

---

# ArXiv Intelligence: Topic Classification of Academic Papers

---

Sid Bansal Aryan Gulati Aditya Kumar

## Abstract

Classifying long documents, that extend beyond the token limits of most transformer models, is an important real-world challenge. In this paper, we propose several methods for classifying such documents, focusing on arXiv papers belonging to 11 specific disciplines in mathematics and computer science. We examine the performance of a baseline Naive Bayes method, and transformer-based architectures like BERT (Devlin et al., 2018) and Longformer (Beltagy et al., 2020). We use F1 score as our primary evaluation metric, and we find that our transformer-based models significantly outperform our baseline. Our best-performing method uses BERT representations of the first 512 tokens of the paper as well as a representation of randomly chosen sentences from the rest of the document, with an F1 score of 0.8636. Although our error analysis reveals some shortcomings, we conclude that transformer-based methods can effectively classify academic papers by discipline.

## 1. Introduction

The pre-train then fine-tune paradigm has become the standard for text classification – where a pre-trained language model (e.g. BERT (Devlin et al., 2018), or its variants) is fine-tuned for classification on a given dataset. However, these models are generally trained with an architecture that can only process sequences of up to 512 tokens. Documents, such as academic papers, often exceed the token limits of these models.

Due to the vast expanse of academic literature, the ability to categorize papers according to their domains is an important issue to solve. By effectively automating the process of classifying academic papers, significant improvements can be made to literature reviews, collaboration among disciplines, and the overall discovery of knowledge. This challenge lies within the broader category of topic classification: a set of problems in which documents of text are assigned to specific categories.

Our model will output classifications of arXiv papers by

discipline. There are 11 such disciplines in our dataset, with three falling under “math” and eight falling under “CS”. More descriptions about these labels are provided in section 3. The input to the model will be academic papers which fall into one of these 11 disciplines.

We have developed four fully functioning pipelines: a baseline Naive Bayes classifier, a model using BERT with truncation, a model using BERT with random added context, and a model using Longformer (Beltagy et al., 2020). The Naive Bayes baseline achieves an F1 score of 0.66, whereas the other three models achieve relatively high scores around 0.85. More details about results are provided in section 5.

## 2. Related Work

There are various approaches in the literature to classify long documents with transformers. A straightforward baseline is to truncate long sequences to their first 512 tokens and then fine-tune a model end-to-end on these truncated sequences, as in Adhikari et al. (2019). Similar to our work, they also evaluate their approach on a dataset of academic papers from arXiv. However, our final approach differs from the truncated BERT classifier because we incorporate random context. Furthermore, their method struggles due to the loss of context from later parts of the document, hindering the model’s ability to accurately understand overall meaning. Prior work has also observed this effect, and shows that adding additional context generally leads to improved performance (Park et al., 2022).

We plan on incorporating this insight into our own methods by concatenating the representations of randomly selected sentences to the representation of the first 512 tokens in the document, as proposed in Park et al. (2022). The same work also proposes concatenating the representations of the most important sentences as determined by TextRank (Mihalcea & Tarau, 2004). These augmentations include any important context that may not be present in the first 512 tokens of the sequence, addressing a main concern of the baseline approach. However, this still results in the loss of information and forces the model to make classifications without having access to the entire document. Although we use the same approach as this paper, we apply it to a new domain: academic literature. Another difference in our approach is that we do not use TextRank to choose the

most important sentences, as our method picks sentences completely randomly.

Hierarchical transformers (Pappagari et al., 2019; Zhang et al., 2019) address the limitation of the model not having access to the full document. The process involves splitting text into segments of length less than 512, encoding each segment with a pre-trained encoder, and training a model with two transformer blocks on the representations of the segments. This method addresses the challenge of extracting contextual information from the entire document by encoding sentences throughout the input document. Nonetheless, a limitation of this approach is that each sequence of 512 tokens is encoded separately. This may result in the loss of information if there are dependencies or important context that spans multiple sequences. Similar to hierarchical methods, our approach also attempts to incorporate contextual information from the entire document. However, we only choose a random subset of the data, instead of encoding the entire text.

Beltagy et al. (2020) introduce the Longformer, which uses a sparse version of the self-attention mechanism and can be used on sequences of up to 4096 tokens. Zaheer et al. (2020) also propose similar mechanisms and release Big-Bird, another pre-trained language model that can handle up to 4096 characters. Using transformer models which can handle longer inputs reduces the loss of contextual information resulting from splitting up the document into separate sequences. We use the model weights released by Beltagy et al. (2020) in our experiments, but we work with data from academic papers instead of news articles. Regardless, Park et al. (2022) find that these large, complex models are still sometimes outperformed by the aforementioned simpler BERT baselines. Our results also find a similar outcome: the more complex Longformer is outperformed by both of our BERT-based methods.

Finally, Chen & Lv (2022) propose a novel approach to long document classification, and also classify academic papers from arXiv as part of their evaluation. Their method involves training a model to choose the most relevant segments from the text, and then using these chosen segments to classify the data. Although they evaluate on a very similar dataset, their approach differs significantly from ours. In particular, we do not choose segments from the text based on relevance, instead we choose either random context or truncate the text to fit the maximum context length of our models.

### 3. Dataset and Evaluation

#### 3.1. Dataset Labels

We will use a dataset of approximately 33,000 arXiv papers (He et al., 2019). ArXiv has a labelling system for papers by general categories and specific disciplines within

that category. Our dataset contains 11 specific disciplines across 2 categories: computer science (“cs”) and mathematics (“math”). For example, “cs.AI” refers to the category of computer science, with a specific discipline of artificial intelligence. The labels are associated with a feature document which all contain more than 4,000 tokens. Each document is a paper found on arXiv, which we aim to classify. The 11 possible labels are:

- **math.AC**: Commutative Algebra
- **cs.CV**: Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition
- **cs.AI**: Artificial Intelligence
- **cs.SY**: Systems and Control
- **math.GR**: Group Theory
- **cs.DS**: Data Structures and Algorithms
- **cs.CE**: Computer Engineering, Finance, and Science
- **cs.PL**: Programming Languages
- **cs.IT**: Information Theory
- **cs.NE**: Neural and Evolutionary Computing
- **math.ST**: Statistics Theory

A distribution of occurrences of each label is provided in Figure 1.




Figure 1. Occurrences of each label in the full dataset.

In our midterm report, we trained binary classification models to distinguish CS and math papers. Since this task was too easy (test F1 score of 0.96 by BERT), we switched to 11-way classification for this report.

---

## 3.2. Data Splitting & Model Evaluation

The original dataset contains approximately 33,000 ArXiv papers. The dataset is split into 2,500 papers each for the test and development set, and the remaining into the training set.

Our dataset has slight class imbalance as shown in Figure 1, so we need to consider the recall and precision of the model. We will evaluate all of our models using F1 score. Our goal is to achieve a higher score with deep learning models than our baseline.

## 4. Methods

### 4.1. Naive Bayes

The Naive Bayes classifier is a probabilistic model that uses the occurrences of features to predict labels. The classifier assumes features are probabilistically independent given their label. Because we are classifying research papers, Naive Bayes can handle each data point’s varying number of features.

The arXiv classification dataset contains 11 labels, and each academic paper is assigned one label. We trained our Naive Bayes model to predict 1 of the 11 labels for each paper.

A hash-vectorizer is used to featurize text documents. The hash-vectorizer tokenizes text data, hashes each token, and finally counts the occurrences of each hash. The number of hashes, or the number of features to extract, can be defined while processing the data. We tried 10, 50, 100, 200, 500, 1000, 2000, and 20,000 features while hyperparameter tuning. More details about the hyperparameter selection process is provided in section 5.1. Because there is a limited hash size and there are more tokens than hashes, some tokens may be mapped to the same hash index in the final feature vector. Overall, the hashed vectors allowed Naive Bayes to learn reduced features and use the occurrences of each feature for a final prediction.

### 4.2. BERT with Truncation

BERT, Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers, is a state-of-the-art machine learning framework developed by Google for natural language tasks (Devlin et al., 2018). It is a transformer encoder model that is pre-trained on a large corpus of English text, and can be fine-tuned for many downstream tasks (Devlin et al., 2018).

The input text is first tokenized using the BERT pre-trained tokenizer. We truncated all tokens past the first 512 because BERT can only process 512 tokens at once. Then, we used a pre-trained BERT model with a linear classification layer built on top of the encoder architecture. Finally, we fine-tuned this model for 11-way classification on the arXiv

academic paper dataset.

We experimented with various batch sizes, learning rates, and number of training epochs during fine-tuning. We chose the hyperparameters that produced our best performing model on the validation dataset. See section 5.1 for the results and chosen values after this process.

