (MV), ratio of eigenvectors (ER, Dalvi et al. 4), TE (Bonald and Combes [2]), and Plug-in gradient descent (PGD, Ma et al. 15). Then we compare their performances when applied separately to each task type clustered using Algorithm 1 to demonstrate the importance of separating tasks by type. A large number of algorithms have been proposed for crowdsourcing including Spectral-EM (Zhang et al. [25]), and message-passing (Karger et al. [12]) to name just a few. Exhaustively comparing with all the algorithms is difficult, so we have chosen to compare our algorithms to ER, TE, and PGD for the following reason: many algorithms have been compared in Dalvi et al. [4], Bonald and Combes [2] and Ma et al. [15], where it was shown that ER, TE and PGD consistently out-perform other algorithms.

Dataset	# Workers	# Tasks	MV	ER	TE	PGD
Bluebird	39	108	24.07	27.78	17.59	25.93
Dog	78	807	24.07	11.11	12.96	12.96
RTE	164	800	0.00	16.67	4.63	12.97
Ducks	53	240	26.15	19.85	13.64	19.01
HC-TREC	10	1000	26.15	0.78	12.23	20.56
Temp	76	462	0.00	19.07	1.41	-1.64
Bluebird-TA			32.58	59.37	41.04	38.96
Bluebird-C			32.58	24.33	41.67	32.58
Dog-TA			0.00	35.04	-0.6	6.38
Dog-C			33.70	68.80	67.30	30.80
RTE-TA			33.70	40.90	30.60	40.80
RTE-C			0.00	27.90	36.6	0.00
Ducks-TA						
Ducks-C						
HC-TREC-TA						
HC-TREC-C						
Gain						

Table 1. Dataset Descriptions and Label Estimation Errors

Label estimation errors for the datasets considered are shown in Table 1. We observe that clustering improves performance in most cases. In the case of RTE and Temp datasets, with or without clustering, the accuracy of label estimation is 100%, that is why we did not include them in the Table 1. Hence, our results show that clustering does not hurt the accuracy even in cases where it may not be required.

An interesting question to understand is why clustering performs better than directly applying a DS algorithm to each of the datasets. To answer this question, we plotted the eigenspectrum of the matrix T in Figure 1. As we can see, all the datasets exhibit at least two eigenvalues which are larger than the rest of them which are close to zero, thus indicating that there is more than one type of task. Therefore, clustering helps to separate tasks by their reliabilities.

6.2 Comparison with Task-specific Reliability Models

As discussed in the related work section, several previous papers address models with multiple types of tasks and use different task-specific reliability models to infer task labels. Notable works include Khetan and Oh [13], Shah et al. [20], Shah and Lee [18], Kim et al. [14] to name a few. The model in Khetan and Oh [13] assumes that $E(T)$ is a rank-1 matrix. Clearly, this is not true in all




Fig. 1. Eigenspectrum of T for different datasets: (a) Bluebird, (b) TREC, (c) Dog, (d) Duck, (e) RTE, and (f) Temp. For each plot, the y-axis represents the eigenvalues, and the x-axis represents the corresponding index of each eigenvalue.

the datasets we have considered as shown in Figure 1. The algorithm in Shah et al. [20] involves a large number of parameters, leading to very poor performance on the datasets we used, therefore we are not comparing it with our model. Thus, we restrict the comparison of our algorithm to those in Shah and Lee [18] and Kim et al. [14].

Dataset	TE-C	SDP-2	SDP-3	SDP-4	SS-2	SS-3	SS-4
Bluebird	12.96	24.81	44.07	40.25	25.68	27.9	22.62
Dog	12.23	34.56	39.41	39.18	51.70	74.85	74.65
Duck	41.67	19.88	22.17	23.08	56.58	68.67	75.12
TREC	30.6	48.94	42.95	38.22	49.39	66.49	75.7
Temp	0	1.93	19.96	31.28	50.35	67.67	74.26

Table 2. Comparison of our approach with Task-specific Reliability Models. ‘TE-C’ is our two step approach - clustering followed by TE-WMV; ‘SDP-g’ and ‘SS-g’ are the algorithms from Kim et al. [14] and Shah and Lee [18] considering g-type specialization model.

Table 2 shows the comparison of our algorithm with the SDP-based algorithm in Kim et al. [14](alg3 in that paper) and the Subset selection algorithm(SS) in Shah and Lee [18]. Both the SPD and SS algorithm requires an input: the number of specializations considered in their g-type specialization model. In the Table 1, the column ‘TE-C’, ‘SDP-g’ and ‘SS-g’ correspond to our two-step approach, SDP-based algorithm in Kim et al. [14] with g number of specializations and SS algorithm from Shah and Lee [18] with g number of specializations, respectively. We used the MATLAB code provided by the authors in Kim et al. [14] for running different ‘SDP’ and ‘SS’ algorithms. We see that our algorithm outperforms SDP and SS in the following datasets: “Bluebird”, “TREC”, “Dog”, “temp”. The “ducks” dataset is an exception: here, ‘SDP-2’ beats ‘TE-C’. We believe that the reason for this is the following: ‘SDP-2’ uses majority voting among the matched workers instead of weighted majority voting as in ‘TE-C’. It is widely reported in the prior literature that weighted majority voting is better than simple majority voting for most crowdsourcing applications.

However, there are datasets for which this is not true, the “Duck” dataset is one such example. as can be seen from the ‘Duck’ entry in Table 1.

7 Conclusion

We considered a crowdsourcing model which is more appropriate than the Dawid-Skene model when there are tasks that require different levels of skill sets. Then we described a spectral clustering algorithm that clusters tasks by difficulty and analyzed its performance in clustering and its performance in label estimation when combined with TE and NP-WMV for each task type separately. Experiments with real-life datasets demonstrate the benefits of our algorithm.

References

- [1] Daniel Berend and Aryeh Kontorovich. 2014. Consistency of weighted majority votes. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 27* (2014).
- [2] Thomas Bonald and Richard Combes. 2017. A Minimax Optimal Algorithm for Crowdsourcing. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, I. Guyon, U. Von Luxburg, S. Bengio, H. Wallach, R. Fergus, S. Vishwanathan, and R. Garnett (Eds.), Vol. 30. Curran Associates, Inc.
- [3] Chris Buckley, Matthew Lease, and Mark D. Smucker. 2010. Overview of the TREC 2010 Relevance Feedback Track (Notebook). <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:17491541>
- [4] Nilesh Dalvi, Anirban Dasgupta, Ravi Kumar, and Vibhor Rastogi. 2013. Aggregating Crowdsourced Binary Ratings. In *Proceedings of the 22nd International Conference on World Wide Web (Rio de Janeiro, Brazil) (WWW '13)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 285–294. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2488388.2488414>
- [5] A. P. Dawid and A. M. Skene. 1979. Maximum Likelihood Estimation of Observer Error-Rates Using the EM Algorithm. *Applied Statistics* 28, 1 (1979), 20–28.
- [6] Jia Deng, Wei Dong, Richard Socher, Li-Jia Li, Kai Li, and Li Fei-Fei. 2009. ImageNet: A large-scale hierarchical image database. In *2009 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*. 248–255. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CVPR.2009.5206848>
- [7] Jianqing Fan, Weichen Wang, and Yiqiao Zhong. 2018. An ℓ_∞ eigenvector perturbation bound and its application to robust covariance estimation. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 18, 207 (2018), 1–42.
- [8] Chao Gao, Yu Lu, and Dengyong Zhou. 2016. Exact Exponent in Optimal Rates for Crowdsourcing. In *Proceedings of The 33rd International Conference on Machine Learning (Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, Vol. 48)*, Maria Florina Balcan and Kilian Q. Weinberger (Eds.). PMLR, New York, New York, USA, 603–611.
- [9] Lan He, Yanqi Huang, Zelan Ma, Cuishan Liang, Changhong Liang, and Zaiyi Liu. 2016. Effects of contrast-enhancement, reconstruction slice thickness and convolution kernel on the diagnostic performance of radiomics signature in solitary pulmonary nodule. *Sci Rep* 6 (Oct. 2016), 34921.
- [10] David R. Karger, Sewoong Oh, and Devavrat Shah. 2013. Efficient crowdsourcing for multi-class labeling. *SIGMETRICS Perform. Eval. Rev.* 41, 1 (jun 2013), 81–92. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2494232.2465761>
- [11] David R. Karger, Sewoong Oh, and Devavrat Shah. 2014. Budget-Optimal Task Allocation for Reliable Crowdsourcing Systems. *Operations Research* 62, 1 (February 2014), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1287/opre.2013.1235>
- [12] David R. Karger, Sewoong Oh, and Devavrat Shah. 2014. Budget-Optimal Task Allocation for Reliable Crowdsourcing Systems. *Oper. Res.* 62, 1 (feb 2014), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.1287/opre.2013.1235>
- [13] Ashish Khetan and Sewoong Oh. 2016. Achieving budget-optimality with adaptive schemes in crowdsourcing. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, D. Lee, M. Sugiyama, U. Luxburg, I. Guyon, and R. Garnett (Eds.), Vol. 29. Curran Associates, Inc.
- [14] Doyeon Kim, Jeonghwan Lee, and Hye Won Chung. 2022. A Generalized Worker-Task Specialization Model for Crowdsourcing: Optimal Limits and Algorithm. In *2022 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*. 1483–1488. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ISIT50566.2022.9834403>
- [15] Yao Ma, Alex Olshevsky, Venkatesh Saligrama, and Csaba Szepesvari. 2022. Gradient Descent for Sparse Rank-One Matrix Completion for Crowd-Sourced Aggregation of Sparsely Interacting Workers. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* 21, 1, Article 133 (jun 2022), 36 pages.
- [16] Lester Mackey, Michael I. Jordan, Richard Y. Chen, Brendan Farrell, and Joel A. Tropp. 2014. Matrix concentration inequalities via the method of exchangeable pairs. *The Annals of Probability* 42, 3 (2014), 906 – 945. <https://doi.org/10.1214/13-AOP892>
- [17] Shmuel Nitzan and Jacob Paroush. 1983. SMALL PANELS OF EXPERTS IN DICHOTOMOUS CHOICE SITUATIONS*. *Decision Sciences* 14, 3 (1983), 314–325. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-5915.1983.tb00188.x> arXiv:<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/j.1540-5915.1983.tb00188.x>

