

# DEDPUL: Difference-of-Estimated-Densities-based Positive-Unlabeled Learning

Dmitry Ivanov

National Research University Higher School of Economics  
Saint-Petersburg, Russia  
diivanov@hse.ru

## ABSTRACT

Positive-Unlabeled Learning is an analog to supervised binary classification for the case when the negative (N) sample in the training set is noisy, i.e. is contaminated with latent instances of the positive (P) class and hence is unlabeled (U). The objective is to classify U, which requires to identify the mixing proportions of P and N in U first. Recently, unbiased Risk Estimation has been successfully applied to train classifiers on PU data, achieving state-of-the-art results (du Plessis et al., 2017). This approach, however, exhibits two major bottlenecks. First, the mixing proportions are assumed to be known in the domain or estimated with additional methods. Second, the approach relies on the classifier being a neural network. In this paper, we propose DEDPUL<sup>1</sup>, a method that solves PU Learning without the aforementioned issues. The mechanism behind DEDPUL is to apply a computationally cheap post-processing procedure to predictions of any classifier, trained to distinguish P from U. Instead of assuming the proportions to be identified, DEDPUL estimates them alongside with classifying U. Experiments show that DEDPUL outperforms the Risk Estimation approach when neural networks are used as classifiers. On some data sets, the performance can be improved even further if ensembles of trees are used as classifiers instead. At the same time, DEDPUL also outperforms the current state-of-the-art in Mixture Proportion Estimation, especially in the cases when P and U distributions are similar.

## KEYWORDS

Positive-Unlabeled Classification; Mixture Proportion Estimation; Semi-Supervised Learning; Density Estimation; Neural Networks

## 1 INTRODUCTION

Positive-Unlabeled (PU) Learning is a semi-supervised analog of binary classification. Unlike the latter, PU Classification does not require labeled samples from both classes for training. Instead, two samples are required: a labeled sample from positive (P) class, and an unlabeled (U) sample with mixed data from both positive and negative (N) classes with generally unknown mixing proportions.

PU Classification naturally emerges in numerous real-world cases where obtaining labeled data from both classes is either complicated or impossible. We informally divide the applications into three categories. In the first category, PU learning is an analog to binary classification. Here, the latter could be applied, but the former accounts for the noise and hence is more accurate. An example is identification of disease genes [30]. Typically, the already identified disease genes are treated as P and the rest unknown genes are treated as N. Instead, the authors more accurately treat the latter as U.

In the second category, PU learning is an analog to one-class classification. The latter only uses P data to learn and assumes N to be uniformly distributed [5], whereas the former approximates N distribution as the difference between U and P distributions. Moreover, the outcome of the one-class approach is usually an anomaly metric, while PU learning provides tools to estimate both prior and posterior probabilities. Examples are detection of deceptive reviews [25] or anomalous time-series [22].

The third category contains the cases for which neither supervised nor one-class classification could be used. An example is identification of corruption in Russian procurement auctions [11]. An extensive data set of the auctions can be freely accessed. However, it does not contain any labels of corruption. The proposed solution is to detect only successful corruptioneers by treating runner-ups as fair (P) and winners as possibly corrupted (U) participants. On the one hand, ignoring the noise and using the supervised approach is equivalent to assuming all winners to be corrupted – an overly strong assumption that defeats the purpose. Winning is not suspicious per se. On the other hand, the one-class approach is too insensitive, unable to detect subtle differences between the winners and the runner-ups based solely on the runner-ups’ sample. Thus, neither could be used, while PU learning is a viable option.

Our main contribution is a flexible transparent method named Difference-of-Estimated-Densities-based Positive-Unlabeled Learning, or DEDPUL. The method simultaneously estimates the proportions of the mixing components in U and classifies it. The experiments show that DEDPUL outperforms the current state-of-the-art methods [14, 24], each able to solve only one of the two problems.

DEDPUL adheres to the following two-step strategy. In the first step, a Non-Traditional Classifier (NTC) is constructed [9]. NTC is any classifier trained to distinguish P from U samples. During learning, NTC simply treats U as N, which leads to biased estimates. The second step should eliminate this bias. At the second step, densities of the NTC predictions for both P and U samples are explicitly estimated. As a theoretical ground for DEDPUL, we derive equation (11) which connects the estimated densities to the posterior probability of being positive via the Bayes rule.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces notations, formalizes the problems of Mixture Proportion Estimation and PU Classification, and solves them for the case of known densities. Section 3 proposes DEDPUL. Section 4 briefly summarizes the history of PU Classification. Section 5 describes the experimental procedure. Section 6 provides the results of comparison with state-of-the-art, as well as an ablation study. Section 7 concludes.

<sup>1</sup>Implementation of DEDPUL is available at <https://github.com/dimonenka/DEDPUL>

## 2 PROBLEM SETUP AND NOTATION

In this section, we cover the population case when the densities of P and U distributions are known in advance. We introduce relevant notations and formally define the problems of Mixture Proportions Estimation and PU Classification. We also prove that NTC is a posterior-preserving transformation.

