The R Package **sentometrics** to Compute, Aggregate and Predict with Textual Sentiment Supplementary Appendix

David Ardia Keven Bluteau Samuel Borms* Kris Boudt

Efficiency of various lexicon-based sentiment analysis tools in R

This appendix provides an illustrative comparison of the computation time of various lexicon-based sentiment analysis tools in R. The core of the sentiment computation in the R package sentometrics (Ardia et al. 2019) is implemented in C++ through Rcpp (Eddelbuettel and Francois 2011). We compare the speed of our computation with the R packages meanr (Schmidt 2019), SentimentAnalysis (Feuerriegel and Pröllochs 2019), syuzhet (Jockers 2017), quanteda (Benoit et al. 2018), and tidytext (Silge and Robinson 2016). The first three of these five packages have proper sentiment functions. The quanteda and tidytext packages have no explicit sentiment computation function; it needs to be constructed first, based on their respective toolsets. This is an entry barrier for less-experienced programmers. The SentimentAnalysis package has the tm package as backend and uses internally a similar calculation as tm's tm_term_score() function. The sentimentr package is not part of the exercise because it proved to be vastly slower than all others, which was anticipated as it aims to handle more difficult linguistic edge cases.

We perform two analyses. Sentiment is computed for 1000, 5000, 10000, 25000, 50000, 75000 and 100000 texts, and the average execution time in seconds across five repetitions, using the **microbenchmark** (Mersmann and Ulrich 2019) package, is shown in Table 1.

The first analysis (see Panel 1a) benchmarks these implementations with three approaches using the compute_sentiment() function from sentometrics: one without valence shifters, one with valence shifters integrated from a bigrams perspective, and one with valence shifters integrated from a clusters perspective. The number of threads for parallel computation is set to one where appropriate. All other algorithms are run with a version of the Hu & Liu lexicon (about 6600 single words). The computations are counts—based and constructed so as to give the same output across all packages for a binary lexicon, if the tokenization is the same. For example, the sentometrics and tidytext implementations give identical results.

The **meanr** implementation comes out fastest because everything is written in the C programming language. Yet, it offers no flexibility to define the input lexicon nor the scale on which the scores are returned. On the other spectrum, amongst these approaches, the **SentimentAnalysis** and **suyzhet** packages are slowest. The latter package further does not offer the flexibility of adding different sentiment lexicons than those available in their package. **SentimentAnalysis** becomes exponentially slower as it suffers to manage the memory required for larger corpora. The **quanteda** package is

 $^{^*}$ Corresponding author, contact details: samuel.borms@unine.ch.

	seı	ntometric	es					
Texts	unigrams	bigrams	clusters	meanr	Sentiment Analysis	syuzhet	quanteda	tidytext
1000	0.20	0.21	0.20	0.07	1.20	0.37	0.56	0.13
5000	0.89	0.94	0.95	0.36	5.28	2.05	1.88	0.66
10000	1.74	1.73	1.70	0.70	11.17	3.57	3.09	1.14
25000	4.21	4.13	4.34	1.70	32.78	8.73	7.12	2.84
50000	9.14	8.65	8.85	3.66	57.11	17.92	13.92	5.68
75000	14.49	14.11	14.04	5.31	81.36	27.05	22.45	9.22
100000	18.63	18.20	18.74	7.27	165.00	34.82	27.36	11.41

(b) Average execution time of the sentiment computation for nine lexicons

		${f tidy text}$					
Texts	unigrams	unigrams, feats.	bigrams	clusters	clusters, parallel	unigrams	bigrams
1000	0.26	0.24	0.28	0.26	0.21	0.21	0.67
5000	0.99	0.87	1.02	1.00	0.80	0.67	2.83
10000	1.96	1.68	1.98	1.96	1.57	1.28	5.63
25000	4.82	4.40	5.02	5.10	3.85	3.16	13.90
50000	10.23	8.92	10.44	10.57	8.07	6.65	28.86
75000	17.20	14.73	17.02	17.20	13.31	9.91	44.28
100000	33.87	26.49	32.27	32.74	24.53	13.16	67.82

Table 1: Average computation time (in seconds) of various lexicon—based sentiment tools in R. All implementations consider the Hu & Liu lexicon (see Panel 1a), or the nine lexicons specified in the lex object (see Panel 1b). Some implementations do not integrate valence shifters (unigrams), others do from a bigrams perspective (bigrams) or from a clusters perspective (clusters).

fast, but slower than the **sentometrics** and **tidytext** implementations. The **tidytext** package is faster, particularly for the two largest corpus sizes.

