



Signal and Image Processing Lab



Identification of an Anonymous Reviewer of an Academic Paper Lior Kiassi, Roy Hachnochi, Supervised by Pavel Lifshits

Introduction

- Commonly, as part of the process of publishing a scientific paper, the work undergoes peer review.
- "Double Blind" the author and the reviewer are anonymous to each other.

Project Diagram



Clustering

- Finding outliers in dataset OPTICS algorithm.
- Samples visualization.
- Manifold learning learning the feature space of

• Today, due to transparency reasons, several well-known journals publish their reviews.

Goals

- Study the domain of a new problem reviews on academic articles.
- Research how to perform authorship attribution on this domain by learning a different domain.
- Stepping-stone towards the following:
 - Obfuscation of reviews' authors.
 - Dealing with the cross-domain problem learning on articles and inferring on reviews.

Challenges

- No existing labeled ground truth.
- Reviews are short texts.
- Reviews and academic papers are topic related.
- Cross domain work.
- Most articles are written by multiple authors.

Preprocessing

- Tokenizing.
- Ignoring stop words.
- Lemmatization.
- Replacing numbers and signs with '<UNK>'.

Features

- n-gram histograms:
 - $n \in \{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$

• TF-IDF normalization:
$$h[i] = \frac{n_i}{N} \cdot \log\left(\frac{D}{N_i}\right)$$

Average word length.

the train set and the test set.



Feature Selection

- Eliminate bad features (for both domains) with reliefF algorithm.
- For example articles:



Toy Problem

- Small dataset: 100 texts 10 Authors x 10 books (Guttenberg project).
- Goal: create an author classifier (90% Acc.).
- Accuracy vs. text length:



Dataset

Challenges:

• Hard to find (especially labeled ones).

- Number of words.
- Average number of words in a sentence.
- Histogram of the following punctuation signs: , : -

Features – Language Models



- Language model for each author.
- Calculates the probability for the next word.
- LSTM Huggingfaces' Transformers with GPT2.
- Perplexity as feature: $perp(x) = e^{-\frac{1}{N}\sum_{i=1}^{N} \log(P_{\theta}(x_i))}$

Results







- Indicates on the stability of our model for various problems.
- Stepping-stone for possible future work.
- Cross-domain problem hasn't been dealt with for future work.

- Review's authors write only few reviews in total.
- Short texts without meaningful context.
- Different text structures hard for automation.
- Difficulty to obtain papers of a specific person.

Structure:



- Reviews BMJ (British Medical Journal).
- Articles various sources.

- Perplxity indicates the likelihood of a text to be associated with a language model.
- Gives understanding of vocabulary, writing style and more.



Conclusions

- Good results on a naturally challenging domain.
- Future work domain adaptation.
- The quality and size of the dataset have impact on the results.
- Text length may have a great impact on results.
- Using language models and perplexity is a highly valuable feature for this task.
- Feature selection is important when dealing with high feature dimension.