

BadLabel: A Robust Perspective on Evaluating and Enhancing Label-noise Learning

Jingfeng Zhang^{1*}, Bo Song^{2*}, Haohan Wang³, Bo Han^{4,1}, Tongliang Liu^{5,1}, Lei Liu², Masashi Sugiyama^{1,6}

Abstract—Label-noise learning (LNL) aims to increase the model’s generalization given training data with noisy labels. To facilitate practical LNL algorithms, researchers have proposed different label noise types, ranging from class-conditional to instance-dependent noises. In this paper, we introduce a novel label noise type called *BadLabel*, which can significantly degrade the performance of existing LNL algorithms by a large margin. *BadLabel* is crafted based on the label-flipping attack against standard classification, where specific samples are selected and their labels are flipped to other labels so that the loss values of clean and noisy labels become indistinguishable. To address the challenge posed by *BadLabel*, we further propose a robust LNL method that perturbs the labels in an adversarial manner at each epoch to make the loss values of clean and noisy labels again distinguishable. Once we select a small set of (mostly) clean labeled data, we can apply the techniques of semi-supervised learning to train the model accurately. Empirically, our experimental results demonstrate that existing LNL algorithms are vulnerable to the newly introduced *BadLabel* noise type, while our proposed robust LNL method can effectively improve the generalization performance of the model under various types of label noise. The new dataset of noisy labels and the source codes of robust LNL algorithms are available at <https://github.com/zjfheart/BadLabels>.

Index Terms—a challenging type of label noise, robust label-noise learning.

I. INTRODUCTION

LABEL-NOISE learning (LNL) has become increasingly important in deep learning classification problems due to the high cost and often inaccuracy of annotations in large-scale datasets [1]–[4]. To facilitate the development of effective LNL algorithms, researchers have designed various noise types ranging from class-conditional noise (such as symmetry-flipping [4]–[6] and pair-flipping [7] noise) to instance-dependent noise [8]–[10]. In class-conditional noise, a data point’s label has a fixed probability of being flipped to another label; whereas in instance-dependent noise, the label-flipping probability depends on both the true label and features of each data point.

However, it remains unclear whether the existing LNL algorithms, such as DivideMix [11], SOP [12], and ProMix [13], are capable of handling even more challenging types of label noise. In high-stake applications such as medicine [14], [15] and cybersecurity [16], [17], where the use of machine learning techniques is under close scrutiny, it is crucial for practitioners to be aware of the limitations of existing LNL

algorithms and to employ the most robust LNL methods to ensure accurate models under various types of label noise. This motivates the development of challenging label noise types that can expose the vulnerabilities of existing LNL algorithms. Furthermore, the challenging noises can facilitate the development of more robust LNL algorithms that are applicable not only to common but also to rare types of noise.

To this end, we introduce a new type of label noise called *BadLabel*, which is created using label-flipping attacks [18], [19] on a standard multi-class classification task [20]. The discrete label space poses a challenge as it hinders the direct optimization of labels for maximizing a loss. To overcome this issue, we propose a surrogate *flag* array that can produce a label-flipping strategy. As shown in Algorithm 1, we optimize the flag over several training epochs, and the flag array in the end determines which data to flip its label and how the label should be flipped. This approach enables us to effectively handle the discrete label space and generate a challenging label noise that can expose the vulnerabilities of existing label noise learning algorithms.

We visualized and compared different types of label noise in Figure 1, with a focus on the challenging nature of the *BadLabel* to LNL algorithms. In the top row, we used a synthetic three-class classification to show that *BadLabel* often flips the labels of samples that are located far from the class boundary, leading to clusters of noisy-label data. These clusters can significantly mislead the conventional learning algorithm and result in learning wrong decision boundaries or failure in training. In the middle and bottom rows, we used the real-world CIFAR-10 dataset [21] to compare different label-flipping strategies. In the middle row, we visualized the empirical transition matrices of label noise, demonstrating that *BadLabel* has distinct corruptions from other types of label noise [22]. In the bottom row, we used a well-performing classifier to compute the loss values of clean and noisy labels over the whole training set and plot the loss distribution. We observed that *BadLabel* makes the noisy labels less distinguishable from the clean labels in terms of loss values compared to other noise types. It is worth noting that the loss value is a crucial metric in LNL algorithms to select and correct samples [7]. Therefore, *BadLabel* is indeed a challenging type of label noise to the existing LNL algorithms.

To deal with *BadLabel*, we propose a robust LNL algorithm called Robust DivideMix. The standard DivideMix [11] models the loss distribution with a Gaussian Mixture Model (GMM) [23] to divide the training data into a clean labeled set and an unlabeled set, and then applies a semi-supervised learning technique such as MixMatch [24]. However, the

The first two authors made equal contributions.

¹RIKEN Center for Advanced Intelligence Project, ²Shandong University, ³the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, ⁴Hong Kong Baptist University, ⁵the University of Sydney, ⁶the University of Tokyo




Fig. 1: Comparison of different types of label noise: (a) Clean labels, representing a noise-free dataset. (b) Symmetric noise, where the label noise is distributed randomly in each class. (c) Instance-dependent noise, where the label noise is concentrated near the class boundaries. (d) BadLabel, where the label noise is far from the class boundaries. **Top row:** Synthetic three-class examples. **Middle row:** Empirical transition matrices of different types of label noise on the CIFAR-10 dataset. **Bottom row:** Loss distributions of clean and noisy labels of the CIFAR-10 dataset, given a properly trained model.

GMM fails to model BadLabel effectively because the loss values of noisy and clean labels are not always distinguishable, as illustrated in the bottom row of Figure 1. To address this issue, our Robust DivideMix perturbs labels in an adversarial manner to aid in selecting and splitting clean and noisy labels. We then apply the BayesGMM [25] and MixMatch to divide the data and train the models, enabling our method to handle various types of label noise, including BadLabel.

Our contributions can be summarized as follows.

- We are the first to introduce a challenging type of label noise, BadLabel (Algorithm 1). We mathematically analyze and justify our proposed algorithm that can reasonably produce a BadLabel dataset (see Section III).
- We demonstrate that BadLabel noise can significantly degrade the performance of 10 state-of-the-art LNL algorithms (see Section V-A).
- We propose a robust LNL algorithm to deal with BadLabel (see Section IV). Compared to the existing LNL algorithms, our Robust DivideMix can effectively improve

the model’s generalization under BadLabel. Furthermore, Robust DivideMix can maintain comparable performance with DivideMix under other types of label noise, such as symmetric and instance-dependent noises (see Section V-B).

II. RELATED WORKS

This section reviews LNL algorithms and label-flipping attacks.

A. Label-noise Learning (LNL) Algorithms

Deep neural networks (DNNs) can easily memorize and overfit noisy labels and produce suboptimal models [26]. Many LNL algorithms have been proposed to improve the model’s generalization under label noise, which can be broadly classified into four categories: module-based methods, loss-based methods, label correction methods, and sample selection methods.

Module-based methods modify the neural network modules to be more robust against label noise. For example, Sukhbaatar et al. (2015) [27] proposed a method called “Hard Attention” to train a DNN with a binary mask to filter out noisy samples. Goldberger and Ben-Reuven (2017) [28] proposed a method called “Denoising Autoencoder” to reconstruct the clean samples from the noisy samples. Han et al. (2018) [22] proposed a method called “Masking” to train a neural network with a binary mask to filter out noisy labels.

Loss-based methods design the loss function to be more robust against label noise. For example, Zhang and Sabuncu (2018) [29] proposed a method called “Generalized Cross Entropy” to reduce the impact of noisy labels on the loss function. Liu et al. (2020) [30] proposed a method called “PeerLoss” to leverage the consistency between clean and noisy labels to reduce the effect of label noise. Adversarial training [31] and label smoothing [32], [33] are also commonly used techniques to regularize the loss function against label noise.

Label correction methods adjust the loss value or correct the labels to mitigate the impact of label noise. For example, Patrini et al. (2017) [34] proposed a method called “Forward and Backward Loss Correction” to adjust the loss value based on the label confidence. Arazo et al. (2019) [35] proposed a method called “Unsupervised Data Cleaning” to correct the noisy labels by clustering the samples. Chen et al. (2021) [10] proposed a method called “Beyond Learning to Correct” to correct the noisy labels by learning the label transition matrix.

Sample selection methods select the clean samples from the noisy dataset to improve the model’s generalization performance. For example, Han et al. (2018) [7] proposed a method called “Co-teaching” to train two neural networks on different subsets of the dataset and let each network select the clean samples for the other network. Li et al. (2019) [11] proposed a method called “DivideMix” to divide the dataset into a labeled set with clean samples and an unlabeled set, and then applied the semi-supervised learning. Wang et al. (2022) [13] proposed a method called “ProMix” to select the clean samples based on their similarity to the noisy samples.

The existing LNL algorithms have achieved excellent performance under the conventional types of label noise such as symmetry-flipping noise and instance-dependent noise. However, the performance of LNL algorithms under more challenging types of label noise, such as BadLabel, is still an open research problem. BadLabel refers to the label noise that intentionally flips the labels of samples. The noisy-label data are located far from the decision boundary, leading to the clusters, which can significantly mislead the conventional learning algorithms and result in learning the wrong decision boundaries or failure in training. This paper proposes the first attempt to handle BadLabel, but more research is needed to develop robust LNL algorithms under this type of label noise.

B. Label-flipping Attacks

The earliest label-flipping attacks date back to bypassing the detection of spam email: Barreno et al. (2010) [36] purposely gave the benign emails the “spam” labels. In the

following year, Biggio et al. (2011) [18] crafted adversarial labels against the support vector machines (SVMs) [37]. Xiao et al. (2012) [38] further reduced the SVMs’ generalization by formulating a label-flipping optimization problem and maximizing the classification loss. Recently, Zhao et al. (2017) [19] and Paudice et al. (2018) [39] extended label-flipping attacks to other linear classifiers.

