

# A Review of Pseudo-Labeling for Computer Vision

**Patrick Kage\***

P.KAGE@ED.AC.UK

*School of Informatics, The University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK*

**Jay C. Rothenberger\***

JAY.C.ROTHENBERGER@OU.EDU

*School of Computer Science, The University of Oklahoma, Norman OK, USA*

**Pavlos Andreadis**

PAVLOS.ANDREADIS@ED.AC.UK

*School of Informatics, The University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK*

**Dimitrios I. Diochnos**

DIOCHNOS@OU.EDU

*School of Computer Science, The University of Oklahoma, Norman OK, USA*

## Abstract

Deep neural models have achieved state of the art performance on a wide range of problems in computer science, especially in computer vision. However, deep neural networks often require large datasets of labeled samples to generalize effectively, and an important area of active research is *semi-supervised learning*, which attempts to instead utilize large quantities of (easily acquired) unlabeled samples. One family of methods in this space is *pseudo-labeling*, a class of algorithms that use model outputs to assign labels to unlabeled samples which are then used as labeled samples during training. Such assigned labels, called *pseudo-labels*, are most commonly associated with the field of semi-supervised learning. In this work we explore a broader interpretation of pseudo-labels within both self-supervised and unsupervised methods. By drawing the connection between these areas we identify new directions when advancements in one area would likely benefit others, such as curriculum learning and self-supervised regularization.

## 1. Introduction

Deep neural networks have emerged as transformative tools especially in natural language processing and computer vision due to their impressive performance on a broad spectrum of tasks requiring generalization. However, a significant limitation of these systems is their requirement for a large set of labeled data for training. This becomes particularly challenging in niche domains such as scientific fields where human annotation requires domain experts, making the dataset curation process laborious and often prohibitively expensive. This review will focus on a specific methodology within semi-supervised learning, *pseudo-labeling* (PL), and explore its applications within unsupervised learning as well. In Figure 1 we provide a taxonomy of PL.

*Semi-supervised learning* (SSL) aims to address the missing-labeling problem by introducing strategies to incorporate unlabeled samples into the training process, allowing for training with only a small percentage of labeled samples [Amini, Feofanov, Pauletto, Devijver, and Maximov \(2022\)](#); [Chapelle, Schölkopf, and Zien \(2006\)](#); [Ouali, Hudelot, and Tami \(2020\)](#); [Pise and Kulkarni \(2008\)](#); [Prakash and Nithya \(2014\)](#); [van Engelen and Hoos \(2020\)](#); [Yang, Song, King, and Xu \(2023\)](#); [Yang et al. \(2023\)](#); [X. Zhu and Goldberg \(2009\)](#). In recent years

---

\*. Equal contribution.




Figure 1: Family tree of pseudo-labeling methods. Please see Appendix A.1 for a table with section links and references.

so-called “scaling laws” indicate that more data and larger models lead to better performance, thus driven by a demand for data to train ever-larger models SSL has become an important focus of research within the machine learning research community.

*Pseudo-labels* (also known as *proxy labels*) have primarily been considered in the context of SSL. However, pseudo-labeling can also be seen across sub-fields of *unsupervised learning* (UL) as well, particularly *self-supervised learning* Caron et al. (2020) and *knowledge distillation* Hinton, Vinyals, and Dean (2015). We present a new definition of pseudo-labels which unifies these different areas.

In this analysis, we investigate the ways in which PL techniques across SSL and UL compare and contrast with each other. We show that PL techniques largely share one or more of the following characteristics: self-sharpening, where a single model is used to create the pseudo-label from a single view of a set of data points; multi-view learning, where single samples are represented in multiple ways to promote learning generalizable patterns; multi-model learning, where multiple models are used during the learning process (e.g., in a student-teacher setting). We outline directions for future work that lie at the intersection of these areas, and directions illuminated in one area by considering established methods in the other.

Pseudo-labeling was first applied to deep learning for computer vision in Lee (2013). Most techniques within SSL improve on this paper; see Figure 1. In Lee (2013), it is argued that PL is equivalent to *entropy minimization* (EM), maximizing the margin of the decision boundary in a classification problem by ensuring examples with similar labels lie close to each other on the underlying data manifold, and far from other examples. Though not explicitly mentioned in Lee (2013), this is an effect of two of the three assumptions inherent to SSL regimes: the *low density separation assumption* that samples are embedded in high-density

regions separated by low-density regions and the *cluster assumption* that points within high density regions share the same class label [Chapelle et al. \(2006\)](#).<sup>1</sup>

Subsequently, the literature [Berthelot, Carlini, Cubuk, et al. \(2019\)](#); [Berthelot, Carlini, Goodfellow, et al. \(2019\)](#); [Cascante-Bonilla, Tan, Qi, and Ordonez \(2020\)](#); [Isken, Tolias, Avrithis, and Chum \(2019\)](#); [Miyato, Maeda, Koyama, and Ishii \(2019\)](#); [Shi et al. \(2018\)](#); [Sohn et al. \(2020\)](#); [Xie, Dai, Hovy, Luong, and Le \(2019\)](#); [T. Zhou, Wang, and Bilmes \(2020\)](#) includes the notion of *consistency regularization* (CR), in which examples that have been slightly perturbed (e.g., by an augmentation or adversarial additive perturbation) should lie close together in any embedding space or output distribution space produced by the model. CR and EM form strong theoretical arguments for PL with techniques using the average of predicted probabilities for augmentations to assign pseudo-labels to achieve *curriculum learning* (CL) and most approaches choosing to assign “hard” (one-hot) pseudo-labels to examples to encourage EM [Berthelot, Carlini, Cubuk, et al. \(2019\)](#); [Berthelot, Carlini, Goodfellow, et al. \(2019\)](#); [Sohn et al. \(2020\)](#); [B. Zhang et al. \(2021\)](#); [T. Zhou et al. \(2020\)](#).

Pseudo-labels have been applied in sub-fields of unsupervised learning including self-supervised learning [Balestriero et al. \(2023\)](#); [Caron et al. \(2020, 2021\)](#); [T. Chen, Kornblith, Norouzi, and Hinton \(2020\)](#); [Jia et al. \(2021\)](#); [C. Li et al. \(2022\)](#); [Radford et al. \(2021\)](#); [Zhai, Mustafa, Kolesnikov, and Beyer \(2023\)](#), adversarial training [Miyato et al. \(2019\)](#); [Xie et al. \(2019\)](#), and knowledge distillation [Duval, Misra, and Ballas \(2023\)](#); [Hinton et al. \(2015\)](#); [Lopes, Fenu, and Starner \(2017\)](#); [Wen, Lai, and Qian \(2021\)](#); [L. Zhang et al. \(2019\)](#). These sub-fields are not traditionally considered pseudo-labeling, but they all make use of one or more neural networks which provide some notion of supervision. In some cases, this supervision corresponds to an approximation of a ground truth classification function [Hinton et al. \(2015\)](#); [Miyato et al. \(2019\)](#); [Wen et al. \(2021\)](#); [Xie et al. \(2019\)](#); [L. Zhang et al. \(2019\)](#), in some cases this supervision serves only to transfer knowledge from one network (sometimes referred to as the teacher) to another (student) network [Caron et al. \(2021\)](#); [Duval et al. \(2023\)](#); [Hinton et al. \(2015\)](#); [Lopes et al. \(2017\)](#); [Wen et al. \(2021\)](#); [Zhai et al. \(2023\)](#); [L. Zhang et al. \(2019\)](#), and in some cases two (sometimes identical) models provide labels to a batch of samples which are optimized to have certain properties.

We begin by establishing a formal framework to describe . The following sections give an overview of PL approaches organized by supervision regime, mechanism of regularization used, and by model architectures (see [Figure 1](#)). Following these sections we discuss commonalities between these techniques and directions for future work.

## 2. Preliminaries

Before we proceed with our presentation we give some definitions and background that can make the rest of the presentation easier and clearer.

### 2.1 Elementary Definitions and Notation

The set of all real numbers is denoted by  $\mathbb{R}$  and the set of non-negative real numbers is denoted by  $\mathbb{R}_+$ . The interval of real numbers  $[0, 1]$  is denoted by  $\Delta$ . Other sets are denoted with

---

1. The third assumption is the *manifold assumption*, which states that high-dimensional data lies on a low(er)-dimensional manifold embedded within that space [Chapelle et al. \(2006\)](#). This is equivalent to saying the dimensionality of the data can be reduced.

capital calligraphic letters (e.g.,  $\mathcal{A}$ ), whereas the empty set is denoted by  $\emptyset$ . The cardinality of a set is denoted by  $|\mathcal{A}|$  and indicates how many elements the set  $\mathcal{A}$  contains. The Cartesian product of two sets  $\mathcal{A}$  and  $\mathcal{B}$  is denoted by  $\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{B}$  and allows us to create pairs (or higher order tuples when we use it multiple times). The function  $\mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{A}\}$  is the indicator function that returns 1 if the event  $\mathcal{A}$  is true and 0 otherwise. Vectors are denoted with boldface lowercase letters; e.g.,  $\mathbf{a} = \begin{pmatrix} 1.5 \\ 2.0 \end{pmatrix}$  is a vector in  $\mathbb{R}^2$ , while  $\mathbf{a}^T = (1.5, 2.0)$  is the *transpose* of  $\mathbf{a}$ . The

*inner product* of vectors  $\mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{R}^n$  is denoted by  $\langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \rangle$ ; that is,  $\langle \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} \rangle = \mathbf{a}^T \mathbf{b} = \sum_{i=1}^n a_i b_i$ . For a function  $f$  that depends on several variables, the *gradient*  $\nabla f$  is the vector of its partial

derivatives; that is, for a vector  $\mathbf{x} = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \\ \vdots \\ x_n \end{pmatrix}$  we have  $\nabla f(\mathbf{x}) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1}(\mathbf{x}) \\ \vdots \\ \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_n}(\mathbf{x}) \end{pmatrix}$ . While the order of

the elements in a set does not matter, the order of elements in tuples matters. For example,  $\{2, 3\} = \{3, 2\}$  but  $(2, 3) \neq (3, 2)$ . An important operator on tuples is one that allows us to obtain an element that exists at a particular location in the tuple; that is, the *projection* operator  $\text{proj}_i(\cdot)$ . For example, let  $A = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$  be a tuple that has  $n$  elements  $a_1, \dots, a_n$  in that order. Then,  $\text{proj}_i(A) = \text{proj}_i((a_1, \dots, a_n)) = a_i$ .

## 2.2 Fuzzy Partitions

Fuzzy sets have the property that elements of the universe of discourse  $\Omega$  belong to sets with some *degree of membership* that is quantified by some real number in the interval  $\Delta = [0, 1]$ . For this reason a function  $m: \Omega \rightarrow [0, 1]$  is used so that  $m(\omega)$  expresses the *grade* (or, *extent*) to which an  $\omega \in \Omega$  belongs to a particular set. The function  $m = \mu_{\mathcal{A}}$  is called the *membership function* of the fuzzy set  $\mathcal{A}$ . Such a fuzzy set  $\mathcal{A}$  is usually defined as  $\mathcal{A} = (\Omega, \mu_{\mathcal{A}})$  and is denoted as  $\mathcal{A} = \{\mu_{\mathcal{A}}(\omega)/\omega \mid \omega \in \Omega\}$ .

**Example 1** (Illustration of a Fuzzy Set). *Let  $\mathcal{X}$  be the universe of discourse with just four elements; i.e.,  $\mathcal{X} = \{a, b, c, d\}$ . Then,  $\mathcal{S}_1 = \{0.4/a, 0.1/b, 0.0/c, 1.0/d\}$  is a fuzzy set on  $\mathcal{X}$ .*

The intention is to treat the “belongingness” numbers as probabilities that the various elements have for being members of particular sets. In our case we will assume that there is a predetermined number of fuzzy sets  $\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_k$ , for some  $k \geq 2$  and these will correspond to the  $k$  hard labels that are available in a classification problem (more below). Along these lines, an important notion is that of a *fuzzy partition*, which we will use to define pseudo-labeling precisely.

