

# Toward Realistic Evaluation of Deep Active Learning Algorithms in Image Classification

Carsten T. Lüth<sup>1,2</sup>, Till J. Bungert<sup>1,2</sup>, Lukas Klein<sup>1,2,3</sup> & Paul F. Jaeger<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Interactive Machine Learning Group, German Cancer Research Center (DKFZ), Heidelberg, Germany

<sup>2</sup>Helmholtz Imaging, DKFZ, Heidelberg, Germany

<sup>3</sup>Institute for Machine Learning, ETH Zürich, Zürich, Switzerland

carsten.lueth@dkfz-heidelberg.de

## Abstract

Active Learning (AL) aims to reduce the labeling burden by interactively querying the most informative observations from a data pool. Despite extensive research on improving AL query methods in the past years, recent studies have questioned the advantages of AL, especially in the light of emerging alternative training paradigms such as semi-supervised (Semi-SL) and self-supervised learning (Self-SL). Thus, today's AL literature paints an inconsistent picture and leaves practitioners wondering whether and how to employ AL in their tasks. We argue that this heterogeneous landscape is caused by a lack of a systematic and realistic evaluation of AL algorithms, including key parameters such as complex and imbalanced datasets, realistic labeling scenarios, systematic method configuration, and integration of Semi-SL and Self-SL. To this end, we present an AL benchmarking suite and run extensive experiments on five datasets shedding light on the questions: when and how to apply AL?

## 1. Introduction

Given a classification task, interactively querying the most informative samples for labeling has been commonly known as a popular approach for making efficient use of large pools of unlabelled data. While parts of the Active Learning (AL) community actively work on advancing the field by proposing new query methods (QMs) [9, 22], another strain of recent work claims AL to be generally outperformed by alternative training strategies such as Semi-Supervised Learning (Semi-SL) [16, 36] and Self-Supervised Learning (Self-SL) [3], or even by well-configured standard baselines [38]. To add to the confusion, further studies show that AL can even decrease classification performance in certain settings ("cold start problem") [3, 16, 36]. This largely het-




Figure 1. The Active Learning loop featuring the five key parameters (K1-K5) we identified for realistic evaluation in AL. Further information is provided in Sec. 2.

erogeneous state of research poses a challenge for anyone seeking to efficiently annotate their dataset and facing the questions: *On which tasks and datasets is AL beneficial? And how to best employ AL on my dataset?*

In this work, we aim to shed light on these questions and argue that current inconsistencies in AL literature are mainly caused by inconsistent and inadequate evaluation protocols. To this end, we identify 5 *key parameters* (K1-K5, see Sec. 2.3) for realistic evaluation in AL (see Fig. 1). Following the proposed evaluation protocol, we perform an extensive empirical study on 3 development as well as 2 roll-out datasets. Our main insights are:

- AL generally provides substantial gains in class-imbalanced settings.
- Core-Set is the best-performing QM across a realistic range of datasets, starting budgets, and query sizes (except in combination with Semi-SL).
- Small query sizes represent a robust strategy to overcome the major AL failure mode on small starting bud-

Key Parameter	K1	K2	K3	K4	K5
Compared Aspect	Class	Starting	Query	Perform.	HP Optim.
Related Work	Distr.	Budget	Size	Baselines	& Val Split
Munjal et al. [38]	(✓)		✓	✓	✓
Mittal et al. [36]		(✓)		(✓)	
Bengar et al. [3]		✓	(✓)		✓
Gao et al. [16]		✓	(✓)		
Yi et al. [50]	(✓)				(✓)
Krishnan et al. [28]	(✓)				
Kim et al. [22]	(✓)	(✓)	(✓)		
Ours	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Table 1. A comparison of cases in the literature evaluating partial aspects of the five key parameters which we propose to evaluate (Sec. 2.3). Evaluating the influence of the compared aspects from left to right: varying class distributions, starting budgets, query sizes, performant baselines, hyperparameter optimization based on validation splits, Self-SL and Semi-SL.

gets (“cold start problem”).

- Classification performance reported in the AL-literature suffers from subpar method configuration and is substantially improved by lightweight hyperparameter (HP) tuning on the starting budget.
- Combining AL with Self-SL considerably improves performance, shortens the training time, and stabilizes optimization, especially in low-label settings.
- Semi-SL performs best on toy-datasets but does not seem to generalize to more complex settings. Combining the paradigm with AL additionally suffers from extensive training times.

In the remainder of this work, we discuss the most prevalent pitfalls of current AL evaluation and how to improve them (Sec. 2), present the empirical study based on the proposed evaluation protocol (Sec. 3), discuss our findings in the context of the current state of research (Sec. 4), and provide hands-on recommendations for practitioners regarding when and how to apply AL on their dataset (Sec. 5).

## 2. Realistic Evaluation in Active Learning

### 2.1. AL Task Formulation

As depicted in Fig. 1, AL describes a classification task, where a dataset  $\mathcal{D}$  is given that is divided into a labeled set  $\mathcal{L}$  and an unlabeled pool  $\mathcal{U}$ . Initially, only a fraction of the data is labelled (“starting budget”), which is ideally split further into a training set and a validation set for HP tuning and performance monitoring. After initial training, the QM is used to generate queries  $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{U}}$  of a certain amount (“query size”) that represent the most informative samples from  $\mathcal{U}$  based on the current classifier predictions. Subsequently, queried samples are labeled ( $\mathcal{Q}_{\mathcal{L}}$ ), moved from  $\mathcal{U}$  to  $\mathcal{L}$ , and the classifier is re-trained on  $\mathcal{L}$ . This process is repeated

until classifier performance is satisfying as monitored on the validation set.

### 2.2. General Concepts for Realistic Evaluation

Evaluating an AL algorithm typically means testing how much classification performance is gained by data samples queried and added over several training iterations. The QM selecting those samples is considered useful if the performance gains exceed the gains of randomly queried samples. While this process is well-established, it is prone to oversimplification of how AL algorithms are applied in practice and thus neglecting critical concepts for realistic evaluation. To start with, evaluation in AL requires special consideration due to a phenomenon we refer to as the *validation paradox*: Upon application, AL parameters can not be adapted to the dataset at hand. This is because validating the choice of a QM or query size, for instance, implies several parallel query/label trajectories, which directly contradicts AL’s purpose of reducing labeling efforts. Thus, AL application, by definition, implies rolling out pre-configured AL settings on a new dataset. Realistic evaluation needs to reflect these circumstances by 1) identifying generalizing AL settings and 2) testing the generalizability of fixed settings when rolled out on new datasets. Identifying such settings requires evaluating QM under a broad range of potential future data and label scenarios including various datasets, starting budgets, label distributions, and query sizes. This search space can be reduced in the case of application-specific constraints such as a pre-defined data domain or starting budget size. If generalizability is not tested for, the QM might not perform as expected when applied in practice, because any of the described AL parameters might have changed. Failure of QM, i.e. sub-random performance, is a known issue in the research community and commonly referred to as the “cold start problem” ([16]). We argue that following the described recipe for evaluation is an effective countermeasure against this phenomenon.

Another critical aspect of AL evaluation is the fact that a well-performing classifier is the final goal of any AL strategy. This goal implies a strong interconnection of AL performance with other classifier parameters. For instance, a QM should not be evaluated as useful as long as the same performance gains can be obtained by simple modifications of the learning rate, data augmentation, or by employing alternative training strategies such as Self-SL or Semi-SL. Thus, QMs need to be evaluated on well-configured classifiers and compared against or combined with other competitive training strategies.

### 2.3. Current Practice and Proposed Evaluation Protocol

The current AL literature features an inconsistent landscape of evaluation protocols, but none of them adhere to

the concepts for realistic evaluation of AL described above (see Tab. 1). To make these general concepts more concrete, we identify 5 *key parameters* (K1-K5) that need to be considered for meaningful evaluation of QMs. For an overview of the key parameters and how they integrate into the AL setting see Fig. 1. In the following, we discuss, based on the five key parameters, the current practice in AL literature and propose improvements toward realistic evaluation.

**K1: Data Distribution** To ensure that QMs work out-of-the-box in real-life settings, they need to be evaluated on a broad data distribution. Relevant aspects of distribution in the AL-context go beyond the data domain and include class distribution, the relative difficulty of separation across classes, as well as a potential mismatch between the frequency and importance of classes. All of these aspects directly affect the functionality of a QM and may lead to real-life failure of AL when not considered in the evaluation. **Current Practice:** Most current work is limited to evaluating QMs on balanced datasets from one specific domain (e.g. CIFAR-10/100) and under the assumption of equal class importance. To our knowledge, testing the generalizability of a fixed QM setting to new datasets ("roll-out") has not been performed before. There are some experiments conducted on an artificially imbalanced dataset (CIFAR-LT) [28, 38] suggesting good AL performance. Further, [14] studied AL on the ISIC-2016 dataset, but obtained volatile results due to the small dataset size. [1] studied AL on the MIO-TCO dataset and report performance improvements for underrepresented classes. **Proposed Protocol:** We argue that the underrepresentation of class-imbalanced datasets in the field is one reason for current doubts regarding the general functionality of AL. Real-life settings will most likely not be class balanced providing a natural advantage of AL over random sampling. We propose to consider diverse datasets with real class imbalances an essential part of AL evaluation and advocate for the inclusion of "roll-out" datasets as a real-life test of selected and fixed AL settings.

**K2: Starting Budget** There are two reasons to consider why this parameter is an essential aspect of AL evaluation: 1) Upon application, the budget might be fixed and the QM is required to generalize out-of-the box to this setting. 2) We are interested in the minimal budget at which the QM works, since a too high budget implies inefficient labeling (equivalent to random queries) and a too low budget is likely to cause AL failure (cold start problem). This search needs to be performed prior to AL application due to the validation paradox. **Current Practice:** Most recent research publications evaluate AL on starting budget sizes with thousands of samples on datasets such as CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 [22, 38, 50, 51]. Information-theoretic publications commonly use small starting budgets [14, 25], but typically on even simpler datasets

such as MNIST [31]. Some studies were performed with smaller starting budgets mostly in combination with Semi-SL and Self-SL [3, 16, 37] often with the conclusion that smaller starting budgets lead to AL failure. [3] reported that there exists a relationship between the number of classes in a task and the optimal starting budget (the intuition being that class number is a proxy for task complexity). **Proposed Protocol:** We compare three different starting budgets on all datasets (low-, mid-, and high-label regime). Extending on the findings of [3], adequate budget sizes are determined using heuristics based on the number of classes per task.

**K3: Query Size** The number of samples queried for annotation per acquisition step is essential to realistic evaluation of QMs. This is because, upon application, this parameter might be predefined by the compute-versus-label cost ratio of the respective task (smaller query size amounts to more compute but might enable more informed queries and thus less labeling). Since query size can not be validated on the task at hand due to the validation paradox, generalizability of QMs to various settings of this parameter need to be evaluated beforehand. **Current Practice:** In current literature there is a concerning disconnect between theoretical and practical papers regarding what constitutes a reasonable query size. Information-theoretical papers typically select smallest query size possible and QMs such as BatchBALD are specifically designed to simulate reduced query sizes [14, 25, 41]. In contrast, practically-oriented papers usually select larger query sizes [22, 37, 38, 45, 52]. Only a few studies perform limited evaluation of varying query sizes. For instance, [39] conclude that the choice of query size does not matter, but only compared two large values (2500 versus 5000) on a fixed large starting budget (5000 samples). [1] come to a similar conclusion, but only considered a relatively large starting budget (500) for ImageNet-pretrained models on CIFAR-10 where no cold start problem occurs. [3] employ varying query sizes without further analysis of the parameter. **Proposed Protocol:** We evaluate QMs on three different query sizes (deducted heuristically from the three starting budgets (K2)) for each dataset. We further benchmark a QM that simulates a drastic reduction of query size (BatchBALD) on all datasets and run additional ablations with very small query sizes on CIFAR-100.