- [18] Devavrat Shah and Christina Lee. 2018. Reducing Crowdsourcing to Graphon Estimation, Statistically. In *Proceedings of the Twenty-First International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics (Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, Vol. 84)*, Amos Storkey and Fernando Perez-Cruz (Eds.). PMLR, 1741–1750.
- [19] Nihar B. Shah, Sivaraman Balakrishnan, Adityanand Guntuboyina, and Martin J. Wainwright. 2016. Stochastically Transitive Models for Pairwise Comparisons: Statistical and Computational Issues. In *Proceedings of the 33rd International Conference on Machine Learning - Volume 48 (New York, NY, USA) (ICML'16)*. JMLR.org, 11–20.
- [20] Nihar B. Shah, Sivaraman Balakrishnan, and Martin J. Wainwright. 2021. A Permutation-Based Model for Crowd Labeling: Optimal Estimation and Robustness. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 67, 6 (2021), 4162–4184. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TIT.2020.3045613>
- [21] Junji Shiraishi, Shigehiko Katsuragawa, Junpei Ikezoe, Tsuneo Matsumoto, Takeshi Kobayashi, Ken-ichi Komatsu, Mitate Matsui, Hiroshi Fujita, Yoshie Kodera, and Kunio Doi. 2000. Development of a Digital Image Database for Chest Radiographs With and Without a Lung Nodule. *American Journal of Roentgenology* 174, 1 (2000), 71–74. <https://doi.org/10.2214/ajr.174.1.1740071> arXiv:<https://doi.org/10.2214/ajr.174.1.1740071> PMID: 10628457.
- [22] Rion Snow, Brendan O’Connor, Daniel Jurafsky, and Andrew Ng. 2008. Cheap and Fast – But is it Good? Evaluating Non-Expert Annotations for Natural Language Tasks. In *Proceedings of the 2008 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*. Association for Computational Linguistics, Honolulu, Hawaii, 254–263.
- [23] Peter Welinder, Steve Branson, Serge Belongie, and Pietro Perona. 2010. The Multidimensional Wisdom of Crowds. In *NIPS*.
- [24] Y. Yu, T. Wang, and R. J. Samworth. 2014. A useful variant of the Davis–Kahan theorem for statisticians. *Biometrika* 102, 2 (04 2014), 315–323. <https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/asv008> arXiv:<https://academic.oup.com/biomet/article-pdf/102/2/315/9642505/asv008.pdf>
- [25] Yuchen Zhang, Xi Chen, Dengyong Zhou, and Michael I. Jordan. 2016. Spectral Methods Meet EM: A Provably Optimal Algorithm for Crowdsourcing. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 17, 102 (2016), 1–44.

A Additional Experiments : Synthetically Generated Radiology Data

Obtaining real-world datasets for healthcare examples mentioned in the Introduction is difficult. Due to privacy reasons, such datasets do not contain much of the information we require, including ground truths and responses. Nevertheless, we considered one radiology dataset: the Japanese Society of Radiological Technology (JSRT) Database and its report [21] to conduct a synthetic experiment. These datasets only contain information about the reliability of the doctors who looked at the data. In other words, this dataset only provides a range of realistic reliabilities, but we had to generate synthetic ground truths and response matrices.

A.1 Setup

In this subsection, we describe how we generate our synthetic datasets from JSRT report in Shiraishi et al. [21]. The JSRT report contains the performance of 20 radiologists for identifying solitary

Subtlety	0	1	2	3	4	5
Count	93	25	29	50	38	12
Size	0.0	23.0	17.9	17.2	16.4	14.6
Mean sensitivity(accuracy) of experts	80.9	99.6	92.6	75.7	54.7	29.6

Table 3. JSRT dataset. Size is in millimeters, and a subtlety of 0 indicates that a nodular pattern is absent.

pulmonary nodules in chest radiographs. Its dataset statistics are summarized in Table 3. Expert performances are reported for various levels of subtlety defined by the size of nodular patterns. It is clear that detecting nodular patterns becomes significantly more difficult as the size is decreased, demonstrating a multi-type phenomenon with varying levels of task difficulty. Our setup for the JSRT experiments are as follows. There is a total of 6 types according to the mean sensitivity

reported across all radiologists for 6 different subtlety levels. These values are used as the accuracy for each type as described next.

- (1) For the JSTR-6 data, we use the reported means and standard deviations of sensitivities of a type $k \in [6]$: (\tilde{r}_k, σ_k) as: for each type, we sample the probability parameter for each worker i , p_{ki} as a sample from the uniform distribution with support $\tilde{r}_k \pm \sigma_k$. Then we set $r_{ki} = \frac{p_{ki}+1}{2}$.
- (2) To get an easy-hard model from this, we generate the dataset JSRT-2. Here, we combine the higher and lower 3 accuracy parameters as: for the easy type, the sensitivity is estimated as having mean of $\frac{1}{3} \sum_{k=1}^3 \tilde{r}_k$ and standard deviation as the root mean square of the standard deviation of the first three subtlety levels. The parameters for the hard types are generated similarly from the next 3 subtlety levels.

Each truth value y_j is drawn randomly from its class-distribution defined by the sample mean of positive (presence of nodules) cases. We then sample the crowd’s response following the number of tasks per type in Table 3.

A.2 Results

DATASET	MV	ER	TE	PGD
JSRT-2-TA	5.65	5.65	4.74	5.06
JSRT-2-C	5.65	4.39	3.16	3.81
GAIN	0.00	1.26	1.58	1.25
JSRT-6-TA	10.30	10.30	9.96	9.72
JSRT-6-C	10.30	10.02	9.84	9.76
GAIN	0.00	0.28	0.12	-0.04

Table 4. Label estimation errors (%) for the JSRT experiments. “TA” and “C” after dataset names indicate whether label estimation was performed without(type agnostic) or with clustering, respectively.

The performance of crowdsourcing algorithms with and without our clustering algorithm on the JSRT-6 and JSRT-2 datasets is shown in Table 4. As shown, separation consistently increases accuracy over Dawid-Skene algorithms. Because experts labeled the JSRT dataset, we observe a high accuracy using the simple majority vote. However, failing to identify nodules can be consequential and even a small gain in accuracy is critical.

B Proof of Proposition 3.1: Error Rate of Type-Agnostic Weighted Majority Vote

Recall the label estimation error $P_{av}(w) = \frac{1}{d} \sum_j \mathbb{P}(\hat{y}_j^{WMV}(w) \neq y_j)$ defined in equation (9). We drop the task subscript and write $k_j = k$. We also drop the superscript ‘WMV’ in this section from $\hat{y}_j^{WMV}(w)$. For each worker i and task j , let G_{ij} be a random variable which takes the value +1 if worker i correctly labels task j and is -1 otherwise. In other words, $G_{ij} = y_j X_{ij}$, which is +1 with probability $\frac{1}{2}(1 + r_{ki})$.

$$\mathbb{P}_k(\hat{y}_j(w) \neq y_j) \leq \mathbb{P}_k\left(\sum_{i=1}^n w_i G_{ij} \leq 0\right).$$

For any $t > 0$, we bound the error probability using Markov’s inequality on the moment generating function as

$$\mathbb{P}_k\left(\sum_{i=1}^n w_i G_{ij} \leq 0\right) \leq \mathbb{P}_k\left(\exp\left(-t \sum_{i=1}^n w_i G_{ij}\right) \geq 1\right) \leq \mathbb{E}\left(\exp\left(-t \sum_{i=1}^n w_i G_{ij}\right)\right) \quad (57)$$

Then for $t \geq 0$, we can write:

$$\mathbb{P}_k \left(\sum_{i=1}^n w_i G_{ij} < 0 \right) \leq \min_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{E} \left(\exp \left(-t \sum_{i=1}^n w_i G_{ij} \right) \right)$$

Because workers respond independently of each other, G_{1j}, \dots, G_{nj} are mutually independent and

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{t \geq 0} \mathbb{E} \left(\exp \left(-t \sum_{i=1}^n w_i G_{ij} \right) \right) &= \min_{t \geq 0} \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E} \left(\exp(-t w_i G_{ij}) \right) \\ &= \min_{t \geq 0} \prod_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{2} e^{t w_i} (1 - r_{ki}) + \frac{1}{2} e^{-t w_i} (1 + r_{ki}) \right) \\ &= \exp(-n \varphi(w, r_k)), \end{aligned}$$

where $\varphi(w, r_k)$ is defined in equation (12). Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} P_{av}(w) &\leq \frac{1}{d} \left(\sum_{j:k_j=e} \exp(-n \varphi(w, r_e)) + \sum_{j:k_j=h} \exp(-n \varphi(w, r_h)) \right) \\ &= \frac{1}{d} (d_e \exp(-n \varphi(w, r_e)) + d_h \exp(-n \varphi(w, r_h))) \\ &\leq \exp \left(-n \min_k \varphi(w, r_k) \right) \end{aligned}$$

C Proof of Proposition 3.2: Error Rate Lower Bound of Task Agnostic Weighted Majority Vote

Let us first fix a task index j and let the type of that task be $k_j = k$ for some $k \in \{e, h\}$. Defining G_{ij} as in Appendix B,

$$\mathbb{P}_k \left(\hat{y}_j(w) \neq y_j \right) \geq \mathbb{P}_k \left(\sum_{i=1}^n w_i G_{ij} < 0 \right),$$

where we drop the superscript ‘WMV’ in this section from $\hat{y}_j^{WMV}(w)$. We notice that $\sum_{i=1}^n w_i G_{ij}$ can only take finitely many values with the maximum being lower bounded by $\sum_i w_i$. Consider the set $\mathbb{S} = \{s : s = \sum_i g_i, g_i \in \{-w_i, w_i\}\}$. For any positive value of S_k with $0 < S_k \leq \sum_i |w_i|$,

$$\mathbb{P}_k \left(\sum_{i=1}^n w_i G_{ij} < 0 \right) = \mathbb{P}_k \left(-\sum_i w_i G_{ij} > 0 \right) \geq \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}: 0 < s < S_k} \mathbb{P}_k \left(-\sum_i w_i G_{ij} = s \right) \quad (58)$$

$$= \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}: 0 < s < S_k} \sum_{\sum_i g_i = s, g_i \in \{-w_i, w_i\}} \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}_k(-w_i G_{ij} = g_i) \quad (59)$$

holds by the independence of workers. Now, we use a change of measure of the underline random variable. Lets say a new random variable corresponding to each i is \tilde{G}_{ij} given by the following mass distribution for some $t_n(k) \geq 0$

$$\begin{aligned} Q_k \left(\tilde{G}_{ij} = 1 \right) &= \frac{(1 + r_{ki}) e^{-t_n(k) w_i}}{(1 + r_{ki}) e^{-t_n(k) w_i} + (1 - r_{ki}) e^{t_n(k) w_i}}, \\ Q_k \left(\tilde{G}_{ij} = -1 \right) &= \frac{(1 - r_{ki}) e^{t_n(k) w_i}}{(1 + r_{ki}) e^{-t_n(k) w_i} + (1 - r_{ki}) e^{t_n(k) w_i}}. \end{aligned}$$