**Definition 1** (Fuzzy Partition). *Let  $k \geq 2$ . Let  $\mathcal{I} = \{1, \dots, k\}$ . Let  $\mathcal{Q} = (\mathcal{S}_1, \dots, \mathcal{S}_k)$  be a finite family where for each  $i \in \mathcal{I}$ ,  $\mathcal{S}_i$  is a fuzzy set and  $\mu_{\mathcal{S}_i}$  is its corresponding membership function. Then,  $\mathcal{Q}$  is a fuzzy partition if and only if it holds that  $(\forall x \in \mathcal{X}) [\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \mu_{\mathcal{S}_i}(x) = 1]$ .*

**Example 2** (Illustration of a Fuzzy Partition). *Let  $\mathcal{I} = \{1, 2, 3\}$ . Let  $\mathcal{X} = \{a, b, c, d\}$  and consider the following fuzzy sets*

$$\begin{cases} \mathcal{S}_1 & = \{ 0.4/a, 0.1/b, 0.0/c, 1.0/d \} \\ \mathcal{S}_2 & = \{ 0.3/a, 0.6/b, 0.6/c, 0.0/d \} \\ \mathcal{S}_3 & = \{ 0.3/a, 0.3/b, 0.4/c, 0.0/d \} \end{cases}$$

The above family of fuzzy sets  $\mathcal{S}_1, \mathcal{S}_2, \mathcal{S}_3$  together with the corresponding membership functions  $\mu_{\mathcal{S}_1}, \mu_{\mathcal{S}_2}, \mu_{\mathcal{S}_3}$  whose values are shown in the equation on display, provides a fuzzy partition since, for every  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ , it holds that  $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \mu_{\mathcal{S}_i}(x) = 1$ .

More information on fuzzy sets is available at [Ruspini \(1969\)](#); [Zadeh \(1965\)](#).

### 2.3 Machine Learning Notions

We use  $\mathcal{X}$  to denote the *instance space* (or, *sample space*) and  $\mathcal{Y}$  the *label space*. We care about classification problems in which case it holds that  $|\mathcal{Y}| = k$ ; that is there are  $k$  labels (*categories*).

Instances will typically have *dimension*  $n$ . For example,  $\mathbf{x}^T = (1.2, 2.1, 3.2)$  is an instance (in particular, a vector) of dimension  $n = 3$ , where the instance space in this case is the set of all vectors of dimension 3; i.e.,  $\mathcal{X} = \mathbb{R}^3$ . An *example*  $(\mathbf{x}, y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$  is a *labeled instance*. We denote an *unlabeled dataset* with  $\mathcal{D}_U$ ; e.g.,  $\mathcal{D}_U = (\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m)$  is an unlabeled dataset composed of  $m$  instances. If in addition, we have the true labels of all these instances, then we are working with a *labeled dataset* denoted with  $\mathcal{D}_L$ ; e.g.,  $\mathcal{D}_L = ((\mathbf{x}_1, y_1), \dots, (\mathbf{x}_m, y_m))$  is a labeled dataset with  $m$  examples.

Given access to datasets  $\mathcal{D}_U$  and  $\mathcal{D}_L$ , the goal of learning is to develop a *model*  $f$  that approximates well some underlying phenomenon that maps the instance space  $\mathcal{X}$  to the label space  $\mathcal{Y}$ . Examples of this behavior that we want to learn are contained in  $\mathcal{D}_L$  and additional instances are available in  $\mathcal{D}_U$ . Typically the model that we want to learn has trainable parameters  $\theta$  that govern its predictions and for this reason we may write the model as  $f_\theta$  so that this dependence on  $\theta$  is explicit. For example,  $\theta$  can be the set of coefficients in a logistic regression model; that is,  $f_\theta(\mathbf{x}) = \sigma(\langle \theta, \mathbf{x} \rangle) = \sigma(\theta_0 + \theta_1 x_1 + \dots + \theta_n x_n)$ , where  $\sigma(\cdot)$  is the sigmoid function  $\sigma(z) = \frac{1}{1+e^{-z}}$ . In our work  $f$  is going to be an artificial neural network (ANN) and  $\theta$  will be a vector corresponding to all its trainable parameters (e.g.,  $f$  is a feed-forward multi-layer artificial neural network and  $\theta$  is the vector of all the weights on the network). The space of all possible functions  $f_\theta$  that correspond to all the possible parameterizations  $\theta$  is called the *model space* and is denoted by  $\mathcal{F}$ .

A model  $f_\theta \in \mathcal{F}$  improves (trains) its parameters  $\theta$  via *supervision*. Learning proceeds by iteratively sampling some example  $(x, y) \in \mathcal{D}_L$  and making a prediction  $\hat{y} = f_\theta(x)$  on the sampled instance  $x$  and comparing that prediction  $\hat{y}$  with the true label  $y$  that was seen on the sampled example. Ultimately, supervision is achieved by providing feedback to the model as to how good the prediction  $\hat{y}$  was with respect to  $y$ . This is accomplished via a *loss function*  $\lambda: \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ . For example, the *0-1 loss* (or, *misclassification loss*)  $\lambda_{0-1}$  is defined as  $\lambda_{0-1}(f(x), y) = \mathbb{1}\{f(x) \neq y\}$ . This loss function is very natural in *classification* problems when the model  $f$  predicts one of the  $k$  labels.

However, ANNs on some input  $\mathbf{x}$  typically output a tuple  $p_{\mathbf{x}} \in \Delta^k$ , where  $\text{proj}_i(p_{\mathbf{x}})$  is the probability that  $\mathbf{x}$  belongs to the class with label  $i$ . In other words, the ANN on input  $\mathbf{x}$  defines the values of the membership functions  $\mu_{\mathcal{Y}_i}$  for the sets (labels)  $\mathcal{Y}_i$ , for  $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ . Therefore,  $p_{\mathbf{x}} = (p_1, \dots, p_k) = (\mu_{\mathcal{Y}_1}, \dots, \mu_{\mathcal{Y}_k})$ . Furthermore, for every input  $\mathbf{x}$  and respective output  $p_{\mathbf{x}}$  it holds that  $\sum_{i=1}^k p_i = 1$  *regardless* of the parameters  $\theta$  that govern the ANN. As a consequence from the discussion of Section 2.2, for *every* parameter vector  $\theta$ , the model  $f_\theta$  defines a *fuzzy partition*. In this context of making probabilistic predictions, a more useful loss function is *cross-entropy* (or, *log-loss*)  $\lambda_{CE}$ . The cross-entropy

$\lambda_{CE}$  penalizes the model inversely proportional to the probability of membership of the input in the correct class. Even though defining loss functions to have the form  $\lambda: \mathcal{Y} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  is a very natural approach and makes the discussion easier in many cases, one cannot have access to the confidence of the predictions made by a model  $f$ . For this reason, loss functions can be defined as  $\lambda: \mathcal{F} \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$  and now access to more intrinsic mechanics of  $f$  are available to the loss function  $\ell$  and therefore the loss function can provide a penalty that is appropriate for the confidence of the prediction of  $f$ ; e.g., when misclassifying an input  $\mathbf{x}$  with confidence 0.8 and another input  $\mathbf{x}'$  with confidence 0.3, the penalty due to the misclassification of  $\mathbf{x}$  should be larger. Depending on the context we may adopt one or the other definition of loss functions so that the presentation is clearer and as simple and intuitive as possible. Coming back to the cross-entropy loss, with this new formulation where  $\lambda$  accepts three arguments, letting the tuple  $p_{\mathbf{x}}$  be  $f_{\theta}(\mathbf{x}) = p_{\mathbf{x}} = (p_1, \dots, p_k)$  we have  $\lambda_{CE}(f, x, y) = -\sum_{i=1}^k \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{Y}_i = y\} \cdot \log(p_i) = -\sum_{i=1}^k \mathbb{1}\{\mathcal{Y}_i = y\} \cdot \log(\text{proj}_i(p_{\mathbf{x}}))$ . We assume familiarity with artificial neural networks. However, the interested reader can find more information in a plethora of resources, including, e.g., (Géron, 2022; James, Witten, Hastie, Tibshirani, & Taylor, 2023; Mitchell, 1997; Shalev-Shwartz & Ben-David, 2014). To illustrate the relevance of the Definition 1, we present an example from the first deep learning application of pseudo-labeling Lee (2013). Lee utilizes a neural network to perform image classification, which we will call  $f_{\theta}$ . The neural network defines a fuzzy partition. For each classification problem there is an input space of images  $\mathcal{X}$  and a number of target classes  $k$ . For  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  we have  $f_{\theta}(x) \in \Delta^k$  and each position of the vector  $f_{\theta}(x)$  represents a class probability, or equivalently membership in a fuzzy set  $\mathcal{S}_i$ . Note that as training proceeds this network might be updated, but will continue to provide pseudo-supervision.

Oftentimes it is the case that the model may receive a more complicated penalty for its prediction. A simple reason can be that of *regularization* where a penalty term may be applied to the magnitude of the parameters  $\theta$ . The two main ideas behind regularization is that on one hand it may improve the predictive accuracy of a model as it does not allow the model to overfit the dataset  $\mathcal{D}_L$  and on the other hand it may promote interpretability as the magnitude of the individual  $\theta_i$ 's will indicate which variables have a larger amount of say for various predictions. Discussion of regularization is beyond the scope of the current work, but the interested reader may find lots of useful resources (James et al., 2023; Mohri, Rostamizadeh, & Talwalkar, 2018; Shalev-Shwartz & Ben-David, 2014). Along these lines the *average supervised loss*  $\ell_S$  that a model may receive on a dataset  $\mathcal{D}_L$  is  $\ell_S(f_{\theta}, \mathcal{D}_L) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}_L|} \sum_{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) \in \mathcal{D}_L} \lambda_{CE}(f_{\theta}, \mathbf{x}_i, y_i) + \alpha \|\theta\|_2$  which penalizes the model not only for its predictions on the dataset  $\mathcal{D}_L$  using the cross entropy loss, but also using an  $\ell_2$ -norm for the magnitude of the model parameters that were used for the predictions (weighted by some hyper-parameter  $\alpha$ ). Throughout the paper we are using  $\ell$  with some appropriate subscript (e.g.,  $\ell_S$  as in the example above) to denote a penalty that is aggregated over some dataset (e.g.,  $\mathcal{D}_L$ ) and the subscript will have appropriate meaning depending on the context.

Having said the above, the *cumulative loss*  $\mathcal{L}$  that a model may suffer on its predictions may be a function of more than one loss components  $\ell$ . This is very relevant to our discussion as it is related to the use of the unlabeled dataset  $\mathcal{D}_U$  beyond the use of the labeled set  $\mathcal{D}_L$ . Semi-supervised learning makes explicit use of unlabeled data. On one hand they are easier to obtain as no labeling is needed and on the other hand such instances provide more information about the distribution that governs the instance space  $\mathcal{X}$ . Hence, when a model

is trained in a semi-supervised framework, a loss component on the use of the data available in  $\mathcal{D}_U$  is needed either because penalties need to be applied depending on how dissimilar certain instances are with respect to the label that is being predicted for them, or because the model needs to predict labels that are truly unknown and proceed with learning using such inferred labels. We will see examples of such approaches and respective loss functions in the following sections. In general such a (final) cumulative loss  $\mathcal{L}(f_\theta, \mathcal{D}_L, \mathcal{D}_U)$  will typically be a function of some supervised loss component  $\ell_S$  and some unsupervised loss component  $\ell_U$  where the components  $\ell_S$  and  $\ell_U$  provide average loss over some datasets and can potentially include penalty components for regularization purposes.

Table 1 provides a quick summary of some important notation that we have introduced.

Table 1: Main Notations

Notation	Meaning
$\mathcal{X}$	The instance space, a set which contains all samples
$\mathcal{Y}$	The label space ( $ \mathcal{Y}  = k$ )
$\mathcal{D}_U$	Unlabeled dataset
$\mathcal{D}_L$	Labeled dataset
$(\mathbf{x}, y)$	An instance $\mathbf{x}$ and label $y$ pair, usually drawn from $\mathcal{D}_L$
$\theta$	The parameters of a neural network flattened to a vector
$f_\theta(\cdot)$	A learnt model governed by parameters $\theta$
$\mathcal{F}$	Model space; the set of all possible models $f$ that a learner can output
$\nabla$	The gradient operator
$\lambda$	Loss function applied on predicted labels for individual instances
$\ell$	Loss incurred on a dataset; individual predictions are penalized using $\lambda$
$\mathcal{L}$	Cumulative loss that typically has more than one $\ell$ -component

With all the above definitions, in our context, a *supervised learning problem* is specified by the tuple  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D}_L)$ , whereas a *semi-supervised learning problem* is specified by the tuple  $(\mathcal{X}, \mathcal{Y}, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{D}_L, \mathcal{D}_U)$ .