### 4.3. BERT + Random

A major limitation of BERT with Truncation is that all information after the first 512 tokens in the input document is ignored. The BERT + Random method attempts to overcome this limitation by including a BERT representation of randomly chosen sentences from the rest of the paper, as proposed in Park et al. (2022).

Similar to BERT with Truncation, the first step is to tokenize the input text using the pre-trained tokenizer. The first 512 tokens are used in the same manner as our BERT + Truncation method. Then, we separate the document into sentences using spaCy, an open-source library for natural language processing. We exclude sentences corresponding to the first 512 tokens, then randomize the order of the rest of the sentences. Then, we tokenize these sentences and select sentence tokens until we have 512 random tokens. The selected sentences are arranged in chronological order to loosely preserve the structure of the paper. Finally, the first 512 tokens and the 512 random tokens are concatenated.

This tokenized data is fed as input to the BERT model. Since BERT has a token limit of 512, the first 512 tokens and the random 512 tokens are given as input separately, producing a “truncated output” and a “random output”.

These two output representations are concatenated and fed into a 2-layer MLP with input layer size of  $768 \cdot 2$  (since BERT outputs have dimension 768). The MLP has one hidden layer and the size of this layer is a hyperparameter that we tuned. The MLP output layer has size 11 (since there are 11 classes), and the maximum value is used as the overall model’s prediction.

The hyperparameters for this method are the batch size, learning rate, number of training epochs, and MLP hidden layer size.

We believe this method overcomes the limitations of BERT with truncation because additional context is given to the model from other parts of the paper. Often the first 512 tokens contains spurious information such as the name of a university and e-mail addresses; providing the model with context from the rest of the paper can place more of an emphasis on the actual content of the paper. Additionally, random sentences from the rest of the academic paper provide a more holistic representation of the paper’s content, as opposed to just using the first 512 tokens.

#### 4.4. Longformer

Longformer (Beltagy et al., 2020) is also a transformer encoder model, similar to BERT. However, it uses a modified attention mechanism, which allows it to efficiently process sequences of up to 4096 tokens.

The input text is first tokenized using the Longformer tokenizer. The tokenized representations are passed through the model with a final linear classification layer added. We fine-tuned the model end-to-end for 11-way classification on the train split of our dataset.

The context length of Longformer is still not sufficient to fully encode all of the documents in our dataset, so some truncation was still required. However, this method provides the largest amount of context. We expected that this would lead to improved overall performance.

The main hyperparameters that we tuned were learning rate, batch size, and number of epochs. Our final values for these parameters were chosen based on the F1 score on the validation set.

### 5. Experiments

#### 5.1. Hyperparameter Selection

The Hash-Vectorizer for Naive Bayes introduced a hyperparameter – the number of features. We ran Naive Bayes on training and validation data with different values for this parameter.




Figure 2. Training and validation F1 score of Naive Bayes.

Figure 2 indicates that the highest validation F1 score (0.657) was achieved using a vectorizer extracting 1000 features. The corresponding training F1 score achieved was 0.697. Note that the list of values we tried can be found in section 4.1.

For fine-tuning BERT (with truncation), we experimented with different values of the learning rate, batch size, and number of epochs. The results from our various experiments are summarized in Table 1. Note that we only report F1 score in this table for conciseness, but precision, recall and accuracy were also recorded and followed the same trend. The metrics were calculated on the validation set.

Batch Size	Learning Rate	Epochs	F1 Score
2	$5 \times 10^{-5}$	1	0.0189
2	$10^{-5}$	2	0.8224
2	$10^{-6}$	5	0.8005
4	$10^{-5}$	1	0.8013
4	$10^{-5}$	2	0.8345
4	$10^{-5}$	3	<b>0.8416</b>
8	$5 \times 10^{-5}$	1	0.8074
8	$10^{-5}$	3	0.8355
8	$5 \times 10^{-5}$	5	0.8319
16	$10^{-5}$	1	0.7869
16	$10^{-5}$	3	0.8247
16	$5 \times 10^{-5}$	4	0.8372

Table 1. BERT Hyperparameters and corresponding validation F1 score. Best results are bolded.

Overall, the model trained with a batch size of 4, learning rate of  $10^{-5}$ , and 3 epochs performed the best on the validation set, with an F1 score of 0.8416.

Our next method, BERT + Random, used BERT and a 2-layer MLP. Similar to our initial model, we experimented with different values for the learning rate, batch size, and number of epochs. We also experimented on the hidden layer size, a new hyperparameter from the introduction of the 2-layer MLP. The results of our experiments are summarized in Table 2. We recorded precision, recall, accuracy, and F1 score, and we report the F1 score here.

Overall, the BERT + Random model trained with batch size of 4, learning rate of  $10^{-5}$ , 3 epochs, and a hidden layer size of 1024 performed the best on the validation data set, resulting in an F1 score of 0.8446.

Finally, we fine-tuned Longformer. We experimented with 3 hyperparameters: batch size, learning rate, and number of epochs. We recorded precision, recall, accuracy, and F1 score, and we report the F1 score here in Table 3.

Overall, the Longformer model fine-tuned with batch size of 4, learning rate of  $10^{-5}$  and 4 epochs performed the best on the validation dataset, resulting in an F1 score of 0.8248.

We used the highest performing hyperparameters of each model when reporting test set results and conducting error analysis.

Batch	Learning Rate	Epochs	Hidden	F1 Score
4	$10^{-5}$	3	1024	<b>0.8446</b>
4	$10^{-5}$	4	512	0.8339
4	$10^{-5}$	4	1024	0.8414
4	$10^{-5}$	10	512	0.8340
4	$10^{-5}$	10	1024	0.8405
8	$10^{-5}$	4	512	0.8395
8	$10^{-5}$	5	512	0.8407
8	$10^{-5}$	5	1024	0.8402
8	$10^{-5}$	8	1024	0.8381
8	$10^{-5}$	10	1024	0.8409
16	$10^{-4}$	1	512	0.0190
16	$10^{-5}$	1	2048	0.7753
16	$10^{-6}$	1	512	0.3135
16	$10^{-5}$	2	512	0.8151
16	$10^{-5}$	3	1024	0.8330
16	$10^{-5}$	4	1024	0.8384
16	$10^{-5}$	8	1024	0.8443
16	$10^{-5}$	8	4096	0.8318
16	$10^{-5}$	10	1024	0.8395
24	$10^{-5}$	10	512	0.8343
32	$10^{-5}$	3	1024	0.8113

Table 2. BERT + Random: Hyperparameters and validation F1 score. Best results are bolded.

Batch Size	Learning Rate	Epochs	F1 Score
2	$10^{-5}$	1	0.8201
2	$10^{-5}$	2	0.8197
2	$10^{-5}$	4	0.8239
4	$10^{-5}$	1	0.8210
4	$10^{-5}$	2	0.8247
4	$10^{-5}$	4	<b>0.8248</b>

Table 3. Longformer: Hyperparameters and validation F1 score. Best results are bolded.

## 5.2. Results

Naive Bayes performed poorly on the test dataset, with an F1 score of 0.66. This results from Naive Bayes’ strong assumption that each feature in the input document is conditionally independent. The model ignores the meaning created by using words in sequences, reducing performance when differentiating between disciplines that use a similar vocabulary.

All three transformer-based methods performed well on the test set with F1 scores greater than 0.84. Capturing the complex relationships between words by using attention and context embeddings, they understood semantic meaning (from pre-training) and contextual meaning (from fine-tuning). Compared to Naive Bayes, the transformer-based models have a significant advantage when classifying

academic papers that use a similar vocabulary.

	F1	Precision	Recall	Accuracy
Naive Bayes	0.66	0.66	0.67	0.67
BERT	0.8533	0.8536	0.8543	0.8584
BERT + Random	<b>0.8636</b>	<b>0.8641</b>	<b>0.8640</b>	<b>0.8684</b>
Longformer	0.8417	0.8429	0.8426	0.8488

Table 4. Results for: Naive Bayes, BERT, BERT + Random, and Longformer. Highest scores amongst all models are bolded.

Out of the three transformer-based methods, the BERT + Random pipeline performed the best, closely followed by BERT (with truncation), and finally Longformer. The success of BERT + Random makes sense because the random context passes information from all parts of the paper, a feature lacking from the other two transformer-based methods. BERT and Longformer only accept the first 512 and first 4096 tokens, respectively, meaning important context from the middle or end of the paper is absent from the encodings.

We are surprised by Longformer’s inability to outperform the BERT-based methods. Memory errors during hyperparameter tuning or the architecture of the model itself are likely the reason for the decreased performance. We provide more analysis about this in Section 7.

## 6. Discussion

To understand which instances each model failed to classify, we analyzed the labels of misclassified documents from our validation set. For each of our four methods, we begin with general error analysis using confusion matrices, then perform more detailed analysis using specific misclassification examples.

### 6.1. Naive Bayes

Naive Bayes did not perform well classifying academic papers. The arXiv papers shared similar vocabularies, confusing the Naive Bayes model. For instance, upon analyzing papers from the cs.IT and math.ST classes, we noticed that words such as “edge,” “graph,” and “polynomial” are frequently used in both math.ST and cs.IT papers. Figure 3 shows that the model incorrectly predicted approximately 4% of math.ST papers as cs.IT and approximately 4% of cs.IT papers as math.ST. Similar misclassifications are seen between categories of cs.AI, cs.CV, cs.NE, and cs.DS in Figure 3.

### 6.2. BERT with Truncation

BERT with truncation performed well across the dataset, displaying its strength to classify papers within the math discipline. The lowest accuracy score reported on math papers was 0.86 and the highest was 0.96, as shown in Figure






Figure 3. Naive Bayes Confusion Matrix, Normalized by Row

4. However, it was difficult for BERT with truncation to differentiate between cs.AI, cs.DS, cs.CV, and cs.NE papers. As shown in Figure 4, cs.AI had an accuracy score of 63%, the lowest score amongst all categories. Approximately 8.8% of cs.AI papers were falsely predicted as cs.CV, 8.3% as cs.NE, and 11% as cs.CE. A similar trend is shown for other computer science disciplines as well, such as cs.CV papers which are commonly misclassified as cs.AI papers and cs.NE papers which are commonly misclassified as cs.CV or cs.AI.

The limiting factor preventing higher performance is the model’s absence of context from later passages in the paper due to BERT’s 512 token limit. Figure 5 illustrates an example where a statistics paper was misclassified as an AI paper. This LIME explanation shows that “neural,” “convolutional,” and “networks” were the words with strongest influence preventing the model from classifying the paper’s true label. Because academic papers provide an overview of topics in their initial paragraphs, the first 512 tokens may contain general words and phrases that are common amongst similar disciplines, unsurprisingly confusing the model’s prediction. If the model had access to text beyond the initial paragraphs, especially text containing statistics-specific vocabulary, we expect that this paper would have been classified correctly.

From manual error analysis of several other misclassifications, we find that this general pattern continues. Specifically, our model often misclassifies papers where the first 512 tokens contain vocabulary from other disciplines. This is unsurprising due to the lack of context from the rest of the paper in the input to the model.




Figure 4. BERT Confusion Matrix, Normalized by Row

### 6.3. BERT + Random

Figure 6 reveals that BERT + Random performed relatively well (accuracy  $\geq 0.87$ ) for all labels except cs.AI (Artificial Intelligence), cs.DS (Data Structures and Algorithms), and cs.NE (Neural and Evolutionary Computing). Artificial Intelligence papers were often misclassified as cs.CV (Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition) papers. Neural and Evolutionary Computing papers were often misclassified as AI papers.

We first cover the example that BERT misclassified (from Figure 5), which BERT + Random does correctly classify. Then, we review the misclassifications of BERT + Random. Note that the following LIME explanations only include words taken from the first 512 tokens, not words from the random context.

Figure 7 shows the LIME explanation for BERT + Random’s classification of the statistics paper (same paper as Figure 5), revealing that the words have larger positive influences towards labeling the paper as “math.ST.” From manual analysis of the data, we find that the random context does seem to help distinguish this paper as a statistics paper and not an AI one. The beginning of the paper has many references to AI-related words such as “neural” and “network,” but the randomly chosen sentences had more statistics-related words such as “unconfoundedness” and “population.” Therefore, the fact that BERT + Random correctly classified this example was not surprising to us; it simply shows that the random context can work as intended.

Figure 8 shows the LIME explanation for a cs.CE academic




Figure 5. LIME Explanation of Misclassified Statistics Paper by BERT

paper which BERT + Random misclassifies as math.AC. However, our BERT Baseline model does correctly classify this example (we have not included the LIME explanation for this). From the LIME explanation of BERT+Random classifying this paper, it is clear that the model does not pick up on the true positive influence of words such as “computability” and “functions.” A manual analysis of the randomly chosen sentences reveals many equations as well as math-related terms such as “polynomial,” “finite,” and “sums.” Therefore, the random context actually confused the model, causing it to pick a math-related label rather than cs.CE.

In general, although BERT + Random slightly outperforms the BERT baseline, this improvement is only marginal because the random context seems unreliable. From manual analysis of many of the misclassifications, it is clear that sometimes the random context is very useful by including many domain-specific words, and sometimes the random context is almost useless because of inclusion of equations and unrelated sentences. For instance, the randomly chosen sentences could come from the references section, which we found occurs in one misclassification. This fact is further augmented by the fact that the spaCy language model used to distinguish sentences is not trained on text that contains significant mathematical notation. Therefore, although the fact that BERT + Random only marginally improves over BERT was initially surprising to us, manual analysis of the random context in misclassification examples revealed to us the inconsistency of this method.

#### 6.4. Longformer

The overall performance of the Longformer model is worse than the both of our BERT-based methods. This result was surprising, because we expected that providing the model




Figure 6. BERT+Random Confusion Matrix, Normalized by Row

with 8 times longer contexts would give it useful information and lead to better classification decisions, not worsen the performance.

Figure 9 shows the confusion matrix for the validation set. Overall, the trends are quite similar. The model is able to accurately classify papers into the various types of mathematics, but struggles to distinguish between the various related domains like Computer Vision (cs.CV), Neural and Evolutionary Computing (cs.NE) and Artificial Intelligence (cs.AI). Further examination shows that Longformer performs comparably or better than the BERT-based methods for all classes, except the ones listed above. For math papers, Longformer had the same, or 1-2% better performance than BERT + Random. However, for AI and CV papers, the accuracy is substantially worse, with a 14% drop relative to BERT + Random.

Therefore, we find that the added context length helps Longformer perform better than BERT-based methods in some instances - as we expect - but the substantial reduction in classification accuracy for AI papers leads to an overall drop in F1 score.

We were unable to generate LIME explanations for Longformer because of GPU memory limitations. However, manual error analysis shows that a lot of the AI-related papers that were misclassified incorporated vocabulary from the predicted domain. For example, a lot of computer vision papers included the phrase “neural networks” or “classifier” and the model predicted them as cs.AI or cs.NE. It is possible that these terms appear more frequently within the longer




Figure 7. LIME Explanation of Correctly Classified Statistics Paper by BERT + Random




Figure 8. LIME Explanation of Misclassified CE Paper by BERT + Random

context, as papers enter their methods or related works sections, which leads to a reduction in accuracy despite the model having more information.

## 7. Conclusion

In this report, we discussed our machine learning pipelines to rapidly classify arXiv papers across 11 fields in Math and Computer Science.

Our baseline models included Naive Bayes and BERT. Our Naive Bayes model used a Hash-Vectorizer for feature extraction. The number of features that the Hash-Vectorizer extracts was our only hyperparameter. Our experiments found that the feature size of 1,000 yielded the highest F1 score of 0.657 on the validation dataset, and 0.66 on the test dataset. Our second baseline model fine-tuned BERT to




Figure 9. Confusion Matrix for Longformer, Normalized by Row

classify the academic papers. Because BERT can only process a certain number of tokens at once, we truncated each data-point to the first 512 tokens before training the model. After tuning the learning rate, batch size, and number of epochs, the best model achieved an F1 score of 0.8416 on the validation data and 0.8533 on the test data.

Our experimental methods, Longformer and BERT + Random, showed strong improvement over Naive Bayes and mixed results over BERT with truncation. Since Longformer has a higher token limit compared to BERT, we truncated each data-point to its first 4096 tokens. We experimented with various values for the batch size, learning rate, and number of training epochs. Despite the various experiments, Longformer’s best F1 score was 0.8248 on the validation dataset and 0.8417 on the test dataset, overall displaying a slight decrease in performance compared to the BERT with truncation. BERT + Random, our final model, performed the highest amongst all models. After tuning the batch size, learning rate, number of training epochs, and hidden layer size, the best model achieved an F1 score of 0.8446 on the validation dataset and 0.8636 on the test dataset.

The BERT + Random’s F1 score outperformed BERT with truncation by approximately 0.01 and Longformer by 0.02. The precision, recall, accuracy of BERT + Random also outperformed all other models.