However, the prior arts only focused on attacking the simple linear models and binary classification tasks. In this paper, we extend the label-flipping attacks to DNNs and multi-class classification tasks, which are the settings commonly considered by those state-of-the-art LNL algorithms [11]–[13]. We craft a challenging type of label noise via designing a label-flipping attack on the multi-classifications tasks, and propose a novel LNL algorithm that can cope with such challenging label noise.

III. BADLABEL—A CHALLENGING DATASET

In this section, we aim to craft a challenging type of label noise—BadLabel. To this end, we design a label-flipping attack algorithm against a standard multi-classification task.

A. Objective of BadLabel

First, we review the learning objective of the standard multi-classification. Given a C -class training set $D = \{(x_i, y_i) | x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d, y_i \in \{0, \dots, C-1\}\}_{i=1}^n$ where y_i is the clean label of x_i , we can formulate the empirical learning objective as follows.

$$\arg \min_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \ell(y_i, f(x_i)), \quad (1)$$

where f denotes a classifier (i.e., a DNN in this paper), \mathcal{F} is the hypothesis space, ℓ is the loss function for optimization.

Second, we design an objective function of label-flipping attack against a standard multi-class classification task. Given a clean training set D , we flip $(100 \times \rho)\%$ of the clean labels that maximize the loss ℓ , which is formulated as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E}_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \{\max_{y'_i} \ell(y'_i, f(x_i))\} \\ \text{s.t. } & \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{y_i\}}(y'_i) = 1 - \rho, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $y'_i \in \{0, \dots, C-1\}$, $\mathbb{1}_{\{y_i\}}(\cdot)$ is the indicator function that ensures the designated label flipping ratio of clean labels.

B. Algorithm of BadLabel

We craft a BadLabel dataset by solving Eq. (2) approximately. In particular, we need to find for which data the label is flipped and how its label should be flipped. However, this problem is optimization unfriendly because the label space is discrete.

Inspired by Zhao et al. (2017) [19], we introduce a *flag* array $z \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times C}$ that is initialized by the one-hot form of n clean label y_i . The flag array will decide for which data the label is flipped and how its label should be flipped.

The magnitude of the element in the flag array z should indicate the data's loss values to different classes. Therefore, we name $z(i, j)$ the i -th data's **affinity score** to the class j , where $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ means the index of data and $j \in \{1, \dots, C\}$ means the index of classes. For example, larger $z_T(i, j)$ means data x_i with label j has a smaller loss value over the models $\{f_1, \dots, f_T\}$; smaller $z_T(i, j)$ means data x_i with label j has a larger loss value over the models $\{f_1, \dots, f_T\}$. To generate the BadLabel, we assign the i -th data a label j with the lowest affinity score $z_T(i, j)$.

To learn the flag array, we train a DNN for T epochs. At every epoch t , we update the flag array z as follows.

$$z_{t+1} = z_t - \alpha \nabla_Y \ell(Y, f_t(X)), \quad (3)$$

where X is an $n \times d$ tensor (i.e., $[x_1, \dots, x_n]^\top$), and Y is an $n \times C$ array (i.e., one-hot version of hard labels), $t \in \{1, 2, \dots, T\}$ is the iteration index, f_t is a DNN at epoch t , and α is a small step size. In the following subsection III-C, we provide the rationality of Eq. (3).

Finally, the flag array z_T at the last epoch T will decide for which data the label is flipped and how its label should be flipped. Algorithm 1 provides the details as follows.

Algorithm 1 Crafting the BadLabel

Input: A clean set $D = \{(x_i, y_i)\}_{i=1}^n$, flipping ratio ρ , iteration T , step size α .

Output: A label-noise set $D' = \{(x_i, y'_i)\}_{i=1}^n$.

//Stage I: Optimize the data's affinity score $z(i, j)$.

Initialize flag array $z_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times C}$ by Y (i.e., one-hot version of n clean label y_i).

for epoch $t = 1, \dots, T$ **do**

Iterate D to optimize f_t (see Eq. (1)).

Update z_{t+1} by Eq. (3).

Normalize z_{t+1} . // E.g. use softmax function

end for

//Stage II: Obtain z_T and flip ρ ratio of labels.

Re-arrange D in ascending order by $\{\min z_T(i, :)\}_{i=1}^n$.

//Select the first ρ percentage of data.

for epoch $i = 1, \dots, \lfloor \rho \times n \rfloor$ **do**

//Flip its label to the class with the lowest affinity score.

$y'_i = \arg \min z_T(i, :)$

end for

C. Mathematical Analysis of BadLabel

We mathematically explain Eq. (3) used by Algorithm 1. To maximize the loss in Eq. (2), we aim to find a noisy label Y' ($n \times C$ array and one-hot form of noisy labels) that maximizes the loss values over all the functions.

Given a model f_t at epoch t , we can use one-step optimization to approximately find Y'_{t+1} that makes the loss value largest in model f_t , i.e.,

$$Y'_{t+1} = Y'_t + \alpha \nabla_Y \ell(Y, f_t(X)), \quad (4)$$

where Y'_t is the last-epoch noisy label that approximately makes $\ell(Y'_t, f_{t-1}(X))$ largest; Y is the true label.

Then, we expand Eq. (4) over T models of T training epochs that approximately represent all models in the hypothesis space \mathcal{F} , i.e.,

$$Y'_T = Y'_0 + \alpha \sum_{t=0}^T \nabla_Y \ell(Y, f_t(X)). \quad (5)$$

To make Y'_T correspond to an even larger loss value, we consider initializing Y'_0 in Eq. (5) to be $-Y$ that negates the true label, which could be a reasonable starting point to maximize the loss:

$$Y'_T = -Y + \alpha \sum_{t=0}^T \nabla_Y \ell(Y, f_t(X)). \quad (6)$$

Then, we let $z_T = -Y'_T$ and then derive the following equation:

$$z_T = Y - \alpha \sum_{t=0}^T \nabla_Y \ell(Y, f_t(X)), \quad (7)$$

where Eq. (7) corresponds to the optimization of the flag array z in Eq. (3).

Finally, to meet the constraint on ρ , we leverage the flag array z_T to select the $(100 \times \rho)\%$ of data with the lowest affinity scores to flip their labels.

D. Visualization of BadLabel

In the top row of Figure 1, we built a toy example to visualize and compare different types of label noise. We crafted a 3-class classification problem. We used points/squares/triangles to represent samples and different colors (green, red, blue) to represent different annotations on samples. Note that the dashed lines represent the true class boundaries that LNL methods aim to learn.

In Figure 1(a), all samples are correctly labeled, and the learning algorithm can easily learn the true decision boundary and make the correct predictions. In Figure 1(b), the labels are corrupted by symmetric noise that is uniformly distributed inside each class. In each class, the noisy labels are scattered and sparse, which hardly causes a significant impact on learning. Therefore, the large portion of correct labels will gradually guide the classifier to learn the true class boundaries. Figure 1(c), we show the instance-dependent noise, where samples near the decision boundary are most likely to be wrongly annotated [9]. This type of noise may shift the classifier's decision boundary but will not ruin the learning completely.

On the contrary, as shown in Figure 1(d), BadLabel tends to flip the labels of samples that are far away from the class boundary, and the noisy labels are clustered together, which can easily mislead the learning algorithm to learn complex but wrong decision boundaries or even lead to the unstable training. As a result, BadLabel is a more challenging type of label noise compared to the existing types of label noise, which calls for robust LNL algorithms. In the next section, we provide a very first example of a robust LNL algorithm that can handle both the BadLabel and other existing types of label noise.

IV. ROBUST LABEL-NOISE LEARNING ALGORITHM

In this section, we propose a robust LNL algorithm to handle the BadLabel dataset. We perturb labels and model the resulting loss values to select a labeled set \mathcal{X} , which consists mostly of clean samples, and treat the rest as the unlabeled set \mathcal{U} . Then, we use a semi-supervised learning (SSL) algorithm to train DNNs based on both \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{U} . By doing so, we are able to mitigate the negative impact of BadLabel on the model’s generalization performance.

A. Key Observation under BadLabel dataset

DNNs fit noisy labels before clean labels in BadLabel. Previous studies [26], [40], [41] have shown that DNNs tend to learn clean samples before noisy ones, resulting in clean samples having lower loss values than noisy samples, as shown in Figure 1(b) and Figure 1(c). However, this phenomenon does not hold in the BadLabel dataset. As shown in Figures 2(a) (at Epoch #5) and 1(d) (Epoch #10), the DNNs fit noisy labels first in BadLabel, and the loss values of clean and noisy labels gradually become nearly indistinguishable. Consequently, the conventional loss-based LNL methods [7], [11] become ineffective under the BadLabel dataset. Therefore, we need to find a new way to select clean labels and correct noisy labels.




Fig. 2: On CIFAR-10 with 40% BadLabel, we visualized the loss distribution of labels before and after label perturbations. After a few epoch warm-up training, (a) before adversarial perturbation of labels, noisy labels tend to have lower loss values; (b) after adversarial perturbation of labels, the noisy labels have larger loss values. In BadLabel, compared with clean labels, the noisy labels are more sensitive to adversarial perturbations. Note that we used hard labels to calculate the loss values despite the label perturbations.

Adversarial perturbation of labels. We make a key observation that after a few epochs of warm-up training, noisy labels have lower loss values than clean labels (shown in Figure 2(a)), but are more susceptible to adversarial perturbations that increase their loss values (shown in Figure 2(b)).

