

Feature Engineering and Ensemble Modeling for Paper Acceptance Rank Prediction

Yujie Qian*, Yinpeng Dong*, Ye Ma*, Hailong Jin, and Juanzi Li
Department of Computer Science and Technology, Tsinghua University
{qyj13, dongyp13, y-ma13}@mails.tsinghua.edu.cn,
tsinghua_phd@163.com, lijuanzi@tsinghua.edu.cn

ABSTRACT

Measuring research impact and ranking academic achievement are important and challenging problems. Having an objective picture of research institution is particularly valuable for students, parents and funding agencies, and also attracts attention from government and industry. KDD Cup 2016 proposes the *paper acceptance rank prediction* task, in which the participants are asked to rank the importance of institutions based on predicting how many of their papers will be accepted at the 8 top conferences in computer science. In our work, we adopt a three-step feature engineering method, including basic features definition, finding similar conferences to enhance the feature set, and dimension reduction using PCA. We propose three ranking models and the ensemble methods for combining such models. Our experiment verifies the effectiveness of our approach. In KDD Cup 2016, we achieved the overall rank of the 2nd place.

1. INTRODUCTION

Mining academic data and academic social network attracts great research attention in a long time. Many issues in academic network have been investigated and several systems have been developed, such as DBLP, Google Scholar, Microsoft Academic Search, and Aminer [12]. One problem of importance and also difficulty in this field is to measure institution's academic achievement and research impact. Specifically, given a research area, such as Machine Learning, Data Mining, etc., how to rank the most influential institutions, like CMU, Stanford, and MIT?

KDD CUP 2016 focuses on this problem and proposes an innovative and interesting task: *paper acceptance rank prediction*. Given an upcoming top conference in 2016, the goal of this competition is to rank the importance of institutions based on predicting how many of their papers will be accepted. In the competition, 8 computer science conferences are selected as target conferences, which are SIGIR, SIGMOD, SIGCOMM, KDD, ICML, FSE, MobiCom, and MM.

The competition's dataset includes the Microsoft Academic Graph (MAG) [11], and any other publicly available data on the Web.

*indicates equal contribution

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

KDD'16 August 13-17, 2016, San Francisco, CA, USA

© 2018 ACM. ISBN 978-1-4503-2138-9.

DOI: 10.1145/1235

MAG is a large and heterogeneous academic graph provided by Microsoft, containing scientific publication records, citation relationships between publications, as well as authors, institutions, journal and conference venues, and fields of study. The latest version of MAG includes 19,843 institutions, 114,698,044 authors, and 126,909,021 publications.

The evaluation is performed after the conferences announce their decisions of paper acceptance. For every conference, the competition organizers collect the full list of accepted papers, calculate ground truth ranking, and evaluate the participants' submissions. Ground truth ranking is generated following a simple policy to determine the Institution Ranking Score:

1. Each accepted paper has an equal vote (i.e., they are equally important).
2. Each author has an equal contribution to a paper.
3. If an author has multiple affiliations, each affiliation also contributes equally.

The evaluation are conducted in three phases, each chooses one conference to evaluate the predicted result. The competition uses NDCG@20 as the evaluation metric [4], which means only the top 20 institutions will be considered in the evaluation.

There have been some related works of this year's KDD Cup. A few studies try to solve the problem of ranking different objects in academic network, e.g., authors, publications, conferences, and institutions. Christian Zimmermann summarized academic ranking problems and existing methods in [14]. Various ranking criteria can be used in these rankings such as number of works, citation counts, h-index, impact factors, and aggregation of different methods. Besides, many learning-based approaches have been proposed to solve the general ranking problems, which are known as learning to rank [8].

However, this competition is still novel and challenging. First, different from previous KDD Cup challenges, the ground truth (i.e., paper acceptance in 2016) is unknown beforehand, and with considerable uncertainty. Second, the participants do not necessarily use supervised learning algorithms since the problem is an open problem.

In this paper, we introduce the framework of our approach in the competition. We concretely describe our feature engineering methods, including basic feature definitions, finding similar conferences, and dimension reduction. We propose three ranking models, and use the ensemble of different models for final prediction. We also conduct several experiments to verify the effectiveness of our approaches. In KDD Cup 2016, we finally get an overall ranking of the 2nd place, while 10th in Phase 1 (SIGIR), 39th in Phase 2 (KDD), and 14th in Phase 3 (MM).