Its joint distribution over workers $i \in [n]$ is written as Q_k , and Eq. (59) is expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{s \in \mathbb{S}: 0 < s < S_k} \sum_{\sum_i g_i = s, g_i \in \{-w_i, w_i\}} \prod_{i=1}^n \mathbb{P}(-w_i G_{ij} = g_i) \\ & \geq Q_k \left(0 < - \sum_i w_i \tilde{G}_{ij} < S_k \right) \frac{\prod_{i=1}^n \left((1+r_{1i})e^{-t_n(k)w_i} + (1-r_{1i})e^{t_n(k)w_i} \right)}{2e^{S_k}} \end{aligned}$$

where, to obtain the last step above, we have multiplied and divided each term in the product by $\frac{2e^{g_i}}{(1+r_{1i})e^{-t_n(k)w_i} + (1-r_{1i})e^{t_n(k)w_i}}$ and used the bound $\sum |w_i| \leq S_k$. Recall the expression

$$\varphi_n(w, r_k) = - \min_{t \geq 0} \frac{1}{n} \sum_i \log \left(\frac{1}{2} \left((1+r_{ki})e^{-tw_i} + (1-r_{ki})e^{tw_i} \right) \right),$$

Define $t_n(k) = t_n^*(k)$ to be a minimizing argument of $\varphi_n(w, r_k)$ in the domain $t_n(k) \geq 0$. Now, putting the minimizing argument $t_n^*(k)$ in the place of $t_n(k)$ we obtain a lower bound for type k as

$$\mathbb{P}_k(\hat{y}_j \neq y_j) \geq Q_k \left(0 < - \sum_i w_i \tilde{G}_{ij} < S \right) e^{-n\varphi_n(w, r_k) - S_k}. \quad (60)$$

Noting that the distribution $Q_k(\tilde{G}_{i,j})$ is invariant to task index j , we drop the index j in the following bound on the error rate for positive values $S_k, \forall k \in \{e, h\}$ (note that the following holds for all y):

$$\mathbb{P}_{av}(w) \geq \sum_{k \in \{e, h\}} \frac{d_k}{d} Q_k \left(0 < - \sum_i w_i \tilde{G}_i < S_k \right) e^{-n\varphi_n(w, r_k) - S_k}. \quad (61)$$

To analyze this further, use the following Lemma on the distribution of $-\sum_i w_i \tilde{G}_i$, an extension to the asymptotic analysis of majority voting in Gao et al. [8].

Recall our definition $\rho_k \leq \min_i \frac{1+r_{ki}}{2} \leq 1 - \rho_k, \forall k \in \{1, 2\}$. The following lemma is similar to Lemma 6.3 in Gao et al. [8]. The proof is given next to it for completeness.

Lemma C.1. *Let $\rho \leq \frac{1+r_{ki}}{2} \leq 1 - \rho, \forall i \in [n], k \in \{e, h\}$, for some $\rho \in (0, 1/2)$.*

- (1) *Let $t_n^*(k)$ be the minimizer of $\varphi_n(w, r_k)$ defined in equation (12). Then, $0 \leq t_n^*(k) \leq -\frac{n}{\|w\|_1} \log \rho, k \in \{e, h\}, \forall n \geq 1$.*
- (2) *For any $y \in \{\pm 1\}$ and any $t_n(k) \geq 0$,*

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \left(-w_i G_i - \mathbb{E}_{Q_k}[-w_i \tilde{G}_i] \right)}{\sqrt{\text{Var}_{Q_k}(-\sum_{i=1}^n w_i \tilde{G}_i)}} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1), \quad \text{under the measure } Q_k.$$

Moreover, at $t_n(k) = t_n^*(k)$,

$$\frac{-\sum_{i=1}^n w_i \tilde{G}_i}{\sqrt{\text{Var}_{Q_k}(-\sum_{i=1}^n w_i \tilde{G}_i)}} \xrightarrow[n \rightarrow \infty]{d} \mathcal{N}(0, 1), \quad \text{under the measure } Q_k.$$

PROOF. (1) Let

$$\beta_k(t_n(k)) = \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{2} \left[(1+r_{ki})e^{-t_n(k)w_i} + (1-r_{ki})e^{t_n(k)w_i} \right].$$

Then $\beta_k(0) = 1$ and $\forall t_n(k) \geq -\frac{n}{\|w\|_1} \log \rho$, we have that $\beta_k(t_n(k)) \geq \prod_{i=1}^n (\rho e^{t|w_i|}) \geq 1$. Therefore, $t_n^*(k) \in \left[0, -\frac{n}{\|w\|_1} \log \rho \right]$.

(2) For the second part, we use Lindeberg's condition for the Central Limit Theorem for the expression $\sum_{i=1}^n -w_i \tilde{G}_i$. The Lindeberg's condition in this context corresponds to

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}_{Q_k} \left[\left(-w_i \tilde{G}_i - \mathbb{E}_{Q_k} [-w_i \tilde{G}_i] \right)^2 \mathbf{1} \left\{ \left| -w_i \tilde{G}_i - \mathbb{E}_{Q_k} [-w_i \tilde{G}_i] \right| > \epsilon \sqrt{\text{Var}_{Q_k} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n -w_i \tilde{G}_i \right)} \right\} \right]}{\text{Var}_{Q_k} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n -w_i \tilde{G}_i \right)} = 0, \forall \epsilon > 0.$$

A direct calculation gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}_{Q_k} [-w_i \tilde{G}_i] &\stackrel{(a)}{=} w_i \frac{(1-p_{ki})e^{t_n(k)w_i} - p_{ki}e^{-t_n(k)w_i}}{(1-p_{ki})e^{t_n(k)w_i} + p_{ki}e^{-t_n(k)w_i}} \\ &= \frac{\frac{d}{dt_n(k)} \left[(1-p_{ki})e^{t_n(k)w_i} + p_{ki}e^{-t_n(k)w_i} \right]}{(1-p_{ki})e^{t_n(k)w_i} + p_{ki}e^{-t_n(k)w_i}} \\ &= \frac{d}{dt_n(k)} \log \left((1-p_{ki})e^{t_n(k)w_i} + p_{ki}e^{-t_n(k)w_i} \right), \end{aligned}$$

where in (a), we used the following relation : $p_{ki} = \frac{1+r_{ki}}{2}, \forall k \in e, h, i \in [n]$.

The last two equalities imply: at $t_n(k) = t_n^*(k), \mathbb{E}_{Q_k} \left[\sum_{i=1}^n -w_i \tilde{G}_i \right] = 0$. Moreover, $\mathbb{E}_{Q_k} [(-w_i \tilde{G}_i)^2] = w_i^2$. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}_{Q_k} (-w_i \tilde{G}_i) &= w_i^2 \left[1 - \frac{[(1-p_{ki})e^{t_n^*(k)w_i} - p_{ki}e^{-t_n^*(k)w_i}]^2}{[(1-p_{ki})e^{t_n^*(k)w_i} + p_{ki}e^{-t_n^*(k)w_i}]^2} \right] \\ &= w_i^2 \frac{4p_{ki}(1-p_{ki})}{[(1-p_{ki})e^{t_n^*(k)w_i} + p_{ki}e^{-t_n^*(k)w_i}]^2} \\ &\geq \frac{4w_i^2 \rho^2}{(1-\rho)^2 [e^{t_n^*(k)w_i} + e^{-t_n^*(k)w_i}]} \geq \frac{2w_i^2 \rho^2}{(1-\rho)^2 e^{t_n^*(k)|w_i|}} \geq \frac{2w_i^2 \rho^2}{(1-\rho)^2 e^{t_n^*(k)w_u}}, \end{aligned}$$

and hence, $\text{Var}_{Q_k} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n -w_i \tilde{G}_i \right) \geq n \frac{2w_i^2 \rho^2}{(1-\rho)^2 e^{t_n^*(k)w_u}} \rightarrow \infty$ as $n \rightarrow \infty$.

Additionally, $\left| -w_i \tilde{G}_i - \mathbb{E}_{Q_k} [-w_i \tilde{G}_i] \right| \leq 2|w_i| \leq 2w_u$ almost surely (and therefore, $\text{Var}_{Q_k} (-w_i \tilde{G}_i) \leq 4w_u^2$). Thus, for every $\epsilon > 0$ we have that

$$\mathbf{1} \left\{ \left| w_i \tilde{G}_i - \mathbb{E}_{Q_k} [-w_i \tilde{G}_i] \right| > \epsilon \sqrt{\text{Var}_{Q_k} \left(\sum_{i=1}^n -w_i \tilde{G}_i \right)} \right\} = 0, \text{ almost surely}$$

for $n > \frac{2w_u^2(1-\rho)^2 e^{t_n^*(k)w_u}}{\epsilon^2 w_i^2 \rho^2}$. Lindeberg's condition now follows.