Let  $f_p(x)$ ,  $f_n(x)$ ,  $f_u(x)$  be the probability density functions of P, N, and U distributions of  $x$ , where  $x \in \mathbb{R}^m$  is a vector in an  $m$ -dimensional feature space. Let  $\alpha$  be the proportion of  $f_p(x)$  in  $f_u(x)$ :

$$f_u(x) = \alpha f_p(x) + (1 - \alpha) f_n(x) \quad (1)$$

Denote  $f(p | x)$  as the posterior probability that  $x \sim f_u(x)$  is sampled from  $f_p(x)$  rather than  $f_n(x)$ . This posterior probability can be computed using the Bayes rule, providing the priors  $\alpha$  are identified:

$$f(p | x) = \frac{\alpha f_p(x)}{\alpha f_p(x) + (1 - \alpha) f_n(x)} = \alpha \frac{f_p(x)}{f_u(x)} \quad (2)$$

### 2.1 True Proportions are Unidentifiable

The goal of Mixture Proportions Estimation is to estimate the proportions of the mixing components in U, given the samples  $X_p$  and  $X_u$  from the distributions  $f_p(x)$  and  $f_u(x)$  respectively. The problem is fundamentally ill-posed even if the distributions  $f_p(x)$  and  $f_u(x)$  are known. Indeed, a valid estimate of  $\alpha$  is any  $\tilde{\alpha}$  (tilde denotes estimate) that fits the following constraint from (1):

$$\forall x : f_u(x) \geq \tilde{\alpha} f_p(x) \quad (3)$$

The constraint is that a mixing component cannot exceed the mixture itself. In other words, true proportion  $\alpha$  is generally unidentifiable [5], as it might be any value in the range  $\alpha \in [0, \alpha^*]$ . However, the upper bound  $\alpha^*$  of the range can be identified directly from (3):

$$\alpha^* = \inf_{x \sim f_u(x)} \frac{f_u(x)}{f_p(x)} \quad (4)$$

Usually, assumptions in regard to the proportions are made to cope with unidentifiability, e.g. mutual irreducibility in [28] and anchor set in [24, 27]. These assumptions are unverifiable and rarely hold in practice. Instead, we consider estimation of the identifiable upper-bound  $\alpha^*$  as the objective of Mixture Proportions Estimation, explicitly acknowledging that the true proportion  $\alpha$  might be lower. Denote  $f^*(p | x)$  as the corresponding to  $\alpha^*$  posteriors:

$$f^*(p | x) = \alpha^* \frac{f_p(x)}{f_u(x)} \quad (5)$$

### 2.2 Non-Traditional Classifier

Here we discuss how Non-Traditional Classifier (NTC) might be useful for Mixture Proportions Estimation and PU Classification. Define  $y(x)$  as the following likelihood proportion:

$$y(x) = \frac{f_p(x)}{f_p(x) + f_u(x)} \quad (6)$$

Define NTC as a function that estimates  $y(x)$ :

$$NTC : x \in \mathbb{R}^m \rightarrow \tilde{y} \in [0, 1] \quad (7)$$

In practice, NTC is a balanced binary classifier trained on samples  $X_p$  and  $X_u$ .

By definition (6), the proportions (4) and the posteriors (5) can be estimated through  $y(x)$ :

$$\alpha^* = \inf_{x \sim f_u(x)} \frac{1 - y(x)}{y(x)} \quad (8)$$

$$f^*(p | x) = \alpha^* \frac{y(x)}{1 - y(x)} \quad (9)$$

Directly applying (8) and (9) to the output of NTC has been considered by [9] and is referred to as the EN method. Its performance is reported in Section 6.2. We, however, go one step further.

Let  $g_p(y)$ ,  $g_n(y)$ ,  $g_u(y)$  be the probability density functions of the distributions of  $y(x)$  with  $x \sim f_p(x)$ ,  $x \sim f_n(x)$ , and  $x \sim f_u(x)$  respectively. Equation (9) shows that the posteriors  $f^*(p | x)$  are unambiguously and monotonically related to  $y(x)$ . In particular:

$$\forall x_1, x_2 : y(x_1) = y(x_2) \Leftrightarrow f^*(p | x_1) = f^*(p | x_2) \quad (10)$$

This property is crucial. It means that NTC is posterior-preserving transformation:

$$f^*(p | x) = \alpha^* \frac{f_p(x)}{f_u(x)} = \alpha^* \frac{g_p(y)}{g_u(y)} = g^*(p | y) \quad (11)$$

and  $\alpha^*$ -preserving transformation:

$$\alpha^* = \inf_{x \sim f_u(x)} \frac{f_u(x)}{f_p(x)} = \inf_{y \sim g_u(y)} \frac{g_u(y)}{g_p(y)} \quad (12)$$

We now formally prove these statements.

LEMMA 2.1. *NTC is posterior- and  $\alpha^*$ -preserving transformation, i.e. (11) and (12) hold.*


PROOF. To prove (11) and (12), we only need to show that  $\frac{f_p(x)}{f_u(x)} = \frac{g_p(y)}{g_u(y)}$ . For that, we apply rule of variable substitution in probability density function  $f(x) = g(y(x)) * \left| \frac{dy}{dx} \right|$ . Then,  $\frac{f_p(x)}{f_u(x)} = \frac{g_p(y) * \left| \frac{dy}{dx} \right|}{g_u(y) * \left| \frac{dy}{dx} \right|} = \frac{g_p(y)}{g_u(y)}$ .  $\square$

Equation (12) is already known in the literature [13], although the proof is not as simple as ours. Equation (11) has not been proven before.

## 3 ALGORITHM DEVELOPMENT

In this section, we propose DEDPUL to solve both problems of Mixture Proportion Estimation and PU Classification. The method is summarized in Algorithm 1 and is illustrated in Figure 1, while the secondary functions are presented in Algorithm 2.

