

Label Sleuth: From Unlabeled Text to a Classifier in a Few Hours

Eyal Shnarch¹(✉)*, Alon Halfon¹*, Ariel Gera¹*, Marina Danilevsky¹, Yannis Katsis¹, Leshem Choshen¹, Martin Santillan Cooper¹, Dina Epelboim¹, Zheng Zhang², Dakuo Wang¹, Lucy Yip³, Liat Ein-Dor¹, Lena Dankin¹, Ilya Shnayderman¹, Ranit Aharonov¹, Yunyao Li⁴, Naftali Liberman¹, Philip Levin Slesarev¹, Gwilym Newton¹, Shila Ofek-Koifman¹, Noam Slonim¹, Yoav Katz¹
¹IBM Research, ²University of Notre Dame, ³MIT-IBM Watson AI Lab, ⁴Apple[†]
 eyals@il.ibm.com

Abstract

Text classification can be useful in many real-world scenarios, saving a lot of time for end users. However, building a custom classifier typically requires coding skills and ML knowledge, which poses a significant barrier for many potential users. To lift this barrier, we introduce *Label Sleuth*, a free open source system for labeling and creating text classifiers. This system is unique for (a) being a no-code system, making NLP accessible to non-experts, (b) guiding users through the entire labeling process until they obtain a custom classifier, making the process efficient – from cold start to classifier in a few hours, and (c) being open for configuration and extension by developers. By open sourcing Label Sleuth we hope to build a community of users and developers that will broaden the utilization of NLP models.

1 Introduction

Text classification is an NLP task with great practical importance. Practitioners working with large amounts of textual data often need to categorize snippets of text. For instance, a lawyer reviewing contracts may need to find clauses specifying the terms under which a contract can be terminated. Or, a psychologist analyzing treatment notes may be interested in finding all sentences that indicate that a patient is suffering from depression. Often, the text snippets of interest are rare and scattered throughout the dataset. Manually reviewing the entire dataset is inefficient or impractical, thus raising the need for an automated solution in the form of a custom text classification model.

Practitioners, or *domain experts* (a.k.a subject matter experts) who need such models, typically lack the skills to build them, and thus must rely on Machine Learning (ML) experts. This, in turn,

creates a gap between modern text classification techniques and their end users, which we aim to bridge in this work.

We present *Label Sleuth*¹ – an *open source*² system designed to enable domain experts to create a text classifier by themselves, with no dependency on ML experts. Label Sleuth is both a labeling platform and a machine learning platform, and is thus used to collect labeled data as well as to build text classifiers. It enables a domain expert to create a good quality custom classifier from a cold start (no labels) in a few hours, in several short rounds of labeling – enhanced via active learning (Cohn et al., 1996) – that provide feedback to models being trained in the background. Label Sleuth was designed to be intuitive and easy to use by domain experts. Rather than trying to cover many different NLP tasks and increasing the system complexity, it focuses on a single broadly applicable use case of binary text classification, and provides a fully automated flow for building such classifiers.

To the best of our knowledge, Label Sleuth is the first text classification platform intentionally designed for a broad audience - domain experts that typically lack coding skills or an understanding of ML concepts. By open sourcing Label Sleuth, we hope the community will join this effort, to further expand and improve its existing capabilities for the benefit of a potentially wide community of users.

2 System description

2.1 A typical workflow

We illustrate a flow for using Label Sleuth through the eyes of a potential user. We encourage readers to experience this workflow directly, to get a first-hand impression of the process.³ Consider Viki, a Wikipedia editor and expert in animals, who is interested in enriching the content of animal articles

*These authors contributed equally to this work.

[†] Work done while author was working at IBM Research.

¹<https://www.label-sleuth.org>

²<https://github.com/label-sleuth/label-sleuth>

³A step-by-step *tutorial* is provided on the website.




Figure 1: **The workspace screen** when the first classifier is ready. Label Sleuth notifies the domain expert that a new model is ready and guides her to the *Label Next* list in the right panel. The sentences that are predicted as positive by the new classifier are marked with a blue frame (both in the document view and in the list on the right).

on Wikipedia. Her goal is to ensure that accurate information about an animal’s habitat is included in all animal articles. Manually reviewing all articles would be extremely grueling. Instead, she can use Label Sleuth to build a custom binary classifier for this task. The classifier will identify sentences describing an animal’s habitat, allowing her to focus on relevant sentences to review, and to identify articles missing habitat information.

