**Comparative Study To Solve Text Classification**

CES Data Scientist 2017-2018 (Telecom ParisTech)

Jacques Doan-Huu

***Abstract***

In the last decade, **D**eep **L**earning (**DL**) has demonstrated outstanding performance in the field of computer vision beating indisputably traditional methods, thanks to the GPU performance leapfrog and the huge amount of labeled datasets. A bit more recently, DL also went into the **N**atural **L**anguage **P**rocessing (**NLP**) field battle to solve common NLP problems like text classification and translation, with very promising perspectives and results: in particular, word embedding and **R**ecurrent/**C**onvolutional **N**eural **N**etwork (**RNN/CNN**) architectures provide efficient technical responses to NLP objective.

**POSOS** French startup has submitted a NLP data challenge for which I took the opportunity to verify humbly whether DL is a suitable solution compared to traditional techniques, for a beginner like me having very few experiences on NLP/DL area and low end hardware system (DL has the bad reputation to be numerically intensive…).

***Data Challenge Description***

The data challenge is plainly exhibited at ENS school web site ([link](https://challengedata.ens.fr/en/challenge/33/predict_the_expected_answer.html)) and it consists in classifying into **51** intents, drug related questions written in natural language (French to be precise). **POSOS** claimed to get good modeling result with 86% accuracy by utilizing DL: they don’t provide any details on the DL architecture nor any engineering clues except the possibility to extract some relevant information procured by the French drug administration (**ANSM**).

The target categories (question intent) have been intentionally anonymized into indices from 0 to 50: hiding their respective semantic is probably aimed to avoid the usage of topic-specific (and so biased) procedures. Training dataset contains only ~8000 questions: it’s pretty short to produce a good learning outcome. Moreover, the text suffers from many types of anomalies (misspelling, grammatical incorrectness, familiar acronym, …) and employs specific medical vocabulary (drug name like “mirtazapine”, …): it makes the NLP challenge harder to handle.

Here’s an example of misspelled sentence: “8 jrs avant la fin de ma plaquette d'evepar j'ai eu des saignement~~s~~ et des douleurs au bas ventre et au bas du dos dois je m'inquiéter»

***Project Motivation***

The key objective is to compare and the pro and cons between DL and non-DL approaches from different perspectives:

* model accuracy/performance
* operational aspect (tooling, hardware requirement, ...)
* engineering level of difficulty to find the good hyper-parameter, architecture and processing logic

In fact, these aspects are somehow inter-related: typically, model accuracy may be unexpectedly suboptimal due to operational reasons (memory shortage to complete the processing job, …).

The idea is not to get a fined-tuned model across DL or other techniques, but an attempt to explore comparatively the end to end methodology to tackle a text classification problem with 2 distinct technologies.

“Traditional techniques” refer to any ML algorithms which don’t rely on neural network theory (eg: Word2Vec is excluded): to quote some of them, Hidden Markov Model, XGBoost, SVM, logistic regression and PCA are eligible.

Conversely, DL option should rely uniquely on neural network but it can as well benefit from “neutral” text preprocessing (feature enrichment with external source, stemming, stopWords, …) for fairness sake.

***ML Workbench Environment***

All experiments have been written in Python in the popular Jupyter environment: the notebooks are accessible publicly as a github project whose details are provided in the annex section. I had made use of many python packages to satisfy various requirements:

* data manipulation and visualization: pandas, numpy and matplotlib
* text processing (stemming, stopWords, …): nltk, standard regex and spellChecker (built from github)
* ML algorithms (XGBoost, PCA, t-SNE): sklearn and XGBoost
* DL framework: Keras + Tensorflow

In addition to the above runtime packages, this project also takes advantage of public resource or pre-trained models (nltk corpus, FastText, ….).

ML jobs had been initially executed with an old MacBookPro whose chipset was damaged by the heating caused by the overnight DL train, then with a many CPU core/low-end GPU PC workstation.