To perturb all training labels Y' in an adversarial manner, we use the single-step adversarial perturbation formulation as shown in Eq. (8).

$$\tilde{Y} = Y' + \lambda \nabla_{Y'} \ell(Y', f(X)), \quad (8)$$

where $Y' \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times C}$ is an one hot form of noisy labels, $\tilde{Y} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times C}$ is an adversarially perturbed variant of Y' , and λ is the step size.

The observation holds that *before label perturbation, the loss values of noisy labels are smaller compared to those of clean labels, but after label perturbation, the loss values of noisy labels become larger.* This observation is crucial for the proposed LNL algorithm under the BadLabel scenario.

B. Preliminary Techniques

Bayesian Gaussian Mixture Model (BayesGMM) [25]. The standard Gaussian Mixture Model (GMM) is a clustering method, which can give a probability that each data belongs to each cluster. Compared with the standard GMM, BayesGMM can infer from the data the most appropriate number of clusters. When BayesGMM models the per-sample loss distributions, BayesGMM converges slower than the standard GMM if the number of specified clusters is larger than the number of actual clusters [42]. Therefore, we use the convergence speed of BayesGMM to judge whether per-sample loss distributions of noisy and clean data can be properly differentiated. If BayesGMM fits $\{\ell(f_\theta(x_i), y'_i)\}_{i=1}^n$, where $(x_i, y'_i) \in D'$ and D' is a label-noise dataset, and the convergence speed is low, then we can infer that noisy and clean labels are indistinguishable, and conversely, if the convergence speed is fast, then we can infer that noisy and clean labels are distinguishable.

If BayesGMM takes input noisy training set D' and network parameter θ and converges to δ within N_{iter} iterations, the output of BayesGMM is specified as follows.

$$W = \text{BayesGMM}^{\delta, N_{\text{iter}}}(D', \theta), \quad (9)$$

where we specify $W \in [0, 1]^n$ as a vector of size n whose element w_i is the posterior probability of smaller mean (data i -th smaller loss value). Given N_{iter} iterations, the convergence value δ judges the separability of clean and noisy labels.

Confidence Penalty (CP) [43]. Li et al. (2019) proposed DivideMix [11], which uses CP to improve the effectiveness of GMM in modeling clean and noisy labels. They achieved this by making the per-sample loss distributions more distinguishable. During training, a negative entropy term ($-\mathcal{H}$) is added to the loss function Eq. (1) to penalize overconfident predictions and increase the per-sample losses, where $\mathcal{H} = -\sum f_\theta(x) \log(f_\theta(x))$. This prevents the per-sample losses from forming a cluster around zero, making it easier for GMM to separate the loss values.

MixMatch [24]. MixMatch is an effective SSL algorithm. MixMatch can effectively utilize unlabeled data by introducing the powerful data augmentation technique MixUp [44] and encouraging the network to make consistent and high-confident predictions on unlabeled data through consistency regularization and entropy minimization. In DivideMix [11], there are a pair of networks $k = 0$ or 1 . Given network k , GMM can separate the noisy dataset into (mostly) clean \mathcal{X}_k set and unlabeled set \mathcal{U}_k . Then, MixMatch uses \mathcal{X}_k and \mathcal{U}_k as the training data to feed k 's peer network ($k - 1$). The per-epoch cross-training of MixMatch can be specified as

$$\theta_{1-k}^{e+1} = \text{MixMatch}(\mathcal{X}_k, \mathcal{U}_k, \theta_{1-k}^e), \quad (10)$$

where $e \in \{1, 2, \dots, E\}$ is the index of the total E training epochs, and $k \in \{0, 1\}$ is the index of the pair networks θ_k .

C. Algorithm of Robust DivideMix

Here, we provide a robust LNL method called Robust DivideMix (see Algorithm 2). Our method builds upon the preliminary techniques and can handle various types of label noise, including BadLabel noise. Robust DivideMix consists of three stages.

First, we properly initialize the pair networks. Specifically, we conduct warm-up training for a few epochs, in which we use CP to enhance the distinguishability of loss distributions. Then, we leverage the above observation presented in Figure 2 to select a small set of (mostly) clean labeled data \mathcal{X} and treat the rest of data as unlabeled \mathcal{U} . We initialize the pair networks to θ_1^1 and θ_2^1 via one epoch of MixMatch cross-training Eq. (10).

Second, we leverage MixMatch to cross-update parameters of the pair DNNs for E epochs. Unlike DivideMix [11] using GMM, our Robust DivideMix employs BayesGMM to model per-sample loss distributions. When the loss distribution of BadLabel is unimodal rather than bimodal, the convergence speed of BayesGMM is slow when the number of components is preset to two. The convergence speed enables us to determine whether clean and noisy labels can be effectively differentiated during the selection of clean labels. After dividing the training set into labeled and unlabeled sets, we use MixMatch to cross-update the parameters of the pair DNNs.

Third, we leverage the two networks to make a joint prediction.

Remark In the first stage, we conduct warm-up training and partition the training data using label perturbation to obtain a high-quality labeled set that mostly contains clean labels. At this point, the DNN has not completely fit BadLabel, and the perturbation can effectively make the loss distributions distinguishable. However, in the second stage, we no longer use label perturbation because it can be difficult to control and can significantly harm training when noisy labels are accidentally selected. Therefore, we adopt BayesGMM to select clean labels and prevent noisy labels from being included in the labeled set.

V. EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we present the results of our extensive experiments. We start by evaluating the impact of BadLabel on state-of-the-art LNL algorithms and demonstrate that it can significantly degrade their performance in Section V-A. In Section V-B, we show that our proposed Robust DivideMix method can handle various types of label noise, including BadLabel. We compare our method to existing LNL methods on different benchmark datasets and show that it outperforms or matches them in terms of accuracy. All experiments were conducted using a single NVIDIA TESLA V100 GPU.¹

¹To save space, we report only the mean accuracy and standard deviation of our proposed methods. For existing methods, we faithfully use the official codes and refer interested readers to the original papers for their standard deviations.

A. BadLabel

In this subsection, we evaluate BadLabel on 10 state-of-the-art LNL algorithms: Co-teaching [7], T-Revision [45], RoG [46], DivideMix [11], AdaCorr [47], Peer Loss [30], Negative LS [33], PGDF [48], ProMix [13], SOP [12]. As a baseline, we also report the evaluation results on Standard Training, which only uses the cross-entropy loss function for the vanilla training. We conduct experiments on CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100 [21], and MNIST [49] benchmark datasets.

We compare BadLabel with three commonly used synthetic noise types: symmetric noise (Sym.), asymmetric noise (Asym.), and instance-dependent noise (IDN). For symmetric noise, we randomly flip the true label to other classes. For instance-dependent noise, we follow the approach proposed by Chen et al. (2021) [10] for generating the label noise.

We generate the BadLabel datasets of CIFAR-10/100 by utilizing the PreAct-ResNet18 [50] backbone in Algorithm 1. The network is trained using the cross-entropy loss function and the SGD optimizer with a momentum of 0.9 and a weight decay of 0.0005. Iteration T is set to 120. The initial learning rate is set at 0.1, which decreases by a factor of 10 at the 60th and 90th iterations respectively. We set the step size α to 0.1. To ensure consistency, for all LNL algorithms, we use the same network architecture and random seed. In this section, the backbone we adopt for LNL is PreAct-ResNet18, and we also report the evaluation results using DenseNet [51] as the backbone in the Appendix B-B.

Tables I and II show the evaluation results of various LNL algorithms on CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 with different noise types and ratios. We report the best test accuracy across all epochs (Best) and the average test accuracy over the last 10 epochs (Last). For each experiment on BadLabel, we repeat it five times with different random seeds to obtain a standard deviation. As shown in Table I, BadLabel significantly degrades the performance of all LNL algorithms by a large margin. Although most methods can effectively deal with the conventional label noise of various noise ratios, it is challenging to deal with BadLabel dataset. Especially at high noise ratios (60%, 80%), BadLabel almost ruined the training. This shows that BadLabel is more challenging than conventional synthetic noise. In other words, BadLabel can robustly evaluate the existing LNL algorithms, which also calls for more robust LNL methods. We also report similar results on MNIST in Appendix B-A.

B. Robust DivideMix

In this subsection, we robustly evaluate and compare various LNL algorithms, including our proposed Robust DivideMix, using the BadLabel datasets of CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100. Additionally, we examine the generalization of Robust DivideMix and standard DivideMix under conventional synthetic noises such as symmetric and instance-dependent label noises. Furthermore, we also evaluate the generalization of Robust DivideMix on real-world noise datasets such as CIFAR-10N [52] and Clothing1M [53]. For each experiment, we repeatedly run Robust DivideMix five times using different random seeds.

