

# Comparison and Analysis of Machine Learning Classifiers on Abstracts from Scientific Papers on arXiv

Pavithra Parthasarathy

Udem Matricule: 20182678

## 1. Introduction

Text classification is the basic process of assigning categories to text, based on its context from the content. This is one of the foremost steps in Natural Language Processing (NLP). In this challenge, we are given 2 datasets – training set and test set. The training set contains abstracts of 7500 different scientific papers, pre-classified into 15 different categories and the test set with double the number of samples but without labels. This is basically a Multi class text classification problem.

There are 2 parts to this challenge. The first part is where, we are asked to implement a Naïve Bayes Classifier using Bag of Words features. Here, I explored different text preprocessing steps for the algorithm and see why Naïve Bayes can be a good choice for this task. The second interesting part is to try other models and preprocessing steps from readily available libraries to compare their performances.

## 2. Feature Design

The primary step for text classification is to transform the given data to something that the ML model can consume. I implemented the following basic preprocessing steps to manually extract the features:

- Removed hyperlinks
- Removed latex symbols
- Removed some math symbols and punctuation
- Converted everything to lower case
- Manually removed a few stop words (words repeating a lot but does not add much context)

By doing these, I was able to reduce the total number words that did not have a lot of context, making the features less sparse (Reducing from 70,000 words to 24,000 words in vocabulary)

### 2.1. Bag of Words (BoW)

I explored the BoW model. Here terms are just extracted without ordering and rareness being considered and we have a full unique vocabulary list and other information about words w.r.t each unique class to plug in the Naïve Bayes Multinomial Algorithm. I tried the Count Vectorizer from sklearn with the above manual preprocessing steps. This unfortunately gave poor results. I concluded that some of the hyperlink and equation words did have some impact on the final prediction. I also tried to use stop words as English. But gave poor results because there were some words that was more contextual. I did lemmatization and stemming. But both gave poor results. From a peek into the dataset after this step, it can be observed that the dataset was about scientific papers and doing this changed the meaning of some of the scientific words rendering them useless. I discovered that BoW is the simplest Word Embedding, easy to tune and code.

### 2.2. Term Frequency-Inverse Document Frequency (TF-IDF)

In TF-IDF, we weigh each feature(word) with its inverse frequency. This worked better because, we are rescaling the frequency of words. But in Count Vectorizer, it was dominated by words that appeared frequently. I tried to fine tune other parameters found the ngram\_range to work better with combination of unigrams and bigrams. So used the parameter as (1,2). I also set the max document frequency to 0.9 to ignore some of the corpus specific stop words. The combination of unigrams and bigrams which gave

better results with TF-IDF tells us that Markov assumption works better for this dataset of abstracts because it gives us more context.

### 2.3. Word2Vec Embeddings

I also tried the Word2Vec Embeddings since they have shown to capture more contextual information, considering the order of words. I used Word2Vec from `gensim` and used the resulting vector to train Long Short Term Memory network (LSTM). But it performed poorly on the validation set, made me realize that the model was overfitting. I did not delve deeper into it, because the train set was very small in comparison to the actual test set. So, it may not generalize well on the unseen data.

## 3. Algorithms

I investigated the accuracy on following algorithms individually and combined a few based on some voting mechanisms.

### 3.1. Naïve Bayes Classifier

I used the Sklearn version of the Multinomial Naïve Bayes algorithm (MultinomialNB) and tuning with grid search to see the performance. It gave one of the best results in both the validation and test sets. I did a grid search for some of the parameters and settled on smoothing parameter of 0.1. I additionally tried the Bernoulli Naïve Bayes. But comparing the results on the Validation set, it was observed that the MultinomialNB performed better with an accuracy of 81%. This is because some words are repeating in the abstracts within the class and Multinomial NB captures the counts for multiple features that do occur. In the end, this information gives better prediction.

### 3.2. Support Vector Machine (SVM)

I tried SVM because, I learned that SVM can learn independent of the dimensionality of feature space. The complexity of hypotheses is based on the margin with which they separate the data <sup>[1]</sup>. We can't do a lot of feature selection in this case because there are very few irrelevant words. So, this gives a very high dimensional feature space. I used C Support Vector Classifier. I also tried to use LinearSVC to have a faster computation. I experimented with Linear and polynomial kernels. With the Cross validation set, the Linear kernels produced better accuracy results of around 80.06% in comparison to polynomial kernel, which gave 77% accuracy. But the polynomial kernel did better in the public leaderboard. When we examine the two confusion matrices from Figure 1, it can be noted that for the classes astro-ph, hep-ph, cs LG has more false predictions. The data is skewed towards the other classes in the training set, which causes this accuracy difference. But in the final test set, the polynomial kernel ensemble with other models was able to generalize well suggesting that data is well separable in polynomial feature space (I used degree=2 specifically here) <sup>[2]</sup>. This is slightly contradicting the general statement that linear classifiers are better for text classification. Refer Figure 1 for comparison of confusion matrices.

