



BADEN-WÜRTTEMBERG COOPERATIVE
STATE UNIVERSITY KARLSRUHE

T2_2000B

Text Classification with Separable Convolutional Neural Networks

Timo I. Denk

Author	Timo I. Denk (timo.denk@sap.com)
Student ID, course	1441403, TINF16B1
Course of studies	Applied Computer Science
Company	SAP SE Walldorf, Germany
Supervisor	Martin Krämer (martin.kraemer@sap.com)
Date of submission	17. September 2018

Restriction Notice

This report was written during an internship at

SAP SE
Dietmar-Hopp-Allee 16
69190 Walldorf
Germany.

It may be used for examination purposes as a performance record of the department of Applied Computer Science at the Baden-Württemberg Cooperative State University Karlsruhe. **Remarks on SAP products, in particular MLF, are not legally binding. The report does not communicate any official information from SAP.**

Author's Declaration

Unless otherwise indicated in the text or references, or acknowledged above, this thesis is entirely the product of my own scholarly work. This thesis has not been submitted either in whole or part, for a degree at this or any other university or institution.

Walldorf (Germany), 14. September 2018

Timo Denk

Abstract

We present a parameterizable neural network meta-architecture for text classification tasks. It is based on one-dimensional separable convolutional layers, followed by a classification head consisting of stacked fully connected layers. The classifier operates on word level, with words represented by word embeddings, which we fine-tune during the training process.

Experimental evaluation on several large-scale datasets demonstrates the architecture's applicability to a range of different tasks, despite its comparably low number of network parameters.

The implemented classifier extends the SAP Machine Learning Foundation (MLF) product. It is fully integrated into the platform, i.e. it can be used for training and inference through the API of existing MLF services.

Keywords: Machine Learning Foundation, text classification, separable convolution, word embeddings

Contents

Restriction Notice	i
Author’s Declaration	i
Abstract	ii
Contents	iii
Figures	iv
Tables	iv
Listings	iv
1 Introduction	1
2 Related Work	4
2.1 Separable Convolutional Layers	6
3 Method	7
3.1 Embedding Retraining	8
3.2 Network Architecture	11
3.3 Parameterization	13
4 Experimental Evaluation	15
4.1 Network Architecture Decisions	15
4.2 Datasets	16
4.3 Results	18
5 Productization	19
5.1 Integration	19
5.2 Implementation Details	21
6 Future Work	24
7 Conclusion	26
References	30

Figures

1	Characteristic learning curve with dynamic embedding unfreezing	10
2	Illustration of the text classifier meta-architecture	12
3	MLF architecture diagram	20

Tables

1	Comparison of the suggested parameterizations	14
2	Influence of the removal or change of certain meta-architecture properties	16
3	Datasets used for the experimental evaluation	16
4	Testing error on all datasets	18

Listings

1	Storage of embeddings as a TensorFlow variable	24
---	--	----

1 Introduction

Natural language processing (NLP) is an advancing area of computer science. Text classification is an NLP problem that deals with the content-based assignment of labels to given text samples. In single-label classification problems one text must only belong to exactly one label. In multi-label cases there may be more than one label assigned to a text by a classifier.

The task of text classification can be very difficult because it may require the classification algorithm to be capable of understanding the meaning of natural language. In a sentiment classification task, where the goal is to distinguish between text with positive or negative mood, simple approaches can already reach their limits. Given for instance the movie review “The movie was really nice and I liked it.”, traditional approaches which rely on counting the number of positive words will successfully detect “nice” and “liked” and, thus, classify the sample correctly. More entangled examples, however, for example the review “Even though I did like the actors and the chips we had, the movie was not getting anywhere.” does not contain a single negative word but should be classified as negative. This circumstance motivates the development and application of more sophisticated models that can understand natural language and assign labels with higher accuracy.

There are different ways of feeding text into a neural network classifier: The text can be considered a sequence of characters or a sequence of words. Classifiers operating on character-level have to develop a more complex model because they have to learn the concept of words first. However, they are agnostic to the underlying language and processing spelling errors and unknown words is more straightforward. The pre-processing for word-level classifiers commonly searches for each word in a lookup table in order to convert it from textual format into a different representation, e.g. an integral number or a vector.

Non deep-learning-based approaches to text classification consists of a feature extraction algorithm and a classifier. The former is for example a bag of words or n -gram feature extractor, which converts a document into a vector with its entries representing the number of occurrences of individual words or n -grams. While n -grams capture at least some semantic relationships, the bag of words representation does not take word order into consideration at all. The tf-idf statistic can be applied to the vectors to decrease the influence of words that are common across the dataset and are therefore expected to be less relevant for the classification. After extracting feature vectors from documents, a clas-

sifier can be trained to assign labels to them. [Allahyari et al. \(2017\)](#) list a few common classifiers, namely naive Bayes, nearest neighbor, decision tree, and support vector machine (SVM). The advantage of these comparably simple, non word-order-based methods is their firm performance on smaller datasets and tasks which do not require sentence-spanning semantic understanding. In our experiments (section 4.3) we compare classification on n -grams (with and without tf-idf) to our deep learning model.