Upload data and create a classification category. To get started, she uploads the set of Wikipedia articles, split into sentences, into the system.⁴ She then creates a new *workspace* using the uploaded corpus. Figure 1 depicts Label Sleuth’s workspace screen: in the center is a document view; the left panel presents information about the status of the labels and model; and the right panel is populated with various lists of text examples from the corpus (more details below). The workspace enables her to create multiple custom categories (i.e., classes) for classification. Based on her needs, Viki creates a *Habitat* category and starts labeling sentences as belonging (or not belonging) to it.

Finding examples to label. Viki can use the document view to skim articles and label sentences. However, since sentences about habitats are relatively rare, this would lead to her mostly labeling negative examples. To quickly find positive examples, Viki leverages Label Sleuth’s search function-

ality. Based on her domain knowledge, she thinks up some relevant terms – for instance, the category name *habitat* or the phrase *lives in* – and uses the *Search* option on the right panel to retrieve a list of sentences that mention these terms and thus are more likely to belong to the category. Search results can be labeled directly using the ✓ and ✗ buttons. If an example’s context is needed to make a decision, clicking on it shows the source article in the document view, highlighting the example.

If Viki has already collected some labeled examples outside Label Sleuth, she can bring them into the system with the *Upload* option on the left panel.

Automated model training. Once a sufficient set of labeled examples is provided (see App. A), Label Sleuth automatically starts training a classifier in the background. Viki does not need to manually invoke training. However, she can use the progress bar on the left panel to track her progress and see how many more labels are needed before the system starts training a new classifier.

Receive guidance on what to label. Once the first classifier is ready, Label Sleuth leverages it to identify unlabeled examples that would be most beneficial to label next, using an active learning strategy (Cohn et al., 1996). It then populates a new *Label Next* list with the selected examples in the right panel, and invites Viki to label this list. Fig. 1 depicts the system when the first classifier

⁴The Label Sleuth installation includes this dataset.

is available. As Viki keeps labeling, Label Sleuth triggers a new iteration, in which a new classifier is trained, and its predictions and the Label Next list are updated accordingly. With the additional labeled examples, the classifier improves with each such iteration.

Review model predictions. At any point, Viki can review the predictions of the current classifier to get an impression of its performance and provide feedback. She can do this by skimming through different articles in the main document view, which have the positive predictions highlighted. Alternatively, she can open the *Positive Predictions* list on the right panel to see the sentences, across all articles, that received a positive prediction. If she disagrees with a prediction, she can directly label the corresponding element to provide focused feedback to the model.

Evaluate model quality. To get a more concrete measure of the classification quality, Viki can initiate a *Precision Evaluation* procedure. The system samples n sentences that are predicted as positive by the current classifier. Viki is asked to label these sentences and her feedback is used to estimate the precision of the classifier.

Receive guidance on potential labeling errors. While working on a repetitive labeling task, it is natural to make mistakes. These mistakes introduce noise to the labeled data, resulting in degraded model performance. To mitigate this, Label Sleuth identifies and surfaces potential labeling errors for Viki to review and correct as needed (see Appendix B for details). Identifying labeling errors and understanding their causes early on not only improves the performance of the resultant classifier but can also sharpen the user’s understanding of the task for future rounds of labeling.

Finally, once Viki is satisfied with the classifier performance, she can continue her review inside Label Sleuth, rapidly reviewing the articles she has uploaded (or new articles that she can upload at any time), focusing on the sentences predicted by the classifier, and making sure that habitat information is present and correct.⁵

2.2 Guiding design principles

Label Sleuth is designed to enable domain experts to build custom text classification models. This is

⁵Users with engineering skills may export the classifier created by the system and use it on their own environment, or download the collected labeled data and use it to train a different classifier.

in stark contrast to alternative systems that focus on technical users, be it data scientists or ML experts (see § 3). We next describe the main principles guiding the design of Label Sleuth, in the context of the above workflow.

