

---

# sigmoidF1: A Smooth F1 Score Surrogate Loss for Multilabel Classification

---

Gabriel Bénédict<sup>1,2</sup>, Hendrik Vincent Koops<sup>1</sup>, Daan Odijk<sup>1</sup>, Maarten de Rijke<sup>2</sup>

RTL NL<sup>1</sup>, University of Amsterdam<sup>2</sup>

Amsterdam, The Netherlands

gabriel.benedict@rtl.nl, vincent.koops@rtl.nl, daan.odijk@rtl.nl, m.derijke@uva.nl

## Abstract

Multiclass multilabel classification is the task of attributing multiple labels to examples via predictions. Current models formulate a reduction of the multilabel setting into either multiple binary classifications or multiclass classification, allowing for the use of existing loss functions (sigmoid, cross-entropy, logistic, etc.). Multilabel classification reductions do not accommodate for the prediction of varying numbers of labels per example and the underlying losses are distant estimates of the performance metrics. We propose a loss function, sigmoidF1, which is an approximation of the F1 score that (1) is smooth and tractable for stochastic gradient descent, (2) naturally approximates a multilabel metric, and (3) estimates label propensities and label counts. We show that any confusion matrix metric can be formulated with a smooth surrogate. We evaluate the proposed loss function on text and image datasets, and with a variety of metrics, to account for the complexity of multilabel classification evaluation. sigmoidF1 outperforms other loss functions on one text and two image datasets and several metrics. These results show the effectiveness of using inference-time metrics as loss functions for non-trivial classification problems like multilabel classification.

## 1 Introduction


Many real-world classification problems are challenging because of unclear (or overlapping) class-boundaries, subjectivity issues, and disagreement between annotators.

Multilabel learning tasks are common, e.g., document and text classification often deal with multilabel and multiclass (a subfield of multilabel classification where a single label is attributed to an example) problems [10, 13, 32, 78], as do query classification [38, 51], image classification [62, 77] and product classification [2]. Existing optimization frameworks are typically based on variations of the cross-entropy or logistic loss. Menon et al. [52] define these as *multilabel reduction* techniques, with an emphasis on two: One-Versus-All (OVA) and Pick-All-Labels (PAL) [52]. OVA and PAL reformulate the multilabel problem to  $C$  binary classification and  $C$  multiclass classification problems, respectively, where  $C$  is the number of possible classes for labels (see Section 2.3). These methods assume that marginal probabilities of the suitability of a label for an example (a.k.a. Bayes Optimal Classifier [20]) are independent of other label propensities. Consequently, there is a gap between the approximated quantity and the real multilabel evaluation task. The other shortcoming shared by OVA and PAL is the lack of a holistic approach for both label count and label prediction. The methods above either reformulate the problem (multilabel reduction) or deal with subfields<sup>1</sup> (extreme/hierarchical multilabel classification). To the best of our knowledge, there is no generic loss function to deal with multilabel classification in a modern deep learning setting in a single task.

**Proposed solution to multilabel problems.** We propose a loss function that (1) naturally approximates a multilabel metric (see Table 2), (2) estimates

---

<sup>1</sup>In most of this work, the term *multilabel classification* excludes *extreme*, *hierarchical* or *multiclass* subfields.



(a) Finetuning of a pretrained neural net with our classification head and using sigmoidF1 loss to predict movie genre.

(b) Unbounded outputs are transformed to mutually-inclusive predictions with a Softmax.

Figure 1: Our experimental setup for *sigmoidF1* as a loss function.

label propensities and label counts (see Eq. 7), and (3) is decomposable for stochastic gradient descent (see Section 3.1 and Figure 2). Our proposed solution is to use a surrogate of the F1 metric as a loss. Using a metric as a loss function is unpopular for metrics that require a form of thresholding (e.g., counting the number of true positives), as minimizing a step loss function is intractable [58]. In our approach the step function is approximated by a sigmoid curve (see Figure 1).

**Main contributions of the paper.** We introduce *sigmoidF1*, an F1 score surrogate, with a sigmoid function acting as a surrogate thresholding step function. *sigmoidF1* allows for the use of the F1 metric that simultaneously optimizes for label prediction and label counts in a single task. *sigmoidF1* is benchmarked against loss functions commonly used in multilabel learning and other existing multilabel models. We show that our custom losses improve predictions over current solutions on several different metrics, across text and image classification tasks. Pytorch and Tensorflow source code [here] (pending review).

## 2 Background

We use a traditional statistical framework as a guideline for multilabel classification methods [67]. We distinguish the desired theoretical statistic (the **estimand**), its functional form (the **estimator**) and its approximation (the **estimate**); they can be benchmarked with **metrics**. We show how multilabel reduction estimators tend to reformulate the estimand and treat labels independently. For example, by treating a multilabel problem as a succession of binary classification tasks. However, with a proper estimator, it is possible to directly model the estimand. Our proposed loss function, *sigmoidF1*, accommodates for the

true estimand.

We define a learning algorithm  $\mathcal{F}$  (i.e., a class of estimators) that maps inputs to outputs given a set of hyperparameters  $\mathcal{F}(\cdot; \Theta) : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}$ . We consider a particular case, with the input vector  $\mathbf{x} = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$  and each observation is assigned  $k$  labels (one or more)  $\mathbf{l} = \{l_1, \dots, l_C\}$  out of a set of  $C$  classes.  $y_i^j$  are binary variables, indicating presence of a label for each observation  $i$  and class  $j$ . Together they form the matrix output  $\mathbf{Y}$ .

### 2.1 Estimand and definition of the risk

We distinguish between two scenarios: the *multiclass* and the *multilabel* scenario. In the multiclass scenario, a single example is attributed one class label (e.g., classification of an animal on a picture). In the multilabel scenario, a single example can be assigned more than one class label (e.g., movie genres). We focus on the latter. For a particular set of inputs  $\mathbf{x}$  (e.g., movie posters) and outputs  $\mathbf{Y}$  (e.g. movie genre(s)), the risk formulation is [52]:

$$R_{\text{ML}}(\mathcal{F}) = \mathbb{E}_{(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{Y})} [\mathcal{L}_{\text{ML}}(\mathbf{Y}, \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x}))]. \quad (1)$$

The learning algorithm  $\mathcal{F}$  is the estimand: the theoretical statistic. For one item  $x_i$ , the theoretical risk defines how close the estimand can get to that deterministic output vector  $\mathbf{y}_i$ . In practice, statistical models do output probabilities  $\hat{\mathbf{y}}_i$  via an estimator and its estimate (also called propensities or suitabilities [52]). The solution to that stochastic-deterministic incompatibility is either to convert the estimator to a deterministic measure via decision thresholds (e.g., traditional cross-entropy loss), or to treat the estimand as a stochastic measure (our sigmoidF1 loss proposal).

## 2.2 Estimator: the functional form

The estimator  $f \in \mathcal{F}$  is any minimizer of the risk  $R_{ML}$ . Predicting multiple labels per example comes with the assumption that labels are non-mutually exclusive.

**Proposition 1** *The multilabel estimator of  $y_i^j$  is dependent on the input and other groundtruth labels for that example,  $\hat{y}_i^j = f(x, y_i^1, \dots, y_i^{j-1}) = P(y_i^j = 1|x, y_i^1, \dots, y_i^{j-1})$ .*

By proposing this general formulation, we entrench that characteristic in the estimator. Contrary to Menon et al. [52], our proposal above models interdependence between labels and deals with thresholding for the estimate at training time for free. Waegeman et al. [69] show that an estimator of an F-score can be used at inference time for multilabel classification, when using probabilistic models where parameter estimation is possible (e.g., decision trees, probabilistic classifier chains). When it is not possible, we resort to defining a loss function.