The second analysis (see Panel 1b) compares the computation time with multiple lexicons as input. The comparison is against the **tidytext** package, for a unigrams and a bigrams implementation. The lexicons are those defined in lex, nine in total. For the clusters approach, we also look at its parallelized version, using eight cores (see the 'clusters, parallel' column). For the unigrams approach in **sentometrics**, we also assess the additional time it takes to spread out sentiment across features (see the 'unigrams, feats.' column).

The **tidytext** package is, in general, faster for many lexicons as well. Differences are not large nonetheless, and running any **sentometrics** computation in parallel would make the speed differentials disappear. However, the bigrams calculation using **tidytext** is markedly slower. With **sentometrics**, the speed of the computation is comparable across all types of sentiment calculation. The **tidytext** framework thus copes more slowly with complexity.

Overall, the **sentometrics** package brings an off—the—shelf yet flexible sentiment calculator that is computationally efficient, being fast in itself, and independent as to the decision (how) to integrate valence shifters as well as (though to a smaller extent) the number of input lexicons.

Computational details

For the main computational details, we refer to the paper. The timings comparison can be replicated using the R script run_timings.R, available on the sentometrics GitHub repository (https://github.com/sborms/sentometrics) in the appendix folder. To generate the results, we have also used the packages dplyr version 0.8.3 (Wickham et al. 2019), meanr version 0.1.2 (Schmidt 2019), microbenchmark version 1.4.7 (Mersmann and Ulrich 2019), SentimentAnalysis version 1.3.3 (Feuerriegel and Pröllochs 2019), syuzhet version 1.0.4 (Jockers 2017), tidytext version 0.2.2 (Silge and Robinson 2016), and tidyr version 1.0.0 (Wickham and Henry 2019).

References

- Ardia D, Bluteau K, Borms S, Boudt K (2019). "The R Package sentometrics to Compute, Aggregate and Predict with Textual Sentiment." doi:10.2139/ssrn.3067734. Working paper.
- Benoit K, Watanabe K, Wang H, Nulty P, Obeng A, Müller S, Matsuo A (2018). "quanteda: An R Package for the Quantitative Analysis of Textual Data." *Journal of Open Source Software*, **3**(30), 774. doi:10.21105/joss.00774.
- Eddelbuettel D, Francois R (2011). "Rcpp: Seamless R and C++ Integration." *Journal of Statistical Software*, **40**(8), 1–18. doi:10.18637/jss.v040.i08.
- Feuerriegel S, Pröllochs N (2019). **SentimentAnalysis**: Dictionary-Based Sentiment Analysis. R Package Version 1.3.3, URL https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=SentimentAnalysis.
- Jockers M (2017). syuzhet: Extract Sentiment and Plot Arcs from Text. R Package Version 1.0.4, URL https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=syuzhet.
- Mersmann O, Ulrich J (2019). microbenchmark: Accurate Timing Functions. R Package Version 1.4.7, URL https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=microbenchmark.
- Schmidt D (2019). meanr: Sentiment Analysis Scorer. R Package Version 0.1.2, URL https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=meanr.
- Silge J, Robinson D (2016). "tidytext: Text Mining and Analysis Using Tidy Data Principles in R." Journal of Open Source Software, 1(3). doi:10.21105/joss.00037.
- Wickham H, François R, Henry L, Müller K (2019). **dplyr**: A Grammar of Data Manipulation. R package version 0.8.3, URL https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=dplyr.
- Wickham H, Henry L (2019). tidyr: Tidy Messy Data. R package version 1.0.0, URL https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=tidyr.