Figure 1: Framework of our solution.

2. FRAMEWORK

The framework of our solution is illustrated in Fig. 1. It mainly consists of three components: feature extracting and preprocessing, model selection and training, model blending and ensemble. Details of these three parts will be elaborated in the ensuing sections. Below are some general discussion.

The first part of our framework is feature engineering, which is considered to be the most fundamental stage of data mining tasks. We first analyze the given dataset MAG, build up database for future use, and define certain basic and intuitive features. Then we are looking for methods to expand our collection of features, particularly by finding similar conferences to each targeted conference. Finally, we conduct dimension reduction through PCA in order to gain better performance.

In the second part, we primarily select three ranking models in our experiments, including a simple baseline model based on the ranking score in history, popular regression models such as linear regression and support vector regression, and some learning to rank models such as Ranking SVM. We train our models in the training set, and tune the hyper-parameters in the validation set.

In the final part, we apply blending methods to our models, which can effectively integrate different models and make them share complementary advantages.

3. FEATURE ENGINEERING

In this section, we introduce the feature set we derived in our work. Our feature engineering process mainly consists of three steps. At first, we define several basic features for each Institution-Conference-Year tuple. When ranking an institution in a conference, we use the features of the institution in the conference at recent 3 years. Then, we propose an approach to find similar conferences to each interested conference, and add these similar conferences in the feature set in order to incorporate more useful information. Finally, we conduct dimension reduction on the feature set to improve the performance of the ranking models.

3.1 Basic Features

We define six basic features for each Institution-Conference-Year tuple. Specifically, for a tuple of Institution A , Conference B , Year(s) C , these features indicates Institution A 's performance at Conference B in Year(s) C . The features are listed in Table 1. All

Table 1: Features defined for each Institution-Conference-Year tuple (A, B, C) .

Feature	Discription
#paper	Number of papers published
#author	Number of authors who published at least one paper
#author-paper	Number of (author, paper) pair
#1st author	Number of first authors
#2nd author	Number of second authors
score	Institution Ranking Score, as described in Section 1

the features we used are statistical features, representing the institution's performance at the conference. We count the number of first and second authors because the first author is the main contributor of the paper, and the second author is usually the mentor, or another important author. We also calculate the Institution Ranking Score following the metric defined by KDD Cup organizers.

When training ranking model for a conference, we generate features for each institution in last three years, each year separately and four years together. Finally, we have a basic feature vector of length 24 for each institution.

3.2 Similar Conference Features

In order to expand our collection of features and utilize plenty of other information, we find the most similar and representative conferences for each given conference and extract their features to supplement the existing ones. Similar conference features are helpful to predict paper acceptance in a targeted conference. Because of the uncertainty of paper submission and acceptance of an institution, only the targeted conference itself is not enough for prediction. It is common that an institution's performance in a particular conference varies from year to year. Features extracted from similar conferences can help to make more comprehensive and stable measure.

The method we used to find similar conferences is based on collaborative filtering. Concretely, for each one of the eight given conferences, we follow the procedures below:

First of all, we traverse the database to generate the Author-Conference matrix \mathbf{A} , satisfying condition that $\mathbf{A}_{ij} = 1$ if and only if author i has published papers on conference j . During the computation, two extra points are considered. First, we only take recent published papers (no earlier than 2010) into account, which is essential for improving the timeliness of our results. Second, the row number (i.e., author number) of matrix \mathbf{A} equals to the number of authors who has published papers on the given conference, instead of the number of all authors. This can effectively reduce the memory overhead and omit useless information.

Secondly, after getting the author-conference matrix \mathbf{A} , we examine two methods to compute similarity. The first one is to apply L1 normalization on matrix and compute cosine similarity of different column (i.e., conference) vectors. The second method is more intuitive. We just sum each column up to a row vector and find the maximum ones, which indicates they are more similar to the given conference on account of paper number published by authors who has published papers on the given conference.

The results of the similar conferences computed by our algorithm are listed in Table 2. From the table, we can find out the results are basically coincide with our knowledge, such as KDD is most similar with ICDM, ICML is most similar with NIPS, etc.

Table 2: Top five similar conferences for the eight targeted conferences

No.	KDD	ICML	SIGIR	SIGMOD
1	ICDM	NIPS	CIKM	ICDE
2	CIKM	AAAI	WWW	VLDB
3	WWW	CVPR	ECIR	CIKM
4	AAAI	KDD	WSDM	KDD
5	ICDE	ICASSP	KDD	EDBT

No.	SIGCOMM	MobiCom	FSE	MM
1	InfoCom	InfoCom	ICSE	ICME
2	ICC	ICC	ASE	ICIP
3	GlobeCom	GlobeCom	ISSTA	CVPR
4	NSDI	SIGCOMM	ICSM	ICASSP
5	IMC	MobiSys	MSR	ICCV

It is worth mentioning that we determine the similar conferences directly from data instead of manually assigning, which is more convincing and can better capture the correlation between conferences. For example, we find that CVPR is similar to ICML, but actually CVPR is a conference on computer vision while ICML is a conference on machine learning. It is because computer vision researchers also publish many papers in machine learning conferences, such as their theoretical works such as new models and improved algorithms. This kind of correlation is informative for prediction and can be captured by our method.

In this competition, we choose top 3 similar conferences for each targeted conference to enrich the feature set. For similar conferences, we still use the basic features defined in the last subsection to represent the institutions’ performance.

3.3 Dimension Reduction

Data with high dimension will cause the curse-of-dimensionality problem and degrade the efficiency of algorithms. Dimension reduction can mitigate the curse-of-dimensionality and other undesired problems, as illustrated in [5]. Many algorithms for dimensionality reduction have been proposed [13]. Among them, the linear algorithm Principal Component Analysis (PCA) [9] is the most popular because of its effectiveness.

PCA dimension reduction has the following steps:

1. Minus the empirical mean;
2. Compute the covariance matrix $S = \frac{1}{N} \sum_n \mathbf{x}_n \mathbf{x}_n^T$;
3. Eigenvalue decomposition. Let \mathbf{V} denote the eigenvectors of the top d eigenvalues of S ;
4. Reduce the dimension of data $Y = V^T X$.

In the *paper acceptance rank prediction* task, the number of affiliations is relatively small (741) and many of them are duplicates (many affiliations have the same feature vector, the elements of which all equal to zero), which makes it susceptible to over-fitting problem. To overcome this flaw, we use PCA algorithm to reduce the dimension of extracted features and obtain lower dimension features which are fed to later ranking or regression models.

In order to determine the target feature dimension K , we use the most common criterion:

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^K \lambda_i}{\sum_{i=1}^N \lambda_i} > \tau \quad (1)$$

where N is the dimension of initial data space, $\{\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_N\}$ are the eigenvalues of sample covariance matrix, and τ is a threshold which is usually 0.9 or 0.95. In this competition, we choose $\tau = 0.95$ and find that $K = 5$ can satisfy all the requirements. So we perform PCA to obtain a 5-dimension feature vector as the input of ranking models.

4. MODEL

In this section, we introduce three ranking models and the ensemble methods we used in the competition. Each single model is suitable for this task, and we combine these three models for final prediction.

4.1 Baseline Model

The most straight-forward idea to predict an institution’s paper acceptance in a conference this year is to measure its performance at this conference in the last few years. It is natural to assume that an institution which published a large number of papers at a conference last year or the year before last will still have many accepted papers at this year’s same conference. According to this idea, we propose a baseline model.

The KDD Cup organizers defined Institution Ranking Score (as described in Section 1) for a conference, written as $Score_i^t$, represents institution i ’s score in year t . Our baseline model uses the following metric to predict this year’s score:

$$Pred_i^t = \frac{1}{\tau} \sum_{j=1}^{\tau} Score_i^{t-j} \quad (2)$$

i.e., using the average Institution Ranking Score in the last τ years as the prediction score for this year. In the competition, we choose $\tau = 5$. Small τ emphasizes the most recent years, but can be unstable if a institution have an occasional success or failure in a recent year. Large τ takes more years into consideration, but cannot distinguish the institution whose productivity is increasing or declining.

The baseline model follows a simple ranking criterion and does not need any training data. This model works well when the institutions have stable performance in the conference, since it uses average score and does not consider changes over years.

4.2 Regression Model

In supervised learning, the most popular method is regression. The goal of regression is to predict one or more continuous target variables \mathbf{Y} given D dimensional feature vector (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_D) as input variables. The simplest regression model is linear regression which involves a linear combination of input variables,

$$y(\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w}) = w_0 + w_1 x_1 + \dots + w_D x_D \quad (3)$$

where $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_D)$. The training goal is to learn the set of parameters $\mathbf{w} = (w_0, w_1, \dots, w_D)$. We can perform maximum-likelihood estimation for linear regression, which is equivalent to minimize the sum-of-squares error [1], defined as

$$E_D(\mathbf{w}) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n=1}^N (y_n - \mathbf{w}^T \phi(\mathbf{x}_n))^2. \quad (4)$$

Then we can find the optimal parameter \mathbf{w}^* using stochastic gradient descent (SGD) method.

In this task, we treat the ranking score as continuous target variable and the extracted feature illustrated in Section 3 as input variables. Regression model takes the feature vector as input, and directly output the predicted ranking score in 2016 for each institution. We use linear regression model and support vector regression

with linear kernel, and average the output of two models to get the final result. The output of regression model is the ranking score for each institution, and then we can easily obtain the rank of each institution.

4.3 Ranking SVM Model

Learning to rank refers to the machine learning approaches of training models in a ranking task. Consider predicting paper acceptance as a ranking problem, we can apply some learning to rank models in this task. Existing learning to rank models can be categorized into three groups: pointwise, pairwise, and listwise approaches [8, 3]. In this competition, we use a pairwise approach: Ranking SVM [6].

Pairwise approach transforms the learning-to-rank problem into a classification problem – given a pair of items, learning a binary classifier to tell which one should be ranked higher. Then the goal is to minimize average number of inversions in ranking. In Ranking SVM, we train SVM as the classifier.

Now we formally describe Ranking SVM. Suppose the training data is given as $\{(x_i^{(1)}, x_i^{(2)}, y_i)\}$, $i = 1, \dots, m$, where each instance contains two feature vectors $x_i^{(1)}$ and $x_i^{(2)}$, and a label $y_i \in \{+1, -1\}$ indicates which feature factor should be ranked ahead. m is the size of training data. The learning task is to solve a Quadratic Problem,

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{w, \xi} \quad & \frac{1}{2} \|w\|^2 + C \sum_{i=1}^m \xi_i \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & y_i \langle w, x_i^{(1)} - x_i^{(2)} \rangle \geq 1 - \xi_i \\ & \xi_i \geq 0 \\ & i = 1, \dots, m, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes $L2$ -norm, and $C > 0$ is a coefficient. It is equivalent to a non-constrained optimization problem,

$$\min_w \sum_{i=1}^m \max(0, 1 - y_i \langle w, x_i^{(1)} - x_i^{(2)} \rangle) + \lambda \|w\|^2 \quad (6)$$

where $\lambda = \frac{1}{2C}$.

We train the ranking model using historical data. For example, we can pretend to predict the rank in 2015 in the training process since we have already know the answer, and use earlier years' data as input. Pairwise approach (e.g., Ranking SVM) is more appropriate in this specific task, since we have limited number of ranked lists, but enough items in each ranked list.

4.4 Ensemble

Model Ensemble can enhance the overall performance of individual models. In classification problems, the error rate of classifiers can often be reduced by bagging [2] which is a common method of model ensemble. The final model is the combination of many classifiers by uniform voting.

In ranking problems, we can also use the idea of bagging. We train a set of ranking models $\mathbf{M} = (M_1, M_2, \dots, M_K)$ and model M_i gives a prediction ranking score $\mathbf{s}_i = (s_i^1, s_i^2, \dots, s_i^n)$, where s_i^j is the score of instance j , and n is total number of ranking instances. Note that each model's output should be normalized into $[0, 1]$. The ensemble method we use is to average the output scores of all the models, while the final prediction is given by

$$\mathbf{s} = \frac{1}{K} \sum_{i=1}^K \mathbf{s}_i \quad (7)$$

Ensemble modeling can give stabler ranking score compared with

single models. Single model each has its own advantages and disadvantages, and probably has unforeseen problems such as overfitting. Ensemble modeling can blend different models and give more reliable output.

5. EXPERIMENTS

Various experiments were performed to evaluate the performance of the proposed methodologies and well-designed features. More experimental analyses on the effectiveness of some components in our framework are also given. We determine the parameters for our ranking models in the experiments and then predict the paper acceptance ranking in 2016.

