
Learning from Label Proportions and Covariate-shifted Instances

Sagalpreet Singh
Google DeepMind

Navodita Sharma*
Google DeepMind

Shreyas Havaldar*
Google DeepMind

Rishi Saket
Google DeepMind

Aravindan Raghuv eer
Google DeepMind

Abstract

In many applications, especially due to lack of supervision or privacy concerns, the training data is grouped into bags of instances (feature-vectors) and for each bag we have only an aggregate label derived from the instance-labels in the bag. In learning from label proportions (LLP) the aggregate label is the average of the instance-labels in a bag, and a significant body of work has focused on training models in the LLP setting to predict instance-labels. In practice however, the training data may have fully supervised albeit covariate-shifted *source* data, along with the usual *target* data with bag-labels, and we wish to train a good instance-level predictor on the target domain. We call this the covariate-shifted hybrid LLP problem. Fully supervised covariate shifted data often has useful training signals and the goal is to leverage them for better predictive performance in the hybrid LLP setting. To achieve this, we develop methods for hybrid LLP which naturally incorporate the target bag-labels along with the source instance-labels, in the domain adaptation framework. Apart from proving theoretical guarantees bounding the target generalization error, we also conduct experiments on several publicly available datasets showing that our methods outperform LLP and domain adaptation baselines as well techniques from previous related work.

1 Introduction

Learning from label proportions (LLP) is a direct generalization of supervised learning where the training instances (i.e., feature-vectors) are partitioned into *bags* and for each bag only the average label of its instances is available as the *bag*-label. Full supervision is equivalent to the special case of unit-sized bags. In LLP, using bags of instances and their bag-labels, the goal is to train a good predictor of the instance-labels. Over the last two decades, LLP has been used in scenarios with lack of fully supervised data due to legal requirements [Rueping, 2010], privacy constraints [Wojtusiak et al., 2011] or coarse supervision [Chen et al., 2004]. Applications of LLP include image classification [Bortsova et al., 2018, Ørting et al., 2016], spam detection [Quadrianto et al., 2009a], IVF prediction [Hernández-González et al., 2018], and high energy physics [Dery et al., 2017]. More recently, restrictions on cross-site tracking of users has led to coarsening of previously available fine-grained signals which have been used to train large-scale models predicting user behavior for e.g. clicks or product preferences. Popular mechanisms (see Apple SKAN [ska,] and Chrome Privacy sandbox [san,]) aggregate relevant labels for bags of users resulting in LLP training data. Due to revenue criticality of user modeling in advertising, the study of LLP specifically for such applications has gained importance. A popular baseline method to train models using training bags and their bag-labels is to minimize a bag-level loss which for any bag is some suitable loss function between the the average prediction and the bag-label (see [Ardehaly and Culotta, 2017]). Other methods using different bag-level losses have also been proposed (e.g. [Liu et al., 2021, Baručić and Kybic, 2022]) for training models in the LLP setting.

One aspect of data in real-world applications is its heterogeneity, which introduces new aspects to the vanilla

*Equal Contribution.

LLP modeling formulation. In particular, apart from bag-level data from the *target* distribution, the learner may have access to instance labels from a covariate-shifted *source* distribution corresponding for e.g. to online users who have consented to share their labels or to data with less restrictive regulations. Here, we think of covariate-shift as a difference in $p(\mathbf{X})$ – the distribution of feature-vectors – while keeping $p(Y | \mathbf{X})$ the same. We call this *covariate-shifted hybrid LLP* in which the goal is to leverage the full supervision on the source as well as the bag-level supervision on the target to train better instance-label predictors on the target distribution.

Previous work of [Ardehaly and Culotta, 2016, Li and Culotta, 2023a] studied the case where the source training data was aggregated into bags whose bag-labels are available, while the training data from the target distribution is completely unsupervised. The work of [Ardehaly and Culotta, 2016] gave a *self-training* based approach where the model trained on the source data is used to predict bag-labels on the unsupervised target train-set from which a subset of the most confidently labeled bags are used to (along with the source data) retrain the predictor. The more recent work of [Li and Culotta, 2023a] proposed solutions directly applying domain adversarial neural-network (DANN) methods in which apart from minimizing the bag-level loss on the source data, an unsupervised domain prediction loss is *maximized* to ensure that the predictor is domain-independent.

The work of [Ardehaly and Culotta, 2016, Li and Culotta, 2023a] as well as standard domain adaptation methods (for e.g. [Long et al., 2015]) can be applied to our setting by simply ignoring the bag-labels of the target train-set, and treating the labeled instances in the source data as bags of size 1. Note however that these approaches discard the informative signal from the target bag-labels and are thus likely to degrade the predictive performance.

The main contribution of this paper is a suite of techniques which use the bag-labels from the target training set, not only to minimize the bag-loss i.e., the predictive loss on bags, but also to do better domain adaptation. We focus on regression as the underlying task and propose loss functions which, at a high level, have three components: (i) the instance-level loss on the source data, (ii) a bag-level loss on the target training bags, and (iii) a domain adaptation loss which leverages the instance-labels from source and bag-labels from target. We substantially extend to our setting previous techniques for domain adaptation as well as LLP, and prove generalization error bounds which justify our loss formulations. Complementing these analytical insights, we provide extensive

experimental evaluations of our methods showing performance gains, on real as well as synthetic datasets.

1.1 Previous Related Work

Learning from Label Proportions (LLP). Early work on LLP by [de Freitas and Kück, 2005, Hernández-González et al., 2013] applied trained probabilistic models using Monte-Carlo methods, while [Musicant et al., 2007, Rueping, 2010] provided adaptations of standard supervised learning approaches such as SVM, k -NN and neural nets, and [Chen et al., 2009, Stolpe and Morik, 2011] developed clustering based methods for LLP. More specialized techniques were proposed by [Quadrianto et al., 2009b] and later extended by [Patrini et al., 2014] to estimate parameters from label proportions for the exponential generative model assuming well-behaved label distributions of bags. An optimization based approach of [Yu et al., 2013] provided a novel α -SVM method for LLP. Newer methods involve deep learning [Kotzias et al., 2015, Dulac-Arnold et al., 2019, Liu et al., 2019, Nandy et al., 2022] and others leverage characteristics of the distribution of bags [Saket et al., 2022, Zhang et al., 2022, Chen et al., 2023] while [Busa-Fekete et al., 2023] developed model training techniques on derived *surrogate* labels for instances for random bags. Defining the LLP label proportion regression task in the PAC framework, [Yu et al., 2014], established bounds on the generalization error bounds for bag-distributions. For the classification setting and specific types of loss functions, bag-to-instance generalization error bounds were shown by [Busa-Fekete et al., 2023, Chen et al., 2023].

Domain Adaptation. Many of the domain adaptation techniques try to align the source and target distributions by minimizing a distance-measure between domains. The work of [Long et al., 2015] generalized deep convolutional neural networks to the domain adaptation scenario, by matching the task-specific hidden representations for the source and target domains in a reproducing kernel Hilbert space. An extension of this work by [Long et al., 2017] proposed a Joint Adaptation Network which aligns the joint distributions of multiple domain-specific hidden layers using a joint maximum mean discrepancy measure. The technique proposed by [Ganin et al., 2016] focuses on learning from features which are indiscriminate with respect to the shift between domains. Recently, [Li and Culotta, 2023b] applied domain adaptation to the LLP and proposed a model combining domain-adversarial neural network (DANN) and label regularization, to learn from source-domain bags and

predict on instances from a target domain.

2 Preliminaries

For a given $d \in \mathbb{Z}^+$, feature-vectors (instances) are d -dimensional reals and labels are real-valued scalars. Let \mathcal{D}_S and \mathcal{D}_T denote respectively the source and target distributions over $\mathbb{R}^d \times [0, 1]$.

We denote by $\mathcal{S}(n)$ a source *training* set of n examples $\{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) \mid i = 1, \dots, n\}$ drawn iid from \mathcal{D}_S , and analogously define $\mathcal{T}(n)$ as n iid examples from \mathcal{D}_T . However, while the source training set is available at the instance-level, the target train-set is aggregated randomly into *bags*. We specify the bag-creation as follows.

