

# Curating Naturally Adversarial Datasets for Trustworthy AI in Healthcare

Sydney Pugh<sup>1</sup>, Ivan Ruchkin<sup>2</sup>, Insup Lee<sup>1</sup>, James Weimer<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia, PA 19104

<sup>2</sup>University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611

<sup>3</sup>Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN 37235

{sfpugh, lee}@seas.upenn.edu<sup>1</sup>, iruchkin@ece.ufl.edu<sup>2</sup>, james.weimer@vanderbilt.edu<sup>3</sup>

## Abstract

Deep learning models have shown promising predictive accuracy for time-series healthcare applications. However, ensuring the robustness of these models is vital for building trustworthy AI systems. Existing research predominantly focuses on robustness to *synthetic adversarial examples*, crafted by adding imperceptible perturbations to clean input data. However, these synthetic adversarial examples do not accurately reflect the most challenging real-world scenarios, especially in the context of healthcare data. Consequently, robustness to synthetic adversarial examples may not necessarily translate to robustness against *naturally occurring adversarial examples*, which is highly desirable for trustworthy AI. We propose a method to curate datasets comprised of natural adversarial examples to evaluate model robustness. The method relies on probabilistic labels obtained from automated weakly-supervised labeling that combines noisy and cheap-to-obtain labeling heuristics. Based on these labels, our method adversarially orders the input data and uses this ordering to construct a sequence of increasingly adversarial datasets. Our evaluation on six medical case studies and three non-medical case studies demonstrates the efficacy and statistical validity of our approach to generating naturally adversarial datasets.

## Introduction

Deep learning models have shown significant potential in analyzing medical time-series data to facilitate tasks such as disease diagnosis, anomaly detection, and intervention planning (Faust et al. 2018; Morid, Sheng, and Dunbar 2023). However, deep learning models have also been shown to be brittle and non-robust (Szegedy et al. 2013; Alcorn et al. 2019). A typical approach to analyzing the robustness of such models is to evaluate their performance against adversarial examples — perturbed inputs that cause misclassification while being nearly imperceptible to humans.

Much work has been done to evaluate model robustness to adversarial examples, specifically focusing on *synthetic adversarial examples*. These examples are generated by intentionally adding small perturbations to *labeled* input data. However, synthetic adversarial examples for medical time-series data are problematic for two primary reasons. Firstly, they generally do not resemble adversarial examples that would be encountered in the real world (Koh et al. 2021). Simply adding random perturbations to medical data usually

yields invalid and unrealistic examples. Specialized perturbations can mitigate this, but defining them is a complex task that requires significant domain expertise. Furthermore, defining perturbations to cover all clinically plausible real-world adversarial attacks is infeasible. Moreover, improving robustness to synthetic adversarial examples does not necessarily improve robustness to natural adversarial examples.

Secondly, the lack of labeled medical time-series datasets presents a challenge in the generation of synthetic adversarial examples. Such datasets are time-consuming and expensive to create. A common way to do so is to collect data via an observational study (Bonafide et al. 2017) and then have domain experts manually label the data. However, such a study is a major commitment of effort and time.

Instead, we focus on *natural* adversarial examples — real patient examples that are difficult to classify (Hendrycks et al. 2021). Natural adversarial examples capture the inherent variations and uncertainties present in real-world medical data that effectively deceive models. Therefore, evaluating the robustness of medical deep learning models against such examples becomes crucial to ensuring model robustness in the real world. We aim to identify natural adversarial examples in *unlabeled* medical time-series data so that we can produce naturally adversarial *datasets*.

Robustness is commonly evaluated by examining a model’s accuracy on a labeled adversarial dataset. While fully-supervised labels are expensive to procure, obtaining weak labels is a cheap and quick alternative. However, assessing accuracy with respect to weak labels becomes challenging due to the uncertainty surrounding the correctness of the weak labels. In our experience, weak labels for adversarial examples are prone to significant inaccuracies due to the inherent difficulty in classifying these examples. Hence a robust model would tend to disagree with the weak labels of natural adversarial examples. Therefore, we aim to curate *adversarially ordered* datasets, wherein the proportion and severity of adversarial examples gradually increase per dataset, correspondingly leading to a diminishing accuracy of each dataset’s weak labels. In practice, a robust model would be expected to show decreasing accuracy with respect to our weak labels on adversarially ordered datasets.

This paper introduces a weakly-supervised method for curating adversarially ordered datasets containing natural adversarial examples. A key step of our method is to proba-

bilistically label data using *weakly-supervised data labeling*. This process leverages *labeling functions*, which assign labels to subsets of the data. Labeling functions are noisy: their labels can be incorrect, incomplete, or contradictory. Furthermore, labeling functions are assumed to be conditionally independent. We start with a dataset of unlabeled time series and a set of labeling functions. We then select a subset of *independent labeling functions* to be used in our method via a heuristic. The outputs of the selected labeling functions are combined to yield a probabilistic label, i.e., a label and corresponding confidence in it, for each sample in the dataset.

Adversarial examples are by definition difficult to classify, hence the *uncertainty in the label* of an example can indicate how adversarial it is. We identify adversarial examples as those with high label uncertainty. As indication of label uncertainty, we will use label confidence scores. Consequently, they will serve as the basis for adversarial ordering.

Unfortunately, label confidences do not reflect the true accuracies of the labels: weakly-supervised data labeling techniques are generally *poorly calibrated*. To overcome this issue, we construct *confidence intervals* for the probabilistic labels output by these techniques to quantify the uncertainty of the labeling process. An important consideration not previously considered is the *number of labeling functions* combined to produce the label. Informed by this circumstance, our intervals indicate, for a given level of confidence, the range of possible confidence values in the assigned label. Finally, using the lower bounds of confidence intervals, we order the examples by their natural adversarialness.

We validate our method on six medical case studies and three non-medical case studies. The medical case studies include five clinical alarm datasets derived from a 551-hour alarm labeling effort from Children’s Hospital of Philadelphia (CHOP), and one medical imaging dataset extracted from the Open-i dataset (<https://openi.nlm.nih.gov/faq>) maintained by the National Institutes of Health (NIH). The three non-medical case studies include weather-related tweets, book reviews, and synthetic YouTube comments. Our evaluation demonstrates that our approach successfully generates natural adversarial datasets with statistically valid adversarial ordering.

In summary, this paper makes the following contributions:

- An approach to building datasets with increasing amounts of natural adversarial examples,
- A method of selecting independent labeling functions to use for weakly-supervised data labeling,
- Confidence intervals to quantify uncertainty in the probabilistic labels,
- An evaluation of the statistical validity of our curated adversarially ordered natural datasets on 9 case studies.