An early application of deep neural networks to text feature extraction was carried out by [Glorot et al. \(2011\)](#). They train stacked denoising auto-encoders (DAEs; [Vincent et al. \(2010\)](#)) on Amazon reviews — in an unsupervised way — and use the encoded representation as a feature vector. The published experiments show that the neural network does not only outperform the 2011 state-of-the-art but can also profit from being trained on a different category of reviews before being trained on the actual category.

Convolutional neural networks (CNNs) were originally inspired by the visual cortex of humans, see [Lecun et al. \(1998\)](#), and had their most notable breakthrough with the success of AlexNet ([Krizhevsky et al. \(2012\)](#)) in the domain of image classification. The convolutional layers are sliding a kernel over two dimensions of the input while looking at all channels simultaneously. This concept allows for two-dimensional translation invariant feature extraction and has proven to be both effective and efficient. When transferred to the text domain, the kernel slides along a single dimension which corresponds to the sequence of words (or characters). Similar to images, spatially invariant feature extraction is reasonable and intuitively understandable, since e.g. the meaning of the word sequence “not very much” should be equally encoded at any position in the sentence. Filters on the first level learn encodings for such n -grams, while filters in deeper layers learn to find representations for co-occurring n -grams. With increasing depth, the receptive field grows, which allows for the detection of more complex semantics.

While CNNs are being actively applied to text classification tasks, see e.g. [Kim \(2014\)](#); [Kalchbrenner et al. \(2014\)](#), recurrent neural networks (RNN) have been used as well. Intuitively, they might seem better suited for sequence processing as the operation mode sequence-to-vector allows them to *read* an input sequentially and output an encoded version. [Johnson and Zhang \(2016\)](#) use Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM; [Hochreiter and Schmidhuber \(1997\)](#)) to compute such region embeddings. [Lee and Deroncourt \(2016\)](#) approach the problem differently and use an LSTM network to convert a variable-length sequence into

another variable-length sequence (sequence-to-sequence), to which they apply pooling to reduce the dimensionality and retrieve a fixed-size representation. [Yin et al. \(2017\)](#) provide an overview of the, as they call it, “battle between CNNs and RNNs” in the field of NLP.

[Lai et al. \(2015\)](#) combine LSTM and CNN into a recurrent convolutional neural network (RCNN). [Wen et al. \(2016\)](#) extend this idea by placing a highway layer between RNN and CNN. This layer allows parts of the information from the preceding Gated Recurrent Unit (GRU; [Chung et al. \(2014\)](#)) to pass unchanged with the rest passing through a non-linear transformation. The new network architecture is called Recurrent Convolutional Neural Network with Highway Network (RCNN-HW) and achieves slightly better results on the IMDB dataset than the plain RCNN.

The work presented in this document was conducted as part of the Applied Computer Science university studies at Cooperative State University Karlsruhe, during an internship at SAP SE in Walldorf, Germany. The department is called Machine Learning Foundation (MLF); it develops and maintains a platform for training, storage, deployment, and inference of machine learning models. It is meant to be the central platform for all machine learning applications used by SAP products.

The goal of this internship was the development of a CNN-based text classification meta-architecture¹ that operates on word-level and works well for different large-scale classification tasks. It shall be used as a generic, trainable text-classification service on MLF’s platform. The idea of the meta-architecture is to make the expressive power of the model parameterizable such that it can be adjusted depending on the particular use-case. Applications may differ in complexity, the number of classes, or the length of the input. The latter is particularly challenging as convolutional layers themselves cannot convert a variable-sized input to a fixed size representation. It is common to solve this issue by placing global pooling layers behind the last convolutional layer.

The main contributions of this work can be summarized as follows:

- **Design** of a CNN meta-architecture, operating on word embeddings, that is suitable for a variety of large scale text classification tasks while having relatively few parameters and high robustness.

¹We refer to a parameterizable network architecture as *meta-architecture* because its properties, e.g. layer count, filter size, can be adjusted. The meta-architecture in combination with a complete set of hyperparameters is a plain architecture.

- **Evaluation** of the developed meta-architecture on different datasets and comparison with other classification algorithms.
- **Productization** of the trainable classifier, i.e. implementation and integration into the MLF platform. Integration tests and correctness validation for the sake of quality assurance.

The remainder of this document is structured as follows: In section 2 we give an overview of the work that is related to CNN-based text classification and methods of representing the input. Special focus lies on the separable convolution because it is an essential building block of our model. The meta-architecture itself is described in section 3. The experimental evaluation (section 4) contains empirical justifications of network architecture decisions and results on benchmark datasets. The productization and integration into MLF’s ecosystem is described in section 5. Followed by suggestions for future work (section 6) and a conclusion (section 7).