Minimize the labeling effort. The time of domain experts is typically limited and expensive. The system should thus make effective use of their time, as well as demonstrate a quick return on investment to keep them engaged. Label Sleuth accomplishes this in the following ways:

Focus on value-added positive examples. When it comes to building a text classifier, not all labels are equally important. For instance, in the common case where positive examples are scarce, it is these positive examples that are more valuable. Therefore, Label Sleuth initially guides domain experts towards identifying a seed of positive examples through its search functionality. Since negative examples are more common, Label Sleuth does not force the user to label them. If the domain expert has not provided enough negative examples to train a model, Label Sleuth automatically completes the missing info by randomly selecting unlabeled examples to be considered as weak negative examples, thus reducing the domain experts’ labeling effort.

Continuous labeling guidance. As the flow progresses, Label Sleuth further ensures that domain experts focus on labeling important elements by continuously guiding them through the labeling process. This guidance comes in two forms. First, by providing active learning suggestions, the system focuses domain experts on labeling examples useful for improving the model, instead of wasting effort on labeling uninformative examples. Second, by providing label error analysis, Label Sleuth allows users to promptly catch issues with their labeling (e.g., caused by concept drift or ill-defined categories) and revise their work before wasting more time on erroneous labeling.

Progress feedback. Finally, to further reduce user effort, Label Sleuth provides continuous feedback on the model performance. By showing the classifier’s predictions, as well as via the precision evaluation mechanism, the system enables users to understand when the classifier’s performance is adequate and they can safely stop labeling.

Abstract the ML process. Domain experts, while proficient in their domain, may not be familiar with ML techniques or even ML terminology. As a result, the system should abstract the ML pro-

cess as much as possible. This is accomplished in Label Sleuth through the following features:

Automated and transparent ML processes. All ML steps, including model training, inference, and active learning, are automatically initiated and performed in the background without user intervention. Once completed, a colorful confetti animation notifies the user that a new classifier is ready (this also serves as a surprisingly effective means for keeping users engaged). Other than being aware of the classifier being iteratively trained by the system, users are not expected to have any ML knowledge.

Out-of-the-box configuration. Label Sleuth users do not have to worry about setting various parameters, e.g., choosing the model architecture or active learning strategy. The default system configuration defines a workflow that suits a typical classification use case (see App. A). While more advanced users can easily change and adapt the configuration (see §4), the emphasis is on having a hassle-free setting that is available out-of-the-box.

2.3 Real usage examples

Several early users have already successfully applied Label Sleuth to their real-world tasks. For instance, a legal user needed a text classifier to identify clauses of interest in long contracts. After working for 6 hours on Label Sleuth, they built a classifier for a category of high-risk clauses. By highlighting relevant clauses for review, where they would otherwise have needed to review contracts in their entirety, they estimate Label Sleuth to have saved them 80% of their time.

In another example, Gretz et al. (2022) developed VIRA, a chatbot that helps address COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy. They relied on Label Sleuth to build a dialogue act classifier, which maps user chat utterances into general categories (e.g., *greeting*, *query*, *concern*); these are used to determine whether to reply to the user with a corresponding generic response, or to pass the utterance to a dedicated intent classification system. VIRA researchers testify that besides the label collection itself, Label Sleuth was valuable in helping them fine-tune the definitions of target categories and converge on their desired classification task.

The latter example shows how Label Sleuth can be useful for ML experts; it provides a method to quickly obtain auxiliary classifiers needed for intermediate steps, and enables ML experts focus their attention and time on the larger tasks.

3 System comparison

Text labeling (or annotation) tools have proliferated in recent years. Neves and Ševa (2021) surveyed 78 tools. They can be classified into two categories:

Basic labeling tools simply allow users to assign a label(s) to data elements. Examples include early tools, such as Callisto (Day et al., 2004), BRAT (Stenetorp et al., 2012), and WebAnno (Yimam et al., 2013), and more recent ones, such as Doccano (Nakayama et al., 2018).

Labeling tools with ML support are more similar to Label Sleuth, since in addition to collecting labels, they train a classifier with these labels, or accelerate the labeling process by integrating ML.

