



ISSN 2824-7795

Peerannot: learning from crowd-sourced image datasets with Python

Tanguy Lefort IMAG, Univ Montpellier, CNRS, Inria, LIRMM
Benjamin Charlier IMAG, Univ Montpellier, CNRS
Alexis Joly Inria, LIRMM, Univ Montpellier, CNRS
Joseph Salmon IMAG, Univ Montpellier, CNRS, IUF

Date published: 2023-06-22 Last modified: 2023-06-22

Abstract

Crowdsourcing is a quick and easy way to collect labels for large datasets, involving many workers. However, workers often disagree with each other. Sources of error can arise from the workers' skills, but also from the intrinsic difficulty of the task. We present `peerannot`: a Python library for managing and learning from crowdsourced labels. Our library allows users to aggregate labels from common noise models or train a deep learning-based classifier directly from crowdsourced labels. In addition, we provide an identification module to easily explore the task difficulty of datasets and worker capabilities.

Keywords: crowdsourcing, label noise, task difficulty, worker ability

Contents

1	Introduction: crowdsourcing in image classification	2
2	Notation and package structure	3
2.1	Crowdsourcing notation	3
2.2	Storing crowdsourced datasets in <code>peerannot</code>	4
3	Aggregation strategies in crowdsourcing	7
3.1	Classical models	8
3.1.1	Majority vote (MV)	8
3.1.2	Naive soft (NS)	8
3.1.3	Dawid and Skene (DS)	8
3.1.4	Generative model of Labels, Abilities, and Difficulties (GLAD)	9
3.2	Experiments and evaluation of label aggregation strategies	10
3.2.1	Simulated independent mistakes	10
3.2.2	Simulated correlated mistakes	14
3.2.3	Simulated mistakes with discrete difficulty levels on tasks	16
4	Learning from crowdsourced tasks	18
4.1	Classical models	19
4.2	Prediction error when learning from crowdsourced tasks	19
4.3	Use case with <code>peerannot</code> on real datasets	20

¹Corresponding author: tanguy.lefort@umontpellier.fr

5 Exploring crowdsourced datasets	21
5.1 Exploring tasks' difficulty	22
5.1.1 CIFAR-1OH dataset	22
5.1.2 LabelMe dataset	22
5.2 Exploring workers' reliability	24
5.2.1 CIFAR-10H	25
5.2.2 LabelMe	26
6 Conclusion	28

1 Introduction: crowdsourcing in image classification

Image datasets widely use crowdsourcing to collect labels, involving many workers that can annotate images for a small cost (or even free for instance in citizen science) and faster than using expert labeling. Many classical datasets considered in machine learning have been created with human intervention to create labels, such as CIFAR-10, (Krizhevsky and Hinton 2009), ImageNet (Deng et al. 2009) or (Garcin et al. 2021) in image classification, but also COCO (Lin et al. 2014), solar photovoltaic arrays (Kasmi et al. 2023) or even macro litter (Chagneux et al. 2023) in image segmentation and object counting.

Crowdsourced datasets induce at least three major challenges to which we contribute with `peerannot`:

- 1) *How to identify good workers in the crowd?* When multiple answers are given to a single task, looking for who to trust for which type of task becomes necessary to estimate the ground truth or later train a model with as few noise sources as possible. The module `identify` uses different scoring metrics to create a worker and/or task evaluation. This is particularly relevant considering the gamification of crowdsourcing experiments (Servajean et al. 2016)
- 2) *How to aggregate multiple labels into a single label from crowdsourced tasks?* This occurs for example when dealing with a single dataset that has been labeled by multiple workers with disagreements. This is also encountered with other scoring issues such as polls, reviews, peer-grading, etc. In our framework this is treated with the `aggregate` command, that given multiple labels, infers a ground truth label. From aggregated labels, a classifier can then be trained using the `train` command.
- 3) *How to learn a classifier from crowdsourced datasets?* Where the first question is bound by aggregating multiple labels into a single one, this considers the case where we do not need a single label to train on, but instead train a classifier on the crowdsourced data, with the motivation to perform well on a testing set. This end-to-end vision, is common in machine learning, however, it requires the actual tasks (the images, texts, videos, etc.) to train on – and in crowdsourced datasets publicly available, they are not always available. This is treated with the `aggregate-deep` command.

The library `peerannot` addresses these practical questions within a reproducible setting. Indeed, the complexity of experiments often leads to a lack of transparency and reproducible results for simulations and real datasets. We propose standard simulation settings with explicit implementation parameters that can be shared. For real datasets, `peerannot` is compatible with standard neural networks architectures from the `Torchvision` (Marcel and Rodriguez 2010) library and `Pytorch` (Paszke et al. 2019), allowing a flexible framework with easy-to-share scripts to reproduce experiments.




Figure 1: From crowdsourced labels to training a classifier neural network, the learning pipeline using the `peerannot` library. An optional preprocessing step using the `identify` command allows us to remove worse performing workers or images that can not be classified correctly (very bad quality for example). Then, from the cleaned dataset, if we want labels we use the `aggregate` command that follows the chosen strategy. From the aggregated labels we can train a neural network classifier with the `train` command. Otherwise, we can directly train a neural network classifier that takes into account the crowdsourcing setting in its architecture using `aggregate-deep`.

2 Notation and package structure

2.1 Crowdsourcing notation

Let us consider the classical supervised learning classification framework. A training set $\mathcal{D} = \{(x_i, y_i^*)\}_{i=1}^{n_{\text{task}}}$ is composed of n_{task} tasks $x_i \in \mathcal{X}$ (the feature space) with (unobserved) ground truth label $y_i^* \in [K] = 1, \dots, K$ one of the K possible classes. In the following, the tasks considered are generally RGB images. We use the notation σ for the softmax function. We use the i index notation to denote the tasks dimension and the j index notation for the workers in the crowdsourcing experiment. Note that indices start at position 1 in the equation to follow mathematical standard notation such as $[K] = 1, \dots, K$ but it should be addressed that, as this is a Python library, in the code indices start at the 0 position.

With crowdsourced data the ground truth of a task x_i , denoted y_i^* is unknown, and there is no single label that can be trusted as in standard supervised learning (even on the train set!). Instead, there is a crowd of n_{worker} workers from which multiple workers (w_j) $_j$ propose a label $(y_i^{(j)})_j$. The set of workers answering the task x_i is denoted by $\mathcal{A}(x_i) = \{j \in [n_{\text{worker}}] : w_j \text{ answered } x_i\}$. The cardinal $|\mathcal{A}(x_i)|$ is called the feedback effort on the task x_i . Note that the feedback effort can not exceed the total number of workers n_{worker} . Similarly, one can adopt a worker point of view: the set of tasks answered by a worker w_j is denoted $\mathcal{T}(w_j) = \{i \in [n_{\text{task}}] : w_j \text{ answered } x_i\}$. The cardinal $|\mathcal{T}(w_j)|$ is called the workerload of w_j . The final dataset can then be decomposed as:

$$\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}} := \bigcup_{i \in [n_{\text{task}}]} \{(x_i, (y_i^{(j)})) \text{ for } j \in \mathcal{A}(x_i)\} = \bigcup_{j \in [n_{\text{worker}}]} \{(x_i, (y_i^{(j)})) \text{ for } i \in \mathcal{T}(w_j)\} .$$

In this article, we do not address the setting where workers report their self-confidence (Yasmin et

al. 2022), nor settings where workers are presented a trapping set – *i.e* a subset of tasks where the ground truth is known to evaluate them with known labels (Khattak 2017).

2.2 Storing crowdsourced datasets in peerannot

Crowdsourced datasets come in various forms. To store crowdsourcing datasets efficiently and in a standardized way, peerannot proposes the following structure, where each dataset corresponds to a folder. Let us set up a toy dataset example to understand the data structure and how to store it.

```
datasetname
    train
        class1
            imagename-<key>.png
            ...
            anotherimagename-<anotherkey>.png
            ...
        classK
    val
    test
    metadata.json
    answers.json
```

The `answers.json` file stores the different votes for each task as described in Figure 2. Thus, for example for an image named `smiley_face-1`, the associated labels are stored in the `answers.json` at the key numbered 1. This key identification system allows us to track directly from the filename the crowdsourced labels without having to rely on multiple indexing files as can be traditionally proposed. Furthermore, storing labels in a dictionary is more memory-friendly than having an array of size $(n_{\text{task}}, n_{\text{worker}})$ and writing $y_i^{(j)} = -1$ when the worker w_j did not see the task x_i and $y_i^{(j)} \in [K]$ otherwise (used in recent works such as Rodrigues et al. (2017)).

$K = 2$	0: not smiling	1: smiling	0	1	0
Smiling	1	0	1	1	
Neutral	1	X	0	0	
Neutral	X	1	X	1	

Figure 2: From collected labels to data storage in the `answers.json` file for a binary classification ($K = 2$) on recognizing smiling faces. (left: how data is stored in peerannot, right: data collected)

In Figure 2, there are three tasks, $n_{\text{worker}} = 4$ workers and $K = 2$ classes. If the tasks (images) are available, they must be stored as it is usual to store `ImageFolder` datasets with pytorch into a `train`, `val` and `test` folder. Each image can have its name followed by its index in the `answers.json` file.

Finally, a `metadata.json` file includes relevant information related to the crowdsourcing experiment such as the number of workers, the number of tasks, *etc*. For example, a minimal `metadata.json` file for the toy dataset presented in Figure 2 is:

```
{
    "name": "toy-data",
    "n_classes": 2,
    "n_workers": 4,
    "n_tasks": 3
}
```

The toy-data example dataset is available as an example [in the peerannot repository](#). Classical datasets in crowdsourcing such as CIFAR-10H (Peterson et al. 2019) and LabelMe (Rodrigues, Pereira, and Ribeiro 2014) can be installed directly using `peerannot`. To install them, we run the `install` command from `peerannot`:

```
! peerannot install ./datasets/labelme/labelme.py
! peerannot install ./datasets/cifar10H/cifar10h.py

import torch
import matplotlib.pyplot as plt
from PIL import Image
import numpy as np
from pathlib import Path
nrow = 5
ncol = 5
fig, axs = plt.subplots(
    nrow,
    ncol,
    sharey="row",
    sharex="col",
    figsize=(12,8)
)
match_ = {0: "bird", 1: "car", 2: "cat", 3: "deer", 4: "dog", 5: "frog", 6: "horse", 7: "plane",
path = Path.cwd() / "datasets" / "cifar10H" / "train"
for i in range(nrow):
    img_folder = path / f"{match_[i]}"
    all_imgs = list(img_folder.glob("*"))[:ncol]
    for j in range(ncol):
        image = np.asarray(Image.open(path / all_imgs[j]))
        axs[i,j].imshow(image, aspect="equal")
        axs[i,j].axis("off")
        axs[i,j].set_yticklabels([])
plt.subplots_adjust(left=0.05, bottom=0.05, right=0.95, top=0.95, wspace=0.05, hspace=0.05)
plt.show()
```




Figure 3: Example of images to label from the CIFAR-10H dataset with label `bird`, `car`, `cat`, `deer` and `dog` (top to bottom) by row.

Examples of CIFAR-10H images are available in Figure 3, and LabelMe examples in Figure 4 here below.

```

nrow = 5
ncol = 5
fig, axs = plt.subplots(
    nrow,
    ncol,
    sharey="row",
    sharex="col",
    figsize=(12,8)
)
match_ = {0: "coast", 1: "forest", 2: "highway", 3: "insidecity", 4: "mountain", 5: "opencountry"}
path = Path.cwd() / "datasets" / "labelme" / "train"
for i in range(nrow):
    img_folder = path / f"{match_[i]}"
    all_imgs = list(img_folder.glob("*"))[:ncol]
    for j in range(ncol):
        image = np.asarray(Image.open(path / all_imgs[j]))
        axs[i,j].imshow(image, aspect="equal")
        axs[i,j].axis("off")
        axs[i,j].set_yticklabels([])

```

```

plt.subplots_adjust(left=0.05, bottom=0.05, right=0.95, top=0.95, wspace=0.05, hspace=0.05)
plt.show()

```




Figure 4: Example of images to label from the LabelMe dataset with label `coast`, `forest`, `highway`, `insidecity` and `mountain` (top to bottom) by row.

3 Aggregation strategies in crowdsourcing

The first question we address with `peerannot` is: *How to aggregate multiple labels into a single label from crowdsourced tasks?* The aggregation step can lead to two types of learnable labels $\hat{y}_i \in \Delta_K$ (where Δ_K is the simplex of dimension $K - 1 : \Delta_K = \{p \in [K] : \sum_{k=1}^K p_k = 1, p_k \geq 0\}$) depending on the use case for each task x_i , $i = 1, \dots, n_{\text{task}}$:

- a **hard** label: \hat{y}_i is a Dirac distribution, this can be encoded as a classical label in $[K]$,
- a **soft** label: $\hat{y}_i \in \Delta_K$ can any probability distribution (different from a Dirac distribution). In that case, each coefficient in \hat{y}_i represents the probability to belong to the given class.

Learning from soft labels has been shown to improve learning performance and make the classifier learn the task ambiguity (Zhang et al. 2018; Peterson et al. 2019; Park and Caragea 2022). However, crowdsourcing is often used as a stepping stone to creating a new dataset and we usually expect a classification dataset to associate a task x_i to a single label and not a full probability distribution. In this case, we recommend in practice releasing the anonymous answered labels and the aggregation strategy used to reach a consensus on a single label. With `peerannot`, both soft and hard labels can be produced.

Note that when a strategy produces a soft label, a hard label can be induced by taking the mode, i.e.,

the class achieving the maximum probability.

3.1 Classical models

We list below the most classical aggregation strategies used in crowdsourcing.

3.1.1 Majority vote (MV)

While the most intuitive way to create a label from multiple answers for any type of crowdsourced task would be to take the majority vote (MV), this strategy has many shortcomings (James 1998) – there is no noise model, no worker reliability estimated, no task difficulty involved and especially no way to remove poorly performing workers. This baseline aggregation can be expressed as:

$$\hat{y}_i^{\text{MV}} = \operatorname{argmax}_{k \in [K]} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{A}(x_i)} 1_{\{y_i^{(j)} = k\}} .$$

3.1.2 Naive soft (NS)

One pitfall with the MV is that the label produced is hard, hence the ambiguity is discarded by construction. To remedy this, the Naive Soft (NS) labeling consists in using the empirical frequency distribution as the task label:

$$\hat{y}_i^{\text{NS}} = \left(\frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}(x_i)|} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{A}(x_i)} 1_{\{y_i^{(j)} = k\}} \right)_{j \in [K]} .$$

With the NS label, we keep the ambiguity, but all workers and all tasks are put on the same level. In practice, it is known that each worker comes with their abilities, thus modeling this knowledge can produce better results.

3.1.3 Dawid and Skene (DS)

Going further into the aggregation, researchers began creating a noise model to take into account the workers' abilities in the aggregation. These types of models are most often EM-based and one of the most studied (Gao and Zhou 2013) and applied (Servajean et al. 2017; Rodrigues and Pereira 2018) is the Dawid and Skene's (DS) model (Dawid and Skene 1979). Assuming the workers are answering tasks independently, this model boils down to model pairwise confusions between each possible class. Each worker w_j is assigned a confusion matrix $\pi^{(j)} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$ such that $\pi_{k,\ell}^{(j)} = \mathbb{P}(y_i^{(j)} = \ell | y_i^* = k)$. The model assumes that the probability for a task x_i to have true label $y_i^* = k$ follows a multinomial distribution with probabilities $\pi_{k,*}^{(j)}$ for each worker. Each class has a prevalence $\rho_k = \mathbb{P}(y_i^* = k)$ to appear in the dataset. Using the independence between workers, we obtain the following likelihood to maximize (using the EM algorithm):

$$\prod_{i \in [n_{\text{task}}]} \prod_{k \in [K]} \left[\rho_k \prod_{j \in [n_{\text{worker}}]} \prod_{k \in [K]} (\pi_{k,k}^{(j)})^{1_{\{y_i^* = k\}}} \right]^{T_{ik}},$$

with $T_{i,k} = 1_{\{y_i^* = k\}}$. The final aggregated soft label is $\hat{y}_i^{\text{DS}} = T_{i,*}$.

Many variants of the DS model have been proposed in the literature, using Dirichlet priors on the confusion matrices (Passonneau and Carpenter 2014), using L clusters of workers (Imamura, Sato, and Sugiyama 2018) with $1 \leq L \leq n_{\text{worker}}$ (DSWC) or even faster implementation that produces only hard labels (Sinha, Rao, and Balasubramanian 2018).




Figure 5: Bayesian plate notation for the DS model

3.1.4 Generative model of Labels, Abilities, and Difficulties (GLAD)

Finally, we present the GLAD model (Whitehill et al. 2009) that not only takes into account the worker’s ability, but also the task difficulty in the noise model. Denoting $\alpha_j \in \mathbb{R}$ the worker ability (the higher the better) and $\beta_i \in \mathbb{R}_*^+$ the task’s difficulty (the higher the easier), the model noise is:

$$\mathbb{P}(y_i^{(j)} = y_i^* | \alpha_j, \beta_i) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-\alpha_j \beta_i)} .$$

GLAD’s model also assumes that the errors are uniform across wrong labels, thus:

$$\forall k \in [K], \mathbb{P}(y_i^{(j)} = k | y_i^* \neq k, \alpha_j, \beta_i) = \frac{1}{K-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-\alpha_j \beta_i)} \right) .$$

The likelihood can then be optimized using an EM algorithm to recover the soft label \hat{y}_i^{GLAD} .




Figure 6: Bayesian plate notation for the GLAD model

All of these aggregation strategies – and more – are available in the `peerannot` library from the `peerannot.models` module. Each model is a class object in its own Python file. It inherits from the `CrowdModel` template class and is defined with at least two methods:

- `run`: includes the optimization procedure to obtain needed weights (e.g. the EM algorithm for the DS model),
- `get_probas`: returns the soft labels output for each task.

3.2 Experiments and evaluation of label aggregation strategies

One way to evaluate the label aggregation strategies is to measure their accuracy. This means that the underlying ground truth must be known – or at least for a representative subset. As the set of n_{task} can be seen as a training set for a future classifier, we denote this metric AccTrain on a dataset \mathcal{D} for a given aggregated label $(\hat{y}_i)_i$ as:

$$\text{AccTrain}(\mathcal{D}) = \frac{1}{|\mathcal{D}|} \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{D}|} 1_{\{\hat{y}_i^* = \text{argmax}_{k \in [K]} \hat{y}_i\}} .$$

In the following, we write AccTrain for $\text{AccTrain}(\mathcal{D}_{\text{train}})$ as we only consider the full training set so there is no ambiguity. While this metric is useful, in practice there are a few arguable issues:

- the AccTrain does not consider the ambiguity of the soft label, only the most probable class, whereas in some contexts ambiguity can be informative,
- in supervised learning one objective is to identify difficult or mislabeled tasks (Pleiss et al. 2020; Lefort et al. 2022), pruning those tasks can easily artificially improve the AccTrain, but there is no guarantee over the predictive performance of a model based on the newly pruned dataset.

We first consider classical simulation settings in the literature that can easily be created and reproduced using peerannot.

3.2.1 Simulated independent mistakes

The independent mistakes consider that each worker w_j answers following a multinomial distribution with weights given at the row y_i^* of their confusion matrix $\pi^{(j)} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$. Each confusion matrix is generated diagonally dominant. Answers are independent of one another as each matrix is generated independently and each worker answers independently of other workers. In this setting, the DS model is expected to perform the best with enough data as we are simulating data from its assumed noise model.

We simulate $n_{\text{task}} = 200$ tasks and $n_{\text{worker}} = 30$ workers with $K = 5$ possible classes. Each task x_i receives $|\mathcal{A}(x_i)| = 10$ labels.

```
! peerannot simulate --n-worker=30 --n-task=200 --n-classes=5 \
    --strategy independent-confusion \
    --feedback=10 --seed 0 \
    --folder ./simus/independent


from peerannot.helpers.helpers_visu import feedback_effort, working_load
import seaborn as sns
import matplotlib.pyplot as plt
from matplotlib.ticker import MaxNLocator
from pathlib import Path
import matplotlib.ticker as mtick
sns.set_style("whitegrid")

votes_path = Path.cwd() / "simus" / "independent" / "answers.json"
metadata_path = Path.cwd() / "simus" / "independent" / "metadata.json"
efforts = feedback_effort(votes_path)
```

```

workerload = working_load(votes_path, metadata_path)
feedback = feedback_effort(votes_path)
nbins = 17
fig, ax = plt.subplots(1, 2, figsize=(9, 4))
sns.histplot(workerload, stat="percent", bins=nbins, shrink=1, ax=ax[0])
ax[0].yaxis.set_major_formatter(mtick.PercentFormatter(decimals=0))
ax[0].set_xlabel(r"\$|\mathcal{T}(w_j)|\$")
sns.histplot(feedback, stat="percent", bins=nbins, shrink=1, ax=ax[1])
ax[1].yaxis.set_major_formatter(mtick.PercentFormatter(decimals=0))
ax[1].set_xlabel(r"\$|\mathcal{A}(x_i)|\$")
ax[1].xaxis.set_major_locator(plt.MaxNLocator(3))
ax[1].set_xlim(8, 12)
ax[1].xaxis.set_major_locator(MaxNLocator(integer=True))
for i in range(2):
    ax[i].xaxis.set_major_locator(MaxNLocator(3))
    ax[i].xaxis.label.set_size(15)
    ax[i].yaxis.label.set_size(15)
    ax[i].xaxis.set_tick_params(labelsize=13)
    ax[i].yaxis.set_tick_params(labelsize=13)
    ax[i].title.set_size(18)
plt.tight_layout()
plt.show()

```



With the obtained answers, we can look at the aforementioned aggregation strategies performance:

```

for strat in ["MV", "NaiveSoft", "DS", "GLAD", "DSWC[L=5]", "DSWC[L=10]"]:
    ! peerannot aggregate ./simus/independent/ -s {strat}

import pandas as pd
import numpy as np
from IPython.display import display
simu_indep = Path.cwd() / 'simus' / "independent"

```

```

results = {"mv": [], "naivesoft": [], "glad": [], "ds": [], "dswc[l=5)": [], "dswc[l=10)": []}
for strategy in results.keys():
    path_labels = simu_indep / "labels" / f"labels_independent-confusion_{strategy}.npy"
    ground_truth = np.load(simu_indep / "ground_truth.npy")
    labels = np.load(path_labels)
    acc = (
        np.mean(labels == ground_truth)
        if labels.ndim == 1
        else np.mean(
            np.argmax(labels, axis=1)
            == ground_truth
        )
    )
    results[strategy].append(acc)
results = pd.DataFrame(results, index=['AccTrain'])
results.columns = map(str.upper, results.columns)
results = results.style.set_table_styles([dict(selector='th', props=[('text-align', 'center')])])
results.set_properties(**{'text-align': 'center'})
results = results.format(precision=3)
display(results)

```

Table 1: AccTrain metric on simulated independent mistakes considering classical feature-blind label aggregation strategies

	MV	NAIVESOFT	GLAD	DS	D SWC[L=5]	D SWC[L=10]
AccTrain	0.755	0.760		0.780	0.890	0.775

As expected by the simulation framework, Table 1 fits the DS model, thus leading to better accuracy to retrieve the simulated labels for the DS model. The MV aggregation does not consider any worker-ability scoring or the task’s difficulty and performs the worse.

Note that peerannot can also simulate datasets with an imbalanced number of votes chosen uniformly at random between 1 and the number of workers available). For example:

```

! peerannot simulate --n-worker=30 --n-task=200 --n-classes=5 \
    --strategy independent-confusion \
    --imbalance-votes \
    --seed 0 \
    --folder ./simus/independent-imbalanced/

```



```

sns.set_style("whitegrid")



votes_path = Path.cwd() / "simus" / "independent-imbalanced" / "answers.json"
metadata_path = Path.cwd() / "simus" / "independent-imbalanced" / "metadata.json"
efforts = feedback_effort(votes_path)
workerload = working_load(votes_path, metadata_path)
feedback = feedback_effort(votes_path)
nbins = 17

```

```

fig, ax = plt.subplots(1, 2, figsize=(9, 4))
sns.histplot(workerload, stat="percent", bins=nbins, shrink=1, ax=ax[0])
ax[0].yaxis.set_major_formatter(mtick.PercentFormatter(decimals=0))
ax[0].set_xlabel(r"$|\mathcal{T}(w_j)|$")
sns.histplot(feedback, stat="percent", bins=nbins, shrink=1, ax=ax[1])
ax[1].yaxis.set_major_formatter(mtick.PercentFormatter(decimals=0))
ax[1].set_xlabel(r"$|\mathcal{A}(x_i)|$")
ax[1].xaxis.set_major_locator(plt.MaxNLocator(3))
ax[1].xaxis.set_major_locator(MaxNLocator(integer=True))
for i in range(2):
    ax[i].xaxis.set_major_locator(MaxNLocator(3))
    ax[i].xaxis.label.set_size(15)
    ax[i].yaxis.label.set_size(15)
    ax[i].xaxis.set_tick_params(labelsize=13)
    ax[i].yaxis.set_tick_params(labelsize=13)
    ax[i].title.set_size(18)
plt.tight_layout()
plt.show()

```



With the obtained answers, we can look at the aforementioned aggregation strategies performance:

```

for strat in ["MV", "NaiveSoft", "DS", "GLAD", "DSWC[L=5]", "DSWC[L=10]"]:
    ! peerannot aggregate ./simus/independent-imbalanced/ -s {strat}

import pandas as pd
import numpy as np
from IPython.display import display
simu_indep = Path.cwd() / 'simus' / "independent-imbalanced"
results = {"mv": [], "naivesoft": [], "glad": [], "ds": [], "dswc[l=5)": [], "dswc[l=10)": []}
for strategy in results.keys():
    path_labels = simu_indep / "labels" / f"labels_independent-confusion_{strategy}.npy"
    ground_truth = np.load(simu_indep / "ground_truth.npy")

```

```

labels = np.load(path_labels)
acc = (
    np.mean(labels == ground_truth)
    if labels.ndim == 1
    else np.mean(
        np.argmax(labels, axis=1)
        == ground_truth
    )
)
results[strategy].append(acc)
results = pd.DataFrame(results, index=['AccTrain'])
results.columns = map(str.upper, results.columns)
results = results.style.set_table_styles([dict(selector='th', props=[('text-align', 'center')])])
results.set_properties(**{'text-align': 'center'})
results = results.format(precision=3)
display(results)

```

Table 2: AccTrain metric on simulated independent mistakes with an imbalanced number of votes per task considering classical feature-blind label aggregation strategies

	MV	NAIVESOFT	GLAD	DS	DSWC[L=5]	DSWC[L=10]
AccTrain	0.810	0.830		0.810	0.895	0.845

While more realistic, working with an imbalanced number of votes per task leads to disrupting orders of performance for most strategies.

3.2.2 Simulated correlated mistakes

The correlated mistakes are also known as the student-teacher setting. Consider that the crowd of workers is divided into two categories: teachers and students such that $n_{\text{teacher}} + n_{\text{student}} = n_{\text{worker}}$. Each student is randomly assigned to one teacher at the beginning of the experiment. We generate the (diagonally dominant) confusion matrices of each teacher and the students are associated with their's teacher confusion matrix. Then, they all answer independently, following a multinomial distribution with weights given at the row y_i^* of their confusion matrix $\pi^{(j)} \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$.

We simulate $n_{\text{task}} = 200$ tasks and $n_{\text{worker}} = 30$ with 80% of students in the crowd. There are $K = 5$ possible classes. Each task receives $|\mathcal{A}(x_i)| = 10$ labels.

```

! peerannot simulate --n-worker=30 --n-task=200 --n-classes=5 \
    --strategy student-teacher \
    --ratio 0.8 \
    --feedback=10 --seed 0 \
    --folder ./simus/student_teacher


votes_path = Path.cwd() / "simus" / "student_teacher" / "answers.json"
metadata_path = Path.cwd() / "simus" / "student_teacher" / "metadata.json"
efforts = feedback_effort(votes_path)
workerload = working_load(votes_path, metadata_path)

```

```

feedback = feedback_effort(votes_path)
nbins = 17
fig, ax = plt.subplots(1, 2, figsize=(9, 4))
sns.histplot(workerload, stat="percent", bins=nbins, shrink=1, ax=ax[0])
ax[0].yaxis.set_major_formatter(mtick.PercentFormatter(decimals=0))
ax[0].set_xlabel(r"$|\mathcal{T}(w_j)|$")
sns.histplot(feedback, stat="percent", bins=nbins, shrink=1, ax=ax[1])
ax[1].yaxis.set_major_formatter(mtick.PercentFormatter(decimals=0))
ax[1].set_xlabel(r"$|\mathcal{A}(x_i)|$")
ax[1].xaxis.set_major_locator(plt.MaxNLocator(3))
ax[1].set_xlim(8, 12)
ax[1].xaxis.set_major_locator(MaxNLocator(integer=True))
for i in range(2):
    ax[i].xaxis.set_major_locator(MaxNLocator(3))
    ax[i].xaxis.label.set_size(15)
    ax[i].yaxis.label.set_size(15)
    ax[i].xaxis.set_tick_params(labelsize=13)
    ax[i].yaxis.set_tick_params(labelsize=13)
    ax[i].title.set_size(18)
plt.tight_layout()
plt.show()

```



With the obtained answers, we can look at the aforementioned aggregation strategies performance:

```

for strat in ["MV", "NaiveSoft", "DS", "GLAD", "DSWC[L=5]", "DSWC[L=10]"]:
    ! peerannot aggregate ./simus/student_teacher/ -s {strat}

simu_corr = Path.cwd() / 'simus' / "student_teacher"
results = {"mv": [], "naivesoft": [], "glad": [], "ds": [], "dswc[l=5)": [], "dswc[l=10)": []}
for strategy in results.keys():
    path_labels = simu_corr / "labels" / f"labels_student-teacher_{strategy}.npy"
    ground_truth = np.load(simu_corr / "ground_truth.npy")

```

```

labels = np.load(path_labels)
acc = (
    np.mean(labels == ground_truth)
    if labels.ndim == 1
    else np.mean(
        np.argmax(labels, axis=1)
        == ground_truth
    )
)
results[strategy].append(acc)
results = pd.DataFrame(results, index=['AccTrain'])
results.columns = map(str.upper, results.columns)
results = results.style.set_table_styles([dict(selector='th', props=[('text-align', 'center')])])
results.set_properties(**{'text-align': 'center'})
results = results.format(precision=3)
display(results)

```

Table 3: AccTrain metric on simulated correlated mistakes considering classical feature-blind label aggregation strategies

	MV	NAIVESOFT	GLAD	DS	DSWC[L=5]	DSWC[L=10]
AccTrain	0.715	0.690		0.645	0.755	0.795

With Table 3, we see that with correlated data (24 students and 6 teachers), using 5 confusion matrices with DSWC[L=5] outperforms the vanilla DS strategy that does not consider the correlations. And the best-performing method here estimates only 10 confusion matrices (instead of 30 for the vanilla DS model).

3.2.3 Simulated mistakes with discrete difficulty levels on tasks

For the final simulation setting, we consider the discrete difficulty presented in Whitehill et al. (2009). Contrary to other simulations, we here consider that workers belong to two levels of abilities: good or bad, and tasks have two levels of difficulty: easy or hard. The keyword ratio-diff indicates the prevalence of each level of difficulty, it is defined as the ratio of easy tasks over hard tasks:

$$\text{ratio-diff} = \frac{\mathbb{P}(\text{easy})}{\mathbb{P}(\text{hard})} \text{ with } \mathbb{P}(\text{easy}) + \mathbb{P}(\text{hard}) = 1 .$$

Difficulties are then drawn [following at random](#). Tasks that are easy are answered correctly by every worker. Tasks that are hard are answered following the confusion matrix assigned to each worker. Each worker then answers independently to the presented tasks.

We simulate $n_{\text{task}} = 500$ tasks and $n_{\text{worker}} = 100$ with 35% of good workers in the crowd and 50% of easy tasks. There are $K = 5$ possible classes. Each task receives $|\mathcal{A}(x_i)| = 10$ labels.


```

! peerannot simulate --n-worker=100 --n-task=200 --n-classes=5 \
--strategy discrete-difficulty \
--ratio 0.35 --ratio-diff 1 \
--feedback 10 --seed 0 \

```

```
--folder ./simus/discrete_difficulty

votes_path = Path.cwd() / "simus" / "discrete_difficulty" / "answers.json"
metadata_path = Path.cwd() / "simus" / "discrete_difficulty" / "metadata.json"
efforts = feedback_effort(votes_path)
workerload = working_load(votes_path, metadata_path)
feedback = feedback_effort(votes_path)
nbins = 17
fig, ax = plt.subplots(1, 2, figsize=(9, 4))
sns.histplot(workerload, stat="percent", bins=nbins, shrink=1, ax=ax[0])
ax[0].yaxis.set_major_formatter(mtick.PercentFormatter(decimals=0))
ax[0].set_xlabel(r"\vert\mathcal{T}(w_j)\vert")
sns.histplot(feedback, stat="percent", bins=nbins, shrink=1, ax=ax[1])
ax[1].yaxis.set_major_formatter(mtick.PercentFormatter(decimals=0))
ax[1].set_xlabel(r"\vert\mathcal{A}(x_i)\vert")
ax[1].set_xlim(8, 12)
ax[1].xaxis.set_major_locator(MaxNLocator(integer=True))
for i in range(2):
    ax[i].xaxis.set_major_locator(MaxNLocator(3))
    ax[i].xaxis.label.set_size(15)
    ax[i].yaxis.label.set_size(15)
    ax[i].xaxis.set_tick_params(labelsize=13)
    ax[i].yaxis.set_tick_params(labelsize=13)
    ax[i].title.set_size(18)
plt.tight_layout()
plt.show()
```



With the obtained answers, we can look at the aforementioned aggregation strategies performance:

```
for strat in ["MV", "NaiveSoft", "DS", "GLAD", "DSWC[L=2]", "DSWC[L=5]"]:
    ! peerannot aggregate ./simus/discrete_difficulty/ -s {strat}
```

```

simu_corr = Path.cwd() / 'simus' / "discrete_difficulty"
results = {"mv": [], "naivesoft": [], "glad": [], "ds": [], "dswc[l=2)": [], "dswc[l=5)": []}
for strategy in results.keys():
    path_labels = simu_corr / "labels" / f"labels_discrete-difficulty_{strategy}.npy"
    ground_truth = np.load(simu_corr / "ground_truth.npy")
    labels = np.load(path_labels)
    acc = (
        np.mean(labels == ground_truth)
        if labels.ndim == 1
        else np.mean(
            np.argmax(labels, axis=1)
            == ground_truth
        )
    )
    results[strategy].append(acc)
results = pd.DataFrame(results, index=['AccTrain'])
results.columns = map(str.upper, results.columns)
results = results.style.set_table_styles([dict(selector='th', props=[('text-align', 'center')])])
results.set_properties(**{'text-align': 'center'})
results = results.format(precision=3)
display(results)

```

Table 4: AccTrain metric on simulated mistakes when tasks are associated a difficulty level considering classical feature-blind label aggregation strategies

	MV	NAIVESOFT	GLAD	DS	DSWC[L=2]	DSWC[L=5]
AccTrain	0.785	0.790		0.845	0.810	0.600

Finally, in this setting involving task difficulty coefficients, the only strategy that involves a latent variable for the task difficulty, knowing GLAD, outperforms the other strategies (see Table 4). Note that in this case, creating clusters of answers leads to worse decisions than an MV aggregation.

To summarize our simulations, we see that depending on workers answering strategies, different latent variable models perform best. However, these are unknown outside of a simulation framework, thus if we want to obtain labels from multiple responses, we need to investigate multiple models. This can be done easily with `peerannot` as we demonstrated using the `aggregate` module. However, one might not want to generate a label, simply learn a classifier to predict labels on unseen data. This leads us to another module part of `peerannot`.

4 Learning from crowdsourced tasks

Most often, tasks are crowdsourced to create a large training set as modern machine learning models require more and more data. The aggregation step then simply becomes the first step in the complete learning pipeline. However, instead of aggregating labels, modern neural networks let us directly train a classifier from multiple noisy labels.

4.1 Classical models

In recent years, directly learning a classifier from noisy labels was introduced. Two of the most used models: CrowdLayer (Rodrigues and Pereira 2018) and CoNAL (Chu, Ma, and Wang 2021), are directly available in `peerannot`. These two learning strategies directly incorporate a DS-based noise model in the neural network's architecture.

[CrowdLayer](#) trains a classifier with noisy labels as follows. Let the scores (logits) output of a given classifier neural network \mathcal{C} be $z_i = \mathcal{C}(x_i)$. Then CrowdLayer adds as a last layer $\pi \in \mathbb{R}^{n_{\text{worker}} \times K \times K}$, the tensor of all $\pi^{(j)}$'s such that the crossentropy loss (CE) is adapted to the crowdsourcing setting into $\mathcal{L}_{CE}^{\text{CrowdLayer}}$ and computed as:

$$\mathcal{L}_{CE}^{\text{CrowdLayer}}(x_i) = \sum_{j \in \mathcal{A}(x_i)} \text{CE}(\sigma(\pi^{(j)} \sigma(z_i)), y_i^{(j)}) ,$$

where the classical crossentropy loss for two distribution $u, v \in \Delta_K$ is defined as $\text{CE}(u, v) = \sum_{k \in [K]} u_k \log(v_k)$.

The confusion matrices are incorporated as is into the network architecture as a new layer to transform the output probabilities to match each worker's answer. However, for some datasets, it was noticed that global confusion occurs between the proposed classes. It is the case for example in the LabelMe dataset (Rodrigues et al. 2017) where classes overlap. In this case, Chu, Ma, and Wang (2021) proposed to extend the CrowdLayer model by not only modeling the worker confusion matrices; but also a global confusion matrix $\pi^g \in \mathbb{R}^{K \times K}$.

Given the output $z_i = \mathcal{C}(x_i) \in \mathbb{R}^K$ of a given classifier and task, [CoNAL](#) interpolates between the local confusion $\pi^{(j)} z_i$ and the global one $\pi^g z_i$. The loss function is computed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{CE}^{\text{CoNAL}}(x_i) &= \sum_{j \in \mathcal{A}(x_i)} \text{CE}(h_i^{(j)}, y_i^{(j)}) , \\ \text{with } h_i^{(j)} &= \sigma((\omega_i^{(j)} \pi^g + (1 - \omega_i^{(j)}) \pi^{(j)}) z_i) . \end{aligned}$$

The interpolation weight $\omega_i^{(j)}$ is unobservable in practice. So, to compute $h_i^{(j)}$, the weight is obtained through an auxiliary network. This network takes in input the image and worker information and outputs a task-related vector v_i and a worker-related vector u_j of the same dimension. Finally, $\omega_i^{(j)} = (1 + \exp(-u_j^\top v_i))^{-1}$.

Both CrowdLayer and CoNAL model worker confusions directly in the classifier's weights to learn from the noisy collected labels and are available in `peerannot` as we will see in the following.

4.2 Prediction error when learning from crowdsourced tasks

The AccTrain metric presented in Section 3.2 might no longer be of interest when training a classifier. Classical error measurements involve a test dataset to estimate the generalization error. To do so, we present hereafter two error metrics. Assuming we trained our classifier f_θ on a training set:

- the test accuracy is computed as $\frac{1}{n_{\text{test}}} \sum_{i=1}^{n_{\text{test}}} \mathbf{1}_{\{y_i^* = \widehat{f_\theta(x_i)}\}}$
- the expected calibration error (Guo et al. 2017) over M equally spaced bins I_1, \dots, I_M , computed as:

$$\text{ECE} = \sum_{m=1}^M \frac{|B_m|}{n_{\text{task}}} |\text{acc}(B_m) - \text{conf}(B_m)| ,$$

with $B_m = \{x_i | \mathcal{C}(x_i)[1] \in I_m\}$ the tasks with predicted probability in the m -th bin, $\text{acc}(B_m)$ the accuracy of the network for the samples in B_m and $\text{conf}(B_m)$ the associated empirical confidence.

The accuracy represents how well the classifier generalizes, and the expected calibration error (ECE) quantifies the deviation between the accuracy and the confidence of the classifier. Modern neural networks are known to often be overconfident in their predictions (Guo et al. 2017). However, it has also been remarked that training on crowdsourced data, depending on the strategy, mitigates this confidence issue. That is why we propose to compare them both in our coming experiments. Note that the ECE error estimator is known to be biased (Gruber and Buettner 2022). Smaller training sets are known to have a higher ECE estimation error. And in the crowdsourcing setting, openly available datasets are often quite small.

4.3 Use case with peerannot on real datasets

Few real crowdsourcing experiments have been released publicly. Among the available ones, CIFAR-10H (Peterson et al. 2019) is one of the largest with 10000 tasks labeled by workers (the testing set of CIFAR-10). The main limitation of CIFAR-10H is that there are few disagreements between workers and a simple majority voting already leads to a near-perfect AccTrain error. Hence, comparing the impact of aggregation and end-to-end strategies might not be relevant (Peterson et al. 2019; Aitchison 2021), it is however a good benchmark for task difficulty identification and worker evaluation scoring

The LabelMe dataset was extracted from crowdsourcing segmentation experiments and a subset of $K = 8$ classes was released in Rodrigues et al. (2017).

Let us use peerannot to train a VGG-16 with two dense layers on the LabelMe dataset. Note that this modification was introduced to reach state-of-the-art performance in (Chu, Ma, and Wang 2021). Other models from the torchvision library can be used, such as Resnets, Alexnet etc.

```

for strat in ["MV", "NaiveSoft", "DS", "GLAD"]:
    ! peerannot aggregate ./labalme/ -s {strat}
    ! peerannot train ./labelme -o labelme_{strat} -K 8 --labels=./labelme/labels/labels_labelme_
for strat in ["CrowdLayer", "CoNAL[scale=0]", "CoNAL[scale=1e-4]"]:
    ! peerannot aggregate-deep ./ -o labelme_{strat} --answers ./labelme/answers.json -s ${strat}

# command to save separately a specific part of conal model (memory intensive otherwise)
path_ = Path.cwd() / "datasets" / "labelme"
best_conal = torch.load(path_ / "best_models" / "labelme_conal[scale=1e-4].pth", map_location="cpu")
torch.save(best_conal["noise_adaptation"]["local_confusion_matrices"], path_ / "best_models" / "labelme_local_confusion_matrices.pth")

def highlight_max(s, props=''):
    return np.where(s == np.nanmax(s.values), props, '')

def highlight_min(s, props=''):
    return np.where(s == np.nanmin(s.values), props, '')

import json
dir_results = Path().cwd() / 'datasets' / "labelme" / "results"
meth, accuracy, ece = [], [], []
for res in dir_results.glob("modellabelme/*"):
    filename = res.stem

```

```

_, mm = filename.split("_")
meth.append(mm)
with open(res, "r") as f:
    dd = json.load(f)
    accuracy.append(dd["test_accuracy"])
    ece.append(dd["test_ece"])
results = pd.DataFrame(list(zip(meth, accuracy, ece)), columns=["method", "AccTest", "ECE"])
results = results.sort_values(by="AccTest", ascending=True)
results.reset_index(drop=True, inplace=True)
results = results.style.set_table_styles([dict(selector='th', props=[('text-align', 'center')])])
results.set_properties(**{'text-align': 'center'})
results = results.format(precision=3)
results.apply(highlight_max, props='background-color:#e6ffe6;', axis=0, subset=["AccTest"])
results.apply(highlight_min, props='background-color:#e6ffe6;', axis=0, subset=["ECE"])
display(results)

```

Table 5: Generalization performance on LabelMe dataset depending on the learning strategy from the crowdsourced labels. The network used is a VGG-16 with two dense layers.

	method	AccTest	ECE
0	ds	81.061	0.189
1	mv	85.606	0.143
2	naivesoft	86.448	0.136
3	crowdlayer	87.205	0.117
4	glad	87.542	0.124
5	conal[scale=0]	88.468	0.115
6	conal[scale=1e-4]	88.889	0.112

As we can see, CoNAL strategy performs best. In this case, it is expected behavior as CoNAL was created for the LabelMe dataset. However, using peerannot we can look into **why modeling common confusion returns better results with this dataset**. To do so, we can explore the datasets from two points of view: worker-wise or task-wise.

5 Exploring crowdsourced datasets

If a dataset requires citizen knowledge to be labeled, it is because expert knowledge is long and costly to obtain. In the era of big data, where datasets are built using web scraping (or using a platform like [Amazon Mechanical Turk](#)), citizen science is popular as it is an easy way to produce many labels.

However, mistakes and confusions happen during these experiments. Sometimes involuntarily (e.g. because the task is too hard or the worker is unable to differentiate between two classes) and sometimes not (e.g. the worker is a spammer).

Underlying all the learning models and aggregation strategies, the cornerstone of crowdsourcing is evaluating the trust we put in each worker depending on the presented task. And with the gamification of crowdsourcing (Servajean et al. 2016; Tinati et al. 2017), it has become essential to find scoring metrics both for workers and tasks to keep citizens in the loop so to speak. This is the purpose of the identification module in peerannot.

Our test cases are both the CIFAR-10H dataset and the LabelMe dataset to compare the worker and task evaluation depending on the number of votes collected. Indeed, the LabelMe dataset has only up to three votes per task whereas CIFAR-10H accounts for nearly fifty votes per task.

5.1 Exploring tasks' difficulty

To explore the tasks' intrinsic difficulty, we propose to compare three scoring metrics:

- the entropy of the NS distribution: reliable with a big enough and not adversarial crowd, the entropy measures the inherent uncertainty of the distribution to the possible outcomes.
- GLAD's scoring: by construction, Whitehill et al. (2009) introduced a scalar coefficient to score the difficulty of a task.
- the WAUM: introduced in (Lefort et al. 2022), this weighted area under the margins indicates how difficult it is for a classifier \mathcal{C} in $T > 0$ epochs the task given the crowdsourced labels and the trust we have in each worker denoted $s^{(j)}(x_i) > 0$.

The WAUM of a given task $x_i \in \mathcal{X}$ and a set of crowdsourced labels $\{y_i^{(j)}\}_j \in [K]^{\mathcal{A}(x_i)}$ is defined as:

$$\text{WAUM}(x_i) := \frac{1}{|\mathcal{A}(x_i)|} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{A}(x_i)} s^{(j)}(x_i) \left\{ \frac{1}{T} \sum_{t=1}^T \sigma(\mathcal{C}(x_i))_{y_i^{(j)}} - \sigma(\mathcal{C}(x_i))_{[2]} \right\} .$$

Note that each of these statistics is useful in its context. The entropy can not be used in a setting with small $|\mathcal{A}(x_i)|$ (few labels per task), in particular for the LabelMe dataset it is uninformative. The WAUM can handle any number of labels, but the larger the better. However, as it uses a deep learning classifier, the WAUM needs the tasks $(x_i)_i$ in addition to the proposed labels while the other strategies are feature-blind.

5.1.1 CIFAR-1OH dataset

First, let us consider a dataset with a large number of tasks, annotations and workers: the CIFAR-10H dataset by Peterson et al. (2019).

```
! peerannot identify ./datasets/cifar10H -s entropy -K 10 --labels ./datasets/cifar10H/answers.json
! peerannot aggregate ./datasets/cifar10H/ -s GLAD
! peerannot identify ./datasets/cifar10H/ -K 10 --method WAUM \
    --labels ./datasets/cifar10H/answers.json --model resnet34 \
    --n-epochs 100 --lr=0.01 --img-size=32 --maxiter-DS=50 \
    --pretrained
```

The entropy, GLAD's difficulty, and WAUM's difficulty each show different images. We highlight that for the cat label, each strategy retrieves images that are mislabeled in the ground truth labeling – the frog, dog and fox images are labeled as cat in CIFAR-10 – and while the entropy and GLAD output similar tasks, in this case the WAUM often differs. We can also observe an ambiguity induced by the labels in the truck category, with the presence of a trailer that is technically a mixup between a car and a truck.

5.1.2 LabelMe dataset

As for the LabelMe dataset, one difficulty in evaluating tasks' intrinsic difficulty is that there are up to three votes given per task. Hence, the entropy in the distribution of the votes is no longer a reliable metric, and we need to rely on other models.

```

import plotly.graph_objects as go
from plotly.subplots import make_subplots
from PIL import Image
import itertools

classes = (
    "plane",
    "car",
    "bird",
    "cat",
    "deer",
    "dog",

    "frog",
    "horse",
    "ship",
    "truck",
)
)

def load_data(dataset, n_classes, classes):

    entrop = np.load(f"./datasets/{dataset}/identification/entropies.npy")
    path_train = Path(f"./datasets/{dataset}/train")
    glad = 1 / np.exp(
        np.load(f"./datasets/{dataset}/identification/glad/difficulties.npy")[
            :, 1
        ]
    )
    dfwaum = pd.read_csv(
        f"./datasets/{dataset}/identification/resnet34/waum_0.01_yang/waum.csv"
    ) if dataset.startswith("cifar") else pd.read_csv(
        f"./datasets/{dataset}/identification/modellabelme/waum_0.01_yang/waum.csv"
    )
    tasks = dfwaum.sort_values(by="waum")["task"].values
    img_ns, img_glad, img_waum = [], [], []
    idxs_ns = np.argsort(entrop)[::-1]

    idxs_glad = np.argsort(glad)[::-1]
    idxs_waum = [Path(task).stem.split("-")[1] for task in tasks]
    for idxs, im_store in zip(
        [idxs_ns, idxs_glad, idxs_waum], [img_ns, img_glad, img_waum]
    ):
        imgs = []
        for k in range(n_classes):
            imgs.append([])
            flag = 0
            for (id_, file) in list(
                itertools.product(idxs, path_train.glob(f"{classes[k]}/*"))
            ):
                if file.stem.endswith(f3-{id_}):
                    im = Image.open(file)
                    if dataset.startswith("cifar"):
                        im = im.resize((32, 32))
                    else:
                        im = im.resize((64, 64)) # memory saving

```

Now, let us compare the tasks' difficulty distribution depending on the strategy considered using `peerannot`.

```
! peerannot identify ./datasets/labelme -s entropy -K 8 --labels ./datasets/labelme/answers.json
! peerannot aggregate ./datasets/labelme/ -s GLAD
! peerannot identify ./datasets/labelme/ -K 8 --method WAUM --labels ./datasets/labelme/answers.json

classes = {
    0: "coast",
    1: "forest",
    2: "highway",
    3: "insidecity",
    4: "mountain",
    5: "opencountry",
    6: "street",
    7: "tallbuilding",
}
classes = list(classes.values())
n_classes = len(classes)
all_images = load_data("labelme", n_classes, classes)
generate_plot(n_classes, all_images) # create interactive plot
```

Unable to display output for mime type(s): text/html
 Most difficult tasks identified depending on the strategy used (entropy, GLAD or WAUM) using a VGG-16 with two dense layers.

Note that in `?@fig-difficulty-labelme`, because the number of labels given per task is in $\{1, 2, 3\}$, the entropy only takes four values. In particular, tasks with only one label all have a null entropy, so not just consensual tasks.

The underlying difficulty of these tasks mainly comes from the overlap in possible labels. For example, `tallbuildings` are most often found `insidecities`, and so are `streets`. In the `opencountry` we find `forests`, `river-coasts` and `mountains`.

5.2 Exploring workers' reliability

From the labels, we can explore different worker evaluation scores. GLAD's strategy estimates a reliability scalar coefficient α_j per worker. With strategies looking to estimate confusion matrices, we investigate two scoring rules for workers:

- the trace of the confusion matrix: the closer to K the better the worker,
- the spammer score (Raykar and Yu 2011) that is the Frobenius norm between the estimated confusion matrix $\hat{\pi}^{(j)}$ and the closest rank-1 matrix. The further to zero the better the worker.

When the tasks are available, confusion-matrix-based deep learning models can also be of use. We thus add to the comparison the trace of the confusion matrices with CrowdLayer and CoNAL on the LabelMe datasets. For CoNAL, we only consider the trace of the confusion matrix $\pi^{(j)}$ in the pairwise comparison, and provide the common confusion matrix π^g as separate. Moreover, for CrowdLayer and CoNAL we show the weights learned without the softmax operation by row to keep the comparison as simple as possible with the actual outputs of the model.

5.2.1 CIFAR-10H

The CIFAR-10H dataset has few disagreements among workers. However, these strategies disagree on the ranking of good against best workers as they do not measure the same properties.

```
! peerannot aggregate ./datasets/cifar10H/ -s GLAD
for method in ["trace_confusion", "spam_score"]:
    ! peerannot identify ./datasets/cifar10H/ --n-classes=10 \
        -s {method} --labels ./datasets/cifar10H/answers.json

path_ = Path.cwd() / "datasets" / "cifar10H"
results_identif = {"Trace DS": [], "spam_score": [], "glad": []}
results_identif["Trace DS"].extend(np.load(path_ / 'identification' / "traces_confusion.npy"))
results_identif["spam_score"].extend(np.load(path_ / 'identification' / "spam_score.npy"))
results_identif["glad"].extend(np.load(path_ / 'identification' / "glad" / "abilities.npy")[:, 1])
results_identif = pd.DataFrame(results_identif)
g = sns.pairplot(results_identif, corner=True, diag_kind="kde", plot_kws={'alpha':0.2})
plt.show()
```




Figure 8: Comparison of ability scores by workers for the CIFAR-10H dataset.

From Figure 8, we can see that in this dataset, different methods easily separate the worse workers from the rest of the crowd (workers in the tail of the distribution).

5.2.2 LabelMe

Finally, let us evaluate workers for the LabelMe dataset. Because of the lack of data (up to 3 labels per task), ranking workers is more difficult than in the CIFAR-10H dataset.

```
! peerannot aggregate ./datasets/labelme/ -s GLAD
for method in ["trace_confusion", "spam_score"]:
    ! peerannot identify ./datasets/labelme/ --n-classes=8 \
        -s {method} --labels ./datasets/labelme/answers.json
# CoNAL and CrowdLayer were run in section 4
```

```

path_ = Path.cwd() / "datasets" / "labelme"
results_identif = {"Trace DS": [], "Spam score": [], "glad": [], "Trace CrowdLayer": [], "Trace CoNAL[scale=1e-4]": []}
best_cl = torch.load(path_ / "best_models" / "labelme_crowdlayer.pth", map_location="cpu")
best_conal = torch.load(path_ / "best_models" / "labelme_conal[scale=1e-4]_local_confusion.pth", map_location="cpu")
pi_conal = best_conal
results_identif["Trace CoNAL[scale=1e-4]"].extend([torch.trace(pi_conal[i]).item() for i in range(len(pi_conal))])
results_identif["Trace CrowdLayer"].extend([torch.trace(best_cl["confusion"])[i].item() for i in range(len(best_cl["confusion"]))])
results_identif["Trace DS"].extend(np.load(path_ / 'identification' / "traces_confusion.npy"))
results_identif["Spam score"].extend(np.load(path_ / 'identification' / "spam_score.npy"))
results_identif["glad"].extend(np.load(path_ / 'identification' / "glad" / "abilities.npy")[:, 1])
results_identif = pd.DataFrame(results_identif)
g = sns.pairplot(results_identif, corner=True, diag_kind="kde", plot_kws={'alpha': 0.2})
plt.show()

```




Figure 9: Comparison of ability scores by workers for the labelme dataset.

We can see in Figure Figure 9 that the number of labels available by task highly impacts the worker evaluation scores. The spam score, DS model and CoNAL all show similar results in the distribution shape (bimodal distribution) whereas GLAD and CrowdLayer are more concentrated. This difference in worker evaluation scores also further highlights the importance of using test metrics to compare model’s prediction performance in crowdsourcing. We have seen that the library `peerannot` allows users to explore the datasets, both in terms of tasks and workers, and easily compare predictive performance in this setting.

6 Conclusion

We introduced `peerannot`, a library to handle crowdsourced datasets. This library enables both easy label aggregation and direct training strategies with classical state-of-the-art classifiers. The identification module of the library allows exploring the collected data from both the tasks and the workers’ point of view for better scorings and data cleaning procedures. Our library also comes with templated datasets to better share crowdsourced datasets and have strategies more uniform to test on.

We hope that this library helps reproducibility in the crowdsourcing community and also standardizes training from crowdsourced datasets. New strategies can easily be incorporated into the open-source code [available on github](#). Finally, as `peerannot` is mostly directed to handle classification datasets, one of our future works would be to consider other `peerannot` modules to handle crowdsourcing for object detection, segmentation and even worker evaluation in other contexts like peer-grading.

Aitchison, Laurence. 2021. “A Statistical Theory of Cold Posteriors in Deep Neural Networks.” In *ICLR*.

- Chagneux, Mathis, Sylvain LeCorff, Pierre Gloaguen, Charles Ollion, Océane Lepâtre, and Antoine Brûge. 2023. “Macrolitter Video Counting on Riverbanks Using State Space Models and Moving Cameras.” *Computo*, February. <https://doi.org/10.57750/845m-f805>.
- Chu, Zhendong, Jing Ma, and Hongning Wang. 2021. “Learning from Crowds by Modeling Common Confusions.” In *AAAI*, 5832–40.
- Dawid, AP, and AM Skene. 1979. “Maximum Likelihood Estimation of Observer Error-Rates Using the EM Algorithm.” *J. R. Stat. Soc. Ser. C. Appl. Stat.* 28 (1): 20–28.
- Deng, J., W. Dong, R. Socher, L.-J. Li, K. Li, and L. Fei-Fei. 2009. “ImageNet: A Large-Scale Hierarchical Image Database.” In *CVPR*.
- Gao, Chao, and Dengyong Zhou. 2013. “Minimax Optimal Convergence Rates for Estimating Ground Truth from Crowdsourced Labels.” *arXiv Preprint arXiv:1310.5764*.
- Garcin, C., A. Joly, P. Bonnet, A. Affouard, J.-C. Lombardo, M. Chouet, M. Servajean, T. Lorieul, and J. Salmon. 2021. “Pl@ntNet-300K: A Plant Image Dataset with High Label Ambiguity and a Long-Tailed Distribution.” In *Proceedings of the Neural Information Processing Systems Track on Datasets and Benchmarks*.
- Gruber, Sebastian Gregor, and Florian Buettner. 2022. “Better Uncertainty Calibration via Proper Scores for Classification and Beyond.” In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*.
- Guo, C, G Pleiss, Y Sun, and KQ Weinberger. 2017. “On Calibration of Modern Neural Networks.” In *ICML*, 1321.
- Imamura, Hideaki, Issei Sato, and Masashi Sugiyama. 2018. “Analysis of Minimax Error Rate for Crowdsourcing and Its Application to Worker Clustering Model.” In *ICML*, 2147–56.
- James, Gareth Michael. 1998. “Majority Vote Classifiers: Theory and Applications.” PhD thesis, Stanford University.
- Kasmi, Gabriel, Yves-Marie Saint-Drenan, David Trebosc, Raphaël Jolivet, Jonathan Leloux, Babacar Sarr, and Laurent Dubus. 2023. “A Crowdsourced Dataset of Aerial Images with Annotated Solar Photovoltaic Arrays and Installation Metadata.” *Scientific Data* 10 (1): 59.

- Khattak, Faiza Khan. 2017. “Toward a Robust and Universal Crowd Labeling Framework.” PhD thesis, Columbia University.
- Krizhevsky, Alex, and Geoffrey Hinton. 2009. “Learning Multiple Layers of Features from Tiny Images.” University of Toronto.
- Lefort, Tanguy, Benjamin Charlier, Alexis Joly, and Joseph Salmon. 2022. “Identify Ambiguous Tasks Combining Crowdsourced Labels by Weighting Areas Under the Margin.” *arXiv Preprint arXiv:2209.15380*.
- Lin, Tsung-Yi, Michael Maire, Serge J. Belongie, Lubomir D. Bourdev, Ross B. Girshick, James Hays, Pietro Perona, Deva Ramanan, Piotr Doll’ar, and C. Lawrence Zitnick. 2014. “Microsoft COCO: Common Objects in Context.” *CoRR* abs/1405.0312. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1405.0312>.
- Marcel, Sébastien, and Yann Rodriguez. 2010. “Torchvision the Machine-Vision Package of Torch.” In *Proceedings of the 18th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, 1485–88. MM ’10. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/1873951.1874254>.
- Park, Seo Yeon, and Cornelia Caragea. 2022. “On the Calibration of Pre-Trained Language Models Using Mixup Guided by Area Under the Margin and Saliency.” In *ACML*, 5364–74.
- Passonneau, Rebecca J., and Bob Carpenter. 2014. “The Benefits of a Model of Annotation.” *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics* 2: 311–26.
- Paszke, Adam, Sam Gross, Francisco Massa, Adam Lerer, James Bradbury, Gregory Chanan, Trevor Killeen, et al. 2019. “PyTorch: An Imperative Style, High-Performance Deep Learning Library.” In *NeurIPS*, 8024–35.
- Peterson, Joshua C., Ruairidh M. Battleday, Thomas L. Griffiths, and Olga Russakovsky. 2019. “Human Uncertainty Makes Classification More Robust.” In *ICCV*, 9617–26.
- Pleiss, Geoff, Tianyi Zhang, Ethan R Elenberg, and Kilian Q Weinberger. 2020. “Identifying Mislabeled Data Using the Area Under the Margin Ranking.” In *NeurIPS*.
- Raykar, Vikas C, and Shipeng Yu. 2011. “Ranking Annotators for Crowdsourced Labeling Tasks.” In *NeurIPS*, 1809–17.
- Rodrigues, Filipe, Mariana Lourenco, Bernardete Ribeiro, and Francisco C Pereira. 2017. “Learning Supervised Topic Models for Classification and Regression from Crowds.” *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence* 39 (12): 2409–22.
- Rodrigues, Filipe, and Francisco Pereira. 2018. “Deep Learning from Crowds.” In *AAAI*. Vol. 32.
- Rodrigues, Filipe, Francisco Pereira, and Bernardete Ribeiro. 2014. “Gaussian Process Classification and Active Learning with Multiple Annotators.” In *ICML*, 433–41. PMLR.
- Servajean, Maximilien, Alexis Joly, Dennis Shasha, Julien Champ, and Esther Pacitti. 2016. “The PlantGame: Actively Training Human Annotators for Domain-Specific Crowdsourcing.” In *Proceedings of the 24th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, 720–21. MM ’16. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2964284.2973820>.
- . 2017. “Crowdsourcing Thousands of Specialized Labels: A Bayesian Active Training Approach.” *IEEE Transactions on Multimedia* 19 (6): 1376–91.
- Sinha, Vaibhav B, Sukrut Rao, and Vineeth N Balasubramanian. 2018. “Fast Dawid-Skene: A Fast Vote Aggregation Scheme for Sentiment Classification.” *arXiv Preprint arXiv:1803.02781*.
- Tinati, Ramine, Markus Luczak-Roesch, Elena Simperl, and Wendy Hall. 2017. “An Investigation of Player Motivations in Eyewire, a Gamified Citizen Science Project.” *Computers in Human Behavior* 73: 527–40.
- Whitehill, J, T Wu, J Bergsma, J Movellan, and P Ruvolo. 2009. “Whose Vote Should Count More: Optimal Integration of Labels from Labelers of Unknown Expertise.” In *NeurIPS*. Vol. 22.
- Yasmin, Romena, Md Mahmudulla Hassan, Joshua T Grassel, Harika Bhogaraju, Adolfo R Escobedo, and Olac Fuentes. 2022. “Improving Crowdsourcing-Based Image Classification Through Expanded Input Elicitation and Machine Learning.” *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence* 5: 848056.
- Zhang, Hongyi, Moustapha Cissé, Yann N. Dauphin, and David Lopez-Paz. 2018. “Mixup: Beyond Empirical Risk Minimization.” In *ICLR*.