**K4: Method Configuration** As stated in Sec. 2.2, when aiming to draw conclusions about the performance or usefulness of a QM, it is critical that this evaluation is based on well-configured classifiers. Otherwise, performance gains might be attributed to AL that could have been achieved by simple HP modifications. Separating a validation split from the training data is a crucial requirement for sound HP tuning. **Current Practice:** Most studies in AL literature do not report how HPs are obtained and do not mention

the use of validation splits [22, 28, 37, 45, 51]. Typically, reported settings are copied from fully labeled data scenarios. In some cases even proposed QMs themselves feature delicate HPs without reporting how they were optimized raising the question whether these settings generalize on new data [22, 45, 51]. [38] demonstrate how adequate HP tuning on a validation set allows a random query baseline to outperform current QMs under their originally proposed HP settings. However, they run a full grid search for every QM and AL training iteration, which might not be feasible in practice. **Proposed Protocol:** We define a validation dataset of a size deducted heuristically from the starting budget. Based on this data, a small selection of HPs (learning rate, weight decay and data augmentations [13]) is tuned only once per AL experiment while training on the starting budget. The limited search space and discarding of multiple tuning iterations results in a light-weight and practically feasible protocol for method configuration.

**K5: Methodological Context** Analogously to arguments made in K4, meaningful evaluation of AL requires comparison against alternative approaches that address the same problem. Specifically, alternative training paradigms Self-SL [8, 18] and Semi-SL [32, 47] have shown strong potential to make efficient use of an unlabeled data pool in a classification task thus alleviating the labeling burden. Additionally to benchmarking AL against Self-SL and Semi-SL, the question arises whether AL can yield performance gains when combined with these paradigms. **Current Practice:** While most AL studies do not consider Self-SL and Semi-SL, there are a few recent exceptions: [3] benchmark AL in combination with Self-SL and conclude that AL does never decrease performance, but only yields gains under sufficiently high starting budgets. However, these results were obtained without adequate method configuration (K4). [50] propose a QM in combination with Self-SL, but only leverage the fraction of Self-SL potential compatible with the proposed QM. Further, [16] combine Semi-SL with AL and report superior performance compared to ST for CIFAR-10/100 and ImageNet [42], i.e. the datasets on which Semi-SL methods have been developed. Similarly, [36] evaluate a the combination of Semi-SL and AL on CIFAR-10/100, report strong improvements compared to standard AL training and find that AL decreases performance for small starting budgets. **Proposed Protocol:** We investigate AL in the context of both Self-SL and Semi-SL and argue that meaningful benchmarking of the three critically requires to consider all other key parameters for realistic AL evaluation (K1-K4).

### 3. Experimental Setup

This section covers first our improvements concerning the current evaluation of AL techniques and then gives a more

detailed description of the experimental setup which is extended in Appendix C. We first address K1 by extending our evaluation to 5 different datasets, containing different label distributions. Specifically, these datasets include CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100, CIFAR-10 LT, ISIC-2019 and MIO-TCD, where the first three are developmental datasets and the later two exclusively for our proposed roll-out evaluation. Further, we address K2 and K3 by defining three different *label regimes* which we call low-label, medium-label and high-label regime with starting budgets and query sizes both being set to the same value based on the number of classes  $C$  with a size of  $5 \times C$ ,  $25 \times C$  and  $100 \times C$  for the three label regimes.<sup>1</sup> To address K4, we allow method configuration for each of these label regimes using an adequately sized validation set containing five times the number of samples as in the starting budget. Together we evaluate three different label-regimes with corresponding validation sets for each of our five different dataset resulting in 15 different settings for AL experiments. Further, addressing K4 and setting the stage for K5 we use a ResNet-18 [19] as the backbone for all of our experiments and sweep the crucial HPs for each respective training method. At last, we further address K5 by including Self-SL pre-trained models and Semi-SL models.

**Compared Query Methods** In this section, we describe the applied QM in more general terms and refer to Appendix A for a detailed review. Generally QMs can be divided into two categories based on their strategy, using uncertainty or enforcing exploration. **Random:** The baseline all QMs are compared against which randomly draws samples from the pool  $\mathcal{U}$ . **Core-Set:** This explorative QM aims to find the core-set of a convolutional neural network [43] by approximating the K-Center on the representation space with the K-Center Greedy approximation following [43, 51]. **Entropy:** This uncertainty based QM selects greedily the samples with the highest entropy of the predictions [44]. **BALD:** This uncertainty based QM uses the mutual information between class label and predictor parameters with regard to a sample for greedy selection [21], it was introduced with dropout for deep bayesian active learning by [14]. **BatchBALD:** Is a QM extending on BALD by aiming to query a batch of samples with the highest joint mutual information in a greedy approximation which can be interpreted as simulating a smaller query size for BALD [25].

**Datasets** The initial datasets for our experiments are **CIFAR-10/100** [29] these datasets both consist of 60k natural images of size 32x32 with object-centric build having a fixed test and train split of 10k and 50k images. For further analysis we added **CIFAR-10 LT** [6], an artificially created dataset built based upon CIFAR-10 with a long-tail distribution of classes following an exponential decay for the training split.

<sup>1</sup>These deviate for CIFAR-100 [ $5 \times C$  (low-label),  $10 \times C$ ,  $50 \times C$  (high-label)] due to having more classes and the relative size of the dataset being smaller compared to the number of classes.



The imbalance factor  $\rho$  was selected to be 50, following [28] and leading to a training dataset consisting of 13k images. On all three of these datasets we use accuracy on the class balanced test set as primary performance metric. Finally we selected the two datasets, **ISIC-2019** and **MIO-TCD**, as roll-out datasets to verify the effectiveness of AL methods and our methodological approach to evaluation. Both of these datasets have natural arising imbalanced label distributions (and also image distributions), are resized in our experiments to 224x224 and are more likely subject to label noise (than the CIFAR datasets). Therefore we deem them to be a much more realistic assessments of the capabilities of AL and our methodological approach of selecting hyperparameters (K4). Neither of these two datasets have an openly accessible train, validation and test split. Therefore we build a custom split with relative sizes of 60% training, 15% validation and 25% test by randomly splitting these datasets. For both MIO-TCD and ISIC-2019 we use balanced accuracy as our primary performance measure (Appendix C). **ISIC-2019** [10, 11, 48] consists of 25k dermoscopic images of skin lesions with eight different classes. **MIO-TCD** [35] consists of 520k natural images taken with traffic-cameras containing eleven different classes of road participants including background images.

**Active Learning Setup** We report performance measures for each dataset on identical test splits based on three experiments using different seeded models and different train and validation splits to reduce possible influence of these parameters on our results. If not specifically otherwise mentioned each QM can query any sample in the pool. Further, we train the models from fresh initialization on every training step to avoid correlated queries [25].

**Methodological Context** We compare three different training strategies using the ResNet-18 as a backbone. First, standard supervised trained models, which are referred to as ST models. Secondly, we use the popular contrastive SimCLR [8] training strategy as a basis for our Self-SL pre-training. These models are fine-tuned and are referred to as Self-SL models. Self-SL models have a two layer MLP as a classification head to make better use of the representations (ablation in Appendix D). For ST and Self-SL models, we obtain bayesian models by adding dropout to the final representations before the classification head following [14]. And as Semi-SL method, we use FixMatch [47] which combines the principles of consistency and uncertainty reduction in a simple manner. Due to the long training times (factor 80) compared to ST trainings, we only ran experiments in the low- and medium-label regime while increasing the query size by a factor of three to reduce training cost.

**Hyperparameter Selection** The HPs for our models are selected for each label-regime before the AL loop is started using the corresponding validation set. For Self-SL and ST models we use a fixed base training recipe (Scheduler, Op-

timizer, Batch Size, Epochs) and only select learning rate, weight decay and data augmentations. The data augmentations used are standard augmentations and Randaugment which uses stronger data augmentations acting as a regularization [13]. For Semi-SL methods we fix all HPs with the exception of learning rate and weight decay noted as crucial in [47]. Final models ST and Self-SL used on the test set and for query selection are selected based on the best performance on the validation set, whereas for Semi-SL the final checkpoint is used. For imbalanced datasets, we use the weighted cross-entropy-loss (CE-Loss) following [38].

**Low-Label Cold-Start Ablation** To further investigate the effect of the cold-start problem we conduct an ablation with Self-SL models in the low-label regime which additionally investigates the influence of the query size on all datasets additionally using BatchBALD alongside all other QMs. The whole setup was identical to the low-label regime experiments with changes for CIFAR-100 (query size was changed from 500 to 50) and for MIO-TCD (pool reduced by random sampling to 50k samples) to ensure reasonable run-times with BatchBALD.

## 4. Results & Discussion

The results of our empirical study are shown in Fig. 2. An in-depth analysis of results for individual datasets can be found in Appendix E. Here, we will discuss the main findings along the lines of our five identified key parameters for evaluation (K1-K5), demonstrate the necessity of the proposed protocol for realistic evaluation and its potential to generate new general insights about when and how AL works.

**K1 Data Distribution** The proposed evaluation over a diverse selection of dataset distributions including specific roll-out datasets proved essential for realistic evaluating of QMs as well as the different training strategies. One main insight is the fact that class distribution is a crucial predictor for the potential performance gains of AL on a dataset: Performance gains of AL are generally higher on imbalanced datasets and occur consistently even for ST models with small starting budget, which are typically prone to experience cold start problems. This observation is consistent with a few previous studies [22, 28, 50]. Further, our results underpin the importance of the roll-out datasets e.g. when looking at the the sub-random performance of BALD (with Self-SL) and Entropy (with ST) on MIO-TCD. Such worst-case failures of AL application (increased compute and labeling effort due to AL) could not have been predicted based on development data where all AL-parameters are optimized. Another example is the lack of generalizability of Semi-SL, where performance in relation to other Self-SL and ST decreases gradually with data complexity (going from CIFAR-10 to




Figure 2. Results obtained with our proposed evaluation protocol over five different datasets and the three label regimes. These experiments are to our knowledge the largest conducted study for AL and reveal insights along the lines of the five key parameters as discussed in Sec. 4. A detailed analysis of these experiments can be found in Sec. 4. The strong performance dip on MIO-TCD and ISIC-2019 is discussed in Sec. 4.1.

CIFAR-100/-10 LT to the two roll-out datasets MIO-TCD and ISIC-2019.)

**K2 Starting Budget** The comprehensive study of various starting budgets on all datasets reveals that AL methods are more robust with regard to small starting budgets than previously reported [3, 16, 36]. With the exception of Entropy we did not observe cold start problems even for any QM even in combination with notoriously prone ST models. The described robustness is presumably enabled by our thorough method configuration (K4) and heuristically adapted query sizes (K3). This finding has great impact potential suggesting that AL can be applied at earlier points in the annotation process thereby further reduced the labeling cost. Similarly

for Self-SL models AL performs well on the small starting budgets with the exceptions of CIFAR-100 (All QMs), MIO-TCD (BALD), ISIC-2019 (Core-Set).

