

Author Identification : Deep Approach and Comparative study

Anand Pandey(12109)

INDIAN INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY, KANPUR (2015-16)

Introduction

- ✤ Author Identification is a classical problem of Natural Language Processing.
- ✤ It has been widely studied using hand-designed features and grammars
- ✤ For example in [1] Bag-of-Words and Style-Marker features has been used for training.
- ◆ We wanted to explore how Deep Learning can be used to learn the abstract and higher-level features of the document, which could identify the author.
- ✤ We wish to explore several variants from deep architecture, which could be used to tackle this problem.
- **TASK:** Given a text document and a set of authors, learn a function that maps the document to a single author. The training data includes the documents, labelled with their authors.

Previous Works

- ✤ Apart from Stylistic features, Deep learning methods are being widely used for a various tasks.
- ◆ There has been a recent revival of interest in using deep learning methods for various machine learning problems and NLP, in-order to learn more robust features using easily available unlabelled data.
- ✤ Recently few architectures has been proposed for authorship attribution using Deep learning frameworks including LSTM, CNN [6][7][8]etc.
- ✤ In [6] *LSTM with mean pooling* has been used for authorship attribution.
- ✤ Although, LSTMs are able to capture the sequential data effectively, inherent structure of sentences are more complex than a linear chain.
- ✤ In [2], author proposes Tree-LSTM, a recursive neural network which makes use of sentence-parsing.

Dataset

- ✤ No large public dataset was available for author-identification.
- ✤ The dataset should have documents with rich-content and each author should have his own distinct style of writing.
- ✤ Quora, is a Q-and(or)-A website where different people frequently write answers.
- ✤ Quora Top-writers regularly post answers which are large, semantically rich and are personally written.

- ✤ We selected Quora Top-writers and created a corpus of their answers using Quora RSS feed.
- ✤ Answers having short length were ignored.
- ✤ We tried to pick authors mostly from the same domain of the expertise, so that the vocabulary shouldn't over-shadow the writing style of author

Data – Statistics

- Number of authors -47Total answers – 1732
- Vocabulary size 46804
- Total words 723502
- ↔ We then transformed this dataset as per requirements of the model used.

Models

BASELINE

- The baseline is chosen to be a small number(7) of hand-coded features.
- ✤ Features include Average sentence length, Number of words in answer. etc.
- ✤ Then a one-vs-rest SVM was trained on these features.

LSTM

- ✤ LSTMs can model the document as sequences of words,
- ✤ As sequence length increases, error doesn't propagate back after some time.
- * Each answer was broken into sentences. Sentences were grouped together to form a chunk of max-length 150 words.
- ♦ Word embedding were initialised randomly for each word and were learnt while training.
- ✤ Hyper parameters were not tuned for the lack of computational power
- ✤ A soft-max classifier was trained on the mean of hidden vector representation of each time step.



Ankit Pensia(12124)

Guide: Prof Amitabha Mukherjee

LSTM with Mean Pooling

Tree - LSTM

✤ A Recursive Neural Network which makes use of parse-tree of sentence and thus capture rich information. It is able to capture how a phrase depends on its children.





Figure 1: Top: A chain-structured LSTM network. Bottom: A tree-structured LSTM network with arbitrary branching factor.

- ✤ In Tree-LSTM, each input is a sentence.
- Sentences are parsed using a parser and then tree is 'binarized' before being fed into Neural Network.
- ◆ The classifier is trained using hidden vector of the root node and if, a label for each node is available, those are also used.

Paragraph Vectors

- ✤ Bag-of-words feature have two major weaknesses: they lose the ordering of the words and they also ignore semantics of the words
- ★ As proposed in [9], the sentence id is also fed to neural network, and corresponding vector is also learnt while training the word-vectors of the corpus.
- ✤ The paragraph vector is then representative of the whole paragraph and could be used to find similarity among other paragraphs
- Our idea is to check whether we are able to learn the vectorrepresentation of each author and use some similarity metric to identify author.



Conclusions

Dataset	Top-1 Accu	racy	Т ор-	5 Accuracy			
Training	0.9293340	0.929334011		0.954289905			
Test	0.274973712		0.542060988				
LSTM							
Dataset	Тор-1 Асси	Top-1 Accuracy		T op- 5 Accuracy			
Training	0.038106236		0.123556582				
Paragraph Vector							
Dataset	Top-1	C	Dataset	Top-1			
	Accuracy			Accuracy			
Training	0.87	Т	raining	0.197			
T (0.44		Teet	0 1 9 9			

Dataset	Top-1 Accuracy		T op- 5 Accuracy						
Training	0.9293340	0.929334011		0.954289905					
Test	0.2749737	12	0.542060988						
LSTM									
Dataset	Тор-1 Асси	Top-1 Accuracy		T op- 5 Accuracy					
Training	0.0381062	0.038106236		0.123556582					
Paragraph Vector									
Dataset	Top-1 Accuracy	D	ataset	Top-1 Accuracy					
Training	0.87	Т	raining	0.197					
T (0.44		Teet	0 100					

Dataset	Top-1 Accu	racy	Т ор-	5 Accuracy			
Training	0.9293340	0.929334011		0.954289905			
Test	0.274973712		0.542060988				
LSTM							
Dataset	Тор-1 Асси	iracy	Т ор	- 5 Accuracy			
Training	0.0381062	236	36 0.123556582				
Paragraph Vector							
Dataset	Top-1 Accuracy		Dataset	Top-1 Accuracy			
Dataset Training	Top-1 Accuracy 0.87	C 1	Dataset	Top-1 Accuracy 0.197			

Baseline

- (only root node had a label).
- might be a reason.

- Society Conference :64-69

- 12:24932537, 2011.
- 538556. doi: 10.1002/asi.21001

- University
- arXiv:1405.4053



Tree LSTM

★ As expected, all models outperform the random prediction.

◆ LSTM architecture outperformed other models for our problem. ✤ Tree-LSTM suffered from lack of large data and vanishing gradient

♦ Our hypothesis that we could learn an author-embedding was not applicable. The absence of an primary loss function w.r.t author_id

↔ We think that with the addition of more data. Tree-LSTM would be able to learn the grammatical-preferences of an author better.

Bibliography

1. Green, R. M., & Sheppard, J. W. Comparing Frequency- and Style-Based Features for Twitter Author Identication (2013, May). Twenty-Sixth International Florida Artificial Intelligence Research

2. K. S. Tai, R. Socher, and C. D. Manning. Improved semantic representations from tree-structured long short-term memory networks. (2015), ACM Computing Research. Repository Vol:abs/1503.00075 3. Patrick Juola. Authorship attribution. Foundations and Trends in Information Retrieval, 1(3):233334, 2006 4. Ronan Collobert, Jason Weston, L eon Bottou, Michael Karlen, Koray Kavukcuoglu, and Pavel Kuksa. Natural language processing (almost) from scratch.The Journal of Machine Learning Research,

5. Stamatatos, E. (2009), A survey of modern authorship attribution methods. J. Am. Soc. Inf. Sci., 60:

6. Pranav Jindal, Ashwin Paranjape. Deanonymizing Quora Answers (2015). CS224, Stanford University 7. Stephen Macke, & Jason Hirshman Deep Sentence-Level Authorship Attribution (2015).CS224,Stanford

8. Dylan Rhodes(2015) Author Attribution with CNNs CS224, Stanford University 9. Quoc Le, Tomas Mikolov ;Distributed Representations of Sentences and Documents