In our comparison, we focus on representative systems that are most similar to Label Sleuth and have gained users popularity. All these systems offer some form of ML labeling support. However, they are designed with technical users in mind, such as data scientists and developers; they often require complex actions to get started, which assume ML knowledge. They do not offer ML integration out-of-the-box, relying instead on the user to configure the system (e.g., by connecting it to external models). Furthermore, ML support is typically limited to active learning and lacks advanced features that could help domain experts, such as identifying and guiding the user in resolving potential labeling issues. We next provide a brief overview of each of the reviewed systems. Table 1 summarizes their features compared to Label Sleuth.

Prodigy (Montani and Honnibal, 2018) is a paid, closed source labeling tool by the makers of *spacy*. While it offers an intuitive frontend, it targets mainly data scientists, as most tasks (except for basic labeling) - including dataset upload - require using the command-line. Moreover, it does not show examples in context and thus the user must label them in isolation from their source document, and according to a predefined order.

Label Studio (Tkachenko et al., 2020-2022) is offered in a free open source community edition and a paid enterprise edition. While the latter offers ML and active learning support, setting up the process requires invoking external models (which in their simplest form are pre-built container images).

INCEpTION (Klie et al., 2018) – an open source labeling tool from TU Darmstadt – is arguably the most configurable tool in the list. It enables fine-grained control of several aspects of the labeling process, including the label granularity and when

	No technical expertise needed	ML guidance on what to label	ML guidance on label errors	Open source	Tasks other than text classification
Prodigy	✗	✓	✗	✗	✓
Label Studio (Free)	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓
Label Studio (Paid)	✗	✗	✗	✗	✓
INCEpTION	✗	✗	✗	✓	✓
Label Sleuth	✓	✓	✓	✓	✗

Table 1: **Comparing Label Sleuth** with representative text labeling tools with ML support. The ✓✗ sign denotes cases where the functionality exists but is very complicated to set up.

model predictions are shown. However, this customizability further increases the barrier to entry compared to other tools. Even setting up a classification task requires creating complex annotation layers, while integrating a model, in many cases, requires the use of external libraries.

In contrast to Label Sleuth, these systems support NLP tasks other than text classification, such as NER and question answering, or even non-textual tasks, such as audio and image classification. Thus, Label Sleuth and these systems correspond to different points on the trade-off between ease of use and task support. Existing systems support a wide variety of tasks but assume a technical user, while Label Sleuth focuses on text classification but creates an end-to-end model building experience tailored specifically to non-technical users. We believe that it is important to have tools that strike different balances in this trade-off.

4 Architecture

Label Sleuth is composed of backend and frontend layers. The backend is written in Python and uses the Flask framework for exposing a web service; the frontend is a React application which uses the MUI design library. For additional details see our [architecture webpage](#).

While Label Sleuth is well-suited to users with no ML background, it also offers configurability and extensibility options for advanced users. Users can choose from the available *models* and *active learning strategies*, and can also contribute new ones by implementing one or two straightforward functions. In addition, it is possible to configure the system to dynamically switch between models and/or strategies as the labeling progresses. Large models that require a GPU are also supported.

Another extensible component is *training set selection*. While a basic approach would be to train

classifiers using the set of examples labeled by the user, more advanced methods can provide added benefits. The default setting leverages the fact that the negative prior is high (since positive examples are relatively rare), and randomly selects elements from the unlabeled set to be added as weak negative examples for training.

The various system configurations (e.g., classification model, active learning strategy, criterion to trigger the training of a new model) together constitute a policy that shapes the flow and experience of building a classifier. The default policy (see App. A) can be extended and modified to further improve efficiency or to support different scenarios.

The *data access* layer is responsible for saving and exposing the dataset and user labels. The current implementation relies on a combination of in-memory for performance, and local disk storage for persistency. Finally, while English is used as the default language, Label Sleuth provides an infrastructure to easily support other languages.

5 Open source and research opportunities

Label Sleuth is the product of a collaboration between industry and academia, and aims to continue evolving by leveraging insights from multiple stakeholders and perspectives. We welcome further contributions and feedback from domain experts and the open source community, as well as researchers in related fields, including natural language processing and human-computer interaction.