Target Training Bags. A bag $B \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ is a finite set of instances \mathbf{x} with labels $y_{\mathbf{x}}$ and its *bag-label* $y_B := (1/|B|) \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in B} y_{\mathbf{x}}$ is the average of the instance-labels in the bag. The sample target training bags denoted by $\mathcal{B}(m, k)$ is a random set of m k -sized bags $(B_1, y_{B_1}), \dots, (B_m, y_{B_m})$ created as follows:

1. Let $\mathcal{T}(mk) := \{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) \mid i = 1, \dots, mk\}$ be mk iid examples from \mathcal{D}_T .
2. Let $I_j = \{k(j-1) + 1, \dots, kj\}$, $j = 1, \dots, m$ be a partition of $[mk]$.
3. For each $j = 1, \dots, m$, let $B_j = \{\mathbf{x}_i \mid i \in I_j\}$ with bag-labels $y_{B_j} = (1/k) \sum_{i \in I_j} y_i$.

Instance and Bag-level losses. Since we focus on regression as the underlying task for an instance-level predictor we shall define our losses using *mean squared-error* (mse). For any function $h : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the loss w.r.t. to a distribution \mathcal{D} over $\mathbb{R}^d \times \mathbb{R}$ is

$$\varepsilon(\mathcal{D}, h) := \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, y) \leftarrow \mathcal{D}} \left[(h(\mathbf{x}) - y)^2 \right],$$

where we shall let \mathcal{D} be \mathcal{D}_S or \mathcal{D}_T for our purpose. The loss over a finite sample \mathcal{U} of labeled points is:

$$\hat{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{U}, h) := \frac{1}{|\mathcal{U}|} \sum_{(\mathbf{x}, y) \in \mathcal{U}} \left[(h(\mathbf{x}) - y)^2 \right]$$

where we shall take \mathcal{U} as the source training-set \mathcal{S} or target training-set \mathcal{T} (we omit the sizes of the train-set for convenience). Finally, we have the loss on sampled bags:

$$\begin{aligned} & \bar{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{B}, h) \\ := & \frac{1}{|\mathcal{B}|} \sum_{(B, y_B) \in \mathcal{B}} \left[\left(\left(\frac{1}{|B|} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in B} h(\mathbf{x}) \right) - y_B \right)^2 \right] \end{aligned}$$

Function Classes and pseudo-dimension. We will consider a class \mathcal{F} of real-valued functions (regressors) mapping \mathbb{R}^d to $[0, 1]$. For any $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ s.t. $|\mathcal{X}| =$

N , let $\mathcal{C}_p(\xi, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{X})$ denote a minimum cardinality ℓ_p -metric ξ -cover of \mathcal{F} over \mathcal{X} , for some $\xi > 0$. Specifically, $\mathcal{C}_p(\xi, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{X})$ is a minimum sized subset of \mathcal{F} such that for each $f^* \in \mathcal{F}$, there exists $f \in \mathcal{C}_p(\xi, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{X})$ s.t. $(\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} [|f^*(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x})|^p])^{1/p} \leq \xi$ for $p \in [1, \infty)$, and $\max_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}} |f^*(\mathbf{x}) - f(\mathbf{x})| \leq \xi$ for $p = \infty$.

As detailed in Sections 10.2-10.4 of [Anthony and Bartlett, 2009], the largest size of such a cover over all choices of $\mathcal{X} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^d$ s.t. $|\mathcal{X}| = N$ is defined to be $N_p(\xi, \mathcal{F}, N)$.

The *pseudo-dimension* of \mathcal{F} , $\text{Pdim}(\mathcal{F})$ (see Sec. 10.4 and 12.3 of [Anthony and Bartlett, 2009]) can be used to bound the size of covers for \mathcal{F} as follows:

$$N_1(\xi, \mathcal{F}, N) \leq N_\infty(\xi, \mathcal{F}, N) \leq (eN/\xi p)^p \quad (1)$$

where $p = \text{Pdim}(\mathcal{F})$ and $N \geq d$.

Since the task of our interest is regression, we shall assume that for any $f \in \mathcal{F}$, $f(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{r}_f^\top \phi(\mathbf{x})$ where ϕ is a mapping to a real-vector in an embedding space and \mathbf{r}_f is the representation of f in that space (see Appendix A for an explanation).

2.1 Our Contributions

For $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{S}(mk) = \{(\mathbf{z}_i, \ell_i)\}_{i=1}^{mk}$, and $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(m, k) = \{(B_j, y_{B_j})\}_{j=1}^m$ be the bags constructed from $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}(mk)$, we define the following *covariate-shift* loss.

$$\begin{aligned} \xi(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{B}) := & 2 \left\| \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m y_{B_j} \left(\frac{1}{k} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in B_j} \phi(\mathbf{x}) \right) \right. \\ & \left. - \frac{1}{mk} \sum_{i=1}^{mk} y_i \phi(\mathbf{z}_i) \right\|_2 \quad (2) \end{aligned}$$

Note that the above domain adaptation loss depends on the labels from the source train-set labels as well as the bag-labels of the target training bags. In other words, it leverages the supervision provided on the training data \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{B} . We bound the difference of the sample bag-loss on target training bags \mathcal{B} and the sample instance-level loss on the source as follows.

Lemma 2.1. *For any $h \in \mathcal{F}$,*

$$\bar{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{B}, h) - \hat{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{S}, h) \leq \xi(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{B}) \|\mathbf{r}_h\|_2 + \lambda'(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}) + R(h, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T})$$

where $\lambda'(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T})$ is independent of h and $R(h, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T})$ is a label-independent regularization on \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{T} .

The above lemma whose proof along with the expressions for $\lambda'(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T})$ and $R(h, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T})$, is provided in Section 3, shows that minimizing the instance-level loss on the source train-set \mathcal{S} along with the covariate-shift loss training data can upper bound the bag-level loss

on the target training bags \mathcal{B} . Since our goal is to upper bound the instance-level loss on the target distribution, we bound the latter using the bag-loss on the training bags in the following novel generalization error bound.

Theorem 2.2. *For $m, k \in \mathbb{Z}^+, \varepsilon, \delta > 0$, w.p. $1 - \delta$ over choice of $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(m, k)$, $\varepsilon(\mathcal{D}_T, h) \leq 10k\bar{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{B}, h)$ for all $h \in \mathcal{F}$ s.t. $\varepsilon(\mathcal{D}_T, h) \geq \varepsilon$ and $p = \text{Pdim}(\mathcal{F})$, when $m \geq O(p \log p \log(\frac{1}{\delta}) \max\{1/(k\varepsilon^2), k^2/\varepsilon\})$.*

The above is, to the best of our knowledge, the first bag-to-instance generalization error bound for regression tasks in LLP using the pseudo-dimension of the regressor class. Note however that there is a blowup in the error proportional to the bag-size k , which is understandable since, due to convexity, the mse loss between the average prediction in a bag and its bag-label is less than the average loss of the instance-wise predictions and labels. In other words, the error bound from Theorem 2.2 is weaker with increasing bag size. Therefore, it makes sense to directly optimize $\bar{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{B}, h)$ along with $\xi(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{B})$ and $\hat{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{S}, h)$. In particular, combining Lemma 2.1 with the implication of Theorem 2.2 we obtain $\varepsilon(\mathcal{D}_T, h) \leq w_1\bar{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{B}, h) + w_2\hat{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{S}, h) + w_2(\bar{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{B}, h) - \hat{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{S}, h))$ where $w_1 + w_2 \geq 10k$. This can be bounded by $w_1\bar{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{B}, h) + w_2\hat{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{S}, h) + w_2(\xi(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{B})\|\mathbf{r}_h\|_2 + \lambda' + R(h, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}))$. In this, we can assume a bound on $\|\mathbf{r}_h\|_2$ since the range of all $h \in \mathcal{F}$ is bounded in $[0, 1]$. Further, the term $R(h, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T})$ is a difference of two unsupervised regularization terms on \mathcal{S} and \mathcal{T} , which is expected to be small for reasonable covariate-shift in the datasets, and hence can be omitted from the optimization (see Appendix A). With these simplifying assumptions we formalize the above intuition to propose our loss on bags and covariate-shifted instances.