### 2.3.1 DEEPER DISCUSSION ON LABELS

Below we provide more information on how labels and pseudo-labels.

**Definition 2** (Stochastic Labels). *Let  $|\mathcal{Y}| = k$ . Stochastic labels are vectors  $y \in \Delta^k$  where the positions of the vector defines a probability distribution over the classes  $\mathcal{Y}_i \in \mathcal{Y}$  e.g.,  $y = (p_1, \dots, p_k)$ .*

This idea of stochastic labels is very natural as the output of ANNs almost always has the form shown above. However, this notion also makes sense without even considering predictions of a model, but rather allowing instances to have fuzzy membership in different classes; see, e.g., (H. Zhang, Cissé, Dauphin, & Lopez-Paz, 2018).

**Definition 3** (Pseudo-Labels). *Given a fuzzy partition  $\mathcal{Q}$  over  $\mathcal{X}$ , pseudo-labels are vectors  $y \in \Delta^k$  where each position of the vector defines the probability of membership in a unique*

fuzzy set in  $\mathcal{Q}$  (corresponding to a label), but which were not specified as part of the learning problem. For some instance  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  we have  $y = (\mu_{S_1}(x), \dots, \mu_{S_k}(x))$ . We write  $y = \mathcal{Q}(x)$ .

In our example pseudo-labels take the form  $f_\theta(x)$  for some  $x$ . These values are ideally indistinguishable from real labels, so they may be one-hot. It may also be that a pseudo-label is identical to the ground truth label for the same point. The difference between the two in that case is only that the available partition was used to generate the label.

**Definition 4** (Pseudo-Labeling). *Utilizing pseudo-labels generated by at least one fuzzy partition  $\mathcal{Q}$  of the input space  $\mathcal{X}$  inferred from only instances and ground truth labels to provide supervision during the training of a machine learning algorithm is called pseudo-labeling.*

In other words, pseudo-labelling is the process of generating/infering Stochastic Labels. In our example the fuzzy class partition defined by  $f_\theta$  is used to assign pseudo-labels to unseen instances which are then used to optimize the network further.

**Definition 5** (Pseudo-Examples). *Pseudo-labeled examples are tuples  $(x, \mathcal{Q}(x))$ .*

The examples that are formed by the tuples of instances and pseudo-labels are the pseudo-examples which are used during retraining.

### 2.3.2 DATA AUGMENTATION

Data augmentation is a common technique across multiple branches of machine learning disciplines, broadly attempting to generate a set of derivative samples  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}$  from a single sample  $\mathbf{x}$  by modifying the sample in some way. Augmenting samples can help normalize skewed sample class counts by artificially inflating a rare subclass [Shorten and Khoshgoftaar \(2019\)](#), and are used within many unsupervised learning methods to generate distinct samples that are known to be similar for consistency regularization (discussed in [Section 4](#)). These augmentations vary by implementation, but generally fall into one of the following categories [Shorten and Khoshgoftaar \(2019\)](#): *flipping* (flips the image 180 degrees along the horizontal or vertical axes), *color manipulation* (Alters the color information of the image), *cropping* (randomly crops the image), *affine transformations* (rotates, translates, or shears the image), *noise injection* (add random noise to the image), *kernel filters* (applies e.g. a Sobel filter over the image), or random masking (blanks out a section of the image).

## 3. Semi-Supervised Regimes

The classic formulation of PL techniques as applied to deep neural networks is defined in [Lee \(2013\)](#), where PL is presented as a fine-tuning stage in addition to normal training. At a high level, the model  $f_\theta$  is initially trained over samples from the labeled set  $\mathcal{D}_L$ , and after a fixed number of epochs  $\theta$  is frozen and pseudo-examples derived from  $f_\theta$  and  $\mathcal{D}_U$  are added into the training steps, yielding an effective SSL technique. We use the symbol  $f_{\theta'}$  to denote the model trained using the pseudo-examples.

More specifically, this formulation of PL derives labels for samples drawn  $\mathcal{D}_U$  by “sharpening” the predictions of the partially-trained network, effectively reinforcing the partially-trained model’s “best guess” for a particular sample. The loss function  $\mathcal{L}$  optimized has a



supervised component  $\ell_S$  and a nearly-identical unsupervised component  $\ell_U$ ; in every case cross-entropy loss is used to penalize the model’s predictions against, respectively, the true labels, or the pseudo-labels obtained by the sharpening process:

$$\mathcal{L} = \underset{\text{supervised}}{\ell_S(y, f(\mathbf{x}_S))} + \alpha(t) \underset{\text{unsupervised}}{\ell_U(f_\theta(\mathbf{x}_U), f_{\theta'}(\mathbf{x}_U))} \quad (1)$$

Crucially, the unsupervised segment is moderated by  $\alpha(t)$  an epoch-determined annealment parameter. This starts at zero and then ramps linearly up to a ceiling value. According to Lee (2013) careful consideration is required in choosing the scheduling of  $\alpha$ , as setting it too high will disturb training of labeled data and too low will not have an impact on the training process at all.

This is the basic foundation upon which most fine-tuning PL papers are built. The remainder of this section presents modifications and improvements to this formulation. It should be clear from the previous sections how this fits into our new definition for pseudo-labeling. Clearly, the unsupervised portion of the loss is computed through the use of an inferred fuzzy partition (defined by the weights of the model trained so far). In the case of hard pseudo-labels the membership probabilities are one-hot, and in the case of soft pseudo-labels they may not be. Lee (2013) evaluates adding a denoising variational autoencoder in order to simplify the representations of the samples in both datasets  $\mathcal{D}_L$  and  $\mathcal{D}_U$  to boost the performance of the PL steps. For example, assigning sharpened labels to samples drawn from  $\mathcal{D}_U$  can make the training objective unstable when pseudo-labeling some unlabeled samples changes dramatically from one weight update to the next Arazo, Ortego, Albert, O’Connor, and McGuinness (2020). Consequently, one of the primary focuses of work in this direction is how to best choose the pseudo-labels or examples such that training progresses advantageously.

### 3.1 Sample Scheduling

An inherent prerequisite to solving the problem of generating pseudo-labels for samples is determining for *which* samples to generate pseudo-labels. The precise sample schedule can greatly impact the performance of the final pseudo-labeling algorithm Arazo et al. (2020). Across the literature, a variety of techniques have been proposed as improvements to Lee (2013) by altering the manner in which unlabeled instances are selected and how pseudo-labels are assigned to them.

#### 3.1.1 RANDOM SELECTION

The simplest way to choose unlabeled samples to label is to sample them randomly from the unlabeled set. With this method of selection it is assumed that the unlabeled data follow the same distribution as the labeled data, which may not be realistic in the real world thus leading to poor generalization ability of the final model.

Pseudo-labeling techniques are vulnerable to *confirmation bias*, where initially-wrong predictions are reinforced by the PL process Arazo et al. (2020). One solution is to reduce the confidence of the network predictions overall Arazo et al. (2020). This is a feature of *MixMatch* Berthelot, Carlini, Goodfellow, et al. (2019), a hybrid PL technique combining several dominant methods within the SSL space with the goal of preventing overconfident

predictions. MixMatch consists of several steps: a *data augmentation* step, a *label guessing* step (the PL component), and a *sample mixing* step. First, a batch of samples is drawn from both the labeled set  $\mathcal{X} \subset \mathcal{D}_L$  and the unlabeled set  $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{D}_U$ . Samples from  $\mathcal{X}$  are then replaced with stochastically-augmented versions to form  $\hat{\mathcal{X}}$ , and samples from  $\mathcal{U}$  are replaced by  $K$  augmentations of the each sample to form  $\hat{\mathcal{U}}$ . Samples from  $\mathcal{U}$  are pseudo-labeled based on the sharpened average of the model’s predictions for all  $K$  augmentations of each sample. Finally, these samples are then shuffled and mixed using MixUp [Berthelot, Carlini, Goodfellow, et al. \(2019\)](#); [H. Zhang et al. \(2018\)](#) to yield two mixed distributions  $\mathcal{X}', \mathcal{U}'$  containing labeled and unlabeled samples.

*ReMixMatch* [Berthelot, Carlini, Cubuk, et al. \(2019\)](#) was proposed with two additional concepts on top of MixMatch: *distribution alignment* and *augmentation anchoring*, and a modification of the loss function to improve *stability*. Distribution anchoring is the scaling of each prediction’s output probabilities element-wise by the ratio of the output to the average of the outputs over a number of previous batches – replacing the sharpening function in MixMatch and serving as an EM term. The other contribution was augmentation anchoring, which replaced MixMatch’s one-step stochastic augmentation of a true sample with a two step process: first weakly augmenting a sample, and then using that sample/label pair as a base for a series of  $K$  strong augmentations (using their proposed CTAugment, a version of AutoAugment [Cubuk, Zoph, Mané, Vasudevan, and Le \(2018\)](#)). This functions as a consistency regularization technique, and is similar to methods discussed in Section 4 such as SimCLR [T. Chen et al. \(2020\)](#). Additionally, ReMixMatch’s loss function incorporates two additional targets: a *pre-MixUp unlabeled cross-entropy loss* component (comparing unmixed unlabeled samples with their guessed labels) and a *rotation loss* component (rotating a sample randomly in 90 deg increments and predicting the rotation of the sample). These changes yield a significant improvement in the label efficiency of the model, with the authors showing a 5 – 16× reduction in required labels for the same accuracy.

### 3.1.2 METRIC-BASED SELECTION

An alternative approach to random sampling is metric-based sampling, where the sample to pseudo-label is selected from the unlabeled pool  $\mathcal{D}_U$  via a non-random metric such as confidence. One such method is *FixMatch* [Sohn et al. \(2020\)](#); a simplification of the ReMixMatch process. FixMatch again has two loss terms. The labeled loss is cross entropy computed over labels given weakly augmented (flip crop) versions of supervised examples. The unlabeled loss is computed only for confident predictions on weakly augmented versions of the images from the unlabeled set. This is equivalent to filtering unlabeled data based on confidence. Pseudo-labels are again computed from the weakly augmented versions of unlabeled samples, but in FixMatch, hard labels are assigned. FixMatch includes the labeled data (without labels) in the unlabeled set during training.

While most methods use confidence as the metric by which to select, *Time-Consistent Self-Supervision for Semi-Supervised Learning* (TCSSL) [T. Zhou et al. \(2020\)](#) uses a different metric. For each gradient update step, TCSSL maintains a “time consistency” metric which is the exponential moving average of the divergence of the discrete output distribution of the model for each sample. They show this metric is positively correlated with accuracy,

especially at later epochs, and that the more commonly used confidence is not. In addition to PL, this approach includes jointly in its objective representation learning losses.

### 3.2 Curriculum Learning

One of the most natural solutions to choosing a suitable set of examples to pseudo-label is *curriculum learning* (CL) [Bengio, Louradour, Collobert, and Weston \(2009\)](#). In this paradigm, the model is first allowed to learn on “easy” examples of a class or concept and then trained on progressively “harder” examples such that examples which are “easy” to classify from the unlabeled set will be given correct pseudo-labels, and thus we have easily extended our labeled set reliably. Unfortunately designing a curriculum is not easy, and often requires handcrafting a heuristic for determining what is easy and what is hard.

One such CL approach is [Cascante-Bonilla et al. \(2020\)](#). Functionally, it is a self-training framework where the within each epoch unlabeled data is sorted based on the confidence of prediction, and only the top  $k\%$  most confident predictions are given pseudo-labels at each iteration of self training until all labels are exhausted. Curriculum learning is also the foundation of FlexMatch [B. Zhang et al. \(2021\)](#), an extension to the \*-Match family of methods (see Section 3.1). FlexMatch extends FixMatch’s pseudo-label thresholding by introducing dynamically-selected thresholds per-class (dubbed *Curriculum Pseudo-Labeling* or CPL), and these are scaled to the “difficulty” of learning a particular class’ label. This is achieved through two assumptions: the first that the dataset is class-balanced and the second that the difficulty of learning a particular class is indicated by the number of instances with a prediction confidence above a given threshold  $\tau$ . During the training process,  $\tau$  is adjusted down for “hard” classes to encourage learning on more pseudo-labels, and up for “easy” classes in order to avoid confirmation bias [B. Zhang et al. \(2021\)](#). This improves SSL performance without much additional cost, as there are no extra forward passes and no extra learnable parameters [B. Zhang et al. \(2021\)](#).

