

Regression Under Human Assistance*

Abir De¹, Nastaran Okati², Paramita Koley³,
Niloy Ganguly³ and Manuel Gomez Rodriguez²

¹IIT Bombay, abir@cse.iitb.ac.in

²Max Planck Institute for Software Systems, {nastaran, manuelgr}@mpi-sws.org

³IIT Kharagpur, paramita.koley@iitkgp.ac.in, niloy@cse.iitkgp.ac.in

Abstract

Decisions are increasingly taken by both humans and machine learning models. However, machine learning models are currently trained for full automation—they are not aware that some of the decisions may still be taken by humans. In this paper, we take a first step towards the development of machine learning models that are optimized to operate under different automation levels. More specifically, we first introduce the problem of ridge regression under human assistance and show that it is NP-hard. Then, we derive an alternative representation of the corresponding objective function as a difference of nondecreasing submodular functions. Building on this representation, we further show that the objective is nondecreasing and satisfies α -submodularity, a recently introduced notion of approximate submodularity. These properties allow a simple and efficient greedy algorithm to enjoy approximation guarantees at solving the problem. Experiments on synthetic and real-world data from two important applications—medical diagnosis and content moderation—demonstrate that our algorithm outsources to humans those samples in which the prediction error of the ridge regression model would have been the highest if it had to make a prediction, it outperforms several competitive baselines, and its performance is robust with respect to several design choices and hyperparameters used in the experiments.

1 Introduction

In a wide range of critical applications, societies rely on the judgement of human experts to take consequential decisions—decisions which have significant consequences. Unfortunately, the timeliness and quality of the decisions are often compromised due to the large number of decisions to be taken and the shortage of human experts. For example, in certain medical specialties, patients in most countries need to wait for months to be diagnosed by a specialist. In content moderation, online publishers often stop hosting comments sections because their staff is unable to moderate the myriad of comments they receive. In software development, bugs may be sometimes overlooked by software developers who spend long hours on code reviews for large software projects.

In this context, there is a widespread discussion on the possibility of letting machine learning models take decisions in these high-stake tasks, where they have matched, or even surpassed, the average performance of human experts [6, 37, 49]. Currently, these models are mostly trained for full automation—they assume they will take *all* the decisions. However, their decisions are still worse than those by human experts on some instances, where they make far more errors than average [39]. Motivated by this observation, our goal is to develop machine learning models that are optimized to operate under different automation levels—models

*Preliminary version of this work appeared in De et al. [10]. Paramita Koley contributed to this work during her internship at the Max Planck Institute for Software Systems.

that are optimized to take decisions for a given fraction of the instances and leave the remaining ones to humans.

To this end, we focus on the specific problem of ridge regression and introduce a novel formulation that allows for different automation levels. Based on this problem formulation, we make the following contributions:

- I. We show that the problem is NP-hard. This is due to its combinatorial nature—for each potential meta-decision about which instances the machine will decide upon, there is an optimal set of parameters for the regression model, however, the meta-decision is also something we seek to optimize.
- II. We derive an alternative representation of the objective function as a difference of nondecreasing submodular functions. This representation enables us to use a recent iterative algorithm [28] to solve the problem, however, this algorithm does not enjoy approximation guarantees.
- III. Building on the above representation, we further show that the objective function is nondecreasing and satisfies α -submodularity, a notion of approximate submodularity [15]. These properties allow a simple and efficient greedy algorithm (refer to Algorithm 1) to enjoy approximation guarantees.
- IV. We design a practical framework that uses the solution to the ridge regression problem provided by Algorithm 1 and supervised learning to perform predictions about unseen samples at test time (refer to Algorithm 2).

Finally, we experiment with synthetic and real-world data from two important practical applications—medical diagnosis and content moderation. Our results show that our algorithm outsources to humans those samples in which the machine error would have been the highest if it had to predict their response variables. This suggests that our algorithm has the ability to learn the underlying relationship between a given sample and its corresponding human and machine error. Moreover, the results also show that the greedy algorithm outperforms several competitive algorithms, including the iterative algorithm for maximization of a difference of submodular functions mentioned above, and its performance is robust with respect to several design choices and hyperparameters used in the experiments. To facilitate research in this area, we are releasing an open source implementation of our method¹.

Before we proceed further, we would like to acknowledge that our contributions are just a first step towards designing machine learning models that are optimized to operate under different automation levels. It would be very interesting to extend our work to more sophisticated machine learning models and other machine learning tasks (*e.g.*, classification).

2 Related Work

The work most closely related to ours is by Raghu et al. [39], in which a classifier can outsource samples to humans. However, in contrast to our work, their classifier is trained to predict the labels of all samples in the training set, as in full automation, and the proposed algorithm does not enjoy theoretical guarantees. As a result, a natural extension of their algorithm to ridge regression achieves a significantly lower performance than ours, as shown in Figure 8.

There is a rapidly increasing line of work devoted to designing machine learning models that are able to defer decisions [1, 8, 16, 17, 32, 34, 40, 41, 48, 56]. Most previous work focuses on supervised learning and design classifiers that learn to defer either by considering the defer action as an additional label value or by training an independent classifier to decide about deferred decisions. However, there are two fundamental differences between this work and ours. First, they do not consider there is a human decision maker, with a human error model, who takes a decision whenever the classifiers defer it. Second, the classifiers are trained to predict the labels of all samples in the training set, as in full automation. A very recent notable exception is by Meresht et al. [34], who consider there is a human decision maker, however, they tackle the problem in

¹<https://github.com/Networks-Learning/regression-under-assistance>

a reinforcement learning setting. As a result, their formulation and assumptions are fundamentally different and their technical contributions are orthogonal to ours.

Our work is also related to active learning [5, 7, 20, 23, 26, 42, 47, 52], robust linear regression [2, 46, 50, 54] and robust logistic regression [14]. In active learning, the goal is to determine which subset of training samples one should label so that a supervised machine learning model, trained on these samples, generalizes well across the entire feature space during test. In other words, the model needs to predict well *any* sample during test time. In contrast, our trained model only needs to accurately predict samples which are close to the samples assigned to the machine during training time and rely on humans to predict the remaining samples. In robust linear regression and robust logistic regression, the (implicit) assumption is that a constant fraction of the output variables are corrupted by an unbounded noise. Then, the goal is to find a consistent estimator of the model parameters which ignores the samples whose output variables are noisy. In contrast, in our work, we do not assume any noise model for the output variables but rather a human error per sample and find a estimator of the model parameters that outsources some of the samples to humans.

Our work contributes to an extensive body of work on human-machine collaboration [18, 19, 21, 24, 30, 33, 35, 36, 38, 51, 53]. However, rather than developing algorithms that learn to distribute decisions between humans and machines, previous work has predominantly considered settings in which the machine and the human interact with each other.

Finally, our work also relates to a recent line of work that combines deep reinforcement learning with opponent modeling to robustly switch between multiple machine policies [13, 55]. However, this line of work focuses on reinforcement learning, rather than supervised learning, and does not consider the existence of a human policy.

3 Problem Formulation

In this section, we formally state the problem of ridge regression under human assistance, where some of the predictions can be outsourced to humans.

Given a set of training samples $\{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)\}_{i \in \mathcal{V}}$ and a human error per sample $c(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)$, we can outsource a subset $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ of the training samples to humans, with $|\mathcal{S}| \leq n$. Then, ridge regression under human assistance seeks to minimize the overall training error, including the outsourced samples, *i.e.*,

$$\underset{\mathbf{w}, \mathcal{S}}{\text{minimize}} \quad \ell(\mathbf{w}, \mathcal{S}) \text{ subject to } |\mathcal{S}| \leq n, \quad (1)$$

with

$$\ell(\mathbf{w}, \mathcal{S}) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} c(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) + \sum_{j \in \mathcal{S}^c} [(y_j - \mathbf{x}_j^\top \mathbf{w})^2 + \lambda \|\mathbf{w}\|_2^2],$$

where the first term accounts for the human error, the second term accounts the machine error, and λ is a given regularization parameter for the machine.

Moreover, if we define $\mathbf{y} = [y_1, y_2, \dots, y_N]^\top$ and $\mathbf{X} = [\mathbf{x}_1, \mathbf{x}_2, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N]$, we can rewrite the above objective function as

$$\ell(\mathbf{w}, \mathcal{S}) = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} c(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) + (\mathbf{y}_{\mathcal{S}^c} - \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{S}^c}^\top \mathbf{w})^\top (\mathbf{y}_{\mathcal{S}^c} - \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{S}^c}^\top \mathbf{w}) + \lambda \|\mathbf{w}\|_2^2 \cdot |\mathcal{S}^c|,$$

where $\mathbf{y}_{\mathcal{S}^c}$ is the subvector of \mathbf{y} indexed by \mathcal{S}^c and $\mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{S}^c}$ is the submatrix formed by columns of \mathbf{X} that are indexed by \mathcal{S}^c . Then, whenever $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{V}$, it readily follows that the optimal parameter $\mathbf{w}^* = \mathbf{w}^*(\mathcal{S})$ is given by

$$\mathbf{w}^*(\mathcal{S}) = (\lambda |\mathcal{S}^c| \mathbb{I} + \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{S}^c} \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{S}^c}^\top)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{S}^c} \mathbf{y}_{\mathcal{S}^c}.$$

If we plug in the above equation into Eq. 1, we can rewrite the ridge regression problem under human assistance as a set function maximization problem, *i.e.*,

$$\underset{\mathcal{S}}{\text{maximize}} \quad -\log \ell(\mathbf{w}^*(\mathcal{S}), \mathcal{S}) \text{ subject to } |\mathcal{S}| \leq n, \quad (2)$$

where

$$\ell(\mathbf{w}^*(\mathcal{S}), \mathcal{S}) = \begin{cases} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} c(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) + \mathbf{y}_{\mathcal{S}^c}^\top \mathbf{y}_{\mathcal{S}^c} - \mathbf{y}_{\mathcal{S}^c}^\top \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{S}^c}^\top (\lambda |\mathcal{S}^c| \mathbb{I} + \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{S}^c} \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{S}^c}^\top)^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{S}^c} \mathbf{y}_{\mathcal{S}^c} & \text{if } \mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{V}, \\ \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} c(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) & \text{if } \mathcal{S} = \mathcal{V}. \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

Unfortunately, due to its combinatorial nature, the above problem formulation is difficult to solve, as formalized by the following Theorem:

Theorem 1 *The problem of ridge regression under human assistance defined in Eq. 1 is NP-hard.*

Proof Consider a particular instance of the problem with $c(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) = 0$ for all $i \in \mathcal{V}$ and $\lambda = 0$. Moreover, assume the response variables \mathbf{y} are generated as follows:

$$\mathbf{y} = \mathbf{X}^\top \mathbf{w}^* + \mathbf{b}^*, \quad (4)$$

where \mathbf{b}^* is a n -sparse vector which takes non-zero values on at most n corrupted samples, and a zero elsewhere. Then, the problem can be just viewed as a robust least square regression (RLSR) problem [45], *i.e.*,

$$\underset{\mathbf{w}, \mathcal{S}}{\text{minimize}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} (y_i - \mathbf{x}_i^\top \mathbf{w})^2 \quad \text{subject to } |\mathcal{S}| = |\mathcal{V}| - n,$$

which has been shown to be NP-hard [2]. This concludes the proof. \blacksquare

However, in the next section, we will show that, perhaps surprisingly, a simple greedy algorithm enjoys approximation guarantees. In the remainder of the paper, to ease the notation, we will use $\ell(\mathcal{S}) = \ell(\mathbf{w}^*(\mathcal{S}), \mathcal{S})$.

