

Mining Big Data for Data Science - Project 52017

Matan Bendak 205380611
Amit Baitner Shefer 205373947
11/06/23



Introduction

The arXiv is a vast repository of scientific papers covering a wide range of topics, from Computer-Science and Statistics to Mathematics and Biology.

In this project we built a supervised machine learning model that predicts the category of a given paper using the meta-data of it, using the title and abstract as inputs. To do that, we preprocessed and cleaned the title and the abstract, used an embedding over the title and the abstract's text to make the sentences of it as our numeric features and used them to build several prediction models, such as Random-Forest, CatBoost and a Neural-Network.

These models were trained using a random training set, which was created as a sample from the data in a stratified way over the label; assuming there is only one category per paper; In a case where there is more than one possible category per paper, we could be using an iterative stratification method for multi-label tasks, which can be used for future work on the arxiv data.¹

Methods

In order to create a dataset for the categories we wanted to use (or any other set of labels), we created a generator that loads one paper at a time; we used that generator to load papers, check their category, if it has a category we wanted to use- after using regex to extract relevant elements, it saved the retrieved data to a pandas dataframe, including the raw abstract. This dataframe has the following columns: ["category", "title", "abstract", "last_update_date"].

We built a model class called: "BinaryPaperClassifierModel" that fits a model that includes the following:

1. it allows the user to insert a preprocessing (cleaning) method for the text (such as tokenization / removing unnecessary tokens etc...)

¹ Sechidis, Konstantinos & Tsoumakas, Grigorios & Vlahavas, I.. (2011). On the Stratification of Multi-label Data. 3. 145-158. 10.1007/978-3-642-23808-6_10.

2. After using the mentioned method, the fit method trains a Word2Vec over the training set and saves it (for inference) to create a vector embedding of the title and the abstract into numeric features. (We also tried using TF-IDF but it resulted in a too-big RAM consumption, which we wanted to avoid).
3. Trains a machine learning model out of three options² {"Neural Network", "CatBoost Classifier", "Random Forest Classifier"}, as the user chooses (using a relevant parameter). These models are set as binary classifiers.

The predict method is written as the inference part of our model, it does the following:

1. Uses the same preprocessing/cleaning method that was inserted in the initialization of the model.
2. Removes any token that does not exist in the Word2Vec corpus.
3. Uses the trained Word2Vec that was learnt in the fit method.
4. Predicts using the ML model, on the new data using keras/CatBoost/sklearn.
5. Returns the model's score for each observation.

The evaluation process includes calculating the accuracy, precision, recall and f1-score of the model over the test set and calculating the same metrics for each year separately to see if there are differences in the model's abilities over time.

At the beginning of the work we used the TF-IDF method for the embedding process. However, with this method the data size we received was huge. In this method each unique token has a column, the RAM was beyond reasonable even after filtering out many of the words and usage of lemmatization and stemming; Therefore, we decided to go with the second method, Word2vec, so we could embed the data to a smaller feature space in a more efficient way.

Word2Vec and TF-IDF

Word2Vec is a popular algorithm used for natural language processing and text classification. It is a neural network-based approach that learns distributed representations (also called embeddings) of words from a large corpus of text.

TF-IDF is another method used for text representation. It assigns weights to words in a document based on their frequency in the document and inverse frequency in the corpus. The

² CB = CatBoost Classifier, NN = Neural Network, RF = RandomForest Classifier

idea is that words that are frequent in a document but rare in the corpus are likely to be important for that document's meaning.

Word2Vec, on the other hand, is a more complex algorithm that learns vector representations of words based on their context in a large corpus of text. These embeddings show how words are related semantically and grammatically.

Results

We used the three models for the classification into two categories: 'stat', 'q-fin' and compared their results over time. According to the results, when looking at the accuracy, precision, recall and f1 score; We can see that the Neural Network we built has the best results, although the CatBoost model has very similar results, which are good as well.

Note that the metrics of all models are 0 in 2007 not because of poor model performance, but for the reason of not having positive labels in the data in that year.

	year	count	perc_minority	accuracy_cb	precision_cb	recall_cb	f1_score_cb	accuracy_nn	precision_nn	recall_nn	f1_score_nn	accuracy_rf	precision_rf	recall_rf	f1_score_rf
0	2007	240.0	0.000000	0.979167	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000	0.970833	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000	0.991667	0.000000	0.000000	0.000000
1	2008	359.0	0.512535	0.958217	0.988439	0.929348	0.957983	0.963788	0.988571	0.940217	0.963788	0.885794	0.993103	0.782609	0.875380
2	2009	368.0	0.394022	0.961957	0.964539	0.937931	0.951049	0.975543	0.978873	0.958621	0.968641	0.915761	0.959677	0.820690	0.884758
3	2010	308.0	0.240260	0.967532	0.932432	0.932432	0.932432	0.983766	0.985915	0.945946	0.965517	0.935065	0.965517	0.756757	0.848485
4	2011	382.0	0.232984	0.965969	0.963415	0.887640	0.923977	0.952880	0.917647	0.876404	0.896552	0.937173	0.957746	0.764045	0.850000
5	2012	624.0	0.179487	0.979167	0.945946	0.937500	0.941704	0.980769	0.954545	0.937500	0.945946	0.955128	0.956522	0.785714	0.862745
6	2013	725.0	0.191724	0.975172	0.929078	0.942446	0.935714	0.976552	0.935714	0.942446	0.939068	0.961379	0.930233	0.863309	0.895522
7	2014	783.0	0.195402	0.964240	0.931034	0.882353	0.906040	0.969349	0.921569	0.921569	0.921569	0.945083	0.966102	0.745098	0.841328
8	2015	1150.0	0.174783	0.966087	0.926316	0.875622	0.900256	0.966957	0.926702	0.880597	0.903061	0.946087	0.954248	0.726368	0.824859
9	2016	1287.0	0.149184	0.979021	0.960894	0.895833	0.927224	0.979798	0.941489	0.921875	0.931579	0.962704	0.967532	0.776042	0.861272
10	2017	1425.0	0.122105	0.981053	0.945455	0.896552	0.920354	0.979649	0.909605	0.925287	0.917379	0.963509	0.942029	0.747126	0.833333
11	2018	2155.0	0.093735	0.975406	0.898396	0.831683	0.863753	0.978654	0.902062	0.866337	0.883838	0.966125	0.932886	0.688119	0.792023
12	2019	3200.0	0.081250	0.975938	0.886076	0.807692	0.845070	0.976875	0.860465	0.853846	0.857143	0.971250	0.932990	0.696154	0.797357
13	2020	3716.0	0.096878	0.973897	0.912226	0.808333	0.857143	0.976857	0.905325	0.850000	0.876791	0.963132	0.947791	0.655556	0.775041
14	2021	3073.0	0.129841	0.965506	0.901370	0.824561	0.861257	0.965831	0.884817	0.847118	0.865557	0.948259	0.928571	0.651629	0.765832
15	2022	3149.0	0.143220	0.960305	0.917949	0.793792	0.851367	0.961893	0.916877	0.807095	0.858491	0.941251	0.943333	0.627494	0.753662
16	2023	1563.0	0.152911	0.953295	0.910891	0.769874	0.834467	0.957774	0.881057	0.836820	0.858369	0.937940	0.943750	0.631799	0.756892


Discussion

In order to investigate and understand why starting from 2018 we see a decrease in all the metrics, we tried thinking what could cause that. We checked online to see if there was some change in the ArXiv published papers but didn't find anything regarding that year. We also tried looking at the data and found an interesting thing: the percentage of the minority class also decreased and became rare (<10%).

In addition, to examine our assumption, we used a plot that contains the f1-scores over time for each of our models, and the % minority over time. We also checked the Spearman's correlation between each of the models' f1-scores and that percentage.

The Spearman correlation coefficient is high for each of the models, which aligns with our assumption.

```
Spearman correlation between the f1-score of Catboost and %Minority is: 0.792
Spearman correlation between the f1-score of Neural Network and %Minority is: 0.799
Spearman correlation between the f1-score of Random Forest and %Minority is: 0.740
```



Our Neural Network's architecture is:

