
Improving realistic semi-supervised learning with doubly robust estimation

Khiem Pham¹ Charles Herrmann² Ramin Zabih¹

Abstract

A major challenge in Semi-Supervised Learning (SSL) is the limited information available about the class distribution in the unlabeled data. In many real-world applications this arises from the prevalence of long-tailed distributions, where the standard pseudo-label approach to SSL is biased towards the labeled class distribution and thus performs poorly on unlabeled data. Existing methods typically assume that the unlabeled class distribution is either known a priori, which is unrealistic in most situations, or estimate it on-the-fly using the pseudo-labels themselves. We propose to explicitly estimate the unlabeled class distribution, which is a finite-dimensional parameter, *as an initial step*, using a doubly robust estimator with a strong theoretical guarantee; this estimate can then be integrated into existing methods to pseudo-label the unlabeled data during training more accurately. Experimental results demonstrate that incorporating our techniques into common pseudo-labeling approaches improves their performance.

1. Introduction

Semi-supervised learning (SSL) aims to augment the small labeled set of data with a large unlabeled set of data (Chapelle et al., 2009). This is of considerable practical significance since in many applications unlabeled data is easily available but the labeling effort is very costly. Many semi-supervised learning methods have proven successful, even given very small amounts of labeled data. However there is very limited information about the unlabeled data, since we only have access to their features and not the unlabeled class distribution. We will write the labeled and unlabeled class distributions as $P(Y|A = 1)$ and $P(Y|A = 0)$, respectively. In some situations $P(Y|A = 0)$ is known a priori, but in many practical applications it is unknown

¹Cornell Tech ²Google DeepMind. Correspondence to: Khiem Pham <dkp45@cornell.edu>.

Preliminary work. Under review by the International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML). Do not distribute.

and difficult to estimate from $P(Y|A = 1)$. In particular, the distribution $P(Y|A = 0)$ is frequently long-tailed. This SSL variant, where the unlabeled class distribution $P(Y|A = 0)$ is unknown and differs from $P(Y|A = 1)$, is sometimes called *realistic long-tailed semi-supervised learning* (RTSSL). This topic has drawn considerable recent interest (see for example (Du et al., 2024; Kim et al., 2020; Wei et al., 2021; Oh et al., 2022; Wei & Gan, 2023; Ma et al., 2024)) since it reflects realistic assumptions in many applications.

In this paper, we explicitly estimate the unlabeled class distribution $P(Y|A = 0)$ as a separate first step. We note that existing methods that estimate and use this distribution during training produce biased estimate. In particular, SimPro (Du et al., 2024) tends to significantly overestimate the head classes as shown in Figure 1 in 4 out of 5 unlabeled class distributions studied. In contrast, our proposed doubly-robust estimator are more accurate. Our technique derives from semi-parametric efficiency theory predominantly studied in causal inference and has well-understood and strong theoretical guarantee (Chernozhukov et al., 2018). Leveraging this improvement, we plug this first-stage estimate into a second stage algorithm for training the final classifier.

We also adapt a maximum likelihood framework for semi-supervised learning with label shift. The framework uses and estimates a *missingness mechanism* which encodes the tendency of a label to be in the labeled ($A = 1$) or unlabeled ($A = 0$) set, and allows learning from both sets from one missing-data likelihood, which we address with an Expectation-Maximization (EM) algorithm. The basic idea dates as far back as (Ibrahim & Lipsitz, 1996), yet despite its simplicity, it is often overlooked in the label shift and vision community. We show that it naturally generalizes and extends FixMatch (Sohn et al., 2020). The recent work of (Du et al., 2024) can be seen as the same algorithm but with different parameterization (see Section 3.2).

In summary, we propose a 2-stage algorithm for RTSSL (see Figure 2). The first stage uses maximum likelihood and EM to initially learn about the data. The first-stage estimates are used for a meta doubly-robust estimator which significantly improves on the initial estimate of $P(Y|A = 0)$. We then plug this estimate into existing pseudo-labeling-based techniques to learn the final classifier. Experiments demonstrate




Figure 1. The labeled class distribution and 5 possible unlabeled class distributions studied in (Du et al., 2024). SimPro significantly overestimates the head classes in consistent, reverse and head-tail settings. Our doubly-robust estimate is more accurate at the head classes as well as the overall distribution in all but the middle setting, as measured in total variation distance in Table 1. Our proposed 2-stage SimPro+ outperforms SimPro in classification accuracy in the middle setting as well.

that our method produces a significantly better estimate of $P(Y|A = 0)$. We also show that we improve overall accuracy when our estimate is plugged into existing pseudo-labeling-based techniques. Additional experimental results and some technical details are deferred to the supplemental.

2. Background and Related Work

Notation We write the random variable $X \in \mathcal{X}$ for the feature(s) and $Y \in \{1, \dots, C\}$ for the class among C possible classes. We are given a labeled dataset $D_l = \{x_i, y_i\}_{i=1}^{N_l}$ and an unlabeled dataset $D_u = \{x_i\}_{i=N_l+1}^N$, where x_i and y_i are realizations of X and Y . The training dataset is $D_t = D_l \cup D_u$. The auxiliary variable A takes binary values and selects between the different class distributions $P(Y|A)$; let $A = 1$ if the datapoint is in the labeled set and $A = 0$ in the unlabeled set. Therefore $P(Y|A = 0)$ is the class distribution the unlabeled set. The *combined* class distribution $P(Y) = P(A = 0)P(Y|A = 0) + P(A = 1)P(Y|A = 1)$ is the class distribution of the combined dataset. For convenience, we also denote $P(Y|uniform) = 1/C$ everywhere to be the uniform class distribution, noting that it is not another value of A . We assume that the class distribution of the test set is uniform throughout this paper.

Long-tailed Semi-supervised learning is the intersection between long-tailed learning (Buda et al., 2018) and semi-supervised learning (Chapelle et al., 2009), and attempts to

deal with two key real world problems: class distribution in the wild is often long-tailed with many classes having few samples; and the unlabeled data dwarfs the labeled data because of the advent of the web and the significant cost of large-scale manual labeling efforts. Pseudo labeling (Lee et al., 2013; Berthelot et al., 2019b; Xie et al., 2020; Laine & Aila, 2016) has become one of the prominent approaches in semi-supervised learning, and has been extended to the long-tailed case (Wei et al., 2021; Lee et al., 2021), although the unlabeled class distribution was assumed to be the same as the labeled class distribution (Berthelot et al., 2019a). More recent work has tackled the unknown distribution case (Zhao et al., 2022; Duan et al., 2022; Hu et al., 2022; Duan et al., 2023; Wei & Gan, 2023; Du et al., 2024; Ma et al., 2024; Gan et al., 2024).

(Balanced) Pseudo-labeling. Semi-supervised learning methods use a regularization loss on the unlabeled data in addition to the classification loss on the labeled data. A simple technique is to use the model’s own predictions on the unlabeled data. Specifically, FixMatch (Sohn et al., 2020) keeps the maximum predictions that also fall above a certain confidence threshold and convert them into one-hot labels (operator δ), which is called a pseudo label. For example, given a confidence threshold of 0.8, a binary prediction $[0.1, 0.9]$ will be mapped to $[0, 1]$ while $[0.4, 0.6]$ to $[0, 0]$ under the operator δ . FixMatch then minimizes the cross entropy loss between a strongly augmented version and the




Figure 2. Overview of our 2-stage method (Section 3.3). In stage 1, we use Expectation-Maximization (EM, Section 3.1) to estimate the missingness mechanism and classifier from observable data. These quantities are used as nuisance components for the doubly-robust estimator of the class distribution Equation (13). In stage 2, we can use EM or other existing methods that also use logit-adjustment with the (unlabeled) class distribution to estimate the final classifier. We use SimPro as our implementation of EM (Section 3.2). The network in stage 1 can be of equal or smaller size than the network in stage 2 (Section 4.1).

pseudo label of a weakly augmented version of the same unlabeled image:

$$L_u = - \sum_{i=N_l+1}^N \sum_{c=1}^C \delta(P(Y|\alpha(x_i)))_c \log P(Y = c|G(x_i)) \quad (1)$$

where c is the class, G is the strong augmentation, and α is the weak augmentation. FixMatch is simple and performant. However, it suffers when labeled and unlabeled class distributions are different, which label shift approach tries to address.

Label shift and logit-adjustment. Label shift assumes that the probability of X given Y is unchanged:

$$P(X|Y, A) = P(X|Y) \quad (2)$$

i.e. feature X is conditionally independent of the variable A . The posterior change in $P(Y|X, A)$ results from the difference between the class distributions i.e. $P(Y|A=0) \neq P(Y|A=1)$. If the class distributions are known, logit adjustment can be used to convert a classifier of one class distribution to another. When label shift occurs between two datasets, classifiers performing well on one dataset may not perform well on the other. For example, to adapt the labeled class distribution $P(Y|A=1)$ to the test class distribution $P(Y|uniform)$, we can use Bayes formula to get:

$$P(Y|X, uniform) \propto P(Y|X, A=1) \frac{P(Y|uniform)}{P(Y|A=1)} \quad (3)$$

which is the basis of the post-hoc logit adjustment formula for long-tailed learning.