Bags and covariate-shifted instances loss. For parameters $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3 \geq 0$, the **BagCSI** loss is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{BagCSI}(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{B}, h, \{\lambda_i\}_{i=1}^3) \\ := & \lambda_1\bar{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{B}, h) + \lambda_2\hat{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{S}, h) + \lambda_3\xi^2(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{B}) \quad (3) \end{aligned}$$

For practical considerations we use ξ^2 instead of ξ because ξ cannot be summed over mini-batches of the training dataset.

We use **BagCSI** loss to propose model training method in section 5. We also perform extensive experiments to evaluate our methods and share the outcomes in section 6.

3 Proof of Lemma 2.1

Using the definitions in Section 2 define $\mathbf{u}_j := (1/k) \sum_{i \in I_j} \phi(\mathbf{x}_i)$ so that $\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i \in I_j} h(\mathbf{x}_i) = \mathbf{r}_h^\top \mathbf{u}_j$.

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{B}, h) &= \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \left[\left(\left(\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i \in I_j} h(\mathbf{x}_i) \right) - y_{B_j} \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \left[\left(\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i \in I_j} h(\mathbf{x}_i) \right)^2 + y_{B_j}^2 - 2y_{B_j} \mathbf{r}_h^\top \mathbf{u}_j \right] \\ &\leq \frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m \left[\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i \in I_j} (h(\mathbf{x}_i)^2 + y_i^2) - 2y_{B_j} \mathbf{r}_h^\top \mathbf{u}_j \right] \quad (4) \end{aligned}$$

where the last upper bound uses Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{S}, h) &= \frac{1}{mk} \sum_{i=1}^{mk} [(h(\mathbf{z}_i) - \ell_i)^2] \\ &= \frac{1}{mk} \sum_{i=1}^{mk} [h(\mathbf{z}_i)^2 + \ell_i^2 - 2\ell_i \mathbf{r}_h^\top \phi(\mathbf{z}_i)] \quad (5) \end{aligned}$$

Using the above along with (4) we obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} & \bar{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{B}, h) - \hat{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{S}, h) \\ & \leq \frac{1}{mk} \sum_{i=1}^{mk} (h(\mathbf{x}_i)^2 - h(\mathbf{z}_i)^2) \\ & \quad + 2\mathbf{r}_h^\top \left(\frac{1}{m} \sum_{j=1}^m y_{B_j} \mathbf{u}_j - \frac{1}{mk} \sum_{i=1}^{mk} \ell_i \phi(\mathbf{z}_i) \right) \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{mk} \sum_{i=1}^{mk} (y_i^2 - \ell_i^2) \end{aligned}$$

Notice that the second term on the RHS of the above is $\leq \xi(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{B})\|\mathbf{r}_h\|_2$. Taking $\lambda'(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}) = \left| 1/(mk) \sum_{i=1}^{mk} (y_i^2 - \ell_i^2) \right|$ and $R(h, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}) = \left| 1/(mk) \sum_{i=1}^{mk} (h(\mathbf{x}_i)^2 - h(\mathbf{z}_i)^2) \right|$ completes the proof of Lemma 2.1.

4 Proof of Theorem 2.2

We first describe the following equivalent way of sampling the target training bags $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{B}(m, k) = \{(B_j, y_{B_j}) \mid j = 1, \dots, m\}$.

1. Let $\mathcal{Z} := \{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) \mid i = 1, \dots, 2mk\}$ be $2mk$ iid examples from \mathcal{D}_T .
2. Define $\bar{I}_j = \{2k(j-1) + 1, \dots, 2kj\}$, $j = 1, \dots, m$ be a partition of $[2mk]$ into m disjoint subsets.

3. Independently for each $j = 1, \dots, m$, let I_j be a random subset of \bar{I}_j of exactly k indices.
4. For each $j = 1, \dots, m$, let $B_j = \{\mathbf{x}_i \mid i \in I_j\}$ with bag-labels $y_{B_j} = (1/k) \sum_{i \in I_j} y_i$.

Let us first fix $h \in \mathcal{F}$ and \mathcal{Z} and prove a lower bound on the bag-level loss.

4.1 Analysis for fixed h and \mathcal{Z}

Let us assume that $\hat{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{Z}, h) = \zeta$, for some $\zeta \geq 0$. For convenience let $z_i = h(\mathbf{x}_i) - y_i$, $i = 1, \dots, 2mk$. Note that since $y_i, h(\mathbf{x}_i) \in [0, 1]$, $|z_i| \leq 1$. Let $\bar{\mathcal{Z}}^{(j)} = \{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) \mid i \in \bar{I}_j\}$ be the restriction of \mathcal{Z} to the indices in \bar{I}_j , so that $\sum_{j=1}^m \hat{\varepsilon}(\bar{\mathcal{Z}}^{(j)}, h) = \hat{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{Z}, h)$. Over the choice of $\{I_j\}_{j=1}^m$ define the random variable $L_j := \left[\left(\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i \in I_j} h(\mathbf{x}_i) \right) - y_{B_j} \right]^2$. Since $y_{B_j} = (1/k) \sum_{i \in I_j} y_i$, $L_j = \left(\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i \in I_j} z_i \right)^2 \leq \left(\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i \in I_j} |z_i| \right)^2$. Since $I_j \subseteq \bar{I}_j$ and $|z_i| \leq 1$ for all i , this implies

$$\begin{aligned} L_j &\leq \min \left\{ 1, \left(\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i \in \bar{I}_j} |z_i| \right)^2 \right\} \\ &\leq \min \left\{ 1, \frac{2}{k} \sum_{i \in \bar{I}_j} |z_i|^2 \right\} =: \gamma_j \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

since $\sum_{i \in \bar{I}_j} |z_i| \leq \sqrt{2k} \sqrt{\sum_{i \in \bar{I}_j} |z_i|^2}$ by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. Note that after fixing \mathcal{Z} , the choices of I_1, \dots, I_m are independent of each other, and each L_j only depends of the choice of I_j .

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[L_j] &= \mathbb{E} \left[\left(\frac{1}{k} \sum_{i \in I_j} z_i \right)^2 \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{k^2} \left(\sum_{r \in \bar{I}_j} z_r^2 \Pr[r \in I_j] + \sum_{\substack{r, s \in \bar{I}_j \\ r \neq s}} z_r z_s \Pr[r, s \in I_j] \right) \end{aligned}$$

Since I_j is a random subset of \bar{I}_j of k out of $2k$ indices, $\Pr[r \in I_j \mid r \in \bar{I}_j] = 1/2$ and $\Pr[r, s \in I_j \mid r, s \in \bar{I}_j, r \neq s] = (k-1)/(2(2k-1))$ which simplifies the

RHS of the above to:

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2k^2} \left[\left(1 - \frac{k-1}{2k-1} \right) \sum_{r \in \bar{I}_j} z_r^2 + \frac{k-1}{2k-1} \sum_{r, s \in \bar{I}_j} z_r z_s \right] \\ &\geq \frac{1}{2k^2} \left[\frac{1}{2} \sum_{r \in \bar{I}_j} z_r^2 + \frac{k-1}{2k-1} \left(\sum_{r \in \bar{I}_j} z_r \right)^2 \right] \\ &\geq \frac{1}{4k^2} \sum_{r \in \bar{I}_j} z_r^2 \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Using (6) one can apply Hoeffding's inequality to obtain for any $t \geq 0$ (see Appendix B),

$$\begin{aligned} &\Pr \left[\sum_{j=1}^m L_j \leq \mathbb{E} \left[\sum_{j=1}^m L_j \right] - t \right] \\ &\leq 2 \exp \left(\frac{-2t^2}{\sum_{j=1}^m \gamma_j^2} \right) \\ &\leq 2 \exp \left(\frac{-2t^2}{(\max\{\gamma_j\}_{j=1}^m) \sum_{j=1}^m \gamma_j} \right) \\ &\leq 2 \exp \left(\frac{-t^2 k}{\sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{i \in \bar{I}_j} z_i^2} \right) \end{aligned}$$

By definition we have $\sum_{j \in \bar{I}_j} z_i^2 = \sum_{i=1}^{2mk} z_i^2 = 2\zeta mk$. Thus, the above along with (7) yields $\Pr \left[\sum_{j=1}^m L_j \leq \zeta m / (2k) - t \right] \leq 2 \exp \left(\frac{-t^2}{2\zeta m} \right)$. Recalling that $\zeta = \hat{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{Z}, h)$, and noting that $\sum_{j=1}^m L_j = m\bar{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{B}, h)$ while taking $t = \zeta m / (4k)$ we obtain

$$\Pr \left[\bar{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{B}, h) \leq \frac{\hat{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{Z}, h)}{4k} \right] \leq 2 \exp \left(\frac{-\hat{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{Z}, h)m}{32k^2} \right) \quad (8)$$