In the previous section, we have already discussed how to solve the problems of Mixture Proportions Estimation and PU Classification in the case of explicitly known distributions  $f_p(x)$  and  $f_u(x)$ . That is, we can directly apply (4) to find the proportions  $\alpha^*$  and (5) to find the posteriors  $f^*(p | x)$ . However, this is rarely the case: only the samples  $X_p$  and  $X_u$  are usually available. Can we use these samples to estimate densities  $f_p(x)$  and  $f_u(x)$ , e.g. with kernel density estimation, and still apply (4) and (5)? Formally the answer is



**Figure 1: DEDPUL.** **Data:** Upper row (Ones) represents Positive sample  $X_p$ , lower row (Ones and Zeros) represents Unlabeled sample  $X_u$ . **Non-Traditional Classifier:** NTC is a supervised binary classifier trained to distinguish  $X_p$  from  $X_u$ . **Predictions:** Predicted by NTC probabilities  $Y_p$  and  $Y_u$  for samples  $X_p$  and  $X_u$ , obtained with cross-validation. **NTC reduces dimensionality.** **Densities of Predictions:** Probability density functions  $\tilde{g}_p(y)$  and  $\tilde{g}_u(y)$  of  $Y_p$  and  $Y_u$  estimated with Kernel Density Estimation. **Difference of Densities:** Smoothed density ratio  $\frac{\tilde{g}_p(y)}{\tilde{g}_u(y)}$ . **Priors, Posteriors:** Priors  $\alpha^*$  are estimated either as  $\tilde{\alpha}_c^*$  with EM (if converges non-trivially) or as  $\tilde{\alpha}_n^*$  with MAX\_SLOPE. Corresponding posteriors  $g^*(p | y)$  are estimated with the Bayes rule.

---

#### Algorithm 1 DEDPUL

---

- 1: **Input:** Unlabeled sample  $X_u$ , Positive sample  $X_p$
  - 2: **Output:** Priors  $\tilde{\alpha}^*$ , Posteriors  $\{\tilde{f}^*(p | x) : x \in X_u\}$
  - 3:  $\tilde{Y}_u, \tilde{Y}_p = NTC(X_u), NTC(X_p) \setminus \setminus$  We use ensemble of Neural Networks as NTC
  - 4:  $\tilde{g}_u(y), \tilde{g}_p(y) = kde(\tilde{Y}_u), kde(\tilde{Y}_p) \setminus \setminus$  Kernel Density Estimation
  - 5:  $diff = \{\frac{\tilde{g}_p(y)}{\tilde{g}_u(y)} : y \in \tilde{Y}_u\} \setminus \setminus$  Array of density ratios
  - 6:  $diff = diff[argsort(\tilde{Y}_u)] \setminus \setminus$  Sort diff by  $\tilde{Y}_u$
  - 7:  $sort(\tilde{Y}_u) \setminus \setminus$  Sort predictions
  - 8:  $diff = monotonize(diff, \tilde{Y}_u) \setminus \setminus$  This and other functions are defined in Algorithm 2
  - 9:  $diff = rolling\_median(diff)$
  - 10:  $desort(diff) \setminus \setminus$  Return diff to initial unsorted order
  - 11:  $\tilde{\alpha}_c^*, \tilde{g}_c^*(p | y) = EM(diff)$
  - 12:  $\tilde{\alpha}_n^*, \tilde{g}_n^*(p | y) = max\_slope(diff)$
  - 13: **if**  $\tilde{\alpha}_c^* \geq \tilde{\alpha}_n^*$  **then**
  - 14:     **Return**  $\tilde{\alpha}_c^*, \tilde{g}_c^*(p | y)$
  - 15: **else**
  - 16:     **Return**  $\tilde{\alpha}_n^*, \tilde{g}_n^*(p | y)$
- 

positive, and this idea is explored in [13] as a baseline. In practice, however, two crucial issues may arise with this naive approach. Below we formulate these two issues and propose solutions, which eventually results in DEDPUL.

The first issue is that the performance of density estimation methods rapidly decreases as the dimensionality of the distribution increases [21], which makes the estimation of high-dimensional densities difficult. The issue is known as the 'curse of dimensionality'.

The issue may be resolved with a preliminary procedure that reduces the dimensionality of  $X_p$  and  $X_u$ . To this end, we propose the NTC transformation (7). This choice is theoretically motivated by the property of NTC to preserve the priors and the posteriors (Lemma 2.1). After applying this transformation, we may estimate one-dimensional densities  $g_p(y)$  and  $g_u(y)$  of NTC predictions instead of  $m$ -dimensional densities  $f_p(x)$  and  $f_u(x)$ . Consequently, (4) and (5) are replaced with (12) and (11). Note that the choice of NTC is flexible and depends on the data.

The second issue is that (12) systematically underestimates  $\alpha^*$  as it relies solely on the infimum point. The reason this may happen is the noise in estimates of the NTC predictions  $\tilde{y}(x)$  and of their densities  $\tilde{g}_u(y)$  and  $\tilde{g}_p(y)$ . To resolve this issue, we propose two alternative estimates.

### 3.1 Alternative $\alpha^*$ Estimation

Here we propose and illustrate (Fig. 2) two alternative to (12) approaches to estimate the proportions  $\alpha^*$ .

The first approach is based on the rule that the priors are equal to the expected posteriors. We propose  $\tilde{\alpha}_c^*$  as the estimate for which the rule holds. If exists, this estimate can be identified with iterative EM algorithm.

---

**Algorithm 2** Secondary functions for DEDPUL

---

```

1: function EM(diff, tol = 10-5)
2:    $\tilde{\alpha}^* = 1 \setminus\setminus$  Initialize
3:   repeat
4:      $\tilde{\alpha}_{prev}^* = \tilde{\alpha}^*$ 
5:      $\tilde{g}^*(p | y) = \min(\tilde{\alpha}^* * diff, 1) \setminus\setminus$  E-step
6:      $\tilde{\alpha}^* = \text{mean}(\tilde{g}^*(p | y)) \setminus\setminus$  M-step
7:   until  $|\tilde{\alpha}_{prev}^* - \tilde{\alpha}^*| < tol$ 
8:   Return  $\tilde{\alpha}^*, \tilde{g}^*(p | y)$ 
9: function MAX_SLOPE(diff, max_e = 0.05, s = 10-3)
10:  errors = list() \setminus\setminus Array of function values
11:  for  $\tilde{\alpha}^*$  in range(start=0, end=1, step=s) do
12:     $\tilde{g}^*(p | y) = \min(\tilde{\alpha}^* * diff, 1)$ 
13:    idx =  $\tilde{\alpha}^* / s$ 
14:    errors[idx] =  $\tilde{\alpha}^* - \text{mean}(\tilde{g}^*(p | y))$ 
15:  lags = list() \setminus\setminus Array of function second lags
16:  for i in range(start=1, end=length(errors) - 1, step=1) do
17:    lags[i] = (errors[i - 1] - errors[i]) - (errors[i] - errors[i + 1])
18:  idx = argmax(lags) s. t. errors < max_e
19:   $\tilde{\alpha}^* = idx * s$ 
20:   $\tilde{g}^*(p | y) = \min(\tilde{\alpha}^* * diff, 1)$ 
21:  Return  $\tilde{\alpha}^*, \tilde{g}^*(p | y)$ 
22: function MONOTONIZE(diff,  $\tilde{Y}_u$ , threshold = 0.5)
23:  max_cur = 0
24:  for i in range(start=0, end=length(diff), step=1) do
25:    if  $\tilde{Y}_u[i] \geq \text{threshold}$  then
26:      max_cur = max(diff[i], max_cur)
27:      diff[i] = max_cur
28:  Return diff
29: function ROLLING_MEDIAN(diff)
30:  L = length(diff)
31:  k = L/20
32:  diff_new = diff
33:  for i in range(start=0, end=L, step=1) do
34:    k_cur = min(k, i, L - i)
35:    diff_new[i] = median(diff[i - k_cur : i + k_cur])
36:  Return diff_new

```

---

Specifically, on Expectation step the algorithm fixes  $\tilde{\alpha}$  and estimates the posteriors  $\tilde{g}(p | y)$  using clipped (11):

$$\tilde{g}(p | y) = \min\left(\tilde{\alpha} \frac{\tilde{g}_p(y)}{\tilde{g}_u(y)}, 1\right) \quad (13)$$

On Maximization step the algorithm updates the proportions  $\tilde{\alpha}$  as the mean value of the posteriors over the unlabeled sample  $\tilde{Y}_u$ :

$$\tilde{\alpha} = \text{mean}_{y \in \tilde{Y}_u}(\tilde{g}(p | y)) \quad (14)$$

The algorithm iterates until convergence or until the maximum number of steps is reached. It is vital to initialize with  $\tilde{\alpha} = 1$ .

Still, the estimate  $\tilde{\alpha}_c^*$  may not exist. In this case we propose  $\tilde{\alpha}_n^*$  as the estimate where the slope of a function  $D(\tilde{\alpha})$  changes the most:

$$\tilde{D}(\tilde{\alpha}) = \tilde{\alpha} - \text{mean}_{y \in \tilde{Y}_u}(\tilde{g}(p | y)) \quad (15)$$

MAX\_SLOPE identifies  $\tilde{\alpha}_n^*$  on a grid of  $\tilde{\alpha}$  values in  $[0, 1]$ , second difference of  $\tilde{D}(\tilde{\alpha})$  is calculated for each value in the grid, and such  $\tilde{\alpha}$  is chosen that corresponds to the highest second difference.

We now prove that the estimates  $\alpha_c^*$  and  $\alpha_n^*$  these methods are approximating coincide with  $\alpha^*$ .

LEMMA 3.1. *Alternative estimates of priors coincide with its definition (12):  $\alpha_c^* = \alpha_n^* = \alpha^*$ , where  $D(\alpha) = \alpha - \mathbb{E}_{y \sim g_u(y)} [g(p | y)]$ ,*

$$\alpha_c^* = \max_{\alpha \in [0,1]} \{\alpha \mid D(\alpha) = 0\} \quad (16)$$

$$\alpha_n^* = \min_{\alpha \in [0,1]} \{\alpha \mid D(\alpha + \epsilon) - 2D(\alpha) + D(\alpha - \epsilon) > 0\} \quad (17)$$

PROOF. We first prove that  $D(\alpha)$  behaves in a specific way (Fig. 2a). For valid priors  $\alpha \leq \alpha^* \Rightarrow D(\alpha) = 0$ , since priors must be equal to expected posteriors [10]. For invalid priors  $\alpha > \alpha^* \Rightarrow g(p | y) > 1$  for some  $y$  by definition of  $\alpha^*$  (12). To prevent this, the posteriors are clipped as in (13). Then,  $\alpha > \alpha^* \Rightarrow D(\alpha) > 0$ . From the outlined behaviour of  $D(\alpha)$ , it follows that  $\alpha_c^* = \alpha_n^* = \alpha^*$ . Specifically,  $\alpha^*$  is the highest  $\alpha$  for which  $D(\alpha) = 0$ , and the lowest  $\alpha$  for which  $D(\alpha + \epsilon) - 2 * D(\alpha) + D(\alpha - \epsilon) = D(\alpha + \epsilon) > 0$  for some small  $\epsilon$ .  $\square$

Figures 2b and 2c reflect how Figure 2a changes in practice due to noise: in simple words, the curve either ‘rotates’ down or up. In the more frequent first case, non-trivial  $\tilde{\alpha}_c^*$  exists (the curve intersects zero). In the second case, EM converges to  $\tilde{\alpha} = 0$ , and  $\tilde{\alpha}_n^*$  estimate is used instead. In practice we recommend to plot figures similar to Fig. 2 to visually identify  $\alpha_c^*$  (if exists) or  $\alpha_n^*$ .




Figure 2: Behaviours of (16) in theory (a) and practice (b, c)

## 4 RELATED WORK

Here we provide a brief overview of PU Learning methods.

