

Optimal Labeler Assignment and Sampling for Active Learning in the Presence of Imperfect Labels

Pouya Ahadi

POUYA.AHADI@GATECH.EDU

*School of Industrial and Systems Engineering
Georgia Institute of Technology
Atlanta, GA 30332, USA*

Blair Winograd

BWINOGR1@FORD.COM

Ford Motor Company

Camille Zaug

CZAUG@FORD.COM

Ford Motor Company

Karunesh Arora

KARORA4@FORD.COM

Ford Motor Company

Lijun Wang

LWANG149@FORD.COM

Ford Motor Company

Kamran Paynabar*

KAMRAN.PAYNABAR@ISYE.GATECH.EDU

*School of Industrial and Systems Engineering
Georgia Institute of Technology
Atlanta, GA 30332, USA*

Abstract

Active Learning (AL) has garnered significant interest across various application domains where labeling training data is costly. AL provides a framework that helps practitioners query informative samples for annotation by oracles (labelers). However, these labels often contain noise due to varying levels of labeler accuracy. Additionally, uncertain samples are more prone to receiving incorrect labels because of their complexity. Learning from imperfectly labeled data leads to an inaccurate classifier. We propose a novel AL framework to construct a robust classification model by minimizing noise levels. Our approach includes an assignment model that optimally assigns query points to labelers, aiming to minimize the maximum possible noise within each cycle. Additionally, we introduce a new sampling method to identify the best query points, reducing the impact of label noise on classifier performance. Our experiments demonstrate that our approach significantly improves classification performance compared to several benchmark methods.

Keywords: Active Learning; Sequential Sampling; Assignment Problem; Noisy Oracles; Classification Problem

1 Introduction

In typical classification problems, machine learning models are trained using a set of labeled data points, with these labels being assigned through annotation. In numerous applications, the annotation of samples can be a time-consuming or costly endeavor. For instance, Singh et al. (2009) explored the challenges of image classification, where annotating images can

*. Corresponding author

be labor-intensive. Similarly, in the field of additive manufacturing, acquiring labels has become increasingly time- and labor-intensive, especially with the integration of advanced sensors that generate high-dimensional, large datasets (van Houtum and Vlasea, 2021). Given the vast volumes of datasets in many such applications, fully annotating all instances has become an exceedingly challenging, if not impossible, task. As a result, the training of these models often relies on a limited set of labeled data

The limitation in annotating unlabeled samples naturally establishes a labeling budget defined as the number of unlabeled observations that can be annotated. Consequently, selecting a subset for annotation becomes a critical task. In general learning problems, there are typically two strategies for choosing the best samples: *one-shot sampling* methods and *sequential sampling* methods. In the one-shot sampling approach, a fixed number of observations are chosen based on the available budget. Once the labels for all these samples are obtained, a model can be trained using this labeled training data (Johnson et al., 1990; Santner et al., 2018). Conversely, in the *sequential sampling* design, new observations are selected over time, informed by data from previously collected samples. At each step, these accumulated samples are used to update the training model, and the information gained from the most recently updated model guides the selection of subsequent samples Gahrooei et al. (2019); Huang et al. (2023). Therefore, while one-shot sampling methods do not utilize information from earlier observations, sequential sampling methods effectively address this limitation by iteratively updating the model with the most recent observations.

By employing sequential sampling, the total labeling budget can be distributed across several cycles. In each cycle, a number of observations are sampled and labeled, based on the budget allocated for that cycle. Subsequently, the model is updated with this new batch of labels. In the context of Machine Learning, this procedure is termed *active learning (AL)*. In AL, the key challenge is selecting samples in each cycle by leveraging insights from the most recently updated model. A common approach known as *uncertainty sampling*, assumes that observations with higher uncertainty offer more information about the underlying class distribution, making them ideal candidates for labeling (Settles, 2009). There are various methods to quantify uncertainty, leading to different uncertainty sampling strategies, including *least confident* (Settles and Craven, 2008), *margin sampling* (Scheffer et al., 2001), and *entropy sampling* (Li et al., 2019). Among these, entropy sampling, which employs the entropy measure for sampling the observations, is arguably the most widely used method in AL. Therefore, our focus in this paper will be on entropy sampling.

Annotating data points involves assigning labels to unlabeled samples, typically performed by various labelers (oracles). However, in practical scenarios, these labels can often be incorrect due to noisy labelers as noted by Gupta et al. (2019). As a result, the labels obtained might be erroneous, and training a model with such incorrect labels can lead to an inaccurate prediction model. Abdellatif et al. (2021) investigated the issue in the context of connected vehicles, where a single road event may be classified into various classes using multiple vehicles simultaneously. Each vehicle is equipped with a weak prediction model which can generate noisy labels. A critical aspect of noisy labeling is that observations with higher uncertainty are more prone to label noise, as discussed by Du and Ling (2010). This suggests that samples for which the classifier is less confident are also likely to be less certain for the labelers. This presents a challenge in uncertainty sampling methods, as the

tendency to select uncertain observations can unintentionally increase susceptibility to label noise.

Another motivating application of the problem described above is *automated claim management (ACM)* for warranty claims in manufacturing. Daily, warranty claims are submitted to companies and must be categorized into predefined categories. ACM employs machine learning models to categorize all incoming warranty claims. Concurrently, there is a manual process of binning these claims, performed by technicians who act as labelers and provide data for updating the classification model. Due to the large volume of warranty claim data, technicians can only label a subset of the claims. This limitation motivates the integration of Active Learning (AL) into the claim-binning process, leading to the development of an AL-based ACM process for the company. In each AL cycle, selected observations are sent to technicians for labeling, and the received labels are then used to update the classification model. However, due to differences in skill and experience levels, technicians may make mistakes during the manual binning process, resulting in noisy labels.

The main goal of this paper is to propose a novel active learning (AL) framework for selecting informative samples and assigning them to labelers, considering their skill levels and labeling noise. We refer to our method as *OLAS* (Optimal Labeler Assignment and Sampling for Active Learning). We examine the process of noise generation within the AL framework and develop a formulation for assigning query points to labelers, aiming to minimize worst-case noise. Additionally, we adapt the entropy sampling approach to address the challenge of imperfect labels by reformulating it as an optimization model. We also introduce an efficient method for solving this model to optimality.

