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Abstract

Label smoothing (LS) is an arising learning paradigm that uses the positively weighted average of both the hard training labels and uniformly distributed soft labels. It was shown that LS serves as a regularizer for training data with hard labels and therefore improves the generalization of the model. Later it was reported LS even helps with improving robustness when learning with noisy labels. However, we observe that the advantage of LS vanishes when we operate in a high label noise regime. Puzzled by the observation, we proceeded to discover that several proposed learning-with-noisy-labels solutions in the literature instead relate more closely to negative label smoothing (NLS), which defines as using a negative weight to combine the hard and soft labels! We show that NLS functions substantially differently from LS in their achieved model confidence. To differentiate the two cases, we will call LS the positive label smoothing (PLS), and this paper unifies PLS and NLS into generalized label smoothing (GLS). We provide understandings for the properties of GLS when learning with noisy labels. Among other established properties, we theoretically show NLS is considered more beneficial when the label noise rates are high. We provide experimental results to support our findings too.

1 Introduction

Label smoothing (LS) [34] is an arising learning paradigm that uses positively weighted average of both the hard training labels and uniformly distributed soft label:

\[ y_{LS,r} = (1 - r) \cdot y + \frac{r}{K} \cdot \mathbf{1} \]

where we denote the one-hot vector form of hard label and an all one vector as \( y \) and \( \mathbf{1} \) respectively. \( K \) is the number of label classes, and \( r \) is the smooth rate in the range of \([0, 1]\). It was shown that LS serves as a regularizer for the hard training data and therefore improves generalization of the model. The regularizer role of LS prevents the model from fitting overly on the target class. Empirical studies have demonstrated the effectiveness of LS in improving the model performance across various benchmarks [31] (such as image classification [34], machine translation [35], language modelling [5]) and model calibration [26].

Later it was reported LS even helps with improving robustness when learning with noisy labels [24]. However, we observe that the advantage of LS vanishes when we operate in a high label noise regime. In Figure 1 we present a set of experiments on UCI datasets [6]. We highlight best two smooth rates (possible to have tied smooth rates) under each label noise rate. Indeed, non-negative smooth rates (circles colored in red) outperform negative ones when the label noise rates are low. Nonetheless, with the increasing of noise rates, negative smooth rates \( r < 0 \) (Eqn. 1), diamonds colored in green) appear to be more competitive when learning with noisy labels. Puzzled by the observation, we proceeded to discover that several proposed learning-with-noisy-labels solutions in the literature, including Loss Correction [29], NLNL [15] and Peer Loss [23], instead relate more closely to negative label smoothing (NLS), which defines as using a negative weight to combine the hard and soft labels!
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This paper unifies label smoothing with either positive or negative smooth rate into a generalized label smoothing (GLS) framework. Our paper is motivated by the above inconsistent observations and aims to provide a more thorough understanding of GLS under the setting of learning with noisy labels. We first show that negative label smoothing functions substantially differently from positive label smoothing in their achieved model confidence. With the presence of label noise, we then proceed to show that there exists a phase transition behavior when finding the optimal label smoothing rate for GLS. Particularly, when label noise is low, positive label smoothing is able to uncover the optimal model while negative label smoothing is considered more beneficial in a high label noise regime.

We provide extensive experimental evidences to support our findings. For instance, on multiple benchmark datasets, we present the clear transition of the optimal smoothing rate going from positive to negative when we keep increasing noise rates. On CIFAR-10 test data, we show a negative smoothing rate elicits higher model confidence on correct predictions and lower confidence on wrong predictions compared with the behavior of a positive one.

Our contributions summarize as follows:

- We provide understandings for a generalized notion of label smoothing (GLS) when learning with noisy labels, where the label smoothing rate can go negative.
- We show that several robust loss functions in the noise learning literature correspond to learning with GLS, under certain noise rate models.
- We theoretically show that negative label smoothing improves the expected model confidence over the data distribution. With the presence of label noise, we demonstrate learning with a negative smooth rate can be more robust to label noise compared with a positive rate when label noise rates are high.
- Empirical experiments on multiple benchmark datasets demonstrate that with the presence of label noise, NLS becomes competitively robust to label noise. We also empirically show that GLS results in trade-offs in model confidence, bias and variance of the generalization error.

We defer all proofs to Appendix B. Our work primarily contributes to the literature of learning with noisy labels [33, 27, 20, 30, 39, 15, 23]. Our core results are contingent on recent works of understanding the effect of label smoothing when training deep neural network models [26, 19, 43, 38, 3, 7, 2, 18, 22], and in particular when label noise presents [24]. We generalize a concept called generalized label smoothing and provide new understandings for when, instead of setting a positive smoothing rate as the literature would normally do, a negative smoothing rate is considered a better option. Due to the space limit, we defer a detailed discussion of related works into Appendix A.

2 Preliminaries

2.1 Learning with smoothed labels

For a $K$-class classification task, we denote by $X \in \mathcal{X}$ a high-dimensional feature and $Y \in \mathcal{Y} := \{1, 2, ..., K\}$ the corresponding label. Suppose $(X, Y) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ are drawn from a joint distribution $\mathcal{D}$. Let $y_i$ be the one-hot encoded vector form of $y_i$ which generates according to $Y$. The random variable of smoothed label $Y^{LS,r}$ with smooth rate $r \in [0, 1]$ generates $y_i^{LS,r}$ as [34]:

$$y_i^{LS,r} = (1 - r) \cdot y_i + \frac{r}{K} \cdot 1$$

For example, when $r = 0.3$, the smoothed label of $y_i = [0, 1, 0]$ becomes $y_i^{LS,r=0.3} = [0.1, 0.8, 0.1]$.

We consider a broader setting where the smoothed label might be negatively related to the corresponding feature. As a supplementary to existed works on label smoothing, we explore the benefits of learning with generalized label...
smoothing (GLS), i.e., \( r \in (-\infty, 1] \) instead of a non-negative \( r \).
\[
x_{i}^{\text{GLS}, r} := (1 - r) \cdot x_{i} + \frac{r}{K} \cdot 1
\]
(2)
where \( x_{i}^{\text{GLS}, r} \) is given by the random variable of generalized smooth label, namely \( Y_{i}^{\text{GLS}, r} \). We name the scenario \( r < 0 \) as negative label smoothing (NLS). To clarify, we don’t assume a strict lower bound for \( r \). If \( r \to -\infty \), normalizing \( x_{i}^{\text{GLS}, r} \) by \( 1 - r \) returns \( y_{i}^{\text{GLS}, r} = y_{i} - 1/K \). We will show when imposing a negative smoothing parameter will be considered beneficial as compared to a positive one. For the ease of presentation, we focus on binary classification task where \( y_{i} \in \{0, 1\} \) and \( K = 2 \). Denote \( f \) as a deep neural network, \( f(x_{i}) \) is the model prediction of \( x_{i} \in X \) with element \( f(x_{i})_{y_{i}} := P(Y = y_{i} | X = x_{i}, f) \). Given the sample \( x \in X \) and a hard label \( y \in Y \), binary CE loss is defined as \( \ell_{\text{CE}}(f(x), y) := -\log(f(x)_{y}) \). Throughout this paper, we shorthand \( \ell \) as \( \ell_{\text{CE}} \) for a clean presentation.

### 2.2 Learning with noisy labels

The noisy label literature considers the setting where we only have access to samples with noisy labels from \( (X, \tilde{Y}) \). Suppose random variables \( (X, \tilde{Y}) \in X \times \tilde{Y} \) are drawn from a noisy joint distribution \( \tilde{D} \). Statistically, the random variable of noisy labels \( \tilde{Y} \) can be characterized by a noise transition matrix \( T \), where each element \( T_{ij} \) represents the probability of flipping the clean label \( Y = i \) to the noisy label \( \tilde{Y} = j \), i.e., \( T_{ij} = P(\tilde{Y} = j | Y = i) \). In this paper, we are interested in the widely studied class-dependent label noise. We assume the label noise is conditionally independent of features, i.e.,
\[
P(\tilde{Y} = j | Y = i) = P(\tilde{Y} = j | X, Y = i), \forall i, j \in [K].
\]
For the binary classification setting, define \( e_{0} := P(\tilde{Y} = 1 | Y = 0) \), \( e_{1} := P(\tilde{Y} = 0 | Y = 1) \). Without loss of generality, we assume \( e_{1} - e_{0} = e_{\Delta} \geq 0 \). We denote the binary noise transition matrix in the noisy label setting as:
\[
T = \begin{pmatrix}
1 - e_{0} & e_{\Delta} \\
e_{1} & 1 - e_{1}
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

### 2.3 Model confidence

We define a key quantity, model confidence, that plays an important role in later sections.

**Definition 1. Model confidence of model \( f \) for sample \((x, y)\).** Given a model \( f \), a sample \( x \) with its target label \( y \in \{0, 1\} \), the model confidence of \( f \) w.r.t. sample \( x \) is defined as
\[
MC(f; x, y) = f(x)_{y} - f(x)_{1-y}.
\]

Note that when \( f \) gives a wrong prediction, i.e., \( f(x)_{y} < 1/2 \), \( MC(f; x, y) \) returns a negative value, we then separate the distribution \( D \) into
\[
D_{f}^{+} := \{(X, Y) \sim D : MC(f; X, Y) > 0\}, \quad D_{f}^{-} := \{(X, Y) \sim D : MC(f; X, Y) \leq 0\}.
\]
Clearly, by referring to the target \( Y \), correct predictions given by \( f \) are categorized in \( D_{f}^{+} \), while those of wrong predictions belongs to \( D_{f}^{-} \).

### 3 Connection to other robust methods

In this section, we aim to explore the connection between GLS and some state-of-the-art methods such as backward and forward loss correction \([30]\), NLNL \([13]\) and peer loss functions \([23]\).

For \( r \leq 1 \), let \( \tilde{Y} \) be the vector form of noisy label \( \tilde{y} \) obtained from \( \tilde{Y} \), we define the \( r \) smoothed label of \( \tilde{y} \) as \( \tilde{y}^{\text{GLS}, r} \).
\[
\tilde{y}^{\text{GLS}, r} := (1 - r) \cdot \tilde{y} + (r/K) \cdot 1
\]
and is generated by the random variable \( \tilde{Y}^{\text{GLS}, r} \). Risk minimization of the Generalized Label Smoothing (GLS) w.r.t. noisy labels becomes:
\[
\text{Risk Minimization Using GLS:} \quad \min_{f} \mathbb{E}_{(X, \tilde{Y}) \sim \tilde{D}} \left[ \ell(f(X), \tilde{Y}^{\text{GLS}, r}) \right]. \quad (3)
\]
The GLS framework covers three special methods: PLS \((r \in (0, 1])\), Vanilla Loss \((r = 0)\) and NLS \((r < 0)\). Besides, we observe that NLS connects to a special case of label smoothing regularization. We highlight this observation in Theorem[1].
Theorem 1. \( \forall r \in [0, 1], \) NLS with smooth rate \(-r\) is a special form of label smoothing regularization:

\[
\min_E \min_{(X, \hat{Y}) \sim \hat{D}} \left[ \ell(f(X), \hat{Y}^{\text{GLS}, -r}) \right] = \min_E \min_{(X, \hat{Y}) \sim \hat{D}} \left[ 2 \cdot \ell(f(X), \hat{Y}) - \ell(f(X), \hat{Y}^{\text{GLS}, r \geq 0}) \right].
\]

3.1 Loss correction

Loss correction \([29]\) introduces two robust loss designs which are based on the knowledge of non-singular noise transition matrix \(T\). The proposed backward correction \(\ell^-(f(X), \hat{Y})\) re-weights the loss \(\ell(f(X), \hat{Y})\) by \(T^{-1}_{\hat{Y}, \hat{Y}}\) with \(\hat{Y}\) being the model predicted label, while the forward correction \(\ell^+(f(X), \hat{Y})\) multiplies the model predictions by \(T\).

Proposition 2. For \(r_{\text{LC}} := \frac{2e_1}{2e_1 - 1} < 0, \lambda_{\text{LC}} := e_\Delta \cdot \frac{1}{1 - 2e_1}\), risk minimization of both backward and forward correction (with the knowledge of noise rates) are equivalent to the combination of NLS and an extra bias term Bias-LC

\[
\min_E \min_{(X, \hat{Y}) \sim \hat{D}} \left[ \ell^-(f(X), \hat{Y}) \right] = \min_E \min_{(X, \hat{Y}) \sim \hat{D}} \left[ \ell^+(f(X), \hat{Y}) \right]
\]

\[
= \min_E \min_{(X, \hat{Y}) \sim \hat{D}} \left[ \ell(f(X), \hat{Y}^{\text{GLS}, r_{\text{LC}}}) \right] + \lambda_{\text{LC}} \cdot E_{X, \hat{Y} = 1} \left[ \ell(f(X), 1) - \ell(f(X), 0) \right].
\]

The incurred Bias-LC controls the model confidence on \((X, \hat{Y}) \sim \mathcal{D}_f\). Note that when the noise rate is not substantially high, i.e., \(e_1 \in [0, 1/2]\), \(\lambda_{\text{LC}} > 0\). Then, compared with loss correction, NLS with smooth rate \(r_{\text{LC}}\) makes the model \(f\) to be less confident on \((X, \hat{Y} = 1) \sim \mathcal{D}_f^+\) and more confident on \((X, \hat{Y} = 1) \sim \mathcal{D}_f^-\) (wrong predictions). However, the impact of term Bias-LC is diminishing when either \(e_\Delta \rightarrow 0\) (symmetric noise rates) or \(e_1 \rightarrow 0\) (low noise rates) as specified in Theorem 5.

Theorem 3. Assume the noise transition matrix is symmetric, i.e., \(e_\Delta = 0\), backward and forward loss correction are a special form of NLS with smooth rate \(r_{\text{LC}}\):

\[
\min_E \min_{(X, \hat{Y}) \sim \hat{D}} \left[ \ell^+(f(X), \hat{Y}) \right] = \min_E \min_{(X, \hat{Y}) \sim \hat{D}} \left[ \ell^-(f(X), \hat{Y}) \right] = \min_E \min_{(X, \hat{Y}) \sim \hat{D}} \left[ \ell(f(X), \hat{Y}^{\text{GLS}, r_{\text{LC}}}) \right].
\]

3.2 Learning from complementary labels

Complementary label \([12]\) was firstly introduced to mitigate the cost of collecting data. Rather than encouraging the model to fit directly on the target, learning from complementary labels trains the model to not fit on the complementary label which differs from the target. Later, an indirect training method “Negative Learning” (NL) \([15]\) was proposed to reduce the risk of providing incorrect information with the presence of noisy labels and is robust to label noise in multi-class classification tasks. A more generic unbiased risk estimator of learning with complementary labels was proposed \([13]\) and is defined as: \(\ell_{\text{CL}}(f(X), \hat{Y}) := \ell(f(X), \hat{Y}) - \ell(f(X), 1 - \hat{Y})\).

Theorem 4. Learning from complementary labels with \(\ell_{\text{CL}}\) is equivalent to NLS with smooth rate \(r_{\text{CL}} \rightarrow -\infty\):

\[
\min_E \min_{(X, \hat{Y}) \sim \hat{D}} \left[ \ell_{\text{CL}}(f(X), \hat{Y}) \right] \iff \min_E \min_{(X, \hat{Y}) \sim \hat{D}} \left[ \ell(f(X), \hat{Y}^{\text{GLS}, r_{\text{CL}} \rightarrow -\infty}) \right].
\]

3.3 Peer loss functions

Peer loss functions \([23]\) propose a family of robust loss measures which do not require the knowledge of noise rates. The mathematical representation of peer loss functions is \(\ell_{\text{PL}}(f(X), \hat{Y}) := \ell(f(X), \hat{Y}) - \ell(f(X_1), \hat{Y}_2)\), where \((X_1, \hat{Y}_1) \sim \hat{D}\). The second term of peer loss evaluates on randomly paired data samples and labels to punish \(f\) from overly fitting on noisy labels.

Proposition 5. For \(r_{\text{PL}} := 2 \cdot \mathbb{P}(\hat{Y} = 1), \lambda_{\text{PL}} := 1 - r_{\text{PL}}\), risk minimization of peer loss is equivalent to negative label smoothing regularization with an extra term Bias-PL, i.e.,

\[
\min_E \min_{(X, \hat{Y}) \sim \hat{D}} \left[ \ell_{\text{PL}}(f(X), \hat{Y}) \right] = \min_E \min_{(X, \hat{Y}) \sim \hat{D}} \left[ \ell(f(X), \hat{Y}) - \ell(f(X), \hat{Y}^{\text{GLS}, r_{\text{PL}}}) \right]
\]

\[
+ \lambda_{\text{PL}} \cdot E_{X, \hat{Y} = 1} \left[ \ell(f(X), 1) - \ell(f(X), 0) \right].
\]

Bias-PL
The incurred term Bias-PL controls the model confidence on \((X, \tilde{Y} = 1) \sim \tilde{D}\) and has a diminishing effect as \(\mathbb{P}(\tilde{Y} = 1) \to 1/2\). Generally, peer loss relates to GLS as the negatively weighted GLS term appears to be a regularizer. Note that we have access to the \(\mathbb{P}(\tilde{Y} = 1)\), we can bridge the gap between GLS and peer loss by adding an estimable term Bias-PL. With some derivations, we further show in Theorem 6 when noisy priors are equal, peer loss has an exact GLS form.

**Theorem 6.** When the noisy labels have equal prior, i.e., \(\mathbb{P}(\tilde{Y} = 0) = \mathbb{P}(\tilde{Y} = 1)\), peer loss is a special form of NLS regularization with smooth rate \(r_{PL}\). Besides,

\[
\min_{\langle X, \tilde{Y} \rangle \sim \tilde{D}} \mathbb{E}\left[ \ell_{\text{peer}}(f(X), \tilde{Y}) \right] = \min_{\langle X, \tilde{Y} \rangle \sim \tilde{D}} \mathbb{E}\left[ \ell(f(X), \tilde{Y}^{\text{GLS}, r \to -\infty}) \right].
\]

### 4 GLS: model confidence and bias-variance trade-offs

Now we show that NLS functions substantially differently from PLS in their achieved model confidence. The observation holds true for any dataset and we will present our findings when learning with clean data. In addition, we empirically show the role of GLS in the bias-variance trade-off of the generalization error. This discussion sets the foundation for our discussion when learning with noisy labels in next section.

When the label is clean, i.e, \(e_0 = e_1 = 0\), Eqn. (3) reduces to:

\[
\min_{\langle X, Y \rangle \sim D} \mathbb{E}(\langle X, Y \rangle) \left[ \ell(f(X), Y) + \frac{r}{2} \cdot \mathbb{E}(\langle X, Y \rangle) \left( \ell(f(X), 1 - Y) - \ell(f(X), Y) \right) \right].
\]

It is straightforward that the difference between PLS and NLS lie in the weight of Term \(\text{MC}_{\ell}(f; X, Y)\). NLS encourages a high \(\text{MC}_{\ell}(f; X, Y)\) in expectation while PLS has an opposite purpose. For any \(r_{PL} < 0\), \(r_{PL} \in (0, 1)\), denote by \(f^*_N\), \(f^*_P\) the optimal classifiers of Eqn. (4) learned with \(Y^{\text{GLS}, r_N}\) and \(Y^{\text{GLS}, r_P}\) respectively, we show that \(f^*_N\) returns a higher expected model confidence compared with \(f^*_P\) in Theorem 7.

**Theorem 7.** If \(f^*_N \neq f^*_P\), we have: \(\mathbb{E}(\langle X, Y \rangle) \left[ \text{MC}(f^*_N; X, Y) \right] > \mathbb{E}(\langle X, Y \rangle) \left[ \text{MC}(f^*_P; X, Y) \right] \).

We want to emphasize that the proof of Theorem 7 can be extended to any distribution \(D\) even when learning with noisy labels, we state this observation in Corollary 1.

**Corollary 1.** For any data distribution \(D\), the optimal classifier of NLS returns a higher model confidence than that of PLS in expectation.

Recent works [22, 44] have demonstrate that with the presence of label noise, learning with noisy labels directly will eventually result in unconfident model predictions. When \(D' = \tilde{D}\), will NLS remain confident in her predictions? We defer our answer to Section 5. Before digging into the performance of GLS on noisy labels, we share one interesting observation from [44] which is about the bias-variance trade-off when learning with positive soft labels.

Empirical observation from [44] shows that the variance brought by learning with positive soft labels given by a teacher’s model [11] is less than direct training with hard labels. As an extension, we are interested in how GLS interferes with the bias and variance of model prediction. We introduce our empirical observation regarding the role of GLS in bias and variance trade-off in Figure 2: models trained with positive smooth rates (i.e., when \(r > 0.2\)) are more likely to increase the prediction bias and have an overall high variance. Does learning with NLS result in a lower bias?

As shown in Figure 2 when \(r\) decreases from 0.2 to \(-1.0\), pushing the model \(f\) to fit overly on the one-hot encoded label may increase the bias and reduce the prediction variance.

![Figure 2: Bias and variance of pre-trained GLS models on clean CIFAR-10 test dataset.](image-url)
From above, we have shown that NLS and PLS have the opposite functionality on the model confidence when training on clean data. Depending on the distribution of unseen test data, learning with non-negative smooth rates may not always return the best outcome and whether NLS could outperform PLS in certain applications or not requires a more thorough study in the view of bias-variance trade-off.

5 GLS with noisy labels

In this section, we target at the optimal candidates of $r$ in GLS when the label noise presents. Empirical evidences have shown that learning with positive smoothed labels may result in the performance improvement. From Section 4, we observe the optimal smoothing rate may be negative in the view of test accuracy and the bias-variance trade-off. Based on this observation, we delve into details to show when NLS is more favorable than LS and Vanilla Loss.

We start with stating Assumption 1.

**Assumption 1.** We assume learning with clean data distribution $D$ with smooth rate $r^* \leq 1$ in GLS returns the best performance on the unseen clean test data distribution $D_{test}$.

Assumption 1 simply offers an “anchor” point to initiate our analysis for the noisy label setting. To clarify, we don’t rule out the possibility that other methods outperform GLS with optimal smooth rate $r^*$. Later in Section 6.1, we will empirically test what $r^*$ usually is on various datasets. We define the corresponding optimal classifier on $Y^*$ which follows $r^*$ smooth label distribution:

$$f^*_D := \arg\min_f \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim D}[\ell(f(X), Y^*)].$$

With the introduction of $r^*$ and $f^*_D$, our goal is then to recover the classifier $f$ using the noisy training labels. To bridge learning with noisy labels and clean labels for GLS, we define $\lambda_1$, $\lambda_2$ and offer Theorem 8.

$$\lambda_1 := \left((e_1 - \frac{r^*}{2}) + (1 - 2e_1) \cdot \frac{r}{2}\right), \quad \lambda_2 := e_\Delta \cdot (1 - r).$$

**Theorem 8.** The risk minimization of GLS (Eqn. (3)) in the noisy setting relates to the risk defined on the clean data with two additional bias terms:

$$\min_{\ell} \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim D}[\ell(f(X), Y^*)] + \lambda_1 \cdot \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim D}[\ell(f(X), 1 - Y) - \ell(f(X), Y)] + \lambda_2 \cdot \mathbb{E}_{X,Y=1}[\ell(f(X), 0) - \ell(f(X), 1)].$$

In Theorem 8, the True Risk is the risk minimization w.r.t. clean optimal label distribution $Y^*$. Training GLS on noisy labels will result in two extra bias terms which affect the model confidence. Now we answer the question of what parameters are preferred in the noisy setting.

5.1 Symmetric error rates with $e_\Delta = 0$

Symmetric error rates $e := e_0 = e_1$ indicates the probability of flipping to the other class is equal for both classes. In this case, $\lambda_2 = 0$ and Term M-Inc2 is cancelled and Eqn. 5 reduces to

$$\min_{\ell} \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim D}[\ell(f(X), Y^*)] + \lambda_1 \cdot \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim D}[\ell(f(X), 1 - Y) - \ell(f(X), Y)].$$

**Noisy labels impairs model confidence on Vanilla Loss** In the GLS framework, define the optimal $r$ that will cancel the impact of Term M-Inc1 as:

When $r_{opt} := \frac{r^* - 2e}{1 - 2e}, \quad M-\text{Inc1} = 0.$

The threshold $r_{opt}$ in Eqn. 7 implies:

**Theorem 9.** With Assumption 1, GLS with smooth rate $r = r_{opt}$ yields $f^*_D$. 
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• When error rate $e < \frac{r^*}{2}$, $r = r_{opt} > 0$ (PLS);

• When error rate $e = \frac{r^*}{2}$, $r = 0$ (Vanilla Loss);

• When error rate $e > \frac{r^*}{2}$, $r = r_{opt} < 0$ (NLS).

In Theorem 9, adopting NLS when noise rate $e < r^*/2$ induces $\lambda_1 < 0$, Term M-Inc1 makes $f$ overly-confident on its predictions compared with $Y^*$. In Figure 3, with the decreasing of $r^*$, PLS is less tolerant of labels with high noise. Similarly, if $e \geq \frac{r^*}{2}$, with the decreasing of $r^*$, NLS is more robust in the high noise regime while LS makes the model $f$ become less-confident on its predictions. Clearly, NLS outperforms LS especially when noise rates are large and $r^*$ is small.

5.2 Asymmetric error rates with $e_\Delta \neq 0$

In this case, adopting $r = \frac{r^* - 2e_1}{1 - 2e_1}$ removes the Term M-Inc1. However, when $r < 1$, Term M-Inc2 is not negligible due to asymmetric noise transition matrix. As a result, Term M-Inc2 becomes:

$$e_\Delta \cdot \frac{1 - r^*}{1 - 2e_1} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{X,Y=1} \left[ \ell(f(X), 0) - \ell(f(X), 1) \right], \text{ with } e_\Delta \cdot \frac{1 - r^*}{1 - 2e_1} \geq 0.$$

According to Theorem 7, Term M-Inc2 in the minimization increases the model confidence on $(X, Y = 0) \sim D_f^c$. The model will then become overly-confident with the class that has a low noise rate $e_0$. Meanwhile, Term M-Inc2 decreases the model confidence on $(X, Y = 1) \sim D_f^c$ (less-confident to the class with a high noise rate $e_1$).

**Practical consideration** We have theoretically shown when should we adopt NLS and PLS. In practice, we don’t have access to noise rates $e_i$. Our work does not intend to particularly focus on the noise rate estimation. For readers interested in the noise rate estimation, please refer to [21, 25, 9, 29, 41, 46].

**Making GLS more robust to label noise** There is a line of related works targeting at distinguishing clean labels from the noisy labels. Current literature in selecting clean samples from noisy labeled dataset is based on the empirical evidence that samples with noisy/wrong labels have a larger loss than the clean ones, for interested readers, please refer to [8, 14, 42, 40, 36, 28]. Suppose we have access to a clean distribution $D_{clean}$ which is approximated by selected clean samples. Denote the estimated noise rates as $\hat{e}_i$, when $e_\Delta \neq 0$, in order to make GLS be more robust to label noise and fit on the optimal distribution $Y^*$, we improve GLS by performing a model confidence correction on the dominating class:

$$\text{GLS-C: } \min \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y)\sim D} \left[ \ell(f(X), \hat{Y}^{GLS,r}) \right] + (\hat{e}_1 - \hat{e}_0) \cdot (1 - r) \cdot \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y=1)\sim D_{clean}} \left[ \ell(f(X), 1) - \ell(f(X), 0) \right].$$

5.3 Multi-class extension

As an extension to the binary classification task, we next show how GLS extends to the multi-class setting under two broad families of noise transition model. When learning with multi-class classification tasks, we assume Assumption 1 holds in the multi-class setting. And for $Y, \hat{Y} \in [K]$, we extend the definition of model confidence to multi-class classification tasks as:

**Definition 2. Model confidence of sample $x$ (K-class classification).** Given a model $f$, a sample $x$ with its target label $y \in [K]$, the model confidence score of $f$ w.r.t. sample $x$ is defined as

$$MC(f; x, y) = f(x)_y - \frac{1}{K-1} \sum_{i \neq y} f(x)_i$$
Sparse noise transition matrix Sparse noise model \cite{symmetric_noise} assumes \( K \) is an even number. For \( c \in [K/2], i_c < j_c \), sparse noise model specifies \( K/2 \) disjoint pairs of classes \( (i_c, j_c) \) to simulate the scenario where particular pairs of classes are ambiguous and misleading for human annotators. The off-diagonal element of \( T \) reads \( T_{i_c,j_c} = e_0, T_{j_c,i_c} = e_1 \). Suppose \( e_0 + e_1 < 1 \) and then the diagonal entries become \( T_{i_c,i_c} = 1 - e_1, T_{j_c,j_c} = 1 - e_0 \). Clearly, our conclusions in Section \ref{sec:theory} extends directly to the sparse noise transition matrix by simply splitting the \( K \)-class classification task into \( K/2 \) disjoint binary classification tasks.

Symmetric noise transition matrix Symmetric noise model \cite{symmetric_noise} is a widely accepted synthetic noise model in the literature of learning with noisy labels. The symmetric noise model generates the noisy labels by randomly flipping the clean label to the other possible classes with probability \( \epsilon \). \( \forall i \neq j, T_{i,j} = \epsilon/(K - 1) \), and the diagonal entry \( T_{i,i} = 1 - \epsilon \). Define the optimal \( r \) for GLS in the multi-class setting as \( r_{\text{opt}} := (K - 1) \cdot r^* - K \cdot \epsilon \). Theorem \ref{thm:optimal_smooth_rate} can be extended to the multi-class setting as:

**Theorem 10.** Under Assumption \ref{assumption} suppose the symmetric noise rate is not too large, i.e., \( \epsilon < (K - 1)/K \), GLS with smooth rate \( r = r_{\text{opt}} \) yields \( f_D^{\text{opt}} \).

- **When error rate** \( \epsilon < \frac{(K - 1) \cdot r^*}{K} \), \( r = r_{\text{opt}} > 0 \) (PLS);
- **When error rate** \( \epsilon = \frac{(K - 1) \cdot r^*}{K} \), \( r = 0 \) (Vanilla Loss);
- **When error rate** \( \epsilon > \frac{(K - 1) \cdot r^*}{K} \), \( r = r_{\text{opt}} < 0 \) (NLS).

6 Experiment results

We now present our empirical observations regarding the role of GLS under clean and noisy labels by using 2-D synthetic data, UCI dataset and CIFAR-10. Due to space limit, more experiment results (such as bias-variance on noisy dataset, effects of GLS on pre-logits) and details are deferred to \cite{supplementary_material}.

6.1 What is the practical distribution of \( r^* \) and \( r_{\text{opt}} \) ?

**\( r^* \) and \( r_{\text{opt}} \) on synthetic dataset** We generate 2D (binary) synthetic dataset by randomly sampling two circularly distributed classes. The inner annulus indicates one class (blue), while the outer annulus denotes the other class (red). Clearly, the generated dataset is well-separable (Type 1) and we hold 20\% data samples for performance comparison. The noise transition matrix takes a symmetric form with noise rate \( e \) for both classes. To simulate the scenario where the clean data may not be perfectly separated due to a non-negligible amount of uncertainty samples clustering at the decision boundary, we flip the label of 50\% samples near the intersection of two annulus to the other class (Type 2). As specified in Table \ref{tab:comparison} \( r^* = [0.1, 0.4] \) for Type 1 data and \( r^* = [0.0, 0.2] \) for Type 2 data. With the presence of label noise, the distribution of \( r_{\text{opt}} \) shifts from non-negative ones to negative values. Even though NLS fails to outperform PLS on clean data, we observe that NLS is less sensitive to noisy labels. Data with high level noise rates clearly favor NLS with a low smooth rate!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Synthetic data (Type 1)</th>
<th>Synthetic data (Type 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( e_i = 0 )</td>
<td>( e_j = 0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLS</td>
<td>0.896</td>
<td>0.878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanilla Loss</td>
<td>0.889</td>
<td>0.882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NLS</td>
<td>0.892</td>
<td>0.885</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| \( r_{\text{opt}} \) | [0.1, 0.4] | 0.2 | 0.4 | [0.0, 0.2] | 0.3 | 0.5 |

**\( r^* \) and \( r_{\text{opt}} \) on UCI datasets** As for UCI datasets, we pick four datasets for illustration. The noisy labels are generated by a symmetric noise transition matrix with noise rate \( e = [0.1, 0.2, 0.3, 0.4] \). Similarly to our observations in synthetic dataset, as highlighted in Table \ref{tab:comparison} \( r_{\text{opt}} \) appears with positive values when the data is clean (same as \( r^* \)) or of a low noise rate. With the increasing of noise rates, the performance of PLS results in a much larger degradation compared with NLS. We color-code different noise regimes where either PLS (red-ish) or NLS (green-ish) outperforms the other. Clearly there is a separation of the favored smoothing rate for different noise scenarios (Upper left \& low noise for PLS; bottom right \& high noise for NLS).
Table 2: Test accuracies of GLS on clean and noisy UCI datasets with best two smooth rates (green: NLS; red: PLS).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Smooth Rate</th>
<th>Twonorm</th>
<th>Splice</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$e_0 = 0$</td>
<td>$e_0 = 0.1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r = 0.8$</td>
<td>0.990</td>
<td>0.990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r = 0.6$</td>
<td>0.990</td>
<td>0.989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r = 0.4$</td>
<td>0.990</td>
<td>0.989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r = 0.2$</td>
<td>0.990</td>
<td>0.989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r = 0.0$</td>
<td>0.990</td>
<td>0.989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r = -0.4$</td>
<td>0.986</td>
<td>0.986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r = -1.0$</td>
<td>0.986</td>
<td>0.986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r = -2.0$</td>
<td>0.986</td>
<td>0.986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r = -4.0$</td>
<td>0.986</td>
<td>0.986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r = -8.0$</td>
<td>0.986</td>
<td>0.986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r_{opt}$</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Test accuracies of GLS on clean and noisy CIFAR-10 dataset: we report the mean accuracy of each smooth rate setting and the standard deviation. Compared with $r_{opt}$, smooth rates that achieve no worse than 0.05% test accuracies are highlighted for each $\epsilon$ (green: NLS; red: PLS).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Smooth Rate</th>
<th>Clean $\epsilon = 0$</th>
<th>$\epsilon = 0.2$</th>
<th>$\epsilon = 0.4$</th>
<th>$\epsilon = 0.6$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$r = 0.8$</td>
<td>92.91±0.06</td>
<td>88.83±1.61</td>
<td>81.88±2.91</td>
<td>75.16±0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r = 0.6$</td>
<td>92.33±0.09</td>
<td>87.50±1.31</td>
<td>82.11±0.86</td>
<td>73.59±0.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r = 0.4$</td>
<td>93.05±0.04</td>
<td>87.13±0.07</td>
<td>81.50±1.42</td>
<td>74.21±0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r = 0.2$</td>
<td>91.44±0.16</td>
<td>83.08±0.86</td>
<td>80.42±2.29</td>
<td>75.34±0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r = 0.0$</td>
<td>95.55±0.06</td>
<td>87.55±0.08</td>
<td>81.58±0.19</td>
<td>75.92±0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r = -0.2$</td>
<td>92.74±0.05</td>
<td>88.46±0.11</td>
<td>81.56±0.15</td>
<td>76.13±0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r = -1.0$</td>
<td>92.58±0.08</td>
<td>88.58±0.08</td>
<td>81.95±0.10</td>
<td>76.20±0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r = -2.0$</td>
<td>93.30±0.03</td>
<td>88.78±0.09</td>
<td>83.64±0.15</td>
<td>76.11±0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r = -4.0$</td>
<td>93.13±0.04</td>
<td>88.90±0.07</td>
<td>84.34±0.13</td>
<td>77.22±0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$r = -8.0$</td>
<td>93.14±0.08</td>
<td>88.94±0.11</td>
<td>84.52±0.13</td>
<td>77.42±0.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.2 Connection to other robust methods

To validate our main theorems in Section 3, we compare GLS with backward correction, forward correction [29] and peer loss [23] on CIFAR-10 dataset. To approximate the performance of backward/forward Loss Correction, we adopt GLS with smooth rate $\epsilon/(\epsilon - 1)$. As for the approximation of Peer Loss, we choose $\ell(f(X), \hat{Y}) - \ell(f(X), \hat{Y}^{GLS,r=0.5})$ which is equivalent to GLS when $r \rightarrow \infty$. Experiment results in Table 4 on CIFAR-10 with various symmetric noise settings demonstrate that the equivalent forms of GLS are robust to label noise.

Table 4: Comparison of test accuracies on CIFAR-10 under symmetric label noise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>CIFAR-10, Symmetric $\epsilon = 0.2$</th>
<th>$\epsilon = 0.4$</th>
<th>$\epsilon = 0.6$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Backward [29]</td>
<td>84.79</td>
<td>83.40</td>
<td>71.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forward T [29]</td>
<td>84.85</td>
<td>83.98</td>
<td>73.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLS form</td>
<td>87.33</td>
<td>81.73</td>
<td>75.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peer Loss [23]</td>
<td>90.21</td>
<td>86.40</td>
<td>79.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GLS form</td>
<td>88.98</td>
<td>85.05</td>
<td>76.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.3 GLS and model confidence

Model confidence on synthetic data  As for the synthetic data (Type 2) where the clean data can not be perfectly separated, we visualize the confidence of model prediction when GLS meets different levels of noisy labels. In Figure[4] the colored bands depict the different levels of prediction probabilities. When the smooth rate increases from negative to positive (from left to right), more samples fall in the orange and light blue band which indicates uncertain predictions. With the increasing noise rates (from top to bottom), GLS becomes less confident on her predictions as well.

Figure 4: Model confidence visualization of GLS on synthetic data (Type 2) w.r.t. clean data (1st row), noise rate $e_i = 0.2$ (2nd row) and noise rate $e_i = 0.3$ (3rd row). (left: NLS; middle: Vanilla Loss; right: PLS.)

Model confidence on CIFAR-10  In Theorem[7] we have shown that NLS explicitly encourages a higher expected model confidence compared with PLS. Will NLS make the model be more confident on wrong predictions? We train GLS on CIFAR-10 with symmetric ($\epsilon = 0.6$) label noise. As shown in Figure[5] with the decreasing of smooth rates (from right to left), the model confidence on correct predictions gradually approach to its maximum, while for wrong predictions, the model confidence converges to its minimum value. In a nutshell, NLS makes the model prediction become over-confident in correct predictions and almost no confidence on wrong predictions.

Figure 5: Model confidence distribution of correct and wrong predictions on CIFAR-10 test data. (From left to right: NLS ($r = -4.0, -0.8$), Vanilla Loss, PLS ($r = 0.4$)).
Effect of GLS on pre-logits. We visualise the pre-logits of a ResNet-34 for three classes on CIFAR-10. We adopt the visualization method from [26] which illustrates how representations differ between penultimate layers of networks trained with different smooth rates in GLS. As visualized in Figure 6, NLS makes the model \( f \) be confident on her predictions and the distances between three clusters are clearly larger than those appeared in Vanilla Loss and PLS.

Figure 6: Effect of GLS on pre-logits (left: NLS; middle: Vanilla Loss; right: PLS; trained with symmetric 0.2 noisy CIFAR-10 training dataset).

6.4 Bias and variance of GLS on CIFAR-10 test dataset

Empirically, we visualize the bias and variance of pre-trained GLS models (w.r.t. symmetric noisy CIFAR-10 training dataset) on CIFAR-10 test dataset. The \( x \) axis indicates the variable of smooth rates. As shown in Figure 7, experiment results on symmetric 0.4 and 0.6 noisy CIFAR-10 dataset show that the bias of model prediction increases when adopting PLS, which coincides the observation mentioned in [44]. We also observe that switching to a mild negative smooth rate decreases the bias of model prediction. However, pushing the model \( f \) to be overly confident on her predictions may still induce a high bias. There is no clear observation on changes of prediction variance when the smooth rate is moderate (such as \( r \in [-1.0, 0.8] \)), but the variance drops significantly if the smooth rate is too low, i.e, \( r < -2.0 \).

Figure 7: Bias and variance of pre-trained GLS models on CIFAR-10 test dataset. (left: trained on symmetric 0.4 noisy CIFAR-10; right: trained on symmetric 0.6 noisy CIFAR-10.)

7 Conclusion

In this paper, we provide understandings for a generalized notion of label smoothing where the label smoothing rate can go negative. We demonstrate that learning with negatively smoothed labels explicitly improves the confidence of model prediction. This key property acts as a significant role when the confidence of model prediction drops. We make connections between negative label smoothing and existing learning with noisy label solutions. In contrast to exiting works that promote the use of positive label smoothing, we show both theoretically and empirically the advantage of a negative smooth rate when the label noise rate increases. Our observations provide new understanding for the effects of label smoothing, especially when the training labels are imperfect.
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Appendix

The Appendix is organized as follows.
- Section A presents the full version of related works.
- Section B includes omitted proofs for theoretical conclusions in the main paper.
- Section C shows more experimental details and results.

A Full version of related works

Our work supplements to two lines of related works.

Learning with noisy labels Annotated labels from human labelers usually consists of an non-negligible amount of mis-labeled data samples. Making deep neural nets perform robust training on “noisily” labeled datasets remains a challenge. Classical approaches of learning with noisy labels assume the noisy labels are independent to features. They firstly estimate the noise transition matrix then proceed with a loss correction to mitigate label noise. Recent works propose robust loss functions to train deep neural nets directly without the knowledge of noise rates, or design a pipeline which dynamically select and train on “clean” samples with small label noise. Label smoothing and non-uniform label smoothing. More recently, it was shown that an appropriate label smoothing regularizer with reduced label variance boosts the convergence. When label noise presents, gives label smoothing and non-uniform label smoothing. More recently, it was shown that an appropriate label smoothing regularizer with reduced label variance boosts the convergence. Learning with noisy labels Annotated labels from human labelers usually consists of a non-negligible amount of mis-labeled data samples. Making deep neural nets perform robust training on “noisily” labeled datasets remains a challenge. Classical approaches of learning with noisy labels assume the noisy labels are independent to features. They firstly estimate the noise transition matrix then proceed with a loss correction to mitigate label noise. Recent works propose robust loss functions to train deep neural nets directly without the knowledge of noise rates, or design a pipeline which dynamically select and train on “clean” samples with small label noise. Label smoothing and non-uniform label smoothing. More recently, it was shown that an appropriate label smoothing regularizer with reduced label variance boosts the convergence.

Understanding the effect of label smoothing Label smoothing (LS) is an arising learning paradigm that uses positively weighted average of both the hard training labels and uniformly distributed soft labels. Empirical studies have demonstrated the effectiveness of LS in improving the model performance and model calibration. However, knowledge distilling a teacher network (trained on smoothed labels) into a student network is much less effective. Later, generalization effects of more advanced forms of label smoothing was studied, such as structural label smoothing and non-uniform label smoothing. More recently, it was shown that an appropriate label smoothing regularizer with reduced label variance boosts the convergence. When label noise presents, gives theoretical justifications for the memorizing effects of label smoothing. And the effectiveness of label smoothing in mitigating label noise is investigated in.

B Omitted proofs

B.1 Proof of Proposition 2

Proof. The risk minimization of backward correction is equivalent to:

\[ E_{(X, \hat{Y}) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \ell^-(f(X), \hat{Y}) \right] = E_{(X, Y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \ell(f(X), Y) \right] \]  
(By Theorem 1 in [29])

The risk minimization of forward correction is equivalent to:

\[ E_{(X, \hat{Y}) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \ell^+(f(X), \hat{Y}) \right] = E_{(X, Y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \ell(f(X), Y) \right] \]  
(By Theorem 2 in [29])

Thus, for \( r_{LC} = \frac{2e_1}{2e_1 - 1} \), by Theorem 8 (adopt \( r^* = 0 \), we have:

\[
\min E_{(X, Y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \ell(f(X), Y) \right] + \lambda_{LC} \cdot E_{X, Y=1} \left[ \ell(f(X), 1) - \ell(f(X), 0) \right] 
\]

\[
= \min E_{(X, Y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \ell(f(X), Y) \right] + \left[ e_1 + (1 - 2e_1) \cdot \frac{r_{LC}}{2} \right] \cdot E_{(X, Y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \ell(f(X), 1 - Y) - \ell(f(X), Y) \right] 
\]

\[
+ \eta \cdot (1 - r_{LC}) \cdot E_{X, Y=1} \left[ \ell(f(X), 0) - \ell(f(X), 1) \right] + \lambda_{LC} \cdot E_{X, Y=1} \left[ \ell(f(X), 1) - \ell(f(X), 0) \right] 
\]

\[
= \min E_{(X, Y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \ell(f(X), Y) \right] + \eta \cdot \left( \frac{1}{1 - 2e_1} - \frac{1}{1 - 2e_1} \right) \cdot E_{X, Y=1} \left[ \ell(f(X), 0) - \ell(f(X), 1) \right] 
\]

\[
= \min E_{(X, Y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \ell(f(X), Y) \right] 
\]
Thus,
\[
\min E_{(X,Y) \sim D} \left[ \ell^* (f(X), \hat{Y}) \right] = \min E_{(X,Y) \sim D} \left[ \ell^* (f(X), \hat{Y}) \right]
\]
\[
= \min E_{(X,Y) \sim D} \left[ \ell(f(X), \hat{Y}^{\text{GLS,rc}}) \right] + \lambda_{LC} \cdot E_{X,Y=1} \left[ \ell(f(X), 1) - \ell(f(X), 0) \right]
\]

\[\boxed{\text{Bias-LC}}\]

**B.2 Proof of Theorem 3**

*Proof.* Based on Proposition 2 when \( e_\Delta = 0, \lambda_{LC} = 0 \), we directly have:
\[
\min E_{(X,Y) \sim D} \left[ \ell^* (f(X), \hat{Y}) \right] = \min E_{(X,Y) \sim D} \left[ \ell^* (f(X), \hat{Y}) \right]
\]
\[
= \min E_{(X,Y) \sim D} \left[ \ell(f(X), \hat{Y}^{\text{GLS,rc}}) \right]
\]

\[\boxed{\text{Bias-LC}}\]

**B.3 Proof of Theorem 4**

*Proof.* Note that
\[
\min E_{(X,Y) \sim D} \left[ \ell_{\text{CL}} (f(X), \hat{Y}) \right] = \min E_{(X,Y) \sim D} \left[ \ell(f(X), \hat{Y}) - \ell(f(X), 1 - \hat{Y}) \right]
\]

We have:
\[
\min E_{(X,Y) \sim D} \left[ \ell(f(X), \hat{Y}^{\text{GLS,rc}}) \right]
\]
\[
= \min E_{(X,Y) \sim D} \left[ \left(1 - \frac{r_{\text{GLS}}}{2}\right) \cdot \ell(f(X), \hat{Y}) + \frac{r_{\text{GLS}}}{2} \cdot \ell(f(X), 1 - \hat{Y}) \right]
\]
\[
\Leftrightarrow \min E_{(X,Y) \sim D} \left[ \ell(f(X), \hat{Y}) + \frac{r_{\text{GLS}}}{2 - r_{\text{GLS}}} \cdot \ell(f(X), 1 - \hat{Y}) \right]
\]

When \( r_{\text{GLS}} \to -\infty \), we have \( \frac{r_{\text{GLS}}}{2 - r_{\text{GLS}}} \to -1 \). Thus,
\[
\min E_{(X,Y) \sim D} \left[ \ell_{\text{CL}} (f(X), \hat{Y}) \right] = \min E_{(X,Y) \sim D} \left[ \ell(f(X), \hat{Y}^{\text{GLS,rc}} \to -\infty) \right]
\]

\[\boxed{\text{Bias-LC}}\]

**B.4 Proof of Proposition 5**

*Proof.*
\[
\min I \left[ \ell_{\text{peer}} (f(X), \hat{Y}) \right] = \min I \left[ \ell(f(X), \hat{Y}) - \ell(f(X), \hat{Y}_1) \right]
\]
\[
= \min I \left[ \ell(f(X), \hat{Y}) \right] - E_{(X,Y) \sim D} \left[ \ell(f(X), \hat{Y}_1) \right]
\]

Note that:
\[
E_{(X,Y) \sim D} \left[ \ell(f(X), \hat{Y}^{\text{LS}}) \right]
\]
\[
= E_{(X,Y) \sim D} \left[ \left(1 - \frac{r}{2}\right) \cdot \ell(f(X), \hat{Y}) + \frac{r}{2} \cdot \ell(f(X), 1 - \hat{Y}) \right]
\]
\[
= E_{(X,Y) \sim D} \left[ \left(1 - \frac{r}{2}\right) \cdot \ell(f(X), 0) + \frac{r}{2} \cdot \ell(f(X), 1) \right] + E_{X,Y=1} \left[ \frac{r}{2} \cdot \ell(f(X), 0) + (1 - \frac{r}{2}) \cdot \ell(f(X), 1) \right]
\]
And we have:
\[
\mathbb{E}_{(X, Y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \ell(f(X_1), Y_2) \right] \\
= \mathbb{E}_X \left[ \mathbb{P}(Y = 0) \cdot \ell(f(X), 0) + (1 - \mathbb{P}(Y = 0)) \cdot \ell(f(X), 1) \right] \\
= \mathbb{E}_{X, Y = 0} \left[ \mathbb{P}(Y = 0) \cdot \ell(f(X), 0) + (1 - \mathbb{P}(Y = 0)) \cdot \ell(f(X), 1) \right] \\
+ \mathbb{E}_{X, Y = 1} \left[ \mathbb{P}(Y = 0) \cdot \ell(f(X), 0) + (1 - \mathbb{P}(Y = 0)) \cdot \ell(f(X), 1) \right] \\
= \mathbb{E}_{X, Y = 0} \left[ \mathbb{P}(Y = 0) \cdot \ell(f(X), 0) + (1 - \mathbb{P}(Y = 0)) \cdot \ell(f(X), 1) \right] \\
+ \mathbb{E}_{X, Y = 1} \left[ (1 - \mathbb{P}(Y = 0)) \cdot \ell(f(X), 0) + \mathbb{P}(Y = 0) \cdot \ell(f(X), 1) \right] \\
+ (1 - 2 \cdot \mathbb{P}(Y = 0)) \cdot \mathbb{E}_{X, Y = 1} \left[ \ell(f(X), 1) - \ell(f(X), 0) \right]
\]

Thus, for \( r_{PL} = 2 \cdot \mathbb{P}(Y = 1) \), we have:
\[
\mathbb{E}_{(X, Y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \ell_{\text{per}}(f(X), Y) \right] - \mathbb{E}_{(X, Y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \ell(f(X), Y) \right] + \mathbb{E}_{(X, Y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \ell(f(X), Y_{GLS,r}) \right] \\
= (2 \cdot \mathbb{P}(Y = 0) - 1) \cdot \mathbb{E}_{X, Y = 1} \left[ \ell(f(X), 1) - \ell(f(X), 0) \right] = \lambda_{PL} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{X, Y = 1} \left[ \ell(f(X), 1) - \ell(f(X), 0) \right]
\]

\[\Box\]

**B.5 Proof of Theorem 6**

**Proof.** When \( \mathbb{P}(Y = 0) = \mathbb{P}(Y = 1) \), according to Proposition 5 we have \( \lambda_{PL} = 0 \) and:
\[
\min \mathbb{E}_{(X, Y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \ell_{\text{PL}}(f(X), Y) \right] = \min \mathbb{E}_{(X, Y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \ell(f(X), Y) - \ell(f(X), Y_{GLS,r}) \right] \\
= \min \mathbb{E}_{(X, Y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \frac{r_{PL}}{2} \cdot \ell(f(X), Y) - \frac{r_{PL}}{2} \cdot \ell(f(X), 1 - Y) \right] \\
\iff \min \mathbb{E}_{(X, Y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \ell(f(X), Y) - \ell(f(X), 1 - Y) \right]
\]

When \( r_{PL} \rightarrow -\infty \), we further have:
\[
\min \mathbb{E}_{(X, Y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \ell(f(X), Y_{GLS,r}) \right] \iff \min \mathbb{E}_{(X, Y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \ell(f(X), Y) + \frac{r_{CL}}{2 - r_{CL}} \cdot \ell(f(X), 1 - Y) \right] \\
\iff \min \mathbb{E}_{(X, Y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \ell(f(X), Y) - \ell(f(X), 1 - Y) \right]
\]

Thus, Theorem 6 is proved. \[\Box\]

**B.6 Proof of Theorem 1**

Before we prove Theorem 1 we first introduce Lemma 1

**Lemma 1.** \( \forall (x, y_{GLS,r}), \ell(f(x), y_{GLS,r}) = (1 - \frac{r}{2}) \cdot \ell(f(x), y) + \frac{r}{2} \cdot \ell(f(x), 1 - y) \).

**Proof of Lemma 1**

**Proof.** For CE loss, due to its linear property w.r.t. the label, we directly have:
\[
\ell(f(x), y_{GLS,r}) = \ell(f(x), y \cdot (1 - r) + \frac{r}{2}) = (1 - \frac{r}{2}) \cdot \ell(f(x), y) + \frac{r}{2} \cdot \ell(f(x), 1 - y)
\]

\[\Box\]
Proof of Theorem 1

Proof. Based on Lemma 1 with a bit of math, for NLS, we have:

\[
\min \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim D} \left[ \ell(f(X), \hat{Y}_{\text{GLS},r}) \right] = \min \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim D} \left[ (1 + \frac{r}{2}) \cdot \ell(f(X), \hat{Y}) - \frac{r}{2} \cdot \ell(f(X), 1 - \hat{Y}) \right]
\]

= \min \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim D} \left[ (1 + \frac{r}{2}) \cdot \ell(f(X), \hat{Y}) - \frac{r}{2} \cdot \ell(f(X), 1 - \hat{Y}) \right]

= \min \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim D} \left[ \left[ 1 + \frac{r}{2} \right] \cdot \ell(f(X), \hat{Y}) - \left[ \frac{r}{2} \cdot \ell(f(X), 1 - \hat{Y}) \right] \right]

= \min \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim D} \left[ 2 \cdot \ell(f(X), \hat{Y}) - \ell(f(X), \hat{Y}_{\text{GLS},r \geq 0}) \right]

\]

\[\]

B.7 Proof of Theorem 7

Proof. Note that

\[
\mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim D} \left[ \text{MC}(f; X, Y) \right] = \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim D} \left[ \ell(f(X), 1 - Y) - \ell(f(X), Y) \right]
\]

= \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim D} - \log \left( f(X)_{1-Y} \right) + \log \left( f(X)_Y \right)

= \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim D} \log \left( \frac{f(X)_Y}{f(X)_{1-Y}} \right) = \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim D} \log \left( \frac{f(X)_Y}{1 - f(X)_Y} \right)

= \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim D} \left[ \text{MC}(f; X, Y) \right] = \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim D} \left[ f(X)_Y - f(X)_{1-Y} = \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim D} \left[ 2 \cdot f(X)_Y - 1 \right] \right]

Since both \( \log \left( x/(1 - x) \right) \) and \( 2x - 1 \) are monotonically increasing for \( x \in (0,1) \), model \( f \) with high \( \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim D} \left[ \text{MC}(f; X, Y) \right] \) has high \( \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim D} \left[ \text{MC}(f; X, Y) \right] \).

Based on this fact, we next show that

\[
\mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim D} \left[ \text{MC}(f_{p_r}^*; X, Y) \right] \geq \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim D} \left[ \text{MC}(f_{p_r^*}; X, Y) \right].
\]

We prove by contradiction, suppose

\[
\mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim D} \left[ \text{MC}(f_{p_r}^*; X, Y) \right] < \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim D} \left[ \text{MC}(f_{p_r^*}; X, Y) \right],
\]

which is the same as:

\[
\mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim D} \left[ \log \left( \frac{f_{p_r}^*(X)_Y}{1 - f_{p_r}^*(X)_Y} \right) \right] > \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim D} \left[ \log \left( \frac{f_{p_r^*}(X)_Y}{1 - f_{p_r^*}(X)_Y} \right) \right]
\]

\[
\mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim D} \left[ \log \left( f_{p_r}^*(X)_Y \right) \right] > \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim D} \left[ \log \left( f_{p_r^*}(X)_Y \right) \right]
\]

Besides, we have:

\[
\mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim D} \left[ \ell(f_{p_r}(X), Y) \right] + \frac{r_N}{2} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim D} \left[ \ell(f_{p_r^*}(X), 1 - Y) - \ell(f_{p_r}^*(X), Y) \right]
\]

\[
= \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim D} \left[ \log \left( \frac{f_{p_r}(X)_Y}{1 - f_{p_r}(X)_Y} \right) \right] + \frac{r_N}{2} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim D} \left[ \log \left( \frac{f_{p_r^*}(X)_Y}{1 - f_{p_r^*}(X)_Y} \right) \right]
\]

\[
= \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim D} \left[ \log \left( \frac{1 - f_{p_r}(X)_Y}{f_{p_r^*}(X)_Y} \right) \right] + \frac{r_N}{2} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim D} \left[ \log \left( \frac{f_{p_r}(X)_Y}{1 - f_{p_r}(X)_Y} \right) \right]
\]

which means \( f_{p_r}^* = \arg \min \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim D} \left[ \ell(f(X), Y^{\text{GLS},r}) \right] \). Note that \( f_{p_r}^* \neq f_{p_r}^* \), we finished the proof. \( \square \)
B.8 Proof of Theorem 8

Proof.  

\[
E_{\text{eqn.}3} = \min \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \left( 1 - \frac{\nu}{2} \right) \cdot \ell(f(X), \tilde{Y}) + \frac{\nu}{2} \cdot \ell(f(X), 1 - \tilde{Y}) \right]
\]

\[
= \min \mathbb{E}_{X,Y=0} \left[ \mathbb{P}(\tilde{Y} = 0 | Y = 0) \cdot \left( c_1 \cdot \ell(f(X), 0) + c_2 \cdot \ell(f(X), 1) \right) \right]
+ \mathbb{P}(\tilde{Y} = 1 | Y = 0) \cdot \left( c_1 \cdot \ell(f(X), 1) + c_2 \cdot \ell(f(X), 0) \right)
\]

\[
+ \mathbb{E}_{X,Y=1} \left[ \mathbb{P}^\cdot Y = 0 \cdot \left( c_1 \cdot \ell(f(X), 0) + c_2 \cdot \ell(f(X), 1) \right) \right]
+ \mathbb{P}(\tilde{Y} = 1 | Y = 1) \cdot \left( c_1 \cdot \ell(f(X), 1) + c_2 \cdot \ell(f(X), 0) \right)
\]

\[
= \min \mathbb{E}_{X,Y=0} \left[ \left( 1 - e_0 \right) \cdot c_1 + e_0 \cdot c_2 \right] \cdot \ell(f(X), 0) + \left( 1 - e_0 \right) \cdot c_2 + e_0 \cdot c_1 \right] \cdot \ell(f(X), 1)
\]

\[
+ \mathbb{E}_{X,Y=1} \left[ \left( 1 - e_1 \right) \cdot c_1 + e_1 \cdot c_2 \right] \cdot \ell(f(X), 1) + \left( 1 - e_1 \right) \cdot c_2 + e_1 \cdot c_1 \right] \cdot \ell(f(X), 0)
\]

\[
= \min \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \left( 1 - e_0 \right) \cdot c_1 + e_0 \cdot c_2 \right] \cdot \ell(f(X), Y) + \left( 1 - e_0 \right) \cdot c_2 + e_0 \cdot c_1 \right] \cdot \ell(f(X), 1 - Y)
\]

\[
- e_\Delta \cdot (c_1 - c_2) \cdot \mathbb{E}_{X,Y=1} \left[ \ell(f(X), 1) - \ell(f(X), 0) \right]
\]

\[
= \min \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ (c_1 + c_2) \cdot \ell(f(X), Y) \right]
\]

\[
+ \left( 1 - e_0 \right) \cdot c_2 + e_0 \cdot c_1 \right] \cdot \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \ell(f(X), 1 - Y) - \ell(f(X), Y) \right]
\]

\[
- e_\Delta \cdot (c_1 - c_2) \cdot \mathbb{E}_{X,Y=1} \left[ \ell(f(X), 1) - \ell(f(X), 0) \right]
\]

\[
= \min \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \ell(f(X), Y^*) \right] + \lambda_1 \cdot \mathbb{E}_{(X,Y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \ell(f(X), 1 - Y) - \ell(f(X), Y) \right]
\]

\[
+ \lambda_2 \cdot \mathbb{E}_{X,Y=1} \left[ \ell(f(X), 0) - \ell(f(X), 1) \right]
\]

\[
= \text{True Risk} + \text{M-Inc1} + \text{M-Inc2}
\]

\[
\]  

B.9 Proof of Theorem 9

Proof. Note that the optimal $\nu$ that will cancel the impact of Term M-Inc1 is:

\[
r_{\text{opt}} := \frac{\nu^* - 2e}{1 - 2e}
\]

- When $\epsilon < \frac{\nu^*}{2}$, $r_{\text{opt}} > 0$ and is obtained in PLS;

- When $\epsilon = \frac{\nu^*}{2}$, $r_{\text{opt}} = 0$ and is obtained through Vanilla Loss;

- When $\epsilon > \frac{\nu^*}{2}$, $r_{\text{opt}} < 0$ and is obtained in NLS.
B.10 Proof of Theorem 10

Proof. Denote \( p_i = \mathbb{P}(Y = i) \) as the clean label distribution, \( \tilde{p}_i = \mathbb{P}(\tilde{Y} = i) \) as the clean label distribution. Let \( \epsilon' = \frac{K \cdot \epsilon}{K - 1} \), we have:

\[
\mathbb{E}_{(X, Y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ (1 - r) \cdot \ell(f(X), \tilde{Y}) \right] + \mathbb{E}_X \left[ \sum_{i \in [K]} \frac{r}{K} \cdot \ell(f(X), i) \right]
\]

\[
= \sum_{i \in [K]} \mathbb{E}_{(X, \tilde{Y}) \sim \mathcal{D}, Y = i} \left[ (1 - r) \cdot \ell(f(X), \tilde{Y}) \right] + \mathbb{E}_X \left[ \sum_{i \in [K]} \frac{r}{K} \cdot \ell(f(X), i) \right]
\]

\[
= (1 - r) \cdot \sum_{i \in [K]} \mathbb{E}_{X, Y = i} \left[ (1 - \epsilon') \cdot \ell(f(X), i) + \sum_{j \in [K]} \frac{\epsilon'}{K} \cdot \ell(f(X), j) \right] + \mathbb{E}_X \left[ \sum_{i \in [K]} \frac{r}{K} \cdot \ell(f(X), i) \right]
\]

\[
= (1 - r) \cdot \sum_{i \in [K]} \mathbb{E}_{X, Y = i} \left[ (1 - \epsilon') \cdot \ell(f(X), i) \right] + \mathbb{E}_X \left[ \frac{(1 - r) \cdot \epsilon'}{K} + \frac{r}{K} \sum_{j \in [K]} \ell(f(X), j) \right]
\]

\[
= (1 - r) \cdot \left( \sum_{i \in [K]} \mathbb{E}_{X, Y = i} \left[ \ell(f(X), Y) \right] \right) + \mathbb{E}_X \left[ \frac{(1 - r) \cdot \epsilon'}{K} + \frac{r}{K} \sum_{j \in [K]} \ell(f(X), j) \right]
\]

\[
= \frac{c_3}{1 - r^*} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{(X, Y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \ell(f(X), Y) - \frac{r^*}{K} \sum_{j \in [K]} \ell(f(X), j) \right] + c_4 \cdot \mathbb{E}_X \left[ \sum_{j \in [K]} \ell(f(X), j) \right]
\]

Adopting \( r_{opt} = \frac{r^* - \epsilon'}{1 - \epsilon'} \), with a bit of math, the weight of Term M-Inc1 becomes 0 and

\[
\mathbb{E}_{(X, \tilde{Y}) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \ell(f(X), Y^{GLS, r_{opt}}) \right] = \mathbb{E}_{(X, \tilde{Y}) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ (1 - r_{opt}) \cdot \ell(f(X), \tilde{Y}) \right] + \mathbb{E}_X \left[ \sum_{i \in [K]} \frac{r_{opt}}{K} \cdot \ell(f(X), i) \right]
\]

\[
= \frac{c_3}{1 - r^*} \cdot \mathbb{E}_{(X, Y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \ell(f(X), Y^*) \right] \quad \iff \quad \mathbb{E}_{(X, Y) \sim \mathcal{D}} \left[ \ell(f(X), Y^*) \right]
\]

C More Experiment Results and Details

C.1 Definitions of bias and variance

Denote \( \tilde{f}_H, \tilde{f}_S \) as pre-trained models on the training dataset \( \mathcal{D} \) w.r.t. hard labels and soft labels respectively. The vector form of the prediction w.r.t. sample \( x \) given by \( \tilde{f}_H \) and \( \tilde{f}_S \) are \( \tilde{f}_H(x; D) \) and \( \tilde{f}_S(x; D) \). For the ease of presentation, we relate notations with subscript H/S to hard/soft labels without further explanation. Given the sample \( x \) and the one-hot label \( y \), we denote the averaged model prediction by:

\[
\tilde{f}_H(x; D) := \frac{1}{Z_H} \exp \left[ \mathbb{E}_D \log(\tilde{f}_H(x; D)) \right], \quad \tilde{f}_S(x; D) := \frac{1}{Z_S} \exp \left[ \mathbb{E}_D \log(\tilde{f}_S(x; D)) \right]
\]
where $Z_H, Z_S$ are normalization constants. The bias of model prediction is defined as the KL divergence $D_{KL}$ between target distribution (one-hot encoded vector form) $y$ and the averaged model prediction.

$$
\text{Bias}_H := \mathbb{E}_{x, y} \left[ y \log \frac{y}{\bar{f}_H(x; D)} \right], \quad \text{Bias}_S := \mathbb{E}_{x, y} \left[ y \log \frac{y}{\bar{f}_S(x; D)} \right].
$$

While the variance of model prediction measures the expectation of KL divergence between the averaged model prediction and model prediction over $D$:

$$
\text{Var}_H := \mathbb{E}_D \left[ \mathbb{E}_{x, y} \left[ y \log \frac{\bar{f}_H(x; D)}{\hat{f}_H(x; D)} \right] \right], \quad \text{Var}_S := \mathbb{E}_D \left[ \mathbb{E}_{x, y} \left[ y \log \frac{\bar{f}_S(x; D)}{\hat{f}_S(x; D)} \right] \right].
$$

### C.2 Additional experiment on model confidence

**NLS improves model confidence on Synthetic Type 1 dataset**

In Figure 8, the colored bands depict the different levels of prediction probabilities. When the smooth rate increases from negative to positive, more samples fall in the orange and light blue band which indicates uncertain predictions. Besides, with the increasing of noise rates ($e_i = 0 \rightarrow 0.4$), GLS with a fixed smooth rate becomes less confident on its predictions. Thus, a smaller smooth rate is required when the noise rate increases.

**Model confidence of GLS on CIFAR-10 test dataset**

When GLS trained on symmetric 0.2 (see Figure 9) and 0.4 (see Figure 10) noisy CIFAR-10 training dataset, with the decreasing of smooth rates (from right to left), the model confidence on correct predictions gradually approach to its maximum, while for wrong predictions, the model confidence converges to its minimum value. NLS makes the model prediction become over-confident on correct predictions and in-confident on wrong predictions.

### C.3 Experiment details

**Generation of synthetic dataset**

In the synthetic (Type 1) dataset, we generate 500 points for both classes. Class +1 distributes inside the circle with radius 0.25. Class -1 generates by randomly sampling 500 data points in the annulus.
with inner radius 0.28 and outer radius 0.45. As for synthetic (Type 2) dataset, we uniform assign labels for 50% samples in the annulus (with inner radius 0.22, outer radius 0.31) based on Type 1 dataset.

**Generating noise labels on synthetic datasets and UCI datasets**  Note that these datasets are all binary classification datasets, each label in the training and validation set is flipped to the other class with probability $\epsilon$, and we set $\epsilon = 0.1, 0.4$ for synthetic Type 1 dataset, $\epsilon = 0.1, 0.3$ for synthetic Type 2 dataset.

**Training settings of synthetic datasets**  For both types of synthetic datasets, we adopted a three-layer ReLU Multi-Layer Perceptron (MLP), trained for 200 epochs with batch-size 128 and Adam [16] optimizer. The initial learning rate is 0.1, and it multiplies 0.1 for every 40 epochs.

**Training settings of UCI datasets**  We adopted a two-layer ReLU Multi-Layer Perceptron (MLP) for classification tasks on 4 UCI datasets, trained for 1000 episodes with batch-size 64 and Adam [16] optimizer. We report the best performance for each smooth rate under a set of learning rate settings, [0.0007, 0.001, 0.005, 0.01, 0.05].

**Training settings of clean CIFAR-10 dataset**  We adopted ResNet34 [10], trained for 200 epochs with batch-size 128, SGD [32] optimizer with Nesterov momentum of 0.9 and weight decay 1e-4. The learning rate of first 100 epochs is 0.1. And it multiplies with 0.1 for every 50 epochs.

**Generating noise labels on CIFAR-10 dataset**  We adopt symmetric noise model which generates noisy labels by randomly flipping the clean label to the other possible classes with probability $\epsilon$. And we set $\epsilon = 0.2, 0.4, 0.6$.

**Training settings of noisy CIFAR-10 dataset**  The generation of symmetric noisy dataset is adopted from [4]. The symmetric noise rates are [0.2, 0.4, 0.6]. We choose two methods to train GLS.

- **Direct training**  This setting is the same as training on clean CIFAR-10 dataset.
- **Warm-up**  In this case, we firstly train a ResNet34 model with Cross-Entropy loss for 120 epochs. For this warm-up, the only difference in hyper-parameter setting is the learning rate, where the initial learning rate is 0.1 and it multiplies 0.1 for every 40 epochs. After the warm-up, GLS loads the same pre-trained model and trains for 100 epochs with learning rate 1e-6.

**Computing infrastructure**  In our experiments, we use a GPU cluster (8 RTX 2080 GPUs) for training and evaluation.