

A Conformal Prediction Score that is Robust to Label Noise

Coby Penso Jacob Goldberger
coby.penso24@gmail.com jacob.goldberger@biu.ac.il

Bar-Ilan University, Israel

Abstract. Conformal Prediction (CP) quantifies network uncertainty by building a small prediction set with a pre-defined probability that the correct class is within this set. In this study we tackle the problem of CP calibration based on a validation set with noisy labels. We introduce a conformal score that is robust to label noise. The noise-free conformal score is estimated using the noisy labeled data and the noise level. In the test phase the noise-free score is used to form the prediction set. We applied the proposed algorithm to several standard medical imaging classification datasets. We show that our method outperforms current methods by a large margin, in terms of the average size of the prediction set, while maintaining the required coverage.

Keywords: prediction set · conformal prediction · label noise · conformal score

1 Introduction

In medical imaging classification tasks, it is crucial not only to report the most likely diagnosis but equally or even more important to eliminate other possibilities. Reporting decisions in terms of a prediction set of class candidates is thus a natural approach for clinical applications. In this procedure, the network eliminates most classes, and thus presents the physician with a small subset of options for further investigation. In terms of confidence, the prediction set must encompass the true diagnosis with a high probability, such as 90%.

Conformal Prediction (CP) [13,2] is a general non-parametric prediction-set calibration method. Given a required confidence level, it aims to construct a small prediction set with the guarantee that the probability of the correct class being within this set meets or exceeds this requirement.” Recently, CP has become a major calibration tool for neural network systems in various applications including medical imaging [8,7,9]. CP is not a specific algorithm but rather a general framework where selecting a specific conformal score defines how the prediction set is constructed.

Training a neural network requires massive amounts of carefully labeled data to succeed, but acquiring such data is expensive and time-consuming. Medical imaging datasets often contain noisy labels due to ambiguous images that can confuse clinical experts. Physicians may disagree on the diagnosis of the same

medical image, resulting in variability in the ground truth label. Therefore, addressing annotation noise is a crucial topic in medical image analysis. Numerous studies have examined the problem of training networks that are resilient to label noise [11,15]. The collected annotated dataset is randomly split into training and validation sets. Therefore, the existence of noisy labels not only affects the training procedure but also the CP prediction-set calibration step. While significant efforts have been devoted to the problem of noise-robust network training, the challenge of calibrating the models has only recently begun to receive attention [3].

In this study, we address the challenge of applying CP to medical imaging classification networks using a validation set with noisy labels. Network calibration methods are known to be highly susceptible to label noise. Einberder et al. [3] suggested ignoring label noise and applying the standard CP algorithm on the noisy labeled validation set. This strategy results in large prediction sets. Here, we introduce a CP algorithm based on a new conformal score that is robust to label noise. We applied the algorithm to several standard medical imaging classification datasets. The experimental results indicated that our method outperformed state-of-the-art methods that handle label noise by a significant margin.

2 Conformal Prediction and Label Noise

Consider a network that classifies an input x into k pre-defined classes. Given a specified coverage $1 - \alpha$ we want to find a small prediction set (i.e. a subset of the classes) that includes the correct class with a probability of at least $1 - \alpha$. A simple approach to achieving this goal is to include classes from the highest to the lowest probability until their sum just exceeds the threshold of $1 - \alpha$. While the network output has the mathematical form of a distribution, this does not necessarily imply that it represents the true class distribution. The network is usually not calibrated and tends to be over-optimistic [5].

The CP algorithm builds a prediction set with a coverage guarantee. A conformal score $S(x, y)$ measures the network uncertainty between x and its true label y (larger scores encode worse agreement). The Homogeneous Prediction Sets (HPS) score [13] is $S_{HPS}(x, y) = 1 - p(y|x; \theta)$, s.t. θ is the network parameter set. Another widely used score is the Adaptive Prediction Score (APS) [10]:

$$S_{APS}(x, y) = \sum_{\{i|p_i \geq p_y\}} p_i, \quad (1)$$

such that $p_i = p(y = i|x; \theta)$ and p_y is the probability of the true label. The RAPS score [1] is a variant of APS which, in the case of a large number of classes, encourages small prediction sets. It is defined as follows:

$$S_{RAPS}(x, y) = \sum_{\{i|p_i \geq p_y\}} p_i + a \cdot \max(0, (nc - b)) \quad (2)$$

s.t. $nc = |\{i|p_i \geq p_y\}|$ and a, b are parameters that need to be tuned.

The CP calibration procedure operates on a given labeled validation set $(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_n, y_n)$. Let q be the $(1-\alpha)$ quantile of $S(x_1, y_1), \dots, S(x_n, y_n)$. The prediction set of a new test point x is defined as $C(x) = \{y|S(x, y) \leq q\}$. The general CP theory guarantees that $1-\alpha \leq p(y \in C(x)) \leq 1-\alpha + \frac{1}{n+1}$, where y is the unknown true label [13]. Note that this is a marginal probability over all possible test points and coverage may be worse or better for some cases. It can be proved that conditional coverage is, in general, impossible [4].

We can also define a randomized version of a conformal score. For example in the case of APS we define:

$$S_{rand-APS}(x, y, u) = \sum_{\{i|p_i > p_y\}} p_i + u \cdot p_y, \quad u \sim U[0, 1]. \quad (3)$$

The CP threshold q is the $(1-\alpha)$ quantile of $S(x_1, y_1, u_1), \dots, S(x_n, y_n, u_n)$ and the test time (random) prediction set is $C(x) = \{y|S(x, y, u) \leq q\}$. In the random case we still have a coverage guarantee (marginalized overall test points x and samplings u from the uniform distribution). The random version tends to produce prediction sets with smaller sizes [2].

Suppose we have a validation set with potentially inaccurate labels. Let y_1, \dots, y_n be the correct labels, and let $\tilde{y}_1, \dots, \tilde{y}_n$ be the corresponding observed corrupted labels. We assume that the label noise follows a uniform distribution, where with a probability of ϵ , the correct label is replaced by a randomly selected label uniformly from all the k classes:

$$p(\tilde{y} = j|y = i) = (1-\epsilon)1_{\{j=i\}} + \epsilon \frac{1}{k}. \quad (4)$$

The noise is applied to each sample independently. This noise model is commonly referred to as the random flip noise. The challenge is to successfully implement the CP algorithm using a validation set with noisy labels.

Einberder et al. [3] suggested applying the standard CP algorithm to the noisy labeled validation set. We denote their approach as Noisy-CP. The general CP theory guarantees that $1-\alpha \leq p(\tilde{y} \in C_{noisy-cp}(x))$. This guarantee is for the noisy labeled data. They showed that if the classifier $p(y|x; \theta)$ ranks the classes identically to the true distribution $p(y|x)$, we also have a coverage guarantee for the noise-free test data. The CP threshold q_{noise} obtained by the Noisy-CP procedure is usually much higher than the threshold q obtained by using noise-free data. This results in larger prediction sets. Our goal is to find a noise-robust calibration score with the required $1-\alpha$ coverage and with a small prediction-set size.

3 A Noise-Robust Conformal Prediction Score

Let $(x_1, \tilde{y}_1), \dots, (x_n, \tilde{y}_n)$ be a noisy validation set where the labels were corrupted by uniform noise with a noise level ϵ . We aim to find a noise-robust conformal

Table 1: Conformal Prediction methods for validation sets with noisy labels. Given an image x , y is the true label, \hat{y} is its noisy version and ϵ is the noise level. S is a conformal score and \hat{S} is its noise robust variant.

Stage	CP (Oracle)	Noisy-CP [3]	NRES-CP	NR-CP
Learning phase	$S(x, y) \rightarrow q$	$S(x, \tilde{y}) \rightarrow q_{noise}$	$\hat{S}(x, \tilde{y}, \epsilon) \rightarrow q_\epsilon$	$\hat{S}(x, \tilde{y}, \epsilon) \rightarrow q_\epsilon$
Inference phase	$\{y S(x, y) \leq q\}$	$\{y S(x, y) \leq q_{noise}\}$	$\{y \hat{S}(x, y, \epsilon) \leq q_\epsilon\}$	$\{y S(x, y) \leq q_\epsilon\}$

score that can be applied to the noisy labeled data. Since y_t is not observed, we cannot directly compute the score $S(x_t, y_t)$. Instead, we can estimate it using its noisy version \tilde{y}_t :

$$\mathbf{E}(S(x_t, y_t) | \tilde{y}_t) = \sum_{i=1}^k p(y_t = i | \tilde{y}_t) S(x_t, i). \quad (5)$$

Assuming a non-informative uniform prior on the correct label y_t , i.e., $p(y_t = i) = 1/k$, we obtain:

$$p(y_t = i | \tilde{y}_t) = (1 - \epsilon) 1_{\{\tilde{y}_t = i\}} + \frac{\epsilon}{k}. \quad (6)$$