#### 3.2.1 JOINT-OPTIMIZATION SELECTION

Unlike other methods of pseudo-labeling, *Meta Pseudo Label* (MPL) [Pham, Dai, Xie, and Le \(2021\)](#) treats pseudo-label assignment as an optimization problem, with the specific assignment of pseudo-labels jointly optimized with the model itself. The framework consists of two models, a student and a teacher, which share an architecture. The teacher receives unlabeled examples and assigns pseudo-labels to them. The student receives the example pseudo-label pair, and performs a gradient update. The student then is evaluated on a labeled sample. The teacher receives the student performance on the labeled sample, and performs a weight update to make better pseudo-labels. Note that the student is *only* trained on pseudo-labels and the teacher is *only* trained on the student’s response on labeled data. In this way, the teacher learns an approximation of the optimal PL policy with respect to optimizing the student performance on the labeled set, and the student learns to approximate the PL function described by the teacher.

A simplified overview of the MPL method is shown in Figure 2. First, the teacher  $f_{\theta_T}$  is fixed and the student is trying to learn a better model by aligning its predictions to pseudo-labeled batches  $(X_u, f_{\theta_T}(X_u))$ . On a pseudo-labeled batch, the student optimizes its




Figure 2: A figure describing Meta Pseudo Label’s overall architecture. Adapted from [Pham et al. \(2021\)](#).

parameters using

$$\theta_S^{\text{PL}} \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta_S} \ell(\operatorname{argmax}_i f_{\theta_T}(X_u)_i, f_{\theta_S}(X_u)). \quad (2)$$

The hope is that updated student parameters  $\theta_S^{\text{PL}}$  will behave well on the labeled data  $L = (X_L, Y_L) = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^m$ ; i.e., the loss  $\mathcal{L}_L(\theta_S^{\text{PL}}(\theta_T)) = \ell(Y_L, f_{\theta_S^{\text{PL}}}(X_L))$ .  $\mathcal{L}(\theta_S^{\text{PL}}(\theta_T))$  is defined such that the dependence between  $\theta_S$  and  $\theta_T$  is explicit. The loss that the student suffers on  $\mathcal{L}_L(\theta_S^{\text{PL}}(\theta_T))$  is a function of  $\theta_T$ . Exploiting this dependence between  $\theta_S$  and  $\theta_T$ , and making a similar notational convention for the unlabeled batch  $\mathcal{L}_u(\theta_T, \theta_S) = \ell(\operatorname{argmax}_i f_{\theta_T}(X_u)_i, f_{\theta_S}(X_u))$ , then one can further optimize  $\theta_T$  as a function of the performance of  $\theta_S$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{\theta_T} \mathcal{L}_L(\theta_S^{\text{PL}}(\theta_T)), \\ \text{where} \\ \theta_S^{\text{PL}}(\theta_T) \in \operatorname{argmin}_{\theta_S} \mathcal{L}_u(\theta_T, \theta_S). \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

However, because the dependency between  $\theta_T$  and  $\theta_S$  is complicated, a practical approximation is obtained via  $\theta_S^{\text{PL}} \approx \theta_S - \eta_S \cdot \nabla_{\theta_S} \mathcal{L}_u(\theta_T, \theta_S)$  which leads to the practical teacher objective:

$$\min_{\theta_T} \mathcal{L}_L(\theta_S - \eta_S \cdot \nabla_{\theta_S} \mathcal{L}_u(\theta_T, \theta_S)). \quad (4)$$

### 3.3 Metric-Based Assignment

Subtly different from metric-based selection of unlabeled examples, we can also imagine assigning a label based on a metric such as using a  $k$ -nearest-neighbors ( $k$ NN) classifier for PL. Beyond simply using  $k$ NN to approximate distance on the underlying data manifold, we can assign a label based on its geodesic distance to other samples in the embedding space. This approach was first introduced in [X. Zhu and Ghahramani \(2002\)](#) and was extended to deep neural networks in [Isken et al. \(2019\)](#). Under the deep learning regime, a CNN is trained on the labeled data and the representation output by the penultimate layer is used as an approximation of the underlying data manifold. Then, an iterative algorithm assigns soft pseudo-labels to the unlabeled data based on density and geodesic distance to labeled examples. The CNN is retrained on these new targets in addition to the original labels. This process is iterated until some stopping criterion is satisfied. [Shi et al. \(2018\)](#) improves upon this with a regularization they call “Min-Max Feature,” this is a loss which encourages all examples of one class assignment to be embedded far from those of other classes, and examples within an assignment to be drawn together. During model optimization, this

is performed during a separate step subsequent to the optimization of the cross entropy loss over the union of the labeled and pseudo-labeled sets, thus the method is included in semi-supervised section. At the beginning of each self-training iteration hard pseudo-labels are assigned as the argmax of the output of the CNN.

*Iterative Label Improvement* (ILI) [Haase-Schütz, Stal, Hertlein, and Sick \(2020\)](#) recognizes the potential inaccuracies in supervised dataset labels, emphasizing the inherent noise in pseudo-labels. ILI employs a self-training method where the model, post-initial training, may adjust any sample’s label based on confidence levels, without calibration. Additionally, ILI extends through *Iterative Cross Learning* (ICL) [Yuan, Chen, Zhang, Tai, and McMains \(2018\)](#), where models trained on dataset partitions assign pseudo-labels to other segments.

It is known that without special care the outputs of neural networks can be highly uncalibrated, that is to say they are very over- or under-confident. This is a serious issue when confidence is the metric by which unlabeled examples are chosen to be given pseudo-labels. *Uncertainty-Aware Pseudo-Label Selection* (UPS) [Rizve, Duarte, Rawat, and Shah \(2021\)](#) seeks to combat this by training a calibrated network for confidence filtering on the unlabeled set. Popular ways to train uncertainty-aware networks include Bayesian Neural Networks [Blundell, Cornebise, Kavukcuoglu, and Wierstra \(2015\)](#); [Graves \(2011\)](#); [Louizos and Welling \(2016\)](#), Deep Ensembles [Lakshminarayanan, Pritzel, and Blundell \(2017\)](#), and MC Dropout [Gal and Ghahramani \(2016\)](#), but these all come at the expense of extra computation. UPS uses a function of the model confidence and uncertainty estimation to filter unlabeled data. This approach empirically works quite well, but is limited because it requires the training of a deep ensemble for each dataset for uncertainty estimation. Pseudo-labels generated by this method are hard, and only computed after each iteration of self-training.

An additional strategy for label selection is *Class Introspection* [Kage and Andreadis \(2021\)](#), which uses an explainability method over a classifier in order to embed the inputs into a space separated by their learned explanations. This space is then hierarchically clustered in order generate a new (pseudo-) labeling, with the intuition that points which were included in a single class but are explained differently may belong in a separate, new labeling.

### 3.4 Multi-Model Approaches

In multi-model approaches more than one network is used for training one singular model, combining the strengths of the individual component networks. MPL from Section 3.1 (under Joint-Optimization Selection), is an example where a teacher model generates labels and a student model processes labeled data and jointly optimizes both.

Noisy Student Training [Xie, Luong, Hovy, and Le \(2020\)](#) is an effective technique in this category where a student model is initially trained on labeled and pseudo-labeled data. This student then becomes the teacher, and a new, possibly larger, "noised" student model takes its place, undergoing augmentation and stochastic depth adjustments. Training involves using a mix of supervised and pseudo-labeled data, with the teacher model filtering pseudo-labeled examples based on confidence. The process typically involves a few iterations of self-training, after which the final student model is selected. This approach differs from model distillation in that the student model is often larger, subjected to noise, and utilizes unlabeled data, which is not the case in distillation. The addition of noise is believed to make the student model mimic a larger ensemble’s behavior.

However, the student-teacher model is not the only multi-model architecture that relies on pseudo-labels for SSL. A representative technique in this area is *co-training* Blum and Mitchell (1998) in which two models are trained on disjoint feature sets which are both sufficient for classification. In co-training, pseudo-labels are iteratively incorporated into the training set just as with self-training, except labels added to one model’s training set are generated by the other model. The models need not have the same number of parameters, the same architecture, or even be of the same type. One key problem in co-training is that of constructing the views when they are not available Sun, Jin, and Tu (2011); J. Wang, Luo, and Zeng (2008). It is relatively uncommon to have a dataset in which there are two independent and sufficient views for classification. Furthermore, it is possible that the views we have are independent, but not sufficient. Multiple works attempt to address the issue of insufficiency. W. Wang and Zhou (2013) shows that this is still an acceptable setting in which to perform co-training provided that the views are “diverse.”

To address the problem of the lack of independent views, some algorithms propose using a diverse group of classifiers on the same view instead of constructing or otherwise acquiring multiple sufficient and independent views Hady and Schwenker (2008); Y. Zhou and Goldman (2004). These approaches are ensembles where each classifier issues a vote on the class of unlabeled samples, and the majority vote is assigned as the pseudo-label and the instance is added to the training set. In this setting, it is reasonable to assume that the single view is sufficient, as in most supervised learning scenarios we are simply attempting to train the best classifier we can with the data we are given. Independence is far more dubious, as we rely on the diversity of the ensemble to ensure our classifiers do not all fail for the same reasons on points which they classify incorrectly.

In the same vein, *Tri-Training* employs three classifiers in order to democratically select pseudo-labels for  $\mathcal{D}_U$  after being trained on  $\mathcal{D}_L$  Z. Zhou and Li (2005). While this is a simple solution, it comes with a  $3\times$  increase in compute cost. An improvement is *Robust Semi-Supervised Ensemble Learning* Yan, Xu, Tsang, Long, and Yang (2016), which formulates the PL process as an ensemble of low-cost supervisors whose predictions are aggregated together with a weighted SVM-based solver.

*Multi-Head Co-Training* (MHCT) M. Chen, Du, Zhang, Qian, and Wang (2022) uses a shared network block to create an initial representation which is then evaluated with multiple classification heads (see Figure 3). With labeled data, these classification heads (and the shared block) are then all updated as normal. However, when an unlabeled sample is selected, the most confident pseudo-label is assigned based on a consensus between a majority of the heads. For better generalization MHCT uses data augmentation.

*Meta Co-Training* Rothenberger and Diochnos (2023) combines the ideas of Meta Pseudo Labels Pham et al. (2021) and Co-Training Blum and Mitchell (1998). Meta Co-Training introduces a novel bi-level optimization over multiple views to determine optimal assignment of pseudo labels for  $c$ . In this formulation each view is utilized by a single model which serves as both the student for that view and the teacher for the other view. The student is optimized to replicate the pseudo-labels assigned by its teacher given the corresponding instance as input. The teacher is optimized to produce pseudo-labels that improve student performance on a held-out labeled set. This formulation is a natural extension of the ideas of Meta Pseudo Labels to two views. They further propose using pre-trained models to construct two views from a single instance in the dataset. This method of view construction

compresses the input significantly in the case of image classification which mitigates the impact of the expensive computational nature of multi-model semi-supervised approaches, though it requires the existence of such models.




Figure 3: A simplified diagram of Multi-Head Co-Training’s architecture. Adapted from M. Chen et al. (2022).

### 3.5 Knowledge Distillation

Knowledge distillation Hinton et al. (2015) describes the process of transferring the knowledge of a larger network into a smaller one. The significant attention brought to this technique has yielded a variety of techniques Gou, Yu, Maybank, and Tao (2021). In this assessment we are concerned with *response-based* knowledge distillation; i.e., techniques for knowledge distillation that transfer knowledge through pseudo-labels assigned by the larger model. For a more comprehensive treatment of knowledge distillation see Gou et al. (2021).

The formulation in Hinton et al. (2015) is a response-based framework which is semi-supervised. The original larger model is trained in a supervised way on a classification dataset. The process of distilling knowledge into the smaller model is semi-supervised in general, although if only the model and instances are present without labels the distillation can still occur with only self-supervision. The model is trained to minimize a loss function that is composed of a supervised term measuring the disagreement with the true labels of the examples, and another loss term which measures the disagreement with the prediction made by the larger model. This second term is clearly making use of PL.

As mentioned in Caron et al. (2021), the DINO framework for self-supervised learning is interpreted as a framework for knowledge distillation between a student model and a mean teacher (a teacher model which is an average of the student model’s weights). This is self-distillation with *no labels* which is entirely based on PL. DINO can be seen as a special case of the *replace one branch* Duval et al. (2023) approach to knowledge distillation with a slight modification of including a mean teacher. In fact, this is exactly how the smaller published DINO models are created. Rather than training the models from scratch, the smaller architectures’ parameters are trained by holding the parameters of the larger model constant and distilling their knowledge from them into the smaller model using the same DINO framework which was used to train the larger model. This approach is broadly applicable to the above self-supervised frameworks and others which may not utilize PL but have a similar two-branch training structure.

In all cases a fuzzy partition parameterized by a neural network is inferred from data and available at the beginning of the distillation process. This is the teacher model, or

the model which is being distilled. In the case of Hinton’s original formulation this fuzzy partition clearly corresponds to division of the input space into classes informed by real labels. It is also possible to incorporate real labels in the distillation process in that formulation, however pseudo-labels are still used in the training process. In fact, the labels generated by the model and given to the student model are identical to those utilized in traditional pseudo-labeling approaches such as Lee (2013). In the case of DINO and RoB the labels do not necessarily correspond to any ground truth quantity, but the loss function is identical. DINO distillation and RoB also define fuzzy partitions of the input space into categories and the goal of learning in the knowledge distillation regime is the same - minimize the average cross entropy over a set of unlabeled instances and their associated pseudo-labels between the student and the teacher.

## 4. Unsupervised and Self-supervised Regimes

While pseudo-labeling is usually presented in the context of semi-supervised training regimes, there are very close analogues to PL in the domain of unsupervised learning. Specifically, unsupervised consistency regularization approaches show significant similarities with pseudo-labeling approaches as they tend to assign labels to points even if these labels have no relation to any ground truth. For example, EsViT C. Li et al. (2022), DINO Caron et al. (2021), BYOL Grill et al. (2020), and SwAV Caron et al. (2020) all use some form of label assignment as a representation learning *pretext task*, i.e., a task which prepares a model for transfer learning to a downstream task Jing and Tian (2021). Within this section, we will discuss discriminative self-supervised learning, adversarial training, and consistency regularization methods.

### 4.1 Consistency Regularization

It is perhaps surprising to consider pseudo-labeling as a definition for unsupervised learning settings, where traditional, fixed class labels are not available. However, such probability vectors are used in the training of particularly discriminative self-supervised learning. These approaches such as DINO Caron et al. (2021) and are incorporated into the loss function of SWaV Caron et al. (2020), EsViT C. Li et al. (2022), and Deep Cluster Caron, Bojanowski, Joulin, and Douze (2018) and their effectiveness is explained as a form of consistency regularization.

These approaches all result in assigning instances to a particular cluster or class which has no defined meaning, but is rather inferred from the data in order to accomplish the minimization of the self-supervised loss. The goal of the clustering or classification is clear - to place images which share an augmentation relationship into the same cluster or class, and optionally a different class from all other images. The partition of the latent space however is inferred, and it is also fuzzy as membership probabilities may not be one-hot. Thus, these techniques clearly satisfy our definition.

All these frameworks are “unsupervised” in the sense that they do not rely on ground-truth labels, but they truly belong to the category of SSL as they are trained on pretext tasks and are typically applied to semi-supervised tasks. A common adaptation (and indeed the standard metric by which representational performance is judged) is training a linear layer on top of the learned representations T. Chen et al. (2020); Kolesnikov, Zhai, and Beyer (2019),



with the intent of performing well in settings where few labels are available. A common theme in solutions in this space is stochastically augmenting a pair of samples and ensuring that the learned representation of those samples is similar to each other and different to all other samples in the batch, for example as in Figure 4 Caron et al. (2018, 2020); C. Li et al. (2022); Xie et al. (2019). In this sense, these are self-supervised learning techniques that technically




Figure 4: A chart showing how general pairwise consistency regularization works. Generally, samples are drawn from  $\mathbf{x} \sim \mathcal{D}$ , where a series of transformations  $t \sim \mathcal{T}$  transforms  $\mathbf{x}$  into a pair of unequally augmented samples  $\tilde{\mathbf{x}}_1, \tilde{\mathbf{x}}_2$ . This pair of samples is then projected into a latent representation by some projection function  $f(\cdot)$  resulting in latent vectors  $\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2$ . Typically during consistency regularization, the loss function will be structured to minimize the distance from  $\mathbf{z}_1, \mathbf{z}_2$  from the same sample  $\mathbf{x}$  and maximize the distance from other sample representations within a minibatch.

use pseudo-labels. Such self-supervised learning approaches are referred to as “discriminative” as they are designed to discriminate between different ground truth signals by assigning different (pseudo) labels to them. Because they do not predict labels that correspond to any specific important function assignment, they are functionally indistinguishable from techniques like SimCLR T. Chen et al. (2020), and BYOL Grill et al. (2020), which do not make use of any sort of class assignment (pseudo or otherwise).

In a stricter sense, there are approaches such as *Scaling Open-Vocabulary Object Detection* Minderer, Gritsenko, and Houlsby (2023) which make use of actual predicted class labels that are relevant to a future task. This is not a classification task but rather an object detection task, however the CLIP model is used to give weak supervision (pseudo-labels) for bounding boxes and this weak supervision is used as a pre-training step. This kind of weak supervision is common in open-vocabulary settings such as that used to train CLIP, however in the case of CLIP training that weak supervision came from humans not any model outputs.

#### 4.1.1 ADVERSARIAL TRAINING

A common problem within this space is that of overfitting. Under this regime, models are vulnerable to misclassifying samples which are only slightly perturbed from a “true” sample. To combat this, Miyato et al. (2019) proposed *virtual adversarial training* (VAT); a regularization technique which augments the training set by creating new samples that occur from original samples when small perturbations are applied to them. The goal of this process is to increase the robustness and generalization of the final model. Hence, VAT is categorized as a consistency regularization technique (as discussed in Section 1).

In the case of VAT the pseudo-labels are inferred by proximity to the original sample. The fuzzy partition is thus constituted of fuzzy sets which are the union of balls of a chosen radius around points of the same class. In the case of VAT the labels that are assigned are one-hot, but this is a subset of the admissible fuzzy partitions.

## 5. Commonalities Between Discussed Methods

In this section we discuss commonalities between the methods that we have discussed so far.

### 5.1 Filtering the Data

One of the main arguments presented in CLIP Radford et al. (2021) is their extensive dataset filtering technique. Even subsequent works such as ALIGN Jia et al. (2021) still does perform some dataset filtering. Such rigorous dataset construction seems to be the norm now with the LAION dataset using the CLIP pre-trained model to filter out noisy image-caption pairs Schuhmann et al. (2022), and Xu et al. (2023) have argued the dataset curation was an essential aspect of the CLIP’s success. Proprietary pre-filtered datasets such as JFT and IG-1B serve as an integral ingredient in training state-of-the-art models self-supervised and semi-supervised learning Caron et al. (2021); Pham et al. (2021); Radford et al. (2021); Xie et al. (2020). In knowledge distillation, maintaining the full model’s performance requires some access to the training data; without it, we must resort to techniques like data-free knowledge distillation Lopes et al. (2017) or reconstructing a similar dataset from open data such as LAION-5B Schuhmann et al. (2022). Thus, strategic dataset filtering emerges as a key enabler for effective pseudo-labeling.

### 5.2 Establishing a Curriculum

Curriculum learning Bengio et al. (2009) is an approach that was originally proposed for supervised learning, but it is often used as the justification for different metric-based selection procedures for PL (as discussed in 3.3). Outside of SSL, curriculum approaches have received a small amount of attention recently in the knowledge distillation literature with curricula inspired by the training trajectory of the heavier mode Jin et al. (2019), and by the temperature used during training Z. Li et al. (2023). Curriculum learning has also been applied in self-supervised learning to learn representations that are robust to spurious correlations W. Zhu, Liu, Fernandez-Granda, and Razavian (2023). The curricula proposed for knowledge distillation and self-supervised learning are practically interchangeable when using an appropriate framework such as RoB Duval et al. (2023) and DINO Caron et al. (2021) respectively. Though the connection is perhaps looser, the choice of a curriculum is very important for good self-training and co-training performance. There is similarly no practical reason the curricula proposed for self-training could not be applied to knowledge distillation or self-training and vice-versa.

### 5.3 Data Augmentation Strategies

Data augmentations typically perturb the input instances without altering their ground truth assignments, and strategies for this are varied and domain-dependent. All forms of data augmentation can be seen as providing pseudo-labels, as the original sample label

is assigned to a new (augmented) sample. Rather than communicating the prediction of some machine learning model, these pseudo-labels instill an inductive bias. Outside of limited cases such as horizontal flips of most images (which can be known to not change the underlying class), augmentations such as Mixup [H. Zhang et al. \(2018\)](#), the \*-Match family [Berthelot, Carlini, Cubuk, et al. \(2019\)](#); [Berthelot, Carlini, Goodfellow, et al. \(2019\)](#); [Sohn et al. \(2020\)](#); [B. Zhang et al. \(2021\)](#), or even RandAugment [Cubuk, Zoph, Shlens, and Le \(2019\)](#) can meaningfully change or obscure class information. This is critical as they define the invariances the model is to learn and makes the most of limited supervised data.

#### 5.4 Soft vs. Hard Pseudo-Labels

The dominant strategy is in line with the spirit of EM, where choosing hard labels extends the margin of the decision boundary. Some works report better performance when using soft labels, but other works take precautions to avoid trivial solutions when using soft labels; not to mention the challenges of using soft labels (and thus weaker gradients) for larger model architectures. Conversely, hard labels can be sampled from a discrete distribution described by the output vector of a model yielding an assignment less aligned with the ground truth, but which strikes a desirable learning process exploration / exploitation trade-off (e.g. [Pham et al. \(2021\)](#)). Interestingly, this hard-label choice is not nearly as popular in the self-supervised or knowledge distillation areas where the argument usually follows from an argument centered around smoothing a distribution rather than performing EM. Despite this, such techniques typically make use of a large temperature parameter to “harden” the label output by the teacher [Caron et al. \(2021\)](#); [T. Chen et al. \(2020\)](#); [Hinton et al. \(2015\)](#); [C. Li et al. \(2022\)](#); [Z. Li et al. \(2023\)](#); [Wen et al. \(2021\)](#).

#### 5.5 Updating the Teacher

There are a variety of strategies that are employed to update the teacher model from which knowledge is being transferred. In self-supervised settings a teacher is usually a model updated as the EMA of the student’s weights from the last several steps [Caron et al. \(2021\)](#); [Grill et al. \(2020\)](#); [C. Li et al. \(2022\)](#). Conversely, in semi-supervised learning the teacher’s weights are usually the product of a separate optimization—either through meta-learning [Pham et al. \(2021\)](#) or a previous weakly-supervised training iteration [Blum and Mitchell \(1998\)](#); [M. Chen et al. \(2022\)](#); [Hady and Schwenker \(2008\)](#); [McLachlan \(1975\)](#); [Xie et al. \(2020\)](#); [J. Yu et al. \(2021\)](#); [T. Zhou et al. \(2020\)](#). Acknowledging the weakness of the teacher’s labels within the knowledge distillation framework, one can even imagine altering teacher predictions to produce a better student [Wen et al. \(2021\)](#). In all pseudo-labeling cases it is useful to consider how (if at all) the teacher should be updated.

#### 5.6 Self-Supervised Regularization

In practice, there are far more unlabeled samples than labeled samples: for example, open source NLP/CV datasets contain billions of un- or weakly-curated samples [Computer \(2023\)](#); [Schuhmann et al. \(2022\)](#). Typically, representations are learned first on unsupervised data and then are transferred to a downstream task. In the case of full-parameter finetuning, however, it is possible for a network to ‘forget’ valuable information learned during pre-

training while it is being finetuned. An important type of regularization may be to include a semi-supervised objective in the loss such as NT-Xent [T. Chen et al. \(2020\)](#) or the BYOL [Grill et al. \(2020\)](#) loss function; preventing a representation space from collapsing or to allow learning a representation space jointly with the classification objective.

## 6. Open Directions

Below we outline what we believe to be some of the most promising open directions when one tries to exploit commonalities between the different forms of pseudo-labeling.

