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Abstract—This paper proposes new algorithms for the metric learning problem. We start by noticing that several classical metric learning formulations from the literature can be viewed as modified covariance matrix estimation problems. Leveraging this point of view, a general approach, called Robust Geometric Metric Learning (RGML), is then studied. This method aims at simultaneously estimating the covariance matrix of each class while shrinking them towards their (unknown) barycenter. We focus on two specific costs functions: one associated with the Gaussian likelihood (RGML Gaussian), and one with Tyler's M-estimator (RGML Tyler). In both, the barycenter is defined with the Riemannian distance, which enjoys nice properties of geodesic convexity and affine invariance. The optimization is performed using the Riemannian geometry of symmetric positive definite matrices and its submanifold of unit determinant. Finally, the performance of RGML is assessed on real datasets. Strong performance is exhibited while being robust to mislabeled data.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Many classification algorithms rely on the distance between data points. These algorithms include the classical K-means, Nearest centroid classifier, k-nearest neighbors and their variants. The definition of the distance is thus of crucial importance since it determines which points will be considered similar or not, thus implies the classification rule. In practice, classification algorithms most generally rely on the Euclidean distance, which is

\[
d_{IP}(x_i, x_j) = \|x_i - x_j\|_2
\]

for \(x_i, x_j \in \mathbb{R}^P\). However, this distance is prone to several issues. A pathological example is when two classes have a high variance along one common axis: within this configuration, two data points from the same class can be far away from each other, while two data points from different classes can be very close.

To find a more relevant distance for classification, the problem of metric learning has been proposed. Metric learning aims at finding a Mahalanobis distance

\[
d_A(x_i, x_j) = \sqrt{(x_i - x_j)^T A^{-1} (x_i - x_j)}, \tag{1}
\]

that brings data points from same class closer, and furthers data points from different classes away. Mathematically, metric learning is an optimization problem of a loss function that relies on \(d_A\). This minimization is achieved over \(A\), a matrix that belongs to \(S^+_p\) the set of \(p \times p\) symmetric positive definite matrices. The constraints of symmetricity and positivity are enforced so that \(d_A\) is a distance.

In the following, we consider being in a supervised regime with \(K\) classes, i.e. \(m\) data points \(\{x_1, \ldots, x_m\}\) in \(\mathbb{R}^P\) with their labels in \([1, K]\) are available. Data points can be grouped by classes and the elements of the \(k^{th}\) class are denoted \(\{x_{kl}\}\). Then, \(n_k\) pairs, \((x_{kl}, x_{kq})\) with \(kl \neq kq\), of elements of the class \(k\) are formed. The set \(S_k\) contains all these pairs and \(S\) contains the \(n_S = \sum_{k=1}^K n_k\) pairs of all the classes. When \(S\) is used, the class of a pair is not relevant, thus it is denoted by \((x_i, x_q)\) instead of \((x_{kl}, x_{kq})\). The ratio \(\frac{n_k}{n_S}\) is denoted \(\pi_k\). Then, each vector \(s_{ki}\) is defined as the subtraction of the elements of each pair in \(S_k\), i.e. \(s_{ki} = x_{kl} - x_{kq}\) for \((x_{kl}, x_{kq}) \in S_k\). Thus, the set \(\{s_{ki}\}\) contains \(n_k\) elements. Then, the set \(D\) contains \(n_D\) pairs of vectors that do not belong to the same class. Each vector \(d_i\) is defined as the subtraction of the elements of each pair in \(D\), i.e. \(d_i = x_i - x_q\) for \((x_i, x_q) \in D\). Finally, \(S_p\) is the set of \(p \times p\) symmetric matrices, \(S^+_p\) is the set of \(p \times p\) symmetric positive definite matrices, and \(SS^+_p\) is the set of \(p \times p\) symmetric positive definite matrices with unit determinant.

A. State of the art

Many metric learning problems have been formulated over the years (see e.g. [1] for a complete survey). In the following, we present notable ones that are related to our proposal. The Mahalanobis Metric for Clustering (MMC) [2] (Mahalanobis Metric for Clustering) was one of the earliest paper in this field. This method minimizes the sum of squared distances over similar data while constraining dissimilar data to be far away from each other. MMC writes

\[
\arg\min_{A \in S^+_p} \sum_{(x_i, x_q) \in S} d^2_A(x_i, x_q)
\]

subject to \(\sum_{(x_i, x_q) \in D} d_A(x_i, x_q) \geq 1. \tag{2}\)

Notice that \(d_A\) (rather than \(d^2_A\)) is involved in the constraint in order to avoid a trivial rank-one solution.