Several studies have focused on classification problems involving noisy oracles. Gupta et al. (2019) proposed a method for denoising labels by adding an extra denoising layer to a neural network architecture. Other approaches aim to identify and correct erroneous labels. For example, Li et al. (2022) introduced an active label correction approach to identify and correct the most likely mislabeled instances. In the context of connected vehicles, Abdellatif et al. (2021) explored AL with noisy oracles with applications for connected vehicles. In this scenario, vehicles on a road can exchange information, aiding in various classifications. They proposed a method for selecting labelers based on quality, ensuring only competent annotators are chosen for annotation. Additionally, labeler integration methods are employed to mitigate the impact of noisy oracles on observation labels. These approaches involve multiple labelings for a single instance and aggregate these labels to reduce noise. However, such methods require a larger labeling budget to provide sufficient labels for classifiers. The primary objective of this paper is to introduce an approach that addresses the challenge of noisy oracles by annotating each observation with only a single labeler, thereby significantly reducing labeling costs.

The rest of the article is organized as follows. In Section 2 we discuss the steps of the AL framework and we state how our methodology will play a role in the framework of AL. Section 3 includes the details of our methodology by stating two optimization models to deal with noisy labels in the process. In Section 3 we validate the proposed framework through a numerical study using some publicly available data as well as a case study on ACM. Finally, we conclude the paper in Section 5




Figure 1: General framework for AL for classification. The AL cycle will be repeated for T cycles until the total sampling budget is consumed.

2 Overview of the Framework

The AL framework starts with some initially labeled data points. A classifier is then trained with these initially labeled instances. Due to labeling limitation in an AL paradigm, we can only label a partial subset of the unlabeled samples. Hence, we train and update the model sequentially, based on the a subset of newly labeled training samples in each cycle or iteration. Supposed that there a limited budget for labeling only $T \times B$ instances, where B is the labeling budget in each cycle and T is the number of cycles. We denote cycles by $t = 1, 2, \dots, T$.

At each cycle, a sampling criterion is utilized to choose B samples from the pool of unlabeled instances. These selected samples are then assigned to labelers according to the optimization model we propose in the next section, and their labels are queried. The new labels are added to the training set and the model is updated based on the new training set. This process will be repeated for T cycles. Figure 1 illustrates the overall AL framework.

Due to noisy oracles/labelers, we may receive incorrect labels in each cycle, which can degrade the performance of the classifier over time. To maintain an effective active learning (AL) process, it is essential to account for labeling noise in each cycle, both during sampling and assignment. To address this, we model the label noise and apply optimization techniques to propose a sampling strategy, followed by an assignment policy that together form a robust AL framework. We will first study the assignment problem and then propose the optimal sampling approach based on the findings from the labeler assignment problem.

3 Methodology

An AL problem starts with the query selection where the set of unlabeled instances will be investigated to select a set of samples called *query set*. The selection of the query set depends on the sampling strategy. For now, assume that we have used a specific sampling

strategy and obtained a query set $Q_t \subseteq U_t$, where Q_t and U_t denote the selected query set and set of unlabeled data points at Cycle t of AL.

After selecting the query set, each sample in the query set should be assigned to a labeler. We assume we have M labelers where the i -th labeler has an accuracy of $a_i \in [0, 1]$ and capacity of $c_i \in \mathbb{N}$. The accuracy of a labeler is defined as the probability of correctly labeling a sample. We assume these probabilities can be estimated using some historical data, and hence they are given parameters. The capacity is defined as the number of samples that a labeler can annotate in one cycle of AL. If we represent query set at cycle t by $Q_t = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{N_t}\}$, then $N_t \leq \sum_{i=1}^M c_i$ which implies that the number of selected query points at cycle t , N_t , should be bounded by the total labeling capacity.

We also assume that each query point should be labeled only one time using one labeler. This assumption will guide our models to find the best possible solution to deal with noisy labels without requiring multiple-labeling or relabeling a sample. The main question here is how to assign each query point to a labeler. To find out the optimal solution to this problem, we need to dive into the concept of label noise and study what happens after assigning a query point to a labeler.

3.1 Labeler Assignment and Noise Model

Once a selected query point is assigned to a labeler, the labeler examines the instance and returns the corresponding class for the point. Due to the existence of noisy oracles, the label received from the labeler might be incorrect. We assume that the label noise is measured with a value between 0 and 1 where 0 represents the perfect label (ground truth), and 1 shows the highest label noise level. As a general rule, label noise represents the probability that the received label from the oracle is incorrect. Intuitively, the label noise is affected by two factors: the uncertainty of the sample and the accuracy of the labeler. The uncertainty of a sample can be evaluated in a given cycle of AL using the most updated classification model. In this paper, We use the entropy measure to quantify the uncertainty of a data point. The estimated entropy of a given sample point x is calculated by

$$e(x) = - \sum_{i=1}^C P_{\theta}(y_i|x) \times \ln(P_{\theta}(y_i|x)), \quad (1)$$

where $P_{\theta}(y_i|x)$ is the probability that x belongs to class i . These probabilities are obtained from the most updated classification model with the model parameter θ .

Given this information, we measure noise using a noise function defined by $\epsilon(a, e(x)) : [0, 1]^2 \rightarrow [0, 1]$ where $a \in [0, 1]$ is the accuracy of the labeler, and $e(x) \in [0, 1]$ is the entropy of the selected unlabeled data point x . In general, any function of accuracy and entropy with the range of continuous values between 0 and 1 that follows the following conditions is regarded as a valid noise function: the function should be decreasing in terms of labeler accuracy and the function should be increasing in terms of sample uncertainty. The first property is straightforward since by using a high-accuracy labeler, we expect the label noise to decrease. The second property follows the fact that if a sample point is uncertain for the model, the labeler will have less confidence labeling the sample, and hence, the resulting label may have higher noise (Du and Ling, 2010). This simply means unlabeled data points with higher entropy receive higher noisy labels from oracles, and therefore, the noise function

should be an increasing function of the entropy measure. In our experiments, we explored two different valid noise functions.

After defining the noise function, the next step is to optimally assign query points to the available labelers using the noise function. In the next section, we provide an optimization formulation for the *labeler assignment model* to find the best possible assignment.

3.2 Labeler Assignment Model

Let us assume for a given cycle t , $Q_t = \{x_1, \dots, x_{N_t}\}$ is the set of query points selected based on some sampling criteria like uncertainty sampling approaches (Settles, 2009). We assume we have M labelers where the set of labelers accuracy is denoted as $A = \{a_1, \dots, a_M\}$. We formulate the optimization model using the following notations:

INDICES: $i \in \{1, \dots, M\} = [M]$: representing the indices for labelers, $j \in \{1, \dots, N_t\} = [N_t]$: representing the indices for query points.

PARAMETERS: $a_i \in [0, 1]$: accuracy of the i -th labeler, $c_i \in \mathbb{N}$: capacity of the i -th labeler, $e_j \in [0, 1]$: entropy of the j -th query point evaluated by the most updated classification model through AL.

VARIABLES:

$$z_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{; if we assign query point } x_j \text{ to the } i\text{-th labeler,} \\ 0 & \text{; otherwise,} \end{cases}, \forall i \in [M], \forall j \in [N_t].$$

OBJECTIVE FUNCTION: We are interested in an assignment model to minimize the maximum generated noise among all label noises. Since each data point is labeled only once, noise generated for the j -th point is $\sum_{i=1}^M \epsilon(a_i, e_j) z_{ij}$, and therefore, we intend to minimize $\max_j \sum_{i=1}^M \epsilon(a_i, e_j) z_{ij}$. Therefore, the labeler assignment model is defined by

$$\min_z \max_j \sum_{i=1}^M \epsilon(a_i, e_j) z_{ij}, \quad (2a)$$

s.t.

$$\sum_{i=1}^M z_{ij} = 1, \forall j \in [N_t], \quad (2b)$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^{N_t} z_{ij} \leq c_i, \forall i \in [M], \quad (2c)$$

$$z_{ij} \in \{0, 1\}, \forall i \in [M], \forall j \in [N_t]. \quad (2d)$$

The objective 2a minimizes the maximum noise among all labels. Constraint 2b emphasizes the single labeling assumption where each query point will be annotated only once using one labeler, and constraint 2c implies that the number of data points assigned to each labeler should be bounded by the labeler's capacity. Given that the c_i s are integer parameters, the structure of the constraints in model 2 implies that the model can be solved in polynomial time. Moreover, we propose a closed-form solution for the model as follows.

Theorem 1 Assume without loss of generality $e_1 \geq e_2 \geq \dots \geq e_{N_t}$ and $a_1 \geq a_2 \geq \dots \geq a_M$. Optimal solution to the model 2 is as follows:




Figure 2: An example of optimal assignment where $N_t = 5$, $M = 3$ and $c_1 = c_2 = c_3 = 2$. Red circles represent query points and blue triangles show labelers. Assuming that the points and labelers are sorted, $e_1 \geq e_2 \geq \dots \geq e_5$ and $a_1 \geq a_2 \geq a_3$, the assignment policy can be observed from the figure. Data points with higher entropy will be assigned to the labelers with higher accuracy.

$$z_{1j}^* = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } j \leq c_1, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}, \forall j \in \{1, \dots, N_t\}, \quad (3)$$

$$z_{ij}^* = \begin{cases} 1, & \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} c_k < j \leq \sum_{k=1}^i c_k, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}, \forall i \in \{2, \dots, M\}, \forall j \in \{1, \dots, N_t\}. \quad (4)$$

Proof for Theorem 1 is provided in the Appendix A. Theorem 1 indicates that the solution to the optimal assignment is independent of the structure of the noise model existing in the system. Moreover, the optimal solution in the Theorem 1, indicates an assignment policy as follows. For a given set of query points and labelers, a more uncertain query point (with higher entropy) should be assigned to the labeler with the highest accuracy. This policy for the assignment will guarantee the lowest maximum noise generated among all possible assignments. Figure 2 represents an example of the optimal assignment and the corresponding policy.

As discussed earlier, Model 2 finds the optimal assignment of a given set of query points to the labelers. However, it does not provide any guideline for which data points should be sampled at each cycle of the AL framework. Although one can utilize common sampling methods like entropy sampling to select the query set at each cycle, and then use Model 2 to assign optimally, if we use the optimal assignment policy given in Theorem 1 to define the sampling strategy, it will result in a more robust sampling to the label noise compared to the common entropy-based sampling approaches. In the following section, we propose an optimization model that is designed for the query selection, and is consistent with the optimal assignment policy.

3.3 Query Selection Model

The primary step in the active learning (AL) process is the selection of samples to enhance the training set for the next cycle. Specifically, we need to identify the optimal subset Q_t among all unlabeled data points denoted by U_t at cycle t of AL. The set U_t is defined as $U_t = \{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{u_t}\}$, where $u_t = |U_t|$. We assume the elements in U_t are sorted based

on their entropy measure i.e., $e_1 \geq e_2 \geq \dots \geq e_{u_t}$ and labelers are ranked based on their accuracy i.e., $a_1 \geq a_2 \geq \dots \geq a_M$.

In the case of accurate labels (i.e., no noisy labels), the following optimization model represents the entropy-based sampling strategy. Here, $y_k; k = 1, 2, \dots, u_t$, is a binary variable, and $y_k = 1$ if the unlabeled data point x_k with model entropy e_k is selected in the query set, and $\mathcal{C} = \sum_{i=1}^M c_i$.

$$\max_y \sum_{k=1}^{u_t} e_k y_k, \quad (5a)$$

s.t.

$$\sum_{k=1}^{u_t} y_k = \mathcal{C}, \quad (5b)$$

$$y_k \in \{0, 1\}. \quad (5c)$$

This model simply finds the largest possible subset with the data points with the highest entropy measure. Solving Model 5 is straightforward and can be achieved in polynomial time. After evaluating the entropy measure of all unlabeled data points, the points can be sorted based on their entropy and \mathcal{C} unlabeled points with the highest entropy will be selected. Moreover, the solution to this model is totally consistent with uncertainty sampling criteria where we believe uncertain points are more informative for the classification task.

However, when noisy oracles are present, selecting high-entropy points may lead to a higher level of labeling noise, potentially resulting in more incorrect labels. In this case, Model 5 should be modified to control the label noise with an upper bound. Due to different labeling skill levels, evaluating the labeling noise requires knowledge of how query points are assigned to labelers. The optimal assignment policy derived in Theorem 1 would help us formulate the label noise and propose an optimization model for the sampling strategy. Below, we propose the optimization model that simultaneously solves the query selection and assignment problems. We use the following notations:

INDICES: $i \in \{1, \dots, M\} = [M]$: representing the indices for labelers, $j \in \{1, \dots, u_t\} = [u_t]$: representing the indices for unlabeled data points at the beginning of cycle t .

PARAMETERS: $a_i \in [0, 1]$: accuracy of the i -th labeler, $c_i \in \mathbb{N}$: capacity of the i -th labeler, $e_j \in [0, 1]$: entropy of the j -th unlabeled data point evaluated by the most updated classification model through AL, $\beta \in [0, 1]$: an upper-bound on the generated noise for labels of query points.

VARIABLES:

$$y_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{; if unlabeled data point } x_j \text{ is selected as query} \\ & \text{point and will be assigned to the } i\text{-th labeler,} \\ 0 & \text{; otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad \forall i \in [M], \forall j \in [u_t].$$

OBJECTIVE FUNCTION: We are interested in selecting unlabeled data points with the highest entropy values. Given each data point is labeled at most once, i.e., $\sum_{i=1}^M y_{ij} \leq 1, \forall j \in [u_t]$, the objective function can be written as $\max \sum_{j=1}^{u_t} \sum_{i=1}^M e_j y_{ij}$.

Following is the optimization model for simultaneous data sampling and labeler assignment:

$$\max \sum_{j=1}^{u_t} \sum_{i=1}^M e_j y_{ij}, \quad (6a)$$

s.t.

$$\sum_{i=1}^M y_{ij} \leq 1, \quad \forall j \in [u_t], \quad (6b)$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^{u_t} y_{ij} \leq c_i, \quad \forall i \in [M], \quad (6c)$$

$$y_{ij} \epsilon(a_i, e_j) \leq \beta, \quad \forall i \in [M], \forall j \in [u_t], \quad (6d)$$

$$y_{kl} \leq 1 - y_{ij}, \quad \forall i \in \{2, \dots, M\}, \forall j \in [u_t - 1], \forall k \in [i - 1], \forall l \in \{j + 1, \dots, u_t\}, \quad (6e)$$

$$z_i \leq c_i - \sum_{j=1}^{u_t} y_{ij}, \quad \forall i \in [M], \quad (6f)$$

$$z_i \geq \frac{1}{c_i} (c_i - \sum_{j=1}^{u_t} y_{ij}), \quad \forall i \in [M], \quad (6g)$$

$$\sum_{j=1}^{u_t} y_{i+1,j} \leq c_{i+1} (1 - z_i), \quad \forall i \in [M - 1], \quad (6h)$$

$$y_{ij} \in \{0, 1\}, z_i \in \{0, 1\}, \quad \forall i \in [M], \forall j \in [u_t]. \quad (6i)$$

The objective (6a) maximizes the summation of entropy measures for the selected data points which is consistent with the entropy sampling. Constraint (6b) implies that each unlabeled point should be selected and labeled at most once to be included in the query set. Constraint (6c) shows the capacity limitation of each labeler. Constraint (6d) represents the upper bound for noise. If data point x_j is selected and assigned to the i -th labeler, the generated noise $\epsilon(a_i, e_j)$ should be less than or equal to the pre-defined upper bound β .

Constraints (6b) to (6d) impose feasibility without considering any assignment policy. Therefore, constraints (6e) to (6h) are added to impose the optimal assignment policy defined by Theorem 1. Specifically, the optimal assignment policy is achieved by enforcing two conditions at the same time:

- If the j -th data point is selected and assigned to the i -th labeler, none of the data points with an index smaller than j should be assigned to a labeler with an index greater than i . This condition is imposed by Constraint (6e).
- If the i -th labeler has any remaining capacity, there should be no assigned points to all labelers with an index greater than i . This condition is achieved by defining additional binary variable z and imposing Constraints (6f) to (6h).

The optimal solution to Model (6) provides all the necessary information to determine the query points and the optimal assignment in our active learning framework. Specifically, for an unlabeled data point x_j , if there exists an index $i \in [M]$ such that $y_{ij}^* = 1$, then x_j

is selected as a query point to be labeled. Formally, the set of query points at cycle t is defined as:

$$Q_t^* = \{x_j \mid x_j \in U_t, y_{ij}^* = 1, \forall i \in [M], \forall j \in [u_t]\}. \quad (7)$$

Furthermore, if $y_{ij}^* = 1$, this indicates that the sample x_j is optimally assigned to the i -th labeler for annotation.

Accurate noise modeling and selection of the parameter β are crucial for solving the proposed optimization model. In practice, these need to be estimated from data derived from the domain. In Section 3.4, we explain how to estimate the noise model and parameter β , which act as inputs to our optimization model. The following theorem provides the solution to the Model 6.

Theorem 2 *Assume without loss of generality $e_1 \geq e_2 \geq \dots \geq e_{u_t}$ and $a_1 \geq a_2 \geq \dots \geq a_M$. For each $i \in [M]$, **if exists**, define r_i as*

$$r_i = \arg \min_{r \in \mathbb{Z}} \{r : \epsilon(a_i, e_r) \leq \beta, r_{i-1} + c_{i-1} \leq r, 1 \leq r \leq u_t\}.$$

For convention, we define $r_0 = 0$ and $c_0 = 0$. Obviously, if r_u does not exist, then r_v does not exist $\forall v \in \{u, \dots, u_t\}$.

$$y_{ij}^* = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } r_i \text{ exists and } r_i \leq j < r_i + c_i, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}, \quad \forall i \in [M], \forall j \in [u_t], \quad (8)$$

$$z_i^* = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } c_i - \sum_{j=1}^{u_t} y_{ij}^* > 0, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases}, \quad \forall i \in [M]. \quad (9)$$

Proof for Theorem 2 is provided in the Appendix B. Using Theorem 2, a polynomial time algorithm in Algorithm 1 is proposed that returns the selected query points and the optimal assignment of query points to the labelers.

In summary, At the start of each AL cycle, given a set of unlabeled data points U_t , we solve Model 6 using Algorithm 1 to determine the optimal set of query points and assign a labeler to each selected point. Once the labels are received, the query points are removed from the set of unlabeled points and added to the set of labeled points. The classifier is then updated based on the new labeled data, and the process continues through subsequent AL cycles until termination.

Algorithm 1: Optimal Sampling and Labeler Assignment for Cycle t of AL

Input:

- U_t : set of unlabeled data points, sorted in descending order based on the entropy.
- $v \leftarrow 1$: representing index of first uninspected data point in U_t .
- A : set of the accuracy of labelers, sorted in descending order based on accuracy.
- $u \leftarrow 1$: representing index of first available labeler in A with the highest accuracy.
- c_i : capacity of labelers c_i where $\mathcal{C} = \sum_{i=1}^M c_i$.
- $\epsilon(a, e)$: estimated noise model
- β : estimated noise upper-bound parameter
- $Q_t \leftarrow \emptyset$: set of optimal selected samples.

Output: Set of optimal selected samples Q_t and the corresponding labeler assignment for cycle t .

```

1 while  $|Q_t| < \mathcal{C}$  do
2   while  $v \leq |U_t|$  do
3     if  $\epsilon(a_u, e_v) \leq \beta$  then
4        $k \leftarrow \min\{|U_t| - v, c_u - 1\}$ ;
5       Add  $x_v, x_{v+1}, \dots, x_{v+k}$  to set  $Q_t$ ;
6       Assign points  $x_v, x_{v+1}, \dots, x_{v+k}$  to labeler  $u$  ;
7        $u \leftarrow u + 1$  ;
8        $v \leftarrow v + k$  ;
9     else
10       $v \leftarrow v + 1$  ;
11 return  $Q_t$  and the corresponding optimal labeler assignment.
```

3.4 Estimating Noise Model and Parameter β

To formulate and solve the proposed model in practice, we need an estimate of the noise function and the parameter β . To obtain these estimates, we assume access to a dataset with *golden labels*, i.e., true underlying labels for the samples. This dataset can be created by employing experts as labelers (with labeling accuracy of 1). Once true labels are available for all samples in the golden set, these samples can then be labeled by all available labelers, allowing us to estimate the underlying noise function by comparing the estimated labels with the true labels.

This problem can be framed as a simple classification task with two features: the entropy of the sample and the accuracy of the labeler, and a binary output representing whether the estimated label is correct. This classification task can be further formulated as a logistic regression problem with a two-dimensional input and a binary output. The resulting probability function can then serve as an estimate of the noise function. Figure 3 illustrates the experimental framework for estimating the noise function. For each sample-labeler pair in the golden set, we define a two-dimensional feature $x = (e, a)$, where e is the entropy of the sample and a is the accuracy of the labeler. The binary output z is 0 if the label is




Figure 3: Experimental framework for estimating the noise function. Each sample point is evaluated by both an oracle and each labeler. The resulting data is then used to train a logistic regression classifier to estimate the noise function.

incorrect and 1 if the label is correct. A logistic regression classifier is then applied to the data, providing an estimate of the noise function: $\epsilon(e, a) = \mathbb{P}(z = 0 \mid x = (e, a))$.

Estimating the parameter β is crucial, as it represents a trade-off in our model: smaller values of β exclude noisier samples, resulting in a smaller feasible set for Model 6. This may lead to a reduced training set for the next cycle of active learning (AL) compared to cases with larger β values. With an estimate of the noise function in hand, β can be determined through hyperparameter tuning, an efficient process since Algorithm 1 provides a fast method for solving Model 6. Given a set of samples with golden labels, we divide it into two parts: one subset is used to solve the optimization model, serving as set U to identify the best sampling points and optimal assignments. The remaining data subset is used to evaluate the trained classification model and select the optimal value of β .

4 Experiments and Results

In this section, we conduct some numerical studies to evaluate the performance of the proposed methodology and compare it with some benchmark approaches using publicly available data sets. Finally, a case study on labeling warranty-related complaints at an automotive company is conducted to further demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed approach to noise prevention within the AL framework.

4.1 Experiments on Data Sets

In this part we perform experiments using four data sets for classification provided by *UCI Machine Learning Repository* Dua and Graff (2017): Statlog (Heart), Ionosphere, Connectionist Bench, and Spambase. Table 1 represents a summary of each data set. The Statlog (Heart) dataset contains medical data, including features like age and cholesterol levels, and is used to predict the presence or absence of heart disease. The Ionosphere dataset involves radar signal data, where the goal is to classify signals as either clear or noisy. The Connectionist Bench (Sonar) dataset includes sonar signal data, aiming to distinguish between signals bounced off a rock or a metal mine. Lastly, the Spambase dataset focuses on email

classification, using features such as word frequencies and punctuation marks to differentiate between spam and non-spam emails. These datasets are widely used in machine learning for classification tasks in areas such as healthcare, signal processing, and email filtering.

Table 1: Data Sets Used for Experiments

Data Set	Number of Features	Number of Instances
Statlog (Heart)	13	270
Ionosphere	34	351
Connectionist Bench	60	208
Spambase	57	4601

In order to evaluate and compare different approaches, we consider two different noise models in our experiments:

- **Noise Model 1** where we assume $\epsilon(a_i, e_j) = e_j(1 - a_i)$.
- **Noise Model 2** where we consider the function,

$$\epsilon(a_i, e_j) = \begin{cases} (1 - a_i^{2e_j})^{\frac{1}{2e_j}}, & \text{if } 0 \leq e_j \leq 0.5, \\ 1 - (1 - (1 - a_i)^{2(1-e_j)})^{\frac{1}{2(1-e_j)}}, & \text{if } 0.5 < e_j \leq 1. \end{cases}$$

Both functions follow the properties of a noise model, that is they are decreasing in accuracy and increasing in entropy. Figure 4 shows the contours of the second noise function for four fixed entropy values.

The outcome of the noise functions is compared with a threshold, denoted by α to determine whether a label is noisy (incorrect) for a labeled data point. Specifically, for a data point with entropy measure e_j assigned to a labeler with accuracy a_i , the label noise is equal to $\epsilon(a_i, e_j)$. If $\epsilon(a_i, e_j) \geq \alpha$, the label noise is higher than the threshold, and hence, the resulting label will be incorrect. Otherwise, the label is correct matching the ground truth.

As for the benchmark methods, we choose two sampling strategies: random sampling (RS) and entropy sampling (ES). In RS, at each cycle of AL, we pick a fixed number of samples randomly from the set of unlabeled points, however in ES, each unlabeled point is measured based on entropy measure and the instances with the highest entropy are selected. Additionally, for labeler assignment, we consider two approaches: random labeler assignment (RLA) and optimal labeler assignment (OLA). In RLA, each query point will be assigned randomly to a labeler, however in OLA, we use the Model 2 to optimally assign query points to the labelers. In this setting, we have four benchmark methods, along with our proposed approach, designated as follows:

- RS+RLA: which uses RS for sampling and RLA for assignment
- RS+OLA: which uses RS for sampling and OLA for assignment
- ES+RLA: which uses ES for sampling and RLA for assignment
- ES+OLA: which uses ES for sampling and OLA for assignment




Figure 4: Plot of Noise Model 2 for different values of entropy. Plots show that the function is decreasing in terms of labeler accuracy and increasing in terms of data point entropy.

- OLAS: our proposed method based on the optimal solution to the Model 6

We use the F1 score metric to compare the performance of approaches. For this experiment, we fix the value of parameter $\alpha = 0.2$ and we run 10 AL cycles on each data set for two different noise models. Given the size of the dataset, we determine a proper sampling budget in each AL cycle for each dataset, the number of labelers (M), and the capacity of each labeler which is assumed same for all labelers. Table 2 shows the experimental settings for each data set. The accuracy of labelers is generated from a uniform distribution between 0.5 to 0.95, and Random Forest classifier is used for training the classifier with default settings defined in *scikit-learn* package in Python (Pedregosa et al., 2011).

Table 2: Experimental Settings

Data Set	Sampling Budget	M	Capacity
Statlog (Heart)	15	5	3
Ionosphere	20	5	4
Connectionist Bench	12	4	3
Spambase	258	17	16

Each experiment is replicated 100 times for each data set and noise model. For each dataset, 20% of the instances are allocated for testing, while the remaining 80% are utilized for model training. Table 3 presents the F1 score results on test data for the Noise Model 1. As observed, our proposed approach achieves a higher F1 score across all tested datasets, with an improvement of at least 0.416. This is due to the fact that other baseline methods

are either unable to assign points optimally to labelers or they choose sample points with a high risk of receiving noisy labels. Among other baseline methods, ES+OLA returns better results in most cases. This aligns with our expectations, as this approach focuses on highly informative samples compared to RS-based methods. Furthermore, utilizing optimal labeler assignment helps reduce the noise associated with the selected query points. However, we observe that optimal labeler assignment alone is not sufficient for effective label noise reduction. It is also essential to carefully select appropriate samples, a factor considered in our proposed method.

Table 3: F1 Score Results Based on Noise Model 1 (mean \pm standard deviation)

Data Set	RS+RLA	RS+OLA	ES+RLA	ES+OLA	OLAS
Statlog (Heart)	0.344 ± 0.095	0.296 ± 0.104	0.272 ± 0.083	0.353 ± 0.106	0.769 ± 0.051
Ionosphere	0.328 ± 0.098	0.306 ± 0.116	0.270 ± 0.080	0.338 ± 0.133	0.773 ± 0.063
Connectionist Bench	0.347 ± 0.088	0.332 ± 0.100	0.267 ± 0.085	0.347 ± 0.104	0.769 ± 0.054
Spambase	0.321 ± 0.093	0.319 ± 0.108	0.260 ± 0.083	0.342 ± 0.103	0.785 ± 0.050

Table 4 shows the results for Noise model 2. The same results can be achieved from the second noise model as well. Our proposed approach outperforms the other methods in terms of F1 score, achieving an improvement of at least 0.4. Again, the ES+OLA method returns better results compared to other methods. The other observation is that the range of results for the two noise models is pretty similar which shows that the robustness of the results to the variation of noise models.

The other important observation is that OLA is useful when ES is utilized for sampling. When RS is utilized OLA is not improving the performance compared to randomly assigning samples to labelers. This occurs because ES selects samples with the highest uncertainty, making them more likely to receive noisy labels. Thus, the use of OLA is beneficial in this context. Conversely, the diversity of sample entropy is typically low when using RS, meaning that the way samples are assigned to labelers does not significantly impact the control of label noise. On the other hand, ES+RLA is performing worse than RS+RLA.

4.2 Case Study

In this case study, we address the ACM problem, where daily warranty claims must be categorized into appropriate classes to assist with root-cause identification. We use warranty claims data from Ford Motor Company. Due to confidentiality concerns, the data is not publicly available, and a complete description cannot be provided. The Data set includes some categorical and numerical features explaining the characteristics of the vehicle given in a warranty claim as well as the details and description of the warranty issue. Each warranty claim can be categorized into 36 predefined classes. Finding the appropriate label for a given warranty requires manual labeling, relying on expert technicians who label the claims in their spare time. Due to the time limitations, the team is not able to label all claims. Therefore, an AL framework is used to identify a subset of claims for labeling in each cycle, and to sequentially update the model. On the other hand, each technician may have different experience and skill levels which results in different labeling accuracy and may return wrong incorrect during the annotation process.

Table 4: F1 Score Results Based on Nose Model 2 (mean \pm standard deviation)

Data Set	RS+RLA	RS+OLA	ES+RLA	ES+OLA	OLAS
Statlog (Heart)	0.341 ± 0.093	0.308 ± 0.109	0.272 ± 0.089	0.369 ± 0.119	0.769 ± 0.056
Ionosphere	0.344 ± 0.100	0.328 ± 0.096	0.268 ± 0.092	0.368 ± 0.110	0.778 ± 0.053
Connectionist Bench	0.351 ± 0.101	0.318 ± 0.099	0.265 ± 0.084	0.334 ± 0.113	0.769 ± 0.050
Spambase	0.345 ± 0.092	0.316 ± 0.115	0.256 ± 0.087	0.339 ± 0.120	0.768 ± 0.059

Due to the lack of sufficient historical labeled data with corresponding ground truth, we simulate labelers with varying levels of accuracy. Furthermore, we employ the noise model 1, as described in the previous section, to generate label noise. The experiment is conducted over 10 replications, each consisting of 10 AL cycles. In proportion to the size of the training dataset, we allocated a fixed sampling budget of 1900 samples for each cycle of active learning. All comparative approaches are trained on the XGBoost classifier with identical settings in each replication, starting with 16 percent of the training set as the initially labeled dataset.

Figure 5 displays the median of the F1 score for each approach across 10 cycles. The dashed line indicates the performance of the classifier on the whole dataset with true labels, providing an upper bound of 0.127 for all approaches. It is observed that the proposed OLAS approach is capable of training a robust model resistant to noisy labels compared to other methods and as expected its F1 score is gradually converging to the upper bound as more labeled data become available. Moreover, other methods result in almost the same performance, where the ES+OLA approach has slightly better performance compared to other approaches, indicating that utilizing the optimal assignment model is still beneficial for noise reduction. However, the optimal assignment alone is not sufficient since the sample points also play a crucial role in training the model. Therefore, the OLAS method, which incorporates optimal sample selection and assignment, results in significantly better outcomes compared to other benchmark approaches. Additionally, the success of the entire active learning (AL) process relies on the consistent improvement of the classification model as it is trained with more samples in each cycle. However, the presence of noisy labels can disrupt this improvement, potentially leading to a classifier that, after a fixed number of cycles, performs worse than one trained on the initial dataset. This phenomenon is demonstrated in the results of the RS+OLA approach.

To better interpret the results, we focus on the box plot in Figure 6, which presents all 10 replications for the final classifier trained at the end of the last cycle. The results indicate that the performance of the OLAS method is significantly better than that of other benchmarks. Furthermore, the variation of F1 scores obtained by the OLAS method is notably smaller than those of other methods, indicating greater consistency in the outcomes of the proposed method. The mean \pm standard deviation for RS+RLA, RS+OLA, ES+RLA, ES+OLA, and OLAS is 0.083 ± 0.004 , 0.082 ± 0.004 , 0.087 ± 0.006 , 0.088 ± 0.005 , and 0.106 ± 0.003 , respectively. These results further demonstrate that the proposed method not only provides a higher mean but also a smaller variance in terms of the F1 score.




Figure 5: Median outcomes of 10 replications over 10 cycles. The dashed line represents the benchmark performance achieved using the entire dataset with accurate labels. It is evident that the proposed approach surpasses the performance of baseline methodologies.




Figure 6: Box plot of F1 scores over 10 replications for the classifier in the final cycle of AL. The proposed approach demonstrates significantly higher performance compared to other methods, yielding better results with lower variability.

5 Conclusion

In practice, inaccurate annotation from noisy oracles leads to inaccurate training of machine-learning models. In an active learning framework, highly uncertain data points are desirable choices for annotation. However, these points are due to a higher label noise. To control noise in the active learning framework, we study the operations within the active learning procedure. We consider a noise function to be a function of the accuracy of the annotator and the uncertainty of the labeler. It is worth mentioning that accurate estimation of sample uncertainty and labelers' accuracy plays an important role in selecting the best samples and the optimal assignment of samples to labelers. In practice, measuring the accuracies of labelers might be troublesome, requiring both budget and time. However, our results demonstrate that achieving accurate assessments for labelers is crucial and can lead to significant improvements in our model.

Our experiments show that labeler assignment affects the generated noise, and hence, using an optimal assignment policy can be effective in reducing the number of incorrect labels. On the other hand, query selection is another factor that affects the label noise. A formulation was proposed to optimally sample data points at each cycle of AL by maximizing the information while bounding the label noise. Experimental results represent the effectiveness of our sampling approach along with the optimal assignment policy to build a robust classification model in an AL framework.

Appendix A.

In this appendix, we prove Theorem 1 from Section 3.2:

Proof For any $j \in [N_t]$, there exists exactly one $i \in [M]$ such that $\sum_{k=1}^{i-1} c_k < j \leq \sum_{k=1}^i c_k$. Therefore, equations (3) and (4) imply that $\sum_{i=1}^M z_{ij}^* = 1$. Additionally, since $N_t \leq \sum_{k=1}^M c_k$ and there are at most c_k values of $j \in [N_t]$ such that $\sum_{k=1}^{i-1} c_k < j \leq \sum_{k=1}^i c_k$, we have $\sum_{j=1}^{N_t} z_{ij} \leq c_i, \forall i \in [M]$. Hence, equations (3) and (4) define a feasible solution z^* for model 2. To prove the optimality of z^* , we define the set

$$\Pi^* = \{(i, j) \mid i \in [M], j \in [N_t], z_{ij}^* = 1\}.$$

For a given feasible solution z , we define

$$\Pi = \{(i, j) \mid i \in [M], j \in [N_t], z_{ij} = 1\}.$$

We define the objective function as $f(z) = \max_j \sum_{i=1}^M \epsilon(a_i, e_j) z_{ij}$, and since $\sum_{i=1}^M z_{ij} = 1, \forall j \in [N_t]$, for any feasible solution z , there exists $(i, j) \in \Pi$ such that $f(z) = \epsilon(a_i, e_j)$. Let us assume $f(z^*) = \epsilon(a_{i^*}, e_{j^*})$. We then consider the following cases:

1. If $(i^*, j^*) \in \Pi$, then $f(z) \geq \epsilon(a_{i^*}, e_{j^*}) = f(z^*)$.
2. If $(i^*, j^*) \notin \Pi$, there exists $w \in [M]$ such that $(w, j^*) \in \Pi$ and $w \neq i^*$. In this case, there are two possibilities:
 - (a) If $w > i^*$, then $f(z) \geq \epsilon(a_w, e_{j^*}) \geq \epsilon(a_{i^*}, e_{j^*}) = f(z^*)$.
 - (b) If $w < i^*$, the remaining capacity for all labelers with an index less than or equal to i^* is $\sum_{k=1}^{i^*} c_k - 1$. On the other hand, there are $j^* - 1$ available points for assignment with an index less than j^* . From equations (3) and (4), we can infer that

$$j^* \leq \sum_{k=1}^{i^*} c_k \implies j^* - 1 \leq \sum_{k=1}^{i^*} c_k - 1.$$

This means the number of available points for assignment with an index less than j^* is less than or equal to the remaining capacity for all labelers with an index less than or equal to i^* . Therefore, there exists $u \in [N_t]$ and $v \in [M]$ such that $u < j^*, v \geq i^*$, and $(u, v) \in \Pi$. This implies

$$f(z) \geq \epsilon(a_v, e_u) \geq \epsilon(a_{i^*}, e_{j^*}) = f(z^*).$$

Thus, for any feasible solution z , $f(z) \geq f(z^*)$, and z^* is the optimal solution. ■

Appendix B.

In this appendix, we prove Theorem 2 from Section 3.3:

Proof The proof addresses both the feasibility and optimality of the solutions (8) and (9).

- **Feasibility:** We show that y^* and z^* , defined in (8) and (9), satisfy all constraints.
 - Constraint (6b): Based on Theorem 2, for each $j \in [u_t]$, if there exists r_i such that $r_i \leq j < r_i + c_i$, then $\nexists i' \in [M]$ such that $i' \neq i$ and $r_{i'} \leq j < r_{i'} + c_{i'}$, hence $\sum_{i=1}^M y_{ij}^* = 1$. If $\nexists i \in [M]$ such that $r_i \leq j < r_i + c_i$, then $\sum_{i=1}^M y_{ij}^* = 0$, so in general $\sum_{i=1}^M y_{ij}^* \leq 1$.
 - Constraint (6c): For each $i \in [M]$, if r_i does not exist, then $\sum_{j=1}^{u_t} y_{ij}^* = 0$. If r_i exists, there are at most c_i values of j such that $r_i \leq j < r_i + c_i$ and $y_{ij}^* = 1$, so $\sum_{j=1}^{u_t} y_{ij}^* \leq c_i$.
 - Constraint (6d): For each $i \in [M]$, $y_{ij}^* = 1$ only if r_i exists, and by definition, if r_i exists, then $\epsilon(a_i, e_{r_i}) \leq \beta$. The property of the noise function implies that if $\epsilon(a_i, e_{r_i}) \leq \beta$, then $\epsilon(a_i, e_{r_i+u}) \leq \beta$ for any positive integer u . Therefore, for all values of j such that $r_i \leq j < r_i + c_i$, we have $\epsilon(a_i, e_j) \leq \beta$, ensuring the constraint holds.
 - Constraint (6e): If $y_{ij}^* = 1$, then r_i exists and $r_i \leq j < r_i + c_i$. Assume $y_{kl}^* = 1$ and $k < i$, based on equation (8), $r_k \leq l < r_k + c_k$. From Theorem 2,

$$r_k \leq l < r_k + c_k \leq r_i \leq j < r_i + c_i.$$

Thus, $l < j$, which implies $y_{kl}^* = 0, \forall k \in [M], k < i$, and $\forall l \in [u_t], l > j$.

- Constraints (6f) to (6h): Since we have shown that Constraint (6c) holds, $\sum_{j=1}^{u_t} y_{ij}^* \leq c_i, \forall i \in [M]$. For any $i \in [M]$, if $\sum_{j=1}^{u_t} y_{ij}^* = c_i$, then Constraints (6f) and (6g) imply that $z_i = 0$, and thus Constraint (6h) reduces to $\sum_{j=1}^{u_t} y_{i+1,j}^* \leq c_{i+1}$, which holds because y^* satisfies Constraint (6c). If $\sum_{j=1}^{u_t} y_{ij}^* < c_i$, then Constraints (6f) and (6g) imply that $z_i = 1$, and hence Constraint (6h) will reduce to $\sum_{j=1}^{u_t} y_{i+1,j}^* = 0$. This holds since if r_i does not exist, then r_{i+1} does not exist and $\sum_{j=1}^{u_t} y_{i+1,j}^* = 0$. If r_i exists, $\sum_{j=1}^{u_t} y_{ij}^* < c_i$ implies that $r_i \leq u_t < r_i + c_i$, and this implies that r_{i+1} does not exist and again $\sum_{j=1}^{u_t} y_{i+1,j}^* = 0$.

Hence, y^* satisfies all constraints in Model 6 and is a feasible solution.

- **Optimality:** For a given feasible solution (y, z) and the optimal solution (y^*, z^*) , we want to prove that $\sum_{j=1}^{u_t} \sum_{i=1}^M e_j y_{ij}^* \geq \sum_{j=1}^{u_t} \sum_{i=1}^M e_j y_{ij}$.

Let us define the following notations:

$$L^* = \left\{ j \in [u_t] \mid \sum_{i=1}^M y_{i,j}^* = 1 \right\},$$

$$L = \left\{ j \in [u_t] \mid \sum_{i=1}^M y_{i,j} = 1 \right\}.$$

Hence, L^* denotes the index of all samples labeled by labelers given by (8) and (9), and L denotes the index of all samples labeled by labelers given by an arbitrary feasible solution. We also define, $\bar{r} = \max \{j \in [u_t] \mid j \in L^*\}$, which denotes the index of the last sample labeled given (8) and (9).

We first prove the following statement: $\forall j \leq \bar{r}$, if $\sum_{i=1}^M y_{ij} = 1$ for any feasible solution y , then $\sum_{i=1}^M y_{ij}^* = 1$. The statement is true since if $\sum_{i=1}^M y_{ij} = 1$, this means $\exists i' \in [M]$, such that $\epsilon(a_{i'}, e_j) \leq \beta$. This implies that $\exists i \leq i'$ such that, r_i exists and $y_{ij}^* = 1$ or in other words, $\sum_{i=1}^M y_{ij}^* = 1$. This implies that if j -th sample is labeled in any feasible solution, it must be also sampled in optimal solution.

Let us denote $C = \{j \leq \bar{r} \mid y_{i,j} = 1\}$, and $R = \{j > \bar{r} \mid y_{ij}^* = 1\}$ which implies $L = C \cup R$. Given the statement above, we conclude $C \subseteq L^*$. Hence, $L^* = R^* \cup L$ where $R^* = \{j \in L^* \mid j \notin C\}$. We can further conclude,

$$\begin{aligned} f^* - f &= \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{j \in R^*} e_j y_{ij}^* - \sum_{i=1}^M \sum_{j \in R} e_j y_{ij} \\ &= \sum_{j \in R^*} e_j - \sum_{j \in R} e_j. \end{aligned}$$

Since, $\forall j \in R^*, j \leq \bar{r}$ and $\forall j \in R, j > \bar{r}$, this implies that $\forall j \in R^*, j \leq \bar{r}$ and hence, $f^* \geq f$. ■

References

- Alaa Awad Abdellatif, Carla Fabiana Chiasserini, Francesco Malandrino, Amr Mohamed, and Aiman Erbad. Active learning with noisy labelers for improving classification accuracy of connected vehicles. *IEEE Transactions on Vehicular Technology*, 70(4):3059–3070, 2021.
- Jun Du and Charles X Ling. Active learning with human-like noisy oracle. In *2010 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining*, pages 797–802. IEEE, 2010.
- Dheeru Dua and Casey Graff. UCI machine learning repository, 2017. URL <http://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml>.
- Mostafa Reisi Gahrooei, Kamaran Paynabar, Massimo Pacella, and Bianca Maria Colosimo. An adaptive fused sampling approach of high-accuracy data in the presence of low-accuracy data. *IJSE Transactions*, 51(11):1251–1264, 2019.
- Gaurav Gupta, Anit Kumar Sahu, and Wan-Yi Lin. Learning in confusion: Batch active learning with noisy oracle. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1909.12473*, 2019.
- Hanyan Huang, Zecong Liu, Hongyu Zheng, Xiaoyu Xu, and Yanhui Duan. A proportional expected improvement criterion-based multi-fidelity sequential optimization method. *Structural and Multidisciplinary Optimization*, 66(2):30, 2023.
- Mark E Johnson, Leslie M Moore, and Donald Ylvisaker. Minimax and maximin distance designs. *Journal of statistical planning and inference*, 26(2):131–148, 1990.

- Lusi Li, Haibo He, and Jie Li. Entropy-based sampling approaches for multi-class imbalanced problems. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 32(11): 2159–2170, 2019.
- Shao-Yuan Li, Ye Shi, Sheng-Jun Huang, and Songcan Chen. Improving deep label noise learning with dual active label correction. *Machine Learning*, pages 1–22, 2022.
- F. Pedregosa, G. Varoquaux, A. Gramfort, V. Michel, B. Thirion, O. Grisel, M. Blondel, P. Prettenhofer, R. Weiss, V. Dubourg, J. Vanderplas, A. Passos, D. Cournapeau, M. Brucher, M. Perrot, and E. Duchesnay. Scikit-learn: Machine learning in Python. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 12:2825–2830, 2011.
- Thomas J Santner, Brian J Williams, William I Notz, Thomas J Santner, Brian J Williams, and William I Notz. Space-filling designs for computer experiments. *The design and analysis of computer experiments*, pages 145–200, 2018.
- Tobias Scheffer, Christian Decomain, and Stefan Wrobel. Active hidden markov models for information extraction. In *International symposium on intelligent data analysis*, pages 309–318. Springer, 2001.
- Burr Settles. Active learning literature survey. 2009.
- Burr Settles and Mark Craven. An analysis of active learning strategies for sequence labeling tasks. In *proceedings of the 2008 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing*, pages 1070–1079, 2008.
- Mohan Singh, Eoin Curran, and Pádraig Cunningham. Active learning for multi-label image annotation. Technical report, University College Dublin. School of Computer Science and Informatics, 2009.
- Gijs JJ van Houtum and Mihaela L Vlasea. Active learning via adaptive weighted uncertainty sampling applied to additive manufacturing. *Additive Manufacturing*, 48:102411, 2021.