To facilitate this, Label Sleuth was released in July 2022 as open source under the Apache 2.0 license. Following the example of other successful projects, in addition to the [source code](#) of the system, the open source release includes material aimed to facilitate the use of the system and contributions to its development. The material on the




Figure 2: **Policy setting: Choosing the classification model.** If the model in the last two iterations is BERT, using the lighter SVM for the first four iterations does not harm performance in comparison to using the heavier BERT for all iterations. Each point represents the avg. F_1 over 5 classes from 5 different datasets and 5 repetitions (seeds). Each iteration adds 30 examples. See App. C for details.

[project’s website](#) includes an overview of the system (including a short video), quick installation instructions, and a walk-through tutorial tailored to domain experts (building upon the animal habitat scenario and dataset of § 2). There is also detailed documentation of the system’s internals for open source contributors and/or researchers who want to understand the underlying techniques and extend the system for their own needs.

As detailed in § 4, the system is highly extensible, allowing researchers to further improve the system by incorporating novel techniques. A research aspect that we believe will be of particular interest to the NLP community is the unique requirements that arise from the interactive nature with the non-technical target audience of Label Sleuth. We next outline a few examples of such requirements, which we hope the NLP community will contribute solutions to.

Setting the policy. One such challenge is the selection of employed policy (ML models, active learning techniques, etc.). For instance, consider the choice of classification model. In a static system with no interaction, performance on the task may be the most important model characteristic, and thus a large (and slow) model may be preferred. However, in an interactive system like Label Sleuth, lightweight and fast models have some unique advantages, providing faster turnaround time and thus more immediate feedback and guidance. Initial experiments, depicted in Fig. 2, show that utilizing a light SVM model for most iterations and only switching to the heavier and high-performing

BERT model (Devlin et al., 2019) for a few final iterations, leads to an F_1 score that is comparable to using BERT the entire time, while offering a significantly faster run time which improves the interactivity experience.

Model evaluation. Another example is model evaluation. In typical NLP experiments, performance is quantified using some metric (e.g., F_1) over a test set. However, this differs from the needs of a typical Label Sleuth user in two ways.

First, maintaining a separate test set, which is not utilized for model training, undermines the goal of minimizing the labeling effort. Cross validation evaluation is incorrect in this scenario as the labeled examples collected in the process are not necessarily a good representation of the data (being biased towards positive examples and by active learning suggestions). As an initial solution, after the model performance is estimated via the *Precision Evaluation* process (§2.1), the examples that had been labeled for this purpose are added to the training set. In addition, estimating metrics such as recall is impractical when the positive prior is low (common in real-world classification tasks), since a reliable estimate requires a very large amount of test labels.

Second, a very important aspect is communication of evaluation results, especially in such an interactive system. Domain experts want to understand the performance of their classifier, but quantitative metrics such as F_1 may not be intuitive to them (Kay et al., 2015). Thus, there are research challenges for both finding metrics that are less data-hungry, and constructing a user experience to best reflect model performance and convey a tangible sense of progress.

Warm start. Last but not least, advances in pretrained language models and in zero-shot text classification (e.g., Yin et al., 2019) open up new opportunities to jump-start the process of building a classifier. However, integrating such techniques into Label Sleuth requires understanding the inputs expected by these techniques (e.g., category names or descriptions) and how to acquire them from domain experts. Moreover, work is needed to combine zero-shot with supervised techniques into a natural user workflow, where users not only get a good initial model (through zero-shot techniques), but also have the ability to further improve it by providing additional feedback.

6 Conclusions

Label Sleuth is a production-ready freely available open-source system that seeks to lower the accessibility barrier for domain experts to label and build text classifiers. It provides unique opportunities for a more productive and efficient classifier building process – one where the system guides the labeling process, and both the domain expert and the ML components can provide timely feedback to each other. We encourage domain experts, the open source community, and researchers to use, extend, and contribute back to the Label Sleuth project.