Then, ITML [3] (Information-Theoretic Metric Learning) proposed to find a matrix \(A\) that stays close to a pre-defined matrix \(A_0\) while respecting constraints of similarities and dissimilarities. The proximity between \(A\) and \(A_0\) is measured with the Gaussian Kullback-Leibler divergence

\[
D_{KL}(A_0, A) = \text{Tr}(A^{-1}A_0) + \log |A A_0^{-1}|. \tag{3}
\]

ITML writes

\[
\begin{aligned}
&\arg\min_{A \in S^+_p} \text{Tr}(A^{-1}A_0) + \log |A| \\
&\text{subject to } d^2_A(x_i, x_q) \leq u, \quad (x_i, x_q) \in S, \\
& d^2_A(x_i, x_q) \geq l, \quad (x_i, x_q) \in D,
\end{aligned}
\]

where \(u, v \in \mathbb{R}\) are threshold parameters, chosen to enforce closeness of similar points and farness of dissimilar points.
Usually $A_0$ is chosen as the identity matrix or as the sample covariance matrix (SCM) of the set $\{s_{ki}\}$.

Next, GMML (Geometric Mean Metric Learning) [4] is an algorithm of great interest. Indeed, it achieves impressive performance on several datasets while being very fast thanks to a closed form formula. The GMML problem writes

$$\min_{A \in S^+_p} \frac{1}{n_S} \sum_{(x_i, x_q) \in S} d^2_A(x_i, x_q) + \frac{1}{n_D} \sum_{(x_i, x_q) \in D} d^2_A(x_i, x_q). \quad (4)$$

The intuition behind this problem is that $d_A^{-1}$ should be able to further away dissimilar points while $d_A$ close together similar points. Then, GMML formulation (4) can be rewritten

$$\min_{A \in S^+_p} \Tr(A^{-1} S) + \Tr(AD), \quad (5)$$

where $S = \frac{1}{n_p} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} s_{ki}s_{ki}^T$ and $D = \frac{1}{n_p} \sum_{i=1}^{n_S} d_i d_i^T$. In [4], the solution of (5) is derived. It is the geodesic midpoint between $S^{-1}$ and $D$, i.e. $A^{-1} = S^{-1} + \frac{1}{2} D$ where

$$S^{-1} + \frac{1}{2} D = S^{-\frac{1}{2}} (S^{\frac{1}{2}} D S^{\frac{1}{2}})^t S^{-\frac{1}{2}}. \quad (6)$$

Then, [4] proposes to generalize this solution by $A^{-1} = S^{-1} + \frac{1}{2} t D$ with $t \in [0, 1]$.

### B. Metric learning as covariance matrix estimation

In this subsection, some metric learning problems are expressed as covariance matrix estimation problems.

The first remark concerns the ITML formulation (3). Indeed, when the latter is written with the SCM as a prior matrix, it amounts to maximizing the likelihood of a multivariate Gaussian distribution under constraints. Therefore, ITML can be viewed as a covariance matrix estimation problem.

The second remark concerns the GMML solution of (5) which is generalized to $A^{-1} = S^{-1} + \frac{1}{2} t D$ with $t \in [0, 1]$. In their experiments on real datasets, the authors often get their best performance with $t$ small (or even zero) (see Figure 3 of [4]). In this case, the GMML algorithm gives $A = S$. This simple, yet effective, solution can be reinterpreted with an additional assumption on the data. Let us assume that data points of each class are realizations of independent random vectors with class-dependent first and second order moments,