### 6.1 Dataset Filtering

There is significant focus on dataset filtering in the self-supervised learning literature as we discussed in the previous section, however this remains relatively unexplored in semi-supervised learning and knowledge distillation. We believe dataset subsetting has the potential to expedite knowledge distillation. In semi-supervised learning the typical method of evaluating the performance of algorithms is to hold out a subset of the labels in a dataset, but this yields an idealized unlabeled distribution. It seems likely that if some method of intelligent filtering were applied to a large unlabeled and uncured dataset a more realistic evaluation scenario and improved model performance would result.

### 6.2 Establishing a Useful Curriculum

Establishing an effective curriculum is an open direction for all of these pseudo-labeling methods. It seems like some curriculum is more useful than none at all, but it is unclear what properties an ideal curriculum has. There are several recent curricula that have been proposed with different goals, and they have yet to be applied outside of their sub-areas.

### 6.3 Direct Initialization of Models

While we can initialize models naively from some initialization distribution, a large number of pre-trained “foundation” models for vision have been produced which can be compressed using low-rank compression [Xiao et al. \(2023\)](#); [X. Yu, Liu, Wang, and Tao \(2017\)](#) neuron clustering [Cho, Alizadeh-Vahid, Adya, and Rastegari \(2022\)](#) or neuron selection [Samragh et al. \(2023\)](#). Such techniques have the potential to expedite training of the student, or lower the cost of assigning a pseudo-label with the teacher.

### 6.4 Self-Supervised Regularization of Semi-Supervised Learning

In semi-supervised and knowledge distillation there is a risk of representation collapse of the student. To prevent this collapse we can include self-supervised loss terms in the optimization to prevent this collapse. One recent method that does this is *self-supervised semi-supervised learning* [Berthelot, Carlini, Cubuk, et al. \(2019\)](#) in which a model is trained to jointly optimize a supervised and unsupervised loss. Despite the simplicity they are able to improve on supervised baselines. Their approach could easily be extended by optimizing their (relatively simple) losses in a self-training setting, in a knowledge distillation setting, or by simply utilizing more modern self-supervised methods.

## 6.5 Meta Learning to Determine Pseudo-Label Assignment

MPL (Section 3.1) proposed formulating the pseudo-label assignment as a meta-learning approach. To our knowledge meta-learning has not been applied in this way to either knowledge distillation or self-supervised learning. Meta learning response-based distillation targets and discriminative self-supervised targets remain exciting future directions.

## 7. Conclusion

We presented pseudo-labeling methods within the domains of unsupervised and supervised learning. Additionally, we presented a series of commonalities between these methods that reveal future directions pertaining to pseudo-labeling.

## Appendix A. Reference Tables

### A.1 Family Tree Figure Map

Table A.1 has a mapping between the techniques that appear in Figure 1 (first column), with the appropriate references that are associated with the corresponding techniques (second column), and finally the section in this work where that technique is discussed.

Label	Reference	Section
BYOL	Grill et al. (2020)	4.1
Co-training	Blum and Mitchell (1998)	3.4
Cocommittee	Hady and Schwenker (2008)	3.4
DINO	Caron et al. (2021)	3.5
DeepCluster	Caron et al. (2018)	4.1
Dem. Colearning	Y. Zhou and Goldman (2004)	3.4
EsViT	C. Li et al. (2022)	4.1
FixMatch	Sohn et al. (2020)	3.1
FlexMatch	B. Zhang et al. (2021)	3.1
ILI	Haase-Schütz et al. (2020)	3.1
Knowledge Distillation	Hinton et al. (2015)	3.5
LabelPropPL	Iscen et al. (2019)	3.3
MHCT	M. Chen et al. (2022)	3.4
MMF	Shi et al. (2018)	3.3
Meta Co-training	Rothenberger and Diochnos (2023)	3.4
MetaPL	Pham et al. (2021)	3.1
MixMatch	Berthelot, Carlini, Goodfellow, et al. (2019)	3.1
Noisy Student	Xie et al. (2020)	3.4
OVOD	Minderer et al. (2023)	4.1
PL (2013)	Lee (2013)	3
ROSSEL	Yan et al. (2016)	3.4
ReMixMatch	Berthelot, Carlini, Cubuk, et al. (2019)	3.1

Replace One Branch	Duval et al. (2023)	3.5
SwAV	Caron et al. (2020)	4.1
TCSSL	T. Zhou et al. (2020)	3.1
TriTraining	Z. Zhou and Li (2005)	3.4
UDA	Xie et al. (2019)	4.1
UPS	Rizve et al. (2021)	3.1
VAT	Miyato et al. (2019)	4.1

## References

- Amini, M., Feofanov, V., Pauletto, L., Devijver, E., & Maximov, Y. (2022). Self-Training: A Survey. *CoRR*, *abs/2202.12040*. Retrieved from <https://arxiv.org/abs/2202.12040>  
1
- Arazo, E., Ortego, D., Albert, P., O’Connor, N. E., & McGuinness, K. (2020). Pseudo-Labeling and Confirmation Bias in Deep Semi-Supervised Learning. In *2020 international joint conference on neural networks, IJCNN 2020, glasgow, united kingdom, july 19-24, 2020* (pp. 1–8). IEEE. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1109/IJCNN48605.2020.9207304> doi: 10.1109/IJCNN48605.2020.9207304  
9
- Balestrierio, R., Ibrahim, M., Sobal, V., Morcos, A., Shekhar, S., Goldstein, T., . . . Goldblum, M. (2023). A Cookbook of Self-Supervised Learning. *CoRR*, *abs/2304.12210*. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2304.12210> doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2304.12210  
3
- Bengio, Y., Louradour, J., Collobert, R., & Weston, J. (2009). Curriculum learning. In A. P. Danyluk, L. Bottou, & M. L. Littman (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 26th annual international conference on machine learning, ICML 2009, montreal, quebec, canada, june 14-18, 2009* (Vol. 382, pp. 41–48). ACM. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1145/1553374.1553380> doi: 10.1145/1553374.1553380  
11, 18
- Berthelot, D., Carlini, N., Cubuk, E. D., Kurakin, A., Sohn, K., Zhang, H., & Raffel, C. (2019). ReMixMatch: Semi-Supervised Learning with Distribution Alignment and Augmentation Anchoring. *CoRR*, *abs/1911.09785*. Retrieved from <http://arxiv.org/abs/1911.09785>  
3, 10, 19, 20, 21
- Berthelot, D., Carlini, N., Goodfellow, I. J., Papernot, N., Oliver, A., & Raffel, C. (2019). MixMatch: A Holistic Approach to Semi-Supervised Learning. In H. M. Wallach, H. Larochelle, A. Beygelzimer, F. d’Alché-Buc, E. B. Fox, & R. Garnett (Eds.), *Advances in neural information processing systems 32: Annual conference on neural information processing systems 2019, neurips 2019, december 8-14, 2019, vancouver, bc, canada* (pp. 5050–5060). Retrieved from <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2019/hash/1cd138d0499a68f4bb72bee04bbec2d7-Abstract.html>  
3, 9, 10, 19, 21

- Blum, A., & Mitchell, T. M. (1998). Combining Labeled and Unlabeled Data with Co-Training. In P. L. Bartlett & Y. Mansour (Eds.), *Proceedings of the eleventh annual conference on computational learning theory, COLT 1998, madison, wisconsin, usa, july 24-26, 1998* (pp. 92–100). ACM. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1145/279943.279962> doi: 10.1145/279943.279962  
14, 19, 21
- Blundell, C., Cornebise, J., Kavukcuoglu, K., & Wierstra, D. (2015). Weight Uncertainty in Neural Network. In F. R. Bach & D. M. Blei (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 32nd international conference on machine learning, ICML 2015, lille, france, 6-11 july 2015* (Vol. 37, pp. 1613–1622). JMLR.org. Retrieved from <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v37/blundell115.html>  
13
- Caron, M., Bojanowski, P., Joulin, A., & Douze, M. (2018). Deep Clustering for Unsupervised Learning of Visual Features. In V. Ferrari, M. Hebert, C. Sminchisescu, & Y. Weiss (Eds.), *Computer vision - ECCV 2018 - 15th european conference, munich, germany, september 8-14, 2018, proceedings, part XIV* (Vol. 11218, pp. 139–156). Springer. Retrieved from [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-01264-9\\_9](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-01264-9_9) doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-01264-9\\_9  
16, 17, 21
- Caron, M., Misra, I., Mairal, J., Goyal, P., Bojanowski, P., & Joulin, A. (2020). Unsupervised Learning of Visual Features by Contrasting Cluster Assignments. In H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato, R. Hadsell, M. Balcan, & H. Lin (Eds.), *Advances in neural information processing systems 33: Annual conference on neural information processing systems 2020, neurips 2020, december 6-12, 2020, virtual*. Retrieved from <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2020/hash/70feb62b69f16e0238f741fab228fec2-Abstract.html>  
2, 3, 16, 17, 22
- Caron, M., Touvron, H., Misra, I., Jégou, H., Mairal, J., Bojanowski, P., & Joulin, A. (2021). Emerging Properties in Self-Supervised Vision Transformers. In *2021 IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision, ICCV 2021, montreal, qc, canada, october 10-17, 2021* (pp. 9630–9640). IEEE. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCV48922.2021.00951> doi: 10.1109/ICCV48922.2021.00951  
3, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21
- Cascante-Bonilla, P., Tan, F., Qi, Y., & Ordonez, V. (2020). Curriculum Labeling: Self-paced Pseudo-Labeling for Semi-Supervised Learning. *CoRR, abs/2001.06001*. Retrieved from <https://arxiv.org/abs/2001.06001>  
3, 11
- Chapelle, O., Schölkopf, B., & Zien, A. (Eds.). (2006). *Semi-Supervised Learning*. The MIT Press. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/9780262033589.001.0001> doi: 10.7551/MITPRESS/9780262033589.001.0001  
1, 3
- Chen, M., Du, Y., Zhang, Y., Qian, S., & Wang, C. (2022). Semi-supervised Learning with Multi-Head Co-Training. In *Thirty-sixth AAAI conference on artificial intelligence, AAAI 2022, thirty-fourth conference on innovative applications of artificial intelligence, IAAI 2022, the twelfth symposium on educational advances in artificial intelligence,*

- EAAI 2022 virtual event, february 22 - march 1, 2022* (pp. 6278–6286). AAAI Press. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v36i6.20577> doi: 10.1609/AAAI.V36I6.20577  
14, 15, 19, 21
- Chen, T., Kornblith, S., Norouzi, M., & Hinton, G. E. (2020). A Simple Framework for Contrastive Learning of Visual Representations. In *Proceedings of the 37th international conference on machine learning, ICML 2020, 13-18 july 2020, virtual event* (Vol. 119, pp. 1597–1607). PMLR. Retrieved from <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v119/chen20j.html>  
3, 10, 16, 17, 19, 20
- Cho, M., Alizadeh-Vahid, K., Adya, S., & Rastegari, M. (2022). DKM: Differentiable k-Means Clustering Layer for Neural Network Compression. In *The tenth international conference on learning representations, ICLR 2022, virtual event, april 25-29, 2022*. OpenReview.net. Retrieved from [https://openreview.net/forum?id=J\\_F\\_qqCE3Z520](https://openreview.net/forum?id=J_F_qqCE3Z520)  
20
- Computer, T. (2023, October). *RedPajama: an Open Dataset for Training Large Language Models*. <https://github.com/togethercomputer/RedPajama-Data>.  
19
- Cubuk, E. D., Zoph, B., Mané, D., Vasudevan, V., & Le, Q. V. (2018). AutoAugment: Learning Augmentation Policies from Data. *CoRR, abs/1805.09501*. Retrieved from <http://arxiv.org/abs/1805.09501>  
10
- Cubuk, E. D., Zoph, B., Shlens, J., & Le, Q. V. (2019). RandAugment: Practical data augmentation with no separate search. *CoRR, abs/1909.13719*. Retrieved from <http://arxiv.org/abs/1909.13719>  
19
- Duval, Q., Misra, I., & Ballas, N. (2023). A Simple Recipe for Competitive Low-compute Self supervised Vision Models. *CoRR, abs/2301.09451*. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2301.09451> doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2301.09451  
3, 15, 18, 22
- Gal, Y., & Ghahramani, Z. (2016). Dropout as a Bayesian Approximation: Representing Model Uncertainty in Deep Learning. In M. Balcan & K. Q. Weinberger (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 33rd international conference on machine learning, ICML 2016, new york city, ny, usa, june 19-24, 2016* (Vol. 48, pp. 1050–1059). JMLR.org. Retrieved from <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v48/gal16.html>  
13
- Géron, A. (2022). *Hands-on machine learning with Scikit-Learn, Keras, and TensorFlow*. "O'Reilly Media, Inc."
- 6
- Gou, J., Yu, B., Maybank, S. J., & Tao, D. (2021). Knowledge Distillation: A Survey. *Int. J. Comput. Vis.*, 129(6), 1789–1819. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11263-021-01453-z> doi: 10.1007/S11263-021-01453-Z  
15
- Graves, A. (2011). Practical Variational Inference for Neural Networks. In J. Shawe-Taylor, R. S. Zemel, P. L. Bartlett, F. C. N. Pereira, & K. Q. Weinberger (Eds.), *Advances in*