The mathematical notation used throughout this document follows the one defined in the chapter *Notation* of the Deep Learning book by Goodfellow et al. (2016).

2 Related Work

Kim (2014) reports results of a CNN-based language model for sentence classification, operating on word-level with pre-trained word embeddings. He shows that CNNs are capable of solving text classification tasks by pushing the state-of-the-art on four datasets. In contrast, Zhang et al. (2015) are working on character-level, training a CNN from scratch, without any prior knowledge. They evaluate the character-level CNN on several large-scale datasets and compare its results to the traditional methods bag-of-words (with and without tf-idf), bag-of- n -grams (with and without tf-idf), and bag-of-means on word2vec word embeddings. According to the results, character-level CNNs perform better on the large datasets, namely *Yelp Review Full*, *Yahoo! Answers*, and *Amazon Review Full* and *Polarity*. All of them have more than 600,000 training samples. For the four smaller datasets i.e. from 120,000 to 560,000 training samples, the n -gram approaches with and without tf-idf prevail, having the lowest error rates.

There are a variety of ways, words can be represented in order to feed them

into a neural network. The one-hot encoding, employed by [Johnson and Zhang \(2014\)](#), is a representation that leaves the network solely with information about the word order. Less sparse is the approach of assigning a randomly initialized n -dimensional vector to every word. Word embeddings, such as word2vec by [Mikolov et al. \(2013\)](#) or GloVe by [Pennington et al. \(2014\)](#), carry rich semantic information about the words. Two words which commonly occur in similar contexts are represented by vectors that have a low cosine distance. The semantic representations are so powerful that they have been shown to contain enough information for unsupervised word translation; see [Conneau et al. \(2017a\)](#).

Multiple different representations can be combined, as done by [Turian et al. \(2010\)](#); [Zhang et al. \(2016\)](#). The latter train independent sets of filters on up to three different embeddings and concatenate the results at a later stage, prior to a classification layer. In the domain of named entity recognition, [Chiu and Nichols \(2015\)](#) combine word- and character-level information prior to feeding the concatenated vectors into a LSTM network.

It is possible to learn embedding vectors from scratch, i.e. initializing them randomly and updating the representations during training (*rand*). Similarly, pre-trained embeddings (such as word2vec or GloVe) can be fine-tuned during training (*non-static*). As a third option, pre-trained embeddings can be kept *static*, without any adjustment during training. [Kim \(2014\)](#) compares these methods with each other, finding that *rand* is always performing worst, while *static* and *non-static* vary across datasets. In our final setup, we employ the *static* method for the first epochs and switch to *non-static* later on.

The usage of pre-trained word embeddings is a form of transfer learning. It results in faster training and lowers the requirements of the dataset in terms of the number of training samples. [Howard and Ruder \(2018\)](#) see faster convergence on a task after training a language model on Wikipedia beforehand.

Separable CNNs have come up in the image domain, with the Xception network, where [Chollet \(2016\)](#) reinterprets the Inception modules by constructing them with separable convolutions. [Kaiser et al. \(2017\)](#) apply the separable convolution to one-dimensional data in the domain of neural machine translation. Because the separable convolutional layer is less well-known, we explain its functioning in the following section.

2.1 Separable Convolutional Layers

A separable convolutional layer consists of two convolutional layers stacked behind each other. The first of those two is operating on the spatial dimension and acts on the channels separately. The second layer is a pointwise convolution, i.e. the kernels act only on the channel dimension.

In the image domain, the separable two-dimensional convolution can be interpreted as looking at a region of the image on every channel separately and subsequently looking at all channels of a single pixel. When working with text data the one-dimensional convolution is used. The following mathematical definitions are valid for one-dimensional convolutions. c_{in} and c_{out} denote the number of input and output channels, respectively. n denotes the size of the input (e.g. the number of words or characters) and w the kernel width. Let $\mathbf{X} \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times c_{\text{in}}}$ be the layer input.

Mathematically, the **convolution layer** is a function $f^{(c)} : \mathbb{R}^{n \times c_{\text{in}}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times c_{\text{out}}}$, parameterized by a kernel tensor $\mathbf{K}^{(c)} \in \mathbb{R}^{c_{\text{out}} \times w \times c_{\text{in}}}$, and the entries in its output matrix at spatial position s and channel c are defined by

$$f^{(c)}(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{K}^{(c)})_{s,c} = (\mathbf{X} * \mathbf{K}^{(c)})_{s,c} = \sum_{i=1}^{i \leq w} \mathbf{K}_{c,i,:}^{(c)} \cdot \mathbf{X}_{s+i,:}, \quad (1)$$

where the sum iterates over the input channels and the dot product is summing over the spatial dimension.