4 An Algorithm With Approximation Guarantees

In this section, we first show that the objective function in Eq. 2 can be represented as a difference of nondecreasing submodular functions. Then, we build on this representation to show that the objective function is nondecreasing and satisfies α -submodularity [15], a recently introduced notion of approximate submodularity. Finally, we present an efficient greedy algorithm that, due to the α -submodularity of the objective function, enjoys approximation guarantees.

4.1 Difference of submodular functions

We first start by rewriting the objective function $\log \ell(\mathcal{S})$ using the following Lemma, which states a well-known property of the Schur complement of a block matrix:

Lemma 2 *Let $\mathbf{Z} = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{A} & \mathbf{B} \\ \mathbf{C} & \mathbf{D} \end{bmatrix}$. If \mathbf{D} is invertible, then $\det(\mathbf{Z}) = \det(\mathbf{D}) \cdot \det(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}\mathbf{D}^{-1}\mathbf{C})$.*

More specifically, consider $\mathbf{A} = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} c(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) + \mathbf{y}_{\mathcal{S}^c}^\top \mathbf{y}_{\mathcal{S}^c}$, $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{C}^\top = \mathbf{y}_{\mathcal{S}^c}^\top \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{S}^c}^\top$ and $\mathbf{D} = \lambda |\mathcal{S}^c| \mathbb{I} + \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{S}^c} \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{S}^c}^\top$ in the above lemma. Then, for $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{V}$, it readily follows that:

$$\log \ell(\mathcal{S}) = f(\mathcal{S}) - g(\mathcal{S}) \quad (5)$$

where

$$f(\mathcal{S}) = \log \det \begin{bmatrix} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} c(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) + \mathbf{y}_{\mathcal{S}^c}^\top \mathbf{y}_{\mathcal{S}^c} & \mathbf{y}_{\mathcal{S}^c}^\top \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{S}^c}^\top \\ \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{S}^c} \mathbf{y}_{\mathcal{S}^c} & \lambda |\mathcal{S}^c| \mathbb{I} + \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{S}^c} \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{S}^c}^\top \end{bmatrix}$$

$$g(\mathcal{S}) = \log \det [\lambda |\mathcal{S}^c| \mathbb{I} + \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{S}^c} \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{S}^c}^\top].$$

In the above, note that, for $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{V}$, the functions f and g are not defined. As it will become clearer later, for $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{V}$, it will be useful to define their values as follows:

$$f(\mathcal{V}) = \min_{k_1, k_2 \in \mathcal{V}} \left\{ f(\mathcal{V} \setminus k_1) + f(\mathcal{V} \setminus k_2) - f(\mathcal{V} \setminus \{k_1, k_2\}) g(\mathcal{V} \setminus k_1) + g(\mathcal{V} \setminus k_2) - g(\mathcal{V} \setminus \{k_1, k_2\}) \right. \\ \left. + \log \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} c(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) \right\},$$

$$g(\mathcal{V}) = f(\mathcal{V}) - \log \sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} c(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i),$$

where note that these values also satisfy Eq. 5. Next, we show that, under mild technical conditions, the above functions are nonincreasing and satisfy a natural diminishing property called submodularity².

Theorem 3 *Assume $c(\mathbf{x}_k, y_k) \leq \gamma y_k^2$ and $\lambda \geq \frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} \max_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2^2$ with $0 \leq \gamma < 1$, then, f and g are nonincreasing and submodular.*

Proof We start by showing that f is submodular, *i.e.*, $f(\mathcal{S} \cup k) - f(\mathcal{S}) \geq f(\mathcal{T} \cup k) - f(\mathcal{T})$ for all $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{V}$ and $k \in \mathcal{V}$. First, define

$$\mathbf{M}(\mathcal{S}) = \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{y}_{\mathcal{S}^c}^\top \mathbf{y}_{\mathcal{S}^c} + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} c(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) & \mathbf{y}_{\mathcal{S}^c}^\top \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{S}^c}^\top \\ \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{S}^c} \mathbf{y}_{\mathcal{S}^c} & \lambda |\mathcal{S}^c| \mathbb{I} + \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{S}^c} \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{S}^c}^\top \end{bmatrix}.$$

and observe that

$$\mathbf{M}(\mathcal{S} \cup k) = \mathbf{M}(\mathcal{S}) - \begin{bmatrix} y_k^2 - c(\mathbf{x}_k, y_k) & y_k \mathbf{x}_k^\top \\ \mathbf{x}_k y_k & \lambda \mathbb{I} + \mathbf{x}_k \mathbf{x}_k^\top \end{bmatrix}$$

Then, it follows from Proposition 11 (refer to Appendix A) that $\mathbf{M}(\mathcal{S}) - \mathbf{M}(\mathcal{S} \cup k) \succcurlyeq 0$. Hence, we have a Cholesky decomposition $\mathbf{M}(\mathcal{S}) - \mathbf{M}(\mathcal{S} \cup k) = \mathbf{Q}_k \mathbf{Q}_k^\top$. Similarly, we have that $\mathbf{M}(\mathcal{T} \cup k) = \mathbf{M}(\mathcal{T}) - \mathbf{Q}_k \mathbf{Q}_k^\top$, and hence

$$\mathbf{M}(\mathcal{T}) = \mathbf{M}(\mathcal{S}) - \sum_{i \in \mathcal{T} \setminus \mathcal{S}} \mathbf{Q}_i \mathbf{Q}_i^\top \quad (6)$$

Now, for $\mathcal{T} \cup k \subset \mathcal{V}$, a few steps of calculation shows that: $f(\mathcal{S} \cup k) - f(\mathcal{S}) - f(\mathcal{T} \cup k) + f(\mathcal{T})$ equals to

$$\log \frac{\det(\mathbb{I} - \mathbf{Q}_k^\top \mathbf{M}^{-1}(\mathcal{S}) \mathbf{Q}_k)}{\det(\mathbb{I} - \mathbf{Q}_k^\top \mathbf{M}^{-1}(\mathcal{T}) \mathbf{Q}_k)}$$

Moreover, Eq. 6 indicates that $\mathbf{M}(\mathcal{S}) \succcurlyeq \mathbf{M}(\mathcal{T}) \succcurlyeq 0$. Therefore, $\mathbf{M}^{-1}(\mathcal{T}) \succcurlyeq \mathbf{M}^{-1}(\mathcal{S})$ and hence

$$\mathbb{I} - \mathbf{Q}_k^\top \mathbf{M}^{-1}(\mathcal{S}) \mathbf{Q}_k \succcurlyeq \mathbb{I} - \mathbf{Q}_k^\top \mathbf{M}^{-1}(\mathcal{T}) \mathbf{Q}_k.$$

In addition, we also note that $\mathbf{M}(\mathcal{T}) - \mathbf{Q}_k \mathbf{Q}_k^\top \succcurlyeq 0$. This, together with Lemma 2, we have that $\mathbb{I} - \mathbf{Q}_k^\top \mathbf{M}^{-1}(\mathcal{T}) \mathbf{Q}_k \succcurlyeq 0$. Hence, due to Proposition 12 (refer to Appendix A), we have

$$\det(\mathbb{I} - \mathbf{Q}_k^\top \mathbf{M}^{-1}(\mathcal{S}) \mathbf{Q}_k) \geq \det(\mathbb{I} - \mathbf{Q}_k^\top \mathbf{M}^{-1}(\mathcal{T}) \mathbf{Q}_k).$$

Finally, for $\mathcal{T} \cup k = \mathcal{V}$, we have that

$$f(\mathcal{S} \cup k_1) - f(\mathcal{S}) \geq f(\mathcal{V} \setminus k_2) - f(\mathcal{V} \setminus \{k_1, k_2\}) \geq f(\mathcal{V}) - f(\mathcal{V} \setminus \{k_1\}), \quad (7)$$

where the first inequality follows from the proof of submodularity for $\mathcal{T} \cup k \subset \mathcal{V}$ and the second inequality comes from the definition of $f(\mathcal{S})$ for $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{V}$. This concludes the proof of submodularity of f .

Next, we show that f is nonincreasing. First, recall that, for $|\mathcal{S}| < |\mathcal{V}| - 1$, we have that

$$f(\mathcal{S} \cup k) - f(\mathcal{S}) = \log \frac{\det(\mathbf{M}(\mathcal{S}) - \mathbf{Q}_k \mathbf{Q}_k^\top)}{\det(\mathbf{M}(\mathcal{S}))} \quad (8)$$

Then, note that $\mathbf{M}(\mathcal{S}) - \mathbf{Q}_k \mathbf{Q}_k^\top \preccurlyeq \mathbf{M}(\mathcal{S})$ and $\mathbf{M}(\mathcal{S}) - \mathbf{Q}_k \mathbf{Q}_k^\top \succcurlyeq \mathbf{0}$. Hence, using Proposition 12 (refer to Appendix A), it follows that

$$\det(\mathbf{M}(\mathcal{S}) - \mathbf{Q}_k \mathbf{Q}_k^\top) \leq \det(\mathbf{M}(\mathcal{S})),$$

which proves f is nonincreasing for $|\mathcal{S}| < |\mathcal{V}| - 1$. Finally, for $|\mathcal{S}| = |\mathcal{V}| - 1$, it readily follows from Eq. 7 that

$$f(\mathcal{V}) - f(\mathcal{V} \setminus \{k_1\}) \leq f(\mathcal{V} \setminus k_2) - f(\mathcal{V} \setminus \{k_1, k_2\}) \quad (9)$$

²A set function $f(\cdot)$ is submodular iff it satisfies that $f(\mathcal{S} \cup \{k\}) - f(\mathcal{S}) \geq f(\mathcal{T} \cup \{k\}) - f(\mathcal{T})$ for all $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{T} \subset \mathcal{V}$ and $k \in \mathcal{V}$, where \mathcal{V} is the ground set.

Now $f(\mathcal{V} \setminus k_2) - f(\mathcal{V} \setminus \{k_1, k_2\}) \leq 0$ since we have proved that $f(\mathcal{S})$ is nonincreasing for $|\mathcal{S}| < |\mathcal{V}| - 1$. This concludes the proof of monotonicity of f .

Proceeding similarly, it can be proven that g is also nondecreasing and submodular. \blacksquare

We would like to highlight that, in the above, the technical conditions have a natural interpretation. More specifically, the first condition is satisfied if the human error is not greater than a fraction $\sqrt{\gamma}$ of the true response variable and the second condition is satisfied if the regularization parameter is not *too small*.

In our experiments, the above result will enable us to use a series of recent heuristic iterative algorithms for maximizing the difference of submodular functions [28] as baselines. However, these algorithms do not enjoy approximation guarantees—they only guarantee to monotonically reduce the objective function at every step.

4.2 Monotonicity

We first start by analyzing the monotonicity of $\log \ell(\mathcal{S})$ whenever $\mathcal{S} = \mathcal{V} \setminus k$, for any $k \in \mathcal{V}$ in the following Lemma:

Lemma 4 *Assume $c(\mathbf{x}_k, y_k) < \gamma y_k^2$ and $\lambda > \frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} \max_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2^2$ with $0 \leq \gamma < 1$. Then, it holds that $\log \ell(\mathcal{V}) - \log \ell(\mathcal{V} \setminus k) < 0$ for all $k \in \mathcal{V}$.*

Proof By definition, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(\mathbf{w}^*(\mathcal{V}), \mathcal{V}) &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} c(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) + c(\mathbf{x}_k, y_k) \\ \ell(\mathbf{w}^*(\mathcal{V} \setminus k), \mathcal{V} \setminus k) &= y_k^2 - y_k^2 \mathbf{x}_k^\top (\lambda \mathbb{I} + \mathbf{x}_k \mathbf{x}_k^\top)^{-1} \mathbf{x}_k + \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} c(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, note that it is enough to prove that $\ell(\mathbf{w}^*(\mathcal{V}), \mathcal{V}) - \ell(\mathcal{V} \setminus k, \mathcal{V} \setminus k) < 0$, without the logarithms, to prove the result. Then, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(\mathbf{w}^*(\mathcal{V}), \mathcal{V}) - \ell(\mathcal{V} \setminus k, \mathcal{V} \setminus k) &= c(\mathbf{x}_k, y_k) - y_k^2 + y_k^2 \mathbf{x}_k^\top (\lambda \mathbb{I} + \mathbf{x}_k \mathbf{x}_k^\top)^{-1} \mathbf{x}_k \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} c(\mathbf{x}_k, y_k) - y_k^2 + y_k^2 \mathbf{x}_k^\top \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} \mathbb{I} - \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \frac{\mathbf{x}_k \mathbf{x}_k^\top}{1 + \frac{\mathbf{x}_k^\top \mathbf{x}_k}{\lambda}} \right) \mathbf{x}_k \\ &= c(\mathbf{x}_k, y_k) - y_k^2 + y_k^2 \frac{\mathbf{x}_k^\top \mathbf{x}_k}{\lambda} \left(1 - \frac{\mathbf{x}_k^\top \mathbf{x}_k}{\lambda + \mathbf{x}_k^\top \mathbf{x}_k} \right) \\ &= c(\mathbf{x}_k, y_k) - y_k^2 + y_k^2 \frac{\mathbf{x}_k^\top \mathbf{x}_k}{\lambda + \mathbf{x}_k^\top \mathbf{x}_k} \\ &< y_k^2 \left(\frac{\mathbf{x}_k^\top \mathbf{x}_k}{\lambda + \mathbf{x}_k^\top \mathbf{x}_k} - (1 - \gamma) \right) \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{<} y_k^2 \left(\frac{\mathbf{x}_k^\top \mathbf{x}_k}{\frac{\gamma \mathbf{x}_k^\top \mathbf{x}_k}{1-\gamma} + \mathbf{x}_k^\top \mathbf{x}_k} - (1 - \gamma) \right) \\ &= 0, \end{aligned}$$

where equality (a) follows from Lemma 13 (refer to Appendix A) and inequality (b) follows from the lower bound on λ . \blacksquare

Then, building on the above lemma, we have the following Theorem, which shows that $\log \ell(\mathcal{S})$ is a strictly nonincreasing function:

Theorem 5 *Assume $c(\mathbf{x}_k, y_k) < \gamma y_k^2$ and $\lambda > \frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} \max_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2^2$ with $0 \leq \gamma < 1$, then, the function $\log \ell(\mathcal{S})$ is strictly nonincreasing, i.e.,*

$$\log \ell(\mathcal{S} \cup k) - \log \ell(\mathcal{S}) < 0$$

for all $\mathcal{S} \in \mathcal{V}$ and $k \in \mathcal{V}$.

Proof Define $\mathbf{\Lambda}_0 = \lambda|\mathcal{S}^c|\mathbb{I} + \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{S}^c}\mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{S}^c}^\top$, $\mathbf{\Lambda}_1 = \lambda|\mathcal{S}^c|\mathbb{I} + \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{S}^c}\mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{S}^c}^\top - \lambda\mathbb{I} - \mathbf{x}_k\mathbf{x}_k^\top$ and $\mathbf{\Theta} = \lambda\mathbb{I} + \mathbf{x}_k\mathbf{x}_k^\top$. Moreover, note that

$$\mathbf{\Lambda}_1 = \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 - \mathbf{\Theta} \text{ and } \mathbf{\Lambda}_1^{-1} \stackrel{(a)}{=} \mathbf{\Lambda}_0^{-1} + \underbrace{(\mathbf{\Lambda}_0\mathbf{\Theta}^{-1}\mathbf{\Lambda}_0 - \mathbf{\Lambda}_0)^{-1}}_{\text{Define as } \mathbf{\Omega}}$$

where equality (a) follows from Proposition 14 (refer to Appendix A). Then, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(\mathcal{S} \cup k) &= \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} c(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) + c(\mathbf{x}_k, y_k) + \mathbf{y}_{\mathcal{S}^c}^\top \mathbf{y}_{\mathcal{S}^c} - y_k^2 - (\mathbf{y}_{\mathcal{S}^c}^\top \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{S}^c}^\top - y_k \mathbf{x}_k^\top) \mathbf{\Lambda}_1^{-1} (\mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{S}^c} \mathbf{y}_{\mathcal{S}^c} - y_k \mathbf{x}_k) \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} c(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) + c(\mathbf{x}_k, y_k) + \mathbf{y}_{\mathcal{S}^c}^\top \mathbf{y}_{\mathcal{S}^c} - y_k^2 - \mathbf{y}_{\mathcal{S}^c}^\top \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{S}^c}^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_0^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{S}^c} \mathbf{y}_{\mathcal{S}^c} - \mathbf{y}_{\mathcal{S}^c}^\top \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{S}^c}^\top \mathbf{\Omega}^{-1} \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{S}^c} \mathbf{y}_{\mathcal{S}^c} \\ &\quad + 2y_k \mathbf{y}_{\mathcal{S}^c}^\top \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{S}^c}^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_1^{-1} \mathbf{x}_k^\top - y_k^2 \mathbf{x}_k^\top \mathbf{\Lambda}_1^{-1} \mathbf{x}_k \\ &= \ell(\mathcal{S}) + c(\mathbf{x}_k, y_k) - y_k^2 - \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{y}_{\mathcal{S}^c}^\top \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{S}^c}^\top & y_k \mathbf{x}_k^\top \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{\Omega}^{-1} & -\mathbf{\Lambda}_1^{-1} \\ -\mathbf{\Lambda}_1^{-1} & \mathbf{\Lambda}_1^{-1} \mathbf{\Omega} \mathbf{\Lambda}_1^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{X}_{\mathcal{S}^c} \mathbf{y}_{\mathcal{S}^c} \\ y_k \mathbf{x}_k \end{bmatrix} \\ &\quad - y_k^2 \mathbf{x}_k^\top (\mathbf{\Lambda}_1^{-1} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_1^{-1} \mathbf{\Omega} \mathbf{\Lambda}_1^{-1}) \mathbf{x}_k, \end{aligned}$$

where equality (a) follows from Proposition 14 (refer to Appendix A). Finally, we can upper bound the right hand side of the above equation as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \ell(\mathcal{S} \cup k) &\stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \ell(\mathcal{S}) + c(\mathbf{x}_k, y_k) - y_k^2 - y_k^2 \mathbf{x}_k^\top (\mathbf{\Lambda}_1^{-1} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_1^{-1} \mathbf{\Omega} \mathbf{\Lambda}_1^{-1}) \mathbf{x}_k \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} \ell(\mathcal{S}) + c(\mathbf{x}_k, y_k) - y_k^2 + y_k^2 \mathbf{x}_k^\top (\lambda \mathbb{I} + \mathbf{x}_k \mathbf{x}_k^\top)^{-1} \mathbf{x}_k \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{=} \ell(\mathcal{S}) + \ell(\mathcal{V}) - \ell(\mathcal{V} \setminus k), \end{aligned}$$

where inequality (a) uses that $\begin{bmatrix} \mathbf{\Omega}^{-1} & -\mathbf{\Lambda}_1^{-1} \\ -\mathbf{\Lambda}_1^{-1} & \mathbf{\Lambda}_1^{-1} \mathbf{\Omega} \mathbf{\Lambda}_1^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \succcurlyeq 0$, equality (b) follows from the following observation:

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathbf{\Lambda}_1^{-1} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_1^{-1} \mathbf{\Omega} \mathbf{\Lambda}_1^{-1}) &= (\mathbf{\Lambda}_0^{-1} + \mathbf{\Omega}^{-1}) - (\mathbf{\Lambda}_0^{-1} + \mathbf{\Omega}^{-1}) \mathbf{\Omega} (\mathbf{\Lambda}_0^{-1} + \mathbf{\Omega}^{-1}) = -\mathbf{\Lambda}_0^{-1} \mathbf{\Omega} \mathbf{\Lambda}_0^{-1} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_0^{-1} \\ &= -\mathbf{\Lambda}_0^{-1} (\mathbf{\Lambda}_0 \mathbf{\Theta}^{-1} \mathbf{\Lambda}_0 - \mathbf{\Lambda}_0) \mathbf{\Lambda}_0^{-1} - \mathbf{\Lambda}_0^{-1} = -\mathbf{\Theta}^{-1}, \end{aligned}$$

and inequality (c) follows from Lemma 4. ■

Finally, note that the above result does *not* imply that the human error $c(\mathbf{x}_k, y_k)$ is always smaller than the machine error $(y_k - \mathbf{x}_k^\top \mathbf{w}^*(k))^2$, where $\mathbf{w}^*(k)$ is optimal parameter for $\mathcal{S} = \{k\}$, as formalized by the following Proposition:

Proposition 6 Assume $\rho^2 y_k^2 < c(\mathbf{x}_k, y_k) < \gamma y_k^2$ and $\frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} \max_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2^2 < \lambda < \frac{\rho}{1-\rho} \max_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2^2$ with $\gamma < \rho < \sqrt{\gamma}$ and $0 \leq \gamma < 1$, then, it holds that

$$c(\mathbf{x}_k, y_k) > (y_k - \mathbf{x}_k^\top \mathbf{w}^*(k))^2.$$

Proof First, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} (y_k - \mathbf{x}_k^\top \mathbf{w}^*(k))^2 &= (y_k - \mathbf{x}_k^\top \mathbf{w}^*(k))^2 + \lambda \|\mathbf{w}^*(k)\|^2 - \lambda \|\mathbf{w}^*(k)\|^2 \\ &= y_k^2 - y_k^2 \mathbf{x}_k^\top (\lambda \mathbb{I} + \mathbf{x}_k \mathbf{x}_k^\top)^{-1} \mathbf{x}_k - \lambda y_k^2 \mathbf{x}_k^\top (\lambda \mathbb{I} + \mathbf{x}_k \mathbf{x}_k^\top)^{-2} \mathbf{x}_k \\ &= y_k^2 - y_k^2 \frac{\mathbf{x}_k^\top \mathbf{x}_k}{\lambda + \mathbf{x}_k^\top \mathbf{x}_k} - \lambda y_k^2 \mathbf{x}_k^\top (\lambda \mathbb{I} + \mathbf{x}_k \mathbf{x}_k^\top)^{-2} \mathbf{x}_k \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \frac{\lambda y_k^2}{\lambda + \mathbf{x}_k^\top \mathbf{x}_k} - \lambda y_k^2 \mathbf{x}_k^\top \left(\frac{1}{\lambda} \mathbb{I} - \frac{1}{\lambda^2} \frac{\mathbf{x}_k \mathbf{x}_k^\top}{1 + \frac{\mathbf{x}_k^\top \mathbf{x}_k}{\lambda}} \right)^2 \mathbf{x}_k \\ &= \frac{\lambda y_k^2}{\lambda + \mathbf{x}_k^\top \mathbf{x}_k} - \frac{y_k^2}{\lambda} \mathbf{x}_k^\top \left(\mathbb{I} - \frac{\mathbf{x}_k \mathbf{x}_k^\top}{\lambda + \mathbf{x}_k^\top \mathbf{x}_k} \right)^2 \mathbf{x}_k \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{\lambda y_k^2}{\lambda + \mathbf{x}_k^\top \mathbf{x}_k} - \frac{y_k^2}{\lambda} \mathbf{x}_k^\top \left(\mathbb{I} - 2 \frac{\mathbf{x}_k \mathbf{x}_k^\top}{\lambda + \mathbf{x}_k^\top \mathbf{x}_k} + \frac{\mathbf{x}_k \mathbf{x}_k^\top \mathbf{x}_k \mathbf{x}_k^\top}{(\lambda + \mathbf{x}_k^\top \mathbf{x}_k)^2} \right) \mathbf{x}_k \\
&= \frac{\lambda y_k^2}{\lambda + \mathbf{x}_k^\top \mathbf{x}_k} - \frac{y_k^2}{\lambda} \mathbf{x}_k^\top \mathbf{x}_k \left(1 - 2 \frac{\mathbf{x}_k^\top \mathbf{x}_k}{\lambda + \mathbf{x}_k^\top \mathbf{x}_k} + \left(\frac{\mathbf{x}_k^\top \mathbf{x}_k}{\lambda + \mathbf{x}_k^\top \mathbf{x}_k} \right)^2 \right) \\
&= \frac{\lambda y_k^2}{\lambda + \mathbf{x}_k^\top \mathbf{x}_k} - \frac{y_k^2 \lambda \mathbf{x}_k^\top \mathbf{x}_k}{(\lambda + \mathbf{x}_k^\top \mathbf{x}_k)^2} = y_k^2 \left(\frac{\lambda}{\lambda + \mathbf{x}_k^\top \mathbf{x}_k} \right)^2 \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \rho^2 y_k^2,
\end{aligned}$$

where equality (a) follows from Lemma 13 (refer to Appendix A) and inequality (b) follows from the assumption $\lambda \leq \frac{\rho}{1-\rho} \max_i \|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2^2$. Then, since $c(\mathbf{x}_k, y_k) > \rho^2 y_k^2$, we can conclude that $c(\mathbf{x}_k, y_k) > (y_k - \mathbf{x}_k^\top \mathbf{w}^*(k))^2$. ■

4.3 α -submodularity

Given the above results, we are now ready to present and prove our main result, which characterizes the objective function of the optimization problem defined in Eq. 2:

Theorem 7 Assume $c(\mathbf{x}_k, y_k) < \gamma y_k^2$, $\lambda > \frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} \max_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \|\mathbf{x}_i\|_2^2$ with $0 \leq \gamma < 1$, and $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} c(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) \geq 1^3$. Then, the function $-\log \ell(\mathcal{S})$ is a nondecreasing α -submodular function⁴ and the parameter α satisfies that

$$\begin{aligned}
\alpha \leq \alpha^* = 1 - \min \left\{ \frac{(1 - \kappa_\ell) \log \ell(\mathcal{V})}{\max_{k_1, k_2} f(\mathcal{V} \setminus \{k_1, k_2\}) - f(\mathcal{V} \setminus \{k_1\})}, \frac{(1 - \kappa_\ell) \log \ell(\mathcal{V})}{\max_k \log \ell(\mathcal{V} \setminus k) - \log \ell(\mathcal{V})} \right\} \quad (10) \\
\text{with, } \kappa_\ell = \frac{\log [\ell(\emptyset) - \min_k (\ell(\mathcal{V} \setminus k) - \ell(\mathcal{V}))]}{\log \ell(\emptyset)}
\end{aligned}$$

Proof Using that $\sum_{i \in \mathcal{V}} c(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i) > 1$ and the function ℓ is nonincreasing, we can conclude that $1 < \ell(\mathcal{V}) < \ell(\mathcal{S})$. Then, it readily follows from the proof of Theorem 5 that

$$1 < \ell(\mathcal{S} \cup k) < \ell(\mathcal{S}) - (\ell(\mathcal{V} \setminus k) - \ell(\mathcal{V})) \quad (11)$$

Hence we have,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\log \ell(\mathcal{S} \cup k)}{\log \ell(\mathcal{S})} &\leq \frac{\log \left(\ell(\mathcal{S}) - (\ell(\mathcal{V} \setminus k) - \ell(\mathcal{V})) \right)}{\log \ell(\mathcal{S})} \stackrel{(a)}{\leq} \frac{\log \left(\ell_{\max} - (\ell(\mathcal{V} \setminus k) - \ell(\mathcal{V})) \right)}{\log \ell(\mathcal{S})} \Bigg|_{\mathcal{S}^* = \arg \max_{\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{V}} \ell(\mathcal{S})} \\
&\stackrel{(b)}{\leq} \frac{\log \left(\ell(\emptyset) - (\ell(\mathcal{V} \setminus k) - \ell(\mathcal{V})) \right)}{\log \ell(\emptyset)} \leq \kappa_\ell \quad (12)
\end{aligned}$$

where inequality (a) follows from Proposition 15 (refer to Appendix A) and equality (b) follows from Theorem 5, which implies that $\ell_{\max} = \ell(\emptyset)$. Then, we have that

$$\begin{aligned}
1 - \alpha &= \min_{k, \mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{V}} \frac{\log \ell(\mathcal{S}) - \log \ell(\mathcal{S} \cup k)}{\log \ell(\mathcal{T}) - \log \ell(\mathcal{T} \cup k)} \\
&\geq \min \left\{ \min_{k, \mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{T}: |\mathcal{T}| \leq |\mathcal{V}| - 2} \frac{\log \ell(\mathcal{S}) - \log \ell(\mathcal{S} \cup k)}{\log \ell(\mathcal{T}) - \log \ell(\mathcal{T} \cup k)}, \min_{\mathcal{S}, k} \frac{\log \ell(\mathcal{S}) - \log \ell(\mathcal{S} \cup k)}{\log \ell(\mathcal{V} \setminus k) - \log \ell(\mathcal{V})} \right\} \quad (13)
\end{aligned}$$

³Note that we can always rescale the data to satisfy this last condition.

⁴A function $f(\cdot)$ is α -submodular [15] iff it satisfies that $f(\mathcal{S} \cup \{k\}) - f(\mathcal{S}) \geq (1 - \alpha) [f(\mathcal{T} \cup \{k\}) - f(\mathcal{T})]$ for all $\mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{T} \subseteq \mathcal{V}$ and $k \in \mathcal{V}$, where \mathcal{V} is the ground set and α is the generalized curvature [3, 23, 31].

Algorithm 1 Greedy algorithm

Input: Ground set \mathcal{V} , set of training samples $\{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)\}_{i \in \mathcal{V}}$, parameters n and λ .

Output: Solution $(\mathbf{w}^*(\mathcal{S}), \mathcal{S})$

```
1:  $\mathcal{S} \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
2: while  $|\mathcal{S}| < n$  do
3:   % Find best sample
4:    $k^* \leftarrow \operatorname{argmax}_{k \in \mathcal{V} \setminus \mathcal{S}} -\log \ell(\mathcal{S} \cup k) + \log \ell(\mathcal{S})$ 
5:   % Sample is outsourced to humans
6:    $\mathcal{S} \leftarrow \mathcal{S} \cup \{k^*\}$ 
7: end while
8: return  $(\mathbf{w}^*(\mathcal{S}), \mathcal{S})$ 
```

Next, we bound the first term as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{k, \mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{T}: |\mathcal{T}| \leq |\mathcal{V}| - 2} \frac{\log \ell(\mathcal{S}) - \log \ell(\mathcal{S} \cup k)}{\log \ell(\mathcal{T}) - \log \ell(\mathcal{T} \cup k)} &\stackrel{(a)}{\geq} \min_{k, \mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{T}: |\mathcal{T}| \leq |\mathcal{V}| - 2} \frac{(1 - \kappa_\ell) \log \ell(\mathcal{S})}{\log \ell(\mathcal{T}) - \log \ell(\mathcal{T} \cup k)} \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{\geq} \min_{k, |\mathcal{T}| \leq |\mathcal{V}| - 2} \frac{(1 - \kappa_\ell) \log \ell(\mathcal{V})}{\log \ell(\mathcal{T}) - \log \ell(\mathcal{T} \cup k)} \\ &= \min_{k, |\mathcal{T}| \leq |\mathcal{V}| - 2} \frac{(1 - \kappa_\ell) \log \ell(\mathcal{V})}{f(\mathcal{T}) - f(\mathcal{T} \cup k) - (g(\mathcal{T}) - g(\mathcal{T} \cup k))} \\ &\stackrel{(c)}{\geq} \min_{k, |\mathcal{T}| \leq |\mathcal{V}| - 2} \frac{(1 - \kappa_\ell) \log \ell(\mathcal{V})}{f(\mathcal{T}) - f(\mathcal{T} \cup k)} \\ &\stackrel{(d)}{\geq} \frac{(1 - \kappa_l) \log \ell(\mathcal{V})}{\max_{k_1, k_2} (f(\mathcal{V} \setminus \{k_1, k_2\}) - f(\mathcal{V} \setminus k_1))}, \end{aligned}$$

where inequality (a) follows from Eq. 12, inequality (b) follows from the monotonicity of $\log \ell(\mathcal{S})$, and inequalities (c) and (d) follows from Theorem 3. Finally, we use the monotonicity of $\log \ell(\mathcal{S})$ and Eq. 12 to bound the second term in Eq. 13 as follows:

$$\min_{\mathcal{S}, k} \frac{\log \ell(\mathcal{S}) - \log \ell(\mathcal{S} \cup k)}{\log \ell(\mathcal{V} \setminus k) - \log \ell(\mathcal{V})} \geq \frac{(1 - \kappa_\ell) \log \ell(\mathcal{V})}{\max_k \log \ell(\mathcal{V} \setminus k) - \log \ell(\mathcal{V})},$$

which concludes the proof. \blacksquare

4.4 A greedy algorithm

The greedy algorithm proceeds iteratively and, at each step, it assigns to the humans the sample (\mathbf{x}_k, y_k) that provides the highest marginal gain among the set of samples which are currently assigned to the machine. Algorithm 1 summarizes the greedy algorithm.