I finally paid a GPU boosted Amazon instance: even if the GPU/CPU resource is not utilized, the data storage is charged permanently making the overall cost very high (5$/h) during 2 full days.

At the very end, the best money saving option was to buy a PC gamer machine with mid-range Nvidia GPU card to carry out the computing workload: I noticed a huge speed improvement at training time.


***Data Analysis***

Here’s the target distribution on training dataset revealing that it’s pretty imbalanced with a peak at intention=28.

Target distribution (number of classes = 51)



Most of labels are associated to pretty small number of samples: half of classes have less than 100 rows.



Regardless of the ML algorithms and smart feature engineering, achieving a good enough classification rate is really tricky considering the small training size and imbalanced distribution.

Let’s try to guess intuitively the hidden semantic of the most frequent labels:

* **first mode**: intention=28

It looks like to be related to questions on drug side effects and somehow the contraindications



* **second mode**: intention=31

it concerns questions on symptom-drug adequacy/efficiency



* **multi-topic class**: intention=39

the commonality across text samples seems to the presence of multiple question mark tokens (counting it may be a good option to predict mult-topic label)



The painpoint of the text classification problem is to find a way to estimate the intent similarity between 2 questions written in a natural language.

Let’s focus on 2 questions having the same label (symptom-drug adequacy):

* “épilepsie et havlane?”
* “mon medecin me soigne pour une rhino pharingite et m'a prescrit du amoxicilline comme anti biotique. Est-ce vraiment pour cette indication?”

The writing style differ significantly: on one hand, a very concise expression putting the symptom entity and the drug entity in an adversarial fashion, on the other, the question is more detailed with one sentence to set up the context/fact and the second one to raise the concrete question of adequacy between the 2 entities mentioned previously.

This typically illustrates the stylish complexity and diversity of the human language to convey an idea and more particularly a high level topic!

Moreover, notice that certain questions are lexically and syntactically incorrect: words are misspelled especially when dealing with drug product names which are unfamiliar for most of non-professional persons.

To have a glimpse on the classification difficulty, it’s common to perform some visualizations of the feature space distribution.

The multi-sentence question text is basically converted into of bag of words which is vectorized with TF-IDF transformation. Each question is then represented as a data point within the global vocabulary space. To make such data points humanly observable, a dimension reduction of these features is needed at the cost of some approximations: we will use both linear/fast PCA dimension reduction technique and non-linear/slow t-SNE. The data point color is determined by the associate target class.

**PCA-reduced feature space**



**t-SNE-reduced feature space**



Both shapes are very different but as suspected, we can observe from both visualizations that the per label clusters are badly separable in the original feature space, just by considering the occurrence of words. To get a chance of obtaining a better classification performance, it’s obvious that the raw text needs to be encoded into a more suitable space where the semantic proximity between documents is prevailing.

***General NLP Architecture***


Text classification is a common but non-trivial NLP topic following usually below principal steps:



This is the general NLP text classifier framework/guidance but for practical reasons, some processings are skipped or significantly simplified to fit the project timeframe but also because of the lack of French language support (most of NLP packages have been implemented by US academic or privately held institutions).

These steps will be described more precisely in the next section.

***Text Preprocessing***



It’s all about operations on the raw text to make the text more reliable/workable to extract relevant information. It falls into 3 categories: vocabulary alignment, metadata tagging and finally simplification process.

**Vocabulary alignment**

Misspelled words are identified when they are not part of a reference vocabulary (aka **OOV**: Out Of Vocabulary).

Misspelling correction principle is to find out from a set of reliable vocabularies, the word which is the closest from the **Levenhstein** distance standpoint: this distance measures the minimum number of character level operations (change, remove, add) required to map 2 words.

I retained 2 reference vocabularies in the following priority order:

* Custom vocabulary to capture the specific drug domain, typically for drug name and active ingredient entities where misspelling is frequent. It has been built from the public RCP (Résumé des Caractéristiques du Produit) repository supplied by ANSM.
* Predefined general purpose vocabulary coming from the github python project pysspellchecker <https://github.com/barrust/pyspellchecker>

**Annotation/Tagging**

**NER** is a NLP subtask to tag term in a text with predefined categories (eg: location, person, quantity, …). NER may be useful to identify terms related to specific medical entities (drug name, chemical composition, disease, …): indeed, the co-occurrence of certain medical entities and gold standard (time, quantity, …) in a question may indicate a particular intent.

**POS (Part Of Speech) tagging** reveals the grammar role of each word to possibly disambiguate its semantic. Such process can be useful to locate the interrogative proposal sentence and the word role (adverb, noun, verb, …).

**Dependency parsing** is a NLP sub task to discover the grammar dependencies between words within a sentence. This is also a good annotation process to understand word interaction and connect the entities to each other: it’s probably helpful to get a better classification score.

Unfortunately, the most popular package supporting advanced POS tagging and dependency parsing features (namely Stanford NLP) has no official French corpus and only deal with English grammar.

**Text simplification**

For the **stopWords** and **stemming** final steps, I merely leveraged the nltk French corpus: this process simplifies gracefully the phrase structure but at the expense of its semantic and grammar correctness.

In complementary to the stemming process which encodes a word into its etymological root for normalization sake, one idea is to convert word into its most frequent synonym if existed: it likely reduces the distance between 2 semantically similar sentences. Again, unfortunately, the famous **wordnet** database available from nltk package doesn’t support officially French language.

As a reminder, all this pre-processing steps are part of the common trunk between the DL and non-DL predictive pipelines.

***Feature Enrichment***

This step adds a-priori extra features which may explain the target much more than the original features. These additional features can be derived from the raw text (eg: basic statistics like the count of question marks, the text length, …) or can be brought from external resources (eg: once a drug name entity has been tagged/identified, we can then associate to the text all salient characteristics of the mentioned drug)**.**

The primary feature (pre-processed question text) with NLP annotation from the training dataset can be enriched with extra features:

* some handcrafted statistics on the text characteristics can be computed

eg: text length, number of question marks, number of drug occurrences (thanks to the custom NER tagging), number of quantity gold standard occurrences, times, …

* if the drug entity has been identified within the question text, it would be worth to incorporate as additional features, relevant characteristics of the concerned drug extracted from the ANSM database.



For instance, the drug product classes don’t provoke equally the same question natures/intents: the vaccine may raise more questions and concerns on contraindication (a class of intent?).

To combat the training size shortage impose by the data challenge, one option to enrich the former dataset is to complement it with other medication questions from public forum like the one hosted by doctissimo.fr. These extra observations are unlabeled (the 51 target classes are anonymized) and so cannot be used as regular dataset for the supervised training. Nevertheless, it can be consumed to complement gracefully the text corpus for all unsupervised learnings (eg: Word2Vec) to strengthen the modeling result. Such trick is also applicable for unlabeled test dataset of the challenge.

**Feature Representation ?? common trunk**

The text input should be converted into numerical vector because most of ML classifiers can only cope with numeric values and they don’t care about symbol and semantic conveyed by the word entity.

First basic solution is the one-hot-encoding where each word of the vocabulary is represented in column and the text is represented in row: the cell value corresponds to the word occurrence count. Unfortunately, we totally lost the word order/context.

Another more advanced option is to keep the word sequence nature of the text and each word is represented by a k-dimensional numerical vector: a text with n words is shaped as a n x k matrix. k can be the vocabulary size running the risk to fall into the high dimensionality curse as vocabulary size is frequently > 10000 even with the stemming or lemmatization preprocessing.

A popular dimension reduction method namely word embedding enables to overcome this issue: an unsupervised model is learnt from a large text corpora to optimize a lower dimensional vector representation where words which share similar context (within a sentence) are close to each other. The wonder of this technique is that vector proximity is governed by semantic similarity. Word embedding is implemented in a DL flavor (Word2Vec) and in a non-DL way too (GloVe project).

***Traditional Technique***

**Feature Representation**

Once the text has been prepared, it’s time now to find a more suitable representation for machine operations. Indeed, most of ML algorithms operate upon structured data and cannot cope with unstructured data like text, audio or video: relational representation is the de facto standard where each data is organized by column (feature) holding a specific semantic (eg: gender, age, …)

The standard way to transform text into tabular representation is the **TF-IDF** (**T**erm **F**requency **I**nverted **D**ocument **F**requency) where each word of the vocabulary is represented as a column and the document (text) is represented as a row: the weight computation takes care of the term/word frequency from the considered corpus.

The shortcoming is that such vectorization generates a very high dimensional space depending on the vocabulary size. We fall into the well-known curse of dimensionality where data distribution is extremely sparse making classification task inefficient when training size is not sufficient. The usual solution to avoid this pitfall is the dimension reduction method.

Stemming pre-processing already reduces the vocabulary size by projecting terms into root word space, but it doesn’t capture synonym relationship and in general, terms which are conceptually/semantically related like bird<->duck.

The **word embedding** addresses this matter indirectly: this method estimates statistically from a large text corpus the co-occurrence between 2 words in a text context. This vectorization process makes that 2 words which are contextually similar (inter-changeable) are represented as 2 close numerical vectors in the target space.

**GloVe** (Global Vectors for Word Representation) implements the word embedding in a non-DL fashion (conversely to **Word2Vec**): it uses behind the scene matrix factorization method such as LSA (Latent Semantic Analysis).

Once again, probably due to the French language curse, GLOVE is only available for English language. I finally felt back to the **PCA** linear dimension reduction technique which basically keeps the top eigen vectors capturing the maximum of the data distribution variance: PCA is applied upon numerical space generated by the TF-IDF vectorization. This default option is not satisfactory at all because it’s not driven by any context/semantic considerations like GLOVE.

In short, each question (document) is encoded into a vector in a reduced numerical space.

TODO. How to model sequence?

**Classification Modeling Choice**

For the non-DL classifier selection, instead of putting into competition several candidates (SVM, random forest, logistic regression, …), I bet on the **XGBoost** library delivering excellent accuracy in a reasonable time (it’s multi-thread friendly): XGBoost is based on boosting ensemble technique combining sequentially weak classifiers (in general decision tree) where at each iteration, the weighting on incorrected classified observations is increased to enforce the next classifier to focus its attention on feature sub space with high error.

XGBoost classifier comes up with many hyper-parameters to tune. As usual, the parameter selection is driven by the cross-validated (k=5) error assessment.

To avoid endless grid search over all available parameters, a good practice is to focus on the most influent ones and fix them in a particular order:

* https://www.analyticsvidhya.com/blog/2016/03/complete-guide-parameter-tuning-xgboost-with-codes-python/

The objective function is set to softprob for multi class classification task, the early stopping is set to 20 with the max number of estimators to 200 and other parameters are set to their respective default value.

**Implementation & Execution**

Build GPU xgboost

Misspelled > stopword > stemming

Detail the concrete work (processing time, hyper param search, early stopping, …)

CV error

Confusion Matrix

Intention 31

***Deep Learning Technique***

DL is considered as a universal estimator able of fulfilling any kind of modeling requirements from the feature representation layer to the final decision layer inside a single (and complex) neural network. The key benefit of this holistic capacity is that the loss function optimization to find out the modeling parameters (weights, …) operates consistently across all functional layers regardless of their respective purpose (embedding, decision making, …). In contrast, with traditional method, feature representation and classification are 2 concerns which are engineered/optimized separately.

**Feature Representation**

Doc or Sentence Embeddings Mean? (eg: Mean Word Embedding)

Word embedding implementation is available in a DL flavor with **Word2Vec** (Google) and more recently with **FastText** (Facebook): both of them are issued from Mikolov’s research work.

My first thought was to build the embedding model from POSOS training set which contains domain specific terms (drug name like Xanax, active chemical ingredient, …), but the corpus is really too small and badly trustable (misspelled terms, familiar expression, …).

It’s preferable to take advantage of the embedding models learnt from very large and diverse text corpus, which are publicly available from the Web. I only found French trustable models for FastText which in addition offers the capacity to cope with **OOV** (Out Of Vocabulary) case: indeed the embedding model is trained at character level instead of word level.

I experimented both embedding model sources and the general purpose one provided definitively better classification performance (roughly 20% difference in term of classification rate).

The best of breed solution would be to extend the general embedding model by incorporating the pharmaceutical target corpus constituted by the training set and other reliable sources (ANSM, …). This is another and bigger story requiring huge amount of computational resources to rebuild this super model. Even the learning transfer in lieu of an embedding training from scratch is also complicated and out of reach in the context of this study project.

I finally used the French FastText model encoding words into a 300 dimensions space. Medical terms referred in the question texts are either drug product names, special symptoms or active chemical ingredients: such key words are probably absent from the FastText model’s corpus.

How to solve this predominant OOV (Out Of Vocabulary) matter?

One solution is to merely project such unknown words into its **hypernym** more common term with loss of details penalizing indirectly the final classification performance:

* drug product name (Xanax, Abboticine) is converted into constant term ‘médicament’
* active ingredient (eg: Acabavir) is converted into constant term ‘ingrédient’
* …

This projection into hypernym/entity space is possible only if the terms are correctly tagged in the text preprocessing phase (name entity recognition). It’s likely smarter than the common practice to encode unknown words into a random or fixed vector.

“These word embeddings are now the state-of-the-art in NLP. However, it is less clear how we should best represent a sequence of words. a whole sentence, which has complicated syntactic and semantic relations”

local and long-range dependencies

Variable sized vs fixed sized (padding)

**DL Architecture Elaboration**

A possible (but simple) architecture is merely composed of a **Doc2Vec** embedding layer plus a fully connected layer for the classification task.

In practice, **CNN** (Convolutional Neural Network) and **RNN** (Recurrent Neural Network) layouts appear to be predominantly chosen in ML competition for text classification: some practitioners/researchers even recommend combining them as they are complementary.

The hybrid solution mixing up CNN and RNN is not considered here for simplicity sake.

**Doc2Vec based Architecture**

This network has 3 main hidden layers:

* Doc2Vec vectorizes the whole multi-sentence question into a single numerical vector
* A series of fully-connected/dense layer plus dropout layer
  + the activation function would be the sigmoid as we are dealing with shallow network
  + the dropout operations ensure the learning regularization to avoid the overfitting pitfall
* last dense layer with softmax as activation function to produce normalized scores we can interpreted as classification probability

Identically to Word2Vec, it’s highly preferable that the embedding model is trained on a very large and representative corpus but I didn’t find any pre-trained public Doc2Vec models from the DL community. The consequence is that I built my own Doc2Vec model from the pre-processed training and test sets of the data challenge.

The primary downside of the Doc2Vec approach is that in contrast to Word2Vec, we lost the word sequence after the encoding, so that it’s impossible afterwards to model the document semantic based the context defined by the word sequence.

This proposition sounds very naïve but it can serve as a comparison baseline to illustrate the value proposition of more sophisticated CNN and RNN architectures which are capable to extract the context from the sequence.

**CNN Architecture**

In **C**omputer **V**ision (**CV**), convolution operation is well known to be efficient to extract the high level representation of an image by passing a sliding window filter and computing consequently an average value for each filter position as output. These convoluted values are then activated with usual non-linear function and down-sampled thanks to the pooling layer. This pixel-wise processing is inspired by how the visual cortex analyzes the signal sent by the eye receptors.

Surprisingly, such biological inspiration also works well to capture the high level structure of word sequence in NLP. The convolution operates in a 1-dimensional array (word sequence) instead of 2D (pixel matrix) in CV. The sequential filter enforces the neural network to focus its attention on local context which establishes connection between words.

Some research studies demonstrate that convolution is powerful enough to cover embedding requirements making Word2Vec useless. Nevertheless, I preferred to keep going with an embedding layer relying on a proven algorithm (Word2Vec) associated with a convolution layer specialized to extract the high level representation of the text.

In short, here’s the neural network layout:

* word embedding layer as explained in the Feature Representation section
* a series of 1-dimensional convolutional and pooling layers
  + The best practice recommends building many convolutional layers with different filter sizes and/or strides
  + I used Relu (Rectified linear unit) activation function after the convolution operation and the popular maxpooling
* a series of dense layer plus dropout layer
* last dense layer with softmax as activation function

**RNN**

In a classical neural network, we assume that all inputs of a node are independent to each other but it’s not applicable in NLP because text is composed of an ordered sequence of words (inputs) which are inter-related.

Recurrent neural network architecture tries to leverage this sequential information with a particular layout where each layer at the i-th position is fed with the i-th element of the input sequence and the output of the direct preceding layer: each layer captures somehow the hidden state (memory) of the preceding sub sequence of inputs (words).

RNN can be **bi-directional** (instead of forward only) where the i-th layer also depends on the computational output of the direct successor (i+1 th position).



*(source: Wikipedia)*

In practice, the simple layer computational unit (“h” blue box in above diagram) exhibits inability to catch long term dependencies to distant input x(t-n) where n is significant high, due to the vanishing gradient problem.

The **LSTM** (**L**ong **S**hort **T**erm **M**emory) cell unit has been invented to bypass this long-tailed sequential dependency we typically observe in multi-sentence text analysis where the context may be specified upfront far from the concerned word.



*(source: Wikipedia)*

This processing unit adds a secondary flow (upper stream) to update gradually the memory (cell state denoted as C(t)) with contributions controlled by several input gates (shown at the bottom).

The final architecture looks like below:

* word embedding layer as explained in the Feature Representation section
* bi-directional LSTM layer with dropout (for learning regularization)
* dense layer with softmax as activation function

**Implementation & Execution**

I coded all DL experiments with **Keras** as a frontline API on top of Tensorflow engine: Keras provides a very comprehensive and easy-to-use API hiding the Tensforflow verbosity.

Here’s an example of Keras code where the layers are built in a very concise manner thanks to helper object like Convolution2D, Activaction and so forth.

model = Sequential()

model.add(Convolution2D(32, kernel\_size=(3, 3),padding='same',input\_shape=(3 , 100, 100)))

model.add(Activation('relu'))

model.add(Convolution2D(64, (3, 3)))

model.add(Activation('relu'))

model.add(MaxPooling2D(pool\_size=(2, 2)))

model.add(Dropout(0.25))

In general, the model performance depends importantly on the selection of the hyper-parameter values: as the DL training is really slow even with the aid of GPU boosting, I was not able to test a lot of hyper-parameter selections and I proceeded with default or best guess values at the risk to be far from the optimum point.

**Common Setup**

GPU enable config

**Doc2Vec based Implementation**

**CNN Implementation**

**RNN Implementation**

CUDNNLTSM

**Experiment Results**

Nb params to optimize vs nb observation (overfitting) => show error estimation vs validation evolution

***Comparison Study***

**Implementation/Engineering**

**Model Accuracy**

Focus on dominant class error

***Potential Improvement Tracks***

**Feature Engineering**

Building a **custom** **embedding model** from text corpora which are specific to the data challenge domain is a real plus: indeed, the generic FastText model has been trained on clean corpora writing in an elevated literary style by professionals (Wikipedia, newspaper, …) whereas the POSOS text style is much more familiar as questions are mostly raised by uninitiated people.