The **depthwise convolution** $f^{(d)} : \mathbb{R}^{n \times c_{\text{in}}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times c_{\text{in}}}$ is parameterized by a kernel matrix $\mathbf{K}^{(d)} \in \mathbb{R}^{w \times c_{\text{in}}}$ and defined as

$$f^{(d)}(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{K}^{(d)})_{s,c} = \sum_{i=1}^{i \leq w} K_{i,c}^{(d)} X_{s+i,c}. \quad (2)$$

For each of the input channels, there is a kernel vector $\mathbf{K}_{:,c}^{(d)}$ which maps a window of size w to a scalar. Note that the dimensionality of input and output are identical.

The **pointwise convolution** $f^{(p)} : \mathbb{R}^{n \times c_{\text{in}}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times c_{\text{out}}}$ is parameterized by a matrix $\mathbf{K}^{(p)} \in \mathbb{R}^{c_{\text{in}} \times c_{\text{out}}}$ and defined as

$$f^{(p)}(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{K}^{(p)})_s = \mathbf{K}^{(p)} \mathbf{X}_{s,:}. \quad (3)$$

The **separable convolutional layer** $f^{(s)} : \mathbb{R}^{n \times c_{\text{in}}} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{n \times c_{\text{out}}}$ is a composition of depthwise and pointwise convolution,

$$f^{(s)}(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{K}^{(d)}, \mathbf{K}^{(p)}) = f^{(p)} \circ f^{(d)} = f^{(p)}\left(f^{(d)}(\mathbf{X}; \mathbf{K}^{(d)}); \mathbf{K}^{(p)}\right), \quad (4)$$

and therefore parameterized by the two kernel matrices $\mathbf{K}^{(d)}$ and $\mathbf{K}^{(p)}$ of depthwise and pointwise convolution.

The number of parameters of a convolutional layer is given by $w c_{\text{in}} c_{\text{out}}$; on the other hand, a separable convolutional layer has $(w + c_{\text{out}}) c_{\text{in}}$ parameters. The latter is lower, which is the primary advantage of a separable convolution over a normal one. [Chollet \(2016\)](#) shows that with the same number of parameters, a network composed of separable convolutional layers can have a greater expressive power than one with traditional convolutional layers.

TensorFlow’s layers API comes with an implementation of the separable convolutional layer simplifying its usage.

3 Method

Let $\mathbb{T} = \mathbb{N}^+$ denote the set of all variable-length texts (samples), represented as a sequence of word tokens; $+$ is the Kleene plus. Let \mathbb{L} be the set of labels that can be assigned to a sample. We search for a function $f : \mathbb{T} \rightarrow [0, 1]^{|\mathbb{L}|}$, which maps a sample $\mathbf{t} \in \mathbb{T}$ to a probability distribution over all possible labels. We model this function with a neural network, parameterized by a parameter vector θ . The network loss (without regularization terms) $J(f(\mathbf{t}), l_{\text{target}})$ consists of the cross entropy between the network output and a one-hot encoding of the target label l_{target} .

This section describes our method of embedding retraining (section 3.1) and the parameterizable meta-architecture (section 3.2) of the neural network that we use to approximate f . Furthermore, in section 3.3, we make three hyperparameter suggestions for possible parameterizations of the meta-architecture, with low, medium, and high network parameter count.

During the process of development, we have experimented with different kinds of CNN-based network architectures. The separable convolutional neural network, presented in section 3.2, has had the highest accuracy among the candidates, while having the lowest number of trainable parameters. Nevertheless, we want to briefly summarize what the two alternative architectures looked like:

- A simple convolutional neural network with four stacked convolutional layers, followed by three fully connected layers serves as the baseline model. It uses ReLU activation functions and we have experimented with weight decay and dropout.
- Inspired by the Inception network by Szegedy et al. (2014), we have designed a text classifier with *inception-ish* building blocks. Each block contains one-dimensional convolutions in three parallel branches: (1) a single pointwise convolution with 256 filters followed by max pooling with pool size 3 and stride 1, (2) a pointwise convolution with 64 filters followed by a convolution with 64 filters and kernel size 3, and (3) a pointwise convolution with 32 filters followed by a convolution with 32 filters and kernel size 5. The three branches are then concatenated and ReLU activation and batch normalization are applied. The network consists of a single convolutional layer, followed by four inception blocks, global max pooling, and three dense layers.

3.1 Embedding Retraining

We define an embedding function $e : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, which converts a token i into a vector by looking it up in a dictionary $\mathbf{D} \in \mathbb{R}^{w \times d}$:

$$e(i; \mathbf{D}) = \begin{cases} \mathbf{D}_{i,:} & \text{if } i \leq w, \\ \mathbf{D}_{1,:} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

Here, w is the number of words that the dictionary contains and d is the dimensionality of the embedding vectors. If a token is not contained in the dictionary, a placeholder is being used instead.