Since the objective function in Eq. 2 is α -submodular, it readily follows from Theorem 9 in Gattmiry and Gomez-Rodriguez [15] that the above greedy algorithm enjoys an approximation guarantee. More specifically, we have the following Theorem:

Theorem 8 *The greedy algorithm returns a set \mathcal{S} such that $-\log \ell(\mathcal{S}) \geq (1 + 1/(1 - \alpha))^{-1} OPT$, where OPT is the optimal value and $\alpha \leq \alpha^*$ with α^* defined in Eq. 10.*

In the above, note that, due to Theorem 5, the actual (regularized) loss function is strictly nonincreasing and thus the greedy algorithm always goes until $|\mathcal{S}| = n$, however, the overall accuracy may be higher for some values of $|\mathcal{S}| < n$ as shown in Figure 7. Next, we provide a formal analysis of the time complexity of Algorithm 1 in our particular problem setting.

Proposition 9 *The computational cost of Algorithm 1 is $O(nd^2|\mathcal{V}|^2)$, where n is the number of samples*

Algorithm 2 Practical framework for ridge regression under human assistance

Input: Training samples \mathcal{D} , trained model $(\mathbf{w}^*(\mathcal{S}), \mathcal{S})$, and (unlabeled) test samples \mathcal{X} .

Output: Set of predictions \mathcal{D}'

```
1:  $\mathcal{D}' \leftarrow \emptyset$ 
2:  $h_\theta(\mathbf{x}) \leftarrow \text{TRAINCLASSIFIER}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{S})$ 
3: for  $\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{X}$  do
4:   if  $h_\theta(\mathbf{x}) > 0$  then
5:      $\hat{y} \leftarrow \text{OUTSOURCE}(\mathbf{x})$ 
6:   else
7:      $\hat{y} \leftarrow \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{w}^*$ 
8:   end if
9:    $\mathcal{D}' \leftarrow \mathcal{D}' \cup \{(\mathbf{x}, \hat{y})\}$ 
10: end for
11: return  $\mathcal{S}$ 
```

outsourced to humans, d is the dimensionality of the feature vectors \mathbf{x} and $|\mathcal{V}|$ is the number of training samples.

Proof At each step of the n steps of the greedy algorithm, we need to solve $|\mathcal{V}|$ regularized least square problems. Solving each of these problems take each $O(|\mathcal{V}|d^2)$ using Cholesky decomposition. Therefore, the overall complexity of the greedy algorithm is $O(n|\mathcal{V}|^2d^2)$. ■

In the next section, we will demonstrate that, in addition to enjoying the above approximation guarantees, the greedy algorithm performs better in practice than several competitive baselines.

5 Practical Deployment

In practice, to deploy a model $(\mathbf{w}^*(\mathcal{S}), \mathcal{S})$ trained using a dataset $\{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)\}_{i \in \mathcal{V}}$, we need to be able to decide whether to outsource any (unseen) test sample $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{x}_i$ for all $i \in \mathcal{V}$. To this end, we train an additional model $h_\theta(\mathbf{x})$ to decide which samples to outsource to a human using the training set $\{(\mathbf{x}_i, d_i)\}_{i \in \mathcal{V}}$, where $d_i = +1$ if $i \in \mathcal{S}$ and $d_i = -1$ otherwise. In our experiments, we consider three different types of models:

— *Nearest neighbours (NN)*: it outsources a sample \mathbf{x} to a human if the nearest neighbor in the set \mathcal{V} belongs to \mathcal{S} and and pass it on to the machine otherwise, *i.e.*, $h_\theta(\mathbf{x}) = +1$ if $\text{argmin}_{i \in \mathcal{V}} \|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}\| \in \mathcal{S}$ and $h_\theta(\mathbf{x}) = -1$ otherwise.

— *Logistic regression (LR)*: it outsources a sample \mathbf{x} to a human using a logistic regression classifier trained using maximum likelihood, *i.e.*, $h_\theta(\mathbf{x}) = +1$ if $\frac{1}{1+\exp(\theta^T \mathbf{x})} > c$ and $h_\theta(\mathbf{x}) = -1$ otherwise, where $c \in (0, 1)$.

— *Multilayer perceptron (MLP)*: it outsources a sample \mathbf{x} to a human using a multilayer perceptron, *i.e.*, $h_\theta(\mathbf{x}) = +1$ if $f_\theta(\mathbf{x}) > c$ and $h_\theta(\mathbf{x}) = -1$ otherwise, where $f_\theta(\mathbf{x})$ is a multilayer perceptron⁵ and $c \in (0, 1)$.

Algorithm 2 summarizes the above procedure. Within the algorithm, $\text{TRAINCLASSIFIER}(\mathcal{D}, \mathcal{S})$ trains the additional model $h_\theta(\mathbf{x})$ and $\text{OUTSOURCE}(\mathbf{x})$ outsources a sample \mathbf{x} to a human and returns the prediction made by the human. Finally, note that, as long as the feature distribution does not change during test, the above procedure guarantees that the fraction of samples outsourced to humans during training and test time will be similar. More specifically, the following proposition formalizes this result for the case of nearest neighbours:

Proposition 10 *Let $\{(\mathbf{x}_i, y_i)\}_{i \in \mathcal{V}}$ be a set of training samples, $\{\mathbf{x}'_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{V}'}$ a set of (unlabeled) test samples, and n and n' the number of training and test samples outsourced to humans, respectively. If $\mathbf{x}_i, \mathbf{x}_j \sim \mathbb{P}(\mathbf{x})$ for all $i \in \mathcal{V}, j \in \mathcal{V}'$, then, it holds that $\mathbb{E}[n']/|\mathcal{V}'| = n/|\mathcal{V}|$.*

⁵https://scikit-learn.org/stable/modules/generated/sklearn.neural_network.MLPClassifier.html.




Figure 1: Solution $(\mathbf{w}^*(\mathcal{S}^*), \mathcal{S}^*)$ provided by our greedy algorithm for a gaussian and logistic response variable distribution and different number of outsourced samples n . In all cases, we used $d = 1$ and $\sigma_2 = 0.001$. For the logistic distribution, as n increases, the greedy algorithm let the machine to focus on the samples where the relationship between features and the response variables is more linear and outsource the remaining points to humans. For the gaussian distribution, as n increases, the greedy algorithm outsources samples on the tails of the distribution to humans.

Proof Let the feature space be \mathcal{F} . Moreover we denote that $\mathcal{X} = \{\mathbf{x}_i\}_{i \in \mathcal{V}}$ and $\mathcal{X}' = \{\mathbf{x}'_j\}_{j \in \mathcal{V}'}$. Then we denote that

$$H_{\mathbf{x}_i} = \cap_{k \in \mathcal{V}} \{\mathbf{x} \in \mathcal{F} \mid \|\mathbf{x}_i - \mathbf{x}\| \leq \|\mathbf{x}_k - \mathbf{x}\|\}. \quad (14)$$

Hence, the set of test samples, which are nearest to \mathbf{x}_i , is denoted as $\mathcal{X}' \cap H_{\mathbf{x}_i}$. Since the features in \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{X}' are i.i.d random variables, $|\mathcal{X}' \cap H_{\mathbf{x}_i}|$ are also i.i.d random variables for different realizations of \mathcal{X} and \mathcal{X}' . Let us define $\vartheta = \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{X}' \cap H_{\mathbf{x}_i}|]$. Hence we have, $\mathbb{E}[n'] = \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} \mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{X}' \cap H_{\mathbf{x}_i}|] = n\vartheta$ and $\mathbb{E}[|\mathcal{V}'| - n'] = (|\mathcal{V}'| - n)\vartheta$, which leads to the required result. ■

6 Experiments on Synthetic Data

In this section, we experiment with a variety of synthetic examples. First, we look into the solution $(\mathbf{w}^*(\mathcal{S}^*), \mathcal{S}^*)$ provided by the greedy algorithm. Then, we compare the performance of the greedy algorithm with several competitive baselines. Finally, we investigate how the performance of the greedy algorithm varies with respect to the amount of human error.

6.1 Experimental setup

For each sample (\mathbf{x}, y) , we first generate each dimension of the feature vector $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ from a uniform distribution, *i.e.*, $x_i \sim U(-a, a)$, where a is a given parameter, and then sample the response variable y from a Gaussian distribution $\mathcal{N}(\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{x}/d, \sigma_1^2)$ or a logistic distribution $1/(1 + \exp(-\mathbf{1}^\top \mathbf{x}/d))$.

Moreover, we sample the associated human error from a Gaussian distribution, *i.e.*, $c(\mathbf{x}, y) \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_2^2)$.




Figure 2: Mean squared error (MSE) against number of outsourced samples n for the proposed greedy algorithm, DS [28], distorted greedy [22], Triage [39] and CRR [2] on synthetic data. In all cases, we used the MLP model $h_{\theta}(\mathbf{x})$, $d = 5$, $\sigma_2 = 10^{-3}$, $\lambda = 5 \cdot 10^{-3}$ and, for clarity, we explicitly highlight the performance under no automation and full automation. The greedy algorithm consistently outperforms the baselines across the entire range of automation levels. For most automation levels, the competitive advantage provided by the greedy algorithm is statistically significant (Welch’s t-test, p -value = 10^{-3}).