Substituting (6) in (5), yields an estimate $\hat{S}(x_t, \tilde{y}_t, \epsilon)$ of the noise-free score:

$$\hat{S}(x_t, \tilde{y}_t, \epsilon) = \mathbf{E}(S(x_t, y_t) | \tilde{y}_t) = (1 - \epsilon) S(x_t, \tilde{y}_t) + \epsilon S(x_t) \quad (7)$$

s.t. $S(x_t) = \frac{1}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k S(x_t, i)$. Note that to obtain the score estimation $\hat{S}(x_t, \tilde{y}_t, \epsilon)$, we need to either know the noise level ϵ or estimate it from the noisy-label data. We elaborate further on this issue in the next section.

We next apply the CP algorithm on the estimated conformal scores and set q_ϵ to be the $(1 - \alpha)$ quantile of $\hat{S}(x_1, \tilde{y}_1, \epsilon), \dots, \hat{S}(x_n, \tilde{y}_n, \epsilon)$. According to the general CP theory, the prediction set of a given test sample x is:

$$\hat{C}_\epsilon(x) = \{y | \hat{S}(x, y, \epsilon) \leq q_\epsilon\} = \{y | S(x, y) \leq \frac{q_\epsilon - \epsilon S(x)}{1 - \epsilon}\}. \quad (8)$$

Let x be a test point and y and \tilde{y} be its true label and noisy label respectively. The general CP theory guarantees that $1 - \alpha \leq p(\tilde{y} \in \hat{C}_\epsilon(x))$. This guarantee, however, is for the noisy labeled data. Assume that for every x the order of the network class predictions $p(y = i | x; \theta)$ coincides with the order of the true probabilities $p(y = i | x)$. In that case, the same argument that appears in [3] for Noisy-CP, implies a coverage guarantee in the noise-free case. However, the prediction set obtained by the estimated score (8), is usually still too large.

In the case of noisy labels, during the CP learning phase, we need to estimate the score of the correct class. However, to form the prediction set at test time we need to compute the scores of all the possible classes. Hence, in a way similar

Algorithm 1 Noise-Robust Conformal Prediction (NR-CP)

- 1: Input: A conformal score $S(x, y)$, a coverage level $1 - \alpha$ and a validation set $(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_n, y_n)$, s.t. the labels are corrupted by uniform noise with parameter ϵ .
- 2: Compute the estimated scores:

$$s_t = \hat{S}(x_t, y_t, \epsilon) = (1 - \epsilon)S(x_t, y_t) + \frac{\epsilon}{k} \sum_{i=1}^k S(x_t, i), \quad t = 1, \dots, n$$

- 3: Set q to be the $\lceil (n + 1)(1 - \alpha)/n \rceil$ quantile of s_1, \dots, s_n .
 - 4: The prediction set of a test sample x is $C(x) = \{y \mid S(x, y) < q\}$.
-

to the Noisy-CP algorithm, we can thus construct the prediction set of a test sample x using the exact score $S(x, y)$ instead of the estimated score $\hat{S}(x, \tilde{y}, \epsilon)$:

$$C_\epsilon(x) = \{y \mid S(x, y) \leq q_\epsilon\}. \tag{9}$$

We denote the algorithm variants based on Eqs. (8) and (9) as the Noise Robust Estimated Score CP (NRES-CP) and the Noise Robust CP (NR-CP) respectively. The only difference between them lies in how the test-time prediction set is formed. The various noisy label CP methods discussed above are summarized in Table 1. We empirically show below that NR-CP satisfies the coverage requirement and yields an average size that is much smaller than the one obtained by NRES-CP. The NR-CP is summarized in Algorithm Box 1.

We next analyze the proposed noise robust conformal score. It is easy to verify that the prediction set obtained by NR-CP is smaller than the one obtained by NRES-CP, i.e., $C_\epsilon(x) \subset \hat{C}_\epsilon(x)$ if and only if $S(x) \leq q_\epsilon$. In the case of HPS, $S(x) = \frac{1}{k} \sum_i (1 - p(y = i|x)) = (k - 1)/k$ and therefore $\hat{S}(x, \tilde{y}, \epsilon) = (1 - \epsilon)S(x, \tilde{y}) + \epsilon \frac{k-1}{k}$. This implies that $q_\epsilon = (1 - \epsilon)q_{noise} + \epsilon \frac{k-1}{k}$ such that q_{noise} and q_ϵ are the thresholds computed by Noisy-CP [3] and NRES-CP (8) respectively. It is easy to verify that Noisy-CP and NRES-CP yield the same prediction set, i.e. $\{y \mid S(x, y) \leq q_{noise}\} = \{y \mid \hat{S}(x, y, \epsilon) \leq q_\epsilon\}$.

