

Topological-collaborative approach for disambiguating authors' names in collaborative networks

Diego R. Amancio¹, Osvaldo N. Oliveira Jr. and Luciano da F. Costa

*Institute of Physics of São Carlos
University of São Paulo, P. O. Box 369, Postal Code 13560-970
São Carlos, São Paulo, Brazil*

Abstract

Concepts and methods of complex networks have been employed to uncover patterns in a myriad of complex systems. Unfortunately, the relevance and significance of these patterns strongly depends on the reliability of the data sets. In the study of collaboration networks, for instance, unavoidable noise pervading author's collaboration datasets arises when authors share the same name. To address this problem, we derive a hybrid approach based on authors' collaboration patterns and on topological features of collaborative networks. Our results show that the combination of strategies, in most cases, performs better than the traditional approach which disregards topological features. We also show that the main factor for improving the discriminability of homonymous authors is the average distance between authors. Finally, we show that it is possible to predict the weighting associated to each strategy compounding the hybrid system by examining the discrimination obtained from the traditional analysis of collaboration patterns. Once the methodology devised here is generic, our approach is potentially useful to classify many other networked systems governed by complex interactions.

Keywords: collaborative networks, disambiguation, collaboration patterns, hybrid classification

1. Introduction

The last few years have witnessed an increasing interest within the scientific community in the study of the patterns displayed by networked systems such as social networks, the Internet, the WWW and biological structures (Costa, Oliveira Jr., Travieso, Rodrigues, Villas Boas, Antiqueira, Viana & Rocha, 2011). The study of social networks, for instance, has been useful to unveil many properties of collective interactions such as social influence (Watts, 2003; Degenne & Forsé, 1999; Liljeros, Edling, Amaral, Stanley & Aaberg, 2001), disease spreading (Kleczkowski & Grenfell, 1999; Cohen, Havlin & Avraham, 2003; Boguñá, Pastor-Satorras & Vespignani, 2003) and many other sociologic aspects. Of particular interest to the aims of this study are the collaborative networks, which are among the largest social networks ever studied (Newman, 2001). The main findings achieved with the modeling of social interactions as collaborative networks include the observation of non-trivial topological information such as the small-world phenomena (Barabási, 2003). This means that, similarly to random graph models (Erdos & Rényi, 1959), the typical distance between nodes scales logarithmically with the number of agents in the system. Another interesting pattern in the counterpart network, referred to as citation network (Leicht, Clarkson, Shedden & Newman, 2007), is the cumulative behavior (Simon, 1957; Price, 1976), whereby nodes referenced on many occasions tend to be cited again more intensely than other less referenced papers, thus reflecting the preferential attachment (or richer-get-richer paradigm) (Barabási & Albert, 1999).

Collaborative networks have also been employed in information sciences to disambiguate authors' names in papers (Malin, 2005). Among many reasons, the accurate identification of authorship in manuscripts plays a fundamental role in the scientific community. For example, the unprecise quantification of researchers' merit based on their publication profile might lead to unfair decisions regarding the distribution of project financing, awards and so forth,

¹Corresponding author: diego.amancio@usp.br, diego.rafael@gmail.com

undermining the efficiency of the system as a whole. Despite the many attempts to handle the task satisfactory (Smalheiser & Torvik, 2009), a robust, precise system has not been conceived yet. For this reason, the disambiguation task remains an unsolved task for information sciences. Traditional network methods for addressing the problem relies on the assumption that homonymous authors can be distinguished by examining the distinct patterns of collaboration (Malin, 2005), because authors sharing the same alias often collaborate with different colleagues. While the latter strategy might be useful on specially in highly collaborative research areas, it may fail in some areas where papers comprises less than two coauthors (Zhao, 2008). Furthermore, the traditional approach does not take into account other relevant network knowledge. Firstly, patterns of connection with first neighbors are not considered. In the same way, information concerning the global connectivity of authors in their scientific community is also neglected. In this paper, we approach the problem of authors' name disambiguation by compounding both traditional and topological strategies in a hybrid way. More specifically, we show that the ability of discrimination is improved in three data sets with the proposed convex combination of classifiers. We also found that most relevant topological feature for discriminating authors' names is the average shortest path length, which suggests that the long-range connectivity patterns plays a fundamental role. Finally, we show that the weighing associated with the topological strategy can be obtained automatically because it correlates strongly with the discriminability obtained with the traditional approach.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we deal with the methodology employed to combine pattern recognition techniques. In the same section, we introduce the model based on collaborative networks and the topological features employed to characterize the organization of these networks. In Section 3, we display the results and discussions obtained with the proposed technique. Finally, in Section 4 we draw some final conclusions and suggest future works.

2. Topological-collaborative approach

The strategies employed in this paper to disambiguate authors' names are based in the construction of collaborative networks. In Section 2.1 we show how collaborative networks representing the relationship between authors are built. Then the nodes representing ambiguous names are characterized with traditional (or collaborative) features and with attributes extracted from topological measurements of complex networks (Costa, Rodrigues, Travieso, & Villas Boas, 2007) (see Section 2.2). The methodology employed to combine both approaches in a hybrid strategy is then presented in Section 2.3.

