20/02/2020 **Meeting Notes**

Aim: To read through the paper and receive feedback

General Questions:

- **Should I use 'we' instead of 'i' in the paper?** Yes, think of the paper as "living thing", keep everything in present tense, no past or future e.g. don't say "we will"
- **Do you read drafts over the holidays?** Noura works during holidays, I can also schedule meetings during this time
- **Would you recommend the academic writing service?** Ask them to check over the final draft
- **Experimentation:**
    - Feature types: Bi-grams, Tri-grams, BOW, Tf-idf, GloVe, ElMo (I am no longer using BERT)
    - Machine learning classifiers outlined in paper
    - Should I simply evaluate every model on every type of feature? If there is time this would be good. If I think it is feasible, then YES!

Other comments and feedback:

- Add a table of comparison at the end of related work to summarise the whole section with: dataset size, accuracy (what score did it achieve?), is it machine learning or deep learning (what type of model is it e.g. svm)
- Move research questions into a list so they are easier to read
- The introduction should tell the full story of the paper, for example we can summarise related work in introduction in the space of a paragraph
- Solution diagram is nice, keep it there
- Move websites to footnotes in the paper (onion and huff post and irony and sarcasm). The references section should not contain any websites as they may change.
- In the figure of dataset comparisons, the dataset description should say pos and neg instead of +ve and -ve. Then in the caption, it should say pos indicates positive instances and neg indicates negative instances
- When describing the datasets, change datasets reference to “this dataset was introduced by …” instead of tagging the reference at the side - this is not a proper writing style
- Make "I" to "we" changes as well as tense changes
- Add some visualisations to word embedding and contextualised word embeddings to break up the walls of text and help explain them better - I have used a lot of complex language and have not fully described what it means. I.e. Underneath word embeddings, have a model of how glove works and why it is better than word2vec - must describe why glove was chosen over word2vec.
- Add a similar figure to Elmo to properly describe how and why it works and is good
- In the results section, I have talked about the f1 score (evaluation method). This should really be in the evaluation section, but you should probably include a little bit about this as we use the metric in the following figures. At the top of results section, talk about f1 score a bit, then say “we describe this in detail in the evaluation"
- In the evaluation section, we compare our results with baseline results

Sentiment analysis comments:

- Think about negative and positive parts of a sentence, if it's too long, it will end up cancelling each other out
- We are using sentiment analysis on sarcasm dataset to annotate, we are NOT trying to improve sentiment analysis; this is not the aim of the project.
- We want to know if we use them as extra features, does this improve our results?
- We could also try a rule based approach, whenever the probability of sarcasm is uncertain, (i.e. within a specific range of certainty, does supplying this extra data help)
- The stanford CoreNLP library is good for this task, use the SentimentAnnotator

Goals for next time:

- Annotate the datasets with sentiment features
- Finish vectorising the datasets (elmo specifically)
- Introduce the final two datasets (time-permitting)