Algorithm 2 Robust DivideMix

Input: a pair of DNNs parameterized by θ_1, θ_2 , noisy set $D' = (X, Y')$, selection threshold τ_p and τ_c , MixMatch epochs E

Output: A pair of optimized DNNs parameterized by θ_1^E, θ_2^E for making predictions jointly

//Stage I: Initialization of the pair of DNNs θ_1, θ_2

$\theta_1^0, \theta_2^0 = \text{WarmUp}(D', \theta_1, \theta_2)$ // Use D' to conduct standard training for a few epochs

$\tilde{D} = \{(x_i, \tilde{y}_i)\}_{i=1}^n \leftarrow \text{perturb } y'_i \text{ by Eq. (8)}$

$W_1^p = \text{BayesGMM}(\tilde{D}, \theta_2^0), W_2^p = \text{BayesGMM}(\tilde{D}, \theta_1^0)$

for $k = 1, 2$ **do**

$\mathcal{X}_k = \{(x_i, y'_i) | w_i^p \geq \tau_p, \forall (x_i, y'_i, w_i^p) \in (X, Y', W_k^p)\}$ // (mostly) clean labeled set

$\mathcal{U}_k = \{x_i | (x_i, y'_i) \in D' \wedge (x_i, y'_i) \notin \mathcal{X}_k\}$ // unlabeled set

end for

Obtain θ_1^1 and θ_2^1 by Eq. (10) for a single epoch (i.e., $e = 0 \rightarrow e = 1$) // Obtain good initialization of the pair DNNs

//Stage II: Pair-wise training of θ_1, θ_2 using BayesGMM and MixMatch for E epochs

$W_1^c = W_2^p, W_2^c = W_1^p$

for epoch $e = 1, \dots, E$ **do**

if BayesGMM(D', θ_2^e) is converged **then**

$W_1^c = \text{BayesGMM}(D', \theta_2^e)$

end if

if BayesGMM(D', θ_1^e) is converged **then**

$W_2^c = \text{BayesGMM}(D', \theta_1^e)$

end if

for $k = 1, 2$ **do**

$\mathcal{X}_k = \{(x_i, y'_i) | w_i^c \geq \tau_c, \forall (x_i, y'_i, w_i^c) \in (X, Y', W_k^c)\}$ // (mostly) clean labeled set

$\mathcal{U}_k = \{x_i | (x_i, y'_i) \in D' \wedge (x_i, y'_i) \notin \mathcal{X}_k\}$ // unlabeled set

end for

Obtain θ_1^{e+1} and θ_2^{e+1} by Eq. (10) (i.e., $e \rightarrow e + 1$).

end for

//Stage III: Predictions using the pair DNNs (θ_1^E, θ_2^E)

$y = \arg \max (f_{\theta_1^E}(x) + f_{\theta_2^E}(x))$

To maintain consistency, we utilize PreAct-ResNet18 as the backbone of all LNL algorithms. For Robust DivideMix, we use the SGD optimizer with a momentum of 0.9 and weight decay of 0.0005 and keep the batch size at 128 for a total of 300 epochs. We initialize the learning rate to be 0.02 which was then divided by factors of 10 at the 100th and 250th epoch, respectively. We show the specific hyper-parameter settings of Robust DivideMix on synthetic noise in Table IX (in the Appendix). For other baseline LNL algorithms, we faithfully use optimal configurations.

Figure 3 and 4 show the learning curves of different LNL algorithms at different BadLabel noise ratios ranging from 20% to 80%. Among all algorithms, Robust DivideMix has achieved the highest accuracy across all ratios. In particular, when the noise ratio is higher ($\geq 40\%$), Robust DivideMix can significantly outperform other methods, which corroborates that Robust DivideMix can effectively handle the BadLabel.

Besides BadLabel, we show that Robust DivideMix also performs competitively on conventional synthetic label noises. We apply Robust DivideMix to symmetric, asymmetric, and instance-dependent label noises on CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100, respectively. Tables III and IV show the test accuracy

of Standard Training, standard DivideMix and our Robust DivideMix, under different types of label noises. Tables III and IV show that Robust DivideMix can achieve significant improvements on BadLabel while also achieving competitive performance on other types of label noise. Thus, the averaged accuracy of Robust DivideMix is higher than that of baseline methods, indicating that it is a more generalizable method.

Furthermore, we also validate our method on real-world noise datasets. CIFAR-10N [52] is a variant of CIFAR-10 with real human annotations, which contains multiple noise types (Aggregate, Random, and Worst). In our experiments, the noise type we use is ‘‘Worst’’, with the highest real noise ratio of 40.21%. We adopt the same training setting as on symmetric noise of CIFAR-10 and tune N_{iter} to 50. Clothing1M [53] is a large-scale real-world dataset that contains 1 million images and corresponding annotations from the internet. We use ResNet-50 [54] with ImageNet [55] pre-trained weights as the backbone network. We use the SGD optimizer with a momentum of 0.9, weight decay of 0.001, and batch size of 64 to train the networks for 80 epochs (including 2 warm-up epochs). The initial learning rate is set at 0.002 and is reduced by a factor of 10 after the completion of the first

TABLE I: Test accuracy (%) on CIFAR-10 with different types of label noise (symmetric, asymmetric, instance-dependent, and our proposed BadLabel) and noise levels (ranging from 20% to 80%). The most robust evaluations for each LNL method are highlighted in bold.

Method		Noise Type / Noise Ratio															
		Sym.				Asym.		IDN				BadLabel					
		20%	40%	60%	80%	20%	40%	20%	40%	60%	80%	20%	40%	60%	80%		
Standard Training	Best	85.21	79.90	69.79	43.00	88.02	85.22	85.42	78.93	68.97	55.34	76.76 ±1.08	58.79 ±1.49	39.64 ±1.13	17.80 ±0.91		
	Last	82.55	64.79	41.43	17.20	87.28	77.04	85.23	74.06	52.22	28.04	75.31 ±0.24	55.72 ±0.17	35.66 ±0.23	13.44 ±0.26		
Co-teaching Han et al. (2018) [7]	Best	89.19	84.80	58.25	21.76	90.65	63.11	85.72	73.42	45.84	33.43	80.41 ±0.78	56.81 ±3.86	14.42 ±1.22	10.51 ±0.71		
	Last	89.03	84.65	57.95	21.06	90.52	56.33	85.48	72.97	45.53	25.27	79.48 ±0.75	55.54 ±3.74	12.99 ±1.09	4.24 ±2.44		
T-Revision Xia et al. (2019) [45]	Best	89.79	86.83	78.14	64.54	91.23	89.60	85.74	78.45	69.31	56.26	76.99 ±1.38	57.21 ±1.64	36.01 ±1.10	14.93 ±0.50		
	Last	89.59	86.57	76.85	60.54	91.09	89.40	85.43	69.18	58.15	33.15	75.71 ±1.68	55.02 ±1.34	33.99 ±0.29	13.16 ±0.68		
RoG Lee et al. (2019) [46]	Best	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-		
	Last	87.48	74.81	52.42	16.02	89.61	81.63	85.34	76.68	63.79	37.11	85.88±0.32	64.20 ±0.91	35.89 ±1.34	8.64 ±0.76		
DivideMix Li et al. (2019) [11]	Best	96.21	95.08	94.80	81.95	94.82	94.20	91.97	85.84	81.59	59.06	84.81 ±0.78	58.44 ±1.45	28.38 ±0.56	6.87 ±0.59		
	Last	96.04	94.74	94.56	81.58	94.46	93.50	90.77	82.94	81.19	47.81	82.13 ±0.78	57.65 ±1.96	16.21 ±1.24	6.12 ±0.45		
AdaCorr Zheng et al. (2020) [47]	Best	90.66	87.17	80.97	35.97	92.35	88.60	85.88	79.54	69.36	55.86	76.97 ±0.83	57.17 ±0.71	37.14 ±0.38	14.72 ±0.86		
	Last	90.46	86.78	80.66	35.67	92.17	88.34	85.70	79.05	59.13	30.48	74.71 ±0.26	54.92 ±0.22	34.71 ±0.22	11.94 ±0.12		
Peer Loss Liu et al. (2020) [30]	Best	90.87	87.13	79.03	61.91	91.47	87.50	86.46	81.07	69.87	55.51	75.28 ±1.43	55.75 ±1.39	36.17 ±0.23	15.87 ±0.30		
	Last	90.65	86.85	78.83	61.43	91.11	81.24	85.72	74.43	54.57	33.76	74.00 ±1.43	53.73 ±1.25	34.37 ±0.68	14.71 ±0.22		
Negative LS Wei et al. (2021) [33]	Best	87.42	84.40	75.22	43.62	88.34	85.03	89.82	83.66	75.76	64.21	78.77 ±0.66	57.68 ±0.89	36.57 ±0.88	16.46 ±0.82		
	Last	87.30	84.21	75.07	43.50	65.23	47.22	81.87	82.10	70.95	45.62	73.99±0.90	52.45±1.03	26.66 ±0.81	3.21 ±0.44		
PGDF Chen et al. (2021) [48]	Best	96.63	96.12	95.05	80.69	96.05	89.87	91.81	85.75	76.84	59.60	82.72 ±0.47	61.50 ±1.87	34.46 ±1.44	6.37 ±0.34		
	Last	96.40	95.95	94.75	79.76	95.74	88.45	91.30	84.31	69.54	34.81	79.95 ±0.36	56.26 ±1.03	30.14 ±0.85	4.56 ±0.45		
ProMix Wang et al. (2022) [13]	Best	97.40	96.98	90.80	61.15	97.04	96.09	94.72	91.32	76.22	54.01	94.95 ±1.43	48.36 ±1.72	24.87 ±1.47	9.51 ±1.51		
	Last	97.30	96.91	90.72	52.25	96.94	96.03	94.63	91.01	75.12	45.80	94.59 ±1.64	44.08 ±0.49	21.33 ±0.46	7.93 ±1.34		
SOP Liu et al. (2022) [12]	Best	96.17	95.64	94.83	89.94	95.96	93.60	90.32	83.26	71.54	57.14	84.96 ±0.35	66.25 ±1.35	42.59 ±1.25	12.70 ±0.89		
	Last	96.12	95.46	94.71	89.78	95.86	93.30	90.13	82.91	63.14	29.86	82.64 ±0.27	61.89 ±0.25	36.51 ±0.26	8.63 ±0.17		

TABLE II: Test accuracy (%) on CIFAR-100 with different types of label noise (symmetric, instance-dependent, and our proposed BadLabel) and noise levels (ranging from 20% to 80%). The most robust evaluations for each LNL method are highlighted in bold.