4.2 High probability bound for \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{Z}

Let us fix a parameter ε . We fix \mathcal{Z} for now and consider the cover $\mathcal{C}_\infty(\xi, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{Z})$ for some ξ which we will choose later, and $q_\infty = N_\infty(\xi, \mathcal{F}, 2mk)$ be the upper bound on its size. Let $\mathcal{C}_{\text{err}} \subseteq \mathcal{C}_p(\xi, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{Z})$ s.t. $\forall \hat{h} \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{err}}, \hat{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{Z}, \hat{h}) \geq \varepsilon/2$. Taking a union bound of the error in (8) over $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{err}}$ we obtain that:

$$\begin{aligned} &\Pr \left[\forall \hat{h} \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{err}} : \bar{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{B}, \hat{h}) \geq \frac{\hat{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{Z}, \hat{h})}{4k} \right] \\ &\leq 1 - 2q_\infty \exp \left(\frac{-\varepsilon m}{64k^2} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Define $\hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{err}} := \{h \in \mathcal{F} \mid \hat{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{Z}, h) \geq 3\varepsilon/4\}$. For any $h \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{err}}$ there is $\hat{h} \in \mathcal{C}_\infty(\xi, \mathcal{F}, \mathcal{Z})$ s.t. $|\hat{h}(\mathbf{x}) - h(\mathbf{x})| \leq \xi$ for all $(\mathbf{x}, y) \in \mathcal{Z}$. Now, $(\hat{h}(\mathbf{x}) - y)^2 = (h(\mathbf{x}) - y + \hat{h}(\mathbf{x}) - h(\mathbf{x}))^2 \geq (h(\mathbf{x}) - y)^2 - 2|\hat{h}(\mathbf{x}) -$

Table 1: MSE scores for different methods and bag sizes on the Wine dataset (averaged over 20 runs). The source instance loss is 195.47 ± 1.18 and target instance loss is 170.47 ± 0.14 . Lower the better.

| Method \ Bag Size | 8 | 32 | 128 | 256 |
|-------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Bagged-Target | 173.5 \pm 0.37 | 177.7 \pm 1.21 | 191.0 \pm 2.54 | 206.9 \pm 3.52 |
| AF | 186.8 \pm 2.08 | 190.3 \pm 2.81 | 191.0 \pm 2.35 | 192.4 \pm 1.76 |
| LR | 185.9 \pm 1.94 | 191.6 \pm 1.57 | 193.8 \pm 0.82 | 194.5 \pm 1.02 |
| AF-DANN | 187.6 \pm 1.67 | 190.5 \pm 1.68 | 191.2 \pm 2.47 | 191.9 \pm 2.06 |
| LR-DANN | 186.2 \pm 1.46 | 192.1 \pm 1.98 | 193.7 \pm 2.40 | 193.8 \pm 2.45 |
| DMFA | 186.1 \pm 1.73 | 191.8 \pm 2.12 | 193.5 \pm 2.38 | 194.5 \pm 0.92 |
| PL-WFA (our) | 183.0 \pm 0.57 | 186.6 \pm 0.95 | 189.0 \pm 0.75 | 188.9 \pm 1.20 |
| BL-WFA (our) | 180.9 \pm 0.50 | 184.6 \pm 0.72 | 186.0 \pm 0.84 | 186.4 \pm 0.53 |

$h(\mathbf{x})||h(\mathbf{x}) - y| + (\hat{h}(\mathbf{x}) - h(\mathbf{x}))^2 \geq (h(\mathbf{x}) - y)^2 - 2\xi$ since $h(\mathbf{x}), y \in [0, 1]$. Similarly, consider any bag $B \in \mathcal{B}$. Using arguments analogous to above we obtain $(\mathbb{E}[h(\mathbf{x})] - y_B)^2 \geq (\mathbb{E}[\hat{h}(\mathbf{x})] - y_B)^2 - 2|\mathbb{E}[\hat{h}(\mathbf{x}) - h(\mathbf{x})]|(\mathbb{E}[h(\mathbf{x})] - y_B) \geq (\mathbb{E}[\hat{h}(\mathbf{x})] - y_B)^2 - 2\xi$, implying

$$\hat{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{Z}, \hat{h}) \geq \hat{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{Z}, h) - 2\xi, \quad \bar{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{B}, \hat{h}) \geq \bar{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{B}, h) - 2\xi. \quad (10)$$

Therefore, taking $\xi = \varepsilon/(32k)$ we obtain from the first bound above that $\hat{h} \in \mathcal{C}_{\text{err}}$ and further that $\hat{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{Z}, \hat{h}) \geq 2\hat{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{Z}, h)/3 \geq \varepsilon/2 = 16k\xi$. Observe that $\bar{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{B}, \hat{h}) \geq \hat{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{Z}, \hat{h})/(4k)$ implies $\bar{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{B}, \hat{h}) \geq 4\xi$, which in turn implies $\bar{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{B}, h) \geq \bar{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{B}, \hat{h}) - 2\xi \geq \bar{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{B}, \hat{h})/2$. Combining this with (9) and (10) we obtain,

$$\Pr \left[\forall h \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{err}} : \bar{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{B}, h) \geq \frac{\hat{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{Z}, h)}{12k} \right] \leq 1 - 2q_{\infty} \exp \left(\frac{-\varepsilon m}{64k^2} \right) \quad (11)$$

We now unfix \mathcal{Z} , and define $\mathcal{F}_{\text{err}} = \{h \in \mathcal{F} \mid \varepsilon(\mathcal{D}_T, \hat{h}) \geq \varepsilon\}$. By Theorem 17.1 of [Anthony and Bartlett, 2009], we obtain with probability at least $1 - 4q_1 \exp(-2\varepsilon^2 mk/512)$ over the choice of \mathcal{Z} , $h \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{err}} \Rightarrow h \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}_{\text{err}}$ where $q_1 = N_1(\varepsilon/64, \mathcal{F}, 4mk)$. Using this along with (11), we obtain that with probability at least $1 - 2q_{\infty} \exp(-\varepsilon m/(64k^2)) - 4q_1 \exp(-2\varepsilon^2 mk/512)$, $\forall h \in \mathcal{F}_{\text{err}}, \bar{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{B}, h) \geq \frac{\hat{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{Z}, h)}{12k}$. Using the upper bounds in (1) we see that the probability is $1 - \delta$ if we choose $m \geq O(p \log p \log(\frac{1}{\delta}) \max\{1/(k\varepsilon^2), k^2/\varepsilon\})$ thus completing the proof of Theorem 2.2.

5 Proposed Methods

We propose two novel methods. The first method uses BagCSI loss as the objective. We have shown above that BagCSI loss is an upper bound over $\varepsilon(\mathcal{D}_T, h)$ loss

w.r.t target distribution. We now provide intuitive explanation for why BagCSI loss should work.

Let us assume that the goal is to predict label for an unseen instance \mathbf{x} , given feature representations $\phi(\mathbf{x}_i)$ in the embedding space and corresponding labels y_i from training data. A natural prediction would be $\mathbb{E}_i[\rho(\phi(\mathbf{x}), \phi(\mathbf{x}_i))y_i]$, where ρ is some similarity metric. If we choose the similarity metric to be the inner product, the prediction can be written as $\phi(\mathbf{x})^T \mathbb{E}_i[\phi(\mathbf{x}_i)y_i]$. The given feature representations and corresponding labels can come either from the source domain or from the target domain. For learning domain invariant feature representation, the prediction should be similar irrespective of the domain considered. This can be achieved by enforcing the term, $\sum_i y_i \phi(\mathbf{x}_i)$ to be equal for source and target domain. However, this approach requires knowledge of instance-level labels $y_{\mathbf{x}}$ from target domain, which are not available. We can however replace $y_{\mathbf{x}}$ with *pseudo-labels* $\hat{y}_{\mathbf{x}}$, using which we introduce a new domain adaptation loss term in the objective, $\psi^2(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{B})$ where:

$$\psi(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{B}) := \frac{1}{mk} \left\| \sum_{j=1}^m \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{B}_j} \hat{y}_{\mathbf{x}} \phi(\mathbf{x}) - \sum_{i=1}^{mk} y_i \phi(\mathbf{z}_i) \right\|_2 \quad (12)$$

One way is to assign the bag-label as the pseudo-label for all instances within the bag, in which case $\psi(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{B})$ essentially reduces to $\xi(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{B})$. We call this method *Bag Label Weighted Feature Alignment (BL-WFA)* which involves training using the BagCSI loss.