Label shift is the natural assumption in imbalanced / long-tailed learning where the target distribution is the uniform test distribution. Logit adjustment (Menon et al., 2020), implicitly using this assumption, relies on the formula Equation (3) to correct label shift in long-tailed data. When the test distribution is unknown, label shift adaptation methods exist that can estimate the unknown test distribution (Saerens et al., 2002; Alexandari et al., 2020; Lipton et al., 2018; Azizzadenesheli et al., 2019) when given a good classifier of the source data. It is possible therefore to train on the labeled set and use a label shift adaptation method to estimate the unlabeled class distribution. This procedure is best suited to label shift test-time adaptation (Sun et al., 2023; Nguyen et al., 2024) where the unlabeled data is not available during model training. In contrast, when additional unlabeled data is available, semi-supervised EM gives significantly better class distribution estimation.

Non-ignorable missingness. This is a variant of missing data problems where the missing indicator A can depend on both feature X and outcome Y (Rubin, 1976). The dependence on Y distinguishes this variant from the standard ignorable missingness (missing at random) assumption (Tsiatis, 2006). The label shift assumption Equation (2) further assumes that only Y causes A , and this assumption is sufficient to *identify* the true data distribution, meaning that no two distributions can generate our missing data (Miller & Futoma, 2023; Sportisse et al., 2023).

Doubly robust (DR) estimation This approach has roots in semi-parametric efficiency theory (Kennedy, 2024; Chernozhukov et al., 2018). The most successful application of DR is the estimation of the average treatment effect in

causal inference (Tsiatis, 2006; Pham et al., 2023), which is an example of ignorable missingness. Recently doubly machine learning (Chernozhukov et al., 2018; 2022) takes double robustness further by showing that powerful machine learning methods such as neural networks can be used to deal with high-dimensional and complex data while at the same time making valid inference about the target statistics. The applications of DR in modeling more complex data than traditionally studied in statistics have recently gained significant interest (Shi et al., 2019; Chernozhukov et al., 2022; Zhang et al., 2023). We contribute to this line of work, but furthermore shows that we can plug in this estimation to improve the final classification itself.

Our work builds and improves on (Du et al., 2024). Specifically, we show in Section 3.2 that it is a reparameterization of the semi-supervised EM algorithm in Section 3.1, and we use it as the training method for both stages of our algorithm. Our work is also close to (Sportisse et al., 2023; Hu et al., 2022) who also note the connection to non-ignorable missingness and propose doubly robust estimation of the loss. This loss remains consistent even when the pseudo labels are arbitrarily bad, in a similar spirit to (Schmutz et al., 2022; Zhu et al., 2024), as long as the missingness mechanism is correct. Thus they try to safeguard against wrong un-adjusted labels. We on the other hand try to improve the label’s quality via EM and adjustment by the doubly robust estimation of the unlabeled class distribution. An important weaknesses of the doubly robust loss (Sportisse et al., 2023) is that it involves inverse-weighting (Cui et al., 2019) which is prone to unstable training (Ren et al., 2020). We provide more detail about the doubly-robust risk in Appendix B, and experimentally compare with it in Section 4.3

3. Our approach

3.1. Label shift Expectation Maximization

When pseudo-labeling is applied naively, a classifier trained on the labeled set with class distribution $P(Y|A=1)$ may not do well on the unlabeled set that has a different class distribution $P(Y|A=0)$ thus resulting in incorrect pseudo labels for training and consequently confirmation bias (Arazo et al., 2020). We can not straightforwardly adapt to the unlabeled class distribution because it is unknown. In the following, we detail a likelihood maximization framework that eventually is shown to generalize pseudo-labeling to the label shift case. Using the indicator A , we can write the observed (or missing) data log-likelihood as

$$L(\theta) = \sum_{i=1}^{N_l} \log P(X = x_i, Y = y_i, A = 1|\theta) + \sum_{i=N_l+1}^N \log P(X = x_i, A = 0|\theta), \quad (4)$$

where θ represents the parameter of the joint distribution $P(X, A, Y)$. This likelihood consists of the labeled term and an unlabeled term with a missing Y . Immediately, we can maximize $L(\theta)$ by writing the unlabeled term as a Y -marginalization of the joint as in (Sportisse et al., 2023). As we will use EM to maximize $L(\theta)$, we apply Jensen inequality to the each term in the second sum using the posterior weight $\omega^t(x, y) = P(Y = y|X = x, A = 0, \theta^t)$ where θ^t is value of θ in previous EM iteration, to get the lower bound

$$Q(\theta|\theta^t) = \sum_{i=1}^{N_l} \log P(X = x_i, Y = y_i, A = 1|\theta) + \sum_{i=N_l+1}^N \sum_{c=1}^C \omega^t(x_i, c) \log P(X = x_i, Y = c, A = 0|\theta) \quad (5)$$

This is the E-step of EM and we have found the ”pseudo-label” $\omega^t(x, c)$ for our unlabeled data, reducing the problem to a supervised learning one for the moment. Now we need to decide how to decompose the joint $P(X, Y, A|\theta)$ which decides what the parameter specification will be. It is natural that we use the invariance $P(X|Y, A) = P(X|Y)$ in Equation (2) to decompose $P(X|Y)P(Y|A)P(A)$, but this requires generative modeling for $P(X|Y)$. Instead, we use $P(A|Y)P(Y|X)P(X)$, which means we only need to learn a classifier $P(Y|X)$ and a finite-dimensional $P(A|Y)$, which are recipes for the posterior weight $\omega^t(x, y)$. With this, we get

$$Q(\theta|\theta^t) = \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{c=1}^C \gamma_i(c) \log P(Y = c|X = x_i, \theta) + \sum_{c=1}^C \sum_{a=0}^1 \zeta_c(a) \log P(A = a|Y = c, \theta) \quad (6)$$

where $\gamma_i(c) = \mathbf{1}(y_i = c)$ for $i \leq N_l$ and $P(Y = c|X = x_i, A = 0, \theta^t)$ for $i > N_l$. $\zeta_c(1) = \sum_{i=1}^{N_l} \mathbf{1}(y_i = c)$ and $\zeta_c(0) = \sum_{i=N_l+1}^N P(Y = c|X = x_i, A = 0, \theta^t)$. This means that maximizing $L(\theta|\theta^t)$ is equivalent to minimizing a sum of cross entropy losses. To compute the posterior weight $\omega^t(x, c)$, we use Bayes law:

$$\omega^t(x, c) \propto P(Y = c|X = x, \theta^t)P(A = 0|Y = c, \theta^t) \quad (7)$$

In summary, the 2 steps of the EM are:

E-step: Given $P(Y = y|X = x, \theta^t)$ and $P(A = 0|Y = y, \theta^t)$, set $\omega^t(x, c)$ according to Equation (7)

M-step: Given $\omega^t(x, c)$, find the new $P(Y|X, \theta)$ and $P(A|Y, \theta)$ by maximizing $Q(\theta|\theta^t)$.

3.2. Label-shift Fixmatch and SimPro

Pseudo labeling methods such as Fixmatch has a deep connection with Expectation-Maximization. Indeed, Equation (1) without the 3 operators is just the unlabeled term

in Equation (5) and $P(Y|A = 1) = P(Y|A = 0) = P(Y|uniform)$. SimPro is a recent work which also derives an almost equivalent EM formula to ours. They used a similar E-step but also applied Fixmatch’s confidence thresholding and augmentation. Their M-step parameterizes the distribution as 2 parameters $\frac{P(X|Y)}{P(X)}$ and $P(Y|A = 0)$. This is just another decomposition of the unlabeled log-likelihood term in Equation (5) up to a constant $P(A = 0)$:

$$\frac{P(X|Y)}{P(X)}P(Y|A = 0) \propto \frac{P(Y|X)}{P(Y)}P(Y)P(A = 0|Y) \quad (8)$$

Instead of canceling out $P(Y)$, however, SimPro uses a logit adjustment loss (Menon et al., 2020) for the first term in Equation (6):

$$-\sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{c=1}^C \gamma_i(c) \log \left\{ P(Y = c|X = x_i, uniform, \theta) + P(Y = c) \right\} \quad (9)$$

As $P(Y = c)$ is unknown, they use its running estimate. The model is automatically logit adjusted to the uniform test distribution during training. In contrast, if the model is $P(Y|X)$ in Equation (6), we can apply post-hoc logit adjustment. As shown in (Menon et al., 2020), the logit adjustment loss is often slightly better, and this is what we find experimentally as well. Other than this difference, we can recover the class distribution $P(Y|A)$ from the missingness mechanism $P(A|Y)$ and because $P(A)$ is known, so they are learned equivalently.

3.3. Our 2-stage algorithm

Figure 2 shows the overview of our algorithm. During training, we use the current model’s predictions and adjust it to the unlabeled class distribution $P(Y|A = 0)$. The quality our first-stage estimation of $P(Y|A = 0)$ has a direct impact on the pseudo label accuracy, as highlighted in Theorem 3.1 of (Wei et al., 2024). Briefly, the error gap between the adjusted model and the Bayes-optimal model can be bounded by the sum of an error term induced by the model’s performance on the training data and another error term induced by the quality of our unlabeled distribution estimation. Therefore, we should aim for the highest estimation quality we can get in the first stage. To this end, we present 3 possible estimators for the combined class distribution $P(Y)$, the outcome regression (OR) estimator, inverse probability weighted (IPW) estimator and the doubly robust (DR) estimator. The unlabeled class distribution $P(Y|A = 0)$ can be recovered by noting that $P(Y) = \sum_a P(A = a)P(Y|A = a)$ and that $P(A)$ and the labeled class distribution $P(Y|A = 1)$ is known. The OR estimator is simply the average of the model’s predic-

tions

$$\Psi_{or}(c) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N P(Y = c|X = x_i, \theta) \quad (10)$$

where the summation takes both labeled and unlabeled data.

Another estimator is the inverse probability weighted (IPW) estimator. Suppose that we have the ground truth missingness mechanism $P(A|Y)$, then we have the following identity:

$$P(Y = c) = \mathbb{E}_O \left[\frac{\mathbf{1}(A = 1)}{P(A = 1|Y)} \mathbf{1}(Y = c) \right] \quad (11)$$

where O is a random variable representing one observation from the combined dataset, which is complete ($O = (X, A = 1, Y)$) if the datapoint is from the labeled set and missing ($X, A = 0$) if unlabeled set. The indicator $\mathbf{1}(A = 1)$ means that we are not actually using ground truth labels from the unlabeled set, but up-weighting the existing labels from the labeled set by the missingness mechanism. Replacing expectation with sample average and $P(A = 1|Y)$ with an estimation $P(A = 1|Y, \theta)$, we get our IPW estimator of $P(Y)$, which depends on θ

$$\Psi_{ipw}(\theta)(c) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \frac{\mathbf{1}(a_i = 1)}{P(A = 1|Y = y_i, \theta)} \mathbf{1}(y_i = c) \quad (12)$$

Our doubly robust estimator It is worth noting that each estimator above (OR or IPW) uses only one part of the distribution, either $P(Y|X)$ or $P(A|Y)$. The DR estimator takes advantage of both of these quantities. It is

$$\Psi_{dr}(\theta)(c) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left[P(Y = c|X = x_i, \theta) + \frac{\mathbf{1}(a_i = 1)}{P(A = 1|Y = y_i, \theta)} (\mathbf{1}(y_i = c) - P(Y = c|X = x_i, \theta)) \right] \quad (13)$$

$\Psi_{dr}(\theta)$ is called doubly-robust because, given either a correct $P(Y|X)$ or $P(A = 1|Y)$, we will get an unbiased estimate of $P(Y)$. We need to learn both of these quantities from finite data which means their errors will propagate to the final estimation. However, this issue is addressed by the following optimality result.

3.3.1. THEORETICAL GUARANTEES FOR Ψ_{dr}

We can show, under weak assumption on the quality of θ , that Ψ_{dr} has strong theoretical guarantees. Let o_p denote convergence in probability, define the $L_2(P)$ as $\|f\|_{L_2(P)} = (\int |f|^2 dP)^{1/2}$, where P is the true distribution. We make the following assumption.

Assumption 3.1. Assume that both $P(Y|X, \theta)$ and $P(A =$

$1|Y)$ converge at fourth-root-n rate i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \|P(Y|X, \theta) - P(Y|X)\|_{L_2(P)} &= o_p(N^{-1/4}) \\ \|P(A = 1|Y, \theta) - P(A = 1|Y)\|_2 &= o_p(N^{-1/4}) \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Justification: These assumptions (fourth-root-n rate of convergence) have been proven for neural networks (Chernozhukov et al., 2022), which are consistent because of the universal approximation theorem, but tend to be biased because of regularization (Chernozhukov et al., 2018).

We have the following optimality result:

Theorem 3.2. *Under the assumption Assumption 3.1 the DR estimator Ψ_{dr} is asymptotically normal with 0-mean and the efficient influence function’s variance:*

$$\sqrt{N}(\Psi_{dr}(\theta)(c) - P(Y = c)) \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbb{E}[\phi(O)(c)^2]) \quad (15)$$

The proof of theorem Theorem 3.2 is deferred to the supplemental material. This theorem states that Ψ_{dr} is the most efficient regular estimator. Informally speaking, regularity means any other estimator that performs better than Ψ_{dr} at one point, must do considerably worse at nearby points.

To put this theorem into perspective, the sample mean $\frac{1}{n} \sum_i z_i$ is the most efficient estimator of the mean of a random variable Z , of which z_i s are unbiased samples. The OR estimator Ψ_{or} , which looks like a sample mean of $P(Y|X, \theta)$, is however potentially biased as θ is the model’s approximation of the truth using finite data, and this bias slows the convergence of Ψ_{or} if it does not go away quickly enough, for example if the first equation in assumption 3.1 holds (Chernozhukov et al., 2018). The same thing can happen to $P(A = 1|Y, \theta)$. Thus, Theorem 3.2 shows that we can get an estimation quality as if we were using unbiased samples to estimate the mean.

4. Experimental Results

We perform experiments for each stage of our algorithm. In the first stage, we compare among various methods to estimate the unlabeled class distribution $P(Y|A = 0)$, showing that SimPro + DR performs well. In the second stage, we freeze the unlabeled class distribution, using our best estimator SimPro + DR, and plug it into 2 SOTA semi-supervised learning algorithms, SimPro and BOAT (Gan et al., 2024). We show that this simple procedure improves the existing methods, and is even capable of improving the original SimPro when used for both stages.

Datasets We evaluate our method on four standard semi-supervised learning benchmarks: CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100 (Krizhevsky & Hinton, 2009), STL-10 (Coates et al., 2011), and Imagenet-127 (Fan et al., 2022). To simulate

RTSSL, we construct long-tailed labeled and unlabeled sets for CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100. The labeled data follows an imbalance ratio γ_l with head class size n_1 , while the remaining class sizes are computed as $n_c = n_1 \times \gamma_l^{-\frac{c-1}{\sigma-1}}$. The unlabeled data follows a similar setup with γ_u and m_1 .

For CIFAR-10, we set $n_1 = 500$, $m_1 = 4000$, and test two configurations: $\gamma_l = \gamma_u = 150$ and $\gamma_l = \gamma_u = 100$. We generate 10 datasets by permuting the unlabeled class distributions in five ways: *consistent*, *uniform*, *reversed*, *middle*, and *head-tail*, as in (Du et al., 2024). CIFAR-100 follows the same setup with $n_1 = 50$, $m_1 = 400$, and γ_l, γ_u values of 20 and 10.

For STL-10, where unlabeled data lacks ground-truth labels, we use all head-class samples and set γ_l to 10 or 20. Imagenet-127 is naturally long-tailed with 127 classes, and we train on 32×32 and 64×64 resolutions as in (Fan et al., 2022).

Training. We follow the implementation and hyperparameter settings of (Du et al., 2024). We defer these details in Appendix C. One important exception is that for Imagenet-127, we use the smaller Wide ResNet-28-2 in stage 1 and the larger ResNet-50 for stage 2, to demonstrate that a smaller model is sufficient for distribution estimation.

4.1. Better results on label distribution

We have mentioned various ways throughout the papers to estimate the unlabeled class distribution. In what follows, method consists of a model, which is how the learning is done, and an estimator, which is how the final distribution is estimated using parameters learned from the model.

Supervised. The model is trained on the labeled set only and used to estimate the unlabeled class distribution (Garg et al., 2020). 2 successful estimators for this setting are **RLLS** (Azizzadenesheli et al., 2019) and **MLLS** (Saerens et al., 2002).

MLE. The model is trained by directly maximizing the likelihood Equation (4). We also use the decomposition $P(Y|X)$ and $P(A|Y)$, and write the unlabeled term as $P(A = 0, X) = \sum_c P(Y = c|X)P(A = 0|Y = c)$, which enables gradient descent training on these parameters. This is also the MLE method to estimate $P(A|Y)$ in (Sportisse et al., 2023).

EM. We further test the EM algorithm in Section 3.1. In particular we also use strong and weak augmentations similar to FixMatch, but not the pseudo labeling operator. Confidence thresholding removes the soft predictions of the non-dominant classes, which may be better to keep since our target of the first stage is the global class statistics. We also try 3 estimators on this model.

Table 1. Total Variation Distance on CIFAR-10-LT ($N_l = 500$, $M_l = 4000$) with different class imbalance ratios γ_l and γ_u under five different unlabeled class distributions.