$$x_{kl} \overset{d}{=} \mu_k + \Sigma_k^{\frac{1}{2}} u_{kl}, \quad (7)$$

with $\mu_k \in \mathbb{R}^p$, $\Sigma_k \in S^+_p$, $E[u_{kl}] = 0$ and $E[u_{kl}u_{kq}^T] = I_p$ if $kl = kq$, $0_p$ otherwise. Thus, it follows that $s_{kl} = \Sigma_k^{\frac{1}{2}} (u_{kl} - u_{kq})$. Hence, the covariance matrix of $s_{kl}$ is twice the covariance matrix of the $k$th class, $E[s_{kl}s_{kl}^T] = 2 \Sigma_k$. It results that, in expectation, $S$ is twice the arithmetic mean of the covariance matrices of the different classes,

$$E[S] = \frac{1}{n_S} \sum_{k=1}^K \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} E[s_{ki}s_{ki}^T] = 2 \sum_{k=1}^K \pi_k \Sigma_k. \quad (8)$$

The only additional assumption added to GMML to get (8) is (7). This hypothesis is broad since it encompasses classical assumptions such as the Gaussian one. Also notice that using $S$ in the Mahalanobis distance (1) is reminiscent of the linear discriminant analysis (LDA) pre-whitening step of the data.

### C. Motivations and contributions

From Section 1-B, GMML can be interpreted as a 2-steps method that computes, first, the SCM of each class and, two, their arithmetic mean. Thus, this simple approach is not robust to outliers (e.g. mislabeled data) since it uses the SCM as an estimator. Moreover, other mean computation can be used, such as the Riemannian mean which benefits from many properties compared to its Euclidean counterpart [5]. We propose a **metric learning** framework that jointly estimates regularized covariance matrices, in a robust manner, while computing their Riemannian mean. We name this framework **Riemannian Geometric Metric Learning (RGML)**.

This idea of estimating covariance matrices while averaging them was firstly proposed in [6]. The novelty here is fourfold: 1) this formulation is applied to the problem of **metric learning** (see Section II), 2) it makes use of the Riemannian distance on $S^+_p$ which was not covered by [6] (see Section II), 3) we leverage the Riemannian geometries of $S^+_p$ and $SS^+_p$ [7], [8] along with the framework of Riemannian optimization [9] and hence the proposed algorithms are flexible and could be applied to other cost functions than the Gaussian and Tyler [10] ones (see Section III), 4) the framework is applied on real datasets and shows strong performance while being robust to mislabeled data (see Section IV).

### II. Problem formulation

#### A. General formulation of RGML

The formulation of the RGML optimization problem is

$$\min_{\theta \in \mathcal{M}_{p,K}} \left\{ h(\theta) = \sum_{k=1}^K \pi_k \left[ \mathcal{L}_k(A_k) + \lambda d^2(A, A_k) \right] \right\}, \quad (9)$$

where $\theta = (A, \{A_k\})$, $\mathcal{M}_{p,K}$ is the $K + 1$ product set of $S^+_p$, i.e. $\mathcal{M}_{p,K} = (S^+_p)^{K+1}$, $\mathcal{L}_k$ is a covariance matrix estimation loss on $\{s_{ki}\}$, $\lambda > 0$ and $d$ is a distance between matrices. In the next subsections two costs will be considered: the Gaussian negative log-likelihood and the Tyler cost function. Once (9) is achieved, the center matrix $A$ is used in the Mahalanobis distance (1) and the $A_k$ are discarded. The cost function $h$ is explained more in details in the following.

First of all, for a fixed center matrix $A$, (9) reduces to $K$ separable problems

$$\min_{A_k} \mathcal{L}_k(A_k) + \lambda d^2(A, A_k), \quad (10)$$

whose solutions are estimates of $\{\Sigma_k\}$ that are regularized towards $A$.

Second, for $\{A_k\}$ fixed, solving (9) averages the matrices $\{A_k\}$. Indeed, in this case, (9) reduces to

$$\min_{A \in S^+_p} \sum_{k=1}^K \pi_k d^2(A, A_k). \quad (11)$$
For example, if \( d \) is the Euclidean distance \( d_E(A,A_k) = \| A - A_k \|_2 \), then the minimum of (11) is the arithmetic mean \( \sum_{k=1}^{n} \pi_k A_k \). In the rest of the paper, we consider the Riemannian distance on \( S_p^+ \) [7], that is
\[
d_R(A,A_k) = \left\| \logm \left( A^{-\frac{1}{2}} A_k A^{-\frac{1}{2}} \right) \right\|_2. \tag{12}
\]
A nice property of \( d_R \) (12) is its affine invariance. Indeed, for any \( C \) invertible, we have \( d_R(CAC^T,CA_k C^T) = d_R(A, A_k) \). Thus, if \( \{s_k\} \) is transformed to \( \{Cs_k\} \) then the minimum \( (A,\{A_k\}) \) of (13) becomes \( (CAC^T,\{CA_k C^T\}) \). Another nice property of this distance is its geodesic convexity, as it will be discussed in Section III.