Another approach is to use the following process for pseudo-labeling instances in a bag B using hypothesis model h :

1. Compute the predictions $\{h(\mathbf{x})\}_{\mathbf{x} \in B}$.
2. The pseudo-labels are given by adding to each prediction the same $b \in \mathbb{R}$ such that average pseudo-label in the bag equals the bag-label. Note that this is equivalent to the nearest vector of pseudo-

labels (in Euclidean distance) to the vector predictions, that satisfies the bag-label constraint.

We call this method *Pseudo-label Weighted Feature Alignment* (**PL-WFA**) in which $\psi(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{B})$ is used to train the model using the above computed pseudo-labels.

6 Experimental Evaluations

We evaluate our approaches via experiments on both synthetic as well as real-world datasets and compare against the baselines for different bag sizes.

6.1 Baseline Methodologies

In [Li and Culotta, 2023a], authors propose methods for domain adaptation in LLP setting for classification tasks. We adapt these methods for regression tasks and consider those as baselines. In this paper, these baselines are referred to as Average Feature (**AF**), Label Regularization (**LR**), Average Feature DANN (**AF-DANN**) and Label Regularization DANN (**LR-DANN**). See section 3.1.2, 3.1.3, 3.2.1, 3.2.2 in [Li and Culotta, 2023a] for respective methods. In literature on domain adaptation (for non-LLP settings) [Long et al., 2015, Long et al., 2017], it has been shown that approaches using MMD (maximum mean discrepancy) based objectives work well. Hence, we also define a baseline that uses similar objective adapted for our setting, called Domain Mean Feature Alignment (**DMFA**). We also consider bag level target loss (**Bagged-Target**) as a baseline. Appendix C contains additional details about baseline methods. We evaluate and compare our methods against these baselines.

Our model training uses the above losses in a mini-batch loop. For DMFA and PL-WFA we select equal number of instances from both source and target domain in a mini-batch. For BL-WFA, we select as many instances from source domain as the number of bags selected from target domain in a mini-batch. Such a choice avoids explicit normalization in the objective function and incorporates them into the hyperparameters. We evaluate all the baselines and proposed methods for different bag sizes and datasets.

6.2 Datasets

All datasets are split into two components, source and target domain. For our study, it is important that there is a reasonable covariate shift between these two components. The target domain dataset is split into train (80%) and test (20%) sets. The train set is partitioned randomly into bags of equal size.

The synthetic dataset has 64 dimensional continuous feature vectors and scalar-valued continuous label. For covariate shifted source and target domain data, the feature vectors are sampled from a multi-dimensional Gaussian distribution with different means and covariance matrices. The labels for both source and target data are computed using the same randomly initialized neural network. We also evaluate methods on 2 real world datasets: Wine Ratings dataset [Dara, 2018, Zackthouff, 2017] and IPUMS USA dataset [Ruggles et al., 2024]. For wine dataset, the source domain comprises of wines from France and the target domain comprises of wines from all countries but France. For IPUMS dataset, we select a subset of feature columns comprising of the following features: REGION, STATEICP, AGE, IND, GQ, SEX and WKSWORK2 and use INCWAGE as the labels. We consider the data from 1970 as the source domain and data from 2022 as the target domain. Refer Appendix D for more details.

6.3 Training & Evaluation

We use a simple neural network comprising of an input layer followed by two sequential ReLU activated layers (128 nodes) and a final linear layer (1 node). For US Census, dataset, we additionally include embedding layers after the input layer for all the cardinal and categorical features that were not converted to one-hot representations. For AF-DANN and LR-DANN, we also have a sigmoid activated domain prediction layer in parallel to the final dense layer.

During training, we perform a grid search to find the most optimal set of hyperparameters for each configuration (specific dataset, methodology and bag size). We try out two different optimizers for all configurations - Adam and SGD and report scores corresponding to the best performer.

For each configuration, we run the same experiment multiple times and report the MSE scores on target domain’s test data as the evaluation metric. Note that the instances in target domain are randomly bagged for each run. The final evaluation metric is reported by the mean and standard deviation over these runs. Specifically, we run 20 trials for each configuration with Wine and Synthetic dataset and 10 trials for each configuration with US Census dataset. A different random seed is chosen for each trial.

Experimental Code and Resources. We will release the code for our experiments along with the final version of this paper. Our experiments were run on a system with standard 8-core CPU, 256GB of memory with one P100 GPU.

Table 2: MSE scores for different methods and bag sizes on the US Census dataset (averaged over 10 runs). The source instance loss is 1.8714 ± 0.0779 and target instance loss is 1.1237 ± 0.0007 .

| Method \ Bag Size | 8 | 32 | 128 | 256 |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Bagged-Target | 1.14 ± 0.0014 | 1.16 ± 0.0021 | 1.22 ± 0.0046 | 1.31 ± 0.0108 |
| AF | 1.23 ± 0.0088 | 1.31 ± 0.0113 | 1.41 ± 0.0246 | 1.43 ± 0.0205 |
| LR | 1.15 ± 0.0016 | 1.18 ± 0.0042 | 1.24 ± 0.0076 | 1.29 ± 0.0088 |
| AF-DANN | 1.25 ± 0.0163 | 1.33 ± 0.0708 | 1.39 ± 0.0683 | 1.39 ± 0.0219 |
| LR-DANN | 1.16 ± 0.0030 | 1.23 ± 0.0174 | 1.51 ± 0.0726 | 1.61 ± 0.1318 |
| DMFA | 1.15 ± 0.0017 | 1.18 ± 0.0037 | 1.26 ± 0.0089 | 1.30 ± 0.0095 |
| PL-WFA (our) | 1.15 ± 0.0019 | 1.18 ± 0.0041 | 1.25 ± 0.0123 | 1.29 ± 0.0082 |
| BL-WFA (our) | 1.14 ± 0.0010 | 1.16 ± 0.0009 | 1.22 ± 0.0031 | 1.25 ± 0.0066 |

Table 3: MSE scores for different methods and bag sizes on the synthetic dataset (averaged over 20 runs). The source instance loss is 2718.13 ± 2062.3185 and target instance loss is 0.19 ± 0.0208 . Lower the better.

| Method \ Bag Size | 8 | 32 | 128 | 256 |
|-------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Bagged-Target | 0.71 ± 0.0507 | 5.49 ± 0.9308 | 17.87 ± 0.4909 | 19.95 ± 0.3443 |
| AF | 0.96 ± 0.0743 | 6.22 ± 0.8132 | 18.16 ± 0.5037 | 20.00 ± 0.8602 |
| LR | 0.71 ± 0.0426 | 5.15 ± 1.0553 | 18.10 ± 0.4035 | 19.92 ± 1.5498 |
| AF-DANN | 1.23 ± 0.0618 | 8.16 ± 0.5358 | 18.04 ± 0.9549 | 20.15 ± 0.4930 |
| LR-DANN | 1.02 ± 0.0401 | 7.84 ± 0.8667 | 17.76 ± 0.2425 | 19.72 ± 0.2915 |
| DMFA | 0.69 ± 0.0467 | 4.39 ± 0.8367 | 16.50 ± 1.4681 | 19.07 ± 1.1595 |
| PL-WFA (our) | 0.75 ± 0.0629 | 4.43 ± 0.8124 | 15.60 ± 0.9391 | 18.40 ± 0.7378 |
| BL-WFA (our) | 0.75 ± 0.0452 | 2.22 ± 0.2187 | 10.36 ± 3.1493 | 13.76 ± 0.6049 |

7 Results & Inferences

The evaluation metrics are reported for all 3 datasets in tables 1, 2 and 3. For bag size 256, BL-WFA achieves 2.9%, 2.5% and 27.9% improvement over the best baseline method for Wine, US Census and synthetic datasets respectively. MSE is used as evaluation metric, hence scores cannot be compared across datasets due to different scales. Refer Appendix E for more results.