Remark C.2. We can see that $\text{Var}_{Q_k} (-w_i \tilde{G}_i) > 0$ as $t_n^*(k) \leq -\frac{n}{\|w\|_1} \log \rho$

□

Now, let us go back to proving the lower bound. Setting $S_k = \sqrt{\text{Var}_{Q_k}(\sum_i -w_i \tilde{G}_i)}$, we write the following

$$\begin{aligned} & Q_k \left(0 < -\sum_i w_i \tilde{G}_i < S_k \right) \\ &= Q_k \left(0 < -\sum_i w_i \tilde{G}_i < \sqrt{\text{Var}_{Q_k} \left(\sum_i -w_i \tilde{G}_{ij} \right)} \right) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} Q_k \left(0 < \frac{-\sum_i w_i \tilde{G}_i}{\sqrt{\text{Var}_{Q_k}(\sum_i -w_i \tilde{G}_{ij})}} < 1 \right). \end{aligned}$$

In (b), we use the following fact from Lemma C.1: $\sqrt{\text{Var}_{Q_k}(\sum_i -w_i \tilde{G}_{ij})} > 0$ at $t_n(k) = t_n^*(k)$. Also,

$$\exp(-n\varphi_n(w, r_k) - S_k) = \exp\left(-n\varphi_n(w, r_k) - \sqrt{\text{Var}_{Q_k} \left(\sum_i -w_i \tilde{G}_i \right)}\right).$$

Evaluating $\text{Var}_{Q_k}(\sum_i -w_i \tilde{G}_i) \leq \sum_i w_i^2$ and using the following bounds on the entries of w : $w_l \leq w_i \leq w_u, \forall i \in [n]$,

$$\exp\left(-n\varphi_n(w, r_k) - t_n^*(k) \sqrt{\text{Var}_{Q_k} \left(\sum_i -w_i \tilde{G}_i \right)}\right) \geq \exp(-n\|w\|_2 - n\varphi_n(w, r_k)) \quad (62)$$

$$\geq \exp(-\sqrt{n}w_u - n\varphi_n(w, r_k)) \quad (63)$$

Putting it all together, We can write from equation (61),

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_{av}(w) \\ & \geq \sum_{k \in \{e, h\}} \frac{d_k}{d} Q_k \left(0 < \frac{-\sum_i w_i \tilde{G}_i}{\sqrt{\text{Var}_{Q_k}(\sum_i -w_i \tilde{G}_{ij})}} < 1 \right) \exp(-\sqrt{n}w_u - n\varphi_n(w, r_k)) \\ & \geq \min_k \frac{d_k}{d} \exp\left(-\sqrt{n}w_u - n \min_k \varphi_n(w, r_k)\right) \min_k Q_k \left(0 < \frac{\sum_i -w_i \tilde{G}_i}{\sqrt{\text{Var}_{Q_k}(\sum_i -w_i \tilde{G}_{ij})}} < 1 \right) \end{aligned}$$

By first taking a minimum over weight vector w and then taking the \liminf as $n \rightarrow \infty$ and using Lemma C.1,

$$\liminf_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} \log \min_w P_{av}(w) \geq -\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \max_w \min_k \varphi_n(w, r_k).$$

D Proof of Proposition 3.4

The statement is obtained by appropriately modifying Theorem 4.1 in Gao et al. [8] and Theorem 2 in Bonald and Combes [2]. For the known type case, we separate the tasks according to their type and each type is dealt separately as two Dawid-Skene problem instances. Because task types are known for this setting, the TE algorithm is applied separately to each type independently of

the other to estimate each type's reliability vectors. Labels are estimated using the corresponding NP-WMV.

From Theorem 2³ in Bonald and Combes [2]⁴, we have that if the number of workers n satisfies

$$n^2 \geq \frac{3\rho}{\bar{r}} \quad (64)$$

and the number of tasks d_k per type $k \in \{e, h\}$ is

$$d_k \geq \max \left(120 \times 24^2 \frac{n^2}{V_k^4 \rho^2} (n\Phi(r_k) + \log(6n^2)), 30 \times 8^2 \frac{n}{V_k^2 \bar{r}^2} (n\Phi(r_k) + \log(4n^2)) \right), \quad (65)$$

then

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\|\hat{r}_k - r_k\|_\infty \geq \frac{\rho}{n} \right) \leq \exp(-n\Phi(r_k)). \quad (66)$$

The sufficient condition of d can also be written as

$$d_k \geq C_1 \frac{n^2}{V_k^4 \min(\rho^2, \bar{r}^2)} (n\Phi(r_k) + \log(6n^2))$$

with $C_1 = 15 \times 2^9$.

Using the inequality $|\log x - \log y| \leq \frac{|x-y|}{\min\{x,y\}}$, $\forall x, y > 0$ implied by $\log x \leq x - 1$ for positive x , we have that when d_k satisfies (65),

$$\sum_i \max \left\{ \left| \log \frac{1 + \hat{r}_{ki}}{1 + r_{ki}} \right|, \left| \log \frac{1 - \hat{r}_{ki}}{1 - r_{ki}} \right| \right\} \leq \frac{1}{2} \quad (67)$$

with probability $\geq 1 - \exp(-n\Phi(r_k))$. Now define the event

$$E_k := \left\{ \sum_i \max \left(\left| \log \frac{1 + \hat{r}_{ki}}{1 + r_{ki}} \right|, \left| \log \frac{1 - \hat{r}_{ki}}{1 - r_{ki}} \right| \right) \leq \frac{1}{2} \right\}.$$

Under this event, the weights used by the NP estimate is approximately equal to the maximum likelihood weights. Applying (66),

$$\mathbb{P}(E_k^c) \leq \exp(-n\Phi(r_k)).$$

Without loss of generality, consider $y_j = 1$ so that $\hat{y}_j \neq y_j$ implies $\hat{y}_j = -1$.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}(\hat{y}_j \neq y_j) &\leq \mathbb{P}(\{\hat{y}_j \neq y_j\} \cap E_{k_j}) + \mathbb{P}(E_{k_j}^c) \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left(\left\{ \sum_i \left(\log \frac{1 + \hat{r}_{k_j i}}{1 - \hat{r}_{k_j i}} X_{ij} \right) < 0 \right\} \cap E_{k_j} \right) + \mathbb{P}(E_{k_j}^c) \\ &= \mathbb{P} \left(\left\{ \prod_i \left(\frac{1 - \hat{r}_{k_j i}}{1 + \hat{r}_{k_j i}} \right)^{1_{X_{ij}=1}} \left(\frac{1 + \hat{r}_{k_j i}}{1 - \hat{r}_{k_j i}} \right)^{1_{X_{ij}=-1}} \geq 1 \right\} \cap E_{k_j} \right) + \mathbb{P}(E_{k_j}^c) \end{aligned} \quad (68)$$

³According to the TE algorithm described in the section 2.2, the estimated reliabilities are projected onto the set $\rho \leq \frac{1+\hat{r}_{ki}}{2} \leq 1 - \rho$. This step was not included in the original TE algorithm proposed by Bonald and Combes [2]. Nevertheless, the concentration of the reliability estimate derived from Theorem 2 of Bonald and Combes [2] in the max-norm sense also holds under this projection, as it acts as a contraction operator.

⁴One difference between our model and the model considered in Bonald and Combes [2] is that we consider the true labels as deterministic quantity and Bonald and Combes [2] considers them to be random variables. The TE algorithm uses the worker-similarity matrix and we can easily show that the worker-similarity matrix is independent of the true labels and thus the performance bound on the TE algorithm in Theorem 2 in Bonald and Combes [2] is valid for deterministic labels

Define the two random variables

$$A_1 = \prod_i \left(\frac{1 - r_{kji}}{1 + r_{kji}} \right)^{1_{X_{ij}=1}} \left(\frac{1 + r_{kji}}{1 - r_{kji}} \right)^{1_{X_{ij}=-1}}$$

$$A_2 = \prod_i \left(\frac{(1 - \hat{r}_{kji})(1 + r_{kji})}{(1 - r_{kji})(1 + \hat{r}_{kji})} \right)^{1_{X_{ij}=1}} \left(\frac{(1 + \hat{r}_{kji})(1 - r_{kji})}{(1 + r_{kji})(1 - \hat{r}_{kji})} \right)^{1_{X_{ij}=-1}}.$$

Then, the first event in the above probability is given by the product of A_1 and A_2 . On the event E_{k_j} ,

$$A_2 \leq \exp \left(2 \sum_i \max \left(\left| \log \frac{1 + \hat{r}_{kji}}{1 + r_{kji}} \right|, \left| \log \frac{1 - \hat{r}_{kji}}{1 - r_{kji}} \right| \right) \right) \leq \exp(1).$$

Therefore,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\{A_1 A_2 \geq 1\} \cap E_{k_j} \right) \leq \mathbb{P} \left(\{A_1 \geq \exp(-1)\} \cap E_{k_j} \right) \quad (69)$$

$$\leq \underbrace{(a)} \mathbb{P} \left(\left\{ A_1^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\right) \right\} \cap E_{k_j} \right) \quad (70)$$

$$\leq \mathbb{P} \left(\left\{ A_1^{\frac{1}{2}} \geq \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}\right) \right\} \right) \quad (71)$$

$$\leq \underbrace{\exp\left(\frac{1}{2}\right)}_{(b)} \mathbb{E}[A_1^{1/2}], \quad (72)$$

where in (a) we used the observation that $A_1 > 0$ and in (b) we used Markov's inequality on the random variable $A_1^{1/2} > 0$. Evaluating the expectation,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[A_1^{\frac{1}{2}}] &= \prod_i \left(\frac{1 - r_{kji}}{1 + r_{kji}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{1 + r_{kji}}{2} + \left(\frac{1 + r_{kji}}{1 - r_{kji}} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} \frac{1 - r_{kji}}{2} \\ &= \exp \left(\frac{1}{2} \sum_i \log(1 - r_{ki}^2) \right) = \exp(-n\Phi(r_k)). \end{aligned}$$

Returning to (68), we have that for a task j with type k ,

$$\mathbb{P}_k(\hat{y}_j \neq y_j) \leq \exp\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) \mathbb{E}[A_1^{1/2}] + \mathbb{P}(E_{2,k}) \leq \left(\exp\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) + 1 \right) \exp(-n\Phi(r_k)).$$

Averaging, we get the error rate for known types as

$$\mathbb{P}_{av}(y) = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbb{P}(\hat{y}_j \neq y_j) \leq 3 \sum_{k \in \{e,h\}} \frac{d_k}{d} \exp(-n\Phi(r_k)). \quad (73)$$

E Spectral Properties

The content of this section goes as follows:

- (1) We establish the spectral properties of the signal matrix $n^{-1}R_y$ and give a proof to Lemma 3.7.
- (2) Next, we discuss the two largest eigenvalues and the corresponding eigenvectors of the matrix $\mathbb{E}[T]$. This discussion about the spectral properties of $\mathbb{E}[T]$ serves as a basis of the proof of Theorem 4.1 given in H.2.