Model	Estimator	consistent		uniform		reversed		middle		head-tail	
		$\gamma_l = 150$	$\gamma_l = 100$	$\gamma_l = 150$	$\gamma_l = 100$	$\gamma_l = 150$	$\gamma_l = 100$	$\gamma_l = 150$	$\gamma_l = 100$	$\gamma_l = 150$	$\gamma_l = 100$
		$\gamma_u = 150$	$\gamma_u = 100$	$\gamma_u = 1$	$\gamma_u = 1$	$\gamma_u = 1/150$	$\gamma_u = 1/100$	$\gamma_u = 150$	$\gamma_u = 100$	$\gamma_u = 150$	$\gamma_u = 100$
Supervised	MLLS	0.269 ± 0.252	0.038 ± 0.006	0.251 ± 0.046	0.255 ± 0.060	0.429 ± 0.028	0.493 ± 0.050	0.333 ± 0.042	0.320 ± 0.009	0.457 ± 0.034	0.444 ± 0.043
Supervised	RLLS	0.043 ± 0.001	0.044 ± 0.010	0.348 ± 0.034	0.305 ± 0.068	0.769 ± 0.016	0.678 ± 0.028	0.430 ± 0.008	0.368 ± 0.013	0.539 ± 0.018	0.503 ± 0.020
MLE	IPW	0.027 ± 0.001	0.027 ± 0.000	0.319 ± 0.072	0.243 ± 0.010	0.674 ± 0.020	0.646 ± 0.041	0.438 ± 0.020	0.454 ± 0.026	0.547 ± 0.049	0.491 ± 0.059
MLE	OR	0.045 ± 0.004	0.042 ± 0.000	0.215 ± 0.026	0.203 ± 0.032	0.433 ± 0.017	0.395 ± 0.033	0.193 ± 0.006	0.209 ± 0.037	0.307 ± 0.147	0.249 ± 0.130
MLE	DR	0.090 ± 0.002	0.079 ± 0.000	0.407 ± 0.027	0.360 ± 0.007	0.425 ± 0.007	0.421 ± 0.029	0.256 ± 0.001	0.286 ± 0.031	0.435 ± 0.136	0.362 ± 0.122
EM	IPW	0.035 ± 0.002	0.040 ± 0.001	0.021 ± 0.001	0.029 ± 0.015	0.303 ± 0.187	0.091 ± 0.010	0.119 ± 0.011	0.105 ± 0.022	0.104 ± 0.026	0.104 ± 0.051
EM	OR	0.037 ± 0.003	0.042 ± 0.002	0.016 ± 0.001	0.024 ± 0.012	0.269 ± 0.183	0.090 ± 0.008	0.122 ± 0.012	0.103 ± 0.022	0.072 ± 0.012	0.073 ± 0.024
EM	DR	0.034 ± 0.004	0.037 ± 0.001	0.014 ± 0.001	0.027 ± 0.020	0.264 ± 0.191	0.092 ± 0.005	0.111 ± 0.019	0.097 ± 0.026	0.077 ± 0.016	0.073 ± 0.028
SimPro	IPW	0.070 ± 0.011	0.058 ± 0.000	0.046 ± 0.001	0.049 ± 0.005	0.254 ± 0.074	0.223 ± 0.098	0.097 ± 0.025	0.067 ± 0.002	0.105 ± 0.066	0.110 ± 0.079
SimPro	OR	0.071 ± 0.012	0.058 ± 0.000	0.045 ± 0.001	0.049 ± 0.006	0.040 ± 0.003	0.059 ± 0.017	0.074 ± 0.006	0.075 ± 0.002	0.033 ± 0.003	0.033 ± 0.003
SimPro	DR	0.017 ± 0.004	0.026 ± 0.001	0.019 ± 0.002	0.018 ± 0.003	0.039 ± 0.003	0.058 ± 0.025	0.091 ± 0.007	0.031 ± 0.001	0.015 ± 0.003	0.019 ± 0.007

 Table 2. Total Variation Distance on CIFAR-100-LT ($N_l = 50$, $M_l = 400$) with different class imbalance ratios γ_l and γ_u under five different unlabeled class distributions.

Model	Estimator	consistent		uniform		reversed		middle		head-tail	
		$\gamma_l = 20$	$\gamma_l = 10$	$\gamma_l = 20$	$\gamma_l = 10$	$\gamma_l = 20$	$\gamma_l = 10$	$\gamma_l = 20$	$\gamma_l = 10$	$\gamma_l = 20$	$\gamma_l = 10$
		$\gamma_u = 20$	$\gamma_u = 10$	$\gamma_u = 1$	$\gamma_u = 1$	$\gamma_u = 1/20$	$\gamma_u = 1/10$	$\gamma_u = 20$	$\gamma_u = 10$	$\gamma_u = 20$	$\gamma_u = 10$
Supervised	MLLS	0.707 ± 0.016	0.313 ± 0.100	0.445 ± 0.172	0.309 ± 0.119	0.383 ± 0.075	0.397 ± 0.006	0.570 ± 0.001	0.373 ± 0.107	0.543 ± 0.009	0.231 ± 0.057
Supervised	RLLS	0.520 ± 0.007	0.133 ± 0.003	0.337 ± 0.125	0.253 ± 0.082	0.424 ± 0.060	0.463 ± 0.003	0.454 ± 0.021	0.306 ± 0.074	0.460 ± 0.028	0.241 ± 0.040
MLE	IPW	0.075 ± 0.000	0.071 ± 0.001	0.229 ± 0.001	0.167 ± 0.002	0.565 ± 0.005	0.443 ± 0.007	0.415 ± 0.000	0.311 ± 0.005	0.343 ± 0.000	0.280 ± 0.001
MLE	OR	0.065 ± 0.002	0.061 ± 0.001	0.200 ± 0.007	0.143 ± 0.001	0.526 ± 0.011	0.399 ± 0.023	0.360 ± 0.003	0.256 ± 0.012	0.328 ± 0.003	0.266 ± 0.005
MLE	DR	0.149 ± 0.019	0.145 ± 0.010	0.243 ± 0.004	0.214 ± 0.019	0.568 ± 0.005	0.464 ± 0.014	0.403 ± 0.014	0.309 ± 0.012	0.365 ± 0.007	0.320 ± 0.004
EM	IPW	0.097 ± 0.008	0.092 ± 0.004	0.239 ± 0.007	0.179 ± 0.003	0.478 ± 0.012	0.329 ± 0.020	0.262 ± 0.016	0.202 ± 0.003	0.312 ± 0.002	0.227 ± 0.001
EM	OR	0.121 ± 0.007	0.108 ± 0.005	0.261 ± 0.007	0.189 ± 0.004	0.489 ± 0.013	0.335 ± 0.020	0.274 ± 0.016	0.211 ± 0.004	0.336 ± 0.003	0.235 ± 0.001
EM	DR	0.125 ± 0.005	0.111 ± 0.004	0.269 ± 0.007	0.194 ± 0.005	0.497 ± 0.010	0.336 ± 0.024	0.281 ± 0.019	0.219 ± 0.008	0.336 ± 0.007	0.233 ± 0.004
SimPro	IPW	0.125 ± 0.001	0.100 ± 0.005	0.166 ± 0.007	0.141 ± 0.009	0.353 ± 0.023	0.261 ± 0.008	0.202 ± 0.003	0.158 ± 0.005	0.277 ± 0.009	0.197 ± 0.003
SimPro	OR	0.133 ± 0.005	0.100 ± 0.004	0.160 ± 0.007	0.138 ± 0.010	0.322 ± 0.014	0.253 ± 0.008	0.202 ± 0.003	0.156 ± 0.005	0.269 ± 0.006	0.191 ± 0.004
SimPro	DR	0.122 ± 0.003	0.106 ± 0.006	0.188 ± 0.009	0.149 ± 0.006	0.343 ± 0.023	0.257 ± 0.007	0.219 ± 0.010	0.172 ± 0.002	0.279 ± 0.007	0.198 ± 0.004

SimPro (Du et al., 2024) can be seen as our previous EM but also with FixMatch’s confidence thresholding and logit adjustment loss in Section 3.2. Confidence thresholding is a powerful regularization technique that encodes the assumption that classes are well separated (Grandvalet & Bengio, 2004), but can introduce bias to the estimation, which justifies the use of DR.

Results on Table 1 presents the performance of various models and estimators on CIFAR-10. We can see that SimPro + DR performs best. In contrast, SimPro + OR, SimPro’s original way of estimating $P(Y|A = 0)$, and SimPro + IPW tend to underperform EM on the consistent and uniform datasets. The consistent setting is worth noting, since it arises when data is sampled uniformly at random for labeling, representative of a large number of real world situations. EM is competitive to SimPro as well even without pseudo labeling, but overall we found this regularization to offer significant gains in the reversed, middle and head-tail settings. Finally, Supervised with either MLLS or RLLS estimators performs much worse than the semi-supervised methods.

Table 7 aligns with the observations made in Table 1. In particular, SimPro + DR is the best method for class distribution estimation of the much larger Imagenet-127. We also found that a small neural network and a small image resolution is sufficient for the distribution estimation of the much

larger dataset Imagenet-127. This matches our intuition that the finite-dimensional parameter is easier to learn.