In each experiment, we use $|\mathcal{V}| = 400$ training samples and we compare the performance of the greedy algorithm with four competitive baselines on a held-out set of 100 test samples:

- An iterative heuristic algorithm (DS) for maximizing the difference of submodular functions by Iyer and Bilmes [28].
- A greedy algorithm (Distorted greedy) for maximizing γ -weakly submodular functions by Harshaw et al. [22]⁶.
- A natural extension of the algorithm (Triage) by Raghu et al. [39], originally developed for classification under human assistance, which first solve the standard ridge regression problem for the entire training set and then outsources to humans the top n samples sorted in decreasing order of the difference between machine and human error.
- A natural extension of the iterative algorithm for robust least square regression by Bhatia et al. [2], which includes L2 regularization (CRR). Within the algorithm, the $\|\mathbf{b}\|_0 = n$ samples identified as *corrupt* are outsourced to humans.

Moreover, given the solutions provided by the above methods, we independently train three different (additional) models $h_{\theta}(\mathbf{x})$ —nearest neighbors (NN), logistic regression (LR) and multilayer perceptron (MLP)—to decide which samples on the held-out set to outsource to humans. To train the LR and MLP models, we used the python package sklearn. More specifically, for the MLP model, we used the Adam optimizer with learning rate 10^{-3} , set the hidden layer size as 1000 and the number of epochs as 500 and, for the LR model, we used the liblinear solver and set the number of maximum epochs as 100.

6.2 Results

First, we look into the solution $(\mathbf{w}^*(\mathcal{S}^*), \mathcal{S}^*)$ provided by the greedy algorithm both for the Gaussian and logistic distributions and a different number of outsourced samples n . Figure 1 summarizes the results, which reveal several interesting insights. For the logistic distribution, as n increases, the greedy algorithm let the machine to focus on the samples where the relationship between features and the response variables is more linear and outsource the remaining points to humans. For the Gaussian distribution, as n increases, the greedy algorithm outsources samples on the tails of the distribution to humans.

Second, we compare the performance of the greedy algorithm against four competitive baselines in terms of mean squared error (MSE) on a held-out set. Figure 2 summarizes the results, where we use the MLP model

⁶Note that any α -submodular function is γ -weakly submodular [15].




Figure 3: Mean squared error (MSE) achieved by the proposed greedy algorithm against the number of outsourced samples n for different levels of human error (σ_2) on synthetic data. In all cases, we used the MLP model $h_\theta(\mathbf{x})$, $d = 5$ and $\lambda = 5 \cdot 10^{-3}$. For low levels of human error, the overall mean squared error decreases monotonically with respect to the number of outsourced samples. In contrast, for high levels of human error, it is not beneficial to outsource samples to humans.




Figure 4: Mean squared error (MSE) against number of outsourced samples n for the proposed greedy algorithm and three different models $h_\theta(\mathbf{x})$ on synthetic data. In all cases, we used $d = 5$, $\sigma_2 = 10^{-3}$ and $\lambda = 5 \cdot 10^{-3}$. NN and MLP achieve a comparable performance and they beat LR across a majority of automation levels for the Logistic dataset.

$h_\theta(\mathbf{x})$ for all methods. The results show that the greedy algorithm consistently outperforms the baselines for all automation levels and, for most automation levels, the competitive advantage provided by the greedy algorithm is statistically significant (Welch’s t-test, p -value = 10^{-3}). Also, using the greedy algorithm, we find automation levels under which humans and machines working together achieve better performance than machines on their own (Full automation) as well as humans on their own (No automation). We obtained qualitatively similar results using the NN and LR models $h_\theta(\mathbf{x})$ (refer to Appendix B).

Next, we investigate how the performance of our greedy algorithm varies with respect to the amount of human error. Figure 3 summarizes the results, where we again use the MLP model $h_\theta(\mathbf{x})$. The results show that, for low levels of human error, the overall mean squared error decreases monotonically with respect to the number of outsourced samples to humans. In contrast, for high levels of human error, it is not beneficial to outsource samples.

Finally, we compare the performance of the greedy algorithm in terms of mean squared error (MSE) on a held-out set for the above mentioned models $h_\theta(\mathbf{x})$, *i.e.*, nearest neighbors (NN), logistic regression (LR) and multilayer perceptron (MLP). Figure 4 summarizes the results, which show that NN and MLP achieve a comparable performance and they beat LR across a majority of automation levels for the Logistic dataset.




Figure 5: An easy and a difficult sample image from the Stare-D dataset. Both images are given a score of severity zero for the Drusen disease, which is characterized by pathological yellow spots. The easy sample does not contain yellow spots and thus it is easy to predict its score. In contrast, the difficult sample contains yellow spots, which are manifested not from Drusen, but diabetic retinopathy, and thus it is challenging to accurately predict its score. As a result, the greedy algorithm decides to outsource the difficult sample to humans, whereas it lets the machine decide about the easy one.

7 Experiments on Real Data

In this section, we experiment with four real-world datasets from two important applications, medical diagnosis and content moderation. First, we look closely at the samples that our algorithm outsources to humans to better understand to which extent our algorithm has the ability to learn the underlying relationship between a given sample and its corresponding human and machine error. Then, we compare the performance of the greedy algorithm with the same competitive baselines as in the experiments on synthetic data. Finally, we perform a detailed sensitivity analysis that evaluate the robustness of our algorithm with respect to the choice of additional model $h_\theta(\mathbf{x})$ as well as with respect to several hyperparameters used in pre-processing of the four real-world datasets.

7.1 Experimental setup

We experiment with one dataset for content moderation and three datasets for medical diagnosis, which are publicly available [9, 11, 27]. More specifically:

- (i) **Hatespeech:** It consists of ~ 25000 tweets containing words, phrases and lexicons used in hate speech. Each tweet is given several scores by three to five annotators from Crowdfunder, which measure the severity of hate speech.
- (ii) **Stare-H:** It consists of ~ 400 retinal images. Each image is given a score by one single expert, on a five point scale, which measures the severity of a retinal hemorrhage.
- (iii) **Stare-D:** It contains the same set of images from Stare-H. However, in this dataset, each image is given a score by a single expert, on a six point scale, which measures the severity of the Drusen disease.
- (iv) **Messidor:** It contains 400 eye images. Each image is given score by one single expert, on a four point scale, which measures the severity of an edema.

We first generate a $m' = 100$ dimensional feature vector using fasttext [29] for each sample in the Hatespeech dataset, $m' = 1000$ dimensional feature vector using Resnet [25] for each sample in the Stare-H, Stare-D, and a $m' = 4096$ -dimensional feature vector using VGG [44] for each sample in the Messidor dataset. Then, we use the top $m = 50$ features, as identified by PCA, as \mathbf{x} in our experiments. For the image datasets, the response variable y is just the available score by a single expert and the human predictions are sampled from a categorical distribution $s \sim \text{Cat}(\mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{x},y})$, where $\mathbf{p}_{\mathbf{x},y} \sim \text{Dirichlet}(\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\mathbf{x},y})$ are the probabilities of each potential score value s for a sample with features \mathbf{x} and $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\mathbf{x},y}$ is a vector parameter that controls the human accuracy. Here, for each sample (\mathbf{x}, y) , the element of $\boldsymbol{\alpha}_{\mathbf{x},y}$ corresponding to the score $s = y$ has the highest value. For the Hatespeech dataset, the response variable y is the mean of the scores provided by the annotators and




Figure 6: Human and machine error of all training samples on the Hatespeech (first row), Stare-H (second row), Stare-D (third row) and Messidor (third row) datasets for different automation levels. Our algorithm outsources to humans those samples in which the machine error would have been the highest if it had to predict their response variables.

the human predictions are picked uniformly at random from the available individual scores given by each annotator. In each dataset, we compute the human error as $c(\mathbf{x}, y) = \mathbb{E}(y - s)^2$ for each sample (\mathbf{x}, y) and set the same value of λ across all competitive methods. Finally, in each experiment, we use 80% samples for training and 20% samples for testing.

7.2 Results

We first look closely at the samples that our algorithm outsources to humans to better understand to which extent our algorithm has the ability to learn the underlying relationship between a given sample and its corresponding human and machine error. Intuitively, human assistance should be required for those samples which are difficult (easy) for a machine (a human) to decide about. Figure 5 provides an illustrative example of an easy and a difficult sample image. While both sample images are given a score of severity zero for the Drusen disease, one of them contains yellow spots, which are often a sign of Drusen disease⁷, and is therefore

⁷In this particular case, the patient suffered diabetic retinopathy, which is also characterized by yellow spots.




Figure 7: Mean squared error (MSE) achieved by the proposed greedy algorithm against the number of outsourced samples n under different distributions of human errors on three real-world datasets. Under each distribution of human error, human error is low for a fractions ρ_c of the samples and high for the remaining fraction $1 - \rho_c$. In all cases, we use the LR model $h_\theta(\mathbf{x})$ and set $c(\mathbf{x}, y) = 10^{-4}$ for samples in which the human error is low and we set $c(\mathbf{x}, y) = 0.25, 0.1, 0.4$ respectively for Stare-H, Stare-D and Messidor for samples in which the human error is high. As long as there are samples that humans can predict with low error, the greedy algorithm does outsource them to humans and thus the overall performance improves. However, whenever the fraction of outsourced samples is higher than the fraction of samples with low human error, the performance degrades. This results in a characteristic U-shaped curve.

difficult to predict. In this particular case, the greedy algorithm outsourced the difficult sample to humans and let the machine decide about the easy one. Does this intuitive assignment happen consistently?

To answer the above question, we run two complementary experiments. In a first experiment, we compare the human and machine error for each (training and test) sample, independently on whether it was outsourced to humans. Figure 6 summarizes the results for samples in the training set, which show that our algorithm outsources to humans those samples in which the machine error would have been the highest if it had to predict their response variables. Figure 13 in Appendix D summarizes the results for samples in the test set, where the same qualitative observation holds. In a second experiment, we run our greedy algorithm on the Messidor, Stare-H and Stare-D datasets under different distributions of human error and assess to which extent the greedy algorithm outsources to humans those samples they can predict more accurately. More specifically, we sample the human predictions from a non-uniform categorical distribution with parameters $\alpha_{\mathbf{x}, y}$ under which human error is low for a fraction ρ_c of the samples and high for the remaining fraction $1 - \rho_c$. Figure 7 shows the performance of the greedy algorithm for different ρ_c values on a held-out set, where we use the LR model $h_\theta(\mathbf{x})$ for all methods. We observe that, as long as there are samples that humans can predict with low error, the greedy algorithm outsources them to humans and thus the overall performance improves. However, whenever the fraction of outsourced samples is higher than the fraction of samples with low human error, the performance degrades, and this leads to a characteristic U-shaped curve. The results from both experiments suggest that our algorithm has the ability to learn the underlying relationship between a given sample and its corresponding human and machine error.