**K3 Query Size** Based on our evaluation of the query size we can empirically confirm its importance with regard to 1) general AL performance and 2) counteracting the cold start problem. The are, however, surprising findings indicating that the exact interaction between query size and performance remains an open research question. For instance, we observe the cold start problem for AL trained with Self-SL on CIFAR-100 ( $\sim 50\%$  accuracy at 2k labelled samples for query sizes of 500 (low-label regime) and 1k (mid-label regime). On the other hand, in the high label-regime (budget

of 5k and query size of 5k) ST and Self-SL models with similar accuracies of 50% and 60%, respectively, benefit from AL. Since cold start problems are commonly associated with large query sizes, this finding seems counter intuitive, but has been reported before although without further investigations [3, 16, 36]. To gain a better understanding of this phenomenon, we performed a dedicated experiment series for Self-SL training in the low-label regime (see Fig. 3). For this study, we added BatchBALD to the list of QMs as a simulator of smaller query sizes for BALD [26]. Due to the superior performance of BatchBALD compared to BALD and random querying observed in this study, we conclude that smaller query sizes are an effective counter-measure against the cold-start problem. We credit this advantage to the reduced chance of querying substantial amounts of similar samples per training step. Therefore our finding based on 5 data sets including 2 real-world tasks indicates that even small starting budgets can safely be used when combined with sufficiently small query sizes. To our knowledge we are the first to make this observation, which potentially bridges the gap between theoretical works advertising the smallest possible query size [14, 23] and more practical oriented works, where currently small query sizes are not considered as a solution to the cold start problem [3, 16, 37].

**K4 Method Configuration** Our results show that method configuration on a properly sized validation set is essential for realistic evaluation in AL. For instance, our method configuration had the same effect on the classifier performance as increasing the number of labeled training samples by a factor of  $\sim 5$  (there are often much larger factors, e.g. our ST model reached approximately the same accuracy of  $\sim 44\%$  trained on 200 samples compared to models by [3] trained on 1k samples). The effectiveness of our proposed lightweight HP selection on the starting budget including only three parameters (Sec. 3) is demonstrated by the fact that all our ST models substantially outperform respective models found in relevant literature [3, 16, 22, 28, 36, 50, 51] where HP optimization is generally neglected (see Appendix G for a detailed comparison). This raises the question to which extend reported AL advantages could have been achieved by simple classifier configurations. Further, our models also generally outperform expensively configured models by [38]. Thus, we conclude that manually constraining the search space renders HP optimization feasible in practice without decreasing performance and ensures performance gains by Active Learning are not overstated. The importance of the proposed strategy to optimize HPs on the starting budget for each new data set is supported by the fact that the resulting configurations change across datasets.

**K5 Methodological Context** Based on our study benchmarking AL in the context of both Self-SL and Semi-SL,

we see that while Self-SL generally leads to improvements across all experiments, Semi-SL only leads to considerable improved performance on the simpler data sets CIFAR-10/100, on which Semi-SL methods are typically developed. Generally, models trained with either of the two training strategies receive a lower performance gain from AL (over random querying) compared to ST. Crucially, Self-SL models converge around 2.5 times faster than ST models, while training time of Semi-SL models is around 80 times longer than ST and often yield only small benefits over Self-SL or ST models. The fact that AL entails multiple training iterations amplifies the computational burden of Semi-SL rendering their combination prohibitively expensive in most practical scenarios. Further, the fact that we did not manage to get Semi-SL models to generalize to more complex datasets in our setting stands in stark contrast to conclusions drawn by [16, 37] as to which the emergence of Semi-SL renders AL redundant. Interestingly, the exact settings where Semi-SL failed to provide benefits in our study where the ones where AL proved advantageous. The described contradiction with literature underlines the importance of our proposed protocol testing for a method’s generalizability to unseen data sets. This is especially critical for Semi-SL, which is known for instable performance on noisy and class imbalanced datasets [4, 40, 53].

#### 4.1. Limitations

We propose a light-weight and practically feasible strategy for HP optimization and made other design choices (e.g. ResNet-18 classifier), thus we can not guarantee that our configurations are optimal for all compared training strategies and would like to provide a critical discussion:

- 1) The ResNet-18 in combination with our shortened training times might hinder Semi-SL performance more than other strategies. This setting was necessary to be able to cope with computational cost of Semi-SL (factor  $\sim 1000$  training time compared with ST).
- 2) The validation set size of  $5 \times$  starting budget size (i.e. training set) could be considered as larger than practically desirable, where most data would be used for training. This design decision was made following [40], who show that an adequately sized validation set is necessary for proper HP selection (especially for Semi-SL).
- 3) We observe a performance dip of ST models on MIO-TCD and ISIC-2019 at  $\sim 7k$  samples, which we attribute to our HP selection scheme. This indicates that HPs might need to be re-selected occasionally at certain training iterations. However, such cases are immediately detected in practice allowing for correction where necessary. In Appendix H.1 we show that a simple re-optimization in these cases is able to recover the expected performance. A more extensive discussion of limitations can be found in Appendix H.




Figure 3. Results the low-label cold-start ablation for our five different datasets. Generally it can be observed that BatchBALD always outperforms BALD substantially except if BALD already is the best performing QM. Further, the reduction of the query size in CIFAR-100 lead to substantial improvement of the performance of AL methods, directly counteracting the cold-start problem. On Mio-TCD the artificially subsampled pool led to a performance increase for BALD indicating that MIO-TCD has many similar samples which are less likely to be drawn together in this scenario.

## 5. Conclusion & Take-Aways

Our experiments provide strong empirical evidence that the current evaluation protocols do not sufficiently answer the key question every potential AL practitioner faces: Should I employ AL on my dataset? Answering this question entails estimating whether an AL algorithm will provide performance gains over random queries and thus whether the expected reduction in labeling cost outweighs both the additional computational and engineering cost attributed to AL. We argue that our proposed protocol for realistic evaluation represents a cornerstone towards enabling informed decisions in this context. This is made possible by focusing on evaluating the generalizability of AL to new settings under real-life conditions. This perspective manifests in our protocol in the form of five key parameters most commonly neglected in AL literature: data distribution, starting budget, query size, method configuration and methodological context (see Sec. 2.3).

The main empirical insights revealed by this protocol are highlighted in Sec. 1. Beyond the described key parameters as described in Sec. 2, we would like to add the following recommendations for developing and proposing new AL algorithms:

AL algorithms should be tested for generalizability on roll-out data sets and come with a clear recipe for application in real-life including how to adapt all (potential newly added) design choices to new settings. Since the expected gain of AL on a new setting increases with smaller application costs, we believe a high potential towards wide-spread real-life usage of AL lies within reducing the two prevalent cost factors:

1. Engineering cost. Reduced by building easy-to-use AL tools.
2. Computational cost. Reduced by explicitly including methods shortening the training time in AL such as Self-SL.

Re-thinking the described estimation of AI gains and costs faced by practitioners in light of our empirical findings results in the following recommendations for settings where we recommend to use AL in practice:

1. Settings, where there is a mismatch between the task-specific importance of individual classes and their frequency in the data set (e.g. class-imbalanced data sets in combination with tasks requiring a balanced classifier).
2. Settings, where the computation cost is negligible compared to labeling cost, allowing small query sizes and therefore small starting budgets, which implies that AL can support annotators early on in the process.
3. Settings, where both computational cost and labeling cost are low, allowing large starting budgets and large query sizes, a scenario in which AL will almost certainly yield benefits.

We hope that our proposed evaluation protocol in combination with the publicly-available benchmarking suite can help to push active learning towards robust and wide-spread real-life application.



## References

- [1] Parmida Atighehchian, Frédéric Branchaud-Charron, and Alexandre Lacoste. Bayesian active learning for production, a systematic study and a reusable library. *arXiv:2006.09916 [cs, stat]*, June 2020. **3**
- [2] William H. Beluch, Tim Genewein, Andreas Nurnberger, and Jan M. Kohler. The Power of Ensembles for Active Learning in Image Classification. In *2018 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 9368–9377, Salt Lake City, UT, June 2018. IEEE. **23**
- [3] Javad Zolfaghari Bengar, Joost van de Weijer, Bartłomiej Twardowski, and Bogdan Raducanu. Reducing label effort: Self-supervised meets active learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV) Workshops*, pages 1631–1639, Oct. 2021. **1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 23**
- [4] Sayedali Shetab Boushehri, Ahmad Bin Qasim, Dominik Waibel, Fabian Schmich, and Carsten Marr. Systematic comparison of incomplete-supervision approaches for biomedical imaging classification. Preprint, Bioinformatics, Dec. 2020. **7, 13**
- [5] Lars Buitinck, Gilles Louppe, Mathieu Blondel, Fabian Pedregosa, Andreas Mueller, Olivier Grisel, Vlad Niculae, Peter Prettenhofer, Alexandre Gramfort, Jaques Grobler, Robert Layton, Jake VanderPlas, Arnaud Joly, Brian Holt, and Gaël Varoquaux. API design for machine learning software: experiences from the scikit-learn project. In *ECML PKDD Workshop: Languages for Data Mining and Machine Learning*, pages 108–122, 2013. **15**
- [6] Kaidi Cao, Colin Wei, Adrien Gaidon, Nikos Arechiga, and Tengyu Ma. Learning imbalanced datasets with label-distribution-aware margin loss. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019. **4, 13**
- [7] Mark Chen, Alec Radford, Rewon Child, Jeff Wu, Heewoo Jun, David Luan, and Ilya Sutskever. Generative Pretraining from Pixels. *ICML*, page 13, 2020. **13**
- [8] Ting Chen, Simon Kornblith, Mohammad Norouzi, and Geoffrey Hinton. A simple framework for contrastive learning of visual representations. In Hal Daumé III and Aarti Singh, editors, *Proceedings of the 37th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 119 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1597–1607. PMLR, July 2020. **4, 5, 13, 15, 16**
- [9] Gui Citovsky, Giulia DeSalvo, Claudio Gentile, Lazaros Karydas, Anand Rajagopalan, Afshin Roshtamizadeh, and Sanjiv Kumar. Batch active learning at scale. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 34:11933–11944, 2021. **1**
- [10] Noel CF Codella, David Gutman, M Emre Celebi, Brian Helba, Michael A Marchetti, Stephen W Dusza, Aadi Kalloo, Konstantinos Liopyris, Nabin Mishra, Harald Kittler, et al. Skin lesion analysis toward melanoma detection: A challenge at the 2017 international symposium on biomedical imaging (isbi), hosted by the international skin imaging collaboration (isic). In *2018 IEEE 15th international symposium on biomedical imaging (ISBI 2018)*, pages 168–172. IEEE, 2018. **5**
- [11] Marc Combalia, Noel CF Codella, Veronica Rotemberg, Brian Helba, Veronica Vilaplana, Ofer Reiter, Cristina Carrera, Alicia Barreiro, Allan C Halpern, Susana Puig, et al. Bcn20000: Dermoscopic lesions in the wild. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.02288*, 2019. **5**
- [12] Ekin D. Cubuk, Barret Zoph, Jonathon Shlens, and Quoc V. Le. RandAugment: Practical automated data augmentation with a reduced search space, Nov. 2019. **16**
- [13] Ekin D Cubuk, Barret Zoph, Jonathon Shlens, and Quoc V Le. Randaugment: Practical automated data augmentation with a reduced search space. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition workshops*, pages 702–703, 2020. **4, 5**
- [14] Yarín Gal, Riashat Islam, and Zoubin Ghahramani. Deep bayesian active learning with image data. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1183–1192. PMLR, 2017. **3, 4, 5, 7, 12, 15**
- [15] Yarín Gal, Riashat Islam, and Zoubin Ghahramani. Deep Bayesian Active Learning with Image Data. *arXiv:1703.02910 [cs, stat]*, Mar. 2017. **12, 15**
- [16] Mingfei Gao, Zizhao Zhang, Guo Yu, Sercan Ö. Arık, Larry S. Davis, and Tomas Pfister. Consistency-Based Semi-supervised Active Learning: Towards Minimizing Labeling Cost. In Andrea Vedaldi, Horst Bischof, Thomas Brox, and Jan-Michael Frahm, editors, *Computer Vision – ECCV 2020*, volume 12355, pages 510–526. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2020. **1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 23**
- [17] Spyros Gidaris, Praveer Singh, and Nikos Komodakis. Unsupervised Representation Learning by Predicting Image Rotations. *arXiv:1803.07728 [cs]*, Mar. 2018. **13**
- [18] Kaiming He, Haoqi Fan, Yuxin Wu, Saining Xie, and Ross Girshick. Momentum Contrast for Unsupervised Visual Representation Learning. *arXiv:1911.05722 [cs]*, Mar. 2020. **4, 13**
- [19] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer*