## 2.3 Estimate: approximation via a loss function

Most of the literature on multilabel classification can be characterized as multilabel reductions [52]. Given the general non-convex optimization context, the surrogate loss function  $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{y}_i, f)$  can take different forms.

**One-versus-all (OVA)** is a reformulation of the multilabel classification task to a sequence of  $C$  binary classifications  $(f^1, \dots, f^C)$ , with  $C$  the number of classes,  $\mathcal{L}_{OVA}(\mathbf{y}_i, f) = \sum_{c=1}^C \mathcal{L}_{BC}(y_i^c, f^c)$  where  $\mathcal{L}_{BC}$  is a binary classification loss (binary relevance [12, 20, 66]), most often logistic loss. Minimizing binary cross-entropy is equivalent to maximizing for log-likelihood [9,  4.3.4].

**Pick-all-labels (PAL)** gives the loss function  $\mathcal{L}_{PAL}(\mathbf{y}_i, f) = \sum_{c=1}^C y_i^c \cdot \mathcal{L}_{MC}(y_i^c, f)$ , with  $\mathcal{L}_{MC}$  a multiclass loss (e.g. softmax cross-entropy). In this formulation, each example  $(x_i, \mathbf{y}_i)$  is converted to a multiclass framework, with one observation per positive label. The sum of inherently multiclass losses is used to represent the multilabel estimand. Note that cross-entropy loss can be formulated as  $\mathcal{L}_{CE} = -\sum \log(f)$ .

Multilabel reduction methods are characterized by their way of reformulating the estimand, the resulting estimator, and the estimate. This allows the use of existing losses: logistic loss (for binary classification formulations), sigmoid or softmax cross-entropy loss (for multiclass formulations). These reductions imply a reformulation of the estimator (a.k.a. Bayes Opti-

mal) as follows:

$$\hat{y}_i^j = f(x) = P(y_i^j = 1|x_i). \quad (2)$$

Contrary to our definition of the original multilabel estimator (Proposition 1), independence of label propensities is assumed. In other words, the loss function becomes any monotone transformation of the marginal label probabilities  $P(y_i^j = 1|x)$  [20, 39, 75].

## 2.4 Metrics: evaluation at inference time

There is consensus on the use of a confusion matrix and ranking metrics to evaluate multilabel classification models (at inference time) [6, 39, 75]. Confusion matrix metrics come with caveats: most of these measures (1) require hard thresholding, which makes them non-differentiable for stochastic gradient descent; (2) they are very sensitive to the choice of the number top labels to include  $k$  [16]; and (3) they require aggregation choices to be made in terms of micro / macro / weighted metrics. Common confusion matrix metrics are Precision, Recall, F1-score, hinge-loss or one-error-loss; see [75] for others.

## 2.5 Multilabel estimate: F1 metric as a loss

A model’s out-of-sample accuracy is commonly measured on metrics such as AUROC, F1 score, etc. These reflect an objective catered towards evaluating the model over an entire ranking. Due to the lack of differentiability, these metrics cannot be directly used as loss functions at training time (in-sample). Eban et al. [25] propose a framework for deriving decomposable surrogates to some of these metrics. We propose our own decomposable surrogates tailored for multilabel classification.

In a typical machine learning classification task, binary labels are compared to a probabilistic measure (or a reversible transformation of a probabilistic measure such as a sigmoid or a softmax function). If the number  $n_i$  of labels to be predicted per example is known a priori, it is natural at training time to assign the  $top_{n_i}$  predictions to that example [41, 42]. If the number of labels per example is not known a priori, the question remains at both training and at inference time as to how to decide on the number of labels to assign to each example. This is generally done via a *decision threshold*, that can be set globally for all examples [47]. This threshold can optimize for specificity or sensitivity [16] (for per-class thresholding see [17]). We propose an approach where this threshold is implicitly defined, by using a loss function that penalizes explicitly for wrong label counts and fits to the original estimand in Proposition 1. In the next section, we show how  $F_1$  is formulated into a surrogate loss  $\mathcal{L}_{\hat{F}_1}$ .




Figure 2: Different thresholding regimes: the non-decomposable step function, the unbounded linear function and the sigmoid function at different parametrizations.

### 3 Method

We introduce our approach for multilabel problems, with a smoothed confusion matrix metric as a loss (the original confusion matrix metrics rely on step functions and are therefore intractable, see Figure 2). We first briefly define our learning setting and define the confusion matrix metrics in this setting more formally.

We use the binary classification setting (two classes) to simplify notation, without loss of generalization to the multilabel case. In a typical binary classification problem with the label vector  $\mathbf{y} = \{y_1, \dots, y_n\}$ , predictions are probabilistic and it is necessary to define a threshold  $t$ , at which a prediction is dichotomized. With  $\mathbb{1}$  as an indicator function,  $\mathbf{y}^+ = \sum \mathbb{1}_{\hat{\mathbf{y}} \geq t}$ ,  $\mathbf{y}^- = \sum \mathbb{1}_{\hat{\mathbf{y}} < t}$  are thus the count of positive and negative predictions at threshold  $t$ . Let  $tp$ ,  $fp$ ,  $fn$ ,  $tn$  be number of true positives, false positives, false negatives and true negatives respectively:

$$\begin{aligned} tp &= \sum \mathbb{1}_{\hat{\mathbf{y}} \geq t} \odot \mathbf{y} & fp &= \sum \mathbb{1}_{\hat{\mathbf{y}} \geq t} \odot (\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{y}) \\ fn &= \sum \mathbb{1}_{\hat{\mathbf{y}} < t} \odot \mathbf{y} & tn &= \sum \mathbb{1}_{\hat{\mathbf{y}} < t} \odot (\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{y}), \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

with  $\odot$  the component-wise multiplication sign. For simplicity, in the formulation above and the ones that follow scores are calculated for a single class, therefore the sum is implicitly over all examples  $\sum_i$ . This is useful for the binary classification problem but also for the multilabel problem, when micro metrics are calculated (i.e. metric for each class which is then averaged over all classes). In the multilabel setting  $\mathbf{y}$  can be substituted by  $\mathbf{y}^j$  for each class  $j$ . Note that vectors could be trivially substituted by matrices ( $\mathbf{Y}$ ) in the following expressions to obtain the macro formulation. Given the four confusion matrix quadrants, we can generate further metrics like precision and recall (see Table 1 in appendix). However, none of these metrics are decomposable due to the hard thresholding, which is, in effect, a step function (see Figure 2).

Next, we define desirable properties for decomposable thresholding, unbounded confusion matrix entries and a sigmoid transformation that renders confusion ma-

trix entries decomposable. Finally, we focus on a smooth F1 score.

#### 3.1 Desirable properties of decomposable thresholding

We define desirable properties for a decomposable sign function  $f(u)$  as a surrogate of the above indicator function  $\mathbb{1}_{\hat{\mathbf{y}} < t}$ .

**Property 1 Boundedness:**  $|f(u)| < M$ , where  $M$  is an upper and lower bound.

The groundtruth  $\mathbf{y}$  is bounded between  $[0, 1]$  and thus it must be compared to a bounded prediction  $\hat{\mathbf{y}}$ , preferably bounded by  $[0, 1]$ , to avoid further scaling.

**Property 2 Saturation:**  $\int_s^\infty f^{-1}(u) = \int_{-\infty}^{-s} f(u) = \epsilon$ , with  $\epsilon$  a number close to zero and  $s$  a saturation bound.

For the surrogate to be a proper sign function substitute, it is important to often return values close to 1 or 0. Saturation is defined in the context of neural network activation functions and refers to the propensity of iterative backpropagation to progressively lead to values very close to 0 or 1 after a long enough training period. While activation functions should tend to be non-saturated, in order for the derivative at point  $u$  to be non-null and information to flow back to the network [40], our sign function substitute must output values close to 0 or 1, in order to be comparable to a step function.