Given the ordered response matrix X we consider in Section 3.2, where the easy and hard tasks are listed consecutively in the columns, the true response matrix with arbitrary task ordering is obtained by a column permutation of X . It is easy to see that the ordered task similarity matrix $T = n^{-1}X^T X$ is then related to the true task similarity matrix with type-permutations by a similarity transform. All eigenvalues and eigen-spectrums are therefore related by the same permutations, and as long as the algorithm does not utilize an unknown prior on the ordering of these types, its analysis still pertains to the un-ordered case.

Recall the decomposition of the expected task similarity matrix $\mathbb{E}[T]$ into

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[T] &= \underbrace{n^{-1} \text{diag}(y) \begin{pmatrix} \|r_e\|_2^2 1_{d_e \times d_e} & r_e^T r_h 1_{d_e \times d_h} \\ r_h^T r_e 1_{d_h \times d_e} & \|r_h\|_2^2 1_{d_h \times d_h} \end{pmatrix}}_{n^{-1}R_y} \underbrace{\text{diag}(y) - n^{-1} \text{diag} \left([\|r_e\|_2^2 1_{1 \times d_e}, \|r_h\|_2^2 1_{1 \times d_h}]^T \right)}_S + I_d \\ &= n^{-1}R_y + S, \end{aligned} \quad (74)$$

where S is a diagonal matrix.

E.1 Proof of Lemma 3.7 : Spectral Properties of $n^{-1}R_y$

Recall, $n^{-1}R_y$ is defined as, $n^{-1}R_y = n^{-1} \text{diag}(y) \begin{pmatrix} \|r_e\|_2^2 1_{d_e \times d_e} & r_e^T r_h 1_{d_e \times d_h} \\ r_h^T r_e 1_{d_h \times d_e} & \|r_h\|_2^2 1_{d_h \times d_h} \end{pmatrix} \text{diag}(y)$. Clearly, the $n^{-1}R_y$ is a rank- ℓ matrix with $\ell \leq 2$. Specifically,

$$\ell = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{when } r_e \text{ and } r_h \text{ are collinear} \\ 2, & \text{else} \end{cases}$$

Next, we calculate the eigenspectrum of $n^{-1}R_y$. First consider the case when $r_e^T r_h \neq 0$.

Case 1: When $r_e^T r_h \neq 0$:

Consider a generic vector q of the form $\text{diag}(y) [\bar{s} 1_{1 \times d_e}, 1_{1 \times d_h}]^T$ for some \bar{s} as the ratio of the magnitude between the entries of the vector corresponding to different types of tasks.. A normalization of q serves as a candidate eigenvector for the matrix $n^{-1}R_y$, where

$$\frac{q}{\|q\|_2} = \text{diag}(y) \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\bar{s}}{\sqrt{d_e \bar{s}^2 + d_h}} 1_{d_e \times 1} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{d_e \bar{s}^2 + d_h}} 1_{d_h \times 1} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (75)$$

The eigen-pair equation for the candidate eigenvector above is calculated to be:

$$\frac{1}{n} R_y q = \text{diag}(y) \begin{bmatrix} \left[\frac{1}{n} (\bar{s} d_e \|r_e\|_2^2 + d_h r_e^T r_h) \right] 1_{d_e \times 1} \\ \left[\frac{1}{n} (\bar{s} d_e r_e^T r_h + d_h \|r_h\|_2^2) \right] 1_{d_h \times 1} \end{bmatrix} = \left[\frac{1}{n} (\bar{s} d_e r_e^T r_h + d_h \|r_h\|_2^2) \right] q \quad (76)$$

Now as \bar{s} is the ratio between the quantity $\frac{1}{n} (\bar{s} d_e \|r_e\|_2^2 + d_h r_e^T r_h)$ and $\frac{1}{n} (\bar{s} d_e r_e^T r_h + d_h \|r_h\|_2^2)$, we can write:

$$\bar{s} \left[\frac{1}{n} (\bar{s} d_e r_e^T r_h + d_h \|r_h\|_2^2) \right] = \frac{1}{n} (\bar{s} d_e \|r_e\|_2^2 + d_h r_e^T r_h). \quad (77)$$

The solutions to this quadratic equation are given by

$$s, \bar{s} = \frac{d_e \|r_e\|_2^2 - d_h \|r_h\|_2^2 \pm \sqrt{[d_e \|r_e\|_2^2 - d_h \|r_h\|_2^2]^2 + 4 d_e d_h (r_e^T r_h)^2}}{2 d_e r_e^T r_h}. \quad (78)$$

The eigenvalues $n^{-1}(\bar{s}d_e r_e^T r_h + d_h \|r_h\|_2^2)$ of $n^{-1}R_y$ corresponding to each solution of \bar{s} are

$$\lambda_1(n^{-1}R_y) = \frac{d_e \|r_e\|_2^2 + d_h \|r_h\|_2^2 + \sqrt{[d_e \|r_e\|_2^2 - d_h \|r_h\|_2^2]^2 + 4d_e d_h (r_e^T r_h)^2}}{2n}$$

and

$$\lambda_2(n^{-1}R_y) = \frac{d_e \|r_e\|_2^2 + d_h \|r_h\|_2^2 - \sqrt{[d_e \|r_e\|_2^2 - d_h \|r_h\|_2^2]^2 + 4d_e d_h (r_e^T r_h)^2}}{2n}, \quad (79)$$

where $\lambda_1(n^{-1}R_y) \geq \lambda_2(n^{-1}R_y)$. By Assumption 2.1, we have $\|r_e\| > 0$. Hence, for $d_e \geq 1$ and $d_h \geq 1$, we can write, $\lambda_1(n^{-1}R_y) > 0$ and $\lambda_2(n^{-1}R_y) \geq 0$. When r_e and r_h are co-linear, $\lambda_2(n^{-1}R_y) = 0$.

Case 2: when $r_e^T r_h = 0$:

When the reliability vectors are orthogonal, we can write

$$n^{-1}R_y = n^{-1}\|r_e\|_2^2 \text{diag}(y_{1:d_e}) 1_{d_e \times d_e} \text{diag}(y_{1:d_e}) \oplus \|r_h\|_2^2 \text{diag}(y_{d_e+1:d}) 1_{d_h \times d_h} \text{diag}(y_{d_e+1:d}), \quad (80)$$

where $y_{1:d_e}$ and $y_{d_e+1:d}$ are the ground truth vectors corresponding to type easy tasks and type hard tasks respectively and \oplus is the notation for a direct sum. From the expression (80), it is clear that $\text{rank}(n^{-1}R_y) = 2$ when $\|r_h\|_2 \neq 0$ with the following eigenvalues:

$$\lambda_1(n^{-1}R_y) = n^{-1} \max_{k \in \{e, h\}} d_k \|r_k\|_2^2 \geq \lambda_2(n^{-1}R_y) = n^{-1} \min_{k \in \{e, h\}} d_k \|r_k\|_2^2, \quad (81)$$

with $\lambda_2(n^{-1}R_y) \geq \lambda_j(n^{-1}R_y) = 0$ for all $j = 3, \dots, d$.

Also, the eigenvectors of $n^{-1}R_y$ corresponding to the eigenvalues $n^{-1}d_e \|r_e\|_2$ and $n^{-1}d_h \|r_h\|_2$ are respectively

$$\text{diag}(y) \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{d_e}} 1_{d_e \times 1} \\ 0_{d_h \times 1} \end{bmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{diag}(y) \begin{bmatrix} 0_{d_e \times 1} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{d_h}} 1_{d_h \times 1} \end{bmatrix}$$

E.2 Spectral Properties of $\mathbb{E}[T]$

The calculation of the spectral properties of $\mathbb{E}[R]$ is similar to the case of the matrix $n^{-1}R_y$. We observe that the structure of the principal eigenvectors in both the matrices are similar with a difference in the ratio between the magnitude of the entries in the vector. Lets consider the case $r_e^T r_h \neq 0$ first.

Case 1: $r_e^T r_h \neq 0$

Consider a generic vector q of the form $\text{diag}(y)[\bar{y} 1_{1 \times d_e}, 1_{1 \times d_h}]^T$ for some \bar{y} . A normalization of q serves as a candidate eigenvector for the matrix $\mathbb{E}[T]$, where

$$\frac{q}{\|q\|_2} = \text{diag}(y) \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\bar{y}}{\sqrt{d_e \bar{y}^2 + d_h}} 1_{d_e \times 1} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{d_e \bar{y}^2 + d_h}} 1_{d_h \times 1} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (82)$$

The eigen-pair equation for the candidate eigenvector above is calculated to be

$$\mathbb{E}[T]q = \text{diag}(y) \begin{bmatrix} \left[\frac{1}{n}(\bar{y}d_e \|r_e\|_2^2 + d_h r_e^T r_h) - \frac{1}{n}\bar{y} \|r_e\|_2^2 + \bar{y} \right] 1_{d_e \times 1} \\ \left[\frac{1}{n}(\bar{y}d_e r_e^T r_h + d_h \|r_h\|_2^2) - \frac{1}{n}\|r_h\|_2^2 + 1 \right] 1_{d_h \times 1} \end{bmatrix} \quad (83)$$

$$= \left[\frac{1}{n}(\bar{y}d_e r_e^T r_h + d_h \|r_h\|_2^2) - \frac{1}{n}\|r_h\|_2^2 + 1 \right] q, \quad (84)$$

which gives rise to the quadratic equation

$$\bar{y} \left[\frac{1}{n}(\bar{y}d_e r_e^T r_h + d_h \|r_h\|_2^2) - \frac{1}{n}\|r_h\|_2^2 + 1 \right] = \frac{1}{n}(\bar{y}d_e \|r_e\|_2^2 + d_h r_e^T r_h) - \frac{1}{n}\bar{y} \|r_e\|_2^2 + \bar{y}. \quad (85)$$

The condition on \bar{y} given by ((85)) corresponds to a quadratic equation whose solutions are given by

$$y, \bar{y} = \frac{(d_e - 1)\|r_e\|_2^2 - (d_h - 1)\|r_h\|_2^2 \pm \sqrt{[(d_e - 1)\|r_e\|_2^2 - (d_h - 1)\|r_h\|_2^2]^2 + 4d_e d_h (r_e^T r_h)^2}}{2d_e r_e^T r_h}. \quad (86)$$