In the case of the APS conformal score, it is easy to see that: $(\hat{p} + 1)/2 \leq S(x) \leq (\hat{p} + k - 1)/k$, s.t. $\hat{p} = \max_i p(y = i|x; \theta)$ is the network confidence on its single-class prediction. Hence, when the prediction sets obtained by NR-CP are smaller than those obtained by NRES-CP, the prediction confidence satisfies $(\hat{p} + 1)/2 \leq S(x) \leq q_\epsilon$. In this case the network is less confident ($\hat{p} \leq 2q_\epsilon - 1$) and thus the size prediction set is expected to be larger.

4 Experiments and Results

In this section, we evaluate the capabilities of our NR-CP algorithm on various medical imaging datasets. We share our code for reproducibility¹.

¹ <https://github.com/cobypenso/Noise-Robust-Conformal-Prediction>

Table 2: APS Caibration results for $1-\alpha = 0.9$. We report the mean and the std over 5000 different splits.

Dataset	CP Method	size ↓	q (%)	coverage (%)
TissueMNIST [17] (8 classes)	CP	3.47 ± 0.02	98.59 ± 0.05	90.00 ± 0.22
	Noisy-CP	5.14 ± 0.03	99.89 ± 0.01	97.64 ± 0.11
	NRES-CP	6.16 ± 0.03	99.16 ± 0.03	93.85 ± 0.15
	NR-CP	3.87 ± 0.02	99.16 ± 0.03	92.63 ± 0.16
PathMNIST [17] (9 classes)	CP	4.27 ± 0.09	97.49 ± 0.31	90.03 ± 0.71
	Noisy-CP	6.21 ± 0.11	99.38 ± 0.15	96.06 ± 0.39
	NRES-CP	6.10 ± 0.15	98.60 ± 0.17	94.90 ± 0.43
	NR-CP	5.16 ± 0.09	98.60 ± 0.17	93.64 ± 0.41
HAM10000 [12] (7 classes)	CP	3.95 ± 0.21	97.55 ± 0.39	90.20 ± 1.78
	Noisy-CP	5.10 ± 0.19	99.05 ± 0.21	95.41 ± 1.07
	NRES-CP	5.12 ± 0.18	98.18 ± 0.17	93.92 ± 1.23
	NR-CP	4.37 ± 0.13	98.18 ± 0.17	92.36 ± 1.10
OrganSMNIST [17] (11 classes)	CP	4.07 ± 0.07	99.6 ± 0.04	90.02 ± 0.57
	Noisy-CP	6.67 ± 0.12	99.96 ± 0.01	98.40 ± 0.20
	NRES-CP	6.52 ± 0.13	99.84 ± 0.02	94.87 ± 0.36
	NR-CP	5.20 ± 0.07	99.84 ± 0.02	95.19 ± 0.34

Compared methods. Our method takes an existing conformal score S and creates a variant of it \hat{S} that is robust to label noise. We implemented the three most popular conformal prediction scores, namely APS [10], RAPS [1] and HPS [13]. For each score S , we compared four CP methods: (1) CP (Oracle) - using a validation set with clean labels, (2) Noisy-CP - applying a standard CP on noisy labels without any modifications [3], (3) NRES-CP and (4) NR-CP. Table 1 summarizes the differences between methods.

Evaluation Measures. The evaluation was done on a noise-free test set. We evaluated each method based on the average length of the prediction sets (where a small value means high efficiency) and the fraction of test samples for which the prediction sets contain the ground-truth labels. These two evaluation metrics can be formally defined as:

$$\text{size} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_i |C(x_i)|, \quad \text{coverage} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_i \mathbf{1}(y_i \in C(x_i))$$

such that n is the size of the test set.

Datasets. We present results on several publicly available medical imaging classification datasets. **TissuMNIST** [16,17]: It contains 236,386 human kidney cortex cells, organized into 8 categories. Each gray-scale image is $32 \times 32 \times 7$ pixels. The 2D projections were obtained by taking the maximum pixel value along the axial-axis of each pixel, and were resized into 28×28 gray-scale images [14]. **HAM10000** [12]: This dataset contains 10,015 dermatoscopic images of size 800×600 . Cases include a representative collection of 7 diagnostic categories in the realm of pigmented lesions. We used a train/validation/test split of 8,013/1,001/1,001 images. **PathMNIST** [17]: A dataset that contains 97,176

Table 3: APS and RAPS (randomized versions) calibration results for $1 - \alpha = 0.9$. We report the mean and the std over 5000 different splits.