With this Riemannian distance, the general formulation of the RGML optimization problem (9) becomes
\[
\min_{\theta \in \mathcal{M}_{p,K}} \left\{ h(\theta) = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \pi_k \left[ L_k(A_k) + \lambda d_R^2(A, A_k) \right] \right\}. \tag{13}
\]
We emphasize that the optimization of (13) is performed with respect to all the matrices \( A \) and \( \{A_k\} \) at the same time. Thus it both estimates regularized covariance matrices \( \{A_k\} \) while averaging them to estimate their unknown barycenter \( A \).

### B. RGML Gaussian

To get a practical cost function \( h \) (13), it only remains to specify the functions \( L_k \). The most classical assumption on the data distribution is the Gaussian one (e.g. considered in ITML with the SCM as prior). Thus, the first functions \( L_k \) considered are the centered multivariate Gaussian negative log-likelihoods
\[
L_{G,k}(A) = \frac{1}{n_k} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} s_i^T A^{-1} s_i + \log |A|. \tag{14}
\]
With this negative log-likelihood, the RGML optimization problem (13) becomes
\[
\min_{\theta \in \mathcal{M}_{p,K}} \left\{ h_G(\theta) = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \pi_k \left[ L_{G,k}(A_k) + \lambda d_R^2(A, A_k) \right] \right\}. \tag{15}
\]

### C. RGML Tyler

When data is non-Gaussian, robust covariance matrix estimation methods are a preferred choice. This occurs whenever the probability distribution of the data is heavy-tailed or a small proportion of the samples represents outlier behavior. In a classification setting, the latter happens when data are mislabeled. A classical robust estimator is the Tyler’s estimator [10] which is the minimizer of the following cost function
\[
L_{T,k}(A) = \frac{p}{n_k} \sum_{i=1}^{n_k} \log \left( s_i^T A^{-1} s_i \right) + \log |A|. \tag{16}
\]
An important remark is that (16) is invariant to the scale of \( A \). Indeed \( \forall \lambda > 0 \), it is easily checked that \( L_{T,k}(\lambda A) = L_{T,k}(A) \). Thus, a constraint of unit determinant is added to (13) to fix the scales of \( \{A_k\} \). Furthermore, the Riemannian distance (12) is also the one on \( S_{S_p^+} \). Thus, we choose to also constrain \( A \) so that it is the Riemannian mean of \( \{A_k\} \) on \( S_{S_p^+} \). We denote by \( \mathcal{S}_{M_{p,K}} \) this new parameter space
\[
\mathcal{S}_{M_{p,K}} = \{ \theta \in \mathcal{M}_{p,K}, |A| = |A_k| = 1, \forall k \in [1,K] \}. \tag{17}
\]
Thus, the RGML optimization problem (13) with the Tyler cost function (16) becomes
\[
\min_{\theta \in \mathcal{S}_{M_{p,K}}} \left\{ h_T(\theta) = \sum_{k=1}^{K} \pi_k \left[ L_{T,k}(A_k) + \lambda d_R^2(A, A_k) \right] \right\}. \tag{18}
\]

### III. RIEMANNIAN OPTIMIZATION

The objective of this section is to present the Algorithms 1 and 2 which minimize (15) and (18) respectively. They leverage the Riemannian optimization framework [9], [11]. The products manifolds \( \mathcal{M}_{p,K} \) and \( \mathcal{S}_{M_{p,K}} \) (directly inherited from \( S_p^+ \) and \( S_{S_p^+} \) [7], [8]) are presented.

#### A. Riemannian optimization and g-convexity on \( \mathcal{M}_{p,K} \)

Since, \( \mathcal{M}_{p,K} \) is an open set in a vector space, the tangent space \( T_0\mathcal{M}_{p,K} \) (linearization of the Riemannian manifold at a given point) is identified to \( (S_p)^{K+1} \). Then, the affine invariant metric is chosen as the Riemannian metric [7], \( \forall \xi, \eta = (\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_K) \), \( \forall \eta = (\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_K) \) in \( T_0\mathcal{M}_{p,K} \)
\[
\langle \xi, \eta \rangle_{\mathcal{M}_{p,K}} = \text{Tr}(A^{-1} \xi A^{-1} \eta) + \sum_{k=1}^{K} \text{Tr}(A_k^{-1} \xi_k A_k^{-1} \eta_k). \tag{19}
\]
Thus the orthogonal projection from the ambient space onto the tangent space at \( \theta \) is
\[
P^{\mathcal{M}_{p,K}}_\theta(\xi) = (\text{sym}(\xi), \{\text{sym}(\xi_k)\}), \tag{20}
\]
where \( \text{sym}(\xi) = \frac{1}{2}(\xi + \xi^T) \). Then, the exponential map (function that maps tangent vectors, such as gradients of loss functions, to points on the manifold) is
\[
\exp^{\mathcal{M}_{p,K}}_\theta(\xi) = \left( \exp A(\xi), \left\{ \exp A_k(\xi_k) \right\} \right), \tag{21}
\]
where \( \exp A(\xi) = A \exp (A^{-1} \xi) \). Then, for a loss function \( \ell : \mathcal{M}_{p,K} \to \mathbb{R} \), the Riemannian gradient at \( \theta \) denoted \( \nabla_{\mathcal{M}_{p,K}} \ell(\theta) \) is defined as the unique element such that \( \forall \xi \in T_0\mathcal{M}_{p,K} \), \( D \ell(\theta)(\xi) = \langle \nabla_{\mathcal{M}_{p,K}} \ell(\theta), \xi \rangle_{\mathcal{M}_{p,K}} \) where \( D \) is the directional derivative. It results that
\[
\nabla_{\mathcal{M}_{p,K}} \ell(\theta) = P^{\mathcal{M}_{p,K}}_\theta(A \Delta A.G_k \{A_k G_k A_k\}), \tag{22}
\]
where \( \langle G, \{G_k\} \rangle \) is the classical Euclidean gradient of \( \ell \) at \( \theta \). In practice this Euclidean gradient can be computed using automatic differentiation libraries such as JAX [12]. With the exponential map (21), and the Riemannian gradient (22), we have the main tools to minimize (15). However, to improve the numerical stability, a retraction (approximation of the exponential map (21)) is preferred,
\[
R^{\mathcal{M}_{p,K}}_\theta(\xi) = \left( R^+_A(\xi), \left\{ R^+_A(\xi_k) \right\} \right), \tag{23}
\]
where \( R^+_A(\xi) = A + \xi + \frac{1}{2} \xi A^{-1} \xi \). A Riemannian gradient descent minimizing (15) is presented in Algorithm 1.
We finish this subsection by presenting the geodesic convexity of \( h_G \) on \( M_{p,K} \) (see [11, Chapter 11] for a presentation of the geodesic convexity). First of all, the geodesic convexity of \( h \) on \( M \) is said to be geodesically convex (or g-convex) if
\[
\ell (a\#b) \leq t \ell (a) + (1 - t) \ell (b), \quad \forall t \in [0,1].
\]
If \( \ell \) is g-convex, then any local minimizer is a global minimizer. [6] proves that \( h_G \) (15) is g-convex. Hence, any local minimizer of (15) is a global minimizer.

B. \( SM_{p,K} \): a geodesic submanifold of \( M_{p,K} \)

In (17), \( SM_{p,K} \) is defined as a subset of \( M_{p,K} \). In fact, \( SM_{p,K} \) can even be turned into a Riemannian submanifold of \( M_{p,K} \). First of all, the tangent space of \( SM_{p,K} \) at \( \theta \) is
\[
T_\theta SM_{p,K} = \{ \xi \in T_\theta M_{p,K} : \text{Tr}(A^{-1} \xi) = 0, \text{Tr}(A_k^{-1} \xi_k) = 0 \quad \forall k \in \{1, K\} \}. \tag{26}
\]
By endowing \( SM_{p,K} \) with the Riemannian metric of \( M_{p,K} \), it becomes a Riemannian submanifold of \( M_{p,K} \), i.e., the geodesics of \( SM_{p,K} \) are those of \( M_{p,K} \). It results that the exponential mapping on \( SM_{p,K} \) is \( \exp_{\theta}^{SM_{p,K}}(\xi) = \exp_{\theta}^{M_{p,K}}(\xi) \). Then, for a loss function \( \ell \) : \( SM_{p,K} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \), the Riemannian gradient at \( \theta \) is
\[
\nabla_{SM_{p,K}} \ell (\theta) = P_{\theta}^{SM_{p,K}}(A \xi) \}
\]
where \( P_{\theta}^{SM_{p,K}}(\xi) = \text{sym} (\xi) - \frac{1}{p} \text{Tr} (A^{-1} \text{sym} (\xi)) A \). A remarkable result is that \( SM_{p,K} \) is a geodesic submanifold of \( M_{p,K} \), i.e., the geodesics of \( SM_{p,K} \) are those of \( M_{p,K} \). It results that the exponential mapping on \( SM_{p,K} \) is \( \exp_{\theta}^{SM_{p,K}}(\xi) = \exp_{\theta}^{M_{p,K}}(\xi) \). Then, for a loss function \( \ell \) : \( SM_{p,K} \rightarrow \mathbb{R} \), the Riemannian gradient at \( \theta \) is
\[
\nabla_{SM_{p,K}} \ell (\theta) = P_{\theta}^{SM_{p,K}}(A \xi) \}
\]
where \( (G, \{G_k\}) \) is the classical Euclidean gradient of \( \ell \) at \( \theta \). Once again, a retraction that approximates the exponential mapping is leveraged to improve the numerical stability,
\[
R_{\theta}^{SM_{p,K}}(\xi) = \left( R_{A}^{SS^+}(\xi), R_{A_k}^{SS^+}(\xi_k) \right), \tag{29}
\]
where
\[
R_{A}^{SS^+}(\xi) = \frac{A + \xi + \frac{1}{2} A^{-1} \xi}{|A + \xi + \frac{1}{2} A^{-1} \xi|^2}.
\]
The implementations of the cross-validation as well as the k-nearest neighbors are from the scikit-learn library [14]. The proposed methods RGML Gaussian and RGML Tyler have been implemented using JAX [12]. The chosen value of parameter $\lambda$ is 0.05. Its value has little impact on performance as long as it is neither too small nor too large. The proposed algorithms are compared to the classical metric learning algorithms: the identity matrix (called Euclidean in Table I), the SCM computed on all the data, ITML [3], GMML [4], and LMNN [15]. The implementations of the metric-learn library [16] are used for the last three algorithms.

From Table I, several observations are made. First of all, on the raw data (i.e. when the mislabeling rate is 0%) the RGML Gaussian is always the best performing algorithm among those tested. Also, the RGML Tyler always comes close with a maximum discrepancy of 0.26% versus the RGML Gaussian. Then, the RGML Tyler is the best performing algorithm when the mislabeling rate is 5% or 10%. When the mislabeling rate is 15%, RGML Tyler is the best performing algorithm for the Vehicle dataset and it is only beaten by ITML - Identity on the two other datasets. This shows the interest of considering robust cost functions such the Tyler’s cost function (16) in the presence of poor labeling.

Finally, the RGML algorithms are fast. Indeed, Figure 1 shows that both RGML Gaussian and RGML Tyler converge in less than 20 iterations on the Wine dataset.

V. CONCLUSIONS

This paper has proposed to view some classical metric learning problems as covariance matrix estimation problems. From this point of view, the RGML optimization problem has been formalized. It aims at estimating regularized covariance matrices, in a robust manner, while computing their Riemannian mean. The formulation is broad and several more specific cost functions have been studied. The first one leverages the classical Gaussian likelihood and the second one the Tyler’s cost function. In both cases, the RGML problem is g-convex and thus any local minimizer is a global one. Two Riemannian-based optimization algorithms are proposed to minimize these cost functions. Finally, the performance of the proposed approach is studied on several datasets. They improve the classification accuracy and are robust to mislabeled data.
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