- vision and pattern recognition*, pages 770–778, 2016. 4, 15
- [20] Wassily Hoeffding. Probability inequalities for sums of bounded random variables. In *The collected works of Wassily Hoeffding*, pages 409–426. Springer, 1994. 14
- [21] Neil Houlsby, Ferenc Huszár, Zoubin Ghahramani, and Máté Lengyel. Bayesian Active Learning for Classification and Preference Learning. *arXiv:1112.5745 [cs, stat]*, Dec. 2011. 4
- [22] Kwanyoung Kim, Dongwon Park, Kwang In Kim, and Se Young Chun. Task-Aware Variational Adversarial Active Learning. In *2021 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 8162–8171, Nashville, TN, USA, June 2021. IEEE. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 12
- [23] Andreas Kirsch, Sebastian Farquhar, Parmida Atighehchian, Andrew Jesson, Frédéric Branchaud-Charron, and Yarin Gal. Stochastic Batch Acquisition for Deep Active Learning. *arXiv:2106.12059 [cs, stat]*, Jan. 2022. 7
- [24] Andreas Kirsch and Yarin Gal. A Practical & Unified Notation for Information-Theoretic Quantities in ML. *arXiv:2106.12062 [cs, stat]*, Dec. 2021. 12
- [25] Andreas Kirsch, Joost van Amersfoort, and Yarin Gal. BatchBALD: Efficient and diverse batch acquisition for deep bayesian active learning. In H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, A. Beygelzimer, F. dAlché-Buc, E. Fox, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32. Curran Associates, Inc., 2019. 3, 4, 5, 13, 15, 22
- [26] Andreas Kirsch, Joost van Amersfoort, and Yarin Gal. BatchBALD: Efficient and Diverse Batch Acquisition for Deep Bayesian Active Learning. *arXiv:1906.08158 [cs, stat]*, Oct. 2019. 7
- [27] Jannik Kossen, Sebastian Farquhar, Yarin Gal, and Tom Rainforth. Active Testing: Sample-Efficient Model Evaluation. *arXiv:2103.05331 [cs, stat]*, June 2021. 14, 23
- [28] Ranganath Krishnan, Nilesh Ahuja, Alok Sinha, Mahesh Subedar, Omesh Tickoo, and Ravi Iyer. Improving Robustness and Efficiency in Active Learning with Contrastive Loss. *arXiv:2109.06873 [cs]*, Sept. 2021. 2, 3, 4, 5, 7
- [29] Alex Krizhevsky, Geoffrey Hinton, et al. Learning multiple layers of features from tiny images. 2009. 4
- [30] Ananya Kumar, Aditi Raghunathan, Robbie Jones, Tengyu Ma, and Percy Liang. Fine-Tuning can Distort Pretrained Features and Underperform Out-of-Distribution. *arXiv:2202.10054 [cs]*, Feb. 2022. 23
- [31] Yann LeCun. The mnist database of handwritten digits. <http://yann.lecun.com/exdb/mnist/>, 1998. 3
- [32] Dong-Hyun Lee et al. Pseudo-label: The simple and efficient semi-supervised learning method for deep neural networks. In *Workshop on Challenges in Representation Learning, ICML*, volume 3, page 896, 2013. 4, 13
- [33] Peng Liu, Lizhe Wang, Guojin He, and Lei Zhao. A Survey on Active Deep Learning: From Model-driven to Data-driven, Feb. 2022. 12
- [34] Xiao Liu, Fanjin Zhang, Zhenyu Hou, Li Mian, Zhaoyu Wang, Jing Zhang, and Jie Tang. Self-supervised learning: Generative or contrastive. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, pages 1–1, 2021. 13
- [35] Zhiming Luo, Frédéric Branchaud-Charron, Carl Lemaire, Janusz Konrad, Shaozi Li, Akshaya Mishra, Andrew Achkar, Justin Eichel, and Pierre-Marc Jodoin. Mio-tcd: A new benchmark dataset for vehicle classification and localization. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 27(10):5129–5141, 2018. 5
- [36] Sudhanshu Mittal, Maxim Tatarchenko, Özgün Çiçek, and Thomas Brox. Parting with Illusions about Deep Active Learning. *arXiv:1912.05361 [cs]*, Dec. 2019. 1, 2, 4, 6, 7, 23
- [37] Sudhanshu Mittal, Maxim Tatarchenko, Özgün Çiçek, and Thomas Brox. Parting with Illusions about Deep Active Learning. *arXiv:1912.05361 [cs]*, Dec. 2019. 3, 4, 7, 23
- [38] Prateek Munjal, Nasir Hayat, Munawar Hayat, Jamshid Sourati, and Shadab Khan. Towards robust and reproducible active learning using neural networks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 223–232, 2022. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 7, 15, 23, 24
- [39] Prateek Munjal, Nasir Hayat, Munawar Hayat, Jamshid Sourati, and Shadab Khan. Towards Robust and Reproducible Active Learning Using Neural Networks. *arXiv:2002.09564 [cs, stat]*, Apr. 2022. 3, 23
- [40] Avital Oliver, Augustus Odena, Colin Raffel, Ekin D. Cubuk, and Ian J. Goodfellow. Realistic Evaluation of Deep Semi-Supervised Learning Algorithms. *arXiv:1804.09170 [cs, stat]*, June 2019. 7, 13, 14
- [41] Robert Pinsler, Jonathan Gordon, Eric Nalisnick, and José Miguel Hernández-Lobato. Bayesian Batch Active Learning as Sparse Subset Approximation. *arXiv:1908.02144 [cs, stat]*, Feb. 2021. 3
- [42] Olga Russakovsky, Jia Deng, Hao Su, Jonathan Krause, Sanjeev Satheesh, Sean Ma, Zhiheng Huang, Andrej Karpathy, Aditya Khosla, Michael Bernstein, Alexander C. Berg, and Li Fei-Fei. ImageNet Large Scale

Visual Recognition Challenge. *International Journal of Computer Vision (IJCV)*, 115(3):211–252, 2015. 4

image classification tasks. In *Bildverarbeitung für die Medizin 2022*, pages 291–296. Springer, 2022. 7

- [43] Ozan Sener and Silvio Savarese. Active learning for convolutional neural networks: A core-set approach. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018. 4, 12
- [44] Burr Settles. Active learning literature survey. Computer Sciences Technical Report 1648, University of Wisconsin–Madison, 2009. 4, 12
- [45] Samrath Sinha, Sayna Ebrahimi, and Trevor Darrell. Variational Adversarial Active Learning. In *2019 IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, pages 5971–5980, Seoul, Korea (South), Oct. 2019. IEEE. 3, 4, 12
- [46] Samarth Sinha, Sayna Ebrahimi, and Trevor Darrell. Variational adversarial active learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, Oct. 2019. 23
- [47] Kihyuk Sohn, David Berthelot, Nicholas Carlini, Zizhao Zhang, Han Zhang, Colin A Raffel, Ekin Dogus Cubuk, Alexey Kurakin, and Chun-Liang Li. FixMatch: Simplifying semi-supervised learning with consistency and confidence. In H. Larochelle, M. Ranzato, R. Hadsell, M. F. Balcan, and H. Lin, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pages 596–608. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020. 4, 5, 13, 15, 16, 17
- [48] Philipp Tschandl, Cliff Rosendahl, and Harald Kittler. The ham10000 dataset, a large collection of multi-source dermatoscopic images of common pigmented skin lesions. *Scientific data*, 5(1):1–9, 2018. 5
- [49] R.W. Yeung. A new outlook on Shannon’s information measures. *IEEE Trans. Inform. Theory*, 37(3):466–474, May 1991. 13
- [50] John Seon Keun Yi, Minseok Seo, Jongchan Park, and Dong-Geol Choi. Using Self-Supervised Pretext Tasks for Active Learning. *arXiv:2201.07459 [cs]*, Jan. 2022. 2, 3, 4, 5, 7
- [51] Donggeun Yoo and In So Kweon. Learning Loss for Active Learning. In *2019 IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, pages 93–102, Long Beach, CA, USA, June 2019. IEEE. 3, 4, 7, 23
- [52] Donggeun Yoo and In So Kweon. Learning loss for active learning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, June 2019. 3, 12
- [53] Maximilian Zenk, David Zimmerer, Fabian Isensee, Paul F Jäger, Jakob Wasserthal, and Klaus Maier-Hein. Realistic evaluation of fixmatch on imbalanced medical

## A. Active Learning, in more detail

First we will give an additional task description of Active Learning (AL) in Appendix A.1 introducing necessary concepts and mathematical notation for our compared query methods which are discussed in Appendix A.2. Finally we give intuitions where the connection of AL to Self-Supervised Learning (Self-SL) and Semi-Supervised Learning (Semi-SL) lies in Appendix A.3 and Appendix E.3.

### A.1. From Supervised to Active Learning

In supervised learning, we are given a labeled dataset of sample-target pairs  $(x, y) \in \mathcal{L}$  sampled from an unknown joint distribution  $p(x, y)$ . Our goal is to produce a prediction function  $p(Y|x, \theta)$  parametrized by  $\theta$ , which outputs a target value distribution for previously unseen samples from  $p(x)$ . Choosing  $\theta$  might amount, for example, to optimizing a loss function which reflects the extent to which  $\arg\max_c p(Y = c|x, \theta) = y$  for  $(x, y) \in \mathcal{L}$ . However, in pool-based AL we are additionally given a collection of unlabeled samples  $\mathcal{U}$ , sampled from  $p(x, y)$ . By using a query method (QM), we hope to leverage this data efficiently through querying and successively labeling the most informative samples  $(x_1, \dots, x_B)$  from the pool. This should lead to a prediction function which is better reflecting  $p(Y|x)$  than random samples were queried.

From a more abstract perspective, the goal of AL is to use the information of the labeled dataset  $\mathcal{L}$  and the prediction function  $p(Y|x, \theta)$ , to find the samples giving the most information where  $p(Y|x)$  deviates from  $p(Y|x, \theta)$ . This is also being reflected by the way performance in AL is measured – which is the relative performance gain of the prediction function with queries from a QM compared to random queries. Making the prediction function implicitly the gauge for measuring the "success" of an AL strategy.

At the heart of AL is an optimization problem: AL is a game of reducing cost – one trades in computation cost with the expectation of lowering labeling cost which is deemed to be the bottleneck.

### A.2. Query Methods

A comprehensive overview over AL and its methods is out of the scope of this paper, we refer interested readers to [44] as a basis and [33] for an overview over current research. Most QMs fall into two categories following either: explorative strategies, which enforce queried samples to explore the distribution of  $p(x)$ ; and uncertainty based strategies, which make direct use of the prediction function  $p(Y|x, \theta)$ .<sup>2</sup> The principled combination of both strategies,

<sup>2</sup>This is conceptually similar to the exploration and exploitation paradigm seen in Reinforcement Learning and there actually exist strong parallels between Reinforcement Learning and Active Learning – so much so that Reinforcement Learning has been proposed to use in AL and AL based strategies have been proposed to be used in Reinforcement Learning.

especially to allow higher query sizes for uncertainty based QM, is an open research question.

In our work we focus exclusively on QMs which induce no changes to the prediction function and add no additional HPs except for bayesian QMs modelled with dropout. This immediately rules out QMs like Learning-Loss [52] or TA-VAAL [22], changing the prediction function, and QMs like VAAL [45], introducing new HPs. The QMs we use for our comparisons are currently state-of-the-art in AL on classification tasks. Further, they require no additional hyperparameters (HPs) to be set for the query function which is hard to evaluate in practice due to the validation paradox.