We make the following inferences from the results:

1. PL-WFA and BL-WFA consistently outperform all other baselines for large enough bag sizes. This is expected because with increase in bag size, the information from just the bagged target domain is not rich enough and benefits greatly from inclusion of covariate shifted source domain data. By leveraging not just the features from target domain but also the bagged-labels, PL-WFA and BL-WFA outperform other baseline methods which rely only on features from target domain for domain adaptation.
2. With increase in bag size, the performance drops. This is expected as information is lost with increase in bag size.
3. On synthetic dataset (where we definitely have a reasonable amount of covariate shift), even with bag size as large as 256, we see that the performance of our proposed methods - PL-WFA and BL-WFA is better than the case where we use instance level labeled target data for training (target instance loss). This improvement is achieved despite the fact that performance when just using the source data for training (source instance loss) is poor.
4. On smaller bag sizes, other methods (for example, LR and DMFA on synthetic dataset and Bagged-Target on Wine dataset) seem to outperform our proposed methods. Such behavior is expected when the information from target data is itself sufficient to learn a good enough function approximator. It is worth noting that the objective function in our proposed method reduces to that of LR for $\lambda = 0$. So, in theory PL-WFA and BL-WFA are always better than LR. By decreasing the λ value, our methods can do at least as good as LR.
5. Although the best baseline method is different for different datasets under consideration (AF-DANN on Wine, LR on US Census and DMFA on synthetic), BL-WFA consistently beats the best baseline for a large enough bag size.

8 Conclusion

We formally define the problem of learning from label aggregates where source data has instance wise labels while target data has aggregate labels of instances grouped into bags. We also give bag-to-instance generalization error bound for regression tasks in LLP and use it to arrive at BagCSI loss. We propose two new methods, BL-WFA (based on BagCSI) and PL-WFA (based on a variant of BagCSI) that naturally incorporate the knowledge of aggregate labels from target domain in the domain adaptation framework leading to improvement over baseline methods. We also adapt several methods from literature in domain adaptation and LLP to this setting. Through experiments on synthetic and real-world datasets we show that our methods consistently outperform baseline techniques.

References

- [ska,] Apple storekit ad network. <https://developer.apple.com/documentation/storekit/skadnetwork/>.
- [san,] Private aggregation api of chrome privacy sandbox. <https://developer.chrome.com/docs/privacy-sandbox/aggregation-service/>.
- [Anthony and Bartlett, 2009] Anthony, M. and Bartlett, P. L. (2009). *Neural Network Learning: Theoretical Foundations*. Cambridge University Press, USA, 1st edition.
- [Ardehaly and Culotta, 2016] Ardehaly, E. M. and Culotta, A. (2016). Proc. IJCAI. pages 3670–3676.
- [Ardehaly and Culotta, 2017] Ardehaly, E. M. and Culotta, A. (2017). Co-training for demographic classification using deep learning from label proportions. In *ICDM*, pages 1017–1024.
- [Baručić and Kybic, 2022] Baručić, D. and Kybic, J. (2022). Fast learning from label proportions with small bags. In *2022 IEEE International Conference on Image Processing (ICIP)*, pages 3156–3160.
- [Bortsova et al., 2018] Bortsova, G., Dubost, F., Ørting, S. N., Katramados, I., Hogeweg, L., Thomsen, L. H., Wille, M. M. W., and de Bruijne, M. (2018). Deep learning from label proportions for emphysema quantification. In *MICCAI*, volume 11071 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 768–776. Springer.
- [Busa-Fekete et al., 2023] Busa-Fekete, R. I., Choi, H., Dick, T., Gentile, C., and Muñoz Medina, A. (2023). Easy learning from label proportions. *CoRR*, abs/2302.03115.
- [Chen et al., 2023] Chen, L., Fu, T., Karbasi, A., and Mirrokni, V. (2023). Learning from aggregated data: Curated bags versus random bags. *arXiv*.
- [Chen et al., 2004] Chen, L., Huang, Z., and Ramakrishnan, R. (2004). Cost-based labeling of groups of mass spectra. In *Proc. ACM SIGMOD International Conference on Management of Data*, pages 167–178.
- [Chen et al., 2009] Chen, S., Liu, B., Qian, M., and Zhang, C. (2009). Kernel k-means based framework for aggregate outputs classification. In Saygin, Y., Yu, J. X., Kargupta, H., Wang, W., Ranka, S., Yu, P. S., and Wu, X., editors, *ICDM*, pages 356–361.
- [Dara, 2018] Dara (2018). Wine ratings. <https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/dbahri/wine-ratings/data>. Licensed under CC BY-NC-SA 4.0.
- [de Freitas and Kück, 2005] de Freitas, N. and Kück, H. (2005). Learning about individuals from group statistics. In *UAI*, pages 332–339.
- [Dery et al., 2017] Dery, L. M., Nachman, B., Rubbo, F., and Schwartzman, A. (2017). Weakly supervised classification in high energy physics. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 2017(5):1–11.
- [Dulac-Arnold et al., 2019] Dulac-Arnold, G., Zeghidour, N., Cuturi, M., Beyer, L., and Vert, J. P. (2019). Deep multi-class learning from label proportions. *CoRR*, abs/1905.12909.
- [Ganin et al., 2016] Ganin, Y., Ustinova, E., Ajakan, H., Germain, P., Larochelle, H., Laviolette, F., March, M., and Lempitsky, V. (2016). Domain-adversarial training of neural networks. *Journal of machine learning research*, 17(59):1–35.
- [Hernández-González et al., 2013] Hernández-González, J., Inza, I., and Lozano, J. A. (2013). Learning bayesian network classifiers from label proportions. *Pattern Recognit.*, 46(12):3425–3440.
- [Hernández-González et al., 2018] Hernández-González, J., Inza, I., Crisol-Ortíz, L., Guembe, M. A., Iñarra, M. J., and Lozano, J. A. (2018). Fitting the data from embryo implantation prediction: Learning from label proportions. *Statistical methods in medical research*, 27(4):1056–1066.
- [Kotzias et al., 2015] Kotzias, D., Denil, M., de Freitas, N., and Smyth, P. (2015). From group to individual labels using deep features. In *Proc. SIGKDD*, pages 597–606.