*neural information processing systems 24: 25th annual conference on neural information processing systems 2011. proceedings of a meeting held 12-14 december 2011, granada, spain* (pp. 2348–2356). Retrieved from <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2011/hash/7eb3c8be3d411e8ebfab08eba5f49632-Abstract.html>

13

Grill, J., Strub, F., Alché, F., Tallec, C., Richemond, P. H., Buchatskaya, E., ... Valko, M. (2020). Bootstrap Your Own Latent - A New Approach to Self-Supervised Learning. In H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato, R. Hadsell, M. Balcan, & H. Lin (Eds.), *Advances in neural information processing systems 33: Annual conference on neural information processing systems 2020, neurips 2020, december 6-12, 2020, virtual*. Retrieved from <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2020/hash/f3ada80d5c4ee70142b17b8192b2958e-Abstract.html>

16, 17, 19, 20, 21

Haase-Schütz, C., Stal, R., Hertlein, H., & Sick, B. (2020). Iterative Label Improvement: Robust Training by Confidence Based Filtering and Dataset Partitioning. In *25th international conference on pattern recognition, ICPR 2020, virtual event / milan, italy, january 10-15, 2021* (pp. 9483–9490). IEEE. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICPR48806.2021.9411918> doi: 10.1109/ICPR48806.2021.9411918

13, 21

Hady, M. F. A., & Schwenker, F. (2008). Co-training by Committee: A New Semi-supervised Learning Framework. In *Workshops proceedings of the 8th IEEE international conference on data mining (ICDM 2008), december 15-19, 2008, pisa, italy* (pp. 563–572). IEEE Computer Society. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICDMW.2008.27> doi: 10.1109/ICDMW.2008.27

14, 19, 21

Hinton, G. E., Vinyals, O., & Dean, J. (2015). Distilling the Knowledge in a Neural Network. *CoRR*, *abs/1503.02531*. Retrieved from <http://arxiv.org/abs/1503.02531>

2, 3, 15, 19, 21

Iscen, A., Toliás, G., Avrithis, Y., & Chum, O. (2019). Label Propagation for Deep Semi-Supervised Learning. In *IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, CVPR 2019, long beach, ca, usa, june 16-20, 2019* (pp. 5070–5079). Computer Vision Foundation / IEEE. Retrieved from [http://openaccess.thecvf.com/content\\_CVPR\\_2019/html/Iscen\\_Label\\_Propagation\\_for\\_Deep\\_Semi-Supervised\\_Learning\\_CVPR\\_2019\\_paper.html](http://openaccess.thecvf.com/content_CVPR_2019/html/Iscen_Label_Propagation_for_Deep_Semi-Supervised_Learning_CVPR_2019_paper.html) doi: 10.1109/CVPR.2019.00521

3, 12, 21

James, G., Witten, D., Hastie, T., Tibshirani, R., & Taylor, J. (2023). *An introduction to statistical learning: With applications in python*. Springer Nature.

6

Jia, C., Yang, Y., Xia, Y., Chen, Y., Parekh, Z., Pham, H., ... Duerig, T. (2021). Scaling Up Visual and Vision-Language Representation Learning With Noisy Text Supervision. In M. Meila & T. Zhang (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 38th international conference on machine learning, ICML 2021, 18-24 july 2021, virtual event* (Vol. 139, pp. 4904–4916). PMLR. Retrieved from <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v139/jia21b.html>

3, 18

- Jin, X., Peng, B., Wu, Y., Liu, Y., Liu, J., Liang, D., . . . Hu, X. (2019). Knowledge Distillation via Route Constrained Optimization. In *2019 IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision, ICCV 2019, seoul, korea (south), october 27 - november 2, 2019* (pp. 1345–1354). IEEE. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCV.2019.00143> doi: 10.1109/ICCV.2019.00143  
18
- Jing, L., & Tian, Y. (2021). Self-Supervised Visual Feature Learning With Deep Neural Networks: A Survey. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, 43(11), 4037–4058. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1109/TPAMI.2020.2992393> doi: 10.1109/TPAMI.2020.2992393  
16
- Kage, P., & Andreadis, P. (2021). Class introspection: A novel technique for detecting unlabeled subclasses by leveraging classifier explainability methods. *CoRR, abs/2107.01657*. Retrieved from <https://arxiv.org/abs/2107.01657>  
13
- Kolesnikov, A., Zhai, X., & Beyer, L. (2019). Revisiting Self-Supervised Visual Representation Learning. In *IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, CVPR 2019, long beach, ca, usa, june 16-20, 2019* (pp. 1920–1929). Computer Vision Foundation / IEEE. Retrieved from [http://openaccess.thecvf.com/content\\_CVPR\\_2019/html/Kolesnikov\\_Revisiting\\_Self-Supervised\\_Visual\\_Representation\\_Learning\\_CVPR\\_2019\\_paper.html](http://openaccess.thecvf.com/content_CVPR_2019/html/Kolesnikov_Revisiting_Self-Supervised_Visual_Representation_Learning_CVPR_2019_paper.html) doi: 10.1109/CVPR.2019.00202  
16
- Lakshminarayanan, B., Pritzel, A., & Blundell, C. (2017). Simple and Scalable Predictive Uncertainty Estimation using Deep Ensembles. In I. Guyon et al. (Eds.), *Advances in neural information processing systems 30: Annual conference on neural information processing systems 2017, december 4-9, 2017, long beach, ca, USA* (pp. 6402–6413). Retrieved from <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2017/hash/9ef2ed4b7fd2c810847ffa5fa85bce38-Abstract.html>  
13
- Lee, D.-H. (2013, July). Pseudo-Label : The Simple and Efficient Semi-Supervised Learning Method for Deep Neural Networks. *ICML 2013 Workshop : Challenges in Representation Learning (WREPL)*.  
2, 6, 8, 9, 16, 21
- Li, C., Yang, J., Zhang, P., Gao, M., Xiao, B., Dai, X., . . . Gao, J. (2022). Efficient Self-supervised Vision Transformers for Representation Learning. In *The tenth international conference on learning representations, ICLR 2022, virtual event, april 25-29, 2022*. OpenReview.net. Retrieved from <https://openreview.net/forum?id=fVu3o-YUGQK>  
3, 16, 17, 19, 21
- Li, Z., Li, X., Yang, L., Zhao, B., Song, R., Luo, L., . . . Yang, J. (2023). Curriculum Temperature for Knowledge Distillation. In B. Williams, Y. Chen, & J. Neville (Eds.), *Thirty-seventh AAAI conference on artificial intelligence, AAAI 2023, thirty-fifth conference on innovative applications of artificial intelligence, IAAI 2023, thirteenth symposium on educational advances in artificial intelligence, EAAI 2023, washington, dc, usa, february 7-14, 2023* (pp. 1504–1512). AAAI Press. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v37i2.25236> doi: 10.1609/AAAI.V37I2.25236

- 18, 19
- Lopes, R. G., Fenu, S., & Starner, T. (2017). Data-Free Knowledge Distillation for Deep Neural Networks. *CoRR*, *abs/1710.07535*. Retrieved from <http://arxiv.org/abs/1710.07535>
- 3, 18
- Louizos, C., & Welling, M. (2016). Structured and Efficient Variational Deep Learning with Matrix Gaussian Posteriors. In M. Balcan & K. Q. Weinberger (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 33rd international conference on machine learning, ICML 2016, new york city, ny, usa, june 19-24, 2016* (Vol. 48, pp. 1708–1716). JMLR.org. Retrieved from <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v48/louizos16.html>
- 13
- McLachlan, G. J. (1975). Iterative Reclassification Procedure for Constructing an Asymptotically Optimal Rule of Allocation in Discriminant Analysis. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, *70*(350), 365–369. Retrieved 2024-01-31, from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2285824>
- 19
- Minderer, M., Gritsenko, A. A., & Houlsby, N. (2023). Scaling Open-Vocabulary Object Detection. *CoRR*, *abs/2306.09683*. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2306.09683> doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2306.09683
- 17, 21
- Mitchell, T. M. (1997). *Machine learning, International Edition*. McGraw-Hill. Retrieved from <https://www.worldcat.org/oclc/61321007>
- 6
- Miyato, T., Maeda, S., Koyama, M., & Ishii, S. (2019). Virtual Adversarial Training: A Regularization Method for Supervised and Semi-Supervised Learning. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, *41*(8), 1979–1993. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1109/TPAMI.2018.2858821> doi: 10.1109/TPAMI.2018.2858821
- 3, 17, 22
- Mohri, M., Rostamizadeh, A., & Talwalkar, A. (2018). *Foundations of Machine Learning* (2nd ed.). MIT Press.
- 6
- Ouali, Y., Hudelot, C., & Tami, M. (2020). An Overview of Deep Semi-Supervised Learning. *CoRR*, *abs/2006.05278*. Retrieved from <https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.05278>
- 1
- Pham, H., Dai, Z., Xie, Q., & Le, Q. V. (2021). Meta Pseudo Labels. In *IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, CVPR 2021, virtual, june 19-25, 2021* (pp. 11557–11568). Computer Vision Foundation / IEEE. Retrieved from [https://openaccess.thecvf.com/content/CVPR2021/html/Pham\\_Meta\\_Pseudo\\_Labels\\_CVPR\\_2021\\_paper.html](https://openaccess.thecvf.com/content/CVPR2021/html/Pham_Meta_Pseudo_Labels_CVPR_2021_paper.html) doi: 10.1109/CVPR46437.2021.01139
- 11, 12, 14, 18, 19, 21
- Pise, N. N., & Kulkarni, P. A. (2008). A Survey of Semi-Supervised Learning Methods. In *2008 international conference on computational intelligence and security, CIS 2008, 13-17 december 2008, suzhou, china, volume 2, workshop papers* (pp. 30–34). IEEE Computer Society. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1109/CIS.2008.204> doi: 10.1109/CIS.2008.204

- 1  
Prakash, V. J., & Nithya, L. M. (2014). A Survey on Semi-Supervised Learning Techniques. *CoRR*, *abs/1402.4645*. Retrieved from <http://arxiv.org/abs/1402.4645>
- 1  
Radford, A., Kim, J. W., Hallacy, C., Ramesh, A., Goh, G., Agarwal, S., ... Sutskever, I. (2021). Learning Transferable Visual Models From Natural Language Supervision. In M. Meila & T. Zhang (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 38th international conference on machine learning, ICML 2021, 18-24 july 2021, virtual event* (Vol. 139, pp. 8748–8763). PMLR. Retrieved from <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v139/radford21a.html>
- 3, 18  
Rizve, M. N., Duarte, K., Rawat, Y. S., & Shah, M. (2021). In Defense of Pseudo-Labeling: An Uncertainty-Aware Pseudo-label Selection Framework for Semi-Supervised Learning. In *9th international conference on learning representations, ICLR 2021, virtual event, austria, may 3-7, 2021*. OpenReview.net. Retrieved from <https://openreview.net/forum?id=-ODN6SbiUU>
- 13, 22  
Rothenberger, J. C., & Diochnos, D. I. (2023). Meta Co-Training: Two Views are Better than One. *CoRR*, *abs/2311.18083*. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2311.18083> doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2311.18083
- 14, 21  
Ruspini, E. H. (1969). A new approach to clustering. *Information and Control*, *15*(1), 22-32. Retrieved from <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0019995869905919> doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0019-9958\(69\)90591-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0019-9958(69)90591-9)
- 5  
Samragh, M., Farajtabar, M., Mehta, S., Vemulapalli, R., Faghri, F., Naik, D., ... Rastegari, M. (2023). Weight subcloning: direct initialization of transformers using larger pretrained ones. *CoRR*, *abs/2312.09299*. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2312.09299> doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2312.09299
- 20  
Schuhmann, C., Beaumont, R., Vencu, R., Gordon, C., Wightman, R., Cherti, M., ... Jitsev, J. (2022). LAION-5B: An open large-scale dataset for training next generation image-text models. In S. Koyejo, S. Mohamed, A. Agarwal, D. Belgrave, K. Cho, & A. Oh (Eds.), *Advances in neural information processing systems 35: Annual conference on neural information processing systems 2022, neurips 2022, new orleans, la, usa, november 28 - december 9, 2022*. Retrieved from [http://papers.nips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2022/hash/a1859debfb3b59d094f3504d5ebb6c25-Abstract-Datasets\\_and\\_Benchmarks.html](http://papers.nips.cc/paper_files/paper/2022/hash/a1859debfb3b59d094f3504d5ebb6c25-Abstract-Datasets_and_Benchmarks.html)
- 18, 19  
Shalev-Shwartz, S., & Ben-David, S. (2014). *Understanding Machine Learning - From Theory to Algorithms*. Cambridge University Press. Retrieved from <http://www.cambridge.org/de/academic/subjects/computer-science/pattern-recognition-and-machine-learning/understanding-machine-learning-theory-algorithms>
- 6