Method		Noise Type / Noise Ratio											
		Sym.				IDN				BadLabel			
		20%	40%	60%	80%	20%	40%	60%	80%	20%	40%	60%	80%
Standard Training	Best	61.41	51.21	38.82	19.89	70.06	62.48	53.21	45.77	56.75 ±0.98	35.42 ±0.77	17.70 ±1.02	6.03 ±0.24
	Last	61.17	46.27	27.01	9.27	69.94	62.32	52.55	40.45	56.30 ±0.13	34.90 ±0.17	17.05 ±0.28	4.18 ±0.16
Co-teaching Han et al. (2018) [7]	Best	62.80	55.02	34.66	7.72	66.16	57.55	45.38	23.83	54.30 ±0.78	26.02 ±2.13	3.97 ±0.11	0.99 ±0.21
	Last	62.35	54.84	33.44	6.78	66.02	57.33	45.24	23.72	53.97 ±0.71	25.74 ±1.21	3.67 ±0.14	0.00 ±0.00
T-Revision Xia et al. (2019) [45]	Best	65.19	60.43	43.01	4.03	68.77	62.86	54.23	45.67	57.86 ±1.02	40.60 ±1.33	13.06 ±1.20	1.92 ±0.56
	Last	64.95	60.26	42.77	3.12	68.53	62.39	53.07	41.85	57.26 ±1.54	38.40 ±0.96	12.65 ±0.58	1.43 ±0.95
RoG Lee et al. (2019) [46]	Best	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Last	66.68	60.79	53.08	22.73	66.39	60.80	56.00	48.62	70.55±0.55	58.61 ±0.65	25.74 ±0.28	4.13 ±0.41
DivideMix Li et al. (2019) [11]	Best	77.36	75.02	72.25	57.56	72.79	67.82	61.08	51.50	65.55 ±0.65	42.72 ±0.44	19.17 ±1.28	4.67 ±0.87
	Last	76.87	74.66	71.91	57.08	72.50	67.37	60.55	47.86	64.96 ±0.47	40.92 ±0.36	13.04 ±0.85	1.10 ±0.21
AdaCorr Zheng et al. (2020) [47]	Best	66.31	59.78	47.22	24.15	68.89	62.63	54.91	45.22	56.22 ±0.82	35.38 ±1.27	16.87 ±1.36	4.81 ±0.22
	Last	66.03	59.48	47.04	23.90	68.72	62.45	54.68	41.95	55.69 ±0.44	33.88 ±0.88	14.88 ±0.52	3.76 ±1.24
Peer Loss Liu et al. (2020) [30]	Best	61.97	51.09	39.98	18.82	69.63	63.32	55.01	46.20	55.58 ±1.79	37.11 ±2.01	19.53 ±1.29	6.42 ±0.52
	Last	60.64	43.64	26.23	7.65	69.38	62.70	53.90	42.14	55.00 ±1.41	35.85 ±1.48	18.65 ±0.22	5.74 ±0.76
Negative LS Wei et al. (2021) [33]	Best	63.65	57.17	44.18	21.31	69.20	62.67	54.49	46.96	57.76 ±0.56	36.80 ±0.21	17.96 ±0.31	5.88 ±0.11
	Last	63.54	56.98	43.98	21.19	63.38	55.72	42.87	24.69	56.42 ±0.71	33.38 ±0.22	11.42 ±0.38	1.28 ±0.14
PGDF Chen et al. (2021) [48]	Best	81.90	78.50	74.05	52.48	75.87	71.72	62.76	53.16	69.44 ±0.26	46.39 ±0.39	19.05 ±0.37	5.08 ±0.13
	Last	81.37	78.21	73.64	52.11	74.90	71.32	62.06	51.68	68.18 ±0.16	45.38 ±0.15	16.84 ±0.24	0.72 ±0.25
ProMix Wang et al. (2022) [13]	Best	79.99	80.21	71.44	44.97	76.61	71.92	66.04	51.96	69.80 ±1.58	37.73 ±1.09	15.92 ±1.88	4.62 ±0.95
	Last	79.77	79.95	71.25	44.64	76.44	71.66	65.94	51.77	69.68 ±0.99	37.24 ±0.84	14.88 ±1.02	3.42 ±0.22
SOP Liu et al. (2022) [12]	Best	77.35	75.20	72.39	63.13	72.52	63.84	56.79	50.20	65.80 ±0.68	45.61 ±0.34	22.68 ±0.27	2.88 ±0.11
	Last	77.11	74.89	72.10	62.87	72.11	63.15	53.35	40.77	65.51 ±0.12	45.24 ±0.26	21.55 ±0.18	2.48 ±0.16




Fig. 3: Learning curves of several LNL algorithms on CIFAR-10 under varying BadLabel noise ratios. The shaded area represents the error bar corresponding to the standard deviation of Robust DivideMix. Note that, to facilitate a fair comparison of the learning curves, we normalized the learning steps by using uniform sampling, taking into account that different LNL algorithms have different optimal learning schedules.




Fig. 4: Learning curves of several LNL algorithms on CIFAR-100 under varying BadLabel noise ratios.

40 epochs. We set λ as 0.2, N_{iter} as 50, and δ as 0.01. We report the test accuracy with the standard deviation of Robust DivideMix on the real-world noise datasets in Table V. Compared with DivideMix, Robust DivideMix still achieves

strong generalization. In other words, Robust DivideMix is a more general method that can also effectively deal with real-world noises.

Ablation Study. We investigate the effects of different com-

TABLE III: Comparison of the test accuracy (%) between Robust DivideMix and baseline methods on CIFAR-10 with different types and ratios of label noise. The best average performance under each noise ratio is highlighted in bold.

Noise Type		Method / Noise Ratio											
		Standard Training				DivideMix				Robust DivideMix			
		20%	40%	60%	80%	20%	40%	60%	80%	20%	40%	60%	80%
Sym.	Best	85.21	79.90	69.79	43.00	96.21	95.08	94.80	81.95	95.45±0.36	94.84±0.13	94.25±0.11	61.59±1.24
	Last	82.55	64.79	41.43	17.20	96.04	94.74	94.56	81.58	95.28±0.38	94.71±0.16	94.11±0.12	60.98±1.21
Asym.	Best	88.02	85.22	-	-	94.82	94.20	-	-	91.77±0.46	86.88±0.82	-	-
	Last	87.28	77.04	-	-	94.46	93.50	-	-	90.62±0.38	84.02±1.65	-	-
IDN	Best	85.42	78.93	68.97	55.34	91.97	85.84	81.59	59.06	90.44±1.09	89.71±0.74	78.12±0.31	60.64±0.46
	Last	85.23	74.06	52.22	28.04	90.77	82.94	81.19	47.81	87.30±1.72	89.16±0.69	72.33±1.08	50.38±0.68
BadLabel	Best	76.76	58.79	39.64	17.80	84.81	58.44	28.38	6.87	92.07±1.06	86.70±3.83	76.47±3.89	27.41±3.25
	Last	75.31	55.72	35.66	13.44	82.13	57.65	16.21	6.12	91.76±1.27	85.96±4.33	73.29±3.81	25.20±2.72
Average	Best	83.85	75.71	59.47	38.71	91.95	83.39	68.26	49.17	92.43±0.74	89.53±1.38	82.95±1.43	49.88±1.65
	Last	82.59	67.90	43.10	19.56	90.85	82.21	63.99	45.17	91.24±0.93	88.46±1.71	79.91±1.67	45.52±1.54

TABLE IV: Comparison of the test accuracy (%) between Robust DivideMix and baseline methods on CIFAR-100 with different types and ratios of label noise. The best average performance under each noise ratio is highlighted in bold.

Noise Type		Method / Noise Ratio											
		Standard Training				DivideMix				Robust DivideMix			
		20%	40%	60%	80%	20%	40%	60%	80%	20%	40%	60%	80%
Sym.	Best	61.41	51.21	38.82	19.89	77.36	75.02	72.25	57.56	77.35±0.28	74.40±0.20	70.74±0.45	48.13±0.80
	Last	61.17	46.27	27.01	9.27	76.87	74.66	71.91	57.08	77.06±0.28	74.16±0.23	69.93±0.59	47.84±0.82
IDN	Best	70.06	62.48	53.21	45.77	72.79	67.82	61.08	51.50	73.49±0.28	69.47±0.18	63.64±0.21	52.74±0.73
	Last	69.94	62.32	52.55	40.45	72.50	67.37	60.55	47.86	73.10±0.20	68.88±0.13	61.03±0.31	46.84±0.17
BadLabel	Best	56.75	35.42	17.70	6.03	65.55	42.72	19.17	4.67	65.29±0.76	46.64±0.48	41.80±1.19	21.48±0.39
	Last	56.30	34.90	17.05	4.18	64.96	40.92	13.04	1.10	64.49±0.96	45.26±0.40	35.91±0.67	16.91±0.41
Average	Best	62.74	49.70	36.58	23.90	71.90	61.85	50.83	37.91	72.04±0.44	63.50±0.29	58.73±0.62	40.78±0.64
	Last	62.47	47.83	32.20	17.97	71.44	60.98	48.50	35.35	71.55±0.48	62.77±0.25	55.62±0.52	37.20±0.47

TABLE V: Test accuracy (%) on different real-world noise datasets.

Dataset / Method	DivideMix	Robust DivideMix
CIFAR-10N	92.56	92.70±0.20
Clothing1M	74.76	74.13±0.29

ponents in Robust DivideMix by removing the corresponding parts. In Table X, we report the test accuracy of Robust DivideMix with different settings on CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 corrupted by BadLabel. In detail, to study the impact of introducing BayesGMM, we remove BayesGMM and replace it with the classical GMM. We present the results in the “w/o BayesGMM” item. To study the effect of label perturbation, we remove the single-step perturbation by setting λ to 0, and the results are shown in the “w/o label perturbation” item. To study the effect of filtering low-quality data divisions, we remove the filtering component and train the networks on new data divisions in each epoch. The results are shown in the “w/o filtering low-quality divisions” item. As shown in Table X, every component is beneficial to the good performance of Robust DivideMix.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we have introduced a challenging label noise called BadLabel. We have theoretically analyzed BadLabel’s algorithm and empirically justified its effectiveness in significantly degrading the performance of existing LNL algorithms. Besides, we have proposed a robust LNL algorithm, namely,

Robust DivideMix, specifically designed to handle the challenges posed by BadLabel. Additionally, we have shown that Robust DivideMix is also capable of handling conventional types of label noise, providing robust performance in various scenarios.

However, there are some limitations to our work that should be acknowledged. Firstly, the evaluation of our proposed algorithm has primarily focused on image classification tasks, and further investigations are needed to assess its performance in other domains. Secondly, although Robust DivideMix has shown promising results, there is still room for improving the efficiency of hyperparameter tuning, such as λ in Eq. (8). Future research could include developing more effective and efficient LNL algorithms to robustly handle various types of label noise.

REFERENCES

- [1] Y. Yan, R. Rosales, G. Fung, R. Subramanian, and J. Dy, “Learning from multiple annotators with varying expertise,” *Machine learning*, vol. 95, no. 3, pp. 291–327, 2014.
- [2] W. Li, L. Wang, W. Li, E. Agustsson, and L. Van Gool, “Webvision database: Visual learning and understanding from web data,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1708.02862*, 2017.
- [3] X. Yu, T. Liu, M. Gong, and D. Tao, “Learning with biased complementary labels,” in *Proceedings of the European conference on computer vision (ECCV)*, 2018, pp. 68–83.
- [4] N. Natarajan, I. S. Dhillon, P. K. Ravikumar, and A. Tewari, “Learning with noisy labels,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 26, 2013.
- [5] D. Angluin and P. Laird, “Learning from noisy examples,” *Machine Learning*, vol. 2, no. 4, pp. 343–370, 1988.
- [6] B. Van Rooyen, A. Menon, and R. C. Williamson, “Learning with symmetric label noise: The importance of being unhinged,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 28, 2015.

- [7] B. Han, Q. Yao, X. Yu, G. Niu, M. Xu, W. Hu, I. Tsang, and M. Sugiyama, "Co-teaching: Robust training of deep neural networks with extremely noisy labels," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 31, 2018.
- [8] X. Xia, T. Liu, B. Han, N. Wang, M. Gong, H. Liu, G. Niu, D. Tao, and M. Sugiyama, "Part-dependent label noise: Towards instance-dependent label noise," *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 33, pp. 7597–7610, 2020.
- [9] Y. Zhang, S. Zheng, P. Wu, M. Goswami, and C. Chen, "Learning with feature-dependent label noise: A progressive approach," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2020.
- [10] P. Chen, J. Ye, G. Chen, J. Zhao, and P.-A. Heng, "Beyond class-conditional assumption: A primary attempt to combat instance-dependent label noise," in *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 35, no. 13, 2021, pp. 11 442–11 450.
- [11] J. Li, R. Socher, and S. C. Hoi, "Dividemix: Learning with noisy labels as semi-supervised learning," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- [12] S. Liu, Z. Zhu, Q. Qu, and C. You, "Robust training under label noise by over-parameterization," in *Proceedings of the 39th International Conference on Machine Learning*, ser. Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, K. Chaudhuri, S. Jegelka, L. Song, C. Szepesvari, G. Niu, and S. Sabato, Eds., vol. 162. PMLR, 17–23 Jul 2022, pp. 14 153–14 172.
- [13] H. Wang, R. Xiao, Y. Dong, L. Feng, and J. Zhao, "Promix: Combating label noise via maximizing clean sample utility," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2207.10276*, 2022.
- [14] L. Ju, X. Wang, L. Wang, D. Mahapatra, X. Zhao, Q. Zhou, T. Liu, and Z. Ge, "Improving medical images classification with label noise using dual-uncertainty estimation," *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging*, vol. 41, no. 6, pp. 1533–1546, 2022.
- [15] D. Karimi, H. Dou, S. K. Warfield, and A. Gholipour, "Deep learning with noisy labels: Exploring techniques and remedies in medical image analysis," *Medical image analysis*, vol. 65, p. 101759, 2020.
- [16] R. Taheri, R. Javidan, M. Shojafar, Z. Pooranian, A. Miri, and M. Conti, "On defending against label flipping attacks on malware detection systems," *Neural Computing and Applications*, vol. 32, pp. 14 781–14 800, 2020.
- [17] C. Catal, G. Giray, B. Tekinerdogan, S. Kumar, and S. Shukla, "Applications of deep learning for phishing detection: a systematic literature review," *Knowledge and Information Systems*, vol. 64, no. 6, pp. 1457–1500, 2022.
- [18] B. Biggio, B. Nelson, and P. Laskov, "Support vector machines under adversarial label noise," in *Asian conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2011, pp. 97–112.
- [19] M. Zhao, B. An, W. Gao, and T. Zhang, "Efficient label contamination attacks against black-box learning models," in *Proceedings of the 26th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2017, pp. 3945–3951.
- [20] M. Aly, "Survey on multiclass classification methods," *Neural Netw.*, vol. 19, no. 1, p. 9, 2005.
- [21] A. Krizhevsky, G. Hinton *et al.*, "Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images," 2009.
- [22] B. Han, J. Yao, G. Niu, M. Zhou, I. Tsang, Y. Zhang, and M. Sugiyama, "Masking: A new perspective of noisy supervision," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 31, 2018.
- [23] H. Permuter, J. Francos, and I. Jermyn, "A study of gaussian mixture models of color and texture features for image classification and segmentation," *Pattern recognition*, vol. 39, no. 4, pp. 695–706, 2006.
- [24] D. Berthelot, N. Carlini, I. Goodfellow, N. Papernot, A. Oliver, and C. A. Raffel, "Mixmatch: A holistic approach to semi-supervised learning," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 32, 2019.
- [25] S. J. Roberts, D. Husmeier, I. Rezek, and W. D. Penny, "Bayesian approaches to gaussian mixture modeling," *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, vol. 20, no. 11, pp. 1133–1142, 1998.
- [26] D. Arpit, S. Jastrzebski, N. Ballas, D. Krueger, E. Bengio, M. S. Kanwal, T. Maharaj, A. Fischer, A. Courville, Y. Bengio *et al.*, "A closer look at memorization in deep networks," in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2017, pp. 233–242.
- [27] S. Sukhbaatar, J. Bruna, M. Paluri, L. Bourdev, and R. Fergus, "Training convolutional networks with noisy labels," in *3rd International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2015*, 2015.
- [28] J. Goldberger and E. Ben-Reuven, "Training deep neural-networks using a noise adaptation layer," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2017.
- [29] Z. Zhang and M. Sabuncu, "Generalized cross entropy loss for training deep neural networks with noisy labels," *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 31, 2018.
- [30] Y. Liu and H. Guo, "Peer loss functions: Learning from noisy labels without knowing noise rates," in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2020, pp. 6226–6236.
- [31] I. J. Goodfellow, J. Shlens, and C. Szegedy, "Explaining and harnessing adversarial examples," in *3rd International Conference on Learning Representations*, Y. Bengio and Y. LeCun, Eds., 2015.
- [32] M. Lukasik, S. Bhojanapalli, A. Menon, and S. Kumar, "Does label smoothing mitigate label noise?" in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2020, pp. 6448–6458.
- [33] J. Wei, H. Liu, T. Liu, G. Niu, and Y. Liu, "Understanding generalized label smoothing when learning with noisy labels," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.04149*, 2021.
- [34] G. Patrini, A. Rozza, A. Krishna Menon, R. Nock, and L. Qu, "Making deep neural networks robust to label noise: A loss correction approach," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2017, pp. 1944–1952.
- [35] E. Arazo, D. Ortego, P. Albert, N. O'Connor, and K. McGuinness, "Un-supervised label noise modeling and loss correction," in *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 2019, pp. 312–321.
- [36] M. Bareno, B. Nelson, A. D. Joseph, and J. D. Tygar, "The security of machine learning," *Machine Learning*, vol. 81, no. 2, pp. 121–148, 2010.
- [37] W. S. Noble, "What is a support vector machine?" *Nature biotechnology*, vol. 24, no. 12, pp. 1565–1567, 2006.
- [38] H. Xiao, H. Xiao, and C. Eckert, "Adversarial label flips attack on support vector machines," in *Proceedings of the 20th European Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2012, pp. 870–875.
- [39] A. Paudice, L. Muñoz-González, and E. C. Lupu, "Label sanitization against label flipping poisoning attacks," in *Joint European conference on machine learning and knowledge discovery in databases*. Springer, 2018, pp. 5–15.
- [40] C. Zhang, S. Bengio, M. Hardt, B. Recht, and O. Vinyals, "Understanding deep learning requires rethinking generalization," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2017.
- [41] P. Chen, B. B. Liao, G. Chen, and S. Zhang, "Understanding and utilizing deep neural networks trained with noisy labels," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2019, pp. 1062–1070.
- [42] B. Wang and D. Titterton, "Convergence properties of a general algorithm for calculating variational bayesian estimates for a normal mixture model," *Bayesian Analysis*, vol. 1, 09 2006.
- [43] G. Pereyra, G. Tucker, J. Chorowski, Ł. Kaiser, and G. Hinton, "Regularizing neural networks by penalizing confident output distributions," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1701.06548*, 2017.
- [44] H. Zhang, M. Cissé, Y. N. Dauphin, and D. Lopez-Paz, "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*, 2018.
- [45] X. Xia, T. Liu, N. Wang, B. Han, C. Gong, G. Niu, and M. Sugiyama, "Are anchor points really indispensable in label-noise learning?" *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, vol. 32, 2019.
- [46] K. Lee, S. Yun, K. Lee, H. Lee, B. Li, and J. Shin, "Robust inference via generative classifiers for handling noisy labels," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2019, pp. 3763–3772.
- [47] S. Zheng, P. Wu, A. Goswami, M. Goswami, D. Metaxas, and C. Chen, "Error-bounded correction of noisy labels," in *International Conference on Machine Learning*. PMLR, 2020, pp. 11 447–11 457.
- [48] W. Chen, C. Zhu, and Y. Chen, "Sample prior guided robust model learning to suppress noisy labels," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.01197*, 2021.
- [49] Y. LeCun and C. Cortes, "MNIST handwritten digit database," 2010. [Online]. Available: <http://yann.lecun.com/exdb/mnist/>
- [50] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun, "Identity mappings in deep residual networks," in *European conference on computer vision*. Springer, 2016, pp. 630–645.
- [51] G. Huang, Z. Liu, L. Van Der Maaten, and K. Q. Weinberger, "Densely connected convolutional networks," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2017, pp. 4700–4708.
- [52] J. Wei, Z. Zhu, H. Cheng, T. Liu, G. Niu, and Y. Liu, "Learning with noisy labels revisited: A study using real-world human annotations," in *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- [53] T. Xiao, T. Xia, Y. Yang, C. Huang, and X. Wang, "Learning from massive noisy labeled data for image classification," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2015, pp. 2691–2699.
- [54] K. He, X. Zhang, S. Ren, and J. Sun, "Deep residual learning for image recognition," in *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2016, pp. 770–778.