Dataset	CP Method	rand-APS		rand-RAPS	
		size ↓	coverage (%)	size ↓	coverage (%)
TissueMNIST [17] (8 classes)	CP	2.35 ± 0.01	91.39 ± 0.19	2.33 ± 0.01	90.01 ± 0.23
	Noisy-CP	4.68 ± 0.04	99.34 ± 0.05	4.72 ± 0.04	99.27 ± 0.05
	NRES-CP	4.27 ± 0.08	97.42 ± 0.12	4.40 ± 0.05	98.65 ± 0.13
	NR-CP	3.27 ± 0.02	96.71 ± 0.08	3.40 ± 0.02	96.94 ± 0.08
PathMNIST [17] (9 classes)	CP	2.74 ± 0.10	91.09 ± 0.54	2.71 ± 0.10	90.02 ± 0.70
	Noisy-CP	6.12 ± 0.14	96.36 ± 0.32	6.15 ± 0.13	96.43 ± 0.32
	NRES-CP	4.47 ± 0.11	95.30 ± 0.21	6.02 ± 0.10	96.10 ± 0.15
	NR-CP	4.33 ± 0.08	94.01 ± 0.30	4.67 ± 0.08	94.45 ± 0.29
HAM10000 [12] (7 classes)	CP	2.71 ± 0.27	90.68 ± 1.57	2.71 ± 0.27	90.21 ± 1.77
	Noisy-CP	4.98 ± 0.22	95.88 ± 0.96	4.99 ± 0.22	95.86 ± 0.94
	NRES-CP	3.85 ± 0.17	94.52 ± 0.55	5.02 ± 0.15	96.33 ± 0.79
	NR-CP	3.54 ± 0.12	92.77 ± 0.88	3.69 ± 0.15	92.94 ± 0.90
OrganSMNIST [17] (11 classes)	CP	1.67 ± 0.02	93.33 ± 0.36	1.63 ± 0.02	90.02 ± 0.57
	Noisy-CP	6.15 ± 0.16	99.76 ± 0.05	6.23 ± 0.15	99.54 ± 0.08
	NRES-CP	5.96 ± 0.09	99.50 ± 0.16	6.31 ± 0.10	99.61 ± 0.17
	NR-CP	2.96 ± 0.06	98.35 ± 0.12	4.31 ± 0.22	99.20 ± 0.11

images of colon pathology with nine classes. The images’ size is 28×28 . Here, we used a train/validation/test split of 89,996/3,590/3,590 images. **OrganSMNIST** [17]: A dataset that contains 25,221 images of abdominal CT with eleven classes. The images are is 28×28 in size. Here, we used a train/validation/test split of 13,940/2,452/8,829 images.

Implementation details. Each task was trained by fine-tuning on a pre-trained ResNet-18 [5] network. The models were taken from the PyTorch site². This network architecture was selected because of its widespread use in classification problems. The last fully connected layer output size was adjusted to fit the corresponding number of classes for each dataset. For the HAM10000 models we fine-tuned using cross-entropy loss and the Adam optimizer, whereas for PathMNIST, TissueMNIST, and OrganSMNIST we used publicly available checkpoints³. For each dataset, we combined the validation and test sets and then constructed 5000 different splits where 50% was used for the calibration phase and 50% used for testing.

CP Results. Tables 2 and 3 report the noisy label calibration results for APS, and RAPS. In all cases, we used $1 - \alpha = 0.9$ and a noise level of $\epsilon = .2$. We report the mean and standard deviation over 5000 random splits. Table 2 shows that in the case of a validation set with noisy labels, the CP threshold becomes larger to facilitate the uncertainty induced by the noisy labels. This yielded larger prediction sets and the coverage was higher than the target coverage which was set to 90%. The NR-CP method, which was aware of the noise rate, yielded

² <https://pytorch.org/vision/stable/models.html>

³ <https://github.com/MedMNIST/MedMNIST>




Fig. 1: Mean size and coverage as a function of the noise level across different conformal prediction methods for HAM-10000 and $1 - \alpha = 0.9$.

better results in terms of the prediction set size, and approached the noise-free scenario. Both Noisy-CP and NRES-CP were under-confident and failed to reflect the uncertainty on the test set.

