

SimLabel: Similarity-Weighted Semi-supervision for Multi-annotator Learning with Missing Labels

Liyun Zhang
D3 Center, Osaka University
Japan
zhang.liyun@ids.osaka-u.ac.jp

Zheng Lian
Institute of automation, Chinese
academy of science
China

Hong Liu
Xiamen University
China

Takanori Takebe
Cincinnati Children's Hospital
Medical Center
Japan

Yuta Nakashima
D3 Center, Osaka University
Japan

ABSTRACT

Multi-annotator learning has emerged as an important research direction for capturing diverse perspectives in subjective annotation tasks. Typically, due to the large scale of datasets, each annotator can only label a subset of samples, resulting in incomplete (or missing) annotations per annotator. Traditional methods generally skip model updates for missing parts, leading to inefficient data utilization. In this paper, we propose a novel similarity-weighted semi-supervised learning framework (SimLabel) that leverages inter-annotator similarities to generate weighted soft labels. This approach enables the prediction, utilization, and updating of missing parts rather than discarding them. Meanwhile, we introduce a confidence assessment mechanism combining maximum probability with entropy-based uncertainty metrics to prioritize high-confidence predictions to impute missing labels during training as an iterative refinement pipeline, which continuously improves both inter-annotator similarity estimates and individual model performance. We contribute a new video emotion recognition dataset, AMER2, with higher missing rates. Experimental results demonstrate the effectiveness of our method.

CCS CONCEPTS

• **Computing methodologies** → **Semi-supervised learning settings**; **Machine learning**; **Multi-task learning**.

KEYWORDS

Multi-annotator Learning, Missing Labels, Soft Label, Annotator Similarity, Semi-supervision

1 INTRODUCTION

Multi-annotator learning (MAL) has recently emerged as an important research direction [28], aiming to build independent models for

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than the author(s) must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

© 2025 Copyright held by the owner/author(s). Publication rights licensed to ACM.
ACM ISBN 978-x-xxxx-xxxx-x/YY/MM
<https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnnn.nnnnnnn>




Figure 1: Comparisons. Three annotators label a video sample with different annotations, with the third annotator's label missing. (a) In existing methods, the predicted label distribution $\hat{p}_3$ from *annotator 3's* model M_3 lacks supervision due to the missing label, resulting in the model training being skipped without updates. (b) In contrast, our proposed method leverages similarities of annotators' labeling patterns derived from the dataset to generate a soft label $\hat{p}_{3,soft}$ that closely approximates *annotator 3's* true label. This is achieved by applying similarity-weighted aggregation to the predictions $\hat{p}_1$ and $\hat{p}_2$ from other annotator models, enabling semi-supervised updating of models with missing labels.

each annotator to capture their different labeling patterns. MAL has gained popularity due to its broad applicability in crowdsourcing-driven tasks, such as emotion recognition, medical diagnosis, and industrial manufacturing.

MAL frequently faces the challenge of missing or incomplete labels. This stems from the nature of crowdsourcing, where annotators are typically assigned portions of data rather than entire datasets to enhance annotation efficiency [14]. The problem becomes particularly acute in large-scale datasets, where obtaining complete annotations from every expert would be prohibitively expensive or impractical, where annotators may only label a subset of the data due to time constraints, domain expertise limitations, or resource allocation strategies.

Existing MAL methods generally ignore the challenge of missing labels in multi-annotator learning. Traditional approaches to this problem often just resort to simply discarding instances with missing labels during the training of annotator-specific models, leading to a low data utilization rate and a potential risk of model overfitting for large missing labels. To address this limitation, we propose a novel similarity-weighted semi-supervised learning framework (SimLabel). Our method calculates pairwise similarities between annotators' labeling patterns and uses these similarity scores to generate weighted soft labels for missing annotations.

Specifically, consider the example in Figure 1, which involves three annotators (i.e., A_1 , A_2 , and A_3). For a given sample, A_1 and A_2 provide emotion labels, while A_3 's annotation is missing. As shown in Figure 1(a), existing approaches train separate models (i.e., M_1 , M_2 , and M_3) for each annotator and predict individual label distributions (i.e., $\hat{p}_1$, $\hat{p}_2$, and $\hat{p}_3$, respectively) for the same video sample. Typically, each annotator model is trained using supervised learning from each label to capture individual annotators' annotation patterns. However, when encountering missing labels, such as when A_3 's label is absent, existing methods directly skip M_3 's model updates due to the lack of supervision. While M_1 and M_2 continue to be updated because they have corresponding labels. This wastes valuable data utilization opportunities. Repeated application of this practice results in low data utilization efficiency and potentially increases the risk of overfitting for annotator models with numerous missing labels.

In contrast, our method proposed in (b) of Figure 1 leverages Cohen's kappa coefficient [20] to calculate the differences between multiple annotators' labeling patterns in the dataset, deriving a similarity matrix that we visualize in a similarity space. Compared to the relationship between A_3 and A_2 , A_3 and A_1 demonstrate greater similarity, indicating they frequently exhibit high consistency when annotating the same samples. Therefore, when A_3 's label is missing, A_1 's label carries high weight in representing A_3 's potential annotation because they are closer in the statistical similarity space. Based on this principle, when A_3 's label is missing, we calculate the similarity weights of other annotators A_1 and A_2 relative to A_3 , then weight these with their predicted label distributions $\hat{p}_1$ and $\hat{p}_2$ to obtain a similarity-weighted soft label $\hat{p}_{soft}$. We use this as the corresponding label for A_3 's predicted label distribution $\hat{p}_3$ to update the annotator model M_3 . This approach implements a form of semi-supervision, avoiding the low data utilization efficiency and potential overfitting risks caused by skipping model updates due to a lack of supervision when labels are missing.