**Property 3 Dynamic Gradient:**  $f'(u) \gg 0 \quad \forall u \in [-s, s]$ , where  $s$  is the saturation bound.

Inside the saturation bounds  $[-s, s]$ , the derivative should be significantly higher than zero in order to facilitate stochastic gradient descent and backpropagation. Note that the upper and lower limits of  $f(u)$  are interchangeably  $[-1, 1]$  or  $[0, 1]$  along this paper and in literature. The conditions above still apply by linear transformation. Next, we show how our formalization of an unbounded F1 surrogate would not fulfill these properties and how our proposition of a smooth bounded alternative does.

#### 3.2 Unbounded confusion matrix entries

A first trivial remedy to allow for derivation of the sign function  $f(u)$ , is to define *unbounded* confusion matrix entries by replacing the dichotomized predictions with prediction probabilities. This way, (i.e.  $\overline{tp}$ ,  $\overline{fp}$ ,  $\overline{fn}$  and  $\overline{tn}$  are not natural numbers anymore):

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{tp} &= \sum \hat{\mathbf{y}} \odot \mathbf{y} & \overline{fp} &= \sum \hat{\mathbf{y}} \odot (\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{y}) \\ \overline{fn} &= \sum (\mathbf{1} - \hat{\mathbf{y}}) \odot \mathbf{y} & \overline{tn} &= \sum (\mathbf{1} - \hat{\mathbf{y}}) \odot (\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{y}), \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where  $tp$ ,  $fp$ ,  $fn$  and  $tn$  are now replaced by rough surrogates. The disadvantages are that the desirable properties mentioned above are not fulfilled, namely (1)  $\hat{\mathbf{y}}$  is unbounded and thus certain examples can have over-proportional effects on the loss; (2) it is non-saturated; while non-saturation is desirable for activation functions [40], it would be here desirable to tend towards saturation (i.e., tend to values close to 0 or 1, so as to give the most accurate predictions at any thresholding values at inference time); and (3) the gradient of that linear function is 1 and therefore backpropagation will not learn depending on different inputs at this stage of the loss function. However, this method has the advantage of resulting in a linear loss function that avoids the concept of thresholding altogether and is trivial to decompose for stochastic gradient descent.

### 3.3 Smooth confusion matrix entries

We propose a sigmoid-based transformation of the confusion matrix that renders its entries decomposable and fulfills the three desirable properties above:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{tp} &= \sum \mathbf{S}(\hat{\mathbf{y}}) \odot \mathbf{y} & \tilde{fp} &= \sum \mathbf{S}(\hat{\mathbf{y}}) \odot (\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{y}) \\ \tilde{fn} &= \sum (\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{S}(\hat{\mathbf{y}})) \odot \mathbf{y} & \tilde{tn} &= \sum (\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{S}(\hat{\mathbf{y}})) \odot (\mathbf{1} - \mathbf{y}), \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

with  $\mathbf{S}(\cdot)$  the vectorial form of the sigmoid function  $S(\cdot)$ :

$$S(u; \beta, \eta) = \frac{1}{1 + \exp(-\beta(u + \eta))}, \quad (6)$$

with  $\beta$  and  $\eta$  tunable parameters for slope and offset respectively. Higher  $\beta$  results in steeper slope at the center of the sigmoid and thus more stringent thresholding. At its extreme,  $\lim_{\beta \rightarrow \infty} S(u; \beta, \eta)$  corresponds to the step function used in Equation 3. Note that negative values of  $\beta$  geometrically reflect the sigmoid function across the horizontal line at 0.5 and thus invert predictions. These smooth confusion matrix entries allow us to build any related metric (see Table 1 in appendix). Furthermore, the surrogate entries are decomposable, bounded, saturated and have a dynamic gradient.

In this paper we focus on *sigmoidF1* ( $\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{F1}}$ ) because it has the ability to implicitly penalize for both inaccurate label propensity and label count.

### 3.4 Smooth macro F1 scores

The above title contains a new term. Macro-averaging regards all classes as equally important, whereas micro-averaging reflects within-class frequency. *unboundedF1* and *sigmoidF1* below are thought of as macro scores (aggregated over all classes). These scores require a high enough number of representatives

in the four confusion matrix quadrants to learn from batch to batch. Ideally, each training epoch would have only one batch, so as to have the most representatives. Following Eq. 4, it is possible to define an *unbounded F1* score:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\overline{F1}} = \frac{2\overline{tp}}{2\overline{tp} + \overline{fn} + \overline{fp}}. \quad (7)$$

While this alternative abstracts the thresholding away, which is convenient for fine-tuning purposes, it does not fulfill the desirable properties of a dichotomization threshold surrogate (see Section 3.2). *unboundedF1* will be used to benchmark against our proposed *sigmoidF1* loss. Given the definitions of smooth confusion matrix metrics above, we can now write  $\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{F1}}$ :

$$\mathcal{L}_{\tilde{F1}} = \frac{2\tilde{tp}}{2\tilde{tp} + \tilde{fn} + \tilde{fp}}. \quad (8)$$

*sigmoidF1* is particularly suited for the multilabel setting because it is a proper hard thresholding surrogate as defined in the previous sections and because it contains a significant amount of information about label prediction accuracy:  $\tilde{tp}$ ,  $\tilde{fn}$  and  $\tilde{fp}$  are indicative of the number of predicted labels in each category of the confusion matrix but also contain a notion of certainty, given that they are rational numbers. The built in sigmoid function ensures that certainty increases along training epochs, as outlined by property 2. Finally, as the harmonic mean of precision and recall (a property of F1 in general), it weighs in both relevance metrics.

## 4 Experimental Setup

We test multilabel learning using our proposed *sigmoidF1* loss function on three datasets across different modalities (image and text). We take a state-of-the-art model that generates an embedding layer and append a sigmoid activation and different losses. Multilabel deep learning is usually implemented with sigmoid cross-entropy directly on the last neural layer (a simplification of the OVA and PAL reductions). We follow this approach for our experiments (e.g. in the BERT domain [22, 82]). Existing baselines in the literature tend to include multilabel reformulation choices: only keeping the top-n occurring classes (often 4–10) [e.g., 19, 86], multiclass classification on each entity within an example (objects in an image, expressions in a text) [e.g., 45, 70, 73, 88].

### 4.1 Datasets

Two of the datasets are multilabel in nature and are related to movies (moviePosters [55]) and arXiv paper abstracts (arXiv2020 [68]). In addition, we use the image segmentation dataset Pascal-VOC [27]. We refer

to the appendix for further descriptions of the datasets and download links.

## 4.2 Learning framework

The learning framework consists of two parts: a pre-trained deep neural network and a classification head (see Figure 1); different loss functions are computed in the classification head.

**Neural network architecture** For the moviePoster image dataset, we use a MobileNetV2 [60] architecture that was pretrained on ImageNet [21]. This network architecture is typically used for inference on small computing devices (e.g., smartphones). We use a version of MobileNetV2 already stripped off of its original classification head [28]. For the three text datasets, we use DistilBert [61] as implemented in Hugging Face. This is a particularly efficient instance of the BERT model [31]. For the Pascal-VOC dataset, we use the recent state-of-the-art resnet TresNet [59] pretrained on ImageNet [21] and some of the best practices for Pascal-VOC collected in a recent benchmark [5]. We use Tresnet-m-21K (while an L and an XL version of the model exist, the code available online did not allow for correct loading of the weights. 21K stands for Imagenet21K, the larger Imagenet corpus). In all cases, we use the final pretrained layer as an embedding of the input. To ensure that the results of different loss functions are comparable, we fix the model weights of the pretrained MobileNetV2, DistilBert and TresNet and keep the hyperparameter values that were used to be trained from scratch.

The **classification head** is a latent representation layer (the final pretrained layer mentioned above) connected with a RELU activation. This layer is linked to a final classification layer with a linear activation. The dimension of the final layer is equal to the number of classes in the dataset. The attached loss function is either crossEntropy, focalLoss [46], ASL [5], unboundedF1 or sigmoidF1 (ours). When computing the loss, a sigmoid transforms the unbounded last layer to a  $[0, 1]$  bounded vector. At inference time, the last layer is used for prediction and is bounded with a softmax function. A threshold must then be chosen at evaluation time to compute different metrics. Figure 1 depicts this learning framework.

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of our experimental datasets.

	Type	Classes	Average label count	Number of examples
moviePosters	image	28	2.165	37,632
arXiv2020	text	155	1.888	26,558
Pascal-VOC	image	20	1.560	9963

**Metrics** In our experiments, we report on weightedF1, microF1, macroF1, Precision, mAP (mAP is used in some recent multilabel benchmarks, see metrics in appendix) and (micro) *weightedF1* (where within-class scores are weighted by their representation in the dataset). We focus our discussion around weightedF1 as it is the most comprehensive F1 measure we could find on multilabel problems. Given limited resources we rerun each model on each loss with 5 random seeds. With only 5 runs per loss function, hypothesis testing results would have been particularly sensitive to the choice of distribution<sup>2</sup>. Instead we show the distribution of results in the appendix which show robust statistics (median and interquartile range). Note that cross-validation could not have been performed, given that Pascal-VOC has fixed train-validation-test sets. There is an interaction between our optimization on *sigmoidF1* and our evaluation using (weighted) F1 metrics. We expect higher values on F1-related metrics during evaluation and thus report on alternative metrics too.

## 4.3 Hyperparameters and reproducibility

We implemented all losses in Pytorch and Tensorflow. Batch size is set at a relatively high value of 256. We thus increase accuracy over traditional losses [63], but also allow heterogeneity in the examples within the batch, thus collecting enough values in each quadrant of the confusion matrix (see Section 3.4 for a discussion). Regarding the *sigmoidF1* hyperparameters  $\beta$  and  $\eta$ , we performed a grid search with the values in the range  $[1, 30]$  for  $\beta$  and  $[0, 2]$  for  $\eta$ . In our experiments, we evaluate the sensitivity of our method to these hyperparameters (see Figure 2 and appendix for optimal values). We made sure to split the data in the same training, validation and test sets for each loss function. We trained for 60 (Pascal-VOC) to a 100 (arXiv2020, moviePosters) epochs, depending on convergence. Our code, dataset splits and other settings are shared to ensure reproducibility of our results.

## 5 Experimental Results

We present classification results for *sigmoidF1* on three datasets, moviePosters, arXiv2020 and Pascal-VOC in Table 2.

**Overall classification results.** ASL performs best on mAP, this is in line with [5], whereas crossEntropy performs best on precision. For the remainder of the F-score metrics, sigmoidF1 ( $\mathcal{L}_{\overline{F1}}$ ) can top other losses

<sup>2</sup>We found that, given some unstable results on unboundedF1, even a conservative student t distribution would imply that the 95% confidence interval covers metric values over 100%

Table 2: Multilabel classification mean performance over 5 random seeds.

Loss	weightedF1	microF1	macroF1	Precision	mAP
Tresnetm21K (CNN) on Pascal-VOC @0.5					
$\mathcal{L}_{CE}$	87.516	85.847	87.756	<b>90.750</b>	91.539
$\mathcal{L}_{FL}$	72.540	59.240	76.823	84.704	76.186
$\mathcal{L}_{ASL}$	77.850	76.525	75.977	65.362	<b>93.110</b>
$\mathcal{L}_{\overline{F1}}$	77.236	74.844	75.312	75.529	79.359
$\mathcal{L}_{\overline{F1}}$	<b>88.198</b>	<b>87.697</b>	<b>87.869</b>	85.357	92.362
DistilBert (NLP) on arXiv2020 @0.05					
$\mathcal{L}_{CE}$	20.593	18.192	18.418	10.145	10.500
$\mathcal{L}_{FL}$	18.847	16.592	18.013	10.103	10.429
$\mathcal{L}_{ASL}$	19.146	16.902	18.164	<b>10.322</b>	<b>10.531</b>
$\mathcal{L}_{\overline{F1}}$	15.232	13.743	14.500	10.274	10.487
$\mathcal{L}_{\overline{F1}}$	<b>20.602</b>	<b>18.204</b>	<b>18.425</b>	10.147	10.503
MobileNetV2 (CNN) on moviePosters @0.05					
$\mathcal{L}_{CE}$	13.785	9.471	<b>12.939</b>	5.513	5.777
$\mathcal{L}_{FL}$	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	5.804
$\mathcal{L}_{ASL}$	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	5.804
$\mathcal{L}_{\overline{F1}}$	13.971	9.841	10.108	<b>5.586</b>	<b>5.892</b>
$\mathcal{L}_{\overline{F1}}$	<b>14.805</b>	<b>10.328</b>	10.565	5.577	5.805

that are based on cross-entropy loss and its sister unboundedF1 ( $\mathcal{L}_{\overline{F1}}$ ). Note that the latter was found particularly unstable for Pascal-VOC over 5 different seeds (see extended results in appendix). Provided it is unbounded, predictions can diverge towards (positive or negative) infinite values.

Pascal-VOC shows higher results. mAP scores are 1–2% away from the current state of the art [5] (with a smaller model, see Section 4.2). The classes in Pascal-VOC are a lot more concrete (e.g. car, person, bicycle) and are directly related to the original classes of ImageNet on which the TresNet / MobileNetV2 were trained, as opposed to movie genres for moviePosters or arXiv paper scientific domain. For example, on the moviePosters dataset, some predictions never reach high enough values to pass the threshold  $t = 0.05$ .

*FocalLoss* and its multilabel counterpart *ASL*, which are specifically tailored for sparse data, perform worse on F1 metrics. They are extensions of cross-entropy which is designed for multiclass problems and ignore label dependencies: they are computed per-example at training time, as opposed to per batch for *sigmoidF1*.

**Sensitivity analysis.** In Figure 3, we show the sensitivity of *sigmoidF1* to different parametrizations of  $\eta$  and  $\beta$ . Within the chosen values (see Section 4.3), we chose to display a parameter space similar to the one illustrated in Figure 2. Moving the sigmoid to

the left allows the learning algorithm to tend to a (local) optimum. In general and across datasets, when sampling for  $\eta$ , we noticed how the optimum tended towards positive values. Offsetting the sigmoid curve to the left has the effect of pushing more candidate predictions to the rank of positive instance (or at least close to 1). We also note how  $\beta$  (which cannot be negative or otherwise the sigmoid function would flip around the horizontal axis) is at best close to a value close to 0 on this dataset (we show discrete values here for display purposes). The sigmoid is thus relatively flat, which involves dynamic gradients over different batches. The idea is similar to a high learning rate. In our experiments, this rarely gave rise to divergent behavior in the loss function (learning curve).

The results in this section show that, in general, multilabel classification results measured on F1 metrics are consistently improved using sigmoidF1 – independently of the dataset, its modality or the neural network architecture.

## 6 Related Work

Existing solutions to deal with multilabel tasks can be divided into *fit-data-to-algorithm* solutions, which map multilabel problems to a known problem formulation like multiclass classification, and *fit-algorithm-to-data* solutions, which adapt existing classification algorithms to the problem at hand [50].

**Fit-data-to-algorithm.** In fit-data-to-algorithm solutions, cross-entropy losses are used at training time and thresholding is done at inference time to determine how many labels should be assigned to an instance. This has also been called multilabel reduction [52] and differs from multiclass-to-binary classifications [57, 65, 85]. We can further distinguish between One-versus-all (OVA) and Pick-all-labels (PAL) solutions [52] (see Section 2). In OVA, one reduces the classification problem to independent binary classifications [12, 20, 66, 76]. In PAL, one reformulates the task to independent multiclass classifications [11, 36, 37]. The *label powerset* approach considers each set of labels as a class [11]. In Pick-One-Label (POL), a single multiclass example is created by randomly sampling a positive label [36, 37]. Within the multilabel reduction framework, extreme multilabel classification [1, 35, 36] gives rise to specific solutions such as label embeddings [8] or negative mining [58]. Another subfield of multilabel reduction, hierarchical labeling, allows one to constrain the algorithm to learn  $K \geq 1$  labels per group in the hierarchy [see, e.g., 29, 43, 79]. Alternatively, *ranking by pairwise comparison* is a solution where the dataset is duplicated for each possible label pair. Each duplicated dataset has therefore two




Figure 3: DistilBert (NLP) on arXiv2020 – different weightedF1 scores at a 0.5 threshold for different values of  $\eta$  and  $\beta$  in a sampling region similar to Figure 1.

classes and only contains instances that have at least one of the labels in the label pair. Different ranking methods exist [33, 49]. More recently, hierarchical datasets such as DBpedia [43] are used to finetune BERT-based models [79, 82]; the latter publications use cross-entropy to predict the labels.

**Fit-algorithm-to-data.** In fit-algorithm-to-data solutions, elements of the learning algorithm are changed (e.g., the back propagation procedure). Early representatives stem from heterogeneous domains of machine learning. MultiLabel k-Nearest Neighbors [84], Multi-Label Decision Tree [18], Ranking Support Vector Machine [26] and Backpropagation for MultiLabel Learning [83]. More recently, the idea of multi-task learning for *label prediction* and *label count prediction* was introduced [MLNET, 24, 44, 74]. A formulation similar to *unboundedF1* was proposed in an unpublished blog post, which was referred to as *softF1* [14]. A similar method to *sigmoidF1* was proposed outside of the context of neural networks: the *Maximum F1-score criterion* for automatic mispronunciation detection as an objective function to a Gaussian Mixture Model-hidden Markov model (GMM-HMM) [30]. A variation of the cross-entropy loss adapted to multilabel classification has been proposed [5, 74]; it extends the multiclass sparse class representation setting [46]. In the ranking domain, LambdaLoss has been proposed to optimize directly for the lambdaRank metric [72].

An important limitation shared by both *fit-data-to-algorithm* and *fit-algorithm-to-data* is the lack of a holistic approach for both label count and label prediction. *sigmoidF1* handles these aspects by computing a loss over the aggregation of examples in a batch at training time.

## 7 Conclusions

To solve multilabel learning tasks, existing optimization frameworks are typically based on variations of

the cross-entropy loss. Instead, we propose the *sigmoidF1* loss, as part of a general loss framework for confusion matrix metrics. *sigmoidF1* loss can achieve significantly better results for most metrics on three diverse datasets and outperforms other losses on the weightedF1 metric. Generally, our smooth formulation of confusion matrix metrics allows us to optimize directly for these metrics that are usually reserved for the evaluation phase.

More experimentation is needed to find proper heuristics for finetuning the hyperparameters of *sigmoidF1* loss. The proposed *unboundedF1* counterpart does not require tuning and delivered better results than existing multiclass losses on most metrics; it can act as a mathematically less robust approximation of *sigmoidF1*.

In future work and within the generic multilabel setting, a first step could be to train on a bigger dataset like MS-COCO (given more resources) and use more robust transfer learning/finetuning procedures, for example with dynamic weight freezing for finetuning [29]. Alternatively, we could train a CNN or a BERT model for multilabel tasks with our smooth losses from scratch (c.f., [74] and [46]). If training from scratch, this can be combined with representation learning [53, 71] or self-supervised learning, in order to model abstract relationships.

Next, one could tackle other multilabel settings, such as hierarchical multilabel classification [7], active learning [54], multi-instance learning [e.g., 64, 87], holistic label learning (see dataset *Large Scale Holistic Video Understanding* [23]), or extreme multilabel prediction [4, 15, 48, 56, 80] (with missing labels [34, 81]), where the number of classes ranges in the tens of thousands. Beyond the multilabel setting, *sigmoidF1* could be tested on any model that uses F1 score as an evaluation metric such as the recent AC-SUM-GAN [3].

We believe that smooth metric surrogates should in-



form future research on multilabel classification tasks. From the results presented in this paper, we consider metrics-as-losses as the next step in the evolution of multilabel classification algorithms.

## References

- [1] Rahul Agrawal, Archit Gupta, Yashoteja Prabhu, and Manik Varma. Multi-label learning with millions of labels: Recommending advertiser bid phrases for web pages. In *Proceedings of the 22nd International Conference on World Wide Web, WWW '13*, page 13–24, New York, NY, USA, 2013. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450320351. doi: 10.1145/2488388.2488391. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2488388.2488391>.
- [2] Hesam Amoualian, Parantapa Goswami, Laurent Ach, Pradipto Das, and Pablo Montalvo. Sigir 2020 e-commerce workshop data challenge overview. In *Proceedings Proceedings of ACM SIGIR Workshop on eCommerce (SIGIR eCom'20)*. ACM. ACM, 2020.
- [3] E. Apostolidis, E. Adamantidou, A. I. Metsai, V. Mezaris, and I. Patras. Ac-sum-gan: Connecting actor-critic and generative adversarial networks for unsupervised video summarization. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, 2020.
- [4] Rohit Babbar and Bernhard Schölkopf. Dismec: Distributed sparse machines for extreme multilabel classification. In *Proceedings of the Tenth ACM International Conference on Web Search and Data Mining, WSDM '17*, page 721–729, New York, NY, USA, 2017. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450346757. doi: 10.1145/3018661.3018741. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3018661.3018741>.
- [5] Emanuel Ben Baruch, Tal Ridnik, Nadav Zamir, Asaf Noy, Itamar Friedman, Matan Protter, and Lihi Zelnik-Manor. Asymmetric loss for multilabel classification. *CoRR*, abs/2009.14119, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2009.14119>.
- [6] B. Behera, G. Kumaravelan, and P. Kumar B. Performance evaluation of deep learning algorithms in biomedical document classification. In *2019 11th International Conference on Advanced Computing (ICoAC)*, pages 220–224, 2019. doi: 10.1109/ICoAC48765.2019.246843.
- [7] F. Benites and E. Sapozhnikova. Haram: A hierarchical aram neural network for large-scale text classification. In *2015 IEEE International Conference on Data Mining Workshop (ICDMW)*, pages 847–854, 2015. doi: 10.1109/ICDMW.2015.14.
- [8] Kush Bhatia, Himanshu Jain, Purushottam Kar, Manik Varma, and Prateek Jain. Sparse local embeddings for extreme multi-label classification. In C. Cortes, N. Lawrence, D. Lee, M. Sugiyama, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 28. Curran Associates, Inc., 2015.
- [9] Christopher M. Bishop. *Pattern Recognition and Machine Learning*. Information science and statistics. Springer, 5 edition, 2007. ISBN 9780387310732. URL <https://www.worldcat.org/oclc/71008143>.
- [10] M. J. Blosseville, G. Hébrail, M. G. Monteil, and N. Pénot. Automatic document classification: Natural language processing, statistical analysis, and expert system techniques used together. In *Proceedings of the 15th Annual International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, SIGIR '92*, page 51–58, New York, NY, USA, 1992. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 0897915232. doi: 10.1145/133160.133175. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/133160.133175>.
- [11] Matthew R. Boutell, Jiebo Luo, Xipeng Shen, and Christopher M. Brown. Learning multi-label scene classification. *Pattern Recognition*, 37(9):1757–1771, 2004. ISSN 0031-3203. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.patcog.2004.03.009>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0031320304001074>.
- [12] Klaus Brinker, Johannes Fürnkranz, and Eyke Hüllermeier. A unified model for multilabel classification and ranking. In *Proceedings of the 2006 Conference on ECAI 2006: 17th European Conference on Artificial Intelligence August 29 – September 1, 2006, Riva Del Garda, Italy*, page 489–493, NLD, 2006. IOS Press. ISBN 1586036424.
- [13] Trstenjak Bruno, Mikac Sasa, and Dzenana Donko. Knn with tf-idf based framework for text categorization. volume 69, 11 2013. doi: 10.1016/j.proeng.2014.03.129.
- [14] Wei-Cheng Chang, Hsiang-Fu Yu, Kai Zhong, Yiming Yang, and Inderjit S. Dhillon. The unknown benefits of using a soft-f1 loss in classification systems. *Towards Data Science*, Dec 2019. URL <https://towardsdatascience.com/the-unknown-benefits-of-using-a-soft-f1-loss-in-classification-systems-753902c0105d>.
- [15] Wei-Cheng Chang, Hsiang-Fu Yu, Kai Zhong,

- Yiming Yang, and Inderjit S. Dhillon. Taming pretrained transformers for extreme multi-label text classification. *Proceedings of the 26th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining*, Jul 2020. doi: 10.1145/3394486.3403368. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/3394486.3403368>.
- [16] J. J. Chen, C.-A. Tsai, H. Moon, H. Ahn, J. J. Young, and C.-H. Chen. Decision threshold adjustment in class prediction. *SAR and QSAR in Environmental Research*, 17(3):337–352, Jun 2006. ISSN 1029-046X. doi: 10.1080/10659360600787700. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10659360600787700>.
- [17] Wei-Ta Chu and Hung-Jui Guo. Movie genre classification based on poster images with deep neural networks. *Proceedings of the Workshop on Multimodal Understanding of Social, Affective and Subjective Attributes*, Oct 2017. doi: 10.1145/3132515.3132516. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/3132515.3132516>.
- [18] Amanda Clare and Ross D. King. Knowledge discovery in multi-label phenotype data. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 42–53, 2001. ISSN 0302-9743. doi: 10.1007/3-540-44794-6\_4. URL [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/3-540-44794-6\\_4](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/3-540-44794-6_4).
- [19] Washington Cunha, Vítor Mangaravite, Christian Gomes, Sérgio Canuto, Elaine Resende, Cecilia Nascimento, Felipe Viegas, Celso França, Wellington Santos Martins, Jussara M. Almeida, Thierson Rosa, Leonardo Rocha, and Marcos André Gonçalves. On the cost-effectiveness of neural and non-neural approaches and representations for text classification: A comprehensive comparative study. *Information Processing & Management*, 58(3):102481, 2021. ISSN 0306-4573. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ipm.2020.102481>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0306457320309705>.
- [20] Krzysztof Dembczyński, Weiwei Cheng, and Eyke Hüllermeier. Bayes optimal multilabel classification via probabilistic classifier chains. In *Proceedings of the 27th International Conference on International Conference on Machine Learning, ICML’10*, page 279–286, Madison, WI, USA, 2010. Omnipress. ISBN 9781605589077.
- [21] J. Deng, W. Dong, R. Socher, L.-J. Li, K. Li, and L. Fei-Fei. ImageNet: A Large-Scale Hierarchical Image Database. In *CVPR09*, 2009.
- [22] Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. BERT: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. In *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long and Short Papers)*, pages 4171–4186, Minneapolis, Minnesota, June 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/N19-1423. URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/N19-1423>.
- [23] Ali Diba, Mohsen Fayyaz, Vivek Sharma, Manohar Paluri, Jurgen Gall, Rainer Stiefelhagen, and Luc Van Gool. Large Scale Holistic Video Understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1904.11451v3*, 2019.
- [24] Jingcheng Du, Qingyu Chen, Yifan Peng, Yang Xiang, Cui Tao, and Zhiyong Lu. Ml-net: Multi-label classification of biomedical texts with deep neural networks. *Journal of the American Medical Informatics Association*, 26(11):1279–1285, Jun 2019. ISSN 1527-974X. doi: 10.1093/jamia/ocz085. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/jamia/ocz085>.
- [25] Elad Eban, Mariano Schain, Alan Mackey, Ariel Gordon, Ryan Rifkin, and Gal Elidan. Scalable Learning of Non-Decomposable Objectives. In Aarti Singh and Jerry Zhu, editors, *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 54 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 832–840. PMLR, 20–22 Apr 2017. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v54/eban17a.html>.
- [26] André Elisseeff and Jason Weston. A kernel method for multi-labelled classification. In *Proceedings of the 14th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems: Natural and Synthetic*, NIPS’01, pages 681–687, Cambridge, MA, USA, 2001. MIT Press.
- [27] Mark Everingham, Luc Van Gool, Christopher KI Williams, John Winn, and Andrew Zisserman. The pascal visual object classes challenge 2007 (voc2007) results. 2007.
- [28] Google. Feature vectors of images with mobilenet v2 (depth multiplier 1.00) trained on imagenet (ilsvrc-2012-cls). [https://tfhub.dev/google/imagenet/mobilenet\\_v2\\_100\\_224/feature\\_vector/4](https://tfhub.dev/google/imagenet/mobilenet_v2_100_224/feature_vector/4), 2021.
- [29] Jeremy Howard and Sebastian Ruder. Universal language model fine-tuning for text classification. *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, 2018. doi: 10.18653/v1/p18-1031. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.18653/v1/p18-1031>.
- [30] Hao Huang, Haihua Xu, Xianhui Wang, and

- Wushour Silamu. Maximum f1-score discriminative training criterion for automatic mispronunciation detection. *IEEE/ACM Transactions on Audio, Speech, and Language Processing*, 23(4):787–797, Apr 2015. ISSN 2329-9304. doi: 10.1109/taslp.2015.2409733. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/taslp.2015.2409733>.
- [31] Huggingface. Distilbert. [https://huggingface.co/transformers/model\\_doc/distilbert.html](https://huggingface.co/transformers/model_doc/distilbert.html), 2021.
- [32] David A Hull. *Information retrieval using statistical classification*. PhD thesis, Citeseer, 1994.
- [33] Eyke Hüllermeier, Johannes Fürnkranz, Weiwei Cheng, and Klaus Brinker. Label ranking by learning pairwise preferences. *Artificial Intelligence*, 172(16):1897–1916, 2008. ISSN 0004-3702. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.artint.2008.08.002>. URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S000437020800101X>.
- [34] Himanshu Jain, Yashoteja Prabhu, and Manik Varma. Extreme multi-label loss functions for recommendation, tagging, ranking; other missing label applications. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining, KDD '16*, page 935–944, New York, NY, USA, 2016. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450342322. doi: 10.1145/2939672.2939756. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/2939672.2939756>.
- [35] Himanshu Jain, Venkatesh Balasubramanian, Bhanu Chunduri, and Manik Varma. Slice: Scalable linear extreme classifiers trained on 100 million labels for related searches. In *WSDM '19, February 11–15, 2019, Melbourne, VIC, Australia*. ACM, February 2019. URL <https://www.microsoft.com/en-us/research/publication/slice-scalable-linear-extreme-classifiers-trained-on-100-million-labels-for-related-searches/>. Best Paper Award at WSDM '19.
- [36] Yacine Jernite, Anna Choromanska, and David Sontag. Simultaneous learning of trees and representations for extreme classification and density estimation. In *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning - Volume 70, ICML'17*, page 1665–1674. JMLR.org, 2017.
- [37] Armand Joulin, Edouard Grave, Piotr Bojanowski, and Tomas Mikolov. Bag of tricks for efficient text classification. In *Proceedings of the 15th Conference of the European Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Volume 2, Short Papers*, pages 427–431, Valencia, Spain, April 2017. Association for Computational Linguistics. URL <https://www.aclweb.org/anthology/E17-2068>.
- [38] In-Ho Kang and GilChang Kim. Query type classification for web document retrieval. In *Proceedings of the 26th Annual International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Informaion Retrieval, SIGIR '03*, page 64–71, New York, NY, USA, 2003. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 1581136463. doi: 10.1145/860435.860449. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/860435.860449>.
- [39] Oluwasanni O Koyejo, Nagarajan Natarajan, Pradeep K Ravikumar, and Inderjit S Dhillon. Consistent multilabel classification. In C. Cortes, N. Lawrence, D. Lee, M. Sugiyama, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 28, pages 3321–3329. Curran Associates, Inc., 2015. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2015/file/85f007f8c50dd25f5a45fca73cad64bd-Paper.pdf>.
- [40] Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Geoffrey E. Hinton. Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks. *Communications of the ACM*, 60(6):84–90, May 2017. ISSN 1557-7317. doi: 10.1145/3065386. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/3065386>.
- [41] Maksim Lapin, Matthias Hein, and Bernt Schiele. Top-k multiclass svm. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems - Volume 1, NIPS'15*, page 325–333, Cambridge, MA, USA, 2015. MIT Press.
- [42] Maksim Lapin, Matthias Hein, and Bernt Schiele. Loss functions for top-k error: Analysis and insights. *2016 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, Jun 2016. doi: 10.1109/cvpr.2016.163. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/cvpr.2016.163>.
- [43] Jens Lehmann, Robert Isele, Max Jakob, Anja Jentzsch, Dimitris Kontokostas, Pablo N Mendes, Sebastian Hellmann, Mohamed Morsey, Patrick Van Kleef, Sören Auer, et al. Dbpedia—a large-scale, multilingual knowledge base extracted from wikipedia. *Semantic web*, 6(2):167–195, 2015.
- [44] Yuncheng Li, Yale Song, and Jiebo Luo. Improving pairwise ranking for multi-label image classification. *2017 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, Jul 2017. doi: 10.1109/cvpr.2017.199. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/cvpr.2017.199>.
- [45] Tsung-Yi Lin, Michael Maire, Serge Belongie, James Hays, Pietro Perona, Deva Ramanan, Piotr Dollár, and C. Lawrence Zitnick. Microsoft

- coco: Common objects in context. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 740–755, 2014. ISSN 1611-3349. doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-10602-1\_48. URL [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-10602-1\\_48](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-10602-1_48).
- [46] Tsung-Yi Lin, Priya Goyal, Ross Girshick, Kaiming He, and Piotr Dollar. Focal loss for dense object detection. *2017 IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision (ICCV)*, Oct 2017. doi: 10.1109/iccv.2017.324. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/iccv.2017.324>.
- [47] Zachary C. Lipton, Charles Elkan, and Balakrishnan Naryanaswamy. Optimal thresholding of classifiers to maximize f1 measure. *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 225–239, 2014. ISSN 1611-3349. doi: 10.1007/978-3-662-44851-9\_15. URL [http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-44851-9\\_15](http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/978-3-662-44851-9_15).
- [48] Jingzhou Liu, Wei-Cheng Chang, Yuexin Wu, and Yiming Yang. Deep learning for extreme multi-label text classification. *Proceedings of the 40th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, Aug 2017. doi: 10.1145/3077136.3080834. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/3077136.3080834>.
- [49] E. Loza Mencia and J. Furnkranz. Pairwise learning of multilabel classifications with perceptrons. In *2008 IEEE International Joint Conference on Neural Networks (IEEE World Congress on Computational Intelligence)*, pages 2899–2906, 2008. doi: 10.1109/IJCNN.2008.4634206.
- [50] Gjorgji Madjarov, Dragi Kocev, Dejan Gjorgjevikj, and Sašo Džeroski. An extensive experimental comparison of methods for multi-label learning. *Pattern recognition*, 45(9):3084–3104, 2012. ISSN 0031-3203.
- [51] Christopher D. Manning, Prabhakar Raghavan, and Hinrich Schütze. *Introduction to Information Retrieval*. Cambridge University Press, 2008. doi: 10.1017/CBO9780511809071.
- [52] Aditya K Menon, Ankit Singh Rawat, Sashank Reddi, and Sanjiv Kumar. Multilabel reductions: what is my loss optimising? In H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, A. Beygelzimer, F. d'Alché-Buc, E. Fox, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32. Curran Associates, Inc., 2019. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2019/file/da647c549dde572c2c5edc4f5bef039c-Paper.pdf>.
- [53] Timo Milbich, Omair Ghori, Ferran Diego, and Björn Ommer. Unsupervised representation learning by discovering reliable image relations. *Pattern Recognition*, 102:107107, Jun 2020. ISSN 0031-3203. doi: 10.1016/j.patcog.2019.107107. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.patcog.2019.107107>.
- [54] Felipe Kenji Nakano, Ricardo Cerri, and Celine Vens. Active learning for hierarchical multi-label classification. *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, 34(5):1496–1530, 2020. doi: 10.1007/s10618-020-00704-w. URL <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10618-020-00704-w>.
- [55] Neha. Movie genre from its poster. <https://www.kaggle.com/nehah703/movie-genre-from-its-poster>, 2018.
- [56] Yashoteja Prabhu, Anil Kag, Shrutendra Harbola, Rahul Agrawal, and Manik Varma. Parabel: Partitioned label trees for extreme classification with application to dynamic search advertising. In *Proceedings of the 2018 World Wide Web Conference, WWW '18*, page 993–1002, Republic and Canton of Geneva, CHE, 2018. International World Wide Web Conferences Steering Committee. ISBN 9781450356398. doi: 10.1145/3178876.3185998. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3178876.3185998>.
- [57] Harish G. Ramaswamy, Balaji Srinivasan Babu, Shivani Agarwal, and Robert C. Williamson. On the consistency of output code based learning algorithms for multiclass learning problems. In Maria Florina Balcan, Vitaly Feldman, and Csaba Szepesvári, editors, *Proceedings of The 27th Conference on Learning Theory*, volume 35 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 885–902, Barcelona, Spain, 13–15 Jun 2014. PMLR. URL <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v35/ramaswamy14.html>.
- [58] Sashank J. Reddi, Satyen Kale, Felix Yu, Daniel Holtmann-Rice, Jiecao Chen, and Sanjiv Kumar. Stochastic negative mining for learning with large output spaces. In Kamalika Chaudhuri and Masashi Sugiyama, editors, *Proceedings of the Twenty-Second International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, volume 89 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 1940–1949. PMLR, 16–18 Apr 2019. URL <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v89/reddi19a.html>.
- [59] Tal Ridnik, Hussam Lawen, Asaf Noy, Emanuel Ben Baruch, Gilad Sharir, and Itamar Friedman. Tresnet: High performance gpu-dedicated architecture. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision (WACV)*, pages 1400–1409, January 2021.
- [60] Mark Sandler, Andrew Howard, Menglong Zhu, Andrey Zhmoginov, and Liang-Chieh Chen. Mo-

- bilenetv2: Inverted residuals and linear bottlenecks. pages 4510–4520, 06 2018. doi: 10.1109/CVPR.2018.00474.
- [61] Victor Sanh, Lysandre Debut, Julien Chaumond, and Thomas Wolf. Distilbert, a distilled version of BERT: smaller, faster, cheaper and lighter. *CoRR*, abs/1910.01108, 2019. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1910.01108>.
- [62] Fumin Shen, Yadong Mu, Yang Yang, Wei Liu, Li Liu, Jingkuan Song, and Heng Tao Shen. Classification by retrieval: Binarizing data and classifiers. In *Proceedings of the 40th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval, SIGIR '17*, page 595–604, New York, NY, USA, 2017. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450350228. doi: 10.1145/3077136.3080767. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3077136.3080767>.
- [63] Samuel L. Smith, Pieter-Jan Kindermans, and Quoc V. Le. Don’t decay the learning rate, increase the batch size. *CoRR*, abs/1711.00489, 2017. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1711.00489>.
- [64] H. Soleimani and D. J. Miller. Semisupervised, multilabel, multi-instance learning for structured data. *Neural Computation*, 29(4):1053–1102, 2017. doi: 10.1162/NECO\_a\_00939.
- [65] Ambuj Tewari and Peter L. Bartlett. On the consistency of multiclass classification methods. In Peter Auer and Ron Meir, editors, *Learning Theory*, pages 143–157, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2005. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. ISBN 978-3-540-31892-7.
- [66] Grigorios Tsoumakas and Ioannis Katakis. Multi-label classification: An overview. *International Journal of Data Warehousing and Mining (IJDWM)*, 3(3):1–13, 2007. URL <https://EconPapers.repec.org/RePEc:igg:jdw00:v:3:y:2007:i:3:p:1-13>.
- [67] John Wilder Tukey. *Exploratory data analysis*. Addison-Wesley series in behavioral science : quantitative methods. Addison-Wesley, Reading, Mass. ;, 1977. ISBN 0201076160.
- [68] Cornell University. arxiv dataset and metadata of 1.7m+ scholarly papers across stem. [kaggle.com/Cornell-University/arxiv](https://kaggle.com/Cornell-University/arxiv), 2021.
- [69] Willem Waegeman, Krzysztof Dembczyński, Arkadiusz Jachnik, Weiwei Cheng, and Eyke Hüllermeier. On the bayes-optimality of f-measure maximizers. *J. Mach. Learn. Res.*, 15(1):3333–3388, January 2014. ISSN 1532-4435.
- [70] Jiang Wang, Yi Yang, Junhua Mao, Zhiheng Huang, Chang Huang, and Wei Xu. Cnn-rnn: A unified framework for multi-label image classification. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, June 2016.
- [71] Jingdong Wang, Ke Sun, Tianheng Cheng, Borui Jiang, Chaorui Deng, Yang Zhao, Dong Liu, Yadong Mu, Mingkui Tan, Xinggang Wang, and et al. Deep high-resolution representation learning for visual recognition. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, pages 1–1, 2020. ISSN 1939-3539. doi: 10.1109/tpami.2020.2983686. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/tpami.2020.2983686>.
- [72] Xuanhui Wang, Cheng Li, Nadav Golbandi, Mike Bendersky, and Marc Najork. The lambdaloss framework for ranking metric optimization. In *Proceedings of The 27th ACM International Conference on Information and Knowledge Management (CIKM '18)*, pages 1313–1322, 2018.
- [73] Yunchao Wei, Wei Xia, Min Lin, Junshi Huang, Bingbing Ni, Jian Dong, Yao Zhao, and Shuicheng Yan. Hcp: A flexible cnn framework for multi-label image classification. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 38(9):1901–1907, 2016. doi: 10.1109/TPAMI.2015.2491929.
- [74] Baoyuan Wu, Weidong Chen, Yanbo Fan, Yong Zhang, Jinlong Hou, Jie Liu, and Tong Zhang. Tencent ml-images: A large-scale multi-label image database for visual representation learning. *IEEE Access*, 7:172683–172693, 2019. ISSN 2169-3536. doi: 10.1109/access.2019.2956775. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/access.2019.2956775>.
- [75] Xi-Zhu Wu and Zhi-Hua Zhou. A unified view of multi-label performance measures. In Doina Precup and Yee Whye Teh, editors, *Proceedings of the 34th International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 70 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 3780–3788. PMLR, 06–11 Aug 2017. URL <http://proceedings.mlr.press/v70/wu17a.html>.
- [76] Marek Wydmuch, Kalina Jasinska, Mikhail Kuznetsov, Róbert Busa-Fekete, and Krzysztof Dembczyński. A no-regret generalization of hierarchical softmax to extreme multi-label classification, 2018.
- [77] Jianxiong Xiao, James Hays, Krista A. Ehinger, Aude Oliva, and Antonio Torralba. Sun database: Large-scale scene recognition from abbey to zoo. In *2010 IEEE Computer Society Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 3485–3492, 2010. doi: 10.1109/CVPR.2010.5539970.

- [78] Yiming Yang. An evaluation of statistical approaches to text categorization. *Information Retrieval*, 1:69–90, 2004.
- [79] Zhilin Yang, Zihang Dai, Yiming Yang, Jaime Carbonell, Russ R Salakhutdinov, and Quoc V Le. Xlnet: Generalized autoregressive pre-training for language understanding. In H. Wallach, H. Larochelle, A. Beygelzimer, F. d'Alché-Buc, E. Fox, and R. Garnett, editors, *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 32, pages 5753–5763. Curran Associates, Inc., 2019. URL <https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper/2019/file/dc6a7e655d7e5840e66733e9ee67cc69-Paper.pdf>.
- [80] Ian E.H. Yen, Xiangru Huang, Wei Dai, Pradeep Ravikumar, Inderjit Dhillon, and Eric Xing. Pdpdparse: A parallel primal-dual sparse method for extreme classification. In *Proceedings of the 23rd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, KDD '17, page 545–553, New York, NY, USA, 2017. Association for Computing Machinery. ISBN 9781450348874. doi: 10.1145/3097983.3098083. URL <https://doi.org/10.1145/3097983.3098083>.
- [81] Hsiang-Fu Yu, Prateek Jain, Purushottam Kar, and Inderjit S. Dhillon. Large-scale multi-label learning with missing labels. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on International Conference on Machine Learning - Volume 32*, ICML'14, page I–593–I–601. JMLR.org, 2014.
- [82] Manzil Zaheer, Guru Guruganesh, Kumar Avinava Dubey, Joshua Ainslie, Chris Alberti, Santiago Ontanon, Philip Pham, Anirudh Ravula, Qifan Wang, Li Yang, and Amr Ahmed. Big bird: Transformers for longer sequences. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2020. URL <https://papers.nips.cc/paper/2020/file/c8512d142a2d849725f31a9a7a361ab9-Paper.pdf>.
- [83] Min-Ling Zhang and Zhi-Hua Zhou. Multilabel neural networks with applications to functional genomics and text categorization. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 18(10):1338–1351, Oct 2006. ISSN 1041-4347. doi: 10.1109/tkde.2006.162. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/tkde.2006.162>.
- [84] Min-Ling Zhang and Zhi-Hua Zhou. Ml-knn: A lazy learning approach to multi-label learning. *Pattern Recognition*, 40(7):2038–2048, Jul 2007. ISSN 0031-3203. doi: 10.1016/j.patcog.2006.12.019. URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.patcog.2006.12.019>.
- [85] Tong Zhang. Statistical behavior and consistency of classification methods based on convex risk minimization. *The Annals of Statistics*, 32(1):56–85, 2004. doi: 10.1214/aos/1079120130. URL <https://doi.org/10.1214/aos/1079120130>.
- [86] Xiang Zhang, Junbo Zhao, and Yann LeCun. Character-level convolutional networks for text classification. In *Proceedings of the 28th International Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems - Volume 1*, NIPS'15, page 649–657, Cambridge, MA, USA, 2015. MIT Press.
- [87] Zhi-Hua Zhou, Min-Ling Zhang, Sheng-Jun Huang, and Yu-Feng Li. Multi-instance multi-label learning. *Artificial Intelligence*, 176(1):2291–2320, 2012. ISSN 0004-3702. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.artint.2011.10.002>. URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0004370211001123>.
- [88] Feng Zhu, Hongsheng Li, Wanli Ouyang, Nenghai Yu, and Xiaogang Wang. Learning spatial regularization with image-level supervisions for multi-label image classification. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, July 2017.