Table 2 shows that most methods understandably struggle to estimate the class distributions in CIFAR-100. This is because there are few samples in each class, the head class has 10 times less samples while the number of classes multiplies 10 times compared to CIFAR-10. We see here that SimPro + DR is not the best method, but the relative gap between estimators are small.

4.2. Two-stage algorithm improves accuracy

In the second stage of our algorithm, we freeze our estimation and plug it in SimPro and BOAT. We denote SimPro+ and BOAT+ for algorithms that use our first stage estimate.

Table 3 shows that for CIFAR-10 SimPro+ and BOAT+ improve over their original versions across most settings, leading to large improvements in both the consistent and middle class distribution settings. In particular, our two-stage approach improves SimPro in 9 / 10 settings and BOAT in 8 / 10 settings. We also observe consistent improvements over both base algorithms, SimPro and BOAT, for several other datasets. Table 5 demonstrates improvements for 2 / 2 class imbalance ratios in STL-10 and Table 6 for 2 / 2 different resolutions of ImageNet-127.

Table 3. Top-1 accuracy (%) on CIFAR-10-LT ($N_l = 500, M_l = 4000$) with different class imbalance ratios γ_l and γ_u under five different unlabeled class distributions. In most settings, our two stage algorithm improves SimPro (9 / 10) and BOAT (8 / 10). We use green to indicate when our plug-in improves and red when it degrades the base model.

	consistent		uniform		reversed		middle		head-tail	
	$\gamma_l = 150$	$\gamma_l = 100$	$\gamma_l = 150$	$\gamma_l = 100$	$\gamma_l = 150$	$\gamma_l = 100$	$\gamma_l = 150$	$\gamma_l = 100$	$\gamma_l = 150$	$\gamma_l = 100$
	$\gamma_u = 150$	$\gamma_u = 100$	$\gamma_u = 1$	$\gamma_u = 1$	$\gamma_u = 1/150$	$\gamma_u = 1/100$	$\gamma_u = 150$	$\gamma_u = 100$	$\gamma_u = 150$	$\gamma_u = 100$
FixMatch	62.9 ± 0.36	67.8 ± 1.13	67.6 ± 2.56	73.0 ± 3.81	59.9 ± 0.82	62.5 ± 0.94	64.3 ± 0.63	71.7 ± 0.46	58.3 ± 1.46	66.6 ± 0.87
CReST+	67.5 ± 0.45	76.3 ± 0.86	74.9 ± 0.90	82.2 ± 1.53	62.0 ± 1.18	62.9 ± 1.39	58.5 ± 0.68	71.4 ± 0.60	59.3 ± 0.72	67.2 ± 0.48
DASO	70.1 ± 1.81	76.0 ± 0.37	83.1 ± 0.47	86.6 ± 0.84	64.0 ± 0.11	71.0 ± 0.95	69.0 ± 0.31	73.1 ± 0.68	70.5 ± 0.59	71.1 ± 0.32
Supervised	63.2 ± 0.14	66.0 ± 0.27	63.3 ± 0.28	65.8 ± 0.19	63.1 ± 0.19	65.9 ± 0.51	63.5 ± 0.22	65.8 ± 0.03	63.0 ± 0.18	66.4 ± 0.07
EM	69.1 ± 1.29	73.8 ± 0.71	94.0 ± 0.08	93.2 ± 0.94	76.6 ± 2.72	82.2 ± 0.24	79.5 ± 0.35	81.6 ± 0.58	79.2 ± 0.50	79.8 ± 0.17
SimPro	74.4 ± 0.71	79.7 ± 0.45	93.3 ± 0.10	93.3 ± 0.47	83.8 ± 0.80	84.1 ± 0.24	78.7 ± 0.30	84.2 ± 0.26	81.2 ± 0.20	82.0 ± 1.07
SimPro+	77.8 ± 1.50	81.2 ± 0.39	93.7 ± 0.07	93.7 ± 0.24	83.3 ± 0.38	84.7 ± 0.78	79.2 ± 0.70	85.4 ± 0.66	81.3 ± 0.27	82.5 ± 0.56
BOAT	80.5 ± 0.39	83.3 ± 0.27	93.9 ± 0.03	94.1 ± 0.10	79.7 ± 0.25	81.1 ± 0.15	79.7 ± 1.15	81.6 ± 0.09	79.4 ± 0.44	80.9 ± 0.16
BOAT+	81.6 ± 0.15	83.8 ± 0.04	93.7 ± 0.23	94.1 ± 0.17	80.4 ± 0.71	81.7 ± 0.38	80.3 ± 0.28	83.1 ± 0.45	79.7 ± 0.29	81.0 ± 0.36

Table 4. Top-1 accuracy (%) on CIFAR-100-LT ($N_l = 50, M_l = 400$) with different class imbalance ratios γ_l and γ_u under five different unlabeled class distributions. Despite poor estimation in stage 1, our approach does not degrade the accuracy for most of the settings. We use green to indicate when our plug-in improves and red when it degrades the base method.

	consistent		uniform		reversed		middle		head-tail	
	$\gamma_l = 20$	$\gamma_l = 10$	$\gamma_l = 20$	$\gamma_l = 10$	$\gamma_l = 20$	$\gamma_l = 10$	$\gamma_l = 20$	$\gamma_l = 10$	$\gamma_l = 20$	$\gamma_l = 10$
	$\gamma_u = 20$	$\gamma_u = 10$	$\gamma_u = 1$	$\gamma_u = 1$	$\gamma_u = 1/20$	$\gamma_u = 1/10$	$\gamma_u = 20$	$\gamma_u = 10$	$\gamma_u = 20$	$\gamma_u = 10$
Supervised	32.4 ± 0.40	38.4 ± 0.18	32.7 ± 0.25	38.0 ± 0.22	32.5 ± 0.51	38.4 ± 0.43	32.3 ± 0.08	37.9 ± 0.43	32.1 ± 0.33	38.2 ± 0.38
EM	42.4 ± 0.43	49.6 ± 0.30	50.9 ± 0.27	58.0 ± 0.35	42.1 ± 0.16	49.8 ± 0.47	42.8 ± 0.41	49.6 ± 0.36	41.5 ± 1.26	49.5 ± 0.18
SimPro	42.5 ± 0.58	49.6 ± 0.22	51.7 ± 0.22	58.1 ± 0.53	44.9 ± 0.21	51.8 ± 0.42	42.7 ± 0.06	49.8 ± 0.45	43.3 ± 0.76	50.9 ± 0.19
SimPro+	42.8 ± 0.49	50.1 ± 0.33	51.6 ± 0.63	57.8 ± 0.38	44.7 ± 0.51	51.4 ± 0.88	43.4 ± 0.58	50.4 ± 0.28	43.8 ± 0.50	50.7 ± 0.76
BOAT	43.7 ± 0.16	51.4 ± 0.32	55.1 ± 0.95	60.5 ± 0.15	43.1 ± 0.49	52.7 ± 0.23	43.6 ± 0.19	51.4 ± 0.39	43.9 ± 0.42	51.4 ± 0.14
BOAT+	44.8 ± 0.13	51.4 ± 0.51	53.8 ± 0.32	60.5 ± 0.69	43.4 ± 0.56	52.4 ± 0.36	43.9 ± 0.59	50.8 ± 0.09	43.6 ± 0.50	51.9 ± 0.49

Table 5. Top-1 Accuracy (%) on STL-10. Our two-stage algorithms improves both SimPro and BOAT for both settings.

Method	$\gamma_l = 10$	$\gamma_l = 20$
Supervised	73.9 ± 0.57	70.4 ± 0.95
MLE	67.6 ± 0.57	58.9 ± 4.05
EM	84.9 ± 0.14	83.6 ± 0.25
SimPro	82.4 ± 1.57	80.5 ± 0.96
SimPro+	83.9 ± 0.76	82.7 ± 0.86
BOAT	83.8 ± 0.20	82.0 ± 0.34
BOAT+	84.1 ± 0.38	82.4 ± 0.10

We also evaluate on CIFAR-100 for multiple unlabeled class distribution settings and with mediocre class label distribution estimates in stage 1, demonstrate no degradation in accuracy in stage 2. As shown in Table 4, the two stage algorithm with a mediocre stage 1 estimation leads to parity with the baseline. Stage 2 provides small improvements in 5 / 10 settings for SimPro and in 4 / 10 (with 2 ties) for BOAT.

4.3. Ablation Study: Alternative implementations.

In this section, we ablate on our 2-stage choice. Specifically, we consider 2 alternative implementations:

Table 6. Top-1 Accuracy (%) on Imagenet-127. Our two-stage approach improves both SimPro and BOAT for both resolutions.