- [55] J. Deng, W. Dong, R. Socher, L.-J. Li, K. Li, and L. Fei-Fei, "Imagenet: A large-scale hierarchical image database," in *2009 IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. Ieee, 2009, pp. 248–255.




Jingfeng Zhang is a research scientist at the RIKEN Center for Advanced Intelligence Project. He will be soon joining the University of Auckland as a lecturer. He obtained his Ph.D. in computer science from the National University of Singapore in 2020 and his Bachelor's degree in computer science from Shandong University's Taishan College in 2016. He is the receiver of JST ACT-X FY2021-23, JSPS Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research (KAKENHI) for Early-Career Scientists FY2022-23, and the RIKEN Ohbu Award 2022. He has published 15 papers

in prestigious conferences and journals, including ICML, ICLR, NeurIPS, and IEEE TDSC. He also serves as an associate editor of IEEE Artificial Intelligence and actively contributes to paper reviews across various domains. With his expertise and dedication, Jingfeng is committed to advancing the technologies of machine learning and ensuring their secure integration for the benefit of humanity.




Bo Song is currently a postgraduate student at the School of Software, Shandong University, China. He received his Bachelor's degree in software engineering from Shandong University in 2021. His research interests include adversarial attacks and label-noise learning.



Haohan Wang is an assistant professor in the School of Information Sciences at the University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign. His research focuses on the development of trustworthy machine learning methods for computational biology and healthcare applications, such as decoding the genomic language of Alzheimer's disease. In his work, he uses statistical analysis and deep learning methods, with an emphasis on data analysis using methods least influenced by spurious signals. Wang earned his PhD in computer science through the Language

Technologies Institute of Carnegie Mellon University where he works with Professor Eric Xing. In 2019, Wang was recognized as the Next Generation in Biomedicine by the Broad Institute of MIT and Harvard because of his contributions in dealing with confounding factors with deep learning.



Bo Han is an Assistant Professor in Machine Learning at Hong Kong Baptist University and a BAIHO Visiting Scientist at RIKEN AIP, where his research focuses on machine learning, deep learning, and their applications. He was a Visiting Faculty Researcher at Microsoft Research and a Postdoc Fellow at RIKEN AIP. He has co-authored a machine learning monograph by MIT Press. He has served as Area Chairs of NeurIPS, ICML, ICLR and UAI. He has also served as Associate Editors of TMLR and IEEE TNNLS, and Editorial Board Members

of JMLR and MLJ. He received Outstanding Paper Award at NeurIPS and Outstanding Area Chair at ICLR.



Tongliang Liu is the Director of Sydney AI Centre at the University of Sydney. He is also heading the Trustworthy Machine Learning Laboratory. He is a Visiting Scientist with RIKEN AIP, Japan; a Visiting Associate Professor at Mohamed bin Zayed University of AI, UAE; and a Visiting Professor at the University of Science and Technology of China, China. He is broadly interested in the fields of trustworthy machine learning and its interdisciplinary applications, with a particular emphasis on learning with noisy labels, adversarial learning,

transfer learning, unsupervised learning, and statistical deep learning theory. He has authored and co-authored more than 100 research articles including ICML, NeurIPS, ICLR, CVPR, ICCV, ECCV, AAAI, IJCAI, KDD, IEEE T-PAMI, T-NNLS, and T-IP. He is/was a (senior-) meta reviewer for many conferences, such as ICML, NeurIPS, ICLR, UAI, AAAI, IJCAI, and KDD. He is a recipient of the Discovery Early Career Researcher Award (DECRA) from Australian Research Council (ARC) in 2018, the Future Fellowship Award from ARC in 2022, and AI's 10 to Watch Award from IEEE in 2022.



Lei Liu is a full professor in the school of software, Shandong University. He obtained the master and Ph.D degree in 2005 and 2010 from Bradford University, UK, respectively. Dr. LIU has published over 70 research papers on international conferences and journals. His research interest includes AI enabled network engineering, 5g technology, quality of service, AIoT.



Masashi Sugiyama received his Ph.D. in Computer Science from the Tokyo Institute of Technology in 2001. He has been a professor at the University of Tokyo since 2014, and also the director of the RIKEN Center for Advanced Intelligence Project (AIP) since 2016. His research interests include theories and algorithms of machine learning. In 2022, he received the Award for Science and Technology from the Japanese Minister of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology.

APPENDIX A
MATHEMATICAL NOTATION

This section provides a concise reference describing the notation used throughout this paper.

TABLE VI: Notation table

Notation	Description
f	A deep neural network (DNN)
θ	The parameter of the DNN
f_θ	The DNN f parameterized by θ
T	The total iterations for generating the BadLabel, where $t \in \{1, 2, \dots, T\}$
f_t	a DNN at iteration t
θ	The parameter of a DNN f_θ
D	a clean C -class training set $D = \{(x_i, y_i) x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d, y_i \in \{0, \dots, C-1\}\}_{i=1}^n$
ρ	The percentage of label-flipped data over whole n data
D'	a noisy C -class training set $D' = \{(x_i, y'_i) x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d, y'_i \in \{0, \dots, C-1\}\}_{i=1}^n$
$\mathbb{1}_{\{\cdot\}}(\cdot)$	indicator function, measuring ρ -distance of D and D' , i.e., $\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{1}_{\{y_i\}}(y'_i) = 1 - \rho$
X	The $n \times d$ tensor (i.e., $[x_1, \dots, x_n]^\top$), where x_i come from the training set D
Y	$n \times C$ array (i.e., one-hot version of clean labels) for initializing the label optimization
Y'	$n \times C$ array, in which $Y' \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times C}$ is an optimized and noisy counterpart of Y
z	flag array $z \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times C}$, whose element $z(i, j)$ denotes data x_i affinity to label $j \in \{0, \dots, C-1\}$
\tilde{Y}	$n \times C$ array, in which \tilde{Y} is adversarial perturbed variant of one-hot encoded noisy labels Y'
λ	the step size of adversarial label perturbation
BayesGMM	BayesGMM clusters per-sample losses $\{\ell(f_\theta(x_i), y'_i)\}_{i=1}^n$, where $(x_i, y'_i) \in D'$
δ	The convergence value of BayesGMM
N_{iter}	The convergence iteration of BayesGMM
MixMatch	A semi-supervised learning algorithm taking input labeled set \mathcal{X} and unlabeled set \mathcal{U}
E	The total training epochs of MixMatch, where $e \in \{1, 2, \dots, E\}$
θ^e	The parameter of a DNN at the epoch e
θ_k	The parameter of a pair of DNNs indexed by k , where $k \in \{0, 1\}$
WarmUp	The standard training of DNNs for a few epochs for the warm-up purposes
\mathcal{X}	A (mostly) clean labeled set
\mathcal{U}	A unlabeled set
τ_p	The selection threshold of adversarially perturbed labels for a clean labeled set
τ_c	The selection threshold of unperturbed labels for a clean labeled set

APPENDIX B
ADDITIONAL EXPERIMENTS

In this section, we evaluate BadLabel on various state-of-the-art LNL algorithms using different datasets and network backbones. Furthermore, we plot the learning curves of various LNL algorithms.

A. Evaluation of BadLabel on MNIST

For MNIST, we synthesize BadLabel noise based on the PreAct-ResNet18 [50] backbone. We train the network using the SGD optimizer with a momentum of 0.5. Iteration T is set to 20. The learning rate is set to 0.01, and α is set to 0.1.

Table VII reports the test accuracies of various methods on MNIST with different noise types and ratios. BadLabel significantly degrades the performance of multiple methods in most cases, which shows the vulnerability of existing LNL algorithms against BadLabel.

B. Evaluation of BadLabel on DenseNet

In previous experiments, we used PreAct-ResNet18 as the backbone of the LNL algorithm. To confirm that BadLabel is challenging on methods based on different network architectures, we use a 40-layer DenseNet [51] as the backbone of the LNL algorithm for experiments. Table VIII shows the test accuracy of different methods using the DenseNet backbone on CIFAR-10. BadLabel still drastically reduces the performance of methods.

TABLE VII: Test accuracy (%) on MNIST with different noise types and noise ratios. The lowest test accuracy for each method at the same noise ratio is marked in bold.