As a result, we see that eigenvalues corresponding to eigenvectors of the form (82) are given by

$$\frac{(d_e - 1)\|r_e\|_2^2 + (d_h - 1)\|r_h\|_2^2 + \sqrt{[(d_e - 1)\|r_e\|_2^2 - (d_h - 1)\|r_h\|_2^2]^2 + 4d_e d_h (r_e^T r_h)^2}}{2n} + 1 \quad (87)$$

$$\frac{(d_e - 1)\|r_e\|_2^2 + (d_h - 1)\|r_h\|_2^2 - \sqrt{[(d_e - 1)\|r_e\|_2^2 - (d_h - 1)\|r_h\|_2^2]^2 + 4d_e d_h (r_e^T r_h)^2}}{2n} + 1. \quad (88)$$

Next we show that the expression in equation (87) corresponds to the largest eigenvalue of $\mathbb{E}[T]$ when $\min(d_e, d_h) \geq 2$. Recall the decomposition $\mathbb{E}[T] = n^{-1}R_y + S$. We also know that S is a diagonal matrix with its eigenvalues belonging to the set $\{1 - n^{-1}\|r_h\|_2, 1 - n^{-1}\|r_e\|_2\}$. Clearly with an application of Weyl's inequality we can bound the g -th largest eigenvalue of $\mathbb{E}[T]$ as

$$\lambda_g(\mathbb{E}[T]) \leq \lambda_g(n^{-1}R_y) + \{1 - n^{-1}\|r_h\|_2 \leq \lambda_g(n^{-1}R_y) + 1$$

We observe when $\min(d_e, d_h) \geq 2$, the following is satisfied :

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{(d_e - 1)\|r_e\|_2^2 + (d_h - 1)\|r_h\|_2^2 + \sqrt{[(d_e - 1)\|r_e\|_2^2 - (d_h - 1)\|r_h\|_2^2]^2 + 4d_e d_h (r_e^T r_h)^2}}{2n} + 1 \\ & \geq \lambda_g(n^{-1}R_y) + 1, \forall g \geq 2 \end{aligned}$$

implying,

$$\lambda_1(\mathbb{E}[T]) = \frac{(d_e - 1)\|r_e\|_2^2 + (d_h - 1)\|r_h\|_2^2 + \sqrt{[(d_e - 1)\|r_e\|_2^2 - (d_h - 1)\|r_h\|_2^2]^2 + 4d_e d_h (r_e^T r_h)^2}}{2n} + 1$$

Case 2: when $r_e^T r_h = 0$:

In this case, $\mathbb{E}[T]$ is block-diagonal and can be expressed as the direct sum

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[T] &= \frac{1}{n} \text{diag}(y_e) \|r_e\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{d_e \times d_e} \text{diag}(y_e) - \frac{1}{n} \|r_e\|_2^2 I_{d_e} + I_{d_e} \\ &\oplus \frac{1}{n} \text{diag}(y_h) \|r_h\|_2^2 \mathbf{1}_{d_h \times d_h} \text{diag}(y_h) - \frac{1}{n} \|r_h\|_2^2 I_{d_h} + I_{d_h}. \end{aligned}$$

The eigenvalues of $\mathbb{E}[T]$ are the eigenvalues of its blocks. Each block indexed by k is associated with eigenvalues $1 + n^{-1}(d_k - 1)\|r_k\|_2^2 \geq 1$ and $1 - n^{-1}\|r_k\|_2^2$ with multiplicity $d_k - 1$. Hence, the largest two eigenvalues have the following relation:

$$\lambda_1(\mathbb{E}[T]) = 1 + \max_{k \in \{e, h\}} \frac{d_k - 1}{n} \|r_k\|_2^2 \geq 1 + \min_{k \in \{e, h\}} \frac{d_k - 1}{n} \|r_k\|_2^2 = \lambda_2(\mathbb{E}[T]),$$

and $\lambda_2(\mathbb{E}[T]) \geq 1 - n^{-1}\|r_h\|_2^2$ is the second largest eigenvalue.

By a direct calculation using the same steps as in the non-orthogonal case, the two corresponding eigenvectors are given by

$$\text{diag}(y) \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{d_e}} \mathbf{1}_{d_e \times 1} \\ 0_{d_h \times 1} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{diag}(y) \begin{bmatrix} 0_{d_e \times 1} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{d_h}} \mathbf{1}_{d_h \times 1} \end{bmatrix}$$

corresponding to the eigenvalue associated with $1 + n^{-1}(d_e - 1)\|r_e\|_2^2$ and $1 + n^{-1}(d_h - 1)\|r_h\|_2^2$, respectively. The normalized eigen-gap of $\mathbb{E}[T]$ is then given by

$$\sigma(\mathbb{E}[T]) = d^{-1}n^{-1}|(d_e - 1)\|r_e\|_2^2 - (d_h - 1)\|r_h\|_2^2|. \quad (89)$$

F Remaining Part of Proofs for Theorem 3.12

F.1 Relating the Event of Misclustering to Eigenvector Concentration

Before stating the sufficient condition for the perfect clustering, we state a more general result that provides the sufficient conditions for a clustering error $\eta \leq 1 - t$ for some $t \in [0, 1]$ in the following proposition:

Proposition F.1. *Let θ be the sign that resolves the eigenvector ambiguity*

$$\theta = \arg \min_{\theta \in \{-1, +1\}} \|v(n^{-1}R_y) - \theta\hat{v}\|.$$

Fix any non-negative $t \leq 1$. Algorithm 1 returns cluster membership with $\eta \leq 1 - t$ on the following event on the random vector \hat{v} and the random variable $\hat{\mu}$:

$$\frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbf{1}(E_{\hat{v},j}) \geq t \quad (90)$$

where,

$$E_{\hat{v},j} = \{|v_j(n^{-1}R_y) - \theta\hat{v}_j| + |\mu(n^{-1}R_y) - \hat{\mu}| < \min\{m_e(n^{-1}R_y), m_h(n^{-1}R_y)\}\} \quad (91)$$

PROOF. Assume the event defined in equation (90) is true for a fixed t such that $0 \leq t \leq 1$. Under this event we show that there exists a permutation π from $\{e, h\}$ to $\{e, h\}$ such that $\eta \leq 1 - t$. First, consider the case of $\mu_e(n^{-1}R_y) \geq \mu_h(n^{-1}R_y)$. Our candidate permutation for this case is $\pi = \{e \mapsto e; h \mapsto h\}$. We claim that when event $E_{\hat{v},j}$ is true, the task j is clustered into group 1 if $k_j = e$ and into group 2 otherwise. Under this claim, it is easy to see that on the event (90), at least t fraction of tasks are correctly clustered, that is, $\eta \leq 1 - t$. We are left to prove the claim now. Consider the case $k_j = e$ for a task j . By definition of the absolute margins $m_e(n^{-1}R_y)$ and $m_h(n^{-1}R_y)$, we have that $\min\{m_e(n^{-1}R_y), m_h(n^{-1}R_y)\} \leq |v_j(n^{-1}R_y)| - \mu$. Suppose $E_{\hat{v},j}$ is true. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} |\hat{v}_j| - \hat{\mu} &= |v_j(n^{-1}R_y)| - \mu(n^{-1}R_y) + \mu(n^{-1}R_y) - \hat{\mu} + |\theta\hat{v}_j| - |v_j(n^{-1}R_y)| \\ &\geq \min\{m_e(n^{-1}R_y), m_h(n^{-1}R_y)\} - |v_j(n^{-1}R_y) - \theta\hat{v}_j| + |\mu(n^{-1}R_y) - \hat{\mu}| \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{>} \min\{m_e(n^{-1}R_y), m_h(n^{-1}R_y)\} - \min\{m_e(n^{-1}R_y), m_h(n^{-1}R_y)\} = 0, \end{aligned}$$

where (a) is due to event $E_{\hat{v},j}$. This implies $|\hat{v}_j| > \hat{\mu}$. This proves that task j is correctly clustered as $\hat{k}_j = e$ and $\pi(\hat{k}_j) = e$. By the similar arguments for $k_j = h$, we obtain that $\pi(\hat{k}_j) = h$ in the same event.

Lastly, consider the case of $\mu_e(n^{-1}R_y) < \mu_h(n^{-1}R_y)$. The flow is almost identical for the case of $\mu_e(n^{-1}R_y) \geq \mu_h(n^{-1}R_y)$ but, it is given below for completeness. Our candidate permutation for this case is $\pi = \{e \mapsto h; h \mapsto e\}$. We claim that when event $E_{\hat{v},j}$ is true, the task j is clustered into group 1 if $k_j = h$ and into group 2 otherwise. Under this claim, it is easy to see that under event (90), at least t fraction of tasks are correctly clustered, that is, $\eta \leq 1 - t$. We are left to prove the claim now. Consider the case $k_j = e$ for a task j . By definition of the absolute margins $m_e(n^{-1}R_y)$ and

$m_h(n^{-1}R_y)$, we have that $\min\{m_e(n^{-1}R_y), m_h(n^{-1}R_y)\} \leq \mu(n^{-1}R_y) - |v_j(n^{-1}R_y)|$. Suppose $E_{v,j}$ is true. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mu} - |\hat{v}_j| &= \mu - |v_j(n^{-1}R_y)| + \hat{\mu} - \mu(n^{-1}R_y) + |\theta\hat{v}_j| - |v_j(n^{-1}R_y)| \\ &\geq \min\{m_e(n^{-1}R_y), m_h(n^{-1}R_y)\} - |v_j(n^{-1}R_y)| - \theta\hat{v}_j + |\mu(n^{-1}R_y) - \hat{\mu}| \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{>} \underbrace{\min\{m_e(n^{-1}R_y), m_h(n^{-1}R_y)\} - \min\{m_e(n^{-1}R_y), m_h(n^{-1}R_y)\}}_{=0}, \end{aligned}$$

where (a) is due to the event $E_{\hat{v},j}$. This implies $|\hat{v}_j| < \hat{\mu}$. This proves that task j is correctly clustered as $\pi(\hat{k}_j) = e$. Repeating the same argument for $k_j = h$, we obtain that $\pi(\hat{k}_j) = h$ in the same event. \square

F.1.1 Concentration of the Threshold $\hat{\mu}$. Recall, the Algorithm 1 uses the following threshold to cluster the entries of $|\hat{v}|$:

$$\hat{\mu} = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^d |\hat{v}_j|$$

Fact: For any vectors v, \hat{v} of dimension d the mean absolute error $|\mu(n^{-1}R_y) - \hat{\mu}|$ between the average of magnitudes $\mu = d^{-1} \sum_{j=1}^d |v_j|$ and that of \hat{v} satisfies

$$|\mu - \hat{\mu}| \leq d^{-1/2} \min_{\theta \in \{-1, +1\}} \|v - \theta\hat{v}\|_2 \leq \min_{\theta \in \{-1, +1\}} \|v - \theta\hat{v}\|_\infty. \quad (92)$$