Second, we compare the performance of the greedy algorithm in terms of mean squared error (MSE) on a held-out set against the same competitive baselines used in the experiments on synthetic data. Figure 8 summarizes the results, where we use the LR model $h_\theta(\mathbf{x})$ for all methods. The results show that the greedy algorithm outperforms the baselines across a majority of automation levels. Moreover, for most automation levels, the competitive advantage provided by the greedy algorithm is statistically significant (Welch’s t-test, p -value = 10^{-3}). Here, we note that error reaches the steady state around $n/|\mathcal{V}| = 0.3$. Hence, reducing the clinical workload as a factor of 2 still provides a similar performance to the case when all samples are outsourced to medical experts. We obtained qualitatively similar results using the NN and MLP models $h_\theta(\mathbf{x})$ (refer to Appendix C).

Third, we perform a detailed sensitivity analysis to evaluate the robustness of our algorithm with respect




Figure 8: Mean squared error (MSE) against number of outsourced samples n for the proposed greedy algorithm, DS [28], distorted greedy [22], triage [39] and CRR [2] on four real-world datasets. In all cases, we use the LR model $h_\theta(\mathbf{x})$ and, for clarity, we explicitly highlight the performance under no automation and full automation. In Stare-H, Stare-D and Messidor, for each sample (\mathbf{x}, y) , the element of $\alpha_{\mathbf{x}, y}$ corresponding to the score $s = y$ has the highest value. For example, if $y = 0$, we set $\alpha_{\mathbf{x}, y} = [6, 3, 2, 2, 1]$ for Panel (b), $\alpha_{\mathbf{x}, y} = [6, 3, 2, 2, 1]$ for Panel (c), and $\alpha_{\mathbf{x}, y} = [6, 3, 1]$ for Panel (d). The greedy algorithm outperforms the baselines across a majority of automation levels. For most automation levels, the competitive advantage provided by the greedy algorithm is statistically significant (Welch’s t-test, p -value = 10^{-3}). We omitted the DS algorithm for the Hatespeech dataset because it did not scale.




Figure 9: Sensitivity analysis with respect to the choice of additional model $h_\theta(\mathbf{x})$. In all panels, we measure performance in terms of mean squared error (MSE) against number of outsourced samples n . In Stare-H, Stare-D and Messidor, for each sample (\mathbf{x}, y) , the element of $\alpha_{\mathbf{x}, y}$ corresponding to the score $s = y$ has the highest value, similarly as in Figure 8. The results show that LR performs best, followed closely by MLP, and NN performs worst.

to the choice of additional model $h_\theta(\mathbf{x})$ as well as with respect to several hyperparameters used in our experiments. In terms of the choice of additional model, Figure 9 summarizes the results, which show that, in contrast with the experiments on synthetic data (refer to Figure 4), LR performs best, followed closely by MLP, and NN performs worst. In terms of hyperparameters used in our experiments, we analyze the sensitivity with respect to: (i) $|\mathcal{V}|$, *i.e.*, the size of the ground set in Hatespeech dataset; (ii) the dimension (m') of the intermediate embedding provided by VGG; and, (iii) the dimension (m) of the output features provided by the PCA for the Messidor dataset. Figure 10 summarizes the results, which show that our algorithm outperforms the baselines for most of the hyperparameter values. We did perform further experiments on sensitivity, *e.g.*, sensitivity with respect to m for the Hatespeech dataset, however, we do not report them since we obtained qualitatively similar results.




Figure 10: Sensitivity analysis with respect to the hyperparameters used in our experiments. In all panels, we measure performance in terms of mean squared error (MSE) against number of outsourced samples n and use a MLP model $h_\theta(\mathbf{x})$. We found qualitatively similar results for the LR and NN models $h_\theta(\mathbf{x})$.

8 Conclusions

In this paper, we have initiated the development of machine learning models that are optimized to operate under different automation levels. We have focused on ridge regression under human assistance and have shown that a simple greedy algorithm is able to find a solution with nontrivial approximation guarantees. Using both synthetic and real-world data, we have shown that this greedy algorithm has the ability to learn the underlying relationship between a given sample and its corresponding human and machine error, it outperforms several competitive algorithms, and it is robust with respect to several design choices and hyperparameters used in the experiments. Moreover, we have also shown that humans and machines working together can achieve a considerably better performance than each of them would achieve on their own.

Our work also opens many interesting venues for future work. For example, it would be very interesting to advance the development of other more sophisticated machine learning models, both for regression and classification, under different automation levels. It would be helpful to find tighter lower bounds on the parameter α , which better characterize the good empirical performance. It would be very interesting to study sequential decision making scenarios under human assistance in a variety of scenarios, *e.g.*, autonomous driving under different automation levels [34]. In our particular problem setting, the computational cost of the greedy algorithm is quadratic on the size of the training set. To lower this cost down, one can think

of adapting highly efficient streaming algorithms for maximizing weakly submodular functions [12]. In our work, we have assumed that we know the human error for every training sample. It would be interesting to tackle the problem in an online learning setting, where one needs to balance exploration, *e.g.*, the estimation of the human error, and exploitation, *e.g.*, low error over time. Finally, it would be interesting to assess the performance of ridge regression under human assistance using interventional experiments on a real-world application.

References

- [1] Peter Bartlett and Marten Wegkamp. Classification with a reject option using a hinge loss. *JMLR*, 9 (Aug):1823–1840, 2008.
- [2] Kush Bhatia, Prateek Jain, Parameswaran Kamalaruban, and Purushottam Kar. Consistent robust regression. In *NeurIPS*, pages 2110–2119, 2017.
- [3] Ilija Bogunovic, Junyao Zhao, and Volkan Cevher. Robust maximization of non-submodular objectives. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1802.07073*, 2018.
- [4] Stephen Boyd, Laurent El Ghaoui, Eric Feron, and Venkataramanan Balakrishnan. *Linear matrix inequalities in system and control theory*, volume 15. Siam, 1994.
- [5] Xue Chen and Eric Price. Active regression via linear-sample sparsification. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.10051*, 2017.
- [6] Justin Cheng, Cristian Danescu-Niculescu-Mizil, and Jure Leskovec. Antisocial behavior in online discussion communities. In *ICWSM*, 2015.
- [7] David Cohn, Zoubin Ghahramani, and Michael Jordan. Active learning with statistical models. In *NeurIPS*, pages 705–712, 1995.
- [8] Corinna Cortes, Giulia DeSalvo, and Mehryar Mohri. Learning with rejection. In *ALT*, pages 67–82. Springer, 2016.
- [9] Thomas Davidson, Dana Warmsley, Michael Macy, and Ingmar Weber. Automated hate speech detection and the problem of offensive language. *ICWSM*, pages 512–515.
- [10] Abir De, Paramita Koley, Niloy Ganguly, and Manuel Gomez-Rodriguez. Regression under human assistance. In *AAAI*, 2020.
- [11] Etienne Decencière, Xiwei Zhang, Guy Cazuguel, Bruno Lay, Béatrice Cochener, Caroline Trone, Philippe Gain, Richard Ordonez, Pascale Massin, Ali Erginay, Béatrice Charton, and Jean-Claude Klein. Feedback on a publicly distributed database: the messidor database. *Image Analysis & Stereology*, 33(3):231–234, August 2014.
- [12] Ethan Elenberg, Alexandros G Dimakis, Moran Feldman, and Amin Karbasi. Streaming weak submodularity: Interpreting neural networks on the fly. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 4044–4054, 2017.
- [13] Richard Everett and Stephen Roberts. Learning against non-stationary agents with opponent modelling and deep reinforcement learning. In *2018 AAAI Spring Symposium Series*, 2018.
- [14] Jiashi Feng, Huan Xu, Shie Mannor, and Shuicheng Yan. Robust logistic regression and classification. In *NeurIPS*, pages 253–261, 2014.
- [15] Khashayar Gatmiry and Manuel Gomez-Rodriguez. Non-submodular function maximization subject to a matroid constraint, with applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.07863*, 2019.

- [16] Yonatan Geifman and Ran El-Yaniv. Selectivenet: A deep neural network with an integrated reject option. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.09192*, 2019.
- [17] Yonatan Geifman, Guy Uziel, and Ran El-Yaniv. Bias-reduced uncertainty estimation for deep neural classifiers. 2018.
- [18] Ahana Ghosh, Sebastian Tschiatschek, Hamed Mahdavi, and Adish Singla. Towards deployment of robust ai agents for human-machine partnerships. In *AAMAS*, 2019.
- [19] Aditya Grover, Maruan Al-Shedivat, Jayesh K Gupta, Yura Burda, and Harrison Edwards. Learning policy representations in multiagent systems. In *ICML*, 2018.
- [20] Yuhong Guo and Dale Schuurmans. Discriminative batch mode active learning. In *NeurIPS*, pages 593–600, 2008.
- [21] Dylan Hadfield-Menell, Stuart J Russell, Pieter Abbeel, and Anca Dragan. Cooperative inverse reinforcement learning. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 3909–3917, 2016.
- [22] Christopher Harshaw, Moran Feldman, Justin Ward, and Amin Karbasi. Submodular maximization beyond non-negativity: Guarantees, fast algorithms, and applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.09354*, 2019.
- [23] Abolfazl Hashemi, Mahsa Ghasemi, Haris Vikalo, and Ufuk Topcu. Submodular observation selection and information gathering for quadratic models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.09919*, 2019.
- [24] Luis Haug, Sebastian Tschiatschek, and Adish Singla. Teaching inverse reinforcement learners via features and demonstrations. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 8464–8473, 2018.
- [25] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *CVPR*, 2016.
- [26] Steven Hoi, Rong Jin, Jianke Zhu, and Michael R Lyu. Batch mode active learning and its application to medical image classification. In *ICML*, 2006.
- [27] Adam Hoover, Valentina Kouznetsova, and Michael Goldbaum. Locating blood vessels in retinal images by piecewise threshold probing of a matched filter response. *IEEE Transactions on Medical imaging*, 19(3):203–210, 2000.
- [28] Rishabh Iyer and Jeff Bilmes. Algorithms for approximate minimization of the difference between submodular functions, with applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1207.0560*, 2012.
- [29] Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, Piotr Bojanowski, Matthijs Douze, H erve J egou, and Tomas Mikolov. Fasttext. zip: Compressing text classification models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1612.03651*, 2016.
- [30] Parameswaran Kamalaruban, Rati Devidze, Volkan Cevher, and Adish Singla. Interactive teaching algorithms for inverse reinforcement learning. In *IJCAI*, 2019.
- [31] Benny Lehmann, Daniel Lehmann, and Noam Nisan. Combinatorial auctions with decreasing marginal utilities. *Games and Economic Behavior*, 55(2):270–296, 2006.
- [32] Ziyin Liu, Zhikang Wang, Paul Pu Liang, Russ R Salakhutdinov, Louis-Philippe Morency, and Masahito Ueda. Deep gamblers: Learning to abstain with portfolio theory. In *NeurIPS*, 2019.
- [33] Owen Macindoe, Leslie Pack Kaelbling, and Tom as Lozano-P erez. Pomcop: Belief space planning for sidekicks in cooperative games. In *Eighth Artificial Intelligence and Interactive Digital Entertainment Conference*, 2012.