Limitations

As mentioned in § 3, being focused on a single task has its limitations. The obvious one is not supporting other useful tasks, such as entity labeling, relation extraction, question answering. Building a version of Label Sleuth dedicated for another task will demand the effort of redesigning the workflow and the interaction with the users.

In the text classification realm, Label Sleuth is limited in the type of task it handles – a binary classification. Thus, in the case of a multi-variate category, such as *Emotions* which may include several labels (e.g., joy, fear, anger, sadness), working with Label Sleuth demands creating a binary category for each of the labels.

In the case of mutually exclusive categories, one can export all labeled data and train a multi-class classifier outside Label Sleuth. However, if the categories are not mutually exclusive, the selected data cannot be used as is for training a multi-label classifier, as it is likely that most collected examples were only labeled for a subset of the categories.

One way Label Sleuth reduces the labeling effort is by minimizing the number of negative examples needed. The system achieves this by automatically selecting unlabeled examples as weak labeled examples, relying on the low prior of positives. If this is not the case, this feature should be disabled and users would have to spend additional time on labeling negative examples.

Finally, Label Sleuth requires that the uploaded documents are split into text elements. This split is static once the data was loaded. Thus, users are limited to labeling these standalone elements. They cannot, for example, mark that several elements constitute a positive example only when considered together. This requirement stems from the need to perform inference during the labeling process,

which in turn requires specifying the text units to be inferred.

Ethics Statement

We believe that this work has the potential to make NLP model building more inclusive by making it accessible to community members that until now did not have the means to create custom models; whether that was due to lack of technical knowledge or due to lack of resources to hire ML experts. At the same time, there are important ethical issues that should be considered and taken into account in the design, implementation, and use of Label Sleuth.

First, since the goal of the system is to automate parts of the model building process, it has the potential to take over responsibilities that were until now carried out mainly by ML experts/developers. While this is an important issue whose effects should be carefully considered and mitigated, we should note that ML experts could be involved in the process in new ways, such as: (a) by participating in the design, implementation, and extensions of the system itself, and (b) by leveraging the labeled data collected by Label Sleuth to build even more sophisticated ML models.

Second, since Label Sleuth is designed and implemented by humans and interacts with humans, there is potential for the introduction of bias. Bias could be introduced in two main places:

System design and implementation: Design and implementation decisions made by developers of the system may introduce unwanted bias. This includes decisions on the frontend (e.g., using culture-specific icons, supporting only left-to-right languages on the frontend, etc) and the backend (e.g., selecting model learning algorithms that support or perform better in specific languages, etc.). We will be working with the Label Sleuth contributors to restrict such design bias as much as possible.

Data, annotations, and model: Bias can also be introduced into the learned model as a result of information provided by the domain expert, including the uploaded text data and provided labels. To avoid such bias, the system should inform the domain expert of potential implicit bias and suggest ways to mitigate it (such as uploading more diverse datasets). Understanding how to identify, communicate, and allow domain experts to limit such bias is a very interesting area of future research.

Finally, Label Sleuth inherits all considerations

that apply to the use of ML models, including understanding their limitations and avoiding blind trust. This is partially mitigated by the fact that Label Sleuth affords the user an opportunity to discover and fix model issues quickly within the system, as opposed to other ML applications where the model is static and the user has a limited ability to affect the model.

Acknowledgements

We thank Frederick Reiss for his guidance on open-sourcing the project, Natti Eder and Shao Zhang (Shanghai Jiao Tong University) for their contributions to the system design, and Lucian Popa for supporting the project.