PROOF.

$$\hat{\mu} - \mu = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^d (|\theta\hat{v}_j| - |v_j|) = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^d (|\hat{v}_j| - |v_j|).$$

Taking the absolute value and using the triangle inequality, followed by the root mean square - arithmetic mean inequality,

$$|\hat{\mu} - \mu| \leq \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^d |\hat{v}_j - v_j| \leq d^{-1/2} \|\hat{v} - v\| \leq \min_{\theta \in \{-1, +1\}} \|v - \theta\hat{v}\|_\infty.$$

\square

Using the above fact, we can relate the concentration of $\hat{\mu}$ with respect to $\mu(n^{-1}R_y) = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^d |v_j(n^{-1}R_y)|$ as

$$|\hat{\mu} - \mu(n^{-1}R_y)| \leq \frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^d |\hat{v}_j - v_j(n^{-1}R_y)| \leq d^{-1/2} \|\hat{v} - v(n^{-1}R_y)\| \leq \min_{\theta \in \{-1, +1\}} \|v(n^{-1}R_y) - \theta\hat{v}\|_\infty. \quad (93)$$

F.2 Proof of Proposition 5.2: Relating the Event of Perfect Clustering with Eigenvector Concentration

The Proposition 5.2 is an immediate implication of F.1 and the equation (93). On the event E_{l_∞} , using equation (93), the following is satisfied: $|\hat{\mu} - \mu| < \frac{1}{2} \min\{m_e(n^{-1}R_y), m_h(n^{-1}R_y)\}$. Hence, the event $E_{\hat{v},j}$ is satisfied for all $j \in [n]$. Hence $\eta = 0$ is achieved from Proposition F.1.

G Label Estimation Performance: Proof of Theorem 3.13

The expected rate of labeling error using the law of total expectation can be decomposed as :

$$\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{d} \sum_j \mathbf{1}(\hat{y}_j \neq y_j) \right) = \underbrace{\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{d} \sum_j \mathbf{1}(\hat{y}_j \neq y_j) | E_{pc} \right) \mathbb{P}(E_{pc})}_{I} + \underbrace{\mathbb{E} \left(\frac{1}{d} \sum_j \mathbf{1}(\hat{y}_j \neq y_j) | E_{pc}^c \right) \mathbb{P}(E_{pc}^c)}_{II} \quad (94)$$

where E_{pc} is defined as the event of perfect clustering, that is $\eta = 0$. We upper bound second term II as $\mathbb{P}(E_{pc}^c)$. When the condition (32) is satisfied by $(n_{cl}, d, r_k(\mathcal{N}_{cl}))$ for each $k \in \{e, h\}$ it is characterized by Theorem 3.12 as :

$$II \leq 2d^2 \exp(-C_4 n_{cl} D(r_e(\mathcal{N}_{cl}), r_h(\mathcal{N}_{cl}), \alpha, d))$$

To upper bound the term I , we invoke the Proposition 3.4. Recall the partition of the set of workers to mutually exhaustive sets \mathcal{N}_{cl} and \mathcal{N}_{rl} for clustering and the labeling steps respectively. Hence, given the event E_{pc} , the labeling step has perfect knowledge of each task's type and $NP - WMV$ for known type model would yield the following error rate when $(n_{rl}, d_e, d_h, r_k(\mathcal{N}_{rl}))$ satisfy the conditions stated in Proposition 3.4:

$$I \leq 3 \sum_{k \in \{1,2\}} \frac{d_k}{d} \exp(-n_{rl} \Phi_{k, \mathcal{N}_{rl}}).$$

H Imperfect Cluster: Proof of Theorem 4.1

Below we give a proof sketch for theorem 4.1. The idea is to view the task-similarity T matrix as a perturbation of its expectation $\mathbb{E}[T]$. Recall, in the proof of Theorem 3.12 given in Section 5, we leverage the structure of the vector $v(n^{-1}R_y)$ as it has the type information for all tasks. In contrast, we leverage the structure of the principal eigenvector of $\mathbb{E}[T]$ for this proof. While the key steps are similar to the proof of clustering theorem 3.12, there are a few technical differences. The proof goes as follows:

- (1) In Section E.2, we have shown the structure of the principal eigenvector $v(\mathbb{E}[T])$ of the matrix $\mathbb{E}[T]$. We observe that the tasks can be clustered into easy and hard types by clustering the magnitude of the entries of $v(\mathbb{E}[T])$. In the first part of the proof, we show that \hat{v} , the principal eigenvector of T is a perturbation of $v(\mathbb{E}[T])$ in the l_2 -norm sense. This is established using a Davis-Kahan perturbation result on the following matrix perturbation $T = \mathbb{E}[T] + N$. The detail of this step is given in Section H.1.
- (2) Next we relate the event $\eta \leq t$, for some $t \in [0, 1)$ with the concentration of \hat{v} around $v(\mathbb{E}[T])$ in the l_2 -norm sense and prove that the event occurs with high probability. Recall, in contrast, the proof of Theorem 3.12 characterizes the event $\eta \neq 0$. This step is carried out in detail in Section H.2.

H.1 l_2 Concentration of the Principal Eigenvector

Lemma H.1 (l_2 norm concentration). *For every $t \geq 0$,*

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\min_{\theta \in \{\pm 1\}} \|v(\mathbb{E}[T]) - \theta \hat{v}\|_2 \geq t \right) \leq 2d \exp \left(-C_7 n \frac{(\lambda_1(\mathbb{E}[T]) - \lambda_2(\mathbb{E}[T]))^2}{d^2} t^2 \right) \quad (95)$$

where $C_7 = 2^{-6}$ is a universal constant.

PROOF. We use the Davis-Kahan Theorem to relate the concentration of the principal eigenvector of T with that of the matrix $\mathbb{E}[T]$. Then we apply the Matrix-Hoeffding inequality to obtain a tail bound on the difference $T - \mathbb{E}[T]$ in the l_2 -norm sense.

The Davis-Kahan Theorem Yu et al. [24] states that

$$\min_{\theta \in \{\pm 1\}} \|v(\mathbb{E}[T]) - \theta \hat{v}\|_2 \leq 2^{\frac{3}{2}} \frac{\|T - \mathbb{E}[T]\|_2}{\lambda_1(\mathbb{E}[T]) - \lambda_2(\mathbb{E}[T])} \quad (96)$$

Next, we obtain the tail bound on the operator norm $\|T - \mathbb{E}[T]\|_2$ using Matrix-Hoeffding inequality. A version (cf. Mackey et al. [16], Corollary 4.2) that works for our application is stated below:

Lemma H.2 (Matrix Hoeffding). *Consider a sequence of independent Hermitian matrices $\{Z_i\}_{i=1}^n$, each of dimension d . Suppose for some sequence of Hermitian matrices $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^n$, each Z_i satisfies*

$$\mathbb{E}Z_i = 0, -A_i^2 \leq Z_i^2 \leq A_i^2,$$

where \leq is the Löwner order. Then,

$$\mathbb{P}\left(\left\|\sum_i Z_i\right\|_2 \geq t\right) \leq 2d \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{2\sigma^2}\right)$$

where $\sigma^2 = \frac{1}{2}\|\sum_i (A_i^2 + \mathbb{E}Z_i^2)\|$.

To apply the above result, consider the $d \times d$ matrix $n^{-1}(X_i^T X_i - \mathbb{E}[X_i^T X_i])$ formed by the response of worker i to be substituted as Z_i . The matrix Z_i contains entries whose magnitude is bounded by $2n^{-1}$, and its square is therefore bounded element-wise. As a result, we have

$$-\frac{4d^2}{n^2}I_d \leq Z_i^2 \leq \frac{4d^2}{n^2}I_d, \quad \sigma^2 \leq \frac{4d^2}{n}. \quad (97)$$

where we choose the sequence of Hermitian matrices $\{A_i\}_{i=1}^n$ for our purpose as $A_i = \frac{4d^2}{n^2}I_d, \forall i \in [n]$. Using the construction $\sum_{i=1}^n Z_i = T - \mathbb{E}[T]$, we directly obtain

$$\mathbb{P}(\|T - \mathbb{E}[T]\|_2 \geq t) \leq 2d \exp\left(-\frac{nt^2}{8d^2}\right). \quad (98)$$

Combining with Davis-Kahan's Theorem, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\min_{\theta \in \{\pm 1\}} \|v - \theta \hat{v}\|_2 \geq t\right) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\|T - \mathbb{E}[T]\|_2 \geq 2^{-3/2}(\lambda_1(\mathbb{E}[T]) - \lambda_2(\mathbb{E}[T]))t\right) \\ &\leq 2d \exp\left(-\frac{n(\lambda_1(\mathbb{E}[T]) - \lambda_2(\mathbb{E}[T]))^2}{2^6 d^2}t^2\right) \end{aligned}$$

□

H.2 Proof of Theorem 4.1: Imperfect Clustering

First, we need to define a few quantities based on the vector $v(\mathbb{E}[T])$. Similar to the definition of $\mu(n^{-1}R_y)$, $\mu_e(n^{-1}R_y)$, $\mu_h(n^{-1}R_y)$, $m_e(n^{-1}R_y)$ and $m_h(n^{-1}R_y)$, let us define the quantities based on the vector $v(\mathbb{E}[T])$. That is,

$$\mu_e(\mathbb{E}[T]) = \begin{cases} \left|\frac{\gamma}{\sqrt{\gamma^2 d_e + d_h}}\right|, & \text{when } r_e^\top r_h \neq 0 \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{d_e}}, & \text{when } r_e^\top r_h = 0 \end{cases} \quad (99)$$

$$\mu_h(\mathbb{E}[T]) = \begin{cases} \left|\frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma^2 d_e + d_h}}\right|, & \text{when } r_e^\top r_h \neq 0 \\ 0, & \text{when } r_e^\top r_h = 0 \end{cases} \quad (100)$$

$$\mu(n^{-1}R_y) = \frac{d_e}{d} \mu_e(n^{-1}R_y) + \frac{d_h}{d} \mu_h(n^{-1}R_y). \quad (101)$$

$$m_e(n^{-1}R_y) = \mu_e(\mathbb{E}[T]) - \mu(\mathbb{E}[T]) = \frac{d_h}{d} (\mu_e(\mathbb{E}[T]) - \mu_h(\mathbb{E}[T])) = \frac{d_h}{d} \frac{||\gamma| - 1|}{\sqrt{d_e \gamma^2 + d_h}} \quad (102)$$

$$m_h(n^{-1}R_y) = \mu(\mathbb{E}[T]) - \mu_h(\mathbb{E}[T]) = \frac{d_e}{d} (\mu_e(\mathbb{E}[T]) - \mu_h(\mathbb{E}[T])) = \frac{d_e}{d} \frac{||\gamma| - 1|}{\sqrt{d_e \gamma^2 + d_h}}. \quad (103)$$

Recall the Proposition F.1 where, we give sufficient condition for the event $\eta \leq 1 - t$ for some $t \in [0, 1]$ which was related to the concentration of \hat{v} to $v(n^{-1}R_y)$. It turns out the similar relation holds when we replace $v(n^{-1}R_y)$, $\mu(n^{-1}R_y)$, $m_e(n^{-1}R_y)$ and $m_h(n^{-1}R_y)$ with $v(\mathbb{E}[T])$, $\mu(\mathbb{E}[T])$, $m_e(\mathbb{E}[T])$ and $m_h(\mathbb{E}[T])$, respectively. It is shown in the following proposition.