5.1 Experimental Setup

To demonstrate the effectiveness of our proposed method, we divide the dataset into training set and validation set. Since MAG dataset only contains the full paper list of targeted conferences from 2011 to 2015, we train our model by predicting paper acceptance in 2014 (using 2011-2013 data to generate input features and using 2014 score as ground truth), and validate our model by predicting paper acceptance in 2015 (using 2012-2014 data to generate input features and using 2015 score as ground truth).

We train the ranking model for each targeted conference separately, i.e., SIGMOD, KDD and ICML will have different ranking models. As mentioned in Section 3, we define 6 basic features for each Institution-Conference-Year tuple. For each institution, we consider its performance in 6 conference settings: targeted conference (full paper), targeted conference (all paper), 3 similar conferences (all paper), and all these 4 conferences, and further in 4 year settings: last 3 years separately, and together. So the initial feature vector length for each conference will be 144 ($6 \times 6 \times 4$). High feature dimension is usually harmful to the model performance. So we further perform PCA algorithm and reduce the feature dimension to 5 (details can be found in Subsection 3.3).

We compare the models introduced in Section 4, i.e., Baseline, Regression (using the implementation of *scikit-learn* toolbox [10]), Ranking SVM (using the implementation of SVMRank [7]), and Ensemble Modeling. We utilize the training data to train the model, and test the performance on the validation data. The same as the competition, we use NDCG@20 as the metric to measure the ranking quality. The definition of NDCG@ n is following,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{DCG}@n &= \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{\text{Score}_i}{\log_2^{i+1}} \\ \text{NDCG}@n &= \frac{\text{DCG}@n}{\text{IDCG}@n} \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where IDCG@ n is the DCG@ n of the ideal rank.

When predicting the institution ranking in 2016, we use both training and validation data mentioned above to train the ranking models. Then we generate input feature vectors using 2013-2015 data, and use the ensemble of three models' output as our final prediction.

All the experiment codes are implemented in C++, Python, and Matlab, and the evaluations are performed on an x86-64 machine with 2.70GHz Intel Core i5 CPU and 8GB RAM. The operating system is OS X 10.11.5.

5.2 Experiment Results

We evaluate the performance using validation set. The results are shown in Table 3. From this table, we can see that regression model gets the highest NDCG@20 score in SIGCOMM, KDD, FSE and MM, while model ensemble achieves the highest score in SIGIR,




Figure 2: Experiment results at different steps of feature engineering.

Table 3: Validation Results of Different Models and Ensemble (NDCG@20)

Conference	Baseline	Regression	Ranking SVM	Ensemble
SIGIR	0.7664	0.8101	0.8178	0.8189
SIGMOD	0.7979	0.8179	0.8052	0.8222
SIGCOMM	0.7788	0.8059	0.7738	0.8028
KDD	0.7828	0.8341	0.8132	0.8325
ICML	0.8918	0.8794	0.8688	0.8740
FSE	0.5815	0.6145	0.5427	0.6050
MobiCom	0.6763	0.6644	0.6820	0.6955
MM	0.5331	0.5345	0.5344	0.5265
Average	0.7261	0.7451	0.7297	0.7472

SIGMOD and MobiCom. In average, model ensemble has the best performance. Model ensemble does not significantly outperform single model because these ranking models can achieve high performance themselves, and the number of models is also very limited. However, the ensemble of different models can reduce the uncertainty and get more reliable prediction compared with single model.

We note that the baseline method performs well enough compared with regression and ranking models. But the average of the last 5 years’ score is very simple approach, and it cannot capture the trend of each institution’s research ability. For example, if an institution gets a high score in the first years and decrease year by year, while another institution starts with relative low score, but keeps increasing recently. The baseline model may predict these two institutions the same, but we believe the latter one will do better because of the rising trend. Even though baseline model outperforms other methods in ICML prediction, we still choose the ensemble model to generate our final prediction.

5.3 Discussions

In the subsection, we investigate the effectiveness of the three feature engineering steps in our framework. We report the results at different settings, starting from using basic features, and gradually improve the feature set. All the experiments are conducted on the same training and validation set as mentioned before. The performance of baseline model will not be included in this subsection because baseline model does not use any training data, so its prediction is independent of feature engineering methods.

We compare the results in three settings:

1. Only use basic features to train the model;

Table 4: Performance comparison at different steps of feature engineering (average of 8 targeted conferences, NDCG@20).

No.	Method	Regression	Ranking SVM
1	Basic features	0.7289	0.7078
2	1 + Similar conferences features	0.7289	0.7026
3	2 + Dimension reduction	0.7451	0.7297

2. Add the similar conference features, but do not perform reduce dimension;
3. Add the similar conference features, and then use PCA to reduce dimension as mentioned in Section 3.3.

Figure 2 shows the performance under each setting at 8 targeted conferences, and we list the average results in Table 4. We hope that adding similar conference features and performing dimension reduction can help with the prediction. However, the improvement does not always hold at every conference because of the uncertainty of paper acceptance. In average, we see that simply adding similar conference features have no improvement in regression model, and even a decrease of NDCG in Ranking SVM model. It is reasonable, because the dimension of feature vector expands a lot after adding similar conferences, and high dimension will cause overfitting. After performing dimension reduction, the NDCG significantly gains in both models. So we can conclude that similar conference features are beneficial for prediction as long as dimension reduction is performed.

The above experiments confirm the strengths of our proposed methods in the prediction task.

6. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we introduce our solution at KDD Cup 2016 competition. We describe our effort in feature engineering, includes basic feature definition, finding similar conferences, and dimension reduction methods. We propose three ranking models and the ensemble method for prediction. Our empirical experiments illustrates the effectiveness of our approaches. In the competition, we achieved a final rank of the 2nd place.

7. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The work is supported by 973 Program (No. 2014CB340504), NSFC-ANR (No. 61261130588), NSFC key project(No. 61533018), Tsinghua University Initiative Scientific Research Program (No. 20131089256).

8. REFERENCES

- [1] C. Bishop. *Pattern Recognition and Machine Learning*. Information Science and Statistics. Springer, 2006.
- [2] L. Breiman. Bagging predictors. *Machine learning*, 24(2):123–140, 1996.
- [3] L. Hang. A short introduction to learning to rank. *IEICE TRANSACTIONS on Information and Systems*, 94(10):1854–1862, 2011.
- [4] K. Järvelin and J. Kekäläinen. Cumulated gain-based evaluation of ir techniques. *ACM Transactions on Information Systems (TOIS)*, 20(4):422–446, 2002.
- [5] L. O. Jimenez and D. A. Landgrebe. Supervised classification in high-dimensional space: geometrical, statistical, and asymptotical properties of multivariate data. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics, Part C (Applications and Reviews)*, 28(1):39–54, 1998.
- [6] T. Joachims. Optimizing search engines using clickthrough data. In *Proceedings of the eighth ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 133–142. ACM, 2002.
- [7] T. Joachims. Training linear svms in linear time. In *Proceedings of the 12th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 217–226. ACM, 2006.
- [8] T.-Y. Liu. Learning to rank for information retrieval. *Foundations and Trends in Information Retrieval*, 3(3):225–331, 2009.
- [9] K. Pearson. Liii. on lines and planes of closest fit to systems of points in space. *The London, Edinburgh, and Dublin Philosophical Magazine and Journal of Science*, 2(11):559–572, 1901.
- [10] F. Pedregosa, G. Varoquaux, A. Gramfort, V. Michel, B. Thirion, O. Grisel, M. Blondel, P. Prettenhofer, R. Weiss, V. Dubourg, J. Vanderplas, A. Passos, D. Cournapeau, M. Brucher, M. Perrot, and E. Duchesnay. Scikit-learn: Machine learning in Python. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 12:2825–2830, 2011.
- [11] A. Sinha, Z. Shen, Y. Song, H. Ma, D. Eide, B.-j. P. Hsu, and K. Wang. An overview of microsoft academic service (mas) and applications. In *Proceedings of the 24th International Conference on World Wide Web*, pages 243–246. ACM, 2015.
- [12] J. Tang, J. Zhang, L. Yao, J. Li, L. Zhang, and Z. Su. Arnetminer: extraction and mining of academic social networks. In *Proceedings of the 14th ACM SIGKDD international conference on Knowledge discovery and data mining*, pages 990–998. ACM, 2008.
- [13] L. Van Der Maaten, E. Postma, and J. Van den Herik. Dimensionality reduction: a comparative. *J Mach Learn Res*, 10:66–71, 2009.
- [14] C. Zimmermann. Academic rankings with repec. *Econometrics*, 1(3):249–280, 2013.