Method	32 × 32	64 × 64
SimPro	54.8	63.7
SimPro+	55.1	64.2
BOAT	51.6	58.7
BOAT+	52.0	59.2

Doubly-robust risk This approach is (Sportisse et al., 2023; Hu et al., 2022), as discussed in Section 2. we consider the doubly-robust risk as our training loss. We use the missingness mechanism estimation from stage-1 of SimPro+ for fair comparison. Equation (28) is used for training in which the pseudo-labeling operators can be applied straightforwardly. More detail in Appendix B

Batch-update doubly-robust $P(Y|A)$ Different from SimPro+, here we remove the first stage and instead update our doubly robust estimation of the unlabeled class distribution using a moving average of the batch statistics.

Table 8 shows that the batch-update version of SimPro+ is significantly worse on the consistent and uniform settings, while the doubly-robust risk is worst overall, especially in the reversed setting where $P(A|Y)$ is very small for the labeled tail classes, causing instability issues during training.

Table 7. Total Variation Distance on Imagenet-127

Method	Estimator	32 × 32	64 × 64
MLE	IPW	0.103 ± 0.034	0.051 ± 0.000
MLE	OR	0.153 ± 0.052	0.041 ± 0.000
MLE	DR	0.100 ± 0.029	0.075 ± 0.003
EM	IPW	0.141 ± 0.006	0.163 ± 0.010
EM	OR	0.205 ± 0.006	0.236 ± 0.011
EM	DR	0.024 ± 0.001	0.042 ± 0.004
SimPro	IPW	0.041 ± 0.012	0.224 ± 0.040
SimPro	OR	0.036 ± 0.014	0.291 ± 0.079
SimPro	DR	0.017 ± 0.000	0.037 ± 0.004

Table 8. Top-1 Accuracy (%) on CIFAR-10. We compare our 2-stage SimPro+ with 1) an 1-stage alternative that updates and uses the doubly-robust estimation on-the-fly and 2) SimPro with doubly-robust risk. We use $\gamma_l = 150$. green color indicates that our method performs best.

Method	consistent	uniform	reversed	middle	headtail
SimPro+	77.8	93.7	83.3	79.2	81.3
batch-update	71.9	91.4	82.6	78.6	81.2
DR-risk	72.1	89.8	67.1	75.6	79.5

In conclusion, our 2-stage approach is the best.

5. Conclusion

we addressed the challenge of limited information about the class distribution in unlabeled data for semi-supervised learning. We propose to explicitly estimate the unlabeled class distribution as an initial step then pass it to existing pseudo labeling approaches. Leveraging connecting to non-ignorable missingness, we introduce the doubly robust estimator which has strong theoretical guarantee for the distribution estimation. We show improved results on 3 different datasets, CIFAR-10, STL-10, and Imagenet-127, and that even inaccurate class label distributions do not lead to degraded accuracy in CIFAR-10.

Impact Statement

This paper presents work whose goal is to advance the field of Machine Learning. There are many potential societal consequences of our work, none which we feel must be specifically highlighted here.

References

Alexandari, A., Kundaje, A., and Shrikumar, A. Maximum likelihood with bias-corrected calibration is hard-to-beat at label shift adaptation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 222–232. PMLR, 2020.

Arazo, E., Ortego, D., Albert, P., O’Connor, N. E., and McGuinness, K. Pseudo-labeling and confirmation bias in deep semi-supervised learning. In *2020 International joint conference on neural networks (IJCNN)*, pp. 1–8. IEEE, 2020.

Azizzadenesheli, K., Liu, A., Yang, F., and Anandkumar, A. Regularized learning for domain adaptation under label shifts. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.09734*, 2019.

Berthelot, D., Carlini, N., Cubuk, E. D., Kurakin, A., Sohn, K., Zhang, H., and Raffel, C. Remixmatch: Semi-supervised learning with distribution alignment and augmentation anchoring. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1911.09785*, 2019a.

Berthelot, D., Carlini, N., Goodfellow, I., Papernot, N., Oliver, A., and Raffel, C. A. Mixmatch: A holistic approach to semi-supervised learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019b.

Buda, M., Maki, A., and Mazurowski, M. A. A systematic study of the class imbalance problem in convolutional neural networks. *Neural networks*, 106:249–259, 2018.

Chapelle, O., Scholkopf, B., and Zien, A. Semi-supervised learning (chapelle, o. et al., eds.; 2006)[book reviews]. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, 20(3):542–542, 2009.

Chernozhukov, V., Chetverikov, D., Demirer, M., Duflo, E., Hansen, C., Newey, W., and Robins, J. Double/debiased machine learning for treatment and structural parameters, 2018.

Chernozhukov, V., Newey, W., Quintas-Martinez, V. M., and Syrgkanis, V. Riesznet and forestriesz: Automatic debiased machine learning with neural nets and random forests. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 3901–3914. PMLR, 2022.

Coates, A., Ng, A., and Lee, H. An analysis of single-layer networks in unsupervised feature learning. In *Proceedings of the fourteenth international conference on*

- artificial intelligence and statistics*, pp. 215–223. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings, 2011.
- Cui, Y., Jia, M., Lin, T.-Y., Song, Y., and Belongie, S. Class-balanced loss based on effective number of samples. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 9268–9277, 2019.
- Du, C., Han, Y., and Huang, G. Simpro: A simple probabilistic framework towards realistic long-tailed semi-supervised learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.13505*, 2024.
- Duan, Y., Qi, L., Wang, L., Zhou, L., and Shi, Y. Rda: Reciprocal distribution alignment for robust semi-supervised learning. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pp. 533–549. Springer, 2022.
- Duan, Y., Zhao, Z., Qi, L., Zhou, L., Wang, L., and Shi, Y. Towards semi-supervised learning with non-random missing labels. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pp. 16121–16131, 2023.
- Fan, Y., Dai, D., Kukleva, A., and Schiele, B. Cossl: Co-learning of representation and classifier for imbalanced semi-supervised learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 14574–14584, 2022.
- Foster, D. J. and Syrgkanis, V. Orthogonal statistical learning. *The Annals of Statistics*, 51(3):879–908, 2023.
- Gan, K., Wei, T., and Zhang, M.-L. Boosting consistency in dual training for long-tailed semi-supervised learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.13187*, 2024.
- Garg, S., Wu, Y., Balakrishnan, S., and Lipton, Z. A unified view of label shift estimation. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 33:3290–3300, 2020.
- Grandvalet, Y. and Bengio, Y. Semi-supervised learning by entropy minimization. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 17, 2004.
- Hu, X., Niu, Y., Miao, C., Hua, X.-S., and Zhang, H. On non-random missing labels in semi-supervised learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2206.14923*, 2022.
- Ibrahim, J. G. and Lipsitz, S. R. Parameter estimation from incomplete data in binomial regression when the missing data mechanism is nonignorable. *Biometrics*, pp. 1071–1078, 1996.
- Kallus, N. Deepmatch: Balancing deep covariate representations for causal inference using adversarial training. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 5067–5077. PMLR, 2020.
- Kennedy, E. H. Towards optimal doubly robust estimation of heterogeneous causal effects. *Electronic Journal of Statistics*, 17(2):3008–3049, 2023.
- Kennedy, E. H. Semiparametric doubly robust targeted double machine learning: a review. *Handbook of Statistical Methods for Precision Medicine*, pp. 207–236, 2024.
- Kim, J., Hur, Y., Park, S., Yang, E., Hwang, S. J., and Shin, J. Distribution aligning refinery of pseudo-label for imbalanced semi-supervised learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:14567–14579, 2020.
- Krizhevsky, A. and Hinton, G. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. Technical Report 0, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, 2009. URL <https://www.cs.toronto.edu/~kriz/learning-features-2009-TR.pdf>.
- Laine, S. and Aila, T. Temporal ensembling for semi-supervised learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.02242*, 2016.
- Lee, D.-H. et al. Pseudo-label: The simple and efficient semi-supervised learning method for deep neural networks. In *Workshop on challenges in representation learning, ICML*, volume 3, pp. 896. Atlanta, 2013.
- Lee, H., Shin, S., and Kim, H. Abc: Auxiliary balanced classifier for class-imbalanced semi-supervised learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34: 7082–7094, 2021.
- Lipton, Z., Wang, Y.-X., and Smola, A. Detecting and correcting for label shift with black box predictors. In *International conference on machine learning*, pp. 3122–3130. PMLR, 2018.
- Ma, C., Elezi, I., Deng, J., Dong, W., and Xu, C. Three heads are better than one: Complementary experts for long-tailed semi-supervised learning. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 38, pp. 14229–14237, 2024.
- Menon, A. K., Jayasumana, S., Rawat, A. S., Jain, H., Veit, A., and Kumar, S. Long-tail learning via logit adjustment. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.07314*, 2020.
- Miller, A. C. and Futoma, J. Label shift estimators for non-ignorable missing data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.18261*, 2023.
- Neal, R. M. and Hinton, G. E. A view of the em algorithm that justifies incremental, sparse, and other variants. In *Learning in graphical models*, pp. 355–368. Springer, 1998.

- Nguyen, M., Wang, A. Q., Kim, H., and Sabuncu, M. R. Adapting to shifting correlations with unlabeled data calibration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.05996*, 2024.
- Oh, Y., Kim, D.-J., and Kweon, I. S. DASO: Distribution-aware semantics-oriented pseudo-label for imbalanced semi-supervised learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 9786–9796, 2022.
- Pham, K., Hirshberg, D. A., Huynh-Pham, P.-M., Santacatterina, M., Lim, S.-N., and Zabih, R. Stable estimation of survival causal effects. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.02278*, 2023.
- Ren, J., Yu, C., Ma, X., Zhao, H., Yi, S., et al. Balanced meta-softmax for long-tailed visual recognition. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33: 4175–4186, 2020.
- Rubin, D. B. Inference and missing data. *Biometrika*, 63(3): 581–592, 1976.
- Saerens, M., Latinne, P., and Decaestecker, C. Adjusting the outputs of a classifier to new a priori probabilities: a simple procedure. *Neural computation*, 14(1):21–41, 2002.
- Schmutz, H., Humbert, O., and Mattei, P.-A. Don’t fear the unlabelled: safe semi-supervised learning via simple debiasing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.07512*, 2022.
- Shi, C., Blei, D., and Veitch, V. Adapting neural networks for the estimation of treatment effects. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- Sohn, K., Berthelot, D., Carlini, N., Zhang, Z., Zhang, H., Raffel, C. A., Cubuk, E. D., Kurakin, A., and Li, C.-L. Fixmatch: Simplifying semi-supervised learning with consistency and confidence. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 33:596–608, 2020.
- Sportisse, A., Schmutz, H., Humbert, O., Bouveyron, C., and Mattei, P.-A. Are labels informative in semi-supervised learning? estimating and leveraging the missing-data mechanism. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 32521–32539. PMLR, 2023.
- Sun, Q., Murphy, K. P., Ebrahimi, S., and D’Amour, A. Beyond invariance: test-time label-shift adaptation for addressing “spurious” correlations. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:23789–23812, 2023.
- Tsiatis, A. A. *Semiparametric theory and missing data*, volume 4. Springer, 2006.
- Van der Vaart, A. W. *Asymptotic statistics*, volume 3. Cambridge university press, 2000.
- Wager, S. and Athey, S. Estimation and inference of heterogeneous treatment effects using random forests. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 113(523):1228–1242, 2018.
- Wei, C., Sohn, K., Mellina, C., Yuille, A., and Yang, F. Crest: A class-rebalancing self-training framework for imbalanced semi-supervised learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 10857–10866, 2021.
- Wei, T. and Gan, K. Towards realistic long-tailed semi-supervised learning: Consistency is all you need. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pp. 3469–3478, 2023.
- Wei, T., Mao, Z., Zhou, Z.-H., Wan, Y., and Zhang, M.-L. Learning label shift correction for test-agnostic long-tailed recognition. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024.
- Xie, Q., Luong, M.-T., Hovy, E., and Le, Q. V. Self-training with noisy student improves imagenet classification. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 10687–10698, 2020.
- Zhang, J., Jennings, J., Hilmkil, A., Pawlowski, N., Zhang, C., and Ma, C. Towards causal foundation model: on duality between causal inference and attention. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.00809*, 2023.
- Zhao, Z., Zhou, L., Duan, Y., Wang, L., Qi, L., and Shi, Y. Dc-ssl: Addressing mismatched class distribution in semi-supervised learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pp. 9757–9765, 2022.
- Zhu, B., Ding, M., Jacobson, P., Wu, M., Zhan, W., Jordan, M., and Jiao, J. Doubly-robust self-training. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.

A. Proof of Theorem 3.2

We require some additional regularity assumptions:

Assumption A.1. 1) The number of classes C is bounded w.r.t the number of samples N , 2) the missingness mechanism $P(A = 1|Y, \theta)$, as well as its estimated counterpart $\hat{P}(A = 1|Y, \theta)$, are bounded below by some constant $\epsilon > 0$, 3) the quantities $P(Y|X, \theta)$ and $P(A|Y, \theta)$ are estimated using auxiliary samples independent of samples used for the sample averaging.

Assumptions 1 and 2 are natural. For the missingness mechanism, the ground truth being bounded means that there is a non-vanishing proportion of samples for every class. The boundedness of the estimate can be enforced by clipping the estimate. Assumption 3 is called sample splitting in (Kennedy, 2024).

For convenience we use operator \mathbb{E}_N to denote the average of N samples i.e. $\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N$. Note that this is by itself a random variable, in contrast to \mathbb{E} which is a fixed number.

Proof of Theorem 3.2. Because C is bounded (assumption A.1), we can fix a class c and prove the theorem. Let us define the influence function ϕ , parameterized by θ , as

$$\phi(O|\theta)(c) = P(Y = c|X, \theta) + \frac{\mathbf{1}(A = 1)}{P(A = 1|Y, \theta)} (\mathbf{1}(Y = c) - P(Y = c|X, \theta)) - P(Y = c) \quad (16)$$

As we have done in the main text, we use $\phi(O)$ to denote the same function but all estimated quantities are replaced with their truths. In other words, we use $\phi(O)$ for $\phi(O|\theta_0)$ where θ_0 is the truth, given that our model contains θ_0 e.g. when the model is consistent.

Recall that:

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{dr}(\theta)(c) &= \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left\{ P(Y = c|X, \theta) + \frac{\mathbf{1}(A = 1)}{P(A = 1|Y, \theta)} (\mathbf{1}(Y = c) - P(Y = c|X, \theta)) \right\} \\ &= \mathbb{E}_N[\phi(O|\theta)(c)] + P(Y = c) \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

We will show that:

$$\Psi_{dr}(\theta)(c) - P(Y = c) = (\mathbb{E}_N - \mathbb{E})[\phi(O)(c)] + o_P(N^{-1/2}) \quad (18)$$

To do that, we use the following decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_{dr}(\theta)(c) - P(Y = c) &= \mathbb{E}_N[\phi(O|\theta)(c)] \\ &= (\mathbb{E}_N - \mathbb{E})[\phi(O)(c)] + (\mathbb{E}_N - \mathbb{E})[\phi(O|\theta)(c) - \phi(O)(c)] + \mathbb{E}[\phi(O|\theta)(c)] \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

and analyze the second and third term. The third term is:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\phi(O|\theta)(c)] &= \mathbb{E}[P(Y = c|X, \theta)] + \mathbb{E} \left[\frac{\mathbf{1}(A = 1)}{P(A = 1|Y, \theta)} (\mathbf{1}(Y = c) - P(Y = c|X, \theta)) \right] - P(Y = c) \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[P(Y = c|X, \theta) + \frac{P(A = 1|Y)}{P(A = 1|Y, \theta)} (P(Y = c|X) - P(Y = c|X, \theta)) \right] - \mathbb{E}[P(Y = c|X)] \\ &= \mathbb{E} \left[(P(Y = c|X, \theta) - P(Y = c|X)) (P(A = 1|Y, \theta) - P(A = 1|Y)) \frac{1}{P(A = 1|Y, \theta)} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

by Cauchy-Schwarz inequality:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\phi(O|\theta)(c)] &\leq \frac{1}{\epsilon} \|P(A = 1|Y, \theta) - P(A = 1|Y)\|_2 \|P(Y = c|X, \theta) - P(Y = c|X)\|_{L_2(P)} \\ &= \frac{1}{\epsilon} o_P(N^{-1/4} N^{-1/4}) = o_P(N^{-1/2}) \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

by assumption 3.1 and that $P(A = 1|Y, \theta) > \epsilon$ (assumption A.1). The second term can be bounded by Chebyshev inequality

$$P(|(\mathbb{E}_N - \mathbb{E})[\phi(O|\theta)(c) - \phi(O)(c)]| \geq t) \leq \frac{\mathbf{var}[\mathbb{E}_N[\phi(O|\theta)(c) - \phi(O)(c)]]}{t^2} = \frac{\mathbf{var}[\phi(O|\theta)(c) - \phi(O)(c)]}{Nt^2} \quad (22)$$

note here that θ is independent of the samples used for \mathbb{E}_N by assumption A.1. For any $\epsilon > 0$, by picking $t = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N\epsilon}}$ we get

$$P\left(\left|\frac{(\mathbb{E}_N - \mathbb{E})[\phi(O|\theta)(c) - \phi(O)(c)]}{N^{-1/2}}\right| \geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\epsilon}}\right) \leq \epsilon \mathbf{var}[\phi(O|\theta)(c) - \phi(O)(c)] \quad (23)$$

by the definition of O_P , we then get

$$(\mathbb{E}_N - \mathbb{E})[\phi(O|\theta)(c) - \phi(O)(c)] = O_P(N^{-1/2} \mathbf{var}[\phi(O|\theta)(c) - \phi(O)(c)]) \quad (24)$$

Because ϕ is a continuous function of $P(Y|X, \theta)$ and $P(A|Y, \theta)$ (given $P(A|Y, \theta) > \epsilon$, assumption A.1), by the continuous mapping theorem and the fact that $P(Y|X, \theta)$ and $P(A|Y, \theta)$ are convergent in probability (assumption 3.1), we get $\mathbf{var}[\phi(O|\theta)(c) - \phi(O)(c)] = o_P(1)$. This gives

$$(\mathbb{E}_N - \mathbb{E})[\phi(O|\theta)(c) - \phi(O)(c)] = o_P(N^{-1/2}) \quad (25)$$

Therefore, we have shown that the second and third term are both $o_P(N^{-1/2})$, proving Equation (18). As the final step, multiply both sides of this equation by \sqrt{N} we get:

$$\sqrt{N}(\Psi_{dr}(\theta)(c) - P(Y = c)) = \sqrt{N}(\mathbb{E}_N - \mathbb{E})[\phi(O)(c)] + o_P(1) \rightsquigarrow \mathcal{N}(0, \mathbf{var}[\phi(O)(c)]) \quad (26)$$

by the central limit theorem, and $\mathbf{var}[\phi(O)(c)] = \mathbb{E}[\phi(O)(c)^2]$ because $\mathbb{E}[\phi(O)(c)] = 0$. \square

While we started with the definition of ϕ , Equation (18) shows that ϕ is indeed an influence function. Now we show that ϕ is also the efficient influence function, by using the characterization of the model's tangent space (Tsiatis, 2006). Note that the joint probability factorizes as $P(X, A, Y) = P(X)P(Y|X)P(A|Y)$, therefore the tangent space \mathcal{T} factorizes as $\mathcal{T} = \mathcal{T}_X \oplus \mathcal{T}_{Y|X} \oplus \mathcal{T}_{A|Y}$ where $\mathcal{T}_X = \{h(X) : \mathbb{E}[h] = 0\}$, $\mathcal{T}_{Y|X} = \{h(X, Y) : \mathbb{E}[h|X] = 0\}$, $\mathcal{T}_{A|Y} = \{h(A, Y) : \mathbb{E}[h|Y] = 0\}$, and the 3 subspaces are pairwise orthogonal. All influence functions are orthogonal to the tangent space, but the influence function that is also in the tangent space has the smallest variance and is called the efficient influence function. As ϕ is already an influence function, we need only show that ϕ is in \mathcal{T} . We write ϕ as

$$\phi(O)(c) = (P(Y = c|X) - P(Y = c)) + \left[\frac{\mathbf{1}(A = 1)}{P(A = 1|Y)} - 1 \right] (\mathbf{1}(Y = c) - P(Y = c|X)) + (\mathbf{1}(Y = c) - P(Y = c|X)) \quad (27)$$

and note that the first, second and third term are in \mathcal{T}_X , $\mathcal{T}_{A|Y}$ and $\mathcal{T}_{Y|X}$ respectively. Therefore, ϕ is indeed in \mathcal{T} . The efficient influence function has the smallest variance of all influence function, and therefore our estimator being asymptotically linear in ϕ (Equation (18)) has the smallest mean squared error in a local asymptotic minimax sense (Kennedy, 2024; Van der Vaart, 2000)

B. Further background and related work

Discussion on semi-supervised EM. It appears that semi-supervised EM was first used for parameter estimation when the missingness mechanism is non-ignorable in (Ibrahim & Lipsitz, 1996), but has not been used for label shift estimation. Perhaps this is because the semi-supervised situation where additional unlabeled data is available during training is rarer than the test-time adaptation case. EM is well suited to take advantage of the extra unlabeled data to improve the classifier under very scarce and long-tailed labeled data. While the connection between pseudo-labeling and EM has been explored before (Grandvalet & Bengio, 2004), the situation with label shift has not until recently (Du et al., 2024). Here the application of EM is much more interesting, because other than simply giving pseudo-labeling a rigorous formulation, EM also estimates the missingness mechanism (equivalently the label distribution shift), which is important for shift correction and thus high-quality pseudo-labels (Wei & Gan, 2023). The application of confidence thresholding can be seen as a sparse variant of EM (Neal & Hinton, 1998).

The doubly-robust risk. A technique that also derives from the theory of semi-parametric efficiency is orthogonal statistical learning (Foster & Syrgkanis, 2023). The idea is to minimize the doubly-robust risk:

$$\mathcal{R}(\theta_2) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \left[l(x_i, \hat{y}_i | \theta_2) + \frac{\mathbf{1}(a_i = 1)}{P(A = a_i | Y = y_i, \theta_1)} (l(x_i, y_i | \theta_2) - l(x_i, \hat{y}_i | \theta_2)) \right] \quad (28)$$

where $l(x, y | \theta) = -\sum_{c=1}^C [y]_c \log P(Y = c | X = x, \theta)$ is the negative cross-entropy. The notation $[y]_c$ means that we are using the c -entry in a C -dimension probability vector y . Thus, y_i denotes the one-hot label of observation i , while \hat{y}_i denotes the pseudo-label, which can be one-hot or all-zero. Finally, we use θ_1 to denote that $P(a|y, \theta_1)$ is an estimation from a previous stage, but it can be estimated with θ_2 as well. The risk $\mathcal{R}(\theta_2)$ can be used as a training loss in a straightforward fashion. Similar to the doubly robust estimation of $P(Y)$, the doubly robust risk provides approximately unbiased estimation of the risk. This property has been used in (Sportisse et al., 2023; Hu et al., 2022; Zhu et al., 2024) also in the semi-supervised learning setting. More broadly, it is at the heart of one of the core techniques in heterogenous treatment effect estimation in causal estimation (Kennedy, 2023; Foster & Syrgkanis, 2023; Wager & Athey, 2018). The focus here is not the estimation of $\mathcal{R}(\theta_2)$ per se, but the quality of the learned model (Foster & Syrgkanis, 2023). By using the doubly-robust risk, we can achieve an optimality result similar in spirit to our theorem Theorem 3.2, but for the generalization error. While this is appealing, in practice there are 2 problems with this approach. First, the inverse probability weight $P(A = a_i | Y = y_i, \theta_1)$ can be very large if the class ratio is highly unlabeled, making training unstable (Kallus, 2020; Pham et al., 2023). This problem exists for our estimation as well. However, it is much easier to control for estimation than for training because of the iterative nature of model update. Secondly, we can further write \mathcal{R} as:

$$\mathcal{R}(\theta_2) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N l \left(x_i, \hat{y}_i + \frac{\mathbf{1}(a_i = 1)}{P(A = a_i | Y = y_i, \theta_1)} (y_i - \hat{y}_i) \middle| \theta_2 \right) \quad (29)$$

which is a cross-entropy loss with new meta-pseudo-labels. However, these labels are not meant to be learned exactly, and furthermore they can be negative. Thus, theoretical works have to put stringent assumptions on the models. In Section 4.3, we show that experimentally that the instability problem makes doubly-robust risk performance worse than our 2-stage approach.

C. Training and hyperparameter settings.

For neural network training, we follow the implementation and hyperparameter settings of (Du et al., 2024). In particular, we adapt the core code of SimPro for Supervised, MLE and EM. For MLE, we update $P(A|Y)$ using the Adam optimizer with learning rate 1e-3, while for EM we use a momentum update similar to SimPro’s update of $P(Y|A)$ because it has a closed-form solution at each mini-batch. We use Wide ResNet-28-2 on all methods and all datasets in this section, including Imagenet-127, because we are motivated by the fact that stage-1’s goal is not classification accuracy but the estimation of a finite-dimensional parameter. When using Wide ResNet-28-2 for Imagenet-127, we use the hyperparameters of CIFAR-100, except we lower the batch size of unlabeled data to 2 times that of labeled data instead of 8 for memory reason. We do not perform additional hyperparameter tuning. All experiments can be performed on 1 A6000 RTX GPU, and are run 3 times. We report the total variation distance between the estimated and the ground truth unlabeled class distribution, similar to its usage in Theorem 3.1 of (Wei et al., 2024), and the top-1 classification accuracy.

In the second stage of our algorithm, we freeze our estimation and plug it in SimPro and BOAT. We keep exactly the same hyperparameter settings that SimPro and BOAT use. In particular, for Imagenet-127, we now use ResNet-50 and run each experiment once. In SimPro, we set the unlabeled class distribution $P(Y|A = 0)$ at the E-step; however, we still keep a running estimate of the class distribution $P(Y)$ in the logit adjustment loss Equation (9). While it is possible to use the first stage estimate in the logit adjustment loss, we observe that doing so results in lower accuracy than using the the running average. This is conceptually consistent with the role of the running average - serving not as an accurate estimate of $P(Y)$ but to make the classifier’s class distribution uniform through the logit adjustment loss, which is good for the test set. Similarly, in BOAT, we only replace $\Delta_c = \log P(Y|A = 1) - \log P(Y|A = 0)$ in equation (4) of (Gan et al., 2024), which is adjusting a classifier’s predictions from the labeled to the unlabeled class distribution, with our SimPro + DR estimate instead of their on-the-fly estimate.