- [34] Vahid Balazadeh Meresht, Abir De, Adish Singla, and Manuel Gomez-Rodriguez. Learning to switch between machines and humans. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.04258*, 2020.
- [35] Stefanos Nikolaidis, Ramya Ramakrishnan, Keren Gu, and Julie Shah. Efficient model learning from joint-action demonstrations for human-robot collaborative tasks. In *2015 10th ACM/IEEE International Conference on Human-Robot Interaction (HRI)*, pages 189–196. IEEE, 2015.
- [36] Stefanos Nikolaidis, Jodi Forlizzi, David Hsu, Julie Shah, and Siddhartha Srinivasa. Mathematical models of adaptation in human-robot collaboration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.02586*, 2017.
- [37] Michael Pradel and Koushik Sen. Deepbugs: A learning approach to name-based bug detection. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages*, 2(OOPSLA):147, 2018.
- [38] Goran Radanovic, Rati Devidze, David Parkes, and Adish Singla. Learning to collaborate in markov decision processes. In *ICML*, 2019.
- [39] Maithra Raghu, Katy Blumer, Greg Corrado, Jon Kleinberg, Ziad Obermeyer, and Sendhil Mullainathan. The algorithmic automation problem: Prediction, triage, and human effort. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.12220*, 2019.
- [40] Maithra Raghu, Katy Blumer, Rory Sayres, Ziad Obermeyer, Bobby Kleinberg, Sendhil Mullainathan, and Jon Kleinberg. Direct uncertainty prediction for medical second opinions. In *ICML*, 2019.
- [41] Harish Ramaswamy, Ambuj Tewari, and Shivani Agarwal. Consistent algorithms for multiclass classification with an abstain option. *Electronic J. of Statistics*, 12(1):530–554, 2018.
- [42] Sivan Sabato and Remi Munos. Active regression by stratification. In *NeurIPS*, pages 469–477, 2014.
- [43] Jack Sherman and Winifred J Morrison. Adjustment of an inverse matrix corresponding to a change in one element of a given matrix. *The Annals of Mathematical Statistics*, 21(1):124–127, 1950.
- [44] Karen Simonyan and Andrew Zisserman. Very deep convolutional networks for large-scale image recognition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1409.1556*, 2014.
- [45] Christoph Studer, Patrick Kuppinger, Graeme Pope, and Helmut Bolcskei. Recovery of sparsely corrupted signals. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 58(5):3115–3130, 2011.
- [46] Arun Sai Suggala, Kush Bhatia, Pradeep Ravikumar, and Prateek Jain. Adaptive hard thresholding for near-optimal consistent robust regression. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1903.08192*, 2019.
- [47] Masashi Sugiyama. Active learning in approximately linear regression based on conditional expectation of generalization error. *JMLR*, 7(Jan):141–166, 2006.
- [48] Sunil Thulasidasan, Tanmoy Bhattacharya, Jeff Bilmes, Gopinath Chennupati, and Jamal Mohd-Yusof. Combating label noise in deep learning using abstention. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.10964*, 2019.
- [49] Eric Topol. High-performance medicine: the convergence of human and artificial intelligence. *Nature medicine*, 25(1):44, 2019.
- [50] Efthymios Tsakonas, Joakim Jaldén, Nicholas D Sidiropoulos, and Björn Ottersten. Convergence of the huber regression m-estimate in the presence of dense outliers. *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, 21(10):1211–1214, 2014.
- [51] Sebastian Tschiatschek, Ahana Ghosh, Luis Haug, Rati Devidze, and Adish Singla. Learner-aware teaching: Inverse reinforcement learning with preferences and constraints. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 4147–4157, 2019.

- [52] Rebecca Willett, Robert Nowak, and Rui M Castro. Faster rates in regression via active learning. In *NeurIPS*, 2006.
- [53] H James Wilson and Paul R Daugherty. Collaborative intelligence: humans and ai are joining forces. *Harvard Business Review*, 96(4):114–123, 2018.
- [54] John Wright and Yi Ma. Dense error correction via ℓ^1 -minimization. *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 56(7):3540–3560, 2010.
- [55] Yan Zheng, Zhaopeng Meng, Jianye Hao, Zongzhang Zhang, Tianpei Yang, and Changjie Fan. A deep bayesian policy reuse approach against non-stationary agents. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 954–964, 2018.
- [56] Liu Ziyin, Blair Chen, Ru Wang, Paul Pu Liang, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, Louis-Philippe Morency, and Masahito Ueda. Learning not to learn in the presence of noisy labels. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.06541*, 2020.

A Auxiliary Lemmas and Propositions

Proposition 11 Assume $c(\mathbf{x}_k, y_k) \leq \gamma y_k^2$ and $\lambda \geq \frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} \|\mathbf{x}_k\|_2^2$. Then, it holds that

$$\begin{bmatrix} y_k^2 - c(\mathbf{x}_k, y_k) & y_k \mathbf{x}_k^\top \\ \mathbf{x}_k y_k & \lambda \mathbb{I} + \mathbf{x}_k \mathbf{x}_k^\top \end{bmatrix} \succcurlyeq 0$$

Proof We use the Schur complement property for positive-definiteness [4, Page 8]

on the matrix $\begin{bmatrix} y_k^2 - c(\mathbf{x}_k, y_k) & y_k \mathbf{x}_k^\top \\ \mathbf{x}_k y_k & \lambda \mathbb{I} + \mathbf{x}_k \mathbf{x}_k^\top \end{bmatrix}$, i.e.,

$$\lambda \mathbb{I} + \mathbf{x}_k \mathbf{x}_k^\top - \mathbf{x}_k \mathbf{x}_k^\top (y_k^2 / (y_k^2 - c(\mathbf{x}_k, y_k))) \succcurlyeq \lambda \mathbb{I} - \frac{\gamma}{1-\gamma} \mathbf{x}_k \mathbf{x}_k^\top.$$

Given that $\mathbf{x}_k \mathbf{x}_k^\top$ is a rank one matrix, it has only one non-zero eigenvalue. Hence it is same as $\text{tr}(\mathbf{x}_k \mathbf{x}_k^\top) = \|\mathbf{x}_k\|_2^2$, which along with the assumed bound on λ proves that

$$\lambda \mathbb{I} + \mathbf{x}_k \mathbf{x}_k^\top - \mathbf{x}_k \mathbf{x}_k^\top (y_k^2 / (y_k^2 - c(\mathbf{x}_k, y_k))) \succcurlyeq 0.$$

Then, from the Schur complement method, we have that

$$\begin{bmatrix} y_k^2 - c(\mathbf{x}_k, y_k) & y_k \mathbf{x}_k^\top \\ \mathbf{x}_k y_k & \lambda \mathbb{I} + \mathbf{x}_k \mathbf{x}_k^\top \end{bmatrix} \succcurlyeq 0.$$

Proposition 12 Let \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} be two positive definite matrices such that $\mathbf{A} \succcurlyeq \mathbf{B}$. Then, it holds that $\det(\mathbf{A}) \geq \det(\mathbf{B})$. ■

Proof Let $\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{L}\mathbf{L}^\top$ be the Cholesky factorization and note that, since \mathbf{A} is strictly positive definite, \mathbf{L} has an inverse. Then, it follows that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A} \succcurlyeq \mathbf{B} &\implies \mathbb{I} \succcurlyeq \mathbf{L}^{-1} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{L}^{-\top} \succcurlyeq 0 \implies 1 > \text{eig}_i(\mathbf{L}^{-1} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{L}^{-\top}) > 0 \forall \text{ eigenvalues } \text{eig}_i \\ &\implies 1 > \prod_i \text{eig}_i(\mathbf{L}^{-1} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{L}^{-\top}) \implies 1 > \det(\mathbf{L}^{-1} \mathbf{B} \mathbf{L}^{-\top}) \\ &\implies 1 > (1/\det(\mathbf{A}))(\det(\mathbf{B})) \end{aligned}$$

which immediately gives the required result. ■

Lemma 13 (Sherman-Morrison formula [43]) Assume \mathbf{A} is an invertible matrix. Then, the following equality holds:

$$(\mathbf{A} + \mathbf{u}\mathbf{v}^\top)^{-1} = \mathbf{A}^{-1} - \frac{\mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{u} \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{A}^{-1}}{1 + \mathbf{v}^\top \mathbf{A}^{-1} \mathbf{u}} \quad (15)$$

Proposition 14 Assume \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} are invertible matrices. Then, the following equality holds:

$$(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B})^{-1} = \mathbf{A}^{-1} + (\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}^{-1}\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A})^{-1} \quad (16)$$

Proof We observe that, $(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}^{-1}\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}) = (\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}^{-1}\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A})\mathbf{A}^{-1}(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B}) + (\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B})$. Pre-multiply by $(\mathbf{A}\mathbf{B}^{-1}\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A})^{-1}$ and post-multiply by $(\mathbf{A} - \mathbf{B})^{-1}$ on both sides to get the result. ■

Proposition 15 The function $t(x) = \frac{\log(x-a)}{\log x}$ is increasing for $x > a + 1$.

Proof

$$dt(x)/dx = \frac{x \log x - (x-a) \log(x-a)}{x(x-a)(\log x)^2} > 0 \quad (17)$$

B Performance with the LR and NN models $h_\theta(\mathbf{x})$ on synthetic data




Figure 11: Mean squared error (MSE) against number of outsourced samples n for the proposed greedy algorithm and four baselines with the LR and NN models $h_\theta(\mathbf{x})$ on synthetic data. In all cases, we used $d = 5$, $\sigma_2 = 10^{-3}$ and $\lambda = 5 \cdot 10^{-3}$. For most automation levels, the competitive advantage provided by the greedy algorithm is statistically significant (Welch’s t-test, p -value = 10^{-3}).

C Performance with the MLP and NN models $h_\theta(\mathbf{x})$ on real data




Figure 12: Mean squared error (MSE) against number of outsourced samples n for the proposed greedy algorithm and four baselines with the MLP model (first row) and NN model (second row) $h_\theta(\mathbf{x})$ on four real-world datasets. In Stare-H, Stare-D and Messidor, for each sample (\mathbf{x}, y) , the element of $\alpha_{\mathbf{x},y}$ corresponding to the score $s = y$ has the highest value, similarly as in Figure 9. For most automation levels, the competitive advantage provided by the greedy algorithm is statistically significant (Welch’s t-test, p -value = 10^{-3}).

D Human and machine error for test samples in real data




Figure 13: Human and machine error of all test samples on the Hatespeech (first row), Stare-H (second row), Stare-D (third row) and Messidor (third row) datasets for different automation levels. Our algorithm outsources to humans those samples in which the machine error would have been the highest if it had to predict their response variables