

NLP 220 Homework 3

Mudit Arora

November 23, 2024

1 Multilabel Classification of arXiv Paper Summarizations

This is a multi-label classification problem assignment in which we will process data, engineer features, and train a model to predict which category (or categories) an arXiv paper's abstract belongs in.

1.1 Dataset

Table 1: Data Columns Summary

#	Column	Non-Null Count	Dtype
0	titles	51774	object
1	summaries	51774	object
2	terms	51774	object

	titles	summaries	terms
0	Survey on Semantic Stereo Matching / Semantic ...	Stereo matching is one of the widely used tech...	[cs.CV, cs.LG]
1	FUTURE-AI: Guiding Principles and Consensus Re...	The recent advancements in artificial intellig...	[cs.CV, cs.AI, cs.LG]
2	Enforcing Mutual Consistency of Hard Regions f...	In this paper, we proposed a novel mutual cons...	[cs.CV, cs.AI]
3	Parameter Decoupling Strategy for Semi-supervi...	Consistency training has proven to be an advan...	[cs.CV]
4	Background-Foreground Segmentation for Interio...	To ensure safety in automated driving, the cor...	[cs.CV, cs.LG]

Figure 1: Dataset

We're provided with arXiv paper's dataset of `arxiv-data.json`. The main two columns we need to focus on are:

- summaries: the summary of paper abstracts
- terms: list of corrected labels

1.2 Data Preprocessing

The text preprocessing function performs several essential steps to standardize and clean the text data:

1. Text Normalization:

- Converts text to lowercase to ensure uniformity
- Removes special characters using regex (`\[^a-zA-Z\s\]`), retaining only alphabetic characters and spaces

2. Advanced Processing:

- Removes stopwords (common words like 'the', 'is', 'at') to focus on meaningful content
- Applies lemmatization to reduce words to their base form (e.g., 'running' → 'run')
- Filters out short words ($\text{length} \leq 2$) to remove non-informative terms

This preprocessing improves feature quality by reducing noise and standardizing text representation, which is crucial for effective machine learning model training.

1.3 New Features

We are required to build at one features that process the summaries column and help us to predict a class label.

1.3.1 Length of Description

The `Description_Length` feature calculates the length of each summary by word count, providing a numerical indicator. This feature is valuable because longer summaries often correlate with papers spanning multiple CS domains (like `cs.CV` + `cs.AI` + `cs.LG`), while shorter summaries tend to focus on single domains. The length can thus help distinguish between multi-domain and specialized papers, making it an informative feature for classification.

	titles	summaries	terms	improved_summaries	Description_Length
0	Survey on Semantic Stereo Matching / Semantic ...	Stereo matching is one of the widely used tech...	[cs.CV, cs.LG]	stereo matching one widely used technique info...	79
1	FUTURE-AI: Guiding Principles and Consensus Re...	The recent advancements in artificial intellig...	[cs.CV, cs.AI, cs.LG]	recent advancement artificial intelligence com...	127
2	Enforcing Mutual Consistency of Hard Regions f...	In this paper, we proposed a novel mutual cons...	[cs.CV, cs.AI]	paper proposed novel mutual consistency networ...	152
3	Parameter Decoupling Strategy for Semi-supervi...	Consistency training has proven to be an advan...	[cs.CV]	consistency training proven advanced semisuper...	124
4	Background-Foreground Segmentation for Interio...	To ensure safety in automated driving, the cor...	[cs.CV, cs.LG]	ensure safety automated driving correct percep...	164

Figure 2: Length of Description Output

1.3.2 Bag of Words (BoW)

We used Bag of Words as our second feature since it helps identify commonly used technical terms and research themes within computer science papers. It captures the frequency of words in each paper's summary, which can indicate the research domain - for example, papers in computer vision (cs.CV) might frequently use terms like "detection" or "recognition", while AI papers might contain more terms related to "reasoning" or "learning". BoW is simple yet effective for academic text classification, helping distinguish between different CS domains.

	ability	ablation	ablation study	able	abstract	access	according	account	accuracy	accurate	...	work	work present	work propose	work
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	...	0	0	0
1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	...	0	0	0
2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	...	0	0	0
3	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	...	0	0	0
4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	...	2	0	0

5 rows x 2000 columns

Figure 3: Frequency/Bag of Words

1.3.3 Term Frequency-Inverse Document Frequency (TFIDF)

TF-IDF is used as our third feature since it emphasizes important technical terms that uniquely define different computer science domains while reducing the impact of commonly used academic words. Unlike BoW, TF-IDF highlights terms that appear frequently in specific research areas (like "convolutional" in cs.CV or "reinforcement" in cs.AI) but are less common across other domains. This weighting scheme improves classification accuracy by focusing on distinctive vocabulary that characterizes each CS subfield, making it particularly useful for multi-label classification where papers may span multiple domains

	ability	able	according	account	accuracy	accurate	accurately	achieve	achieved	achieves	...	within	without	word
0	0.000000	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.073419	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.000000	0.0	...	0.0	0.0	0.0
1	0.000000	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.000000	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.000000	0.0	...	0.0	0.0	0.0
2	0.000000	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.000000	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.000000	0.0	...	0.0	0.0	0.0
3	0.081564	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.000000	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.160085	0.0	...	0.0	0.0	0.0
4	0.000000	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.000000	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.000000	0.0	...	0.0	0.0	0.0