Early PU learning methods mostly concerned text classification [18, 20, 31]. The strategy behind these methods was (i) to identify Reliably Negative (RN) instances in U and (ii) to train a traditional classifier on P and RN samples. The drawbacks of such strategy are obvious: on the one hand, a large and potentially useful subsample of U is ignored; on the other hand, RN may still be contaminated with P. In 2003 two studies have considered a different strategy: to adapt logistic regression [17] and SVM [19] for PU setting by changing their loss functions. These methods successfully outperformed the heuristic approach.

The paper of [9] is often considered to be a milestone in PU classification. The authors proposed two PU classification methods. First, they introduced the notion of NTC and algebraically connected

its predictions  $y(x)$  with the posteriors  $f(p | x)$  through (9). Second, they considered U data as simultaneously P and N, weighted with opposite weights. By introducing these weights into the loss function, any PN classifier may be learned directly from PU data. Disappointingly, these weights are exactly the posteriors  $f(p | x)$  and  $f(n | x)$ , meaning that to implement the method the answer is required. Nevertheless, this general idea of loss function reweighting would later be adopted by the Risk Estimation framework [6, 7] and its latest non-negative modification [14], that is currently considered state-of-the-art. For a more complete overview of the methods, see [4].

Most of the described methods require prior knowledge of the mixing proportions, which may be considered a bottleneck. Among those only [9] address this issue by proposing three ways to estimate the proportions (one of which is (8)). Fortunately, multiple studies focus solely on this problem known as Mixture Proportions Estimation [3, 8, 13, 24, 26]. The state-of-the-art method is KM [24], which is based on mean embeddings of P and U samples into reproducing kernel Hilbert space. Another noteworthy method is AlphaMax [13], which explicitly estimates the total likelihood of  $X_p$  and  $X_u$  as a function of  $\alpha$ , and identifies the proportions as the point where the slope of the likelihood changes the most.

Some recent studies concern the question of how PU data is generated [12, 13]. Most methods, including DEDPUL, assume that the distributions of labeled and unlabeled Positives coincide. From the data generation perspective, this can be formulated as Selected Completely At Random assumption: the probability of a Positive instance  $x$  to be labeled is a constant and does not depend on  $x$ . A more general alternative to this is Selected At Random assumption, which allows labeling probability to be a function of  $x$ , called propensity score [2]. Unfortunately, dropping SCAR in favor of SAR means sacrificing the identifiability of the priors  $\alpha^*$ .

## 5 EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURE

We conduct experiments on synthetic and benchmark data sets to evaluate the performance of the algorithms (DEDPUL, EN, KM, nnRE). We consider Mixture Proportions Estimation and PU Classification as separate problems and measure performance on them independently. The Mixture Proportions Estimation algorithms try to identify the proportions, while the PU Classification algorithms receive the proportions  $\alpha^*$  (synthetic data) or  $\alpha$  (benchmark data) as an input and try to classify  $X_u$ . The algorithms are tested on numerous data sets that differ in the initial distributions of the mixing components, in their proportions, and in the extent of their intersection. Additionally, each experiment is repeated 10 times for different randomly drawn samples, and the performance is averaged. The algorithms are compared pair-wise and the significance is verified using paired Wilcoxon signed-rank test with 0.001 P-value threshold.

### 5.1 Data

In the synthetic setting we experiment with mixtures of one-dimensional Laplace distributions. We fix  $f_p(x)$  as  $L(0, 1)$  and mix it with different  $f_n(x)$ :  $L(1, 1)$ ,  $L(2, 1)$ ,  $L(4, 1)$ ,  $L(0, 2)$ , and  $L(0, 4)$ . For each of these cases, the proportion  $\alpha$  is varied in  $\{0.01, 0.05, 0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 0.95, 0.99\}$ . Sizes of the samples  $X_p$  and  $X_u$  are fixed as 500 and 2500.

In the benchmark setting we experiment with eight data sets from UCI machine learning repository [1], MNIST image data set of handwritten digits [16], and CIFAR-10 image data set [15] of vehicles and animals (Table 1). The proportion  $\alpha$  is varied in  $\{0.05, 0.25, 0.5, 0.75, 0.95\}$ . The samples  $X_p$  and  $X_u$  are randomly drawn from the data sets in a stratified manner to satisfy these proportions. The joint size of the samples does not exceed 5000. Categorical features are transformed into numerical features with dummy encoding. Numerical features are normalized. Regression and multi-classification target variables are adapted for binary classification.

**Table 1: Description of benchmark data sets**

data set	initial size	dim	positive target values	negative target values
bank	45211	16	yes	no
concrete	1030	8	(35.8, 82.6)	(2.3, 35.8)
landsat	6435	36	4, 5, 7	1, 2, 3
mushroom	8124	22	p	e
pageblock	5473	10	2, 3, 4, 5	1
shuttle	58000	9	2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7	1
spambase	4601	57	1	0
wine	6497	12	red	white
mnist	70000	784	1, 3, 5, 7, 9	0, 2, 4, 6, 8
cifar10	60000	3072	plane, car, ship, track	bird, cat, deer, frog, dog, horse

### 5.2 Measures for Performance Evaluation

The synthetic setting provides a straightforward way to evaluate performance. Since the underlying distributions  $f_p(x)$  and  $f_u(x)$  are known, we calculate the true values of the proportions  $\alpha^*$  and the posteriors  $f^*(p | x)$  using (4) and (5) respectively. Then, we directly compare these with algorithm’s estimates using mean absolute errors (Table 2, row 1). In the benchmark setting the distributions are unknown, and the performance measures of the synthetic setting are unavailable. Here, for Mixture Proportions Estimation we use a similar measure, but substitute  $\alpha^*$  with  $\alpha$ , while for PU Classification we use  $1 - accuracy$  with 0.5 probability threshold (Table 2, row 2).

**Table 2: Performance measures for estimates of priors and posteriors on synthetic and benchmark data**

	$\alpha^*$	$f^*(p   x)$
synthetic	$ \alpha^* - \tilde{\alpha}^* $	$mean_{x \in X_u}  f^*(p   x) - \tilde{f}^*(p   x) $
benchmark	$ \alpha - \tilde{\alpha}^* $	1 - accuracy

Note that such measure of proportion estimation in the benchmark data favors the algorithms that consistently underestimate it, since generally  $\alpha < \alpha^*$ . In this sense, synthetic experiments are more reliable due to ability to compare directly to  $\alpha^*$ . Surprisingly, we do not know a single paper that takes this into account, as unidentifiable  $\alpha$  and not  $\alpha^*$  has traditionally been used as the ground truth.

### 5.3 Implementations of Algorithms

DEDPUL is implemented according to Algorithms 1 and 2. As NTC we use an ensemble of 10 neural networks with 1 hidden layer (aside from the input and the output layers) of 32 to 512 neurons, depending on the data. For CIFAR-10 a light version of all-convolutional net [29] with 6 convolutional layers is used. The networks are trained on the logistic loss with the ADAM optimizer. The predictions of each network are obtained with 3-fold cross-validation and are averaged over the ensemble. Densities of the predictions are computed using kernel density estimation with Gaussian kernels. Instead of  $\tilde{y}(x) \in [0, 1]$ , we estimate densities of appropriately ranged  $\log\left(\frac{\tilde{y}(x)}{1-\tilde{y}(x)}\right)$  and make according post-transformations. Bandwidths are set as 0.1 and 0.05 for  $\tilde{g}_p(y)$  and  $\tilde{g}_u(y)$  respectively. In practice, a high-performing heuristic is to independently choose bandwidths for  $\tilde{g}_p(y)$  and  $\tilde{g}_u(y)$  that maximize average log-likelihood during cross-validation. Threshold in MONOTONIZE is chosen as  $\tilde{y} \in \tilde{Y}_u$ .

Below this threshold, a smother variant of monotonization is applied.

Elkan-Noto (EN) is implemented as in [9]. The paper proposes posteriors' estimator (9) and three proportions' estimators e1, e2, and e3, where e3 is analogous to (8). We use e3 and e1 for the synthetic and the benchmark data sets respectively. Predictions  $\tilde{y}(x)$  are obtained with the same NTC as in DEDPUL.

The implementations of the Kernel Mean based gradient thresholding algorithm are retrieved from the original paper [24].<sup>2</sup> We provide experimental results for KM2, which is a better performing version. As initially advised, MNIST and CIFAR-10 data is reduced to 50 dimensions with Principal Component Analysis. Since it has been shown in the literature that KM outperforms Alphamax [13] and performs on the level of TicE [3], we imply that by comparing DEDPUL with KM we also compare with these methods.

We explore two versions of the non-negative Risk Estimation (nnRE) algorithm [14]. In original nnRE-sigmoid the networks are trained on the sigmoid loss<sup>3</sup>, while in nnRE-brier we propose to use the Brier loss instead. The architectures are adjusted to optimize performance: we use an ensemble of 10 neural networks with 3 hidden layers of 32 to 256 neurons, depending on the data. For CIFAR-10, the same light version of all-convolutional net is used. The hyperparameters are chosen as  $\beta = 0.1$  and  $\gamma = 0.9$ .

## 6 EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS

### 6.1 Comparison with State-of-the-art

Results of comparison between DEDPUL and state-of-the-art methods are presented in Figures 3-6. DEDPUL significantly outperforms both KM and nnRE on both the synthetic and the benchmark data.

On the benchmark data (Fig. 4) DEDPUL outperforms KM. On some data sets (landsat, pageblock, spambase, wine), the algorithms perform comparably for all  $\alpha$  values except for the highest  $\alpha = 0.95$  where KM breaks. On all other data sets except for bank, DEDPUL strictly outperforms KM. Likewise, DEDPUL outperforms KM on all synthetic data sets (Fig. 3), especially when the priors are high. Evidently, DEDPUL is applicable to a wider range of mixture proportions than KM.

<sup>2</sup><http://web.eecs.umich.edu/~cscott/code.html#kmpe>.

<sup>3</sup>The sigmoid and the Brier loss functions are mean absolute and mean squared errors between classifier's predictions and true labels.




Figure 3: Performance of Mixture Proportions Estimation methods on mixtures of Laplace distributions




Figure 4: Performance of Mixture Proportions Estimation methods on benchmark data sets




Figure 5: Performance of Positive-Unlabeled Classification methods on mixtures of Laplace distributions




Figure 6: Performance of Positive-Unlabeled Classification methods on benchmark data sets

In the synthetic setting (Fig. 5) DEDPUL and modified nnRE-brier perform comparably. However, the original version nnRE-sigmoid performs unanimously worse than both the modified version and DEDPUL. Seemingly, neural networks trained on sigmoid loss poorly estimate probabilities. The reason for such difference between the losses might be that the sigmoid loss is minimized by the median prediction, i.e. either 0 or 1 label, while the Brier loss is minimized by the mean prediction, i.e. a probability in  $[0, 1]$  range.

DEDPUL also outperforms both nnRE-sigmoid and nnRE-brier on most benchmark data sets. In the next subsection we show that on the data sets where DEDPUL performs mildly worse than nnRE-brier (bank, spambase), this could be changed by a more appropriate choice of NTC. The original nnRE-sigmoid still performs poorly despite only being required to predict labels.

## 6.2 Ablation study

DEDPUL is a combination of multiple parts such as NTC, density estimation, EM algorithm, and several heuristics. To disentangle the contribution of these parts to the overall performance of the method, we perform an ablation study. We modify different details of DEDPUL and report changes in performance in Figures 7-10.

First, we vary NTC. Instead of an ensemble of neural networks, we test gradient boosting of decision trees. The implementation we use is an open-source library *CatBoost* [23]. The maximum length of trees is fixed as 4 for the synthetic data and as 10 for the benchmark data; the learning rate is chosen as 0.1; the amount of trees is defined by early stopping when the loss starts to increase; small L2-regularization is applied.