Meanwhile, we introduce a confidence assessment mechanism for the similarity-weighted soft labels. This mechanism integrates both maximum probability values and entropy-based uncertainty

metrics to provide comprehensive confidence estimates. If the confidence score exceeds a predetermined threshold, indicating high reliability of the generated soft label, it is imputed into the original dataset to recalculate the inter-annotator similarity matrix. Through this mechanism, we establish a self-reinforcing cycle that continuously refines the inter-annotator similarity relationships and the individual annotator models' ability, leading to progressively more accurate predictions throughout the training process.

To validate the effectiveness of our method, we additionally introduce AMER2, a new video emotion recognition dataset with higher missing rates than the previous AMER dataset [28]. Compared to AMER's overall average missing rate of 69.6%, AMER2 reaches an overall average missing rate of 79.0%, with one annotator's missing labels reaching an extreme 91.3%. Our work makes the following key contributions:

- **We propose a novel approach to address the issue of multi-annotator learning with missing labels.** This approach leverages inter-annotator similarities to generate weighted soft labels, enabling the utilization and updating of missing parts rather than skipping them. This, in turn, improves data utilization and leads to better performance.
- **We introduce a confidence-driven mechanism.** This mechanism combines the maximum probability with entropy-based uncertainty measures to prioritize high-confidence predictions to impute missing labels during training as an iterative refinement pipeline, which continuously improves both inter-annotator similarity estimates and individual model performance.
- **We specifically construct a new dataset, AMER2,** with a high proportion of missing labels to better mimic real-world annotation patterns. Extensive experiments demonstrate the effectiveness of our method, which achieves better performance under extreme missing conditions.

2 RELATED WORK

2.1 Multi-label Learning with Missing Labels

Missing labels represent a significant challenge in machine learning, with considerable research focused on addressing this issue specifically in the multi-label learning context. In multi-label learning, each instance can belong to multiple categories simultaneously, and the absence of certain category annotations creates distinct challenges compared to multi-class classification.

Bucak et al. [2] pioneered work in this area by introducing a ranking loss-based approach for handling incomplete class assignments in multi-label learning. Their method demonstrated the feasibility of learning effective classifiers despite missing annotations. Building on this foundation, Wu et al. [21] proposed a comprehensive framework that leverages matrix completion techniques to recover missing labels, utilizing both feature and label correlations to improve performance. This approach recognizes the inherent relationships between labels, a concept that influences our work's exploration of annotator relationships.

The concept of weak labels was explored by Sun et al. [17], who addressed scenarios where labels are incomplete but the specific missing labels are unknown. Their semi-supervised approach demonstrated how partial information could be effectively utilized

Table 1: Label statistics and missing rates of the AMER2 dataset compared to the AMER dataset. For each annotator, the number of labeled samples, the corresponding missing rate (%), as well as the average data, and the total number of samples are reported. AMER contains 13 annotators while AMER2 contains 10 annotators, denoted as A_k .

Number of samples	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5	A_6	A_7	A_8	A_9	A_{10}	A_{11}	A_{12}	A_{13}	Average	Total
AMER	1096	1031	1022	1036	1012	970	1064	1049	1060	1062	5187	5197	5202	1999.1	5207
AMER2	545	538	201	557	493	545	346	544	542	545	-	-	-	485.6	2311
Missing rate (%)	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5	A_6	A_7	A_8	A_9	A_{10}	A_{11}	A_{12}	A_{13}	Average	-
AMER	79.0	80.2	80.4	80.1	80.6	81.4	79.6	79.9	79.6	79.6	0.4	0.2	0.1	69.6	-
AMER2	76.4	76.7	91.3	75.9	78.7	76.4	85.0	76.5	76.5	76.4	-	-	-	79.0	-

for learning. Similarly, Yu et al. [26] introduced feature-induced partial multi-label learning for scenarios with only partially known positive labels, showing how feature information can guide label completion.

Advancing these ideas, Xu et al. [22] applied matrix completion with side information to speed up multi-label learning with missing labels, while Durand et al. [4] developed deep convolutional neural networks for multi-label classification with partial labels. Liu and Dietterich [13] approached the problem from a different angle, using a conditional multinomial mixture model for superset label learning, addressing cases where only a set of possible labels is known.

Recent advances include work by Yang et al. [25] on supervised learning of semantics-preserving hash with deep convolutional neural networks, Zhang and Wu’s [29] comprehensive review of multi-label learning algorithms, and Kapoor et al.’s [10] application of Bayesian compressed sensing to multilabel classification. Huang and Zhou [8] explored exploiting label correlations locally for multi-label learning. Zhan and Zhang [27] proposed inductive semi-supervised multi-label learning with co-training, and Huang et al. [7] improved multi-label classification with missing labels by learning label-specific features. Finally, Jing et al. [9] introduced semi-supervised low-rank mapping learning for multi-label classification.

While these approaches have significantly advanced our understanding of learning with missing labels, they primarily focus on multi-label scenarios where instances can belong to multiple categories simultaneously. They do not address the unique challenges of multi-annotator learning, where different annotators may provide conflicting yet valid perspectives on the same instance, and where preserving annotator-specific characteristics is essential.

2.2 Multi-annotator Learning with Missing Labels

Unlike multi-label learning with missing labels, the problem of missing labels in multi-annotator learning has received comparatively little attention, despite its practical importance. In multi-annotator learning, the goal is to model individual annotator labeling patterns rather than simply aggregating annotations to determine a single ground truth.