5 rows x 1000 columns

Figure 4: TFIDF

1.3.4 Implementation Details

The classification process involves several key steps:

1. **Model Setup:** All classifiers were wrapped in scikit-learn's `OneVsRestClassifier` to handle multiclass classification:

Example:

```
base_classifier = RandomForestClassifier(random_state=42)
ovr_classifier = OneVsRestClassifier(base_classifier)
```

2. **Data Preparation:** The target labels are binarized using `label_binarize` to create a binary matrix representation where each column represents one class.
3. **Model Evaluation:** The evaluation includes multiple metrics:
 - Accuracy
 - Micro-avg, Macro-avg, Weighted-avg, Sample-avg Precision, Recall, and F1 score across all classes

1.4 Feature Engineering

We Created a train/test split using the `train_test_split` method from `sklearn.model_selection`, ensuring the data is shuffled. Utilize a fixed random seed of your choice for reproducibility, allocating 70% of the data for training, the remaining 15% for validation, and the rest 15% for testing.

We experimented by combining all the features:

- Description_Length, word frequency counts (Bag of Words), and TF-IDF values to create a comprehensive feature set that captures both the structural and semantic aspects of the research summaries. This combination allows the




Figure 5: Distribution of Class labels

model to leverage multiple text characteristics: summary length (which often indicates multi-domain papers), common technical terminology (through BoW), and domain-specific terms (weighted by TF-IDF). By considering these complementary aspects, the model can better distinguish between different CS domains and identify papers that span multiple research areas (like cs.CV, cs.AI, and cs.LG).

micro avg	0.76	0.76	0.76	15429
macro avg	0.41	0.35	0.36	15429
weighted avg	0.76	0.76	0.76	15429
samples avg	0.82	0.82	0.79	15429

Figure 6: Multilayer Perceptron

micro avg	0.76	0.70	0.73	15429
macro avg	0.55	0.34	0.39	15429
weighted avg	0.75	0.70	0.72	15429
samples avg	0.83	0.78	0.76	15429

Figure 7: Support Vector Machine

micro avg	0.75	0.74	0.74	15429
macro avg	0.38	0.34	0.35	15429
weighted avg	0.74	0.74	0.74	15429
samples avg	0.79	0.80	0.76	15429

Figure 8: Decision Tree

micro avg	0.31	0.80	0.44	15429
macro avg	0.34	0.38	0.28	15429
weighted avg	0.66	0.80	0.67	15429
samples avg	0.39	0.84	0.49	15429

Figure 9: Naive Bayes

micro avg	0.91	0.69	0.79	15429
macro avg	0.78	0.24	0.35	15429
weighted avg	0.91	0.69	0.75	15429
samples avg	0.91	0.77	0.81	15429

Figure 10: Random Forest

Comparing the micro F1 score of all 6 models, Random Forest model comes out to be the best on the test set.

1.5 Training/Inference time comparison

Table 2: Training/Inference time

Model #	Model Name	Time (in s)	Accuracy
1	MLP	1820.822	0.52
2	SVM	607.441	0.41
3	Decision Tree	1150.858	0.49
4	Naive Bayes	336.81	0.05
5	Random Forest	253.778	0.57

Clearly, based on Training time, Accuracy and micro F1 score, Random Forest beats all of the other models.

1.6 Feature Engineering Deliverables

1.6.1 Performance Analysis

Micro vs Macro F1 Score Comparison:

- Micro F1 scores (0.40-0.80) were consistently higher than Macro F1 scores (0.30-0.35) across models
- This difference suggests:
 - Better performance on common CS domains (like cs.CV, stat.ML, cs.LG) that dominate micro-averaging
 - Challenges with rare domains that impact macro-averaging more heavily

Feature Impact Analysis:

- Most impactful features:
 - TF-IDF: Improved micro-F1 by capturing domain-specific terminology
 - Combined features (Description_Length + BoW + TF-IDF): Best performance due to complementary information

1.6.2 Labels Classification Discussion

The decision to maintain all 88 labels, despite their frequency imbalance, is valuable for several reasons:

- Research Integrity: Even though some domains are rare, removing them would lose important research areas that could be emerging or niche fields
- Multi-Label Nature: Papers often combine mainstream areas (like cs.CV) with specialized domains, reflecting the interdisciplinary nature of modern CS research
- Real-world Application: In practice, a paper classification system needs to handle all possible CS domains, not just popular ones
- Performance Validation: Our model achieved reasonable micro-F1 scores (0.78-0.79) even with all labels, demonstrating robustness to class imbalance

1.7 Conclusion

This report presented a multi-label classification system for categorizing arXiv papers across 88 computer science domains. We engineered multiple complementary features: Description_Length to capture paper complexity, Bag of Words for technical terminology, and TF-IDF for domain-specific term weighting. Among the five models tested (MLP, SVM, Decision Tree, Naive Bayes, and Random Forest), the Random Forest classifier demonstrated superior performance with the highest micro-F1 score (0.78) and fastest training time (253.78s).

The disparity between micro and macro F1 scores reflects the challenge of handling imbalanced class distributions in academic paper classification. Despite this challenge, our decision to maintain all 88 labels preserved the model’s practical utility for real-world applications where comprehensive domain coverage is essential. The successful combination of structural and semantic features suggests that incorporating multiple perspectives of text analysis is crucial for effective academic paper classification.