2.1. Network formation

A network \mathcal{G} is defined as $\mathcal{G} = \{\mathcal{V}, \mathcal{E}\}$, where \mathcal{V} represents the set of nodes and \mathcal{E} represents the set of edges. In a collaborative network, nodes represent authors. An edge exists between two authors if they published at least one paper together. Each homonymous author is represented as a different node because the disambiguation is performed at the paper level (Malin, 2005; Amancio, Oliveira Jr. & Costa, 2012). The strength of the link connecting nodes i and j is

$$w_{ij} = \sum_{\rho \in \Pi} \frac{\delta_{ij\rho}}{\|\rho\|}, \quad (1)$$

where Π is the set comprising all papers in the database, $\|\rho\|$ represents the number of authors in paper ρ and

$$\delta_{ij\rho} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } i \text{ and } j \text{ collaborate in paper } \rho, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

In eq. (1), $\|\rho\|$ is employed as a normalization factor to take into account the fact that strengths of links connecting a few authors tend to be more intense than those involving many authors (Malin, 2005). To illustrate the process of building the network, consider a toy database comprising 7 papers and 8 authors, as shown in Figure 1. We hypothesize that *Author 4* and *Author 5* share the same alias. For this reason, each of their apparitions are considered as a distinct node in the network (see highlighted nodes). According to eq. (1), the strength w_{12} of the edge linking *Author 1* and *Author 2* is $1/3$ (from paper 1). Analogously, $w_{23} = 2/3$, i.e., $1/3$ from paper 1 plus $1/3$ from paper 3.




Figure 1: Example of collaborative network acquired for the following toy database: Paper 1 (*Author 1*, *Author 2* and *Author 3*), Paper 2 (*Author 1* and *Author 4*), Paper 3 (*Author 3*, *Author 4* and *Author 2*), Paper 4 (*Author 5* and *Author 4*), Paper 5 (*Author 5*, *Author 6*, *Author 7* and *Author 8*), Paper 6 (*Author 6* and *Author 4*) and Paper 7 (*Author 8* and *Author 2*). Since *Author 1* and *Author 4* share the same alias in this example, each of their occurrences is presented as a different node in the network.

2.2. Network characterization

The characterization of each node was performed in two different ways. In the first strategy, referred to as collaborative method, nodes representing ambiguous names are characterized by the weight w_{ij} of their edges. In other words, the node v_i is characterized by the vector $\vec{w}(i) = (w_{i1}, w_{i2} \dots w_{in})^T$, where $n = \|\mathcal{V}\|$ is the total number of authors. Thus, if two ambiguous nodes tend to connect to the same neighbors one expects that $\|\Delta\vec{w}\| \rightarrow 0$. In the second strategy, referred to as topological approach, nodes are represented mathematically with the vector $\vec{\mu}(i) = (\mu_{i1}, \mu_{i2} \dots \mu_{iF})$ storing F topological measurements of complex networks (Costa, Rodrigues, Travieso, & Villas Boas, 2007). This strategy is based on the conjecture that the same author tends to display a regular organization in the collaboration network so that the connectivity patterns of distinct authors might be differentiated by the number of links, by the average connectivity of neighbors and so on. In the current study, the following complex network measurements were employed:

- **Degree:** the degree $k_i^{(1)} = \sum_j a_{ij} = \sum_k a_{ki}$ quantifies the number of neighbors connected to the node v_i , where

$$a_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{whenever } w_{ij} > 0, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

- **Strength:** represents the sum of the edges weights of the neighbors and is computed as $s_i^{(1)} = \sum_j w_{ij} = \sum_k w_{ki}$.
- **Neighborhood degree:** the neighborhood degree distribution of v_i is summarized with the average $k_{i,n}$

$$k_{i,n} = \sum_j a_{ij} k_j^{(1)} / \sum_j a_{ij} \quad (4)$$

and with the standard deviation $\Delta k_{i,n}$

$$\Delta k_{i,n} = \left[\sum_j a_{ij} \left(k_j^{(1)} - \sum_k a_{ik} k_i^{(1)} / \sum_k a_{ik} \right)^2 / \sum_j a_{ij} \right]^{1/2} \quad (5)$$

- **Neighborhood strength:** the weighted connectivity of the neighbors of v_i is represented with the average $s_{i,n}$

$$s_{i,n} = \sum_j a_{ij} s_j^{(1)} / \sum_j a_{ij} \quad (6)$$

and standard deviation $\Delta s_{i,n}$

$$\Delta s_{i,n} = \left[\sum_j a_{ij} \left(s_j^{(1)} - \sum_k a_{ik} s_i^{(1)} / \sum_k a_{ik} \right)^2 / \sum_j a_{ij} \right]^{1/2} \quad (7)$$

of the strength of the neighbors.

- **Clustering coefficient:** the quasi-local topological structure of nodes is measured in terms of the clustering coefficient $C^{(1)}$, which quantifies the extent to which neighbors tend to cluster together. The local version of this measurement quantifies how close are the neighbors to become a clique, i.e., a fully connected subgraph. Using the adjacency matrix, $C^{(1)}$ is computed as

$$C_i^{(1)} = 3 \sum_{k>j>i} a_{ij} a_{ik} a_{jk} \left[\sum_{k>j>i} a_{ij} a_{ik} + a_{ji} a_{jk} + a_{ki} a_{kj} \right]^{-1} \quad (8)$$

- **Average shortest path length:** this measurement is calculated from the quantity d_{ij} measuring the minimum cost required to reach a given node v_j :

$$l_i = \frac{1}{n-1} \sum_{i=1}^n d_{ij} \quad (9)$$

- **Betweenness:** the centrality of nodes was also examined in terms of the total the number of shortest paths that pass through them. If $\sigma(v_i, v_u, v_j)$ represents the number of shortest paths from node v_i to node v_j passing through v_u , and $\sigma(v_i, v_j)$ is the total number of shortest path from v_i to v_j then the betweenness B is computed as:

$$B_u = \frac{\sigma(v_i, v_u, v_j)}{\sigma(v_i, v_j)}. \quad (10)$$

- **Hierarchical measurements:** the hierarchical representation of traditional measurements takes into account further neighborhoods to quantify the local structure of nodes (Costa & Andrade, 2007; Costa & Silva, 2006). To define this level of representation, consider the following definitions. Consider that \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{W} are the matrices storing the elements a_{ij} and w_{ij} , respectively. Let $\mathcal{R}_1(i)$ be the set of immediate neighbors of v_i . This set accounts for the transmission of information from v_i to every node belonging to the set $\{v_j \in \mathcal{V} \mid v_j \notin \mathcal{R}_1(i)\}$. Hence, $\mathcal{R}_1(i)$ is responsible for the creation of “virtual edges” connecting v_i and the nodes two hops away from v_i . Mathematically, $\mathcal{R}_1(i)$ is deduced from the vector $\vec{v}_1(\mathbf{i})$:

$$\vec{v}_1(\mathbf{i}) = \mathcal{A}_i \cdot \vec{v}(i), \quad (11)$$

where \mathcal{A}_i is the i -th line of \mathcal{A} and

$$\vec{v}(\mathbf{1}) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\vec{v}(\mathbf{2}) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\vec{v}(\mathbf{3}) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The quantity $\rho_1^\vec{v}(i)$ is defined with the heaviside function δ as $\rho_1^\vec{v}(i) = \delta(\vec{v}_1(i))$. Thus, if $v_j \in \mathcal{R}_1(i)$, then $\rho_1^\vec{v}(i) = 1$. Otherwise, $\rho_1^\vec{v}(i) = 0$. The definition of $\vec{v}_1(i)$, might be extended to consider further neighborhoods. This is achieved with the vector $\vec{v}_h(i)$, whose non-zero elements represent the set $\{v_j \in \mathcal{V} \mid d_{ij} = h\}$, i.e., \mathcal{R}_h :

$$\vec{v}_h(i) = \mathcal{W}^h \cdot \vec{v}(i). \quad (12)$$

Analogously to the definition of $\rho_1^\vec{v}$, $\rho_h^\vec{v}$ might be defined as the of set of nodes whose maximum distance from node v_i does not exceed h steps :

$$\rho_h^\vec{v}(i) = \delta \left(\sum_{k=1}^h \rho_k^\vec{v}(i) + \vec{v}(i) \right). \quad (13)$$

Note that, with the definition of $\rho_h^\vec{v}$ in eq. (13), \vec{v}_h might be computed alternatively as $\vec{v}_h(i) = \rho_h^\vec{v}(i) - \rho_{h-1}^\vec{v}(i)$. Let γ_h the subnetwork comprising nodes inside the radius $\mathcal{R}_h(i)$ plus the edges between the nodes in $\mathcal{R}_h(i)$. The hierarchical level h of the network is defined as γ_h plus the edges going to γ_{h+1} . Thus, the hierarchical version of the traditional measurements are computed by collapsing the nodes inside the radius $\mathcal{R}_h(i)$ as a single node, disregarding both internal nodes and edges. An example of hierarchy is illustrated in Figure 2. In the current study, we employed the second and third hierarchies for the degree ($k^{(2)}$ and $k^{(3)}$), strength ($s^{(2)}$ and $s^{(3)}$) and clustering coefficient ($C^{(2)}$ and $C^{(3)}$), respectively.

2.3. Fuzzy algorithm description

The pattern recognition technique we propose is an extension of the well established “crisp” κ NN algorithm (Duda, Hart & Stork, 2000), an algorithm that has been shown to be both computationally efficient and highly effective in small and medium scale databases (Dasarathy, 1980; Keller, Gray & Givens Jr., 1985). The “crisp” κ NN algorithm is defined as follows. Consider an training dataset $\mathcal{W} = \{x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots, x_n\}$. As we shall show, this set will be used to detect useful patterns for the disambiguating task. The class i of each x_k , $1 \leq k \leq n$ is known beforehand. Given a new unclassified object x , one desires to classify it in the most likely class. To achieve this, the algorithm initially selects the κ nearest objects of the training dataset. Then, the most frequent class in this κ -set is used to decide the class of x . If a tie occurs for two or more classes, the algorithm selects the class of the nearest object belonging to one of the




Figure 2: Examples of hierarchies calculated for the yellow central node depicted in network (a). Red nodes belong to the set $\mathcal{R}_1(\text{yellow})$, while blue nodes belong to set $\mathcal{R}_2(\text{yellow})$. In order to compute the hierarchical measurements, nodes belonging to a given hierarchy (i.e., nodes inside the lines denoted by dotted lines) are collapsed into a single node while external (dotted) edges are kept. In panel (b), the neighbors of the yellow node were collapsed into a single node, while in panel (c) the neighbors of the neighbors were collapsed into a single node. Hence, the hierarchical degree at the second and third levels are respectively $k_{\text{yellow}}^{(2)} = 8$ and $k_{\text{yellow}}^{(3)} = 9$. The other hierarchical measurements can be computed in an analogous manner.

tied classes. The obvious limitations the “crisp” κ algorithm is that the training objects in the same class are equally representative for that class. This deficiency is evident when one compares objects situated in the centers with objects located on the border of the class. Another problem concerning the algorithm is that x is classified to a single class. There is no concept of strength of membership (Duda, Hart & Stork, 2000). To overcome such problems, we derived a different approach based on the fuzzy definition proposed in Ref. (Keller, Gray & Givens Jr., 1985).

To define the fuzzy algorithm, consider the following definitions. Let $u_{ij} \in [0, 1]$ be the membership strength of x_j in class i . By definition, u_{ij} is restricted to the following conditions:

$$\sum_{i=1}^c u_{ik} = 1, \quad (14)$$

$$0 < \sum_{i=1}^c u_{ik} < n, \quad (15)$$

where c is the number of classes. Eq. (14) allows us to interpret u_{ik} as the likelihood of x_k to belong to class i . Therefore, if $c = 2$ and $u_{1k} = 0.95$ we note that it is very likely that x_k belongs to $i = 1$. Differently, if $u_{1k} = 0.55$ then x_k probably is located at the border of that class. As for eq. (15), it simply imposes that each class cannot contain more than n objects. In the fuzzy algorithm, the non-normalized membership strength $\tilde{u}_i(x)$ of an unclassified object x in the i -th class is computed in function of the distance of x to the κ nearest neighbors:

$$\tilde{u}_i(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{\kappa} u_{ij} \|x - x_j\|^{2/(1-m)}. \quad (16)$$

Note that the membership $\tilde{u}_i(x)$ depend on both the distance to the nearest κ objects and the strength membership of the training set. As such, $\tilde{u}_i(x)$ will take large values whenever the distance between x and x_j is small and x_j is a strongly representative object in class i (i.e., u_{ij} is large). The parameter m accounts for the weight associated to the distance $\|x - x_j\|$. If m take high values, $\|x - x_j\|$ weakly interferes on the the computation of $\tilde{u}_i(x)$. On the other hand, whenever $m \rightarrow 1$ the influence of the nearest objects becomes so strong that the contribution of the farthest objects in the κ -set practically disappears. To assure that $u_i(x)$ represents a probability, it is necessary to normalize $\tilde{u}_i(x)$ so that $\sum_i \alpha \tilde{u}_i(x) = 1$. α can be computed from

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha^{-1} &= \sum_i \tilde{u}_i(x) \\ &= \sum_i \sum_j u_{ij} \|x - x_j\|^{2/(1-m)} \\ &= \sum_j \left[\sum_i u_{ij} \|x - x_j\|^{2/(1-m)} \right] \\ &= \sum_j \|x - x_j\|^{2/(1-m)} \sum_i u_{ij} \\ &= \sum_j \|x - x_j\|^{2/(1-m)} \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Therefore, $u_i(x)$ is given by:

$$u_i(x) = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^{\kappa} u_{ij} \|x - x_j\|^{2/(1-m)}}{\sum_{j=1}^{\kappa} \|x - x_j\|^{2/(1-m)}}. \quad (18)$$

In order to define the strength u_{ij} of each object x_j in the training set with regard to class i , consider the following definitions. $\mu_i = \sum_{j, x_j \in i} x_j / n_i$ represents the centroid of class i comprising n_i objects and s_{ab} is the covariance between attributes a and b :

$$s_{ab} = \frac{1}{Q-1} \sum_{v=1}^Q (a(v) - \langle a \rangle)(b(v) - \langle b \rangle), \quad (19)$$

where $\langle \dots \rangle$ is the average over Q observations of the two variables. The covariance matrix between all attributes is defined as $C = [C(a, b)]$. The similarity between object x_j and a class i is given by

$$\sigma(i, x_j) = \left[(x_j - \mu_i)^T S_i^{-1} (x_j - \mu_i) \right]^{-1/2}, \quad (20)$$




Figure 3: $d^{(euc)}(p, \text{red}) / d^{(euc)}(p, \text{blue}) = 1.15$ and $d^{(mah)}(p, \text{red}) / d^{(mah)}(p, \text{blue}) = 0.62$. Even though the euclidian distance from p to the two groups are similar, p is more similar to the red group according to the Mahalanobis distance because the latter is more sparse.

which represents the inverse of the Mahalanobis distance (Duda, Hart & Stork, 2000). In particular, such similarity measure was chosen because it takes into account the dispersion of the classes to compute the distance between x_j and the cluster i . In this way, if x_j is far away from the centroid c_i but is included inside the dispersion region of i , then distance between x_j and i will be small. On the other hand, if x_j is close to c_i but the dispersion of i is too small so that x_j falls outside the boundaries of i , then then distance between x_j and i will be probably greater than the previous scenario.

Finally, the strength membership of x_j representing an training object in class i is given by

$$u_{ij} = \frac{\sigma(i, x_j)}{\sum_i \sigma(i, x_j)}, \quad (21)$$

Note that $\sigma(i, x_j)$ is normalized by the sum of the similarity between x_j and all classes to satisfy Eq. (14).

2.4. Hybrid classification and evaluation

The fuzzy algorithm described in Section 2.3 is employed to construct the hybrid classifier as follows. If $u_{ij}^{(T)}$ represents the strength membership of the object x_j in class i when the collaborative attributes are employed and $u_{ij}^{(C)}$ represents the analogous when the CN topological measurements are used, then the strength membership of x_j in class i in the hybrid approach is

$$u_{ij}^{(H)} = \lambda u_{ij}^{(T)} + (1 - \lambda) u_{ij}^{(C)}. \quad (22)$$

Note that λ in eq. (22) plays the role of weighting distinct strategies. The larger is the value of λ , the greater is the importance allocated to the topological strategy and vice-versa. Finally, the class i associated to object x_j is the one satisfying the relation $u_{ij} = \max_i u_{ij}$.

Many evaluation methods have been employed to compare performance of classifiers (Duda, Hart & Stork, 2000). For simplicity's sake, we measure the distinguishability of homonymous authors as the accuracy rate provided by the 10-fold cross-validation strategy (Duda, Hart & Stork, 2000). This strategy is robust because it can be used even when there is not a specific set to assess discriminability. In this method, the training set is randomly separated into 10 parts so that 9 parts are used for training and the remaining one is employed for evaluation. The process is iterated 10 times until all parts are used for evaluation. Finally, the accuracy rate is computed as the average accuracy rate obtained along this iterative process.

3. Results and discussion

In this section we described the results obtained with three data sets derived from the arXiv repository, which have been used in previous studies (Amancio, Oliveira Jr. & Costa, 2012; Viana, Amancio & Costa, 2013). The three




Figure 4: Giant component of the collaborative network obtained from the CN database. Node sizes are proportional to the total number of distinct collaborators.

collaborative networks comprise papers from the following research areas: “complex networks”, “topological insulators” and “liquid crystals”, which are henceforth abbreviated as **CN**, **TI** and **LC**, respectively. The CN collaborative network is illustrated in Figure 7. In all experiments, we have employed $m = 2$ in eq. (18).

3.1. Comparing the hybrid with the traditional approach

The traditional approach based on the use of collaboration patterns was compared with the hybrid strategy as follows. For each pair of homonymous authors, we employed the hybrid algorithm described in Section 2.3 to take into account the topological information. The accuracy rate Γ_H was computed for each λ and then the best λ^* was determined. Figure 7 illustrates the variation of Γ_H as λ varies within the interval $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ for three specific pairs of homonymous authors. In the three cases, the best discrimination occurs with $\lambda^* > 0$, hence confirming that the use of topological features is useful to enhance the disambiguation task. In particular cases, it is even feasible to put away from the analysis the traditional approach because the optimum Γ_H was found to include $\lambda = 1$ (see e.g. Figure 7(a) and 7(c)). In other cases, the best Γ_H was observed through a convex combination of strategies, i.e. $0 < \lambda < 1$ (see




Figure 5: Variation of the accuracy rate Γ_H in function of λ for a particular pair of homonymous authors in the (a) CN; (b) TI; and (c) LC databases. Note that in (a) and (b) the best Γ_H includes $\lambda = 1$. This means that the best accuracy was might be obtained exclusively with topological features in particular cases. The hybrid effect can be observed in (b) because there is a mixture of both traditional and topological approaches.

Figure 7(b)). The distribution of λ^* for all pairs of authors displayed in Figure 6 confirms that the topology plays a fundamental role on the task because in almost all databases $\lambda^* \neq 0$.

The individual accuracy rates, viz. Γ_C (for the traditional collaborative approach) and Γ_T (for the topological approach) were compared with the hybrid strategy in Table 1, whose lines represent an specific pair of homonymous authors. For each database (CN, LC and TI), we show the 15 best results where the hybrid approach displayed the highest increase in performance when compared with the traditional strategy. In other words, the rows are sorted in the decreasing order of the margin of gain $\Gamma_{HC} = \Gamma_H - \Gamma_C$. As the table shows, the magnitude of Γ_{HC} depends on the database. While for the CN and LC networks the maximum improvement in performance reached 32.5% and 30.0 % respectively, for the TI database the maximum gain Γ_{HC} did not exceed 10.0%. These results suggest that the discrimination in the latter case is hampered because the TI collaborative network presents a more regular topological structure when compared with the other two networks.

3.2. Relevance of topological measurements

In the previous section we have observed that topological measurements extracted from collaborative networks are useful to enhance the performance of disambiguating homonymous authors. In this section we focus on an approach to better understand which topological factors accounts for the improvement in the discrimination ability. To achieve this, we adopted a procedure to rank the relevance of the topological measurements. For each of the three databases, we selected the pairs of homonymous authors whose discriminability (revealed by the “kNN crisp” algorithm) falls below a given threshold. We chose to select only the worst traditional classifiers to perform the assessment of relevance of topological measurements in order to focus the analysis on the situations where the structural approach is in fact responsible for the disambiguation. For each pair of homonymous authors we computed the relevance upon assessing the discriminability of every possible classifier constructed with a smaller combination of the original measurements. Thus, if \mathcal{F} represents the total number of measurements, then $\sum_{i=0}^{\mathcal{F}} \mathcal{F}! / (\mathcal{F} - i)! i! = 2^{\mathcal{F}}$ classifiers are generated. With this procedure we aimed at identifying the most relevant measurements as those appearing among those combinations of classifiers with the highest discriminative rates. The relevance was then quantified from the analysis of the matrix \mathcal{M} , with $2^{\mathcal{F}}$ rows and \mathcal{F} columns, whose elements m_{ij} are given by

$$m_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if the } i\text{-th best combination employed the } j\text{-th feature,} \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (23)$$

Note that if a feature j always appears among the best classifiers then $f(x) = \sum_{i=1}^x m_{ij}$, $\{x \in \mathbb{N}^* | x \leq 2^{\mathcal{F}}\}$ will increase quickly. On the other hand, if j tends to appear among the worst classifiers, $f(x)$ increases significantly only when x




Figure 6: Distribution of λ^* for the (a) CN ; (b) TI; and (c) LC databases. It is worth noting that $\lambda^* > 0$ for most case, which reinforce the suitability of topological measurements to improve the performance of the task.

Table 1: Values of accuracy rate using the traditional (Γ_C), topological (Γ_R) and hybrid Γ_H approaches. Rows are sorted by the margin of gain $\Gamma_{HC} = \Gamma_H - \Gamma_C$ in each database. The values of λ concerning the best Γ are also provided in the last columns. Note in particular that the margin of gain Γ_{HC} vary from network to network, reaching a maximum of 32.5 % in the CN database.

Complex Networks				Topological Insulators				Liquid crystals			
Γ_C	Γ_T	Γ_H	λ^*	Γ_C	Γ_T	Γ_H	λ^*	Γ_C	Γ_T	Γ_H	λ^*
(%)	(%)	(%)	–	(%)	(%)	(%)	–	(%)	(%)	(%)	–
51.3	82.5	83.8	0.55	88.8	98.8	98.8	1.00	52.5	82.5	82.5	1.00
47.5	75.0	75.0	1.00	35.8	41.6	42.5	0.85	50.0	72.5	72.5	1.00
77.5	98.3	99.2	0.98	62.5	63.8	68.8	0.56	67.5	77.5	85.0	0.77
72.5	90.0	90.0	1.00	28.8	35.0	35.0	1.00	72.5	82.5	87.5	0.98
81.3	97.5	97.5	1.00	18.1	20.6	23.8	0.88	57.5	71.3	71.3	1.00
85.0	97.5	98.8	0.88	95.0	98.7	100.0	0.79	65.0	70.0	77.5	0.53
86.3	96.3	100.0	0.29	18.8	23.8	23.8	1.00	83.8	85.0	95.0	0.60
86.3	93.8	98.8	0.83	61.3	66.3	66.3	1.00	82.5	87.5	92.5	0.31
83.8	95.0	96.3	0.42	90.8	90.8	95.0	0.70	77.5	72.5	87.5	0.48
85.0	94.0	96.3	0.85	20.0	23.3	23.3	1.00	85.0	77.5	92.5	0.29
85.0	95.0	95.0	1.00	97.5	92.5	100.0	0.37	75.0	60.0	82.5	0.03
85.0	87.5	95.0	0.49	31.3	32.5	33.8	0.84	95.0	100.0	100.0	1.00
85.0	84.2	93.4	0.49	28.8	31.3	31.3	1.00	40.0	45.0	45.0	1.00
85.9	94.1	94.2	1.00	26.6	29.2	29.2	1.00	80.0	85.0	85.0	1.00
72.5	76.3	80.0	0.49	33.8	36.3	36.3	1.00	91.3	95.0	95.0	1.00

takes high values. Thus, the relevance $r(j)$ of feature j can be computed as the area underneath the curve $f(x)$:

$$r(f) = \int_1^{2^F} f(x)dx = \sum_{i=1}^{2^F} \sum_{k=1}^{i-1} m_{kj} + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{2^F} m_{ij}. \quad (24)$$

An example of quantification of relevance is provided in Appendix A. At last, the final ranking of features in each database is established following the decreasing geometric mean of $r(j)$ over all pairs of homonymous authors. Note that this ordering scheme corresponds to the the likelihood of reaching just by chance a ranking as good as the one obtained in all pairs of homonymous authors in each database. The results are depicted in Table 2 and summarized below.

Table 2: Ranking (R) of relevance of measurements for the CN, TI and LC databases. Each pair of homonymous authors was evaluated using the quantity $r(j)$ (see eq. (24)) and the final rank in each database was taken as the geometric average of $r(j)$ in each pair of homonymous author. In all three databases, the most prominent topological measurement is the average shortest path length.

R	CN	TI	LC
#1	l	l	l
#2	$k_n^{(1)}$	$C^{(1)}$	$k^{(1)}$
#3	$\Delta s^{(1)}$	B	Δk
#4	$\Delta k^{(1)}$	$\Delta k^{(1)}$	$s^{(1)}$
#5	$s_n^{(1)}$	$\Delta s^{(1)}$	$s_n^{(1)}$
#6	\mathcal{L}	$\Delta s^{(1)}$	B
#7	B	$k^{(1)}$	$C^{(1)}$
#8	$k^{(1)}$	$k_n^{(1)}$	$\Delta s^{(1)}$
#9	$C^{(1)}$	$s^{(1)}$	$k_n^{(1)}$
#10	$s^{(1)}$	\mathcal{L}	\mathcal{L}

- **Average shortest path length (l):** this measurement is the most prominent feature in all three databases. This probably occurs because the average shortest path length, unlikely other traditional collaborative features, takes into account long range connections that might be essential to differentiate distinct patterns of organization occurring in deeper hierarchies.
- **Degrees ($k^{(1)}$, k_n and Δk_n):** these measures are relevant only in particular cases. $k_n^{(1)}$ appears at the second position in the CN database, while the number of neighbors $k^{(1)}$ is the second most relevant feature in the LC database. Remarkably, for the TI database, $k^{(1)}$ and k_n appear at the lower bottom of the relevance table probably because the the connections among neighbors plays a essential role to discriminate ambiguous authors and this characteristic is only captured with the clustering coefficient (see discussion below). The standard deviation of the degree of neighbors Δk_n does not seem to be relevant because it lies at intermediary positions in all three databases.
- **Strength ($s^{(1)}$, s_n and Δs_n):** the strength computed at the first levels are ranked into intermediary positions. The introduction of weights in edges does not seem to enhance significantly the discriminability because the differences $r(k^{(1)}) - r(s^{(1)})$ and $r(k_n) - r(s_n)$ are relatively small.
- **Betweenness (B):** the number of shortest paths passing through nodes representing homonymous authors plays a minor role on the disambiguation task. The best rank achieved was the 3rd position in the TI database. Actually, the weak performance of this quantity reveals that the length of paths and not their quantity is responsible for the improvement in the ability of discriminating authors' names.
- **Clustering coefficient (C):** the connectivity among neighbors seems to be useful only for the TI database. This result contrasts with the result observed for the CN network, where the number of connections outgoing from neighbors was found to be relevant (note that k_n is placed at the 2nd position in the CN ranking). As one can observe in the TI ranking, the total number of external links leaving neighbors is less informative for the discrimination task because $C^{(1)}$ is more important than other measurements that considers external connections such as Δk , Δs and k_n . This means that in the TI database the feature responsible for the distinguishability of authors is the degree of connectivity among collaborators. In other words, homonymous authors might be differentiated from each other because they belong to communities with distinct modularity (Newman, 2006).
- **Locality index (\mathcal{L}):** the percentage of connections located at the first hierarchical level turned out to be weakly discriminative for it achieved only the 6th position at the best case. This result suggests that the locality index of authors in collaborative networks is very invariant. Remarkably, even though the total **number** of external ($k^{(1)}$) and internal links ($C^{(1)}$) is relevant in some cases, the **proportion** of links located more closely to the node under analysis is not.




Figure 7: Predicting the value of λ^* from the analysis of discriminability achieved with the traditional collaborative approach. The best fitting obtained from the CN, TI and LC networks are: (a) $\lambda^* = 3.3222 - 3.389 \times 10^{-2} \Gamma$ ($r = 0.46$ and $p = 4.8 \times 10^{-3}$); (b) $\lambda^* = 1.026 - 9.3 \times 10^{-3} \Gamma$ ($r = 0.79$ and $p = 0$) and (c) $\lambda^* = 1.68433 - 1.633 \times 10^{-2} \Gamma$ ($r = 0.63$ and $p \approx 0$).

3.3. Is it possible to predict λ^* ?

In the current investigation we found that the exact choice of the parameter λ gives rise to an hybrid technique whose combination of strategies is able to enhance the performance of traditional methods relying solely on recurrence of collaborations. The drawback associated with this methodology is that it cannot be straightforwardly employed in real applications because there is no a priori information available that could guide the selection of the best λ .

The strategy we propose to estimate λ^* is based on the assumption that the use of topological features become relevant especially when the discrimination achieved with collaborative attributes is unable to provide a reasonable discrimination. More specifically, our strategy assigns the highest values of λ^* to the worst traditional classifiers in the following manner. Initially, we evaluate the discriminability of homonymous authors by computing the accuracy rate obtained with collaborative features. Next, the value of λ^* is identified using the hybrid approach according to eq. (22). Finally, λ^* is correlated with Γ_C and the best line fitting the data is extracted. In some cases it was imperative to choose a particular value of λ^* because the best λ may occur in intervals (see e.g. Figure 7(a) and (c)). In order to construct the regression model maximizing its prediction ability we chose in these cases the value of λ maximizing the correlation between Γ_C and λ^* with the simulated annealing heuristic (Duda, Hart & Stork, 2000). The relationship between Γ_C and λ^* and the best curve fitting the data are displayed in Figure 7. Note that, in all three databases, the correlation between Γ_C and λ^* reached significant values ($r = 0.46$, $r = 0.79$ and $r = 0.63$ respectively for CN, TI and LC), suggesting that the optimal weighting for the hybrid approach can be reasonably predicted from the traditional analysis of collaborations.

4. Conclusions

The problem of scientific collaboration has been studied by a large number of works. However, the usefulness of topological measurements of complex networks for discriminating authors' names has not been usually taken into account. Actually, the study of topological features of collaborative networks for discriminating homonymous authors has been restricted to a few works (Amancio, Oliveira Jr. & Costa, 2012). In the present article, we devised a classification scheme which considers synchronously both traditional and topological strategies for characterizing authors in scientific papers, which allowed us to obtain better discriminating systems. This classifications scheme was accomplished by defining a classifier whose final inference is based on a weighted convex combination of decisions based on semantical and topological patterns of collaboration. Several interesting results have been obtained. First, the weight related to the topological strategy was different from zero in most cases. This implies that the topological approach plays a complementary role on the characterization of homonymous authors. Another interesting finding was that when researchers are poorly distinguished by the analysis of recurrence of coauthorship patterns, the average

distance between authors in a given research area is the main topological feature that provides valuable information about authors' peculiarities. We also verified the correlation between the weight associated with the topological strategy and the best accuracy rate of the disambiguating system. It followed from this result that the weights are inversely proportional to the distinguishability achieved with coauthorship patterns. As such, the best weight related to the topological approach can be predicted automatically. Further works could introduce a decay factor for edges weights so that old collaborations are mapped into weakened edges. Another possibility is to take into account as well the organization of the authors' collaboration in the attribute space (Silva & Amancio, 2012).

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by FAPESP (2010/00927-9 and 2011/50761-2).

Appendix A. Quantifying feature relevance

The method employed to estimate the relevance of features is based on frequency of its appearance among the most accurate classifiers, when one considers all the possible 2^F combinations of attributes. The fraction of classifiers displaying an accuracy rate above a specific threshold is calculated and the area underneath the curve obtained by varying the threshold in decreasing order is employed as a relevance estimator. This methodology has been chosen because it draws on multivariate analysis, which provides powerful ability for representing and analyzing non-trivial relationships among many features. On the other hand, other more simple methods, such as the Kullback-Leibler divergence (Duda, Hart & Stork, 2000), are unable to grasp complex interactions between features.

Table A.3 exemplifies the quantification of relevance of three features (viz. **A**, **B** and **C**) describing a toy database according to eq.(24). The combinations of classifiers are sorted in decreasing order of precision. For example, the classifier induced solely with the attribute **B** displayed the best performance while the classifier induced with **A** and **B** achieved the second highest accuracy rate. The curves displaying the accumulated frequency above the established threshold for each attribute is given Figure A.8.

Table A.3: Example of computation of relevance r of features according to eq. (24). We consider a toy database represented by three attributes, viz. viz. **A**, **B** and **C**. The classifiers are sorted in decreasing order of precision and the attributes employed in each of the $2^3 = 8$ combinations of classifiers are marked in the respective column with a dot (•). Note that the most efficient classifiers usually employ attribute **B**. Since **B** is used frequently to induce the best classifiers, its respective curve grows more rapidly (see Figure A.8). As a result, $r(\mathbf{B}) > r(\mathbf{A})$ and $r(\mathbf{B}) > r(\mathbf{C})$.

Ranking	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5	#6	#7	#8
Attribute A		•	•		•			•
Attribute B	•	•	•				•	
Attribute C			•			•	•	•




Figure A.8: Quantification of relevance of the attributes (a) **A**, (b) **B** and (c) **C** using eq. (24). The assumed order of performance of classifiers is given in Table A.3. Note that attribute **B** grows more rapidly because it is employed in the best classifiers. On the other hand, the attribute **C** is the less relevant for it appears predominantly among the classifiers with the worst performance in Table A.3.

References

- Amancio, D. R., Nunes, M. G. V., Oliveira Jr., O. N. & Costa, L. da F. (2012). Using complex networks concepts to assess approaches for citations in scientific papers. *Scientometrics*, 90 2.
- Amancio, D. R., Oliveira Jr., O. N., Costa, L. da F. (2012). On the use of topological features and hierarchical characterization for disambiguating names in collaborative networks. *Europhysics Letters* 99 48002.
- Amancio, D. R., Oliveira Jr., O. N., Costa, L. da F. (2012). Three-feature model to reproduce the topology of citation networks and the effects from authors visibility on their h-index. *Journal of Informetrics* 6 3 427.
- Barabási, A.-L. (2003). *Linked: how everything is connected to everything else and what it means for business, science, and everyday life*. New York, Plume.
- Barabási, A. L. & Albert R. (1999). Emergence of scaling in random networks. *Science* 286 5439 509.
- Boguñá, M., Pastor-Satorras, R. & Vespignani, A. (2003). Absence of epidemic threshold in scale-free networks with degree correlations. *Physical Review Letters*, 90 2 028701
- Cohen, R., Havlin, S. & Avraham, D. (2003). Efficient immunization strategies for computer networks and populations. *Physical Review Letters*, 91 24 247901.
- Costa, L. da F., Oliveira Jr., O. N., Travieso, G., Rodrigues, F. A., Villas Boas, P. R., Antiqueira, L.; Viana, M. P. & Rocha, L. E. C. (2011). Analyzing and modeling real-world phenomena with complex networks: a survey of applications. *Advances in Physics*, 60 329.
- Costa, L. da F., Rodrigues, F. A., Travieso, G., & Villas Boas, P. R. (2007). Characterization of complex networks: a survey of measurements. *Advances in Physics*, 56, 167-242.
- Costa, L. da F. & Andrade, R. F. S. (2007). What are the best concentric descriptors for complex networks? *New Journal of Physics* 9 311.
- Costa, L. da F. & Silva, F. N. (2006). Hierarchical characterization of complex networks. *Journal of Statistical Physics* 125 845-876.
- Dasarathy, B. V. (1980). Nosing around the neighborhood: a new system structure and classification rule for recognition in partially exposed environments. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Machine Intell.* 2 1 67.
- Degenne, A., Forsé, M. (1999) *Introducing Social Networks*. Sage Publications Ltd, London.
- Duda R. O., Hart P. E. & Stork D. G. (2000). *Pattern Classification*, Wiley-Interscience.
- Erdos, P. & Rényi, A. (1959). On Random Graphs. *Publ. Math. Debrecen* 6 290.
- Keller, J. M., Gray, M. R. & Givens Jr., J. A. (1985). A fuzzy k-nearest neighbor algorithm. *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man and Cybernetics* 15 4.
- Kleczkowski, A. & Grenfell B. T. (1999). Mean-field-type equations for spread of epidemics: The small world model. *Physica A*, 274 (1-2) 355.
- Leicht, E. A., Clarkson, G., Shedd, K. & Newman, M. E. J. (2007). Large-scale structure of time evolving citation networks. *Eur. Phys. J. B* 59 75.
- Liljeros, F., Edling, C. R., Amaral, L. A. N., Stanley, H. E. & Aaberg, Y. (2001). The web of human sexual contacts. *Nature*, 411 (6840) 907.
- Malin, B. (2005). Unsupervised name disambiguation via social network similarity. *Workshop on link analysis, counterterrorism, and security* 1401 93
- Newman, M. E. J. (2006). Modularity and community structure in networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences USA* 103 23 8577.
- Newman, M. E. J. (2001) Scientific collaboration networks: network construction and fundamental results. *Phys. Rev. E* 64 016131.
- Price, D. S. (1976). A general theory of bibliometric and other cumulative advantage processes. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* 27 292
- Silva, T. C. & Amancio D. R. (2012). Word sense disambiguation via high order of learning in complex networks. *Europhysics Letters* 98 5 58001.
- Simon, H. A. (1957). *Models of man: Social and rational*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Smalheiser, N. & Torvik, V. (2009). Author name disambiguation. *Annual Review of Information Science and Technology* 43 287.
- Viana M. P., Amancio D. R. & Costa L. da F. (2013). On time-varying collaboration networks. *Journal of Informetrics* 7 2 371.
- Watts, D. J. *Six Degrees: The Science of a Connected Age*. (2003). W. W. Norton and Company, New York.
- Zhao, D & Strotmann, A. (2008) Comparing all-author and first-author co-citation analyses of information science. *Journal of Informetrics* 2 3 229.