

The arXiv Data Set

1 The Data

The used data comes from a free Kaggle source, containing information about scientific papers uploaded to the arXiv. For each paper the following relevant metadata is included in the file 'arxiv-metadata.json':

- "id", unique identifier for a given paper containing information about the upload year and month
- "authors"
- "title"
- "abstract"
- "categories", tags in the arXiv system
- "authors_parsed", author names with any additional information removed

The total number of instances is $N_{\text{tot}} = 1796911$, containing all arXiv submissions since 2007.

Our objective is to determine the category of the submission from its title. In order to do so we clean the data in the following way. Since the features are severely limited, distinguishing between all possible 175 arXiv tags is infeasible. Thus, we check whether any given submission falls into the categories

- cs
- math
- physics

where each submission can be in multiple classes or none of them, if it is in any of the other arXiv categories (e.g. econ). We represent these labels with three booleans $y \in \{0, 1\}^3$.

The feature is given by the title of the submission. One way to efficiently encode this text data is the universal sentence encoder. This pretrained model converts the text data into a feature vector x in 512 dimensions of unit norm. The main idea of this encoder is that the scalar product of two "similar" sentences is large, whereas the scalar product of sentences with opposite meaning is small, i.e. negative.

We can make use of the large dataset and check how the number of training examples improves the models. In principle we could use the full data to train our model. However, we will only use a fraction of the data. Starting with an integer k , the sizes of the training and cross validation sets are given by

$$N_{\text{train}} = 0.8 \frac{N_{\text{tot}}}{k}, \quad N_{\text{cv}} = 0.2 \frac{N_{\text{tot}}}{k}. \quad (1)$$

We can use different models and compare them using different values for k . To do so we will plot the accuracy for both the training- and cv- (or test-) data.

2 The models

We compare the performance of four different models, for which we train an independent classifier for each of the three classes.

1. A neural networks consisting of
 - The input layer with 512 nodes
 - A hidden dense layers with 128 nodes and a relu activation
 - The output layer with a single node and sigmoid activation

As optimiser and loss we use "Adam" and the binary cross entropy, respectively. We train for 5 epochs and use a batch size of 32.

2. An XGBoost decision tree model, using a maximum depth of six, a learning rate of 0.3 and a binary logistic objective. The model is boosted for ten rounds.
3. A Support vector classifier with regulariser $C = 1$ and a gaussian kernel.
4. A random forest consisting of 100 decision trees with maximum depth of six and a Gini splitting criterium.

Of course, all the hyperparameters can be tuned. This is then done in a second step. To compare the models we concentrate on the 'physics' label, which has a positive population of about 50%. Thus, it is reasonable to use an accuracy metric in all cases.¹ The training and test accuracy for different values of k can be found in figures 1 and 2 respectively. To get a good overview we use a logarithmic scale using $k \in \{3, 10, 30, 100, 300, 1000, 3000, 10000\}$. Due to the nature of the SVM the training time becomes excessive for small values of k , so we omit the first two data points. Let us give a quick analysis of these results. We see that as expected the testing accuracy generally goes down as k increases which can easily be explained by the decrease of training data. We also see that the models are all relatively robust up to a critical value of k , indicating that initial data is much more valuable. We also see that the XGBoost model is most robust against scarce data. However, in summary we observe that the regression based models (SVM and neural network) have a higher accuracy than the tree based models (XGBoost and random forest), for the relevant values of k .

Turning to the training error we see something completely different. The two decision tree based models eventually reach full training accuracy, as each data point eventually gets its own leaf. Also the SVM has nearly perfect training accuracy, which is also expected as the number of features approaches the number of training data points. For the neural network we observe the opposite behaviour. The training accuracy actually decrease with less data, presumably indicating an insufficient complexity of the model.

Let us also analyse whether we have a bias or a variance problem. To this end we subtract the training error from the testing error. This is depicted in figure 3. Let δ be the difference between the training accuracy and the testing accuracy. For a high bias model, training and testing accuracy are similar, so δ is small. Conversely, a high variance model suffers from overfitting, so δ is large. We see that in general, variance increases with k . This is fairly

¹The XGBoost package only has an inbuilt error metric, which we will use instead, yielding the equivalent results.




Figure 1: Train accuracy of the four models for different values of k




Figure 2: Train accuracy of the four models for different values of k




Figure 3: Difference between train and test accuracy of the four models

obvious, as we are taking a smaller training sample, so the variance naturally increases. We also see that the neural network has similar δ for all values of k , so its complexity is not up to par with the other models.

2.1 The dense NN

Let us now dive into the different models more closely. We saw that the neural network provides good testing accuracy together with a very low variance. Thus, we can try to increase the complexity of the model. We thus compare three different models of different levels of complexity:

- 'denseLayers' = 1, 'denseUnits' = 128
- 'denseLayers' = 2, 'denseUnits' = 256
- 'denseLayers' = 3, 'denseUnits' = 512

where the first model agrees with the original one. We again plot the train and test accuracy for different values of k in figures 4 and 5. The results for the training error are as predicted. With increased complexity the training error becomes lower and also more robust against high k . We also see that the training error for the most complex model essentially vanishes for high k , in parallel to what we saw for the tree based models before. The intermediate model performs similarly to the complex model at low k but does not completely overfit at large k .

Looking at the testing accuracy, the three models perform similar for small k , indicating that there is enough data to gloss over the model differences. We also see that the accuracy decreases approximately linearly with $\log k$. However, for $k > 10^2$ the behaviour changes drastically. Whereas the most complex model keeps its steady decline, the simpler models




Figure 4: Train accuracy of three NN of different complexity




Figure 5: Test accuracy of three NN of different complexity




Figure 6: Train accuracy of six NN of similar intermediate complexity

retain an acceptable accuracy for longer before plummeting at large k , with the intermediate model performing significantly better. Thus, we will further concentrate on models with intermediate complexity. To save time we also concentrate on the regime of intermediate $k \in \{30, 100, 300, 1000\}$.

The number of parameters of a dense neural network with ℓ hidden layers of u units each and 512 input nodes is approximately

$$p \approx 512u + (\ell - 1)u^2, \quad (2)$$

so our intermediate model has $3 \cdot 2^{16}$ parameters. We will now choose various model for $\ell \in [1, 6]$, choosing u such that p is of the same order. The results are shown in figures 6 and 7. From the training accuracy we see that the model with a single layer is too simple, so it should be discarded. The other models all show the expected behaviour. From the test accuracy it becomes apparent that our original model with two layers of 256 units each performs best for all values of k . The models with more layers perform consistently worse, however in an erratic fashion which can not be explained in a simple way.

Another hyperparameter we can tune is the number of training epochs. To check whether it has a big impact on the training accuracy we compute the test accuracy after each epoch for $k = 30$ and $k = 300$. This is shown in figure 8. In both cases we find that the training error approaches zero as the number of epochs increases, as expected. Conversely, the testing error fluctuates with small variance. It is easy to see that the default value of five epochs is a very appropriate choice. We assume that this holds for all cases.

2.2 The SVM

The model with the best initial testing accuracy was the support vector machine with a Gaussian kernel. Let us first check whether a different kernel works better. We see that the




Figure 7: Test accuracy of six NN of similar intermediate complexity




Figure 8: Accuracy of a NN after a different number of training epochs




Figure 9: Train accuracy of three SVMs with different kernels




Figure 10: Test accuracy of four SVMs with different kernels




Figure 11: Test accuracy of SVMs by the regularisation for $k = 100$

linear kernel needs to be ruled out, whereas the other kernels show a similar performance. For reasons of simplicity we will only consider polynomial kernel with degree two and Gaussian kernel from now on. In both cases we will now check whether changing the regulariser C changes the performance. Here, large C indicates little regularisation. The results are shown in figure 11 and indicate that the original regulariser of $C = 1$ was very reasonable.

2.3 The Random Forest

Let us now look at the decision tree based models, starting with random forests. There are two different splitting criteria, 'gini' and 'entropy', which we plot in figure 12. We see that a splitting by the entropy yields better results, so we will change this parameter. The next important hyperparameter of a random forest is the maximum depth of each of the decision trees. Trees with large depth tend to overfit. As shown in figure 13 this seems to be no problem and we will change the maximum depth of the random forests to None. Finally, let us check how the number of estimators impacts the accuracy. We expect that a larger number of estimators improves the accuracy. Indeed, the accuracy improves, however there is very little impact by going over the chosen value of 100 trees. This is shown in figure 14.

2.4 The XGBoost Model

Finally, let us take a closer look at the XGBoost model. The only categorical hyperparameter is the objective, which is usually set to binary logistic. However, we are not really interested in the probability, so a binary Hinge loss is an alternative possibility. These two possibilities are compared in figure 15. We see that there is no reason to change the objective. The remaining hyperparameters are numerical and we should look at them for various choices of k as before. As for the random forest, let us first look at the maximum depth of the decision trees. The




Figure 12: Test accuracy of random forests by splitting criterion




Figure 13: Test accuracy of random forests by maximum depth




Figure 14: Test accuracy of random forests by maximum depth




Figure 15: Test accuracy of XGB models with different objective




Figure 16: Test accuracy of XGB models by maximum depth

results are shown in figure 16 and we see that we should increase the maximum depth, for example to 10. Next, let us check the impact of the learning rate which has been set to $\eta = 0.3$ so far. In figure 17 we see that this choice is justified. Finally, we can change the number of boosted rounds. It is expected that the accuracy only increases while boosting. This is indeed verified by the results shown in figure 18. Boosting is time consuming, but the increase in accuracy is significant enough to boost for 100 rounds.

2.5 Summary

We have now significantly improved the hyperparameters of our models such that they are ideal for $k \approx 30$. To summarise, these are

- A NN with two dense layers of 256 units each with 5 training epochs
- An SVMs with 'rbf' kernel and regulariser $C = 1$
- A random forest with no maximum depth, 'entropy' splitting and 100 estimators
- An XGBoost model with logistic objective, a maximum depth of ten, a learning rate of $\eta = 0.3$ and 1000 boosting rounds

For each of them we go through the entire k -range again and plot them in figure 19.




Figure 17: Test accuracy of XGB models by learning rate




Figure 18: Test accuracy of XGB models by the number of boosting rounds




Figure 19: Test accuracy of the final models as a function of k