Let v denote an embedding layer. It is used to map the network input, namely a vector of tokens, denoted as \mathbf{t} , to a matrix, containing the individual vector representations of the tokens. e is applied element-wise to every entry in \mathbf{t} :

$$v(\mathbf{t}; \mathbf{D})_{i,:} = e(t_i; \mathbf{D}). \quad (6)$$

Throughout the development, we have use word2vec embeddings by Mikolov et al. (2013), referred to as \mathbf{D}_{w2v} , where $d = 300$. We retrain them, i.e. altering the given embedding matrix, while training θ . Kim (2014) compares the

the results of text classification with pretrained embeddings versus static embeddings. Intuitively it makes sense to retrain embeddings, since the vectors were computed on a very generic text corpus and can be fine tuned to match the dataset domain specific specialties. Our results in section 4.1 support this claim.

In mathematical terms, the retraining can be seen as a modification of the dictionary used in e , which we interpret as a sum of two dictionaries

$$\mathbf{D} = \mathbf{D}_{\text{pre}} + \mathbf{D}_{\Delta}, \quad (7)$$

with \mathbf{D}_{Δ} being initialized with zeros and having the same shape as the dictionary with pretrained vectors \mathbf{D}_{pre} .

While training the network weights θ on a task, we keep the embedding dictionary static at first. After a number of steps we *unfreeze* the dictionary and train the embedding matrix \mathbf{D}_{Δ} along-side with the network weights θ . The choice of the unfreezing time is dynamic and depends on the model’s current accuracy on the validation data. As soon as it does not improve over an entire epoch, we unfreeze the embeddings and update them according to the gradient $\nabla_{\mathbf{D}_{\Delta}} J(f(\mathbf{t}), l_{\text{target}})$. Figure 1 shows the validation error of three training runs with dynamic embedding dictionary unfreezing.

We add an L2-regularization term to the loss function J which penalizes strong divergence of the embedding matrix \mathbf{D} from the original pretrained matrix \mathbf{D}_{pre} . Since the dictionary update gradient may have greater magnitudes for vectors which come up more frequently, we adjust the penalty depending on the occurrence frequency of tokens. We thus define the regularization term as

$$\alpha \|v(\mathbf{t}; \mathbf{D}_{\Delta})\|_{\text{F}}, \quad (8)$$

where α is a hyperparameter controlling the strength of the divergence penalty. In contrast to Equation 8, adding $\alpha \|\mathbf{D}_{\Delta}\|_{\text{F}}$ to the loss would penalize all vectors, learned through retraining, with equal strength.

The number of trainable parameters increases by wd when unfreezing \mathbf{D}_{Δ} . Compared to the parameters in θ , this can be quite significant as wd may easily exceed nine million ($30,000 \times 300$). The computational overhead is being reduced by the fact that the gradients must be backpropagated through the network regardless of whether \mathbf{D}_{Δ} is unfrozen or not. In terms of memory requirements, however, the embedding retraining is rather expensive.




Figure 1: The characteristic learning curve, here training the three configurations min, medium, and deep sepcnn (full description in section 3.3) on Amazon Review Full (five classes, description in section 4.2). The dashed, vertical lines indicate the (dynamically chosen) point of \mathbf{D}_Δ unfreezing. The solid, horizontal lines mark the lowest validation error of the individual architectures.

3.2 Network Architecture

We model the classifier f with a deep convolutional neural network. This section describes the meta-architecture of the classifier: It is parameterizable in several aspects and the actual architecture may therefore be adjusted depending on the use-case. Figure 2 is a visual representation of the following, verbal architecture description.

The input to f is a token vector, representing a sentence. For the sake of batching, samples might be collected in batches of fixed size, and padded or cropped if needed. The first layer is the function v , i.e. the embedding lookup layer, described in 3.1. It outputs an $n \times d$ dimensional matrix. In the following, n is referred to as the *spatial* dimension and d is called the *depth*.

The embedding layer is followed by an adjustable number of separable convolutional blocks, inspired by Simakov et al. (2018). Each block has the following internal structure:

1. Dropout with probability p ; Srivastava et al. (2014)
2. Separable convolutional layer $f^{(s)}$ with $c_{\text{out}} = n_{\text{filter}}$ and a fixed kernel size $w = 5$; described in section 2.1
3. PReLU activation function; He et al. (2015)
4. Separable convolutional layer with $c_{\text{out}} = n_{\text{filter}}$ and a fixed kernel size $w = 3$
5. PReLU activation function
6. Batch normalization; Ioffe and Szegedy (2015)
7. One-dimensional max pooling over the spatial dimension, with pool size 3 and stride 3. The pooling reduces the spatial size by a factor of 3.

After the separable convolutional blocks, we add two more separable convolutional layers, with filter size $c_{\text{out}} = 2n_{\text{filter}}$ and kernel size 3. Each of the layers is followed by a PReLU activation and batch normalization. The idea of doubling the filter size is inspired by the architecture of deep convolutional neural networks for image classification which are often continuously decreasing the spatial size of the representations while increasing the depth.