### 3.1. Random Forest Classifier

I used the traditional Random Forest Classifier from sklearn, with `n_estimators=50` and `max_depth=40`. It was showing performance degradation due to sparseness and lack of contextual information. So, I preferred to drop this model from the ensemble bunch, but it performed well on the final test data. Refer to the results section for detailed discussion on this.




Figure 1: *Linear Kernel*

*Polynomial Kernel*

### 3.2. MultiLayer Perceptron (MLP) Classifier

I chose MLP to try a neural network <sup>[11]</sup>. I was expecting it to have a very poor performance because, the training set is small. But surprisingly it gave good results. I focused on tuning the hidden\_layer\_sizes, since the number of layers and nodes has big impact on complexity of the model. With 2 and 3 layers, the model was overfitting the training data. A single hidden layered MLP performed better on the test and validation set and was able to reduce the error due to high variance. (Accuracy on validation set was 81.6%). Here, overfitting is something to be focused more because, the training samples are far fewer in size compared to the test set, making it easily prone to overfitting.

### 3.3. Voting Classifier

All the models mentioned above are dissimilar algorithms which means they don't produce the same test errors. Taking a majority vote on the predicted classes gave a better result than a single algorithm. The idea is to use other models to compensate for the errors of one model. This strategy is 'hard' voting. Taking the predicted class probabilities from the above-mentioned models and choosing the class that corresponding to the greatest sum of weighted probabilities, produced better results. This technique is called 'soft' voting. Though the results are quite similar on the validation set, I chose soft voting classifier because it considers classifier's uncertainty. In the final accuracy rate, 'soft voting' proved to generalize well (prevents overfitting) with a better accuracy.

## 4. Methodology

For the part 4, different stop words gave better accuracy on the validation set. So, I defined a subset of stop words from NLTK. Explored various feature preprocessing using python 're'. Finally computing the log priors and conditional word probabilities for training set, was a straightforward step for final predictions of classes in test set.

For part 5, the first step that I performed was exploring various pre-processing and feature extraction methods (continued from 4). Coming up with an optimum one, also required for it to be tested on an algorithm. I chose to use Naïve Bayes Multinomial model from scikit-learn as the baseline model to make various comparisons of the feature pre – processing and selection. I chose it because it was

computationally faster and had better predictions on sparse features. The simplicity of it cannot be underestimated in favor of more complex algorithms. I concluded on TF-IDF with n\_gram as (1,2). Refer to the Feature Design section to assess the reason for this choice.

I also split the given dataset into 80:20 ratio, for training and validation respectively. I performed Stratified 5-Fold validation on Naïve Bayes because it was relatively less computationally intensive. For Naïve Bayes, SVM, Random Forest and other algorithms like Logistic, I utilized Grid search for hyper parameter tuning. Tuning MLP was very computationally intensive. So, I performed a manual search to get better parameters and tested it in Google colab with an equivalent Keras implementations.

For Multinomial Naïve Bayes, I did not set specific probabilities for class\_priors because I wanted the model to learn from the data. Though the given full data set has uniform class priors, the train/validation split causes some imbalance. The smoothing parameter that I got from grid search was 0.1. In the case of SVM, I wanted to compute probability for soft voting classifier and switched back to SVC from LinearSVC with 'l1' regularization. For the regularization in SVC, I did a partial grid search and chose C=200. I used CalibratedClassifierCV<sup>[5]</sup> to calibrate the probabilities to address in the class distribution of training set.

Apart from the models mentioned above, I also tried Stochastic Gradient Descent Classifier with l2 regularization, logistic regression and AdaBoost Classifier. As a final step, I was trying combinations of different voting classifiers, to assess which one gave better accuracy.

## 5. Results

For the **part 4**, after various preprocessing steps, the Multinomial Naïve Bayes Algorithm using Numpy gave an accuracy of **78.12%**. Overall, Naïve Bayes is showing better prediction accuracy on sparse features and was computationally very fast. This is because, to know why an abstract belongs to a class, we just need to see the weights of words in that class given the abstract. So, can easily see where the misclassification flaws are and fine tune. Other models are hard to visualize and are like black box.

For part 5, among the various preprocessing steps that I tried for TF-IDF continuing from 4, it was strangely giving bad results – 78.57 % accuracy. So, I discarded many of the preprocessing steps, except using lower case and removing newlines.

Naïve Bayes performs best on sparse matrices with higher accuracy and less computational complexity. Multinomial Naïve Bayes (MNB) is stronger for snippets than for longer documents. While (Ng and Jordan, 2002)<sup>[3]</sup> showed that NB is better than SVM/logistic regression (LR) with few training cases, MNB is also better with short documents (in this case, abstracts). Tuning alpha gave different results.

Model	Accuracy (%)
Naïve Bayes Multinomial, Alpha = 1	79.3
Naïve Bayes Multinomial, Alpha = 0.1	80.5

*Table 1: Accuracy based on Laplace smoothing*

In the SVM, I fixed the value of C to be 100 and compared the kernels on Kaggle board. I infer that the final test set is better linearly separable using polynomial kernels.

Model	Accuracy (%)
SVM Linear Kernel	80.33

SVM Polynomial Kernel with degree 2	80.68
-------------------------------------	-------

*Table 2: Accuracy based on SVM Kernel comparison*

In the MLP model, the single hidden layered model, was able to generalize well in comparison to multiple hidden layers. This was because, the multiple hidden layers model was overfitting the training data and had a poor performance on the test data.