- [Li and Culotta, 2023a] Li, X. and Culotta, A. (2023a). Domain adaptation for learning from label proportions using domain-adversarial neural network. *SN Comput. Sci.*, 4(5):615.
- [Li and Culotta, 2023b] Li, X. and Culotta, A. (2023b). Domain adaptation for learning from label proportions using domain-adversarial neural network. *SN Computer Science*, 4(5):615.
- [Liu et al., 2019] Liu, J., Wang, B., Qi, Z., Tian, Y., and Shi, Y. (2019). Learning from label proportions with generative adversarial networks. In *Proc. NeurIPS*, pages 7167–7177.
- [Liu et al., 2021] Liu, J., Wang, B., Shen, X., Qi, Z., and Tian, Y. (2021). Two-stage training for learning from label proportions. In Zhou, Z., editor, *Proc. IJCAI*, pages 2737–2743.
- [Long et al., 2015] Long, M., Cao, Y., Wang, J., and Jordan, M. (2015). Learning transferable features with deep adaptation networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 97–105. PMLR.
- [Long et al., 2017] Long, M., Zhu, H., Wang, J., and Jordan, M. I. (2017). Deep transfer learning with joint adaptation networks. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 2208–2217. PMLR.
- [Musicant et al., 2007] Musicant, D. R., Christensen, J. M., and Olson, J. F. (2007). Supervised learning by training on aggregate outputs. In *ICDM*, pages 252–261. IEEE Computer Society.
- [Nandy et al., 2022] Nandy, J., Saket, R., Jain, P., Chauhan, J., Ravindran, B., and Raghuvver, A. (2022). Domain-agnostic contrastive representations for learning from label proportions. In *Proc. CIKM*, pages 1542–1551.
- [Ørting et al., 2016] Ørting, S., Petersen, J., Wille, M., Thomsen, L., and de Bruijne, M. (2016). Quantifying emphysema extent from weakly labeled ct scans of the lungs using label proportions learning. In *The Sixth International Workshop on Pulmonary Image Analysis*, pages 31–42.
- [Patrini et al., 2014] Patrini, G., Nock, R., Caetano, T. S., and Rivera, P. (2014). (almost) no label no cry. In Ghahramani, Z., Welling, M., Cortes, C., Lawrence, N. D., and Weinberger, K. Q., editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 190–198.
- [Quadrianto et al., 2009a] Quadrianto, N., Smola, A. J., Caetano, T. S., and Le, Q. V. (2009a). Estimating labels from label proportions. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 10:2349–2374.
- [Quadrianto et al., 2009b] Quadrianto, N., Smola, A. J., Caetano, T. S., and Le, Q. V. (2009b). Estimating labels from label proportions. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 10:2349–2374.
- [Rueping, 2010] Rueping, S. (2010). SVM classifier estimation from group probabilities. In *Proc. ICML*, pages 911–918.
- [Ruggles et al., 2024] Ruggles, S., Flood, S., Sobek, M., Backman, D., Chen, A., Cooper, G., Richards, S., Rodgers, R., and Schouweiler, M. (2024). IPUMS USA: Version 15.0 [dataset].
- [Saket et al., 2022] Saket, R., Raghuvver, A., and Ravindran, B. (2022). On combining bags to better learn from label proportions. In *AISTATS*, volume 151 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 5913–5927. PMLR.
- [Stolpe and Morik, 2011] Stolpe, M. and Morik, K. (2011). Learning from label proportions by optimizing cluster model selection. In Gunopulos, D., Hofmann, T., Malerba, D., and Vazirgiannis, M., editors, *ECML PKDD Proceedings, Part III*, volume 6913, pages 349–364. Springer.
- [Wojtusiak et al., 2011] Wojtusiak, J., Irvin, K., Birendinc, A., and Baranova, A. V. (2011). Using published medical results and non-homogenous data in rule learning. In *Proc. International Conference on Machine Learning and Applications and Workshops*, volume 2, pages 84–89. IEEE.
- [Yu et al., 2014] Yu, F. X., Choromanski, K., Kumar, S., Jebara, T., and Chang, S. F. (2014). On learning from label proportions. *CoRR*, abs/1402.5902.
- [Yu et al., 2013] Yu, F. X., Liu, D., Kumar, S., Jebara, T., and Chang, S. (2013). α SVM for learning with label proportions. In *ICML*, volume 28 of *JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings*, pages 504–512.
- [Zackthoutt, 2017] Zackthoutt (2017). Wine reviews. <https://www.kaggle.com/datasets/zynicide/wine-reviews>. Licensed under CC BY-NC-SA 4.0.
- [Zhang et al., 2022] Zhang, J., Wang, Y., and Scott, C. (2022). Learning from label proportions by learning with label noise. In *Proc. NeurIPS*.

A Useful Concepts

A.1 Embedding Space Representation

For a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} of real-valued functions defined over \mathcal{X} , for every $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$ s.t. the mapping $L_{\mathbf{x}} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by $L_{\mathbf{x}}(f) = f(\mathbf{x})$ is bounded i.e., $|L_{\mathbf{x}}(f)| \leq C_{\mathbf{x}}\|f\|_{\mathcal{H}}$, the Riesz Representation Theorem guarantees the existence of $g_{\mathbf{x}} \in \mathcal{H}$ s.t. $L_{\mathbf{x}}(f) = \langle f, g_{\mathbf{x}} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}}$. As we study regression tasks (typically neural regression) in this work, we can assume boundedness and define $f(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{r}_f^T \phi(\mathbf{x})$ where ϕ is a mapping to a real-vector in an embedding space, and \mathbf{r}_f the representation of f in that space.

The function class under consideration in our experiments is a neural network with the final layer being a single node (without any activation) as we are studying the scalar regression use-case. In this case, the embedding space is learnt during training. Here, $\phi(\mathbf{x})$ is the output of penultimate layer of neural network and \mathbf{r}_f are the parameters of the final layer (a single node).

A.2 Excluding Regularization Term in Loss Function

The regularization term $R(h, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}) = \left| 1/(mk) \sum_{i=1}^{mk} (h(\mathbf{x}_i)^2 - h(\mathbf{z}_i)^2) \right|$ enforces that the *average* squared-predictions of h i.e. the squared ℓ_2 -norm of h , on the source and the target domains should be similar. However, covariate-shifts often approximately preserve the ℓ_2 -norm of predictors for e.g. if they are *rotational* in the embedding space $\{\phi(\mathbf{x})\}$. Therefore, for practical settings the contribution of $R(h, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T})$ (for example, to gradient updates in neural networks) can be ignored and the term is omitted from the BagCSI Loss.

B Useful Analytical Tools

We use the Hoeffding’s inequality which is stated below.

Theorem B.1 (Hoeffding). *Let X_1, \dots, X_n be independent random variables, s.t. $a_i \leq X_i \leq b_i$, $\Delta_i = b_i - a_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$. Then, for any $t > 0$,*

$$\Pr \left[\left| \sum_{i=1}^n X_i - \sum_{i=1}^n \mathbb{E}[X_i] \right| > t \right] \leq 2 \cdot \exp \left(- \frac{2t^2}{\sum_{i=1}^n \Delta_i^2} \right).$$

C BASELINE TECHNIQUES

In [Li and Culotta, 2023a], authors define several baselines and propose new methods for domain adaptation in LLP setting for classification tasks. We adapt these methods for regression tasks and consider those as baselines. These baselines are defined in sections C.1, C.2, C.3 and C.4. In literature on domain adaptation (for non-LLP settings) [Long et al., 2015, Long et al., 2017], it has been shown that approaches using MMD (maximum mean discrepancy) based objectives work well. Hence, we also define a baseline that uses similar objective adapted for our setting in section C.5.

C.1 Average Feature Method (AF)

The feature vectors in a bag are averaged and then predictions are made for the bag-averaged feature vectors via a neural network. The L2 loss function is used to compute difference between the predictions and bag level labels for both the source and target domain, the sum of which is used as the objective for optimization.

Let us define average bag feature by \bar{x}_B such that,

$$\bar{x}_B = \frac{\sum_{\mathbf{x} \in B} \mathbf{x}}{|B|}$$

Then, the objective is defined as follows.

$$J(h, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{B}) = \sum_{B, y_B \in \mathcal{T}} (y_B - h(\bar{x}_B))^2 + \hat{\varepsilon}(\mathcal{S}, h)$$

C.2 Label Regularization Method (LR)

This method is similar to Average Input Method with the only difference that predictions are made via neural network for each of the feature vectors in a bag first and then the predictions are averaged.

$$J(h, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{B}) = \hat{\epsilon}(\mathcal{S}, h) + \bar{\epsilon}(\mathcal{B}, h)$$

C.3 Average Feature DANN Method (AF-DANN)

In sections C.1 and C.2, the objective function just aimed to fit the model onto the the data from source and domain data without considering any shift in the distribution of the source and domain datasets. Average Input DANN (Domain Adversarial Neural Network) Method incorporates additional term in the Average Feature Method’s objective to learn features invariant to domain and then use those features for making predictions. This is achieved by introducing an adversarial loss in form of domain prediction. The features from penultimate layer of the neural network are used to classify the input feature vector as belonging to the source/target domain. We denote this domain classifier by $h_d : x \rightarrow [0, 1]$ such that $h_d(x) = \sigma(W_{h_d}^T(\phi_h(x)) + b_{h_d})$ where σ denotes the sigmoid function and h is the actual function approximator. If the classifier is not able to correctly classify labels, it means that the feature representations learnt by the network are invariant to the domain shift. The overall objective is given by J as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} J(h, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{B}) &= \sum_{B, y_B \in \mathcal{T}} (y_B - h(\bar{x}_B))^2 + \hat{\epsilon}(\mathcal{S}, h) - \lambda(L_D) \\ L_D &= \sum_{\mathbf{x}, y \in \mathcal{S}} \mathcal{L}(1, h_d(\mathbf{x})) + \sum_{B, y_B \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in B} \mathcal{L}(0, h_d(\mathbf{x})) \\ \mathcal{L}(y, \hat{y}) &= -y \log(\hat{y}) - (1 - y) \log(1 - \hat{y}) \end{aligned}$$

We call L_D the domain loss. This objective is optimized in two steps. In the first step, J is minimized while keeping $(W_{h_d}$ and $b_{h_d})$ fixed. In the second step, J is maximized while keeping everything but $(W_{h_d}$ and $b_{h_d})$ fixed. Essentially, in the first step encourage domain misclassifications so that the model learns feature representation that is invariant to domain shift present in the dataset. In the second step, the domain classifier is learnt for the updated feature representations. It is worth noting that the domain loss neither depends on the instance level labels from source domain nor does it depend on the bag level labels from target domain.

C.4 Label Regularization DANN Method (LR-DANN)

This method is similar to AF-DANN method (defined in C.3). The only difference comes from using label regularization loss instead of average feature loss in the objective function. The overall objective hence becomes as follows.

$$J(h, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}) = \bar{\epsilon}(\mathcal{B}, h) + \hat{\epsilon}(\mathcal{S}, h) - \lambda(L_D)$$

where L_D is the same as defined in section C.3.

C.5 Domain Mean Feature Alignment Method (DMFA)

The idea is to make the feature representations domain-invariant by reducing the distance between the mean of feature representations from the source and the target domain. The overall objective is given by J as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} J(h, \mathcal{S}, \mathcal{T}) &= \bar{\epsilon}(h, \mathcal{T}) + \hat{\epsilon}(h, \mathcal{S}) + \lambda(L_{DMFA}) \\ L_{DMFA} &= \left\| \sum_{B, y_B \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in B} \frac{\phi(\mathbf{x})}{|B||\mathcal{T}|} - \sum_{\mathbf{x}, y \in D_S} \frac{\phi(\mathbf{x})}{|D_S|} \right\|_2^2 \end{aligned}$$

Note that just like AF-DANN method (defined in section C.3) and LR-DANN (defined in section C.4), this method also doesn’t leverage instance level source labels and bag level target labels in the objective function.

D DATASET PREPARATION DETAILS

D.1 Synthetic Dataset

The feature vector comprises of 64 continuous features. The label is a scalar-valued continuous variable. The source and target components of the dataset have 100,000 instances each. The feature vectors are sampled from a multi-dimensional Gaussian distribution. For the Gaussian distribution, the mean vector is itself sampled from $\mathcal{N}(0, 16)$ for source domain and $\mathcal{N}(50, 16)$ for target domain. For the experiment results presented in main paper, the co-variance matrix is a diagonal matrix where the diagonal elements are sampled from $\mathcal{N}(10, 16)$ for both the source and target domain. However, we also experiment using synthetic dataset generated with non-diagonal covariance matrix, the results for which are reported in appendix. Although the process of generating co-variance matrices is same for source and target domain, the actual covariance matrices are not the same.

As we assume co-variate shift in the source and target distribution, $p(y|x)$ is same for both distributions, hence we initialize a neural network with random weights and use that for obtaining the labels corresponding to feature vectors for both the source and target data.

D.2 Wine Dataset

Wine dataset [Dara, 2018, Zackthoutt, 2017] is a tabular dataset with 39 boolean features indicating whether a particular word was present in the review for that wine. It also has a cardinal feature named points, which ranges between 80 (inclusive) and 100 (exclusive). The label is the price of the wine. We process feature vectors to convert all features to one hot and thus obtain a $39 \times 2 + (100 - 80) = 98$ dimensional boolean-valued multi-hot vector as input feature vector.

The labels in the dataset are skewed. To prevent the outliers from hindering the learning process, we remove the outliers by discarding features with labels in the top 5 percentile.

We split the dataset into two different domains. The source domain comprises of wines from France and the target domain comprises of wines from all countries but France. We select France as the source domain because it has enough number of instances to qualify as a separate domain and not so many that the target domain becomes small. We run another set of experiments where Italy is chosen as the source domain and the target domain comprises of wines from all countries but Italy. The results from former are presented in main paper, and those for the later configuration are presented in the appendix.

D.3 US Census Dataset

US Census [Ruggles et al., 2024] is a large tabular dataset with a huge number of features. This dataset is derived from IPUMS USA database. For our experiments, we select income (INCWAGE) as the label. We select a subset of feature columns comprising of the following features: REGION, STATEICP, AGE, IND, GQ, SEX and WKSWORK2. All of these features are categorical except AGE which is cardinal. We convert GQ (5 categories), SEX (2 categories), WKSWORK2 (7 categories) to one-hot representations while keeping others intact as they have large number of categories which makes one-hot representations impractical.

We consider the data from 1970 as the source domain and data from 2022 as the target domain. Since, the labels (INCWAGE) were large in magnitude, we standardized the labels using $y \rightarrow (y - \mu_Y)/\sigma_Y$ by estimating the mean and variance using source domain labels and target domain train labels only.

E ADDITIONAL EXPERIMENTS

We conduct a few more experiments using variants of the datasets used for experiments outlined in the main paper.

1. We create a different source-target domain split in Wine dataset by choosing wines from Italy in the source domain partition and wines from all other countries in the target domain partition. The results are reported in table 4.

- We create another synthetic dataset where we choose a non-diagonal covariance matrix while keeping all other configurations the same. The results are reported in table 5.

E.1 Hyperparameter Search

We use grid search for finding optimal values of λ and learning rate. The values used in grid search are on a logarithmic scale.

Table 4: MSE scores for different methods and bag sizes on the wine dataset (averaged over 20 runs) using wines from Italy as the source domain. The source instance loss is 204.73 ± 2.66 and target instance loss is 173.91 ± 0.15 . Lower the better.

| Method \ Bag Size | 8 | 32 | 128 | 256 |
|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Bagged Target | 176.2 ± 0.37 | 180.1 ± 0.87 | 193.8 ± 4.19 | 208.0 ± 4.46 |
| AF | 199.3 ± 2.32 | 203.2 ± 2.66 | 203.1 ± 2.54 | 203.7 ± 2.13 |
| LR | 196.0 ± 1.06 | 201.0 ± 1.04 | 203.0 ± 1.12 | 203.2 ± 0.77 |
| AF-DANN | 193.5 ± 3.50 | 195.6 ± 3.25 | 196.2 ± 3.12 | 194.7 ± 2.94 |
| LR-DANN | 195.4 ± 2.51 | 198.6 ± 3.38 | 199.7 ± 3.37 | 199.0 ± 4.06 |
| DMFA | 195.5 ± 2.23 | 201.0 ± 1.18 | 202.5 ± 1.30 | 203.2 ± 1.06 |
| PL-WFA (our) | 186.2 ± 0.93 | 188.8 ± 0.72 | 190.0 ± 0.71 | 190.3 ± 0.78 |
| BL-WFA (our) | 184.5 ± 0.56 | 187.2 ± 1.80 | 188.4 ± 1.21 | 188.0 ± 0.77 |

Table 5: MSE scores for different methods and bag sizes on the synthetic dataset (averaged over 20 runs). The source instance loss is 558.3179 ± 65.7745 and target instance loss is 9.7217 ± 0.4034 . Lower the better.

| Method \ Bag Size | 8 | 32 | 128 | 256 |
|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|--|--|
| Bagged Target | 29.53 ± 0.9380 | 58.06 ± 1.9253 | 128.45 ± 7.0217 | 195.41 ± 9.3439 |
| AF | 75.19 ± 3.2944 | 104.36 ± 4.7012 | 146.00 ± 11.6988 | 207.08 ± 15.7795 |
| LR | 28.36 ± 0.5401 | 54.99 ± 1.7375 | 120.08 ± 5.7786 | 194.86 ± 11.1768 |
| AF-DANN | 74.09 ± 4.1341 | 107.31 ± 5.7001 | 152.74 ± 23.9341 | 203.54 ± 16.1414 |
| LR-DANN | 30.40 ± 0.6901 | 60.58 ± 2.4199 | 130.30 ± 7.8709 | 185.38 ± 25.9651 |
| DMFA | 28.07 ± 0.6331 | 54.65 ± 1.9998 | 118.71 ± 7.1493 | 175.68 ± 15.5491 |
| PL-WFA (our) | 33.75 ± 0.6721 | 63.86 ± 2.4334 | 119.87 ± 5.5094 | 174.12 ± 7.4715 |
| BL-WFA (our) | 39.03 ± 3.73 | 65.4513 ± 3.8550 | 116.92 ± 17.7014 | 159.08 ± 19.6243 |