For this chapter we follow the notation introduced in [24], where e.g.  $X$  represents a random variable and  $x$  represents a concrete sample of variable  $X$ .

**Random** Draws samples from the pool  $\mathcal{U}$  randomly which follows  $p(x, y)$ . Therefore it can be interpreted as an exploratory QM.

**Core-Set** This method is based on the finding that the decision boundaries of convolutional neural networks are based on a small set of samples. To find these samples, the Core-Set QM queries samples which minimize the maximal shortest path from unlabeled to labeled sample in the representation space of the classifier [43]. This is also known as the K-Center problem, for which we use the K-Center greedy approximation. It draws queries especially from tails of the data distribution, to cover the whole dataset as well as possible. Therefore we classify it as an explorative strategy. **In all plots in the Appendix kcentergreedy is used interchangeably with Core-Set.**

**Entropy** The Entropy QM greedily queries the samples  $x$  with the highest uncertainty of the model as shown in Eq. (1) with  $C$  being the number of classes.

$$H(Y|x, \theta) = \sum_{c=1}^C p(Y = c|x, \theta) \cdot \log(p(Y = c|x, \theta)) \quad (1)$$

**BALD** Uses a bayesian model and selects greedily a query of samples with the highest mutual information between the predicted labels  $Y$  and weights  $\Theta$  for a sample  $x$  following [15]. From the weight variable  $\Theta$  the concrete values  $\theta \sim p(\theta|\mathcal{L})$  are then obtained by MC sampling of a bayesian dropout model [14].

$$\text{MI}(Y; \Theta|x, \mathcal{L}) = \sum_{c=1}^C (p(Y = c|x, \mathcal{L}) \cdot \log(p(Y = c|x, \mathcal{L})) - \mathbb{E}_{p(\theta|\mathcal{L})} [H(Y|x, \theta)]) \quad (2)$$

Where  $p(Y|x, \mathcal{L}) = \mathbb{E}_{p(\theta|\mathcal{L})} [p(Y|x, \theta)]$ .



**BatchBALD** Is an extension of BALD which selects a batch of queries  $(x_1, \dots, x_B)$  based on highest joint mutual entropy between their labels  $(Y_1, \dots, Y_B)$  and the weights  $\Theta$ .

$$\text{MI}(Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_B; \Theta|x) = \mu^* \left( \bigcup_{i=1}^B Y_i \cap \Theta \right) \quad (3)$$

Where  $\mu^*$  is a signed measure for discrete random variables  $(X, Y)$  so that  $\text{MI}(X, Y) = \mu^*(X \cap Y)$  and  $H(X, Y) = \mu^*(X \cup Y)$  following [49]. This stands in contrast to the greedy selection schemes for BALD and Entropy making it indirectly a mixture of the explorative and uncertainty paradigms. For further information we refer to [25].

### A.3. Connection to Self-SL

The high-level concept of Self-SL pre-training is to obtain a model by training it with a proxy task which is not dependent on annotations leading to representations that generalize well to a specific task. This allows to induce information from unlabeled data into the model in form of an initialization which can be interpreted as a form of bias. Usually these representations are supposed to be clustered based on some form of similarity which is often induced directly by the proxy task and also the reason why different proxy tasks are useful for different downstream tasks. Several different Self-SL pre-training strategies were developed based on different tasks s.a. generative models or clustering [7, 8, 17, 18], with contrastive training being currently the de facto standard in image classification. For a more thorough overview over Self-SL we refer the interested reader to [34]. Based on this, we use the popular contrastive SimCLR [8] training strategy as a basis for our Self-SL pre-training.

### A.4. Connection to Semi-SL

In Semi-SL the core idea is to regularize  $p(Y|x, \theta)$  by inducing information about the structure of  $p(x)$  using the unlabeled pool additionally to the labeled dataset. Usually this leads to the representations of unlabeled samples with the clustering being more in line with the structure of the supervised task [32]. Several different Semi-SL methods were developed based on regularizations on unlabeled samples which often fall into the category of enforcing consistency of predictions against perturbations and/or reducing the uncertainty of predictions (for more information we refer to [40]). For a more thorough overview over Semi-SL we refer interested readers to [4, 40]. In our experiments we use FixMatch [47] as Semi-SL method which combines both aforementioned principles of consistency and uncertainty reduction in a simple manner.

## B. Dataset Details

Each dataset is split into a training , a validation and a test split.

For CIFAR-10/100 (LT) datasets the test split of size 10000 observations is already given and for MIO-TCD and ISIC-2019 we use a custom test split of 25% random observations of the entire dataset size. For MIO-TCD and ISIC-2019 the train, validation and test splits are imbalanced.

The validation split for all CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 datasets are 5000 randomly drawn observations corresponding to 10% of the entire dataset. For CIFAR-10 LT the validation split also consists of 5000 samples obtained from the dataset before the long-tail distribution is applied onto the training split. The CIFAR-10 LT validation split is therefore balanced. For MIO-TCD and ISIC-2019 the validation splits consist of 15% of the entire dataset.

The shared training & pool dataset for CIFAR-10/100 consist of 45000 observations. For CIFAR-10 LT the training & pool datasets consists of 12,600 observations. For MIO-TCD and ISIC-2019 the training & pool datasets consist of 60% the dataset.

### B.1. Dataset Descriptions

1. CIFAR-10: natural images containing 10 classes, label distribution is uniform  
Splits: (Train:45000; Val: 5000; Test; 10000)  
Whole Dataset: 60000
2. CIFAR-100: natural images containing 100 classes, label distribution is uniform  
Splits: (Train:45000; Val: 5000; Test; 10000)  
Whole Dataset: 60000
3. CIFAR-10 LT: natural images containing 10 classes, label distribution of test and validation split is uniform, label distribution of train split is artificially altered with imbalance factor  $\rho = 50$  according to [6]. The resulting label distribution is shown in Tab. 2.  
Splits: (Train:~12,600; Val: 5000; Test; 10000)  
Whole Dataset: 27600
4. ISIC-2019: dermoscopic images containing 8 classes, label distribution of the dataset is imbalanced and shown in Tab. 3  
Splits: (Train:15200; Val: 3799; Test; 6332)  
Whole Dataset: 25331
5. MIO-TCD: natural images of traffic participants containing 11 classes, label distribution of the dataset is imbalanced and shown in Tab. 4  
Splits: (Train:311498; Val: 77875; Test; 129791)  
Whole Dataset: 519164

Class	Train Split
airplane	4500
automobile (but not truck or pickup truck)	2913
bird	1886
cat	1221
deer	790
dog	512
frog	331
horse	214
ship	139
truck (but no pickup truck)	90

Table 2. Number of Samples for each class in CIFAR-10 LT dataset. validation and test sets are balanced.

Class	Whole Dataset
Melanoma	4522
Melanocytic nevus	12875
Basal cell carcinoma	3323
Benign keratosis	867
Dermatofibroma	197
Vascular lesion	63
Squamos cell carcinoma	64

Table 3. Number of Samples for each class in ISIC-2019

Class	Whole Dataset
Articulated Truck	10346
Background	16000
Bicycle	2284
Bus	10316
Car	260518
Motorcycle	1982
Non-motorized vehicle	1751
Pedestrian	6262
Pickup truck	50906
Single unit truck	5120
Work van	9679

Table 4. Number of samples for each class in MIO-TCD

## C. Experimental Setup, in more Detail

Here we detail the most crucial information for reproducibility, re-implementation and checking our implementation. When in doubt, trust the information documented here with regard to what we wanted to do in our code.

### C.1. Initial Dataset Setup

Before we do anything else the datasets are split according to Fig. 4 resulting in a train split, a validation split and




Figure 4. Description of the three different data splits and their use-cases. The complete separation of a validation split allows to compare across label regimes and incorporate techniques for performance evaluation s.a. Active Testing [27]. For evaluation and development the test split should be as big as possible since QM recommendations are based on the test set performance making it a form of "oracle". An estimate of the size a dataset is required to have to measure specific performance differences can be derived using Hoeffding's inequality [20, 40].

a test split. Each dataset has 3 different validation splits while always using the same test split. This is to ensure comparability across these splits without relying on cross-validation. The exact splits for each dataset are detailed in Appendix B. After that the final datasets use for training and validation are then labeled according to the 'label strategy', which is described in Fig. 5. For all balanced datasets, we use class balanced label strategies since the label strategy only leads to different outcomes for imbalanced datasets. For CIFAR-10 LT we use the label strategy on the train split only, whereas for MIO-TCD and ISIC-2019 we use the label strategy on both train and validation split. The amount of data which is labeled for the final datasets of each split is then dependent upon the label-regime (described in more detail in Appendix C.2).




Figure 5. The Label Strategy used on the two roll-out datasets MIO-TCD and ISIC-2019 and for train and pool set on CIFAR-10 LT. For class balanced datasets this strategy does not induce meaningful changes to balanced starting budgets.

## C.2. Label Regimes

The exact label regimes are obtained by first taking the corresponding splits and then using the proper label strategy (see Fig. 5) in combination with the starting budget and validation set size according to Tab. 5.

## C.3. Model Architecture and Training

On each training step the model is trained from its initialization to avoid a ‘mode collapse’ [25]. Further we select the checkpoint with the best validation set performance in the spirit of [14]. A ResNet-18 [19] is the backbone for all of our experiments with weight decay disabled on bias parameters. If not otherwise noted, a nesterov momentum optimizer with momentum of 0.9 is used. For Self-SL models we use a two layer MLP as a classification head to make better use of the Self-SL representations with further details in Appendix C.5. To obtain bayesian models we add dropout on the final representations before the classification head with probability ( $p = 0.5$ ) following [14]. For all experiments on imbalanced datasets, we use the weighted CE-Loss following [38] based on the implementation in SK-Learn [5] if not otherwise noted. Models trained purely on the labeled dataset upsample it to a size of 5500 following [25] if the labeled train set is smaller.

**Bayesian Models** All steps requiring bayesian properties of the models including the prediction are obtained by drawing 50 MC samples following [15, 25].

**ST** ST models are trained for 200 epochs with Cosine Annealing and 10 epochs warmup.

**Self-SL** Self-SL pre-trained models are trained for 80 epochs with a reduction of the learning rate with a factor of 10 every 20 epochs (MultiStepLR) and using a Mult-Layer-Perceptron (MLP) classification head (detailed description in Appendix C.5). The complete setup of the training for SimCLR is described in Appendix C.4.

**Semi-SL** Semi-SL training is identical to the one proposed with the FixMatch method [47], except that we do not use exponentially moving average models and restrict the training step from  $1e6$  to  $2e5$ . The FixMatch implementation in our experiments is based on the open-source implementation of <sup>3</sup> and MixMatch for distribution alignment <sup>4</sup>. We always select the final Semi-SL model of the training for testing and querying. On imbalanced datasets we change the supervised term to the weighted CE-Loss and use distribution alignment on every dataset except for CIFAR-10 (where it does not improve performance [47]). The HP sweep for our Semi-SL models includes weight decay and learning rate.

**Hyperparameters** All information with regard to the final HPs and our proposed methodology of finding them is detailed in Appendix D

## C.4. Self-Supervised SimCLR Pre-Text Training

Our implementation wraps the Pytorch-Lightning-Bolts implementation of SimCLR: [https://lightning-bolts.readthedocs.io/en/latest/models/self\\_supervised.html#simclr](https://lightning-bolts.readthedocs.io/en/latest/models/self_supervised.html#simclr). The training of our SimCLR models is performed by excluding the validation splits. Therefore three models are trained on each dataset, one for each different validation split. In Tab. 6 we give a list of the HPs used on each of our five different datasets. All other HPs are taken from [8]. Further, we did not optimize the HPs for SimCLR at all, meaning that on MIO-TCD and ISIC-2019 Self-SL models could perform even better than reported here.