The current spatial size of the internal representation varies depending on the length of the network input sequence. The network *head*, however, requires a




Figure 2: Illustration of the text classifier meta-architecture; inputs are at the bottom, outputs at the top. Each block corresponds to a building block. The blocks with double-border contain a parameterizable number of layers.

fixed size feature vector as its input, which it classifies. Therefore, we employ global average pooling

$$\mathbf{y}_c = \text{avg}(\mathbf{X}_{:,c}) \quad (9)$$

to reduce the matrix along the spatial dimension. This technique was first described by [Lin et al. \(2013\)](#). The resulting vector \mathbf{y} has $2n_{\text{filter}}$ entries. We apply dropout to it.

Subsequently, we add an adjustable number of fully connected layers to the network architecture. Each has the following structure:

1. Dense layer with an adjustable number of units and bias
2. PReLU activation
3. Dropout with probability p

A last fully connected layer maps the previous representation to a vector with $|\mathbb{L}|$ dimensions. Applying softmax to it yields the probability distribution over all labels. The label with the highest probability is l_{pred} .

During training, the target label is encoded as a one-hot probability distribution and the network loss J is the cross entropy between that distribution and the softmax output. Additionally, the loss has a regularization term penalizing the embedding retraining, as specified in section 3.1.

We update the network parameters θ and \mathbf{D}_Δ with gradient descent and the step size is chosen by the Adam algorithm by [Kingma and Ba \(2014\)](#).

3.3 Parameterization

The meta-architecture has the following hyperparameters:

- Dropout probability p , used for all dropout layers
- Embedding dictionary \mathbf{D}_{pre} , i.e. which pretrained embeddings to use. This degree of freedom makes the model applicable to any language for which word embedding vectors are available.
- Length of the input sequence n
- Number of separable convolutional blocks and number of filters n_{filter} in each of them

Parameter	Min	Medium	Deep
Layer count	5	8	11
Separable conv. blocks	1	2	3
Filter count n_{filter}	32	64	128
Dense layer units	$ \mathbb{L} $	32, $ \mathbb{L} $	128, 32, $ \mathbb{L} $
Model parameters θ	19,681	64,961	265,409

Table 1: Comparison of the suggested parameterizations. The number of parameters varies slightly depending on $|\mathbb{L}|$, here set to 5.

- Number of fully connected layers and number of units n_{units} in each of them

Increasing the number of separable convolutional blocks, n_{filter} , or n_{units} , increases the capacity and thereby expressive power of the architecture. For large datasets with complex semantics, the number should be higher.

We suggest three possible parameterizations which we also use for the validation in our experiments (section 4). All of them are being trained with a dropout rate of $p = 0.3$ and operate on a $\mathbf{D}_{w_{2v}}$ embedding dictionary. We have set the length of the input sequence to match the average number of words per sample, i.e. $n = \bar{n}_{\text{dataset}}$. Table 3.3 compares the three architectures.

Min sepcnn. The minimalist version of the meta-architecture has one separable convolutional block with 32 filters and no fully connected layers except for the output layer, giving a total of five layers. The parameter count of the network weights θ is 19,681, thus there are 9,019,681 trainable parameters when taking \mathbf{D}_{Δ} into account as well. It can be trained very quickly and is useful for simple tasks and smaller datasets.

Medium sepcnn. The medium-sized version of the meta-architecture has eight layers. It is composed of two separable convolutional blocks and an additional dense layer with 32 units. The number of weights is 64,961, resulting in 9,064,961 trainable parameters in total.

Deep sepcnn. The deep version of the meta-architecture has 11 layers. It is made up of three separable convolutional blocks with 128 filters each and two fully connected layers with unit count 32 and 16 respectively. The number of network weights is with 236,945 by more than a factor of three greater than the medium sepcnn, resulting in 9,236,945 trainable parameters in total. The deep sepcnn, with its comparably large number of layers, is supposed to be able to learn complex language models resulting in higher classification accuracies.

4 Experimental Evaluation

The datasets we are using consist of training and validation set. All reported classification errors are computed over the entire validation set. Lower values are better.

Unless indicated otherwise, we train with the following configuration:

- Adam optimizer, [Kingma and Ba \(2014\)](#), for embedding retraining and network parameter training, with learning rate 8×10^{-4} , $\beta_1 = 0.9$, and $\beta_2 = 0.999$
- Pretrained word2vec embeddings \mathbf{D}_{w2v} , with a dictionary size of $w = 30,000$ and dimensionality $d = 300$; pretrained on Wikipedia
- Embedding retrain penalty $\alpha = 5 \times 10^{-3}$ (see Equation 8)
- Input sequence length n set to the average number of words of the particular dataset \bar{n} ; zero padding for shorter sequences, cropping for longer ones
- No data augmentation, i.e. no synonym lookup tables
- Dropout rate $p = 0.3$ for all dropout layers
- Early stopping after eight unimproved epochs, measured by the classification accuracy on the validation set
- Batch size 512
- Training on a single Tesla K-80 GPU
- Shuffling of the entire dataset before training start; continuous shuffling in a buffer holding 10,000 samples

4.1 Network Architecture Decisions

In this section we analyze several design decision that have been made, when defining the meta-architecture proposed in section 3.2. We run experiments with and without (or with a replacement) of the particular subject of analysis and report the difference in classification error on the dataset Amazon Review Full.