References

- David A Cohn, Zoubin Ghahramani, and Michael I Jordan. 1996. Active learning with statistical models. *Journal of artificial intelligence research*, 4:129–145.
- Corinna Cortes and Vladimir Vapnik. 1995. Support-vector networks. *Machine learning*, 20(3):273–297.
- David S Day, Chad McHenry, Robyn Kozierok, and Laurel D Riek. 2004. Callisto: A configurable annotation workbench. In *LREC*.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2019. [BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Liat Ein-Dor, Alon Halfon, Ariel Gera, Eyal Shnarch, Lena Dankin, Leshem Choshen, Marina Danilevsky, Ranit Aharonov, Yoav Katz, and Noam Slonim. 2020. [Active Learning for BERT: An Empirical Study](#). In *Proceedings of the 2020 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 7949–7962, Online. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Shai Gretz, Assaf Toledo, Roni Friedman, Dan Lahav, Rose Weeks, Naor Bar-Zeev, João Sedoc, Pooja Sangha, Yoav Katz, and Noam Slonim. 2022. [Benchmark data and evaluation framework for intent discovery around COVID-19 vaccine hesitancy](#). *arXiv:2205.11966*.
- Matthew Kay, Shwetak N. Patel, and Julie A. Kientz. 2015. [How good is 85%? a survey tool to connect classifier evaluation to acceptability of accuracy](#). In *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, CHI '15*, page 347–356, New York, NY, USA. Association for Computing Machinery.
- Jan-Christoph Klie, Michael Bugert, Beto Boullosa, Richard Eckart de Castilho, and Iryna Gurevych. 2018. [The INCEpTION platform: Machine-assisted and knowledge-oriented interactive annotation](#). In *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on Computational Linguistics: System Demonstrations*, pages 5–9. Association for Computational Linguistics. Event Title: The 27th International Conference on Computational Linguistics (COLING 2018).
- Ken Lang. 1995. Newsweeder: Learning to filter news. In *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 331–339.
- David D Lewis and William A Gale. 1994. A sequential algorithm for training text classifiers. In *SI-GIR'94*, pages 3–12. Springer.
- Ines Montani and Matthew Honnibal. 2018. Prodigy: A new annotation tool for radically efficient machine teaching. *Artificial Intelligence to appear*.
- Hiroki Nakayama, Takahiro Kubo, Junya Kamura, Yasufumi Taniguchi, and Xu Liang. 2018. [doccano: Text annotation tool for human](#). Software available from <https://github.com/doccano/doccano>.
- Mariana Neves and Jurica Ševa. 2021. An extensive review of tools for manual annotation of documents. *Briefings in bioinformatics*, 22(1):146–163.
- Jeffrey Pennington, Richard Socher, and Christopher D Manning. 2014. Glove: Global vectors for word representation. In *Proceedings of the 2014 conference on empirical methods in natural language processing (EMNLP)*, pages 1532–1543.
- Bo Shao, Lorna Doucet, and David R. Caruso. 2015. [Universality versus cultural specificity of three emotion domains: Some evidence based on the cascading model of emotional intelligence](#). *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 46(2):229–251.
- Pontus Stenetorp, Sampo Pyysalo, Goran Topić, Tomoko Ohta, Sophia Ananiadou, and Jun'ichi Tsujii. 2012. [brat: a web-based tool for NLP-assisted text annotation](#). In *Proceedings of the Demonstrations at the 13th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pages 102–107, Avignon, France. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Maxim Tkachenko, Mikhail Malyuk, Andrey Holmanyuk, and Nikolai Liubimov. 2020–2022. [Label Studio: Data labeling software](#). Open source software available from <https://github.com/heartexlabs/label-studio>.
- Seid Muhie Yimam, Iryna Gurevych, Richard Eckart de Castilho, and Chris Biemann. 2013. [WebAnno: A flexible, web-based and visually supported system for distributed annotations](#). In

Proceedings of the 51st Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: System Demonstrations, pages 1–6, Sofia, Bulgaria. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Wenpeng Yin, Jamaal Hay, and Dan Roth. 2019. [Benchmarking zero-shot text classification: Datasets, evaluation and entailment approach](#). In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and the 9th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (EMNLP-IJCNLP)*, pages 3914–3923, Hong Kong, China. Association for Computational Linguistics.

Xiang Zhang, Junbo Zhao, and Yann LeCun. 2015. Character-level convolutional networks for text classification. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 649–657.

A Default policy

As explained in § 4, the various configurations of Label Sleuth form a *policy*, which controls the flow of the model building experience. Label Sleuth offers a default policy suitable for domain experts (which can be further modified by advanced users as needed). Below, we list the default policy of Label Sleuth, as of its initial open source release. While we do not claim that the chosen settings are optimal, they were chosen empirically, by conducting multiple experiments on a wide variety of use cases and have been found to work well for typical text classification use cases.

Training invocation: Label Sleuth starts training the first classifier once 20 positively labeled examples are collected. After the first classifier, a new classifier is automatically trained for every 20 new labels (positive or negative) provided by the user.

Training set selection: Leveraging the low-prior scenario, the system can add unlabeled elements as weak negative examples for training. If there are fewer than 2 labeled negative examples for every labeled positive example, the system automatically adds weak negatives to meet this 2:1 ratio.

Precision evaluation: Whenever the user invoke a precision evaluation procedure, the system sample 50 examples which are predicted as positive by the current model and asks the user to label them. Once labeled, the system can report precision and add these newly labeled examples to the training set to be used by subsequent training iterations.

Machine learning algorithm: The default classifier is an ensemble of two SVM (Cortes and Vapnik,

1995) classifiers – one using Bag-of-Words representations and the other using GloVe (Pennington et al., 2014) representations.

Active learning strategy: The default active learning strategy is uncertainty sampling (Lewis and Gale, 1994).

B Labeling quality analysis

Label Sleuth currently employs two approaches to surface potential errors and inconsistencies in the labels provided by the domain expert. Each approach yields a list of labeled elements, which is then presented to the domain expert to review and correct as needed.

In the first method, the list of elements to review is based on disagreements between classifier predictions and user labels. The classifier was given these labels as training examples, which presumably lowers the chance of such direct disagreements. Therefore, the implementation relies on cross-validation: several classifiers are trained on different parts of the labeled data; if a classifier’s prediction on a left-out element disagrees with the user-provided label for that element, it is added to the list for review. This list is sorted according to the classifier’s confidence score.

In the second approach, the system presents pairs of examples that have been assigned contradicting labels w.r.t. the target category by the domain expert even though they are semantically similar to each other. This raises the possibility that one element in the pair was given an incorrect label. The list of pairs to be reviewed by the user is sorted based on decreasing similarity. In the current implementation, similarity is calculated by the distance between the average GloVe (Pennington et al., 2014) embeddings of the two texts.

C Figure 2 experimental details

Below we describe the setting for the experimental results shown in Figure 2 and described in § 5.

We experiment with the use of different models over 6 active learning iterations. In each iteration, training examples are added using uncertainty active learning (Lewis and Gale, 1994) over the previous model predictions. We compare two settings: One setting uses a BERT classifier for all iterations, while the other uses SVM for iterations 0-4 and BERT for iterations 5-6 only.

Iteration 0 starts with a query tailored for the target class. Query results and their gold labels are

Dataset	Target category	Query	Test size
20 Newsgroup	sci.med	'health medicine'	7532
AG News	World News	OR over a list of countries and territories	3000
DBPedia	Company	'company'	3000
ISEAR	Joy	'joy happy'	1534
Yahoo! Answers	Sports	'sports'	3000

Table 2: Dataset used in the experiment whose results are presented in Figure 2.

added to the train set until 30 positive instances are reached. These query instances are used to train the iteration 0 model. In each subsequent iteration, a batch of 30 examples, selected by the active learning strategy, is added to the train set and a new model is trained.

Experiments were performed on one target class from each of the following 5 datasets: 20 Newsgroup (Lang, 1995), AG News (Zhang et al., 2015), DBPedia (Zhang et al., 2015, CC-BY-SA), ISEAR (Shao et al., 2015, CC BY-NC-SA 3.0) and Yahoo! Answers (Zhang et al., 2015). Each experiment was repeated 5 times, using different random seeds for sampling from the query. Class and query details appear in Table 2.

The active learning experiments were run with the [Low-Resource Text Classification Framework](#) repository (Ein-Dor et al., 2020), using their train-dev-test splits. For BERT, we fine-tuned BERT_{BASE} (110M parameters) for 5 epochs, with a learning rate of 5×10^{-5} and batch size 32. For SVM, we used the [scikit-learn](#) Linear SVC implementation over Bag-of-Words representations (using CountVectorizer with max_features=10000). In total, the experiment included 175 BERT fine-tuning and inference runs, equaling about 12 total GPU hours using a Tesla V100-PCIE-16GB GPU.