## Related Work

**Adversarial Examples.** Szegedy et al. discovered the existence of *adversarial examples*: inputs intentionally designed to cause machine learning models to predict incorrectly. Subsequent research has predominately focused on *synthetic* adversarial examples, which are artificial inputs

specifically generated to deceive models. A common approach for generating synthetic adversarial examples is to apply adversarial perturbations to clean inputs. For example,  $\ell_p$  adversarial examples are generated by perturbing an input by some worst-case distortion that is small in the  $\ell_p$  sense (Vorobeychik and Kantarcioglu 2018). The small distortion is nearly imperceptible to humans, making it challenging to detect by inspection — but can have a significant negative impact on the behavior of a model. Unfortunately,  $\ell_p$  adversarial examples are not suitable for time series medical data because adding such noise to such data typically yields invalid and unrealistic examples. Adversarial spatial transformations (e.g., rotations, translations) may also be used to perturb inputs to generate synthetic adversarial examples (Xiao et al. 2018). However, this approach is only applicable for data with spatial structure (like image data) and hence is not applicable for time-series data.

An alternative approach for generating synthetic adversarial examples is to use synthetic data generation techniques. Researchers have considered using state-of-the-art patient simulators (Chen et al. 2016; Kushner et al. 2019) and Generative Adversarial Networks (GANs) (Baluja and Fischer 2017; Xiao et al. 2019; Hu and Tan 2022) to efficiently produce perceptually realistic adversarial examples. However, both techniques have substantial limitations. Patient simulators and GANs can struggle to fully replicate complex physiological variations found in real medical data, resulting in unrealistic examples. This difficulty arises due to the inherent complexity of human physiology and the limitations of computational modeling, which require these techniques to learn simplified models of medical scenarios. Adversarial examples generated by these techniques can also be biased. The quality of the adversarial examples generated by these techniques is highly dependent on the quality of the technique’s training data. Thus, biases in the training data (such as under-representation of specific ethnicities) can propagate into the generated data. In contrast to these techniques, our approach consistently produces realistic adversarial examples by sampling them from real medical data. However, our examples may reflect the bias of the input data.

Recently, Hendrycks et al. found that clean, realistic inputs can reliably degrade the performance of machine learning models. These inputs are referred to as *natural* adversarial examples, as they are examples that occur naturally but still lead to erroneous model predictions. In practice, natural adversarial examples are obtained by selecting them from existing datasets. Adversarial filtration is a popular approach to select natural adversarial examples from an existing dataset by removing examples that are diverse in appearance but classified easily via very predictable classification boundaries (Sung 1996). Several works have explored filtration by removing examples solved with simple spurious cues in the image domain (Hendrycks et al. 2021) and natural language processing (NLP) domain (Sakaguchi et al. 2021; Bhagavatula et al. 2019; Zellers et al. 2019; Dua et al. 2019; Bisk et al. 2020; Hendrycks et al. 2020). Unfortunately, the application of this specific method may not be suitable for time-series medical data since these datasets generally lack spurious cues. However, our approach can be considered an

adversarial filtration technique that removes examples based on the lower bound of weak label confidences. We leverage the intuition that low label confidence implies a sample is more “naturally adversarial”. An alternative way to measure label confidence is to crowdsource, i.e., have multiple human labelers label an example and then compute the disagreement amongst the labelers. Hence, adversarial filtration via crowdsourced label uncertainty is an approach alternative to ours.

Adversarial examples typically have a different underlying data distribution than non-adversarial (clean) examples. This suggests that it may be possible to select natural adversarial examples from existing data by observing the input data distribution. For example, natural adversarial examples can present as outliers in the input data feature distribution (Aggarwal 2013). The feature distribution can be estimated via a density estimator, and then an outlier detection method can be used to select the natural adversarial examples. Out-of-distribution (OOD) detectors (Ruff et al. 2021) may also be used to identify natural adversarial examples in existing data. Adversarial examples are similar to the clean examples from the training data distribution but with small imperceptible perturbations, and thus can be considered OOD. This paper focuses on selecting natural adversarial examples based on label uncertainty rather than feature values. We leave the investigation of feature-based approaches to be explored in future work.

**Weakly-Supervised Data Labeling.** Recently, a quick and inexpensive way of labeling data has emerged, known as *weakly-supervised data labeling*. Its key element is a set of quantitative intuitions about how the data corresponds to labels. For example, a clinician might say, “when a patient over 60 years old has had a heart rate over 120 beats for over a minute, such an alarm is a high priority.” These intuitions, algorithmically represented as *labeling functions*, are allowed to be incomplete, sometimes incorrect, and contradictory. A labeling function returns a class label or an “abstain” verdict for any input. Given a diverse combination of many labeling functions and an unlabeled dataset, weakly-supervised data labeling techniques produce probabilistic labels for each sample in the dataset in the form of probability distributions over the label space. Such a label is represented as a probability distribution over the label space. Subsequently, for each sample, the weak label consists of the label with the highest probability and the confidence equal to that probability. A prominent weakly-supervised data labeling technique *Snorkel* (Ratner et al. 2016, 2020) estimates an optimal weight for each labeling function by using a generative graphical model and a prior on the class balance. Our approach takes data and labeling functions as input, feeds them into Snorkel, and builds on the resulting probabilistic labels to order the data adversarially.

Extending the above work, adversarial data programming generates data in addition to labeling it (Pal and Balasubramanian 2018, 2020). A GAN is used to estimate the weight of each labeling function as well as the dependencies between them given a set of labeling functions and an unlabeled dataset. The weights and dependencies are used by the

GAN’s generator to produce labeled samples that come from the data distribution. Hence, one may be able to train an adversarial data programming model to generate more examples given a dataset comprised of natural adversarial examples. However, as mentioned earlier, GAN generated examples can be unrealistic and biased. An intriguing avenue for future work is imposing realistic constraints (Sridhar et al. 2023) on generators of natural adversarial examples.

## Adversarially Ordered Natural Datasets

We start with several notational conventions. Given a set  $B$ , we write  $|B|$  to be the set’s cardinality. Given a value  $v \in \mathbb{R}$ , we write  $\lfloor v \rfloor$ . We are given an evaluation dataset  $X \subset \mathcal{X}$  with *unknown* true labels  $Y$ .

Before formally stating the problem considered in this work, we define adversarially ordered datasets and statistically valid adversarially ordered datasets.