Configuration (instead of)	Change	Error
PReLU (ReLU)	+0.21	40.82
$w = 30,000$ ($w = 1,000,000$)	-0.83	39.78
Dropout $p = 0.3$ ($p = 0$)	+0.34	40.95

Table 2: Validation error on the AmazF dataset with particular changes to the configuration of the deep sepcnn. Replacing all PReLU activations with ReLU has increased the classification error by 0.21 (absolute error 40.82%). Large embedding dictionaries have shown to increase the accuracy; dropout has as positive effect.

Dataset	$ \mathbb{L} $	Train	Valid	\bar{n}
AG	4	120,000	7,600	38
DBP	14	560,000	70,000	49
AmzF	5	3,000,000	650,000	80
AmzP	2	3,600,000	400,000	78

Table 3: Datasets used for the experimental evaluation. $|\mathbb{L}|$ denotes the number of labels. The columns *Train* and *Valid* list the number of training and validation samples of the particular dataset, respectively. \bar{n} is approximately the average number of words that a sample contains.

PReLU activation. We have decided to use PReLU activations after every separable convolutional layer and after every fully connected layer (except for the output). The employment of ReLU activation functions has resulted in a 0.21% higher classification error.

Embedding count. We have noticed that the classification error decreases by 0.83% when using 1,000,000 embeddings rather than 20,000.

Dropout. The removal of all dropout layers increases the classification error by 0.34%.

Label smoothing. We found label smoothing, as suggested by [Pereyra et al. \(2017\)](#), not to improve results.

4.2 Datasets

We ran our evaluation on several datasets which we enumerate in this section. All datasets were also used by [Zhang et al. \(2015\)](#). Table 4.2 lists the properties of all datasets.

AG’s News [AG]. The dataset contains English news articles and assigns one out of four categories to them. The categories are *World*, *Sports*, *Business*, and

Sci/Tech. There are 120,000 training and 7,600 validation samples.

Example with the label *Business*: “Hooker Furniture Puts Investors First. Closing a factory is never popular, but it’s the right thing to do.”

DBPedia [DBP]. The dataset contains samples consisting of title and abstract of English Wikipedia articles. The 14 labels are *Company*, *EducationalInstitution*, *Artist*, *Athlete*, *OfficeHolder*, *MeanOfTransportation*, *Building*, *NaturalPlace*, *Village*, *Animal*, *Plant*, *Album*, *Film*, and *WrittenWork*. There are 560,000 training samples and 70,000 validation samples.

Example for a *Company*: “Export-Import Bank of Romania. Exim Bank is The Export-Import Bank of Romania based in Bucharest.”

Amazon Review. The dataset contains English product reviews from Amazon. Analogous to Yelp, there are two datasets: **Full** [AmzF] with five labels, i.e. the number of stars, for 3,000,000 training and 650,000 validation samples.

Polarity [AmzP] is the biggest dataset with the labels positive/negative and 3,600,000 training and 400,000 validation samples. The following reviews are cherry-picked from the full dataset. We show them here in order to illustrate the degree of difficulty to the reader:

- “Useful, but... This universal remote works fairly well with all the devices I’ve tried it on, except devices that are newer than the remote itself. However, it is missing one key feature that would have stopped me from ever buying it if I had known ahead of time: You cannot reassign a device function to control a different type of device. This missing feature becomes a flaw when you find out that if you want to control a component CD player, you have to use the DVD device button and you can no longer control a DVD player with it.” (2 stars; starts with the positive words “useful” and “works fairly well”)
- “Was painful to watch My husband and me decided to watch something light and how we thought funny that night, but unfortunately this movie was extremely dull and predictable... Very untalented work.” (1 star)
- “Surprisingly good I thought this was going to be an in your face romance but there are some really good plot lines in here. I loved the daring, darling, disastrous prone daughters-they really kept the story moving.” (4 stars; could easily be considered a 5 star rating)
- “korn rules! If your’e tired of listening to Britany Spears and N*sync on the radio over & over again then i would highly recoment this album with

