

CICS 397A: Predictive Analytics

Final Project Report

John Milmore

December 26, 2019

1 Introduction

Natural Language Processing (NLP) is a massive field of study in the Artificial Intelligence (AI) community. One of the fundamental tasks of NLP is text classification – the process of assigning tags or categories to text according to its content. The most common applications of text classification include spam detection and email filtering, sentiment analysis, and document classification, but many more exist. The application considered in this report is document classification.

2 Data

Arxiv.org is an open archive for scholarly articles for many academic fields including physics, economics, computer science, statistics and a few others. Each subject has tens of thousands of papers uploaded each year.

In this project, statistics papers were considered for document classification. The task of distinguishing economics papers and statistics papers was considered to be too trivial of a task. Therefore, the subfields of statistics were attempted to be distinguished from each other. Statistics papers are categorized by their subfield topics which consists of Applications (AP), Computation (CO), Machine Learning (ML), Methodology (ME), Other Statistics (OT) and Statistics Theory (TH).

To attain this dataset, a webscraper was used to extract the abstracts of statistics papers from arxiv. All papers that are labelled statistics from the first nine months of 2019 were extracted. The total number of abstracts in the dataset is 2,686. There are 6 categories and the distribution is shown in fig. 1.

Each instance of the dataset contains a list of selected words from the abstract and the paper's corresponding category. First, the words of the abstract were transformed to all lowercase so words like 'Hypothesis' and 'hypothesis' are not considered completely different words. Then, stop words were removed. Stop words are generally the most common words in a language and essentially provide no contextual evidence to the category of the text. Some stop




Figure 1: Categories of dataset

words include ‘there’, ‘we’, etc. Another step considered in the data cleansing step was word stemming. Word stemming is the process of reducing inflected words to their word stem. An example of this is reducing the words ‘historical’ and ‘historically’ to ‘histor’. Stemming helps in reducing the dimensionality of the dataset. In this report we compare the results of stemmed abstracts and non-stemmed abstracts.

A popular topic in NLP is the representation of textual data. The machine learning models cannot interpret words as humans can. Each word is represented by a string of bits and therefore no semantic or syntactic evidence is available to the model. This is the case when we convert each abstract to an array of frequencies of words in the dictionary (distinct words from all the abstracts in the dataset). This can be done by using sklearn’s `CountVectorizer`. This will convert a collection of text documents to a matrix of token counts. Therefore, the inputs to the model, under this data transformation, are vectors of integers where each index represents a word and a value at that index represents the number of times that word occurs in the abstract. Another feature transformation is called term-frequency inverse document frequency (TF-IDF). This transformation is similar to count vectorizing, but now each value in the transformed vector is a measure of the importance a word is in the document. This transformation can be done using sklearn’s `TfidfVectorizer`.

3 Methodology

Two classification algorithms were considered in this project for the goal of classifying the category of statistics paper’s abstracts.

3.1 Naive Bayes

One the simplest, most intuitive classification algorithms is the multinomial Naive Bayes classifier. Naive Bayes uses Bayes rule to return a probability distribution over categories, given an input of features. To learn this posterior distribution, the likelihood and prior must be learned. The beauty of Naive Bayes is the assumption that all of the input features are conditionally independent given the category. The model is shown below.

$$P(Y|X_1 = x_1, \dots, X_n = x_n) = \alpha P(X_1 = x_1, \dots, X_n = x_n|Y)P(Y)$$

$$= \left[\prod_{i=1}^n P(X_i = x_i|Y) \right] P(Y)$$

This algorithm is implemented using sklearn’s `MultinomialNB` class.

3.2 Random Forest

Random forests are ensemble models that can be used for classification tasks. A random forest is made up of decision tree classifiers. A decision tree is a classifier that assigns labels to inputs by performing a sequence of attribute tests. The decision tree learns which attributes (or features) to split on in order to make a confident prediction. A random forest fits several decision trees on various sub-samples of the dataset and uses averaging to improve predictive accuracy and overfitting. The number of decision trees that were used in the ensemble was 100. This is the default for the sklearn `RandomForestClassifier` class.

4 Experimental Results

In this project several models were fit and compared by a measure of predictive accuracy. The learning algorithms considered included multinomial Naive Bayes and random forest classifier. The data was transformed in two different ways – count vectorizer and TFIDF. Also, the data preprocessing was varied in two ways – stemming and non-stemming. The 10-fold cross validation mean results can be seen in table 1. The best model is highlighted in red text. The predictions of this model are represented in fig. 2. This best model was found by using sklearn’s `Pipeline` and `cross_val_score`.

It can be seen from fig. 2 that this model struggled to predict accurately for papers labelled ‘OT’. A majority of the predictions for this class were incorrect as the model predicted actual ‘OT’ papers as ‘AP’ 29% of the time. The reason that the model was so innacurate for papers labelled ‘OT’ is becuase of the lack of training data. We can see from fig. 1 that papers labelled ‘OT’ occur much less than the other categories. Therefore the model does not learn to predict these papers well. To account for this we can train the models with all abstracts labelled ‘OT’ removed from our dataset. The results of these models are shown in table 2. We can see that the results are strictly better – higher accuracy for

every single model. The best model for this training set is highlighted. The predictions of this model are represented in fig. 3. We can see that the model can learn how to predict the remaining classes much better.

Learning Algorithm	Feature Transformation	Data Preprocessing	Accuracy
Naive Bayes	Count Vect	Non-Stem	0.6672
Naive Bayes	Count Vect	Stem	0.6736
Naive Bayes	TFIDF	Non-Stem	0.5201
Naive Bayes	TFIDF	Stem	0.5100
Random Forest	Count Vect	Non-Stem	0.6091
Random Forest	Count Vect	Stem	0.6131
Random Forest	TFIDF	Non-Stem	0.6251
Random Forest	TFIDF	Stem	0.6162

Table 1: 10-fold CV of various models




Figure 2: Heatmap of best performing model

5 Future Work

The data used in this project was a subset of all the available papers on arxiv.org. In the future, I would like to see how the current models would improve with more available training data. It would also be of interest to experiment with other models, including neural networks especially, if more data was able to be collected.

Learning Algorithm	Feature Transformation	Data Preprocessing	Accuracy
Naive Bayes	Count Vect	Non-Stem	0.6779
Naive Bayes	Count Vect	Stem	0.6828
Naive Bayes	TFIDF	Non-Stem	0.5302
Naive Bayes	TFIDF	Stem	0.5192
Random Forest	Count Vect	Non-Stem	0.6174
Random Forest	Count Vect	Stem	0.6198
Random Forest	TFIDF	Non-Stem	0.6310
Random Forest	TFIDF	Stem	0.6304

Table 2: 10-fold CV of various models without ‘OT’ in dataset




Figure 3: Heatmap of best performing model

I would also like to experiment with different ways to transform the features. Another way to represent textual data for learning algorithms is through continuous vector representations. Methods (like word2vec) have been introduced to transform large corpus of text into word vectors such that similar words (semantically) are closer in the vector space. It would be interesting to see if the models introduced in this report could be improved, or even replaced with other models, by training on these word embeddings.

6 Conclusion

From table 1 we can see that the best performing model, for the dataset including ‘OT’ labels, is Naive Bayes with the features transformed as count vectorizer

and the data stemmed. This model gives an average 10-fold cross validation accuracy of about 67.4%. For the dataset with ‘OT’ labels removed, we can see from table 2 that the best model is the same, but with an improved accuracy of 68.3%. The code used to attain the results are attached below as a pdf.