## C.5. MLP Head Self-SL

The MLP Head used for the Self-SL models has 1 hidden layer of size 512 uses ReLU nonlinearities and BatchNorm. The results on CIFAR-10 based on which this design decision is based on is shown in Tab. 7.

## C.6. List of Data Transformations

**Standard** The standard augmentations we use are based on the different datasets.

For CIFAR datasets these are in order of execution: RandomHorizontalFlip, RandomCrop to  $32 \times 32$  with padding of size 4.

<sup>3</sup><https://github.com/kekmodel/FixMatch-pytorch>

<sup>4</sup><https://github.com/google-research/mixmatch>

Dataset Label Regime	CIFAR-10			CIFAR-100			CIFAR-10 LT			MIO-TCD			ISIC-2019		
	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High
Starting Budget	50	250	1000	500	1000	5000	50	250	1000	55	275	1100	40	200	800
Query Size	50	250	1000	500	1000	5000	50	250	1000	55	275	1100	40	200	800
Final Budget	500	2500	10000	5000	10000	25000	500	2500	10000	550	2750	11000	400	2000	8000
Validation Set Size	250	1250	5000	2500	5000	5000	250	1250	5000	275	1375	5500	200	800	3799

Table 5. The exact values for all label regimes. Final Budget denotes the amount of labeled training samples at the end of the AL pipeline.

Dataset	CIFAR-10/CIFAR100/CIFAR-10 LT	MIO-TCD	ISIC-2019
Epochs	1000	200	1000
Optimizer	LARS	LARS	
Scheduler	Cosine Annealing	Cosine Annealing	
Warmup Epochs	10	10	
Temperature	0.5	0.1	
Batch Size	512	256	
Learning Rate	1	0.3	
Weight Decay	1E-4	1E-6	
Transform. Gauss Blur	False	True	
Transform. Color Jitter	Strength=0.5	Strength=1.0	

Table 6. HPs of the SimCLR pre-text training on each dataset. HP for CIFAR datasets are directly taken [8] whereas MIO-TCD and ISIC-2019 HP are adapted from ImageNet experiments.

For MIO-TCD we use the standard ImageNet transformations: RandomResizedCrop to 224x224, Random Horizontal Flip.

For ISIC-2019 we use ISIC transformations which are: Resize to 300x300, RandomHorizontalFlip, RandomVerticalFlip, ColorJitter(0.02, 0.02, 0.02, 0.01), RandomRotation(rotation=(-180, 180), translate=(0.1, 0.1), scale=(0.7, 1.3)), RandomAffine(-180, 180), RandomCrop to 224x224.

These are based on the ISIC-2018 challenge best single model submission:

<https://github.com/JiaxinZhuang/Skin-Lesion-Recognition.Pytorch>

**RandAugmentMC** We use the same set of image transformations used in RandAugment [12] with the parameters N=2 and M=10. A detailed list of image transformations alongside the corresponding values can be seen in [47] (Table 12).

The RandAugmentMC transformations were used additionally after the corresponding standard transformations for each dataset. RandAugmentMC(CIFAR) also adds cutout as a final transformation.

**RandAugmentMC weak** Works identical as RandAugmentMC and uses the same set of image transformations as for RandAugmentMC but changed its parameters to N=1 and M=2. Therefore the maximal range of values is divided

by a factor of 5.

RandAugmentMC weak does not use cutout in difference to RandAugmentMC on CIFAR datasets.

### C.7. Performance Measure

As a measure of performance on CIFAR-10, CIFAR-100 and CIFAR-10 LT we use the accuracy while on MIO-TCD and ISIC-2019 we use balanced accuracy which is identical to mean recall shown in Eq. (4).

$$\text{Mean Recall} = \sum_{c=1}^C \frac{1}{C} \frac{\text{TP}_c}{\text{TP}_c + \text{FN}_c} \quad (4)$$

Where  $C$  denotes the number of classes  $\text{TP}_c$  is the number of true positives for class  $c$  and  $\text{FN}_c$  being the number of samples belonging to class  $c$  being wrongly misclassified as another class.

### D. Proposed Hyperparameter Optimization

Our proposed HP optimization for AL is based on the notion of minimizing HP selection effort by simplifying and reducing the search space. We use SGD Optimizer with nesterov momentum of 0.9 since it works generally well and select an amount of epochs that always allows to fit the model. The scheduler is also fixed across experiments and similarly warmup epochs if used. Secondly we pre-select the batchsize for each dataset since it is usually not a critical HP as long as it is big enough for BatchNorm to work properly.



Labeled Train Set	Classification Head	Accuracy (Val)	Accuracy (Test)
50	Linear	$69.87 \pm (1.62)$	$69.90 \pm (2.18)$
50	2 Layer MLP	$71.47 \pm (3.06)$	$71.54 \pm (0.56)$
500	Linear	$84.67 \pm (0.36)$	$83.51 \pm (0.45)$
500	2 Layer MLP	$85.37 \pm (0.16)$	$84.60 \pm (0.37)$
1000	Linear	$87.13 \pm (0.69)$	$85.97 \pm (0.64)$
1000	2 Layer MLP	$87.69 \pm (0.55)$	$86.57 \pm (0.42)$
5000	Linear	$90.77 \pm (0.44)$	$90.20 \pm (0.21)$
5000	2 Layer MLP	$91.12 \pm (0.32)$	$90.25 \pm (0.24)$

Table 7. MLP Head Ablation for Self-SL models on CIFAR-10, over all labeled training set a small improvement for Multi-Layer-Perceptron is measurable compared to Linear classification head models.

**ST** For our ST models the final HP for each dataset and label regime are shown in Tab. 8.

HP sweep: weight decay: ( $5E-3$ ,  $5E-4$ ); learning rate: (0.1, 0.01); data transformation: (RandAugmentMC, Standard)

**Self-SL** For our Self-SL pre-trained models the final HP for each dataset and label regime are shown in Tab. 9.

HP sweep: weight decay: ( $5E-3$ ,  $5E-4$ ); learning rate: (0.01, 0.001); data transformation: (RandAugmentMC weak, Standard)

**Semi-SL** For our Semi-SL models we follow [47] with regard to HP selection as closely as possible. The final HP for each dataset and label regime are shown in Tab. 10.

HP sweep: weight decay and learning rate.




Figure 6. CIFAR-10 ST

## E. Results, in more Detail

### E.1. Main Results

**General Observations:** For all datasets, the overall performance of models was primarily determined by the training strategy and the HP selection, with the benefits of AL being generally smaller compared to the proper selection of both. For the three toy datasets Semi-SL generally performed best, followed by Self-SL and ST last, whereas for the two real-world datasets Semi-SL showed no substantial improvement over ST in the first training stage, and therefore further runs were omitted. Also, the performance gains for Self-SL models with AL are generally smaller compared to ST models. For Semi-SL there were generally only very small performance gains or substantially worse performance with AL observed. Concerning the effect of AL, the high-label regime proved to work for ST models on all datasets and Self-SL models. On the two real-world datasets, MIO-TCO and ISIC-2019 a dip in performance at 7k samples for all ST models could be observed. This behavior is ablated in Appendix H.1.

#### E.1.1 CIFAR-10

**ST** Results are shown in Fig. 6.

- Low-label regime: BALD and Core-Set perform on the same level as random. Entropy performs worse than random, presumably due to cold-start.
- Medium-label regime: BALD and Core-Set perform on the same level as random. Entropy performs worse in the beginning but catches up with random in the end.
- High-label regime: Core-Set outperforms random from 3k samples onward, BALD from 6k samples onward and Entropy performs worse in the beginning but catches up later. All QMs outperform random at 10k samples with similar performance.

**Self-SL** Results are shown in Fig. 7.

- Low-label regime: Core-Set outperforms random over from the beginning, BALD starts worse than random but catches up with more queries at 250 samples and Entropy also performs worse but catches up at 400 samples.
- Medium-label regime: All QMs perform very similarly to random with none substantially outperforming or underperforming.

Dataset Label Regime	Low	CIFAR-10 Medium	High	Low	CIFAR-100 Medium	High	Low	CIFAR-10 LT Medium	High	Low	MIO-TCD Medium	High	Low	ISIC-2019 Medium	High
Epochs*		200			200			200			200			200	
Optimizer*		SGD Nesterov 0.9			SGD Nesterov 0.9			SGD Nesterov 0.9			SGD Nesterov 0.9			SGD Nesterov 0.9	
Scheduler*		Cosine Annealing			Cosine Annealing			Cosine Annealing			Cosine Annealing			Cosine Annealing	
Warmup Epochs*		10			10			10			10			10	
Loss*		CE-Loss			CE-Loss			Weighted CE-Loss			Weighted CE-Loss			Weighted CE-Loss	
Batch Size*		1024			1024			1024			512			512	
Learning Rate		0.1			0.1			0.1		0.01	0.01	0.1		0.1	
Weight Decay		5E-3			5E-3			5E-3		5E-3	5E-4	5E-3		5E-3	
Data Augmentation		RandAugmentMC (CIFAR)			RandAugmentMC (CIFAR)			RandAugmentMC (CIFAR)			RandAugmentMC (ImageNet)			RandAugmentMC (ISIC)	

Table 8. Final HPs for each dataset and label regime for our ST models based on our HP tuning. HPs denoted with a \* are fixed across datasets and HP denoted with a + are pre-selected for each dataset while all other HP are obtained via sweeping.

Dataset Label Regime	Low	CIFAR-10 Medium	High	Low	CIFAR-100 Medium	High	Low	CIFAR-10 LT Medium	High	Low	MIO-TCD Medium	High	Low	ISIC-2019 Medium	High
Epochs*		80			80			80			80			80	
Optimizer*		SGD Nesterov 0.9			SGD Nesterov 0.9			SGD Nesterov 0.9			SGD Nesterov 0.9			SGD Nesterov 0.9	
Scheduler*		MultiStepLR			MultiStepLR			MultiStepLR			MultiStepLR			MultiStepLR	
Warmup Epochs*		0			0			0			0			0	
Loss*		CE-Loss			CE-Loss			Weighted CE-Loss			Weighted CE-Loss			Weighted CE-Loss	
Batch Size*		64			64			64			256			128	
Learning Rate		0.001			0.001			0.001		0.001	0.01	0.001		0.001	
Weight Decay		5E-3			5E-3		5E-4	5E-3	5E-4		5E-3			5E-3	
Data Augmentation		RandAugmentMC weak (CIFAR)			RandAugmentMC weak (CIFAR)		Standard (CIFAR)	Standard (CIFAR)		RandAugmentMC weak (ImageNet)	Standard (ImageNet)	Standard (ImageNet)		RandAugmentMC weak (ISIC)	

Table 9. Final HPs for each dataset and label regime for our Self-SL models based on our HP tuning. Overall Performance was remarkably stable with regard to HPs and stronger augmentations did not necessarily improve performance the same way as for ST models. This is presumably due to the pre-trained representations. HP denoted with a \* are fixed across datasets and HP denoted with a + are pre-selected for each dataset while all other HP are obtained via sweeping.




Figure 7. CIFAR-10 Self-SL




Figure 8. CIFAR-10 Semi-SL

- High-label regime: BALD outperforms is best performing QM outperforming random on all points. Entropy is second best followed by Core-Set, all outperforming random queries

**Semi-SL** Results are shown in Fig. 8.

- Low-label regime: noise is very high but Entropy leads to a strong reduction in performance at 100 samples compared to random.
- Medium-label regime: Entropy indicates a small performance increase over random samples. Core-Set underperforms random queries.

## E.1.2 CIFAR-100

**ST** Results are shown in Fig. 9.




Figure 9. CIFAR-100 ST

- Low-label regime: BALD performs similarly to random, Core-Set performs a little bit worse than random and Entropy performs substantially worse than random with a decreasing trend.