We expected the task of classifying CS and Math papers to be more difficult due to the length of the academic papers. We anticipated that the truncation of papers would remove necessary information, negatively affecting the per-



formance of our models. However, all of our transformer-based models were still capable of understanding some of the complex relationships across the content of the paper, ultimately reaching F1 scores greater than 0.84 on the test dataset. As expected, Naive Bayes, incapable of capturing complex relationships between sentences and paragraphs, performed poorly. This task lends itself well to transformer based methods.

The most surprising result was Longformer’s inability to outperform the BERT-based methods. Given that Longformer can process 4096 tokens at once, 8 times the tokens that BERT methods process, we expected minimal influence of rare words and overlapping vocabulary between disciplines. However, Longformer requires a large amount of time and memory to effectively tune hyperparameters, both of which are insufficient resources limiting our experimentation of this method. We expect that the performance decrease may also be a result of Longformer’s sparse self-attention which may not capture the relationships between tokens as well as BERT’s scaled dot-product attention for this task.

BERT + Random was our best model. This model processed 1024 tokens in total, 512 tokens found from the first few sentences of the paper and 512 tokens chosen randomly throughout the paper. We theorize that the high performance of BERT + Random is correlated to its ability to process tokens found throughout the paper. This implies that the model’s ability to access context anywhere in the paper improves its ability to correctly predict the discipline of the paper. Finally, this shows that context throughout an academic paper is the most powerful feature to determine it’s discipline.

## 8. Code Submission

Here is the [link](#) to this project’s GitHub page.

## References

- Adhikari, A., Ram, A., Tang, R., and Lin, J. Docbert: Bert for document classification, 2019.
- Beltagy, I., Peters, M. E., and Cohan, A. Longformer: The long-document transformer, 2020.
- Chen, J. and Lv, S. Long text truncation algorithm based on label embedding in text classification. *Applied Sciences*, 12(19), 2022. ISSN 2076-3417. doi: 10.3390/app12199874. URL <https://www.mdpi.com/2076-3417/12/19/9874>.
- Devlin, J., Chang, M., Lee, K., and Toutanova, K. BERT: pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *CoRR*, abs/1810.04805, 2018. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1810.04805>.
- He, J., Wang, L., Liu, L., Feng, J., and Wu, H. Long document classification from local word glimpses via recurrent attention learning. *IEEE Access*, 7:40707–40718, 2019. doi: 10.1109/ACCESS.2019.2907992.
- Mihalcea, R. and Tarau, P. TextRank: Bringing order into text. In Lin, D. and Wu, D. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 2004 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pp. 404–411, Barcelona, Spain, July 2004. Association for Computational Linguistics. URL <https://aclanthology.org/W04-3252>.
- Pappagari, R., Zelasko, P., Villalba, J., Carmiel, Y., and Dehak, N. Hierarchical transformers for long document classification. In *2019 IEEE Automatic Speech Recognition and Understanding Workshop (ASRU)*, pp. 838–844, 2019. doi: 10.1109/ASRU46091.2019.9003958.
- Park, H., Vyas, Y., and Shah, K. Efficient classification of long documents using transformers. In Muresan, S., Nakov, P., and Villavicencio, A. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 2: Short Papers)*, pp. 702–709, Dublin, Ireland, May 2022. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/2022.acl-short.79. URL <https://aclanthology.org/2022.acl-short.79>.
- Zaheer, M., Guruganesh, G., Dubey, K. A., Ainslie, J., Alberti, C., Ontanon, S., Pham, P., Ravula, A., Wang, Q., Yang, L., and Ahmed, A. Big bird: Transformers for longer sequences. In Larochelle, H., Ranzato, M., Hadsell, R., Balcan, M., and Lin, H. (eds.), *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, volume 33, pp. 17283–17297. Curran Associates, Inc., 2020. URL [https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper\\_files/paper/2020/file/c8512d142a2d849725f31a9a7a361ab9-Paper.pdf](https://proceedings.neurips.cc/paper_files/paper/2020/file/c8512d142a2d849725f31a9a7a361ab9-Paper.pdf).
- Zhang, X., Wei, F., and Zhou, M. HIBERT: Document level pre-training of hierarchical bidirectional transformers for document summarization. In Korhonen, A., Traum, D., and Màrquez, L. (eds.), *Proceedings of the 57th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, pp. 5059–5069, Florence, Italy, July 2019. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/P19-1499. URL <https://aclanthology.org/P19-1499>.