As POSOS training size is not sufficient, it can be completed with other unlabeled drug question sources (eg: doctissimo.fr forum, …): just to remind that embedding is an unsupervised learning process requiring no exhaustive manual labeling.

Another improvement possibility is to refine the proposed **imputation** that replaces words unknown from the embedding model standpoint, by its named entity (hypernym). Typically, train our own NER (Named Entity Recognition) on French general/domain-specific corpora combination with nltk package: the trick here is to take advantage of the English NER model provided by Stanford NLP active community and the English-to-French word translation, in order to get for free the global standard label on French corpora.

ANSM source of information on drug product is poorly exploited: I only extracted vocabulary on drug product names and active ingredients to identify such entities into the text because it’s straight-forward (ANSM public dataset contains a drug product name and active ingredients columns). Other relevant named entities (adverse effect, target body part, drug category, …) should be learnt from the ANSM corpus with manual entity labeling.

For the handcrafted features to characterize the text, thanks to a more complete entity identification (adverse effect, body part, quantity, …) , it would be possible to compute more count-based statistics on entity and even introduce selective entity distance to capture indirectly the word sequential distribution.

**Classification Modeling**

For the classification modeling layer, there’s room for improvement as well. Due to lack of time and computing resource shortage, no extensive hyper-parameters search has been performed mainly in the DL sub project: we know for sure that parameter optimization is crucial to achieve good results.

I intentionally separated the DL and non-DL techniques in order to make an academic comparison but in practice, the state-of-art in ML competition is to build heterogeneous and complex predictive pipeline involving a variety of algorithms and technologies, by sticking to the ensemble learning principle. The DL architecture may be reinforced with handcrafted features utilized in the non-DL approach. In the same vein, CNN and RNN architectures are tested separately but they can be combined nicely into a single neural network to obtain the best of breed learning system.

***Conclusion***

In this present paper, I describe a walkthrough return of experience on text classification problem in a **DL (D**eep **L**earning) and non-DL fashion (a.k.a. traditional method). The goal of the study is to have a fair idea on the pro and cons between above approaches from a practical standpoint on a real use case.

The non-DL track enrolling notably the favorite XGBoost classifier delivers poor modeling performance (X % accuracy in cross validation) mainly due to its inability to leverage natively the sequential context from the text structure: this solution is furthermore penalized by the absence of pre-trained French word embedding model based on non-DL principle (eg: GloVe matrix factorization) and not surprisingly, the handcrafted statistics on text don’t improve at all the final accuracy. Nevertheless, its implementation and execution are pretty straight/simple accommodating with mid-range CPU.

DL option with RNN/LSTM architecture outperforms the non-DL candidate in term of accuracy (X % on validation set), partly thanks to the available pre-trained FastText embedding model and its sequential structure awareness. The counterpart is that DL algorithm is hungry of GPU and badly runs on standard machine configuration: on top of that, elaborating an appropriate architecture (operation composition) and tuning the hyper parameters (activation function, dropout rate, …) demand some strong practical engineering experiences to achieve good enough performance.

In addition to the probable suboptimal ML procedure I had built so far, the low accuracy on validation can also be justified by the learning materials: indeed, the training set is really too small (~8000) with regards to the 51 labels and most of the texts are written in an everyday language style with plenty of abbreviations and misspellings.

Even if the comparison is totally unfair/biased, Deep Learning turns out to be the most efficient ML technique in NLP task solving: it’s presently a very active research topic within the ML community as DL expressiveness/capacity are unbound similarly to the brain plasticity.

**Annex**

The project is hosted into the public github site at the following URL:

<https://github.com/jhuu32/CES>

It contains Jupyter notebooks enabling to reproduce all learning experiments mentioned in this report: the only missing artifact is the FastText embedding model which is too large to be pushed into github (2Gb), but the README.md gives the necessary information to download it.