Second, we vary density estimation methods. Aside from kernel density estimation (kde), we try Gaussian Mixture Models (*GMM*) and histograms (*hist*). The hyperparameters, i.e. numbers of gaussians and bins, are chosen by independently maximizing average log-likelihood of  $g_p(y)$  and  $g_u(y)$  on 5-fold cross-validation. The number of bins is chosen from [20, 250] range, and the number of gaussians is chosen from [1, 50] range.

Third, we replace the proposed estimates of priors  $\alpha_c^*$  and  $\alpha_n^*$  with the default estimate (12) (*simple\_alpha*). This is similar to the pdf-ratio baseline from [13]. We replace strict infimum with 0.05 quantile for improved stability.

Fourth, we stop applying smoothing heuristics *MONOTONIZE* and *ROLLING\_MEDIAN* to estimated density ratio  $\frac{\hat{g}_p(y)}{\hat{g}_u(y)}$  (*no\_smooth*).

Fifth, we report performance of *EN* method [9]. This can be seen as ablation of DEDPUL where density estimation is removed altogether and replaced by simpler equations (8) and (9).

*CatBoost*. In the synthetic setting, CatBoost performs worse as NTC than neural network on both tasks of priors and posteriors estimation. It might not be surprising that the smooth probability curves of Laplace mixtures are better approximated with neural networks' predictions than step-wise predictions of tree ensemble. The situation changes for benchmark data. Here, CatBoost often performs on the level of neural networks or better, especially during label assignment (Fig. 10 - bank, mushroom, pageblock, shuttle, spambase). The only data set where CatBoost performance degrades is concrete, although this is the smallest data set on which 10-deep trees might overfit. Admittedly, the performance of CatBoost is not reported on landsat, mnist, and cifar10 data sets, since trees are naturally worse than neural networks when trained on pixel-wise image data. Overall, this comparison highlights flexibility in the choice of NTC for DEDPUL depending on the task at hand.

*Density estimation*. On most synthetic (L(1, 1), L(2, 1), L(0, 2), L(0, 4)) and some benchmark (pageblock) data sets GMM performs worse as density estimation procedure than kde. On other data sets, the methods perform comparably, which indicates robustness to the choice of the procedure. Conversely, hist underperforms compared to both alternatives on most data sets. In general, the more flexible the procedure is, the better it performs.

*Default  $\alpha^*$* . On all data sets but bank using the default  $\alpha^*$  estimation method (12) massively degrades performance, especially when contamination of the unlabeled sample with positives is high (Fig.

7, 8). This is to be expected, since (12) utilizes a single infimum (or 0.05-quantile) point of noisy density ratio, while the alternatives are based on the whole unlabeled sample. The evidence shows that the usage of the proposed estimates  $\alpha_c^*$  and  $\alpha_n^*$  is vital for DEDPUL stability.

*No smoothing*. Discarding the smoothing techniques is not very impactful on posteriors estimation (Fig. 9, 10), as performance either stays the same or drops only a little. In contrast, using these heuristics is as vital for the quality of priors estimation as using alternative estimates  $\alpha_c^*$  and  $\alpha_n^*$  (Fig. 7, 8). The heuristics are motivated by the additional knowledge that the NTC predictions are biased estimates of the posteriors  $g(p | y)$ , and hence the two should be correlated. Ignoring this knowledge potentially leaves too much noise in the density ratio estimate, to which priors estimation is sensitive.

*EN*. On the synthetic data performance of EN is decent (Fig. 7, 9). While underperforming on some data sets (L(1, 1), L(2, 1), L(4, 1)), it outperforms DEDPUL on others (L(0, 2), L(0, 4)). However, the latter never happens on benchmark data. Only on bank, shuttle, and cifar10 data sets, EN performs comparably with DEDPUL in the computation of the posteriors (Fig. 10), and its performance is poor on all data sets when estimating the priors (Fig. 8). The difference between the two methods is striking despite both being based on NTC. Among the factors that account for this difference might be the smoothing of the density ratio and the alternative estimates of priors that stabilize DEDPUL, but the application of which to EN is unclear. Another explanation is that DEDPUL depends less on the quality of NTC. EN requires NTC to output perfect probability predictions, while this requirement is relaxed in DEDPUL. For instance, it is irrelevant in DEDPUL if all predictions are biased towards 0.5, e.g. are too conservative due to regularization, as long as the density ratio does not change.

## 7 CONCLUSION

This paper makes several distinct contributions. The first contribution is theoretical: the fact that NTC preserves the posteriors has not been proven in the literature. This enables practical estimation of the posteriors with (11) by estimating the probability density functions of NTC predictions. Independently,  $\alpha_c^*$  and  $\alpha_n^*$  are proposed, the two new estimates of the priors that are based on the relation between the priors and the average posteriors. Finally, these new ideas are merged in DEDPUL, a method that simultaneously solves both problems of Mixture Proportion Estimation and PU Classification, outperforms state-of-the-art methods for both problems, and is applicable to a wide range of mixture proportions and data sets. It would be interesting to explore extensions of DEDPUL to the related problems such as PU multi-classification or mutual contamination.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I sincerely thank Ksenia Balabaeva, Vitalia Eliseeva, Alexander Nesterov, Iskander Safiulin, and Alexander Sirotkin for regular revisions of the paper. Support from the Basic Research Program of the National Research University Higher School of Economics is gratefully acknowledged.




Figure 7: Ablations of DEDPUL estimating priors in mixtures of Laplace distributions




Figure 8: Ablations of DEDPUL estimating priors in benchmark data sets




Figure 9: Ablations of DEDPUL estimating posteriors in mixtures of Laplace distributions




Figure 10: Ablations of DEDPUL estimating posteriors in benchmark data sets



## REFERENCES

- [1] K. Bache and M. Lichman. 2013. UCI Machine Learning Repository. (2013). <http://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml>
- [2] Jessa Bekker and Jesse Davis. 2018. Beyond the selected completely at random assumption for learning from positive and unlabeled data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1809.03207* (2018).
- [3] Jessa Bekker and Jesse Davis. 2018. Estimating the class prior in positive and unlabeled data through decision tree induction. In *Proceedings of the 32th AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- [4] Jessa Bekker and Jesse Davis. 2018. Learning from positive and unlabeled data: A survey. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.04820* (2018).
- [5] Gilles Blanchard, Gyemin Lee, and Clayton Scott. 2010. Semi-supervised novelty detection. *Journal of Machine Learning Research* 11, Nov (2010), 2973–3009.
- [6] Marthinus Du Plessis, Gang Niu, and Masashi Sugiyama. 2015. Convex formulation for learning from positive and unlabeled data. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. 1386–1394.
- [7] Marthinus C du Plessis, Gang Niu, and Masashi Sugiyama. 2014. Analysis of learning from positive and unlabeled data. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*. 703–711.
- [8] Marthinus Christoffel du Plessis, Gang Niu, and Masashi Sugiyama. 2015. Class-prior estimation for learning from positive and unlabeled data.. In *ACML*. 221–236.
- [9] Charles Elkan and Keith Noto. 2008. Learning classifiers from only positive and unlabeled data. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*. ACM, 213–220.
- [10] James K Hammitt and Alexander I Shlyakhter. 1999. The expected value of information and the probability of surprise. *Risk Analysis* 19, 1 (1999), 135–152.
- [11] Dmitry I Ivanov and Alexander S Nesterov. 2019. Identifying Bid Leakage In Procurement Auctions: Machine Learning Approach. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.00261* (2019).
- [12] Shantanu Jain, Martha White, and Predrag Radivojac. 2016. Estimating the class prior and posterior from noisy positives and unlabeled data. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. 2693–2701.
- [13] Shantanu Jain, Martha White, Michael W Trosset, and Predrag Radivojac. 2016. Nonparametric semi-supervised learning of class proportions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1601.01944* (2016).
- [14] Ryuichi Kiryo, Gang Niu, Marthinus C du Plessis, and Masashi Sugiyama. 2017. Positive-unlabeled learning with non-negative risk estimator. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. 1675–1685.
- [15] Alex Krizhevsky, Geoffrey Hinton, et al. 2009. *Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images*. Technical Report. Citeseer.
- [16] Yann LeCun, Corinna Cortes, and CJ Burges. 2010. MNIST handwritten digit database. *AT&T Labs [Online]*. Available: <http://yann.lecun.com/exdb/mnist> 2 (2010).
- [17] Wee Sun Lee and Bing Liu. 2003. Learning with positive and unlabeled examples using weighted logistic regression. In *ICML*, Vol. 3. 448–455.
- [18] Xiao Li and Bing Liu. 2003. Learning to classify texts using positive and unlabeled data. In *IJCAI*, Vol. 3. 587–592.
- [19] Bing Liu, Yang Dai, Xiao Li, Wee Sun Lee, and Philip S Yu. 2003. Building text classifiers using positive and unlabeled examples. In *Data Mining, 2003. ICDM 2003. Third IEEE International Conference on*. IEEE, 179–186.
- [20] Bing Liu, Wee Sun Lee, Philip S Yu, and Xiao Li. 2002. Partially supervised classification of text documents. In *ICML*, Vol. 2. Citeseer, 387–394.
- [21] Han Liu, John Lafferty, and Larry Wasserman. 2007. Sparse nonparametric density estimation in high dimensions using the rodeo. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*. 283–290.
- [22] Minh Nhut Nguyen, Xiao-Li Li, and See-Kiong Ng. 2011. Positive unlabeled learning for time series classification. In *IJCAI*, Vol. 11. 1421–1426.
- [23] Liudmila Prokhorenkova, Gleb Gusev, Aleksandr Vorobev, Anna Veronika Dorogush, and Andrey Gulin. 2018. CatBoost: unbiased boosting with categorical features. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*. 6638–6648.
- [24] Harish Ramaswamy, Clayton Scott, and Ambuj Tewari. 2016. Mixture proportion estimation via kernel embeddings of distributions. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*. 2052–2060.
- [25] Yafeng Ren, Donghong Ji, and Hongbin Zhang. 2014. Positive Unlabeled Learning for Deceptive Reviews Detection.. In *EMNLP*. 488–498.
- [26] Tyler Sanderson and Clayton Scott. 2014. Class proportion estimation with application to multiclass anomaly rejection. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*. 850–858.
- [27] Clayton Scott. 2015. A rate of convergence for mixture proportion estimation, with application to learning from noisy labels. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*. 838–846.
- [28] Clayton Scott, Gilles Blanchard, and Gregory Handy. 2013. Classification with asymmetric label noise: Consistency and maximal denoising. In *Conference On Learning Theory*. 489–511.
- [29] Jost Tobias Springenberg, Alexey Dosovitskiy, Thomas Brox, and Martin Riedemiller. 2014. Striving for simplicity: The all convolutional net. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6806* (2014).
- [30] Peng Yang, Xiao-Li Li, Jian-Ping Mei, Chee-Keong Kwoh, and See-Kiong Ng. 2012. Positive-unlabeled learning for disease gene identification. *Bioinformatics* 28, 20 (2012), 2640–2647.
- [31] Hwanjo Yu, Jiawei Han, and Kevin Chen-Chuan Chang. 2002. PEBL: Positive Example Based Learning for Web Page Classification Using SVM. In *Proceedings of the Eighth ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining (KDD '02)*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 239–248. <https://doi.org/10.1145/775047.775083>