Proposition H.3. *Let θ be the sign that resolves the eigenvector ambiguity*

$$\theta = \arg \min_{\theta \in \{-1, +1\}} \|v(\mathbb{E}[T]) - \theta \hat{v}\|.$$

Fix any non-negative $t \leq 1$. Algorithm 1 returns cluster membership with $\eta \leq 1 - t$ when the following event on the random vector \hat{v} and the random variable $\hat{\mu}$ holds true:

$$\frac{1}{d} \sum_{j=1}^d \mathbf{1}(E'_{\hat{v},j}) \geq t \quad (104)$$

where,

$$E'_{\hat{v},j} = \{|v_j(\mathbb{E}[T]) - \theta \hat{v}_j| + |\mu(\mathbb{E}[T]) - \hat{\mu}| < \min\{m_e(\mathbb{E}[T]), m_h(\mathbb{E}[T])\}\} \quad (105)$$

The proof of the above proposition comes immediately once we follow the proof of the proposition F.1 by replacing the associated spectral quantities of $n^{-1}R_y$ with that of $\mathbb{E}[T]$.

Hence, using the above proposition, the tail bound on the fraction of incorrectly clustered tasks η for any t with $0 \leq t < 1$ is bounded as

$$\mathbb{P}(\eta > t) \leq \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{d} \sum_j \mathbf{1}(E'_{\hat{v},j}) < 1 - t\right) \quad (106)$$

$$= \mathbb{P}\left(\frac{1}{d} \sum_j \mathbf{1}(E'_{\hat{v},j}^c) \geq t\right). \quad (107)$$

Define the following event similar to the event E_μ

$$E'_\mu = \left\{ |\hat{\mu} - \mu(\mathbb{E}[T])| < \frac{1}{2} \min\{m_e(\mathbb{E}[T]), m_h(\mathbb{E}[T])\} \right\}. \quad (108)$$

We see that on the event E'_μ , $\min\{m_e(\mathbb{E}[T]), m_h(\mathbb{E}[T])\} - |\hat{\mu} - \mu(\mathbb{E}[T])|$ is non-negative. As a result, the intersection of events $E'_{\hat{v},j}$ and E'_μ can be re-written as

$$(\theta \hat{v}_j - v_j(\mathbb{E}[T]))^2 \geq (\min\{m_e(\mathbb{E}[T]), m_h(\mathbb{E}[T])\} - |\hat{\mu} - \mu(\mathbb{E}[T])|)^2.$$

Using this expression for the right hand side in (107) with using the law of total probability we write,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(\eta > t) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\left\{\frac{1}{d}\sum_j \mathbf{1}(E'_{\hat{v}_j, c}) \geq t\right\} \cap E'_\mu\right) + \mathbb{P}(E_\mu^c) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\left\{\sum_j (\theta\hat{v}_j - v_j(\mathbb{E}[T]))^2 \geq td(\min\{m_e(\mathbb{E}[T]), m_h(\mathbb{E}[T])\} - |\hat{\mu} - \mu|)^2\right\} \cap E'_\mu\right) + \mathbb{P}(E_\mu^c) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\left\{\|\theta\hat{v} - v(\mathbb{E}[T])\|_2 \geq \sqrt{td}|\min\{m_e(\mathbb{E}[T]), m_h(\mathbb{E}[T])\} - |\hat{\mu} - \mu||\right\} \cap E'_\mu\right) + \mathbb{P}(E_\mu^c) \\
&\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\left\{\|\theta\hat{v} - v(\mathbb{E}[T])\|_2 \geq \sqrt{td}\frac{\min\{m_e(\mathbb{E}[T]), m_h(\mathbb{E}[T])\}}{2}\right\}\right) + \mathbb{P}(E_\mu^c).
\end{aligned}$$

Next, we apply the relation (92) to obtain an upper bound on the probability of the event E_μ^c ,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(E_\mu^c) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\min_{\theta \in \{-1, +1\}} \|v(\mathbb{E}[T]) - \theta\hat{v}\|_2 \geq \sqrt{d}\frac{\min\{m_e(\mathbb{E}[T]), m_h(\mathbb{E}[T])\}}{2}\right) \quad (109) \\
&\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \mathbb{P}\left(\min_{\theta \in \{-1, +1\}} \|v(\mathbb{E}[T]) - \theta\hat{v}\|_2 \geq \sqrt{td}\frac{\min\{m_e(\mathbb{E}[T]), m_h(\mathbb{E}[T])\}}{2}\right)
\end{aligned}$$

where, (a) follows due to $t \in [0, 1]$.

Putting it together, after applying the l_2 eigenvector concentration in Lemma H.1 we arrive at the inequality:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbb{P}(\eta > t) &\leq 2\mathbb{P}\left(\min_{\theta \in \{-1, +1\}} \|v(\mathbb{E}[T]) - \theta\hat{v}\|_2 \geq \sqrt{td}\frac{\min\{m_e(\mathbb{E}[T]), m_h(\mathbb{E}[T])\}}{2}\right) \\
&\leq 4d \exp\left(-C_6 n \frac{(\lambda_1(\mathbb{E}[T]) - \lambda_2(\mathbb{E}[T]))^2}{d} \min\{m_e(\mathbb{E}[T]), m_h(\mathbb{E}[T])\}^2 t\right), \quad (110)
\end{aligned}$$

where $C_6 = 2^{-8}$. We can simplify the above right hand side by giving a lower bound on the quantity $\min\{m_e(\mathbb{E}[T])d^{1/2}, m_h(\mathbb{E}[T])d^{1/2}\}$ as follows : From the definition of $m_e(\mathbb{E}[T])$ and $m_h(\mathbb{E}[T])$ in equations (102) and (103),

$$\begin{aligned}
\min\{m_e(\mathbb{E}[T])d^{1/2}, m_h(\mathbb{E}[T])d^{1/2}\} &= \min\left\{\frac{d_h}{d} \frac{\|\gamma\| - 1}{\sqrt{d_e\gamma^2 + d_h}} d^{1/2}, \frac{d_e}{d} \frac{\|\gamma\| - 1}{\sqrt{d_e\gamma^2 + d_h}} d^{1/2}, 1\right\} \\
&= \min\left\{\frac{\alpha\|\gamma\| - 1}{\sqrt{\alpha\gamma^2 + (1 - \alpha)}}, \frac{(1 - \alpha)\|\gamma\| - 1}{\sqrt{\alpha\gamma^2 + (1 - \alpha)}}, 1\right\} \\
&\geq \min\{\alpha, 1 - \alpha\} \frac{\|\gamma\| - 1}{\sqrt{\gamma^2 + 1}}
\end{aligned}$$

Applying the above lower bound on the equation (110), we get,

$$\mathbb{P}(\eta > t) \leq \begin{cases} 4d \exp\left(-C_6 \left(\sigma(\mathbb{E}[T]) \min\{\alpha, 1 - \alpha\} \frac{\|\gamma\| - 1}{\sqrt{\gamma^2 + 1}}\right)^2 nt\right) & \text{when } r_e^\top r_h \neq 0 \\ 4d \exp(-C_6 (\sigma(\mathbb{E}[T]) \min\{\alpha, 1 - \alpha\})^2 nt) & \text{when } r_e^\top r_h = 0 \end{cases} \quad (111)$$

Remark H.4. Recall, the perfect clustering Theorem 3.12 assumes the non-collinearity between r_e and r_h , whereas, the result in Theorem 4.1 works without this assumption. It is an interesting problem to find out if perfect clustering is achievable even when r_e and r_h are collinear.

We acknowledge that the l_2 concentration from Lemma H.1 implies l_∞ concentration in the following sense:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}\left(\min_{\theta \in \{\pm 1\}} \|v(\mathbb{E}[T]) - \theta \hat{v}\|_\infty \geq t\right) &\leq \mathbb{P}\left(\min_{\theta \in \{\pm 1\}} \|v(\mathbb{E}[T]) - \theta \hat{v}\|_2 \geq t\right) \\ &\leq 2d \exp\left(-C_6 \frac{n(\lambda_1(\mathbb{E}[T]) - \lambda_2(\mathbb{E}[T]))^2}{d^2} t^2\right). \end{aligned}$$

For an event of perfect clustering, one sufficient and straightforward condition is that l_∞ error $\min_{\theta \in \{\pm 1\}} \|v(\mathbb{E}[T]) - \theta \hat{v}\|_\infty$ is restricted by a order $\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}$ quantity $\min(m_e(\mathbb{E}[T]), m_h(\mathbb{E}[T]))$ ⁵. But, as the eigenvalues grow linearly with d , the tail bound above results in a vacuous clustering performance when $d = \Omega(n)$ because of the n/d exponent when $t = O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}\right)$. In our problem setting where n workers label $d = \Omega(n)$ tasks, the above argument is insufficient to conclude that all tasks are clustered correctly for a large number of workers even when r_e and r_h are collinear.

⁵Recall, $\mu(\mathbb{E}[T])$, $\mu_e(\mathbb{E}[T])$ and $\mu_h(\mathbb{E}[T])$ are of order $\frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}$