The seminal work by Yan et al. [24] on learning from multiple annotators with varying expertise addresses annotator modeling but focuses primarily on complete annotation scenarios. Their approach

models annotator expertise to improve classification performance but does not specifically address the challenges of missing annotations. Davani et al. [3] moved beyond majority voting in subjective annotations, acknowledging the importance of preserving disagreements, but did not provide a comprehensive framework for learning with missing annotator labels.

Li et al. [11] proposed learning from multiple annotators by incorporating instance features. Tanno et al. [18] focused on learning from noisy labels through regularized estimation of annotator confusion. Guan et al. [5] demonstrated that modeling individual labelers improves classification, and Shah et al. [16] explored mechanisms for self-correction in crowdsourcing. Rodrigues et al. [15] proposed deep learning from crowds, while Yan et al. [23] modeled annotator expertise when everybody knows a bit of something. Albarqouni et al. [1] introduced AggNet for deep learning from crowds for mitosis detection in breast cancer histology images.

While these works have contributed valuable insights to multi-annotator learning, none have specifically addressed the challenge of effectively training annotator-specific models when facing substantial missing labels. Most existing approaches either focus on aggregating annotations to produce a single ground truth or treat annotators as completely separate entities without leveraging their interrelationships to address missing labels, and simply skip annotator model updates when labels are missing.

Our work fills this critical gap by proposing a framework that leverages the similarity relationships between annotators to achieve annotator model updates when labels are missing rather than simply skipping. By introducing this similarity-based soft constraint for cases of missing labels, our approach avoids the low data utilization efficiency and potential overfitting risks caused by skipping model updates due to a lack of supervision when labels are missing.

3 DATASET CONSTRUCTION

This paper introduces a new video emotion recognition dataset, AMER2, which is an extended version of the AMER dataset [28]. The AMER dataset contains 5,207 video samples and provides rich per-annotator labels to meet the requirements of multi-annotator tendency learning [28].

Unlike AMER, AMER2 provides an additional 2,311 samples and sparse per-annotator labels, with the intention of validating




Figure 2: The main framework of SimLabel. For datasets with missing labels, annotator similarity is calculated via the Cohen’s kappa coefficient (darker colors indicate higher similarity). Using video sample V with missing label from A_n : Multiple annotator-specific models process V to produce label distributions. Labeled predictions ($\hat{p}_1, \hat{p}_2$) are supervised through cross-entropy loss with ground truth labels (y_1, y_2). Unlabeled predictions ($\hat{p}_n$) is constrained via KL divergence loss with a soft label ($\hat{p}_{soft}$), generated as a similarity-weighted combination of $\hat{p}_1$ and $\hat{p}_2$ using weights W_1 and W_2 derived from annotator similarities to A_n .

the effectiveness of our proposed method under more challenging missing conditions. In AMER2, most samples focus on single-person videos with relatively complete speech content, sourced from movies and TV series.

During the annotation process, we utilize the Label Studio toolkit [19] and hire multiple annotators who are masters or PhD students in our labs. To ensure annotation quality, these annotators first undergo preliminary exams. In these exams, we provide 10 samples and ask the annotators to select the most likely label from 8 candidate labels: *worry*, *happiness*, *neutral*, *anger*, *surprise*, *sadness*, *other*, and *unknown*. These samples were previously annotated by five experts and have obtained five-agreement labels. Annotators who fail to pass the preliminary exam are removed from the annotation pool. After that, we retained 10 annotators, and each annotator completed the task in approximately two weeks, with scheduled breaks to maintain annotation quality. Finally, each annotator provided approximately 201 to 557 labels.

Table 1 provides statistics for AMER and AMER2. From this table, we observe that AMER2 has an overall average missing rate of 79.0%, with one annotator’s missing labels reaching an extreme of 91.30%, which is higher than AMER’s overall average missing rate of 69.6%. Therefore, AMER2 increases the proportion of missing labels to better mimic real-world scenarios with sparse per-annotator labels. In this paper, we conduct experiments on both datasets, aiming to validate the effectiveness of our method under variable missing rates.

3.1 Overview

We illustrate our proposed SimLabel through two parts: the main framework and confidence cycling. Based on the video emotion classification task, the main framework primarily describes how

SimLabel generates soft labels for missing labels through similarity weights as semi-supervised constraints for annotator models, as shown in Figure 2. Confidence cycling discusses how to dynamically update the annotator similarity matrix by calculating confidence for the generated soft labels for missing annotations, building upon the main framework, as illustrated in Figure 3.

3.2 Main Framework

We propose a novel approach to address the issue of multi-annotator learning with missing labels. As shown in Figure 2, given a video input V from a dataset with missing labels, multiple annotators A_k ($k = 1, \dots, 3$) provide different annotations for video samples. Often, not all annotators label each sample, resulting in missing labels—a common phenomenon in real-world scenarios. In this example, for emotion assessment in the video, A_1 gives the label ‘neutral’, A_2 gives the label ‘sad’, while A_3 does not give the label, i.e., annotation is missing.

The input video is processed by separate classification models M_k for each annotator, designed to learn individual labeling patterns. These models can have diverse architectures, such as Gaussian distribution fitting architecture (PADL [12]), confusion matrix architecture (MaDL [6]), or query-based architecture (QuMATL [28]), etc. Each model produces label distribution predictions $\hat{p}_k$.

For annotators (A_1 and A_2) with labels, we update their respective models (M_1 and M_2) through supervised learning by computing cross-entropy loss with their corresponding labels y_1 and y_2 :

$$\mathcal{L}_{ce}(\hat{p}_k, y_k) = -y_k \log(\hat{p}_k), \quad (1)$$

where each annotator A_k has predicted probabilities $\hat{p}_k \in [0, 1]^C$, reference labels $y_k \in \{0, 1\}^C$ in one-hot vector representation for annotators with labels. C is the number of classes.

For the annotator (A_3) without the label, we update model M_3 through semi-supervised learning by computing Kullback-Leibler (KL) Divergence loss with the generated soft label $\hat{p}_{soft}$:

$$\mathcal{L}_{kl}(\hat{p}_3, \hat{p}_{soft}) = D_{KL}(\hat{p}_3 || \hat{p}_{soft}), \quad (2)$$

where $\hat{p}_{soft} \in [0, 1]^C$ is the generated similarity-weighted soft label for the annotator without the label, and $||$ indicates divergence between the two distributions.

The total training loss $\mathcal{L}_{total}$ for our multi-annotator classification model is defined as:




Figure 3: The confidence cycling of SimLabel. Confidence is calculated for the soft label ($\hat{p}_{soft}$) generated for missing labels. When confidence exceeds a predetermined threshold, the predicted label is obtained and used to impute the corresponding missing label in the dataset. The annotator similarity matrix derived from the dataset is iteratively updated and utilized for soft label ($\hat{p}_{soft}$) generation in subsequent iterations.

$$\mathcal{L}_{total} = \sum_{k=1}^2 \mathcal{L}_{ce}(\hat{p}_k, y_k) + \mathcal{L}_{kl}(\hat{p}_3, \hat{p}_{soft}) \quad (3)$$

The generation of $\hat{p}_{soft}$ is key to our method, based on the core idea that annotator similarity matrices derived from statistical patterns in multi-annotator datasets can inform predictions for missing annotations, and then we leverage inter-annotator similarity correlations across the entire dataset to indirectly constrain models with missing labels through semi-supervised learning. We calculate the similarity matrix between annotators using the Cohen’s kappa coefficient [20] from the original dataset, where deeper colors indicate greater similarity between annotators. As shown in Figure 2, annotator A_1 has higher similarity to A_3 compared to A_2 . When A_3 ’s label is missing, A_1 ’s similarity weight W_1 will be greater than A_2 ’s weight W_2 . Therefore, the soft label $\hat{p}_{soft}$ is generated by the weighted sum of label distribution predictions $\hat{p}_1$ and $\hat{p}_2$ with their corresponding similarity weights W_1 and W_2 :

$$\hat{p}_{soft} = \sum_{k=1}^2 W_k \hat{p}_k, \quad (4)$$

This soft label represents the closest approximation to A_3 ’s true label distribution based on inter-annotator similarity distances.

Algorithm 1 The Confidence Cycling for Dynamic Annotator Similarity Refinement

Require: Dataset $\mathcal{D}$ with missing labels, confidence threshold T

- 1: Initialize similarity matrix SM using Cohen’s kappa coefficient on available labels
- 2: Initialize annotator models $\{M_1, M_2, \dots, M_n\}$
- 3: **for** each training epoch **do**
- 4: **for** each sample with missing labels **do**
- 5: Generate similarity-weighted soft label:

$$\hat{p}_{soft} = \sum_k w_k \hat{p}_k$$
- 6: Calculate confidence:

$$conf = \max(\hat{p}_{soft}) \times (1 - H_{norm}(\hat{p}_{soft}))$$
- 7: **if** $conf \geq T$ **then**
- 8: Extract predicted label:

$$y_{pred} = \arg \max(\hat{p}_{soft})$$
- 9: Impute y_{pred} into dataset for corresponding missing annotation
- 10: Recalculate annotator similarity matrix SM using updated dataset
- 11: **end if**
- 12: Update annotator models using supervised and semi-supervised losses
- 13: **end for**
- 14: **end for**

Ensure: Refined similarity matrix SM , imputed dataset, trained annotator models

3.3 Confidence Cycling

Building on the main framework, we introduce a confidence assessment mechanism for the similarity-weighted soft labels to dynamically update the annotator similarity matrix and enhance this semi-supervision learning approach. This mechanism integrates both maximum probability values and entropy-based uncertainty metrics to provide comprehensive confidence estimates and identify highly reliable soft labels.

As shown in Figure 3, if the confidence score exceeds a predetermined threshold, indicating high reliability of the generated soft label, the predicted label will impute the corresponding missing labels of the original dataset to recalculate the inter-annotator similarity matrix. Through this mechanism, we establish a self-reinforcing cycle that continuously refines the inter-annotator similarity relationships and the individual annotator models’ ability, leading to progressively more accurate predictions throughout the training process.

Confidence Calculation. As shown in Algorithm 1, for the similarity-weighted soft labels $\hat{p}_{soft}$ generated for missing annotations, we perform additional confidence calculations to enhance our semi-supervised method. Our confidence measure combines maximum probability with normalized entropy to provide a comprehensive assessment of prediction reliability:

$$conf = \max(\hat{p}_{soft}) \times (1 - H_{norm}(\hat{p}_{soft})), \quad (5)$$

Table 2: The accuracy metric is to evaluate annotator modeling performance through comparing existing approach (represent by ‘Annotator model architecture - Skip’) and our proposed SimLabel (represent by ‘Annotator model architecture - Ours’ for only main framework, represent by ‘Annotator model architecture - Ours + Confidence’ for main framework with confidence cycling) on the AMER2 dataset for each annotator A_k , $k = 1, \dots, 10$, as well as report the average performance (Avg). Higher is better.

Methods	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5	A_6	A_7	A_8	A_9	A_{10}	Avg
PADL - Skip	0.81	0.84	0.82	0.87	0.78	0.80	0.78	0.84	0.80	0.79	0.81
PADL - Ours	0.84	0.85	0.83	0.89	0.82	0.81	0.82	0.85	0.82	0.83	0.84
PADL - Ours + Confidence	0.86	0.87	0.84	0.90	0.84	0.83	0.85	0.86	0.85	0.86	0.86
MaDL - Skip	0.84	0.83	0.82	0.86	0.81	0.82	0.80	0.82	0.85	0.84	0.83
MaDL - Ours	0.87	0.84	0.85	0.87	0.83	0.85	0.82	0.86	0.86	0.85	0.85
MaDL - Ours + Confidence	0.89	0.86	0.88	0.88	0.86	0.87	0.84	0.88	0.88	0.87	0.87
QuMATL - Skip	0.86	0.83	0.87	0.84	0.86	0.87	0.88	0.83	0.85	0.86	0.86
QuMATL - Ours	0.89	0.85	0.90	0.86	0.89	0.88	0.91	0.85	0.87	0.89	0.88
QuMATL - Ours + Confidence	0.91	0.87	0.92	0.88	0.91	0.90	0.93	0.86	0.90	0.91	0.90

Table 3: The accuracy metric is to evaluate annotator modeling performance through comparing existing approach (represent by ‘Annotator model architecture - Skip’) and our proposed SimLabel (represent by ‘Annotator model architecture - Ours’ for only main framework, represent by ‘Annotator model architecture - Ours + Confidence’ for main framework with confidence cycling) on the annotators of AMER dataset for each annotator A_k , $k = 1, \dots, 13$, as well as report the average performance (Avg). Higher is better.

Methods	A_1	A_2	A_3	A_4	A_5	A_6	A_7	A_8	A_9	A_{10}	A_{11}	A_{12}	A_{13}	Avg
PADL - Skip	0.89	0.90	0.88	0.93	0.87	0.91	0.86	0.94	0.89	0.88	0.47	0.54	0.35	0.80
PADL - Ours	0.91	0.92	0.90	0.94	0.90	0.92	0.89	0.95	0.91	0.91	0.55	0.61	0.45	0.83
PADL - Ours + Confidence	0.92	0.93	0.91	0.95	0.91	0.93	0.90	0.96	0.92	0.93	0.59	0.65	0.50	0.85
MaDL - Skip	0.93	0.91	0.90	0.89	0.90	0.88	0.90	0.89	0.87	0.97	0.50	0.53	0.37	0.80
MaDL - Ours	0.95	0.92	0.92	0.91	0.92	0.90	0.92	0.92	0.90	0.98	0.59	0.60	0.48	0.84
MaDL - Ours + Confidence	0.96	0.93	0.93	0.92	0.93	0.91	0.93	0.93	0.91	0.98	0.64	0.65	0.53	0.86
QuMATL - Skip	0.94	0.93	0.93	0.94	0.94	0.92	0.93	0.95	0.93	0.93	0.59	0.61	0.40	0.84
QuMATL - Ours	0.96	0.94	0.95	0.95	0.95	0.94	0.95	0.96	0.95	0.95	0.68	0.69	0.52	0.88
QuMATL - Ours + Confidence	0.97	0.95	0.96	0.96	0.96	0.95	0.96	0.97	0.96	0.96	0.72	0.73	0.57	0.89

where $\max(\hat{p}_{soft})$ is the maximum probability value in the distribution, and $H_{norm}(\hat{p}_{soft})$ is the normalized entropy calculated as:

$$H_{norm}(\hat{p}_{soft}) = \frac{H(\hat{p}_{soft})}{H_{max}}, \quad (6)$$

The entropy $H(\hat{p}_{soft})$ measures the uncertainty across the entire probability distribution:

$$H(\hat{p}_{soft}) = - \sum_{c=1}^C \hat{p}_{soft,c} \log(\hat{p}_{soft,c}), \quad (7)$$

where $\hat{p}_{soft,c}$ is the probability assigned to class c , and C is the total number of classes. The maximum possible entropy $H_{max} = \log(C)$ occurs when the distribution is uniform.

This formulation requires predictions to have both high maximum probability and low normalized entropy (concentrated distribution) to achieve high confidence scores. This provides a comprehensive assessment of prediction reliability by balancing two key factors: (1) The maximum probability term $\max(\hat{p}_{soft})$ captures

the model’s confidence in the most likely class. (2) The normalized entropy term $H_{norm}(\hat{p}_{soft})$ measures the uncertainty across the entire distribution, with lower values indicating more concentrated (certain) predictions.

Dynamic Refinement Process. As shown in Algorithm 1, when the calculated confidence exceeds a predetermined threshold T (Algorithm 1, line 7), indicating that the generated soft label has high reliability, the predicted label y_{pred} is extracted and incorporated into the location of missing label in the original dataset (lines 8-9). The annotator similarity matrix SM is then recalculated using the updated dataset with newly imputed labels (line 10).

This process facilitates more accurate establishment of similarity relationships between annotators in cases of missing labels. As training progresses and missing labels meeting confidence criteria are incorporated, a virtuous cycle emerges, continuously refining the similarity relationships between annotators. The dynamic refinement allows each annotator model to more accurately capture its specific annotation patterns, even when starting from datasets with significant numbers of missing annotations.

Table 4: Randomly removing annotations at different missing ratios (20%, 30%, and 40%) is to simulate label missing scenarios on the STREET dataset, -Ha, -He, -Sa, -Li, and -Or represent five perspectives of STREET dataset: happiness, healthiness, safety, liveliness, and orderliness. Here, we only show the average performance of 10 annotators’ modeling. This is also applied to AMER2 and AMER datasets to increase the missing rates to validate our approach. Here, the accuracy metric is used for evaluation. Higher is better.

Methods	STREET-Ha	STREET-He	STREET-Sa	STREET-Li	STREET-Or	AMER	AMER2
20% - PADL - Skip	0.53	0.52	0.46	0.51	0.50	0.71	0.73
20% - PADL - Ours	0.56	0.55	0.49	0.54	0.53	0.74	0.76
20% - PADL - Ours + Confidence	0.58	0.57	0.52	0.56	0.55	0.77	0.78
20% - MaDL - Skip	0.56	0.54	0.51	0.53	0.56	0.76	0.77
20% - MaDL - Ours	0.59	0.57	0.54	0.56	0.59	0.79	0.80
20% - MaDL - Ours + Confidence	0.61	0.59	0.56	0.58	0.61	0.82	0.82
20% - QuMATL - Skip	0.61	0.60	0.55	0.58	0.59	0.81	0.82
20% - QuMATL - Ours	0.64	0.62	0.58	0.61	0.62	0.86	0.85
20% - QuMATL - Ours + Confidence	0.66	0.64	0.60	0.63	0.64	0.88	0.87
30% - PADL - Skip	0.48	0.47	0.41	0.46	0.45	0.65	0.67
30% - PADL - Ours	0.52	0.50	0.45	0.50	0.48	0.70	0.71
30% - PADL - Ours + Confidence	0.54	0.53	0.48	0.52	0.51	0.75	0.74
30% - MaDL - Skip	0.54	0.52	0.48	0.49	0.54	0.72	0.70
30% - MaDL - Ours	0.57	0.55	0.51	0.53	0.57	0.75	0.74
30% - MaDL - Ours + Confidence	0.60	0.57	0.54	0.55	0.59	0.78	0.77
30% - QuMATL - Skip	0.58	0.57	0.52	0.55	0.56	0.79	0.78
30% - QuMATL - Ours	0.62	0.60	0.56	0.58	0.60	0.82	0.82
30% - QuMATL - Ours + Confidence	0.64	0.62	0.58	0.61	0.62	0.85	0.84
40% - PADL - Skip	0.44	0.42	0.37	0.43	0.41	0.60	0.61
40% - PADL - Ours	0.48	0.46	0.42	0.47	0.45	0.64	0.66
40% - PADL - Ours + Confidence	0.51	0.49	0.45	0.50	0.48	0.67	0.69
40% - MaDL - Skip	0.50	0.48	0.43	0.50	0.47	0.63	0.65
40% - MaDL - Ours	0.54	0.52	0.47	0.54	0.51	0.66	0.69
40% - MaDL - Ours + Confidence	0.57	0.54	0.50	0.56	0.53	0.71	0.72
40% - QuMATL - Skip	0.55	0.53	0.49	0.52	0.54	0.73	0.74
40% - QuMATL - Ours	0.59	0.57	0.53	0.56	0.58	0.77	0.78
40% - QuMATL - Ours + Confidence	0.62	0.59	0.56	0.59	0.60	0.80	0.81

The effectiveness of this approach lies in its ability to leverage high-confidence predictions to bootstrap the learning process, creating a self-improving system where each iteration potentially enhances the quality of both the similarity matrix and the generated soft labels for remaining missing annotations.

4 EXPERIMENT

We conduct extensive experiments to compare our proposed SimLabel (i.e., using only the main framework of the similarity-weighted soft label, and using both the main framework and confidence cycling) with existing approaches (i.e., directly skipping training on annotator models in case of missing labels), evaluating the performance of multi-annotator modeling. To verify the effectiveness and applicability of SimLabel, we select different annotator model architectures: Gaussian distribution fitting architecture (PADL [12]), confusion matrix architecture (MaDL [6]), and query-based architecture (QuMATL [28]). We evaluate our method on both the AMER2 and AMER datasets containing real missing labels, as well as on the STREET dataset with simulated missing labels at various missing ratios, using accuracy as the evaluation metric [28].

4.1 Implementation Details

We use Cohen’s kappa coefficient [20] to calculate the annotator similarity matrix of multi-annotator datasets. For datasets in the experiment, the input image and video are resized to 224×224 and further normalized. The different annotator model architectures all follow their original settings. During training, we use the AdamW optimizer with an initial learning rate of 1e-4, weight decay of 0.01, and a maximum gradient norm of 1.0 for gradient clipping. A linear warmup strategy is applied for the first 20% steps followed by cosine learning rate decay. We set the maximum number of epochs to 200, with early stopping (patience being 25) to prevent overfitting. To accelerate training, the model is trained using distributed data parallel (DDP) on four NVIDIA V100 GPUs.

4.2 Datasets

For the dataset, we primarily utilize the newly constructed multi-modal emotion recognition dataset AMER2, alongside the earlier version AMER and the city impression assessment dataset STREET [28]. AMER2 and AMER naturally contain missing labels in real-world settings, while STREET is a complete real-world dataset.

Therefore, for the STREET dataset, we randomly remove annotations at different missing ratios to simulate annotation absence. Similarly, we also apply this random removal procedure to AMER2 and AMER datasets to further increase missing rates and validate the effectiveness of our approach.

4.3 Results Analysis

Table 2 and Table 3 present accuracy results for each annotator across different annotator model architectures based on the comparison between our proposed SimLabel (i.e., using only the main framework of the similarity-weighted soft label, defined as “- Ours”, and using both the main framework and confidence cycling, defined as “- Ours + Confidence”) with existing approaches (i.e., directly skipping training on annotator models in case of missing labels, defined as “- Skip”). Table 4 presents average accuracy results for multi-annotators across different annotator model architectures at different missing labels.

On the AMER2 dataset (Table 2), our approach using the main framework (“- Ours”) consistently outperforms existing approaches (“- Skip”) which directly skip training on annotator models in case of missing labels, with average improvements of 3% for PADL, 2% for MaDL, and 2% for QuMATL. When incorporating confidence cycling (“- Ours + Confidence”) for our approach, we observe further enhancements of 2% across all different architectures.

Results on the AMER dataset (Table 3) show similar patterns of improvement. Our approach using the main framework (“- Ours”) improves average accuracy by around 3% for PADL, MaDL, and QuMATL compared to existing approaches (“- Skip”). With confidence cycling (“- Ours + Confidence”) for our approach, these improvements further increase to around 2%. This consistent enhancement across different model architectures of multi-annotator learning validates our central hypothesis that leveraging inter-annotator similarity provides an effective framework for addressing missing label challenges in multi-annotator learning.

For the STREET dataset, we conducted experiments with artificially induced missing labels at rates of 20%, 30%, and 40% (Table 4). To evaluate robustness, we also apply this random removal procedure to AMER2 and AMER datasets to further increase missing rates and validate the effectiveness of our approach. Our approach delivers consistent improvements across all scenarios, with average gains of around 4-7% depending on the dataset and missing ratio.

Importantly, the relative improvement becomes more pronounced as the missing ratio increases, with average gains of 7% at 40% missing labels compared to 5-6% at 20%. This demonstrates that our method is particularly valuable in scenarios with severe label sparsity. On the STREET dataset with its five assessment perspectives, our approach shows uniform improvements, with the largest gains observed for the more challenging safety perspective (Sa).

These results consistently demonstrate that leveraging annotator similarity relationships through our soft label generation and confidence cycling mechanism improves multi-annotator modeling performance, especially in realistic scenarios with missing annotations.

Table 5: Ablation studies on confidence threshold, sensitivity, and calculation ways. Top: Performance with different confidence thresholds. Middle: Sensitivity of optimal threshold across missing ratios. Bottom: Comparison of different confidence calculation methods. They are all performed on AMER2 dataset.

Confidence Threshold	PADL	MaDL	QuMATL	Avg
0.5	0.85	0.86	0.89	0.87
0.6	0.86	0.87	0.90	0.88
0.7	0.84	0.85	0.88	0.86
0.8	0.82	0.83	0.86	0.84
Missing Rate	PADL	MaDL	QuMATL	Best
20%	0.65	0.6	0.6	0.6-0.65
30%	0.6	0.6	0.65	0.6-0.65
40%	0.55	0.55	0.6	0.55-0.6
Confidence Calculation	PADL	MaDL	QuMATL	Avg
$\max(p)$	0.83	0.84	0.87	0.85
$1 - H_{norm}(p)$	0.84	0.85	0.88	0.86
$\max(p) \times (1 - H_{norm}(p))$	0.86	0.87	0.90	0.88

4.4 Ablation Study

To evaluate the design choices in our confidence cycling mechanism, we conduct a detailed ablation study examining confidence threshold selection, its sensitivity to different missing rates, and the effectiveness of different confidence formulation methods. They are all performed on AMER2 dataset.

Confidence Threshold Selection. Table 5 (top) shows the performance of our method with different confidence thresholds. The results indicate that a threshold of 0.6 achieves the best performance across all model architectures. Higher thresholds (0.8) lead to performance degradation, likely because too few predictions meet the criteria for updating the similarity matrix. Lower thresholds (0.5) also perform slightly worse than 0.6, possibly due to the inclusion of lower-quality predictions that introduce noise into the update process.

Threshold Sensitivity Across Missing Rates. We further analyze how the optimal threshold varies with different missing label rates (Table 5, middle). Interestingly, we observe that as the missing rate increases from 20% to 40%, the optimal threshold tends to decrease slightly. This suggests that when more labels are missing, a slightly more lenient threshold may be beneficial to ensure sufficient updates to the similarity matrix while maintaining reasonable prediction quality.

Confidence Formulation Comparison. Finally, we evaluate different confidence calculation methods (Table 5, bottom): (1) using only maximum probability $\max(p)$, (2) using only normalized entropy complement $1 - H_{norm}(p)$, and (3) our proposed combined approach $\max(p) \times (1 - H_{norm}(p))$, where p represents the similarity-weighted soft label probability distribution generated for missing annotations. The results demonstrate that our combined method consistently outperforms single-metric approaches across all architectures, with an average performance improvement of 3% over $\max(p)$ and 2% over entropy-only formulation. This validates

our hypothesis that effective confidence assessment should consider both the strength of the dominant class prediction and the overall distribution shape.

5 CONCLUSION

We addressed the challenge of missing labels in multi-annotator learning through a similarity-weighted semi-supervised framework that leverages inter-annotator relationships instead of skipping model updates. Our approach SimLabel combines soft label generation with a confidence cycling mechanism to dynamically refine inter-annotator similarity estimates. Experiments on different datasets show consistent performance improvements under different missing label scenarios. These results demonstrate the effectiveness of utilizing inter-annotator similarity to address missing label challenges. Future work could extend this framework to handle dynamic annotator behaviors and explore its application to more complex subjective annotation domains such as medical imaging.

REFERENCES

- [1] Shadi Albarqouni, Christoph Baur, Felix Achilles, Vasileios Belagiannis, Stefanie Demirci, and Nassir Navab. 2016. Aggnet: deep learning from crowds for mitosis detection in breast cancer histology images. *IEEE transactions on medical imaging* 35, 5 (2016), 1313–1321.
- [2] Serhat Selcuk Bucak, Rong Jin, and Anil K. Jain. 2011. Multi-label learning with incomplete class assignments. In *CVPR 2011*. 2801–2808. <https://doi.org/10.1109/CVPR.2011.5995734>
- [3] Aida Mostafazadeh Davani, Mark Díaz, and Vinodkumar Prabhakaran. 2022. Dealing with disagreements: Looking beyond the majority vote in subjective annotations. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 10 (2022), 92–110.
- [4] Thibaut Durand, Nazanin Mehrasa, and Greg Mori. 2019. Learning a Deep ConvNet for Multi-label Classification with Partial Labels. *arXiv:1902.09720 [cs.CV]* <https://arxiv.org/abs/1902.09720>
- [5] Melody Guan, Varun Gulshan, Andrew Dai, and Geoffrey Hinton. 2018. Who said what: Modeling individual labelers improves classification. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 32.
- [6] Marek Herde, Denis Huseljic, and Bernhard Sick. 2023. Multi-annotator Deep Learning: A Probabilistic Framework for Classification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.02539* (2023).
- [7] Jun Huang, Feng Qin, Xiao Zheng, Zekai Cheng, Zhixiang Yuan, Weigang Zhang, and Qingming Huang. 2019. Improving multi-label classification with missing labels by learning label-specific features. *Information Sciences* 492 (2019), 124–146.
- [8] Sheng-Jun Huang and Zhi-Hua Zhou. 2012. Multi-label learning by exploiting label correlations locally. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 26. 949–955.
- [9] Liping Jing, Liu Yang, Jian Yu, and Michael K Ng. 2015. Semi-supervised low-rank mapping learning for multi-label classification. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 1483–1491.
- [10] Ashish Kapoor, Raajay Viswanathan, and Prateek Jain. 2012. Multilabel classification using bayesian compressed sensing. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 25 (2012).
- [11] J Li, H Sun, J Li, Z Chen, R Tao, and Y Ge. [n. d.]. Learning from multiple annotators by incorporating instance features (2021). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.15146* ([n. d.]).
- [12] Zehui Liao, Shishuai Hu, Yutong Xie, and Yong Xia. 2024. Modeling annotator preference and stochastic annotation error for medical image segmentation. *Medical Image Analysis* 92 (2024), 103028.
- [13] Liping Liu and Thomas Dietterich. 2012. A conditional multinomial mixture model for superset label learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 25 (2012).
- [14] Gabriele Paolacci, Jesse Chandler, and Panagiotis G. Ipeirotis. 2010. Running experiments on Amazon Mechanical Turk. *Judgment and Decision Making* 5, 5 (2010), 411–419. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1930297500002205>
- [15] Filipe Rodrigues and Francisco Pereira. 2018. Deep learning from crowds. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 32.
- [16] Nihar Shah and Dengyong Zhou. 2016. No oops, you won’t do it again: mechanisms for self-correction in crowdsourcing. In *International conference on machine learning*. PMLR, 1–10.
- [17] Yu-Yin Sun, Yin Zhang, and Zhi-Hua Zhou. 2010. Multi-label learning with weak label. In *Proceedings of the AAAI conference on artificial intelligence*, Vol. 24. 593–598.
- [18] Ryutaro Tanno, Ardavan Saeedi, Swami Sankaranarayanan, Daniel C Alexander, and Nathan Silberman. 2019. Learning from noisy labels by regularized estimation of annotator confusion. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*. 11244–11253.
- [19] Maxim Tkachenko, Mikhail Malyuk, Andrey Holmanyuk, and Nikolai Liubimov. 2020-2025. Label Studio: Data labeling software. <https://github.com/HumanSignal/label-studio> Open source software available from <https://github.com/HumanSignal/label-studio>.
- [20] AnthonyJ. Viera and JoanneM. Garrett. 2005. Understanding interobserver agreement: the kappa statistic. *Family Medicine, Family Medicine* (May 2005).
- [21] Baoyuan Wu, Zhilei Liu, Shangfei Wang, Bao-Gang Hu, and Qiang Ji. 2014. Multi-label learning with missing labels. In *2014 22nd International conference on pattern recognition*. IEEE, 1964–1968.
- [22] Miao Xu, Rong Jin, and Zhi-Hua Zhou. 2013. Speedup matrix completion with side information: Application to multi-label learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems* 26 (2013).
- [23] Yan Yan, Römer Rosales, Glenn Fung, Mark Schmidt, Gerardo Hermosillo, Luca Bogoni, Linda Moy, and Jennifer Dy. 2010. Modeling annotator expertise: Learning when everybody knows a bit of something. In *Proceedings of the thirteenth international conference on artificial intelligence and statistics*. JMLR Workshop and Conference Proceedings, 932–939.
- [24] Yan Yan, Römer Rosales, Glenn Fung, Ramanathan Subramanian, and Jennifer Dy. 2014. Learning from multiple annotators with varying expertise. *Machine learning* 95 (2014), 291–327.
- [25] Huei-Fang Yang, Kevin Lin, and Chu-Song Chen. 2017. Supervised learning of semantics-preserving hash via deep convolutional neural networks. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence* 40, 2 (2017), 437–451.
- [26] Guoxian Yu, Xia Chen, Carlotta Domeniconi, Jun Wang, Zhao Li, Zili Zhang, and Kindong Wu. 2018. Feature-induced partial multi-label learning. In *2018 IEEE international conference on data mining (ICDM)*. IEEE, 1398–1403.
- [27] Wang Zhan and Min-Ling Zhang. 2017. Inductive semi-supervised multi-label learning with co-training. In *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM SIGKDD international conference on knowledge discovery and data mining*. 1305–1314.
- [28] Liyun Zhang, Zheng Lian, Hong Liu, Takanori Takebe, and Yuta Nakashima. 2025. QuMATL: Query-based Multi-annotator Tendency Learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.15237* (2025).
- [29] Min-Ling Zhang and Zhi-Hua Zhou. 2013. A review on multi-label learning algorithms. *IEEE transactions on knowledge and data engineering* 26, 8 (2013), 1819–1837.