Dataset	CIFAR-10			CIFAR-100			CIFAR-10 LT			MIO-TCD			ISIC-2019		
Label Regime	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High	Low	Medium	High
Optimization Steps*	2E5	–	–	2E5	–	–	2E5	–	–	2E5	–	–	2E5	–	–
Optimizer*	SGD Nesterov 0.9	–	–	SGD Nesterov 0.9	–	–	SGD Nesterov 0.9	–	–	SGD Nesterov 0.9	–	–	SGD Nesterov 0.9	–	–
Scheduler*	Cosine Annealing	–	–	Cosine Annealing	–	–	Cosine Annealing	–	–	Cosine Annealing	–	–	Cosine Annealing	–	–
Warmup Steps+	0	–	–	0	–	–	0	–	–	3000	–	–	3000	–	–
Loss+	CE-Loss	–	–	CE-Loss	–	–	weighted CE-Loss	–	–	weighted CE-Loss	–	–	weighted CE-Loss	–	–
$\lambda_u^+$	1	–	–	1	–	–	1	–	–	1	–	–	1	–	–
$\mu^+$	7	–	–	7	–	–	7	–	–	7	–	–	7	–	–
$\tau^+$	0.95	–	–	0.95	–	–	0.95	–	–	0.95	–	–	0.95	–	–
Distribution Alignment+	False	–	–	True	–	–	True	–	–	True	–	–	True	–	–
Batch Size*	64	–	–	64	–	–	64	–	–	64	–	–	64	–	–
Learning Rate	0.03	–	–	0.03	–	–	0.03	–	–	TODO	–	–	TODO	–	–
Weight Decay	5E-4	–	–	5E-4	–	–	1E-3 5E-4	–	–	TODO	–	–	TODO	–	–
Data Augmentation+	Standard (CIFAR)	–	–	Standard (CIFAR)	–	–	Standard (CIFAR)	–	–	Standard (ImageNet)	–	–	Standard (ISIC)	–	–
Unlabeled Augmentation+	RandAugmentMC (CIFAR)	–	–	RandAugmentMC (CIFAR)	–	–	RandAugmentMC (CIFAR)	–	–	RandAugmentMC (ImageNet)	–	–	RandAugmentMC (ISIC)	–	–

Table 10. Final HPs for each dataset and label regime for our Semi-SL models based on our HP tuning. Overall Performance was remarkably stable with regard to HPs and stronger augmentations did not necessarily improve performance the same way as for ST models. This is presumably due to the pre-trained representations. HP denoted with a \* are fixed across datasets and HP denoted with a + are pre-selected for each dataset while all other HP are obtained via sweeping. – denotes not performed experiments.




Figure 10. CIFAR-100 Self-SL




Figure 11. CIFAR-100 Semi-SL

- Medium-label regime: BALD performs identically to random and might improve from 8k samples onward. Core-Set performs similarly as random. Entropy starts performing worse but closes the performance gap till the end.
- High-label regime: All QMs outperform random. BALD performs best on all stages, Core-Set is better than random on all stages but Entropy has a higher final performance.

**Self-SL** Results are shown in Fig. 10.

- Low-label regime: No QM performs as well as random. Core-Set performs closest but falls off later, Entropy performs also worse and BALD performs worst.
- Medium-label regime: No QM performs as well as random. Core-Set performs closest but falls off later, Entropy performs also worse and BALD performs worst.
- High-label regime: All QMs outperform random. Entropy performs best and BALD and Core-Set perform similarly to each other.

**Semi-SL** Results are shown in Fig. 11.

- Low-label regime: random outperforms all QMs. Core-Set is second best and Entropy performs worst.
- Medium-label regime: random outperforms all QMs. Entropy has a similar final accuracy to random.

### E.1.3 CIFAR-10 LT

**ST** Results are shown in Fig. 12.

- Low-label regime: BALD and Core-Set outperform random and lead to substantial 6-8% benefit in accuracy. Entropy performs slightly worse than random.
- Medium-label regime: Core-Set performs best leading to a 10-12% increase in accuracy at 2k samples followed by BALD also substantially improving over random and Entropy performs a little bit worse than random.
- High-label regime: Core-Set performs best leading to more stable performance across all stages. Entropy performance is generally worse than random but catches




Figure 12. CIFAR-10 LT ST




Figure 13. CIFAR-10 LT Self-SL

up at 10k samples and BALD performs much worse than random. Note: slight dip in performance for 3k samples (high-label) with all QMs except for Core-Set. This is ablated in Appendix H.1 and might be due to handling imbalanced datasets with weighted CE-Loss.

**Self-SL** Results are shown in Fig. 13.

- Low-label regime: BALD is best performing leading to 4% accuracy gain over random at 500 samples. Entropy is also outperforming random while Core-Set performs a little bit worse than random.
- Medium-label regime: All QMs outperform random with BALD and Entropy best performing (Entropy has lower variance) and Core-Set still outperforms random but is substantially worse than uncertainty-based QMs.
- High-label regime: All QMs outperform random with BALD and Entropy best performing (Entropy has lower variance) and Core-Set still outperforms random but is substantially worse than uncertainty-based QMs while catching up at later stages.




Figure 14. CIFAR-10 LT Semi-SL




Figure 15. MIO-TCD ST

**Semi-SL** Results are shown in Fig. 14.

- Low-label regime: Trend is unclear everything within variances but Core-Set might lead to benefits.
- Medium-label regime: Core-Set substantially improves performance over random and Entropy. Note: Training of Semi-SL methods might have been prone to lower accuracies on imbalanced datasets.

#### E.1.4 MIO-TCD

**ST** Results are shown in Fig. 15.

- Low-label regime: Core-Set is only QM outperforming random. Entropy and BALD perform a slightly worse than random.
- Medium-label regime: Core-Set is the best performing QM substantially outperforming random, closely followed by BALD. Entropy performs much worse than random QM.
- High-label regime: Core-Set is the best performing QM outperforming random. BALD shows extremely high variance but generally also outperforms random (mean)






Figure 16. MIO-TCD Self-SL

and Entropy performs substantially worse than random even decreasing the absolute performance. Note: Dip in performance for the high-label regime at approximately 7k samples is ablated in Appendix H.1.

**Self-SL** Results are shown in Fig. 16.

- Low-label regime: Core-Set is best performing and Entropy second best, both perform similarly to random. BALD performs much worse than random queries.
- Medium-label regime: Entropy performs a little bit worse than random. Core-Set performs slightly worse than Entropy and BALD performs substantially worse.
- High-label regime: Core-Set and Entropy perform similarly to random. BALD decreases absolute performance in the first query step and performs substantially worse than random.

**Semi-SL** We performed no AL experiments due to bad performance of Semi-SL on the starting budgets. More information can be found in Appendix E.3.

### E.1.5 ISIC-2019

**ST** Results are shown in Fig. 17.

- Low-label regime: All QMs perform on the same level as random with Core-Set maybe giving a minor benefit. The variance is very high.
- Medium-label regime: Core-Set leads to substantial benefit over random queries. BALD and Entropy start with similar performance but lead to reduced performance even reducing absolute performance from approx. 1k samples onward.




Figure 17. ISIC-2019 ST





Figure 18. ISIC-2019 Self-SL Pre-Trained Models

- High-label regime: Core-Set is the best performing QM giving substantial gain over random while Entropy performs similarly to random. BALD performs worse than random from 4k samples onward even reducing absolute performance. Note: The dip in performance for the high-label regime at approximately 7k samples is ablated in Appendix H.1.

**Self-SL** Results are shown in Fig. 18.

- Low-label regime: BALD outperforms random while Entropy performs a little bit worse than random and Core-Set is the worst performing.
- Medium-label regime: BALD is the best performing QM. Entropy performs a slightly better than random and Core-Set performs as well as random.
- High-label regime: Entropy is best performing QM. Core-Set performs a little bit better than random and BALD initially performs better than random but then performs worse than random.



(a) CIFAR-100 with query size re- (b) MIO-TCD with Pool downsampled  
duced from 500 to 50. from 300k to 50k.

Figure 19. Detailed results for the low-label cold-start ablation on CIFAR-100 and MIO-TCD. On CIFAR-100 low-label regime with query size 500 for 1k samples the accuracy of BALD is approx. 42%.

**Semi-SL** We performed no AL experiments due to bad performance of Semi-SL on the starting budgets. More information can be found in Appendix E.3.

## E.2. Low-Label Cold-Start Ablation

The results for CIFAR-100 using a smaller acquisition size and MIO-TCD using a downsampled pool are here set into context in Fig. 19 than in Sec. 4. Here would like to highlight that BALD substantially benefits from smaller query sizes on CIFAR-100. Further, on MIO-TCD the smaller pool leads to a substantial benefit for BALD and BatchBALD brings even greater improvements. This shows similarities to the behavior [25] observe on Repeated MNIST for BALD and BatchBALD. Based on this, we hypothesize that MIO-TCD has more samples with strong similarities to each other than the greedy QMs select for annotation and therefore loose performance compared to random queries.

## E.3. Semi-Supervised Learning

Results of FixMatch for all HPs on the whole validation splits are shown separately for MIO-TCD in Tab. 12 and ISIC-2019 in Tab. 11. Based on the performance which did not improve substantially over even ST models we decided to omit all further AL experiments.

## F. Discussion and further observations

The results are interpreted based on the assumption that a QM performing on a similar level as random is not a drawback as long as it brings in other settings performance improvements over random queries. However, if a QM shows behavior leading to much worse behavior than random as Entropy does, or shows signs of the cold start problem we deem this as highly problematic. In these settings, one loses significant performance whilst paying a cost in computing

FixMatch Sweep ISIC-2019			
Labeled Train Samples	Learning Rate	Weight Decay	Balanced Accuracy (Val)
40	0.3	5E-3	22.5±(2.4)
		5E-4	22.9±(3.9)
	0.03	5E-3	22.2±(2.8)
		5E-4	25.0±(1.6)
200	0.3	5E-3	24.7±(2.4)
		5E-4	25.0±(1.6)
	0.03	5E-3	25.7±(2.1)
		5E-4	28.4±(3.0)

Table 11. ISIC-2019 FixMatch results reported on the three whole validation splits (balanced accuracy in %). Compared to ST with 28% and Self-SL 33% balanced accuracy on the test split with 40 labeled train samples.

FixMatch Sweep MIO-TCD			
Labeled Train Samples	Learning Rate	Weight Decay	Balanced Accuracy (Val)
55	0.3	5E-3	22.9±(4.3)
		5E-4	22.9±(3.7)
	0.03	5E-3	24.6±(4.7)
		5E-4	29.2±(3.0)
275	0.3	5E-3	No Convergence
		5E-4	No Convergence
	0.03	5E-3	25.4±(2.5)
		5E-4	28.6±(2.1)

Table 12. MIO-TCD FixMatch results reported on the three whole validation splits (balanced accuracy in %). Compared to ST with 28% and Self-SL with 42% balanced accuracy on the test split with 55 labeled train samples.

and setup corresponding to AL. Therefore we used random queries as a baseline all QMs are compared to.

Based on this our recommendation for Core-Set is given for Self-SL and ST trainings.

To our knowledge, there exists to this date no ‘more principled’ approach to combine the information about QMs obtained via multiple different experiments or just even a single experiment between two competing QMs if it is not clear that one QM always clearly outperforms the other. Thus, we deem the development of approaches to extract the information captured in an "AL plot" as a crucial future research direction.

## G. Cross-Paper Model Performance comparison

Here we compare the performance of random baselines on the most commonly utilized dataset CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100 across different papers for ST, Self-SL and Semi-SL models along strategic point where overlap in between papers occurs. For CIFAR-10 the results of this comparison are shown for the high-label regime in Tab. 13 and the low- and medium-label regime in Tab. 14. Similarly for CIFAR-100 the results are shown in Tab. 15 for the high-label regime and Tab. 16 for the low- and medium-label regimes. Overall our ST random baselines outperform all other random baselines. Our Self-SL models also outperform the only other relevant

literature [3] on CIFAR-10. Further, our Semi-SL models also outperform the relevant literature [16, 37] on CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100.