End-to-end CP with noise level estimation. We next combined our NR-CP with a state-of-the-art noise-robust network training that estimated the noise level ϵ as part of the training [6]. Fig. 1 reports the mean size and coverage results across different noise levels ϵ and different conformal prediction methods on the HAM-10000 dataset. We denote the NR-CP variant in which ϵ was estimated by NR-CP*. The results show that as the noise rate increased, the noisy labels corrupted the calibration of the network more, as reflected in a larger mean size and higher coverage, whereas our method, even in the case where ϵ was estimated achieved much better calibration results.

To conclude, we presented a procedure that makes it possible to apply the Conformal Prediction algorithm on a validation set with noisy labels. The main novelty of our approach is a transformation that renders a given conformal score robust to label noise. We showed that our method outperforms current methods by a large margin, in terms of the average size of the prediction set, while maintaining the required coverage. In this study, we concentrated on a simple noise model. The proposed NR-CP procedure can easily be extended to general noise models whose parameters can be extracted from the data by applying noise robust network learning methods.

References

1. Angelopoulos, A.N., Bates, S., Malik, J., Jordan, M.I.: Uncertainty sets for image classifiers using conformal prediction. *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)* (2021)
2. Angelopoulos, A.N., Bates, S., et al.: Conformal prediction: A gentle introduction. *Foundations and Trends in Machine Learning* **16**(4), 494–591 (2023)
3. Einbinder, B.S., Bates, S., Angelopoulos, A.N., Gendler, A., Romano, Y.: Conformal prediction is robust to label noise. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.14295* (2022)
4. Foygel Barber, R., Candès, E.J., Ramdas, A., Tibshirani, R.J.: The limits of distribution-free conditional predictive inference. *Information and Inference: A Journal of the IMA* **10**(2), 455–482 (2021)
5. He, K., Zhang, X., Ren, S., Sun, J.: Deep residual learning for image recognition. In: *Proc. of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)* (2016)
6. Li, X., Liu, T., Han, B., Niu, G., Sugiyama, M.: Provably end-to-end label-noise learning without anchor points. In: *International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML)* (2021)
7. Lu, C., Angelopoulos, A.N., Pomerantz, S.: Improving trustworthiness of AI disease severity rating in medical imaging with ordinal conformal prediction sets. In: *International Conference on Medical Image Computing and Computer-Assisted Intervention (MICCAI)* (2022)
8. Lu, C., Lemay, A., Chang, K., Höbel, K., Kalpathy-Cramer, J.: Fair conformal predictors for applications in medical imaging. In: *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence* (2022)
9. Olsson, H., Kartasalo, K., Mulliqi, N., et al.: Estimating diagnostic uncertainty in artificial intelligence assisted pathology using conformal prediction. *Nature Communications* **13**(1), 7761 (2022)
10. Romano, Y., Sesia, M., Candès, E.: Classification with valid and adaptive coverage. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems* (2020)
11. Song, H., Kim, M., Park, D., Shin, Y., Lee, J.G.: Learning from noisy labels with deep neural networks: A survey. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems* pp. 1–19 (2022)
12. Tschandl, P., Rosendahl, C., Kittler, H.: The HAM10000 dataset, a large collection of multi-source dermatoscopic images of common pigmented skin lesions. *Scientific Data* **5**(1), 1–9 (2018)
13. Vovk, V., Gammerman, A., Shafer, G.: *Algorithmic learning in a random world*, vol. 29. Springer (2005)
14. Woloshuk, A., Khochare, S., Almulhim, A.F., McNutt, A.T., Dean, D., Barwinska, D., Ferkowicz, M.J., Eadon, M.T., Kelly, K.J., Dunn, K.W., et al.: In situ classification of cell types in human kidney tissue using 3D nuclear staining. *Cytometry Part A* **99**(7), 707–721 (2021)
15. Xue, C., Yu, L., Chen, P., Dou, Q., Heng, P.A.: Robust medical image classification from noisy labeled data with global and local representation guided co-training. *IEEE Transactions on Medical Imaging* **41**(6), 1371–1382 (2022)
16. Yang, J., Shi, R., Ni, B.: MedMNIST classification decathlon: A lightweight automl benchmark for medical image analysis. In: *The IEEE International Symposium on Biomedical Imaging (ISBI)* (2021)
17. Yang, J., Shi, R., Wei, D., Liu, Z., Zhao, L., Ke, B., Pfister, H., Ni, B.: MedMNIST v2-a large-scale lightweight benchmark for 2D and 3D biomedical image classification. *Scientific Data* **10**(1), 41 (2023)