- Shi, W., Gong, Y., Ding, C., Ma, Z., Tao, X., & Zheng, N. (2018). Transductive Semi-Supervised Deep Learning Using Min-Max Features. In V. Ferrari, M. Hebert, C. Sminchisescu, & Y. Weiss (Eds.), *Computer vision - ECCV 2018 - 15th european conference, munich, germany, september 8-14, 2018, proceedings, part V* (Vol. 11209, pp. 311–327). Springer. Retrieved from [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-01228-1\\_19](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-01228-1_19) doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-01228-1\\_19  
3, 12, 21
- Shorten, C., & Khoshgoftaar, T. M. (2019). A survey on Image Data Augmentation for Deep Learning. *J. Big Data*, 6, 60. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40537-019-0197-0> doi: 10.1186/S40537-019-0197-0  
8
- Sohn, K., Berthelot, D., Carlini, N., Zhang, Z., Zhang, H., Raffel, C., ... Li, C. (2020). FixMatch: Simplifying Semi-Supervised Learning with Consistency and Confidence. In H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato, R. Hadsell, M. Balcan, & H. Lin (Eds.), *Advances in neural information processing systems 33: Annual conference on neural information processing systems 2020, neurips 2020, december 6-12, 2020, virtual*. Retrieved from <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2020/hash/06964dce9addb1c5cb5d6e3d9838f733-Abstract.html>  
3, 10, 19, 21
- Sun, S., Jin, F., & Tu, W. (2011). View Construction for Multi-view Semi-supervised Learning. In D. Liu, H. Zhang, M. M. Polycarpou, C. Alippi, & H. He (Eds.), *Advances in neural networks - ISNN 2011 - 8th international symposium on neural networks, ISNN 2011, guilin, china, may 29-june 1, 2011, proceedings, part I* (Vol. 6675, pp. 595–601). Springer. Retrieved from [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-21105-8\\_69](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-642-21105-8_69) doi: 10.1007/978-3-642-21105-8\\_69  
14
- van Engelen, J. E., & Hoos, H. H. (2020). A survey on semi-supervised learning. *Mach. Learn.*, 109(2), 373–440. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10994-019-05855-6> doi: 10.1007/S10994-019-05855-6  
1
- Wang, J., Luo, S., & Zeng, X. (2008). A random subspace method for co-training. In *Proceedings of the international joint conference on neural networks, IJCNN 2008, part of the IEEE world congress on computational intelligence, WCCI 2008, hong kong, china, june 1-6, 2008* (pp. 195–200). IEEE. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1109/IJCNN.2008.4633789> doi: 10.1109/IJCNN.2008.4633789  
14
- Wang, W., & Zhou, Z. (2013). Co-Training with Insufficient Views. In C. S. Ong & T. B. Ho (Eds.), *Asian conference on machine learning, ACML 2013, canberra, act, australia, november 13-15, 2013* (Vol. 29, pp. 467–482). JMLR.org. Retrieved from <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v29/Wang13b.html>  
14
- Wen, T., Lai, S., & Qian, X. (2021). Preparing lessons: Improve knowledge distillation with better supervision. *Neurocomputing*, 454, 25–33. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neucom.2021.04.102> doi: 10.1016/J.NEUCOM.2021.04.102  
3, 19

- Xiao, J., Zhang, C., Gong, Y., Yin, M., Sui, Y., Xiang, L., . . . Yuan, B. (2023). HALOC: Hardware-Aware Automatic Low-Rank Compression for Compact Neural Networks. In B. Williams, Y. Chen, & J. Neville (Eds.), *Thirty-seventh AAAI conference on artificial intelligence, AAAI 2023, thirty-fifth conference on innovative applications of artificial intelligence, IAAI 2023, thirteenth symposium on educational advances in artificial intelligence, EAAI 2023, washington, dc, usa, february 7-14, 2023* (pp. 10464–10472). AAAI Press. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v37i9.26244> doi: 10.1609/AAAI.V37I9.26244  
20
- Xie, Q., Dai, Z., Hovy, E. H., Luong, M., & Le, Q. V. (2019). Unsupervised Data Augmentation. *CoRR, abs/1904.12848*. Retrieved from <http://arxiv.org/abs/1904.12848>  
3, 17, 22
- Xie, Q., Luong, M., Hovy, E. H., & Le, Q. V. (2020). Self-Training With Noisy Student Improves ImageNet Classification. In *2020 IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, CVPR 2020, seattle, wa, usa, june 13-19, 2020* (pp. 10684–10695). Computer Vision Foundation / IEEE. Retrieved from [https://openaccess.thecvf.com/content\\_CVPR\\_2020/html/Xie\\_Self-Training\\_With\\_Noisy\\_Student\\_Improves\\_ImageNet\\_Classification\\_CVPR\\_2020\\_paper.html](https://openaccess.thecvf.com/content_CVPR_2020/html/Xie_Self-Training_With_Noisy_Student_Improves_ImageNet_Classification_CVPR_2020_paper.html) doi: 10.1109/CVPR42600.2020.01070  
13, 18, 19, 21
- Xu, H., Xie, S., Tan, X. E., Huang, P., Howes, R., Sharma, V., . . . Feichtenhofer, C. (2023). Demystifying CLIP Data. *CoRR, abs/2309.16671*. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2309.16671> doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2309.16671  
18
- Yan, Y., Xu, Z., Tsang, I. W., Long, G., & Yang, Y. (2016). Robust Semi-Supervised Learning through Label Aggregation. In D. Schuurmans & M. P. Wellman (Eds.), *Proceedings of the thirtieth AAAI conference on artificial intelligence, february 12-17, 2016, phoenix, arizona, USA* (pp. 2244–2250). AAAI Press. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1609/aaai.v30i1.10276> doi: 10.1609/AAAI.V30I1.10276  
14, 21
- Yang, X., Song, Z., King, I., & Xu, Z. (2023). A Survey on Deep Semi-Supervised Learning. *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng., 35*(9), 8934–8954. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1109/TKDE.2022.3220219> doi: 10.1109/TKDE.2022.3220219  
1
- Yu, J., Yin, H., Gao, M., Xia, X., Zhang, X., & Hung, N. Q. V. (2021). Socially-Aware Self-Supervised Tri-Training for Recommendation. In F. Zhu, B. C. Ooi, & C. Miao (Eds.), *KDD '21: The 27th ACM SIGKDD conference on knowledge discovery and data mining, virtual event, singapore, august 14-18, 2021* (pp. 2084–2092). ACM. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1145/3447548.3467340> doi: 10.1145/3447548.3467340  
19
- Yu, X., Liu, T., Wang, X., & Tao, D. (2017). On Compressing Deep Models by Low Rank and Sparse Decomposition. In *2017 IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition, CVPR 2017, honolulu, hi, usa, july 21-26, 2017* (pp. 67–76). IEEE Computer Society. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1109/CVPR.2017.15> doi:

10.1109/CVPR.2017.15

20

Yuan, B., Chen, J., Zhang, W., Tai, H., & McMains, S. (2018). Iterative Cross Learning on Noisy Labels. In *2018 IEEE winter conference on applications of computer vision, WACV 2018, lake tahoe, nv, usa, march 12-15, 2018* (pp. 757–765). IEEE Computer Society. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1109/WACV.2018.00088> doi: 10.1109/WACV.2018.00088

13

Zadeh, L. (1965). Fuzzy sets. *Information and Control*, 8(3), 338-353. Retrieved from <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S001999586590241X> doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0019-9958\(65\)90241-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0019-9958(65)90241-X)

5

Zhai, X., Mustafa, B., Kolesnikov, A., & Beyer, L. (2023). Sigmoid Loss for Language Image Pre-Training. In *IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision, ICCV 2023, paris, france, october 1-6, 2023* (pp. 11941–11952). IEEE. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCV51070.2023.01100> doi: 10.1109/ICCV51070.2023.01100

3

Zhang, B., Wang, Y., Hou, W., Wu, H., Wang, J., Okumura, M., & Shinozaki, T. (2021). FlexMatch: Boosting Semi-Supervised Learning with Curriculum Pseudo Labeling. In M. Ranzato, A. Beygelzimer, Y. N. Dauphin, P. Liang, & J. W. Vaughan (Eds.), *Advances in neural information processing systems 34: Annual conference on neural information processing systems 2021, neurips 2021, december 6-14, 2021, virtual* (pp. 18408–18419). Retrieved from <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2021/hash/995693c15f439e3d189b06e89d145dd5-Abstract.html>

3, 11, 19, 21

Zhang, H., Cissé, M., Dauphin, Y. N., & Lopez-Paz, D. (2018). mixup: Beyond Empirical Risk Minimization. In *6th international conference on learning representations, ICLR 2018, vancouver, bc, canada, april 30 - may 3, 2018, conference track proceedings*. OpenReview.net. Retrieved from <https://openreview.net/forum?id=r1Ddp1-Rb>

7, 10, 19

Zhang, L., Song, J., Gao, A., Chen, J., Bao, C., & Ma, K. (2019). Be Your Own Teacher: Improve the Performance of Convolutional Neural Networks via Self Distillation. In *2019 IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision, ICCV 2019, seoul, korea (south), october 27 - november 2, 2019* (pp. 3712–3721). IEEE. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCV.2019.00381> doi: 10.1109/ICCV.2019.00381

3

Zhou, T., Wang, S., & Bilmes, J. A. (2020). Time-Consistent Self-Supervision for Semi-Supervised Learning. In *Proceedings of the 37th international conference on machine learning, ICML 2020, 13-18 july 2020, virtual event* (Vol. 119, pp. 11523–11533). PMLR. Retrieved from <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v119/zhou20d.html>

3, 10, 19, 22

Zhou, Y., & Goldman, S. A. (2004). Democratic Co-Learning. In *16th IEEE international conference on tools with artificial intelligence (ICTAI 2004), 15-17 november 2004, boca raton, fl, USA* (pp. 594–602). IEEE Computer Society. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICTAI.2004.48> doi: 10.1109/ICTAI.2004.48

14, 21

Zhou, Z., & Li, M. (2005). Tri-Training: Exploiting Unlabeled Data Using Three Classifiers. *IEEE Trans. Knowl. Data Eng.*, 17(11), 1529–1541. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1109/TKDE.2005.186> doi: 10.1109/TKDE.2005.186

14, 22

Zhu, W., Liu, S., Fernandez-Granda, C., & Razavian, N. (2023). Making Self-supervised Learning Robust to Spurious Correlation via Learning-speed Aware Sampling. *CoRR*, *abs/2311.16361*. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2311.16361> doi: 10.48550/ARXIV.2311.16361

18

Zhu, X., & Ghahramani, Z. (2002). Learning from Labeled and Unlabeled Data with Label Propagation. *ProQuest Number: INFORMATION TO ALL USERS*.

12

Zhu, X., & Goldberg, A. B. (2009). *Introduction to Semi-Supervised Learning*. Morgan & Claypool Publishers. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.2200/S00196ED1V01Y200906AIM006> doi: 10.2200/S00196ED1V01Y200906AIM006

1