## H. Limitations, in more detail

Additionally to the limitations already discussed in Sec. 4.1 we would like to critically reflect on the following points:

**Query Methods** We only evaluated three different QMs which is only a small sub-selection of all the QMs proposed in the literature. We argue that this may not be optimal, however, deem it justified due to the variety of other factors which we evaluated. Further, we excluded all QMs which induce changes in the classifier (s.a. LLAL [51]) or add a substantial additional computational cost by training new components (s.a. VAAL [46]). These QMs might induce changes in the HPs for every dataset and were therefore deemed too costly to properly optimize.

We leave a combination of K4 with these QMs for future research.

**Validation Set Size** The potential shortcomings of our validation set were already discussed. However, we would like to point out that a principled inclusion of K-Fold Cross-Validation into AL might alleviate this problem. This would also give direct access to ensembles which have been shown numerous times to be beneficial with regard to final performance (also in AL) [2]. How this would allow us to assess performance gains in practice and also make use of improved techniques for performance evaluation s.a. Active Testing [27] in the same way as our proposed solution shown in Fig. 4 is not clear to us. Therefore we leave this point up for future research.

**Performance of ST models** On the imbalanced datasets, the performance of our models is not steadily increasing for more samples which can be traced back to sub-optimal HP selection according to [39]. We believe that our approach of a simplified HP tuning improves over the state-of-the-art in AL showcased by the superior performance of our models on CIFAR-10 and CIFAR-100. However, regularly re-optimizing HPs might be an alternative solution. Another possible solution could be to better handle class imbalanced datasets with regard to the training which is discussed in Appendix H.1.

**Performance of Self-SL models** Our Self-SL models are outperformed on the low-label regime on CIFAR-100 by the Self-SL models by [3], whereas on the medium- and high-label regime our Self-SL models outperform them. We believe that this might be due to our fine-tuning schedule and the possibility that Sim-Siam improves over SimCLR on CIFAR-100. Since our Self-SL models still outperform most Semi-SL models in the literature we believe that drawing conclusions from our results is still feasible. An interesting research direction would be to make better use of the Self-SL

representations s.a. improved fine-tuning regimes [30].

**No Bayesian Query Methods for Semi-SL** The Semi-SL models were neither combined with BALD nor BatchBALD as query functions, even though we showed that small query sizes and BatchBALD can counteract the cold-start problem. Further our Semi-SL models had bigger query sizes by a factor of three, possibly additionally hindering performance gains obtainable with AL. However, in previous experiments with FixMatch, we were not able to combine it with Dropout whilst keeping the performance of models without dropout. This clearly might have been an oversight by us, but we would like to point out that in the works focusing on AL, using Semi-SL without bayesian QMs is common practice [16, 36]

### H.1. Instability of Hyperparameters for Class Imbalanced Datasets

The substantial dip in performance on MIO-TCD and ISIC-2019 for approx 7k samples shown in Fig. 15 and Fig. 17 is ablated in Tab. 17 where we show that simply changing the learning rate leads to stabilizing the performance on both datasets for these cases. Further, we hypothesize that the instability of the training with regard to optimal HP selection and their strong influence on performance might be due to a sub-optimal way of handling the imbalanced datasets by using the weighted CE-Loss which is common practice [38]. We base this on the small dip in performance that can also be observed in the high-label regime for CIFAR-10 LT shown in Fig. 12. To verify our hypothesis, we ran an ablation on CIFAR-10 LT with ST models using standard CE-Loss and all QMs which shows that the uncertainty-based QMs perform better than reported in Appendix E and further the random baseline performance also increases.

Therefore we believe that different methods of handling imbalanced datasets via sampling s.a. balanced sampling should be also taken into key-parameter method configuration (K4). This might also reduce the variance of ST models with BALD as QM in the high-label regime observable in Fig. 15. However, since this would require us not only to rerun all of our experiments but also to optimize the HP for all of our compared training strategies again (especially Semi-SL models with high computational cost), we leave this point for future work.

Information Paper	Training	Model	Source	Number Labeled Training Samples					
				1k	2k	5k	10k	15k	20k
QBC	ST	DenseNet121	Graph	-	-	74*	82.5*	-	-
VAAL	ST	VGG16	Graph	-	-	61.35*	68.17*	72.96*	75.99*
CoreSet	ST	VGG16	Graph	-	-	60*	68*	71*	74*
Agarwal et al.	ST	VGG16	Graph	-	-	61.5	68	72	76
Munjal-SR	ST	VGG16	Table	-	-	82.16	85.07	89.43	91.16
Mittal et al.	ST	WRN28-2	Graph	57	73	82.5	86	90.7	92
LLAL	ST	ResNet18	Graph	51	63	81*	87*	-	-
CoreCGN	ST	ResNet18	Graph	50	64	80*	85.5*	-	-
TA-VAAL	ST	ResNet18	Graph	50	65	81*	87.5*	-	-
Krishnan et al.	ST	ResNet18	Graph	47	60	78	86	-	-
Yi et al.	ST	ResNet18	Graph	47.5	56	78	86	-	-
Bengar et al.	ST	ResNet18	Graph	45	55	73	81	85	88
Munjal-SR	ST	ResNet18	Table	-	-	84.69	88.45	89.98	92.29
Ours	ST	ResNet18	Table	<b>72.4</b>	<b>79.8</b>	<b>85.5</b>	<b>90.5</b>	-	-
Bengar et al.	Self-SL	ResNet18	Graph	<b>87</b>	88	89.5	90.5	91	91.5
Ours	Self-SL	ResNet18	Table	86.2	<b>88.3</b>	<b>90.1</b>	<b>91.4</b>	-	-
Mittal et al.	Semi-SL	WRN28-2	Graph	88	91	92.5	93.8	94	94.5
Gao et al.	Semi-SL	WRN28-2	Graph	91.5	91	-	-	-	-
Ours	Semi-SL	ResNet18	Table	<b>94.7</b>	<b>95.0</b>	-	-	-	-

Table 13. Comparison of random baseline model accuracy in % on the test set for the high label-regime for CIFAR-10 across different papers. Best performing models for each training strategy are **highlighted**. Values denoted with – represent not performed experiments. Values with a \* are reprinted from [38]. Values which are sourced from a graph are subject to human read-out error.

Information Paper	Training	Model	Source	Number Labeled Training Samples				
				50	100	200	250	500
Mittal et al.	ST	WRN28-2	Graph	-	-	-	36	48
Bengar et al.	ST	ResNet18	Graph	-	-	-	-	38
Ours	ST	ResNet18	Table	<b>25.1</b>	<b>32.3</b>	<b>44.4</b>	<b>47.0</b>	<b>61.2</b>
Bengar et al.	Self-SL	ResNet18	Graph	62	<b>77</b>	81	83	85
Ours	Self-SL	ResNet18	Table	<b>71.3</b>	76.8	<b>81.2</b>	81.4	84.1
Mittal et al.	Semi-SL	WRN28-2	Graph	-	-	-	82	85
Gao et al.	Semi-SL	WRN28-2	Table	-	47.85	89.20	90.23	-
Ours	Semi-SL	ResNet18	Graph	<b>90</b>	<b>91</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>93</b>	<b>94</b>

Table 14. Comparison of random baseline model accuracy in % on the test set for the low- and medium-label regime for CIFAR-10 across different papers. Best performing models for each training strategy are **highlighted**. Values denoted with – represent not performed experiments. Values which are sourced from a graph are subject to human read-out error.



Information Paper	Training	Model	Source	Number Labeled Training Samples			
				5k	10k	15k	20k
Agarwal et al.	ST	VGG16	Graph	28	35	41.5	46
Agarwal et al.	ST	ResNet18	Graph	29.5	38	45	49
Core-Set	ST	VGG16	Graph	27	37	42	49
VAAL	ST	VGG16	Graph	28	35	42	46
Munjal et al.	ST	VGG16	Graph	39.44	49	55	59
VAAL	ST	ResNet18	Graph	28	38	45	49
TA-VAAL	ST	ResNet18	Graph	43	52	60	63.5
Bengar et al.	ST	ResNet18	Graph	27	45	52	58
Munjal et al.	ST	ResNet18	Table	?	61.1	<b>66.9</b>	69.8
Mittal et al.	ST	WRN28-2	Graph	44.9	58	64	68
Ours	ST	ResNet18	Table	<b>49.2</b>	<b>61.3</b>	66.7	<b>70.2</b>
Bengar et al.	Self-SL	ResNet18	Table	60	63	63.5	64
Ours	Self-SL	ResNet18	Table	<b>60.4</b>	<b>64.8</b>	<b>68.4</b>	<b>70.7</b>
Mittal et al.	Semi-SL	WRN28-2	Graph	59	65	70	71
Gao et al.	Semi-SL	WRN28-2	Table	<b>63.4</b>	<b>67</b>	68	70
Ours	Semi-SL	ResNet18	Graph	61	<b>67</b>	-	-

Table 15. Comparison of random baseline model accuracy in % on the test set for the high-label regime for CIFAR-100 across different papers. Best performing models for each training strategy are **highlighted**. Values denoted with – represent not performed experiments. Values which are sourced from a graph are subject to human read-out error.

Information Paper	Training	Model	Source	Number Labeled Training Samples			
				500	1000	2000	2500
Mittal et al.	ST	WRN28-2	Graph	9	12	24	27
TA-VAAL	ST	ResNet18	Graph	-	-	20	-
Bengar et al.	ST	ResNet18	Graph	9	12	17	-
Ours	ST	ResNet18	Table	<b>14.0</b>	<b>22.4</b>	<b>32.0</b>	<b>36.3</b>
Bengar et al.	Self-SL	ResNet18	Table	<b>47</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>56</b>	-
Ours	Self-SL	ResNet18	Table	37.32	45.2	52.2	54.7
Mittal et al.	Semi-SL	WRN28-2	Graph	26	35.5	44.5	49
Ours	Semi-SL	ResNet18	Graph	<b>37.5</b>	-	<b>54.5</b>	-

Table 16. Comparison of random baseline model accuracy in % on the test set for the low- and medium- label regime for CIFAR-100 across different papers. Best performing models for each training strategy are **highlighted**. Values denoted with – represent not performed experiments. Values which are sourced from a graph are subject to human read-out error.

Dataset	Labeled Train Set	Data Augmentation	Learning Rate	Weight Decay	Balanced Accuracy (Val)	Balanced Accuracy (Test)
ISIC-2019	7200	RandAugmentMC (ISIC)	0.1	5E-3	33.8±(1.8)	33.1±(1.0)
				5E-4	43.0±(3.1)	40.9±(1.9)
			0.01	5E-3	49.1±(1.1)	51.7±(0.5)
				5E-4	49.1±(2.1)	50.1±(1.1)
MIO-TCD	7700	RandAugmentMC (ImageNet)	0.1	5E-3	42.5±(1.3)	44.0±(0.9)
				5E-4	49.7±(1.6)	50.35±(2.3)
			0.01	5E-3	59.3±(1.6)	60.9±(0.8)
				5E-4	60.1±(1.1)	61.5±(0.9)

Table 17. Ablation study on the performance-dip on MIO-TCD and ISIC-2019 for ST models with regard to HP.




Figure 20. Results of ST models on CIFAR-10 LT showcasing the importance of method configuration (K4) also including handling of imbalanced data.

As can be seen here the two uncertainty based QMs BALD and Entropy perform drastically different based on the used loss function, here performing better with standard CE-Loss. Additionally, training with CE-Loss is more stable showcased by smaller variance of the accuracy for all models and even improving the performance of all QMs including random across the board.