Model	AG	DBP	AmzF	AmzP
Bag-of-means	16.91	9.55	55.87	18.39
n -grams	7.96	1.37	45.73	7.98
n -grams tf-idf	7.64	1.31	47.56	8.46
Small char CNN	11.59	1.89	40.53	5.50
Large char CNN	9.85	1.66	40.89	5.51
Min sepcnn	11.24	*1.52	43.04	*6.75
Medium sepcnn	10.65	*1.32	41.89	*6.05
Deep sepcnn	9.98	* 1.26	* 39.78	* 5.44

Table 4: Testing error on all datasets. The first five rows are taken from [Zhang et al. \(2015\)](#). The bottom three rows are our results. Numbers marked with an asterisk (*) have been trained with a parameterizations diverging from the aforementioned default: DBP and AmzP runs were performed with $w = 100,000$; AmzF, deep sepcnn was trained with $w = 1,000,000$.

korn’s angry lyrics and guitar riffs this album will spare you from all of those lame ass teen heart throb bands!” (4 stars; contains typos, starts off with negative words “tired of listening to”)

The datasets come with a split into training and validation set. We use the validation set for the reporting of the final accuracy and for hyperparameter tuning.

4.3 Results

We report results on the datasets listed in section 4.2 in Table 4. We use two different parameterizations of the meta-architecture presented in section 3.3.

Our deep architecture constantly performs better than medium, which in turn performs better than min. This can be attributed to the varying model capacities. Depending on the training time limitations, the deep architecture should therefore be preferred over the smaller networks.

On the smaller AG’s News dataset, the n -gram approach leads with 7.64% classification error. The best deep learning method are character-level CNNs with 9.85%. Most likely, this is due to the low number of samples that the dataset contains and its semantic simplicity.

On the larger datasets, i.e. DBPedia and both Amazon review sets, our deep method outperforms the character-level CNN as well as the traditional methods. The difference is quite significant when training with $w = 1,000,000$, as done

for the training run of the deep sepcnn on AmzF. It performs by more than 1% better than the second best method in our table.

5 Productization

As part of this work, the existing MLF functionality was extended by a trainable text classification service which will coexist alongside with the existing linear classifier working on tf-idf features. This section describes how the new service integrates with the MLF architecture (section 5.1). The second part (section 5.2) discusses the details of the modifications which were made to the existing services and how the new classification service has been implemented.

5.1 Integration

Figure 3 depicts² the components relevant for using the text classification training service. Using entails both training and inference.

When training the separable CNN text classifier, a persona *model creator* (1) uploads a dataset to the file storage. The dataset must match certain formatting specifications. As of now, supported formats are CSV-files and ZIP-files with an internal folder structure that represents the label assignments.

After completing the upload, the model creator sends an (2) API request to the customizable training service, with the request body containing information about the training job, e.g. which dataset to choose or what the name of the model is going to be. It also includes values for the hyperparameters listed in section 3.3, e.g. number of separable convolutional blocks and dense layer unit count. The service (3) forwards the request to the job submission API which spawns a new training job.

A training job is a Docker container which, in this case, (4) trains a neural network. The container runs inside a Kubernetes pod which is being created dynamically by the job submission API. It is equipped with a GPU to accelerate the process of training. The Elastic File Storage (EFS) folder containing the datasets is mounted into container using the Network File System (NFS) protocol. That way the training job can access the dataset which has been uploaded in step (1). During the training, which may take several hours, the training job

²The diagram is following the Technical Architecture Modelling (TAM) specification.




Figure 3: TAM diagram of the parts of the MLF system related to the developed classifier. Components with a blue background have been altered or created by us. The letter *R* marks API requests, with the arrow indicating the direction of the call. We distinguish between *core services* which are statically deployed, and *runtime artifacts* which spawn dynamically and are specific to the particular model. The *customizable training service* acts as a layer of abstraction that wraps the core services.

writes logs to the file storage. When the early stopping criteria are met, the job (5) uploads the trained model parameters θ and D_{Δ} as well as its architecture graph to the model service. Upon completion, the pod will be deleted and the allocated resources will be freed.

The model creator can constantly monitor the status of the training either through the customizable training service API or the log file, which they can examine through the Minio service using any Amazon S3 compatible client or command line interface (CLI). If they want to serve the model they (6) send a request to the deployment API which (7) fetches the model and (8) places it in a new serving container. The serving container does not have a GPU since inference can be performed sufficiently fast on a CPU.

A different persona, the model consumer may then (9) send API requests to the text classifier API. Such requests contain text samples which they want to classify with the trained neural network. The text classifier service (10) performs some pre-processing and (11) queries the deployed serving container. It responds with a probability distribution over all possible labels which the text classifier returns to the model consumer.

It shall be noted that there are a variety of other aspects to the platform which have been left out for the sake of clarity. These are most notably authentication and authorization, multitenancy, and logging.

5.2 Implementation Details

The development contributions of this work target three components, which are highlighted in blue in Figure 3.

The **customizable training service** has been extended to support API requests aiming to start a training job which trains the new architecture. That includes the Swagger API specification as well as some minor code modifications. The department follows the development principle *