Method		Noise Type / Noise Ratio											
		Sym.				IDN				BadLabel			
		20%	40%	60%	80%	20%	40%	60%	80%	20%	40%	60%	80%
Standard Training	Best	98.68	97.47	97.05	77.65	93.27	77.08	53.78	34.49	87.75	74.37	45.66	23.87
	Last	94.29	80.32	51.78	22.29	87.72	70.86	47.70	23.55	82.53	61.31	39.01	15.93
Co-teaching Han et al. (2018) [7]	Best	99.19	98.96	98.73	77.30	93.91	83.84	63.26	30.07	90.04	67.44	42.88	11.59
	Last	97.28	94.88	92.09	70.10	91.92	74.40	57.73	28.05	87.37	60.01	11.33	10.13
T-Revision Xia et al. (2019) [45]	Best	99.24	99.06	98.56	96.24	90.90	78.82	58.58	11.49	85.34	69.27	45.48	21.83
	Last	99.15	99.02	98.44	96.14	87.74	69.92	46.17	11.35	81.99	60.24	38.26	16.48
RoG Lee et al. (2019) [46]	Best	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Last	95.87	83.08	56.65	21.80	88.92	71.80	53.72	25.80	85.62	65.98	40.58	18.12
DivideMix Li et al. (2019) [11]	Best	99.53	99.40	98.52	88.05	95.74	82.61	54.11	28.05	85.63	64.76	44.77	21.18
	Last	98.79	96.23	91.90	61.79	88.90	68.17	43.70	21.17	83.34	62.04	42.39	19.70
AdaCorr Zheng et al. (2020) [47]	Best	99.01	99.01	98.34	93.70	92.22	79.46	53.14	28.04	84.68	64.86	42.76	20.92
	Last	93.27	77.24	49.89	23.37	87.33	67.71	44.98	22.53	80.53	59.87	38.34	17.78
Peer Loss Liu et al. (2020) [30]	Best	99.10	98.95	98.19	93.81	92.34	85.43	58.22	47.34	88.11	67.34	45.87	24.05
	Last	92.85	76.92	50.98	21.82	87.21	65.20	44.62	21.84	80.49	59.62	38.85	18.87
Negative LS Wei et al. (2021) [33]	Best	99.14	98.79	97.90	85.98	93.90	82.84	55.74	31.78	88.04	69.95	47.80	22.60
	Last	99.00	98.73	97.86	85.92	83.56	77.70	49.73	23.75	10.87	25.80	27.03	10.32
ProMix Wang et al. (2022) [13]	Best	99.75	99.77	98.07	85.50	99.14	96.12	69.88	41.21	99.66	69.35	42.80	28.95
	Last	99.67	99.74	97.76	65.21	97.37	92.74	61.09	30.35	99.56	66.33	35.80	19.09
SOP Liu et al. (2022) [12]	Best	99.21	98.56	97.76	86.30	92.68	77.37	58.00	29.21	91.00	67.60	48.81	28.57
	Last	98.65	94.05	65.03	24.48	91.39	75.97	53.29	26.88	84.66	61.78	37.07	13.95

TABLE VIII: Test accuracy (%) on CIFAR-10 with DenseNet backbone. The lowest test accuracy for each method at the same noise ratio is marked in bold.


Method		Noise Type / Noise Ratio													
		Sym.				Asym.		IDN				BadLabel			
		20%	40%	60%	80%	20%	40%	20%	40%	60%	80%	20%	40%	60%	80%
Standard Training	Best	87.71	83.42	75.23	52.33	89.57	85.75	85.59	79.00	69.69	55.16	77.19	57.54	39.87	16.50
	Last	80.08	70.96	52.83	30.50	82.84	74.37	83.58	73.45	58.21	31.68	70.71	51.30	31.86	12.38
Co-teaching Han et al. (2018) [7]	Best	86.64	85.44	80.94	53.22	87.93	70.07	83.97	76.35	58.21	43.22	76.12	51.62	10.04	10.04
	Last	86.51	85.22	80.69	53.11	87.82	69.60	83.80	76.06	58.02	28.00	75.06	50.58	6.88	4.64
T-Revision Xia et al. (2019) [45]	Best	76.76	74.55	58.82	48.57	78.55	77.34	82.40	71.80	66.52	54.94	70.53	33.32	20.41	5.78
	Last	76.38	74.27	56.92	43.20	78.16	77.23	81.64	70.68	59.50	48.24	70.25	32.63	19.80	4.42
RoG Lee et al. (2019) [46]	Best	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Last	87.02	82.65	75.64	56.93	89.66	87.73	85.33	77.63	65.80	42.52	82.34	60.24	31.23	7.78
DivideMix Li et al. (2019) [11]	Best	91.54	91.03	88.29	85.80	90.55	88.40	88.93	83.81	73.10	59.78	86.88	57.14	11.68	5.11
	Last	91.14	90.62	87.94	85.30	90.02	87.72	88.03	82.99	72.19	45.84	85.38	52.36	10.26	4.69
AdaCorr Zheng et al. (2020) [47]	Best	79.07	74.52	68.68	57.85	79.96	74.24	80.68	77.00	68.42	55.53	70.90	48.36	18.27	3.31
	Last	78.39	73.99	68.50	57.45	79.34	72.35	80.02	76.45	67.80	53.62	69.87	46.96	14.42	0.75
Peer Loss Liu et al. (2020) [30]	Best	88.68	86.56	82.92	62.99	89.09	86.57	86.02	80.28	72.57	57.03	78.72	57.11	34.06	12.04
	Last	88.53	86.39	82.72	62.73	88.87	86.38	85.79	79.49	69.68	45.11	76.92	53.87	32.48	11.08
Negative LS Wei et al. (2021) [33]	Best	80.36	74.55	65.13	51.17	81.94	76.85	82.20	77.76	68.63	59.24	80.36	57.51	30.83	10.84
	Last	79.53	74.11	64.88	50.94	73.81	60.08	78.17	72.24	62.85	46.14	75.22	52.55	25.70	4.78
PGDF Chen et al. (2021) [48]	Best	92.32	91.20	89.79	80.51	91.88	85.48	89.98	86.17	78.55	58.95	84.68	62.95	27.72	2.62
	Last	91.97	90.96	89.57	80.12	91.44	84.28	89.43	85.23	77.34	50.30	82.33	58.69	25.20	2.20
ProMix Wang et al. (2022) [13]	Best	90.44	92.28	90.85	74.92	89.89	89.14	88.99	86.59	73.51	57.06	85.27	47.47	30.69	15.06
	Last	90.22	92.07	90.70	70.11	89.61	88.99	88.77	86.45	72.83	49.50	84.60	45.86	25.98	9.68
SOP Liu et al. (2022) [12]	Best	93.85	92.73	91.55	85.26	93.36	91.26	90.56	85.92	77.11	58.34	87.47	60.88	23.26	5.06
	Last	93.69	92.61	91.48	85.14	93.29	91.14	90.48	85.40	76.17	52.40	87.05	59.67	17.72	2.69

C. Learning Curve


In Figures 5 and 6, we show the learning curves of various methods on CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 with different noises, respectively. When combating BadLabel, methods always show lower performance throughout the learning process.




(a) Standard Training




(b) Co-teaching




(c) T-Revision




(d) DivideMix




(e) AdaCorr




(f) Peer Loss




(g) Negative LS



(h) PGDF




(i) ProMix




(j) SOP







Fig. 5: Learning curves of multiple LNL algorithms on CIFAR-10 with different noise types.



(a) Standard Training



(b) Co-teaching






Fig. 6: Learning curves of multiple LNL algorithms on CIFAR-100 with different noise types.

D. Robust DivideMix

In this section, we provide additional results of robust DivideMix. Table IX show the specific hyper-parameter settings of Robust DivideMix on synthetic noise of CIFAR10/100 datasets. Table X shows the results of an ablation study on investigating the effects of different components in Robust DivideMix by removing the corresponding parts.

TABLE IX: Hyper-parameters for Robust DivideMix on CIFAR-10/100 with synthetic noise.

Dataset		Noise Type / Noise Ratio						
		Sym.	Asym.	IDN	BadLabel			
					20%	40%	60%	80%
CIFAR-10	warm-up	10	10	10	4			
	N_{iter}	20	10	20	20			
	δ	0.01	0.001	0.01	0.01			
	λ	0.2	0.2	0.2	0.5	0.8	1.0	1.0
	τ_p	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5			
	τ_c	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5			
CIFAR-100	warm-up	30	-	30	20	20	10	10
	N_{iter}	50	-	50	50	50	10	10
	δ	0.01	-	0.01	0.01			
	λ	0.2	-	0.2	1.0			
	τ_p	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.8	0.8
	τ_c	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.5	0.8	0.8

TABLE X: Test accuracy (%) of Robust DivideMix with different settings on CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 corrupted by BadLabel. The highest test accuracy on the same noise ratio is highlighted in bold.

Method		Dataset / Noise Ratio							
		CIFAR-10				CIFAR-100			
		20%	40%	60%	80%	20%	40%	60%	80%
Robust DivideMix	Best	92.07	86.70	76.47	27.41	65.29	46.64	41.80	21.48
	Last	91.76	85.96	73.29	25.20	64.49	45.26	35.91	16.91
w/o BayesGMM	Best	88.93	74.08	44.35	15.36	62.34	43.01	30.18	6.15
	Last	88.69	73.48	21.90	7.24	61.86	42.06	6.42	0.04
w/o label perturbation	Best	89.56	60.16	67.98	21.41	64.01	38.87	39.75	20.66
	Last	89.28	58.99	65.46	16.96	63.58	37.62	32.05	16.45
w/o filtering low-quality divisions	Best	75.19	53.47	49.20	10.03	64.73	35.60	27.54	5.38
	Last	75.03	51.16	12.10	5.90	63.38	34.93	3.36	0.05