Model	Accuracy (%)
MLP with 1 hidden layer	80.76
MLP with 2 hidden layers	80.33
MLP with 3 hidden layers	79.89

*Table 3: Accuracy based on number of Hidden layers in MLP*

I first observed that the Random Forest model had a poor accuracy on the validation set and concluded that it had a higher bias in comparison to other models. So, I did not make efforts to tune it. But when included in ensemble with other models, I got a better accuracy! So, it did not have high bias because of sparse features or having less depth. I used 50 trees in the forest with max\_depth of 40, used it in ensemble with other models and got an accuracy of 80.76%

In the Voting Classifier, I tested a combination of different models and different weights, to see which one gave better accuracy based on the probability combinations.

Model	Accuracy (%)
Bernoulli NB, MNB, Logistic, SVM, MLP, Soft Voting	79.75
More weight to MLP	79.96
MNB, SVM, MLP, SGDC, Soft Voting	80.31
MNB, SVM, MLP, Adaboost, Soft Voting	80.33
MNB, SVM, Adaboost, MLP, Logistic, Soft Voting	80.47
MNB, SVM, AdaBoost, SGDC, MLP, Random Forest, Soft Voting	80.76
MNB, LinearSVC, AdaBoost, SGDC, MLP, Hard Voting with more weightage to MNB	80.54

*Table 4: Accuracy based on voting combinations of different models*

All the algorithms gave a poor performance on a few correlated classes. The false positives and false negatives (mis-classified samples) are higher in astro-ph, hep-ph, cs.LG. Refer to Figure 2 for the confusion matrix. In fact, hep-ph and cs.LG are more correlated. On a closer look at the data, they both have description of vectors but in different context (High Energy Physics and Linear Algebra standpoint of view respectively). A better domain knowledge would help analyze even better.

I wanted to show that more data beats things like, hyper parameter tuning to get better accuracies. So, I retrained the model with 100% data from the train set, after validation. Used that model for predicting on test data. This improved accuracy significantly from 79.38 % to more than 80%.




Figure 1: Confusion matrix for the Voting Classifier

## 6. Discussion and Conclusion

The pros of my approach are, I explored a galore of models. This was a good approach to see interesting properties of algorithms w.r.t to this dataset and how they can generalize differently. The cons are, I spent too much time in the different combinations of models in the Voting Classifier. I should have rather spent more time on hyper parameter tuning for each model. Finally, while selecting the model on Kaggle board, I should trust my cross validation rather than just the leader board scores. The problem here was we had a huge test set than a training set that led to some overfitting for the first 30% predictions. This is often the case in a real-life scenario too.

It was computationally intensive to train and tune some of the models with the CPU. It is better to move to GPU and explore more advanced models like BERT, GPT. I will take this up for future work. I am also deeply intrigued by the difference in performance between Linear and Polynomial Kernels in SVM. I will investigate further and probably try to reduce the number of features by using PCA and then apply to the SVM model. I should have also tried Complementary Naïve Bayes for skewed data sets.

This overall exercise made me realize 2 things - the importance of feature preprocessing and how helpful the libraries can be. The solution to every problem is not to jump straight away into complicated models. Simpler models like Naïve Bayes and SVM have better predictions when data set is small, or features are sparse.

## 7. References

- [1] Text Categorization with Support Vector Machines: Learning with Many Relevant Features by Thorsten Joachims, University of Dortmund
- [2] High Performance of Polynomial Kernel at SVM Algorithm for Sentiment Analysis by Lailil Muflikhah Dimas Joko Haryanto, Journal of Information Technology and Computer Science 3(2):194

[3] Scikit-learn user guide

**Blogs, github repos and other links used**

- [4] <https://stackoverflow.com/questions/35360081/naive-bayes-vs-svm-for-classifying-text-data/35360814>
- [5] <https://www.analyticsvidhya.com/blog/2018/02/the-different-methods-deal-text-data-predictive-python/>
- [6] <https://www.analyticsvidhya.com/blog/2020/02/quick-introduction-bag-of-words-bow-tf-idf/>
- [7] <https://machinelearningmastery.com/probability-calibration-for-imbalanced-classification/>
- [8] <https://www.kaggle.com/thomastilli/simple-naive-bayes-classier-0-34974-on-lb>
- [9] <https://www.kaggle.com/sainijagjit/text-classification-using-svm>
- [10] <https://www.analyticsvidhya.com/blog/2017/06/word-embeddings-count-word2veec/>
- [11] <http://uu.diva-portal.org/smash/get/diva2:1275337/FULLTEXT01.pdf>

**For part 4**

- [12] [https://github.com/notAlex2/reddit\\_comment\\_classification/blob/master/naive\\_bayes.py](https://github.com/notAlex2/reddit_comment_classification/blob/master/naive_bayes.py)
- [13] <https://medium.com/syncedreview/applying-multinomial-naive-bayes-to-nlp-problems-a-practical-explanation-4f5271768ebf>