### Definition 1 (Adversarially Ordered Natural Datasets)

Consider a sequence of natural (non-synthetic) datasets  $D_1, \dots, D_N$ , where  $D_i = (X_i, Y_i, \hat{Y}_i)$  is composed of samples  $X_i$ , corresponding unknown true labels  $Y_i$ , and corresponding known noisy labels  $\hat{Y}_i$ . These datasets are adversarially ordered if their accuracy (non-strictly) monotonically decreases. That is,

$$\text{ACC}(Y_1, \hat{Y}_1) \geq \text{ACC}(Y_2, \hat{Y}_2) \geq \dots \geq \text{ACC}(Y_N, \hat{Y}_N)$$

where

$$\text{ACC}(Y, \hat{Y}) = \frac{1}{|Y|} \sum_{i=1}^{|Y|} \mathbf{1}(y_i = \hat{y}_i)$$

In short, the accuracy of the weak labels for each dataset in adversarially ordered natural datasets does not increase. It is important to validate this trend to verify its direction and significance. Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient  $\rho$  is a widely used measure of the strength and direction of a monotonic relationship (Spearman 1987). The coefficient  $\rho$  is a value between -1 and 1, where close to -1 indicates a strong, monotonically decreasing trend and close to 1 indicates a strong, monotonically increasing trend. The coefficient is accompanied by a p-value  $p^*$ , which quantifies the statistical significance of the observed relationship. The following definition describes how to compute Spearman’s Rank Correlation for adversarially ordered natural datasets.

**Definition 2 (Spearman’s Rank Correlation)** Consider adversarially ordered natural datasets  $D_1, \dots, D_N$ . Let  $R = (i_1, \dots, i_N)$  where  $i_n \in \{1, \dots, N\}$  be the rank order of the accuracies of the datasets (i.e.,  $\text{ACC}(Y_{i_1}, \hat{Y}_{i_1}) \leq \text{ACC}(Y_{i_2}, \hat{Y}_{i_2}) \leq \dots \leq \text{ACC}(Y_{i_N}, \hat{Y}_{i_N})$ ). We compute Spearman’s rank correlation coefficient  $\rho$  as follows:

$$\rho = \frac{6 \sum_{i=1}^N (R_i - i)^2}{N(N^2 - 1)}$$

The corresponding p-value is  $p^* = 2 \times \mathbf{P}(T \geq |t|)$ , where  $T$  follows a t-distribution with  $N - 2$  degrees of freedom and

$$t = \rho \sqrt{\frac{N - 2}{1 - \rho^2}}$$

We determine the statistical validity of adversarially ordered datasets by checking that Spearman’s rank correlation is negative and p-value is below a predetermined significance level. We formalize this idea in the definition below.

**Definition 3 (Statistically Valid Adversarial Ordering)**

Consider adversarially ordered natural datasets  $D_1, \dots, D_N$ . Let  $\rho$  and  $p^*$  be the Spearman’s Rank Correlation Coefficient and corresponding p-value, computed from the weak label accuracies of the datasets. The datasets are statistically valid adversarially ordered if the coefficient is negative (i.e.,  $\rho < 0$ ) and the p-value is statistically significant (i.e.,  $p^* \leq \gamma$  where  $\gamma$  is the predetermined adversarial ordering significance threshold).

We are now ready to state our central technical problem.

**Problem.** Given unlabeled data  $X$  and labeling functions  $\Lambda$ , produce statistically valid adversarially ordered natural datasets  $D_1, \dots, D_N$ .

Now we highlight the challenges of obtaining statistically valid adversarially ordered medical datasets — and our steps to overcome them. Our main challenge is the absence of true labels in a given dataset  $X$ , which makes it impossible to directly compute the accuracies in Def. 1. To address this challenge, we will create a *probabilistic labeler* — an algorithm that takes a sample and assigns it an estimated label and a confidence in that label (a value between 0 and 1). We refer to the assigned label as  $\hat{f}(x)$  and its confidence as  $\hat{g}(x)$  for any sample  $x \in \mathcal{X}$ . We will build that labeler from *labeling functions*, which encode the rules of thumb and heuristics acquired from medical experts. A labeling function  $\lambda : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y} \cup \{0\}$  takes a sample  $x \in \mathcal{X}$  and either abstains (i.e., assigns label 0) or assigns one of the classes to it. Labeling functions can contradict each other or abstain in different combinations.

Our second challenge is that probabilistic labelers are generally overconfident in their estimated labels (as our experience shows). That is, confidence scores  $\hat{g}(x)$  are unreliable and should not be used as an indication of the accuracy of label  $\hat{f}(x)$ . Hence, our second task is to better quantify the uncertainty in the estimated labels. For each sample  $x \in X$ , we generate an interval  $I$  of possible confidences in label  $\hat{f}(x)$ . This interval should contain the *true* confidence in label  $\hat{f}(x)$ , call it  $g(x)$ , with probability of at least  $1 - \alpha$  where  $\alpha$  is the significance level specified by the user. The next section details our solution to the problem of this paper.

**Dataset Design via Adversarial Ordering**

This section describes our approach to design adversarially ordered natural datasets. Figure 1 summarizes the steps of our approach. Our approach takes as input an unlabeled dataset  $X$  and a set of labeling functions  $\Lambda$ . The first step of our approach selects a subset of the labeling functions to be used in the next step, probabilistic labeling of the unlabeled dataset. Next, we quantify the uncertainty in the probabilistic labels by constructing confidence intervals around them. Then the confidence intervals are used in the final step to design a sequence of progressively more adversarial datasets.




Figure 1: Our approach for curating adversarially ordered natural datasets.

**Algorithm 1: Selecting independent labeling functions.**

**Input:** Labeling functions  $\Lambda$ , unlabeled data  $X$ , and correlation threshold  $\delta$

**Output:** Independent subset of labeling functions  $\Lambda' \subseteq \Lambda$

- 1: Apply labeling functions  $\Lambda$  to the data  $X$  to get weak labels  $\mathcal{L}_\Lambda(X)$ .
- 2: Compute the correlation  $c_{ij}$  between all pairs of labeling functions  $\lambda_i, \lambda_j \in \Lambda$  where  $i \neq j$  using  $\mathcal{L}_\Lambda(X)$ .
- 3: Construct a labeling function dependency graph  $G$  with labeling functions  $\lambda$  as nodes and edges between labeling functions (nodes) with correlation  $c_{ij} > \delta$ .
- 4: Rank labeling functions in descending order by the number of maximal cliques of  $G$  they belong to, breaking ties by labeling function coverage (higher coverage corresponds to a higher rank). Let  $R$  denote this ranking.
- 5: Let  $\Lambda' = \Lambda$ . For each labeling function  $\lambda$  in the ranking  $R$ , if  $\lambda \in \Lambda'$ , remove all other labeling functions with which it shares a maximal clique in  $G$  from  $\Lambda'$ .

**Labeling Function Pruning**

Labeling functions are a key component of weak supervision techniques, offering a pragmatic approach for annotating data with noisy yet informative labels. However, in practice, labeling functions often exhibit statistical dependencies between them, (e.g., multiple functions relying on the same features or patterns) (Ratner et al. 2016). Dependent labeling functions result in duplicate information that can bias the outputs of weak supervision techniques, unless accounted for in the underlying model. Most techniques commonly assume the independence of labeling functions (conditioned on the true label); however, they also offer the option to provide labeling function dependencies as additional input (Ratner et al. 2016, 2019). When provided, the dependencies are embedded into the underlying model. Unfortunately, in many applications the number of dependencies can become too large for the technique, especially when given many labeling functions. Hence it may be preferred to provide a smaller set of independent labeling functions instead of a larger set of dependent ones. We opt to use weakly-supervised data labeling techniques under the independent labeling function assumption. Therefore, it is crucial to identify a subset of the labeling functions  $\Lambda' \subseteq \Lambda$  where the labeling functions are independent of each other prior to applying these techniques.

The pseudo-code for our independent labeling function selection procedure is presented in Algorithm 1. First, the labeling functions  $\Lambda$  are applied to the dataset  $X$  to obtain

the weak labels. We will refer to the weak labels for  $X$  as  $\mathcal{L}_\Lambda(X) = (\mathcal{L}_{\lambda_1}(X), \dots, \mathcal{L}_{\lambda_{|\Lambda|}}(X))$ . Next, we compute the Pearson correlation coefficients  $c_{ij}$  for each pair of labeling functions  $(\lambda_i, \lambda_j)$  where  $\lambda_i, \lambda_j \in \Lambda$  and  $i \neq j$  from the weak labels, i.e.,  $c_{ij} = \text{PEARSON}(\mathcal{L}_{\lambda_i}(X), \mathcal{L}_{\lambda_j}(X))$ . These coefficients are measures of linear correlation (dependence) between pairs of our labeling functions.

Now we aim to rank the labeling functions from most to least independent. To do this, we first construct a graph representation of the labeling function dependencies (Ratner et al. 2019). Concretely, the nodes of the graph  $G$  are the labeling functions in  $\Lambda$ . We add an edge to  $G$  for each labeling function pair whose correlation is sufficiently large, that is, add edge  $(\lambda_i, \lambda_j)$  if  $|c_{ij}| > \delta$  where  $\delta$  is a user-specified minimum threshold on correlation. Next, we identify maximal cliques of labeling functions, which effectively reveal subsets of labeling functions that tend to share similar labeling patterns (i.e., cover the same information). Hence our intuition is that labeling functions belonging to many cliques are more dependent. We rank the labeling functions by the number of maximal cliques they belong to in  $G$ . Ties in the ranking are resolved by labeling function coverage, that is, the proportion of samples for which a labeling function emits a (non-abstain) label, i.e.,  $\frac{1}{|X|} \sum_{x \in X} \mathbf{1}(\lambda(x) \neq 0)$ . We assign higher rank to labeling functions with higher coverage to retain a substantial proportion of weak labels for the data  $X$ .

Finally, we determine a subset of independent labeling functions  $\Lambda' \subseteq \Lambda$ . Our goal is to select the smallest subset of labeling functions that cover all the cliques. Let  $\Lambda' = \Lambda$  to start. Then for each labeling function  $\lambda$  in the ranking (in descending order), if  $\lambda \in \Lambda'$ , then remove all other labeling functions that share a maximal clique with  $\lambda$ . Now we have an independent subset  $\Lambda' \subseteq \Lambda$  for weak supervision.

## Probabilistic Labeling

In this step, we combine the weak labels produced by the labeling functions into a single “strong” probabilistic label. This label is characterized by a confidence score between 0 and 1, indicating the level of certainty in the label’s accuracy. Mathematically, for each sample  $x \in X$ , we combine its weak labels  $\mathcal{L}_\Lambda(x)$  into a probabilistic strong label  $\hat{f}(x)$  with confidence  $\hat{g}(x)$ .

Our approach computes the strong label and corresponding confidence using a weak supervision technique that performs a *weighted combination* over the weak labels. The weights  $w$  has a fixed vector per class containing one weight per labeling function. While our approach supports a variety of weighted combination techniques, we consider two of them in this paper:

- Majority vote
- Generative model with an uninformed prior

These two techniques are applied in two steps:

1. Determine the weights  $w$
2. Combine the weak labels  $\mathcal{L}_\Lambda(x)$  using weights  $w$  for each  $x \in X$

The first step learns a non-negative weight vector where each weight indicates the relative priority of the corresponding labeling function. Majority vote, a widely-used and straightforward method for combining multiple discrete signals into one, assigns equal priority to each labeling function. Hence, the weight vector for majority vote is uniform (i.e.,  $w_i^{(y)} = 1$  for all  $i \in \{1, \dots, |\Lambda|\}$  and  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ ). Generative models are popular in state-of-the-art weak supervision literature (Ratner et al. 2016; Bach et al. 2017; Pal and Balasubramanian 2018; Fu et al. 2020) These models give higher weights to labeling functions with higher accuracies. The accuracies are unknown a priori, so the model estimates them by observing the agreements and disagreements of the labeling functions in the data  $(\mathcal{L}_\Lambda(x))$  during its training phase. Furthermore, the model can be trained with a prior that specifies the expected frequency of each label in  $\mathcal{Y}$ . We assume the actual prior is unknown and we do not have a labeled dataset on which we can estimate it, so we use an uninformed prior which assigns equal probability to every label. The technical details on this use of generative models can be found in (Pugh et al. 2021).

In the second step, the learned weights are used to combine the weak labels into a single probabilistic label for each sample. Suppose now we want to label a sample  $x$  given its weak labels  $\mathcal{L}_\Lambda(x)$  and the weights  $w$ . First, we obtain label weights by adding up the weights of all labeling functions choosing that label, i.e.,  $\sum_{i=1}^{|\Lambda|} w_i^{(y)} \cdot \lambda_i(x)$  for  $y \in \mathcal{Y}$ . Then we pass the label weights through the softmax function, which is a standard way to normalize positive real numbers into a probability distribution. Finally, the largest normalized weight is used as the confidence  $\hat{g}(x)$  and the label corresponding to that weight becomes the estimated label  $\hat{f}(x)$ .

Unfortunately, as mentioned in the previous section, the confidence scores output by these two weak supervision techniques are typically over-confident; that is, the confidence  $\hat{g}(x)$  overestimates the accuracy of the estimated label  $\hat{f}(x)$ . In other words, weak supervision techniques are poorly calibrated (Guo et al. 2017) – the confidence scores do not reflect the true accuracy of the label. Majority vote can be especially prone to over-confidence because if many of the labeling functions are inaccurate, the label prediction can be incorrect with high confidence. Generative models have an advantage over majority vote because they can account for the inaccuracies of labeling functions and, thus, yield more accurate confidences. However, as we witness in practice, generative models are also often poorly calibrated. Hence, the confidences output by weak supervision techniques should be used with caution or disregarded entirely. In response, we propose using confidence intervals to account for the uncertainty in these confidences.

## Confidence Intervals for Weak Label Accuracies

Our confidences in the estimated labels from the prior subsection can be unreliable. More precisely, the confidences in the estimated labels may not reflect the true accuracy of those estimated labels. We quantify the potential inaccuracy in the estimated labels by providing *confidence intervals*. Our confidence intervals contain the likely true confidences

in the estimated labels. For each sample  $x \in X$ , we aim to generate an interval  $I$  containing the true confidence in the estimated label  $\hat{f}(x)$ , call it  $g(x)$ , with probability of at least  $1 - \alpha$ , i.e.,  $\mathbf{P}[g(x) \in I] \geq 1 - \alpha$ .

We bound the unknown true confidences  $g(X)$  in our estimated labels  $\hat{f}(X)$  using the Clopper-Pearson (CP) interval  $[\theta_L, \theta_U]$  where  $\theta_L, \theta_U \in [0, 1]$  and  $\theta_L < \theta_U$  (Clopper and Pearson 1934). This interval bounds the true success probability  $\mu$ , constructed from a sample  $s \sim B(n, \mu)$  from a binomial distribution with  $n$  trials and success probability  $\mu$ , which holds with probability at least  $1 - \alpha$ , i.e.,  $\mathbf{P}_{s \sim B(n, \mu)}[\theta_L(\alpha; n, s) \leq \mu \leq \theta_U(\alpha; n, s)] \geq 1 - \alpha$ .

Intuitively, few non-abstaining labeling functions with large weights should yield a lower confidence than many non-abstaining labeling functions with moderate weights. Hence, in addition to the labeling function weights, the *number of labeling functions*  $n$  contributing to the estimation of the labels should be considered in the calculation of confidence in  $\hat{f}(x)$ . While the confidences provided by probabilistic labelers  $\hat{g}(X)$  do not take this into account (which can lead to their unreliability), we incorporate the number of voting labeling functions into the construction of our intervals. When a labeling function emits a (non-abstain) label for some sample  $x$ , we consider it a Bernoulli trial whose outcome is a success if that label is correct or a failure if it is incorrect. We let the number of successes  $s$  (of the  $n$  trials) be the normalized probability of label  $\hat{f}(x)$  weighted by the number of non-abstaining labeling functions  $n$ . Hence by definition of the CP interval, we derive the interval  $I = [\theta_L, \theta_U]$  for  $g(x)$  given any sample  $x \in X$  and significance level  $\alpha$  as,

$$\theta_L(\alpha; n, s) = B\left(\frac{\alpha}{2}; s, (n - s + 1)\right)$$

$$\theta_U(\alpha; n, s) = B\left(1 - \frac{\alpha}{2}; (s + 1), (n - s)\right)$$

where

$$n(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{|\Lambda|} \mathbf{1}(\lambda_i(x) \neq 0)$$

$$s(x) = n(x) \cdot \frac{\exp\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{|\Lambda|} w_i^{(\hat{f}(x))} \lambda_i(x)\right\}}{\sum_{y \in \mathcal{Y}} \exp\left\{\sum_{i=1}^{|\Lambda|} w_i^{(y)} \lambda_i(x)\right\}}$$

where  $B(q; a, b)$  is the  $q$ -th quantile from a beta distribution with shape parameters  $a$  and  $b$ .

### Adversarial Dataset Design

Now we create a sequence of adversarially ordered natural datasets. Our confidence interval lower bounds indicate the smallest possible certainty in the estimated label. So as more samples with small lower bounds are included in a dataset, the more adversarial it gets. We arrange the samples in  $X$  by their confidence interval lower bound in descending order, i.e.,  $x_{i_1}, x_{i_2}, \dots, x_{i_{|X|}}$  where  $\theta_L(x_{i_1}) \geq \theta_L(x_{i_2}) \geq \dots \geq \theta_L(x_{i_{|X|}})$  and  $i_1, \dots, i_{|X|} \in \{1, \dots, |X|\}$ . Then we produce a sequence of datasets  $D_1, \dots, D_N$  where each dataset

$D_n$  contains the top  $\frac{i}{N}$  percent of ordered samples and their corresponding estimated labels, that is,

$$D_n = \{(x_{i_j}, \hat{f}(x_{i_j}))\} \quad \text{for } j \in \left\{1, \dots, \frac{i \cdot |X|}{N}\right\}$$

In conclusion, we have natural datasets  $D_1, \dots, D_N$  that are progressively more adversarial.

## Results

In this section, we evaluate our approach on nine case studies (six with clinical relevance). Specifically, we summarize the nine case studies describe comparative approaches, and evaluate the adversarial ordering of natural adversarial datasets produced by our approach.

### Case Studies

We evaluate our approach on five physiological alarm suppression case studies, one clinical text classification case study, and three non-clinical text classification case studies.

**Physiologic Alarm Suppression.** Alarm suppression, which involves distinguishing suppressible (uninformative to clinical care) and non-suppressible physiologic-monitoring alarms, is the aim of the first five datasets. Datasets of heart rate (HR) low/high, respiratory rate (RR) low/high, and SpO<sub>2</sub> low alarms were extracted from (MacMurchy et al. 2017). Each alarm sample is represented as a multi-vital sign time series data. We use the set of sixty-two clinician-designed labeling functions developed for this example from (Pugh et al. 2022, 2021). The labeling functions analyze the time series data to make predictions on suppressibility, e.g., an alarm is non-suppressible if the heart rate is above 220 for longer than 10 seconds after the alarm starts, otherwise it abstains.

**Clinical Text Classification.** The **Crossmodal** dataset aims to label radiography, computed tomography, and electroencephalography images by writing labeling functions over an auxiliary modality, namely, corresponding imaging text reports (Dunnmon et al. 2019). The labeling functions in this example are clinician-designed, expressing simple pattern-matching or ontology-lookup heuristics.

**Non-Clinical Text Classification.** The **Crowdsourcing**, **Recsys**, and **Spam** datasets are publicly-available at [www.snorkel.org](http://www.snorkel.org). The objective of **Crowdsourcing** is to label tweets pertaining to weather expressing either a positive or negative sentiment. **Recsys** aims to predict whether a user will read and like any given book or not. Finally, the **Spam** dataset aims to classify spam emails.

### Comparative Approaches

We previously discussed two primary challenges of probabilistic labeling via weak supervision techniques: (1) labeling function dependence, and (2) unreliability of confidence scores output by probabilistic labelers. In our evaluation, we will demonstrate why addressing these challenges is necessary to achieve sufficient performance. Hence we define three comparative approaches as follows. **PL Conf with all**

Case Study	Probabilistic Labeler (PL)	PL Conf with all LFs	PL Conf with Indep. LFs	CI LB with all LFs	Our Approach
HR Low	Majority Vote	-0.719 (0.019)	<b>-0.903 (0.000)</b>	<b>-0.863 (0.001)</b>	-0.730 (0.017)
	Snorkel	-0.313 (0.379)	-0.730 (0.017)	<b>-0.827 (0.003)</b>	0.595 (0.070)
HR High	Majority Vote	<u>0.818 (0.004)</u>	<b>-0.976 (0.000)</b>	<u>0.857 (0.002)</u>	<b>-1.000 (0.000)</b>
	Snorkel	<u>0.964 (0.000)</u>	<u>0.927 (0.000)</u>	<u>0.988 (0.000)</u>	<b>-0.806 (0.005)</b>
RR Low	Majority Vote	<b>-0.997 (0.000)</b>	<b>-0.879 (0.001)</b>	<b>-0.997 (0.000)</b>	<b>-0.891 (0.001)</b>
	Snorkel	<b>-0.997 (0.000)</b>	-0.394 (0.260)	<b>-0.997 (0.000)</b>	<b>-0.806 (0.005)</b>
RR High	Majority Vote	<b>-1.000 (0.000)</b>	<b>-0.988 (0.000)</b>	<b>-1.000 (0.000)</b>	<b>-0.952 (0.000)</b>
	Snorkel	<b>-1.000 (0.000)</b>	<b>-0.952 (0.000)</b>	<b>-1.000 (0.000)</b>	-0.455 (0.187)
SpO <sub>2</sub> Low	Majority Vote	-0.309 (0.385)	<u>0.891 (0.001)</u>	-0.248 (0.489)	0.188 (0.603)
	Snorkel	<b>-0.988 (0.000)</b>	<u>0.430 (0.214)</u>	-0.455 (0.187)	-0.612 (0.060)
Cross Modal	Majority Vote	<b>-1.000 (0.000)</b>	<b>-1.000 (0.000)</b>	<b>-0.879 (0.001)</b>	<b>-0.782 (0.008)</b>
	Snorkel	<b>-1.000 (0.000)</b>	<b>-0.988 (0.000)</b>	-0.624 (0.054)	<b>-0.806 (0.005)</b>
Crowdsourcing	Majority Vote	<b>-0.864 (0.001)</b>	<b>-0.988 (0.000)</b>	<b>-0.864 (0.001)</b>	<b>-0.976 (0.000)</b>
	Snorkel	<b>-0.976 (0.000)</b>	<b>-0.988 (0.000)</b>	<b>-0.864 (0.001)</b>	<b>-0.976 (0.000)</b>
Recsys	Majority Vote	<b>-1.000 (0.000)</b>	<b>-1.000 (0.000)</b>	-0.321 (0.365)	-0.321 (0.365)
	Snorkel	<b>-0.988 (0.000)</b>	<b>-0.988 (0.000)</b>	-0.539 (0.108)	-0.539 (0.108)
Spam	Majority Vote	<b>-0.985 (0.000)</b>	<b>-0.985 (0.000)</b>	<b>-0.767 (0.010)</b>	<b>-0.767 (0.010)</b>
	Snorkel	-0.673 (0.033)	-0.673 (0.033)	-0.656 (0.039)	-0.656 (0.039)

Table 1: Spearman’s Rank Correlation of the adversarially ordered natural datasets. The values reported are the correlation coefficient and corresponding p-value in parentheses. Values in bold indicate datasets with a statistically significant monotonically decreasing accuracy, while underlined values indicate statistically significant increasing accuracy (i.e., a violation of our requirements). The regular font is used for values indicating a statistically insignificant trend in accuracy.

**LFs** produces datasets by ordering samples by the probabilistic labeler’s confidences ( $\hat{g}(X)$ ) computed using *all* of the provided labeling functions (regardless of the dependencies between them), and then selecting the top- $p$  percent of samples per dataset (as done in our approach). **PL Conf with Indep. LFs** repeats the same steps as **PL Conf with all LFs** but uses a set of independent labeling functions selected by the same procedure from our approach. Lastly, **CI LB w/ all LFs** is an instance of our approach that skips the labeling function pruning step, that is, it is our approach using *all* provided labeling functions.

### Evaluation of Natural Adversarial Ordering

Finally, we present the results of our approach applied to several case studies. Recall that the goal of the paper is to generate a sequence of statistically valid adversarially ordered natural datasets as per Def. 3. We validate the progressive increase of “adversarialness” in the datasets by analyzing the Spearman’s rank correlation (Def. 2) of the adversarially ordered datasets.

The parameters of our approach are set as follows. Correlation between two labeling functions greater than 0.5 indicates that the labeling functions are dependent, i.e., correlation threshold  $\delta = 0.5$ . We allow for a 5% chance of the confidence intervals not containing the true confidence in our probabilistic labels, i.e., significance level  $\alpha = 0.05$ . Lastly, we let the, i.e., adversarial ordering significance threshold  $\gamma = 0.01$ .

We report the Spearman’s rank correlation coefficients and corresponding p-values for the accuracies of the datasets produced by our approach and by the comparative ap-

proaches in Table 1. We plot the actual accuracies of the datasets in the Appendix. The results demonstrate that our approach yields statistically significant adversarially ordered datasets in ten cases, and statistically invalid datasets on all other examples. We interpret this as a substantive outcome: our approach is applicable in a majority of the examples, and never yields datasets with statistically valid increasing accuracy. All the comparative approaches produce at least as many datasets with statistically valid decreasing accuracy, but also produce datasets with statistically significant monotonically increasing accuracy — thus violating our requirements. If used for robustness evaluation of learning models in practice, such datasets can cause incorrect and misleading results. Hence, we conclude that our approach yields more reliable results than the comparative approaches.

### Conclusion

In this paper, we proposed an approach for designing a sequence of adversarially ordered natural datasets for the purpose of evaluating model robustness to natural adversarial examples. Our approach identifies a set of independent labeling functions to use for probabilistic labeling. Probabilistic labels obtained via weak supervision techniques were used as proxy of the unknown true labels. We quantify the uncertainty in these labels with Clopper-Pearson confidence bounds, and construct our datasets according to the lower bound which is a indication of how “naturally adversaria” a sample may be. Finally, we evaluated our approach on six clinical case studies and three others and showed that we produce natural datasets with statistically valid adversarial ordering. Directions for future work include (1) eval-



uating the robustness of real classifiers using our statistically valid adversarially ordered natural datasets, (2) developing weakly-supervised methods for evaluating additional properties of machine learning models, and (3) calibrating weakly-supervised data labeling techniques.

## References

- Aggarwal, C. C. 2013. *Outlier Analysis*. New York: Springer. ISBN 978-1-4614-6395-5.
- Alcorn, M. A.; Li, Q.; Gong, Z.; Wang, C.; Mai, L.; Ku, W.-S.; and Nguyen, A. 2019. Strike (With) a Pose: Neural Networks Are Easily Fooled by Strange Poses of Familiar Objects. In *2019 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 4840–4849. ISSN: 2575-7075.
- Bach, S. H.; He, B.; Ratner, A.; and Ré, C. 2017. Learning the structure of generative models without labeled data. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 273–282. PMLR.
- Baluja, S.; and Fischer, I. 2017. Adversarial transformation networks: Learning to generate adversarial examples. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1703.09387*.
- Bhagavatula, C.; Bras, R. L.; Malaviya, C.; Sakaguchi, K.; Holtzman, A.; Rashkin, H.; Downey, D.; Yih, S. W.-t.; and Choi, Y. 2019. Abductive commonsense reasoning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.05739*.
- Bisk, Y.; Zellers, R.; Gao, J.; Choi, Y.; et al. 2020. Piqa: Reasoning about physical commonsense in natural language. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, volume 34, 7432–7439.
- Bonafide, C. P.; Localio, A. R.; Holmes, J. H.; Nadkarni, V. M.; Stemler, S.; MacMurchy, M.; Zander, M.; Roberts, K. E.; Lin, R.; and Keren, R. 2017. Video Analysis of Factors Associated With Response Time to Physiologic Monitor Alarms in a Children’s Hospital. *JAMIA Pediatrics*, 171(1): 524–531.
- Chen, S.; Sokolsky, O.; Weimer, J.; and Lee, I. 2016. Data-driven Adaptive Safety Monitoring using Virtual Subjects in Medical Cyber-Physical Systems: A Glucose Control Case Study. *Journal of Computer Science and Engineering*, 75–84.
- Clopper, C. J.; and Pearson, E. S. 1934. The use of confidence or fiducial limits illustrated in the case of the binomial. *Biometrika*, 26(4): 404–413.
- Dua, D.; Wang, Y.; Dasigi, P.; Stanovsky, G.; Singh, S.; and Gardner, M. 2019. DROP: A reading comprehension benchmark requiring discrete reasoning over paragraphs. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.00161*.
- Dunnmon, J.; Ratner, A.; Khandwala, N.; Saab, K.; Markert, M.; Sagreiya, H.; Goldman, R.; Lee-Messer, C.; Lungren, M.; Rubin, D.; and Ré, C. 2019. Cross-Modal Data Programming Enables Rapid Medical Machine Learning.
- Faust, O.; Hagiwara, Y.; Hong, T. J.; Lih, O. S.; and Acharya, U. R. 2018. Deep learning for healthcare applications based on physiological signals: A review. *Computer methods and programs in biomedicine*, 161: 1–13.
- Fu, D.; Chen, M.; Sala, F.; Hooper, S.; Fatahalian, K.; and Ré, C. 2020. Fast and three-rious: Speeding up weak supervision with triplet methods. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 3280–3291. PMLR.
- Guo, C.; Pleiss, G.; Sun, Y.; and Weinberger, K. Q. 2017. On calibration of modern neural networks. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning - Volume 70, ICML’17*, 1321–1330. Sydney, NSW, Australia: JMLR.org.
- Hendrycks, D.; Burns, C.; Basart, S.; Critch, A.; Li, J.; Song, D.; and Steinhardt, J. 2020. Aligning ai with shared human values. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2008.02275*.
- Hendrycks, D.; Zhao, K.; Basart, S.; Steinhardt, J.; and Song, D. 2021. Natural Adversarial Examples. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 15262–15271.
- Hu, W.; and Tan, Y. 2022. Generating adversarial malware examples for black-box attacks based on GAN. In *International Conference on Data Mining and Big Data*, 409–423. Springer.
- Koh, P. W.; Sagawa, S.; Marklund, H.; Xie, S. M.; Zhang, M.; Balsubramani, A.; Hu, W.; Yasunaga, M.; Phillips, R. L.; Gao, I.; Lee, T.; David, E.; Stavness, I.; Guo, W.; Earnshaw, B.; Haque, I.; Beery, S.; Leskovec, J.; Kundaje, A.; Pierson, E.; Levine, S.; Finn, C.; and Liang, P. 2021. WILDS: A Benchmark of in-the-Wild Distribution Shifts.
- Kushner, T.; Bequette, B. W.; Cameron, F.; Forlenza, G. P.; Maahs, D. M.; and Sankaranarayanan, S. 2019. Models, Devices, Properties, and Verification of Artificial Pancreas Systems. In *Automated Reasoning for Systems Biology and Medicine*.
- MacMurchy, M.; Stemler, S.; Zander, M.; and Bonafide, C. P. 2017. Research: Acceptability, feasibility, and cost of using video to evaluate alarm fatigue. *Biomedical instrumentation & technology*, 51(1): 25–33.
- Morid, M. A.; Sheng, O. R. L.; and Dunbar, J. 2023. Time Series Prediction Using Deep Learning Methods in Healthcare. *ACM Trans. Manage. Inf. Syst.*, 14(1).
- Pal, A.; and Balasubramanian, V. N. 2018. Adversarial data programming: Using gans to relax the bottleneck of curated labeled data. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 1556–1565.
- Pal, A.; and Balasubramanian, V. N. 2020. Generative adversarial data programming. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.00364*.
- Pugh, S.; Ruchkin, I.; Bonafide, C.; Demauro, S.; Sokolsky, O.; Lee, I.; and Weimer, J. 2022. Evaluating Alarm Classifiers with High-Confidence Data Programming. *ACM Trans. Comput. Healthcare*, 3(4).
- Pugh, S.; Ruchkin, I.; Bonafide, C. P.; DeMauro, S. B.; Sokolsky, O.; Lee, I.; and Weimer, J. 2021. High-Confidence Data Programming for Evaluating Suppression of Physiological Alarms. In *2021 IEEE/ACM Conference on Connected Health: Applications, Systems and Engineering Technologies (CHASE)*, 70–81. IEEE.
- Ratner, A.; Bach, S. H.; Ehrenberg, H.; Fries, J.; Wu, S.; and Ré, C. 2020. Snorkel: Rapid training data creation with weak supervision. *The VLDB Journal*, 29(2-3): 709–730.



Ratner, A.; Hancock, B.; Dunnmon, J.; Sala, F.; Pandey, S.; and Ré, C. 2019. Training complex models with multi-task weak supervision. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 33, 4763–4771.

Ratner, A. J.; De Sa, C. M.; Wu, S.; Selsam, D.; and Ré, C. 2016. Data programming: Creating large training sets, quickly. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 29.

Ruff, L.; Kauffmann, J. R.; Vandermeulen, R. A.; Montavon, G.; Samek, W.; Kloft, M.; Dietterich, T. G.; and Müller, K.-R. 2021. A Unifying Review of Deep and Shallow Anomaly Detection. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 109(5): 756–795. ArXiv:2009.11732 [cs, stat].

Sakaguchi, K.; Bras, R. L.; Bhagavatula, C.; and Choi, Y. 2021. Winogrande: An adversarial winograd schema challenge at scale. *Communications of the ACM*, 64(9): 99–106.

Spearman, C. 1987. The proof and measurement of association between two things. *The American journal of psychology*, 100(3/4): 441–471.

Sridhar, K.; Dutta, S.; Weimer, J.; and Lee, I. 2023. Guaranteed Conformance of Neurosymbolic Models to Natural Constraints. In *L4DC 2023*. ArXiv:2212.01346 [cs].

Sung, K.-K. 1996. Learning and example selection for object and pattern detection.

Szegedy, C.; Zaremba, W.; Sutskever, I.; Bruna, J.; Erhan, D.; Goodfellow, I.; and Fergus, R. 2013. Intriguing properties of neural networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.6199*.

Vorobeychik, Y.; and Kantarcioglu, M. 2018. *Adversarial Machine Learning*. Cham, Switzerland: Morgan & Claypool Publishers. ISBN 978-1-68173-395-1.

Xiao, C.; Li, B.; Zhu, J.-Y.; He, W.; Liu, M.; and Song, D. 2019. Generating Adversarial Examples with Adversarial Networks. arXiv:1801.02610.

Xiao, C.; Zhu, J.-Y.; Li, B.; He, W.; Liu, M.; and Song, D. 2018. Spatially transformed adversarial examples. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.02612*.

Zellers, R.; Holtzman, A.; Bisk, Y.; Farhadi, A.; and Choi, Y. 2019. Hellaswag: Can a machine really finish your sentence? *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.07830*.

## Appendix

### Case Study Summary

The case studies used in the evaluation of our approach for curating adversarially ordered natural datasets are summarized in Table 2.

Example	Train	Valid	Test	Num. LFs
HR Low	79	-	-	62
HR High	1315	-	-	62
RR Low	312	-	-	62
RR High	574	-	-	62
SpO <sub>2</sub> Low	3265	-	-	62
Crossmodal	2630	376	378	18
Crowdsourcing	187	50	50	103
Recsys	796956	8339	42191	5
Spam	1586	-	250	9

Table 2: Summary of our nine case studies.

### Implementation

In this section, we provide details on the implementation of our approach for curating adversarially ordered natural datasets. The implementation of probabilistic labeling via majority vote is straightforward. For probabilistic labeling via a generative model, we use a tool called Snorkel to train a generative model. Snorkel is the state-of-the-art tool for weak label combination and has been applied to several applications. We use the latest version at the time of writing, version 0.9.7 ([www.snorkel.org](http://www.snorkel.org)).

For our confidence intervals, we use the confidence interval for a binomial proportion implementation, namely the “proportion.confint” function, from the statsmodels Python library, version 0.14.0 ([www.statsmodels.org](http://www.statsmodels.org)). We specify the hyperparameters such that the Clopper-Pearson interval based on the Beta distribution with a 5% significance level is used. Specifically, hyperparameters “alpha” and “method” are set to 0.05 and “beta”, respectively.

Generative models do not generalize to unseen samples, so we combine the train, validation, and test splits (without labels) as training data for the generative model. In order to evaluate the accuracy of the noisy datasets produced by our approach, we select the samples to be included in our datasets from the available labeled data (i.e., train for the alarm suppression examples and the validation and test splits combined for all other examples).

### Additional Results

Figure 2 shows the accuracy of the adversarially ordered natural datasets produced by our approach and comparative approaches across our nine case studies. For each case study, we curate ten datasets (i.e.,  $N = 10$ ) and then plot their accuracy scores. We also quantify the uncertainty in these accuracies by placing a 90% binomial confidence interval around them. For each dataset  $D_i = (X_i, Y_i, \hat{Y}_i)$  where

$i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$ , the width of the confidence interval is computed as,

$$1.64 \cdot \sqrt{\frac{\text{ACC}(Y_i, \hat{Y}_i) \cdot (1 - \text{ACC}(Y_i, \hat{Y}_i))}{|Y_i|}}$$

where

$$\text{ACC}(Y, \hat{Y}) = \frac{1}{|Y|} \sum_{i=1}^{|Y|} \mathbf{1}(y_i = \hat{y}_i)$$

and  $|\cdot|$  denotes the cardinality of the given set.




Figure 2: Accuracy of datasets produced by our approach and comparative approaches. Recsys and Spam do not have dependent labeling functions hence the lines for PL with all LFs and PL with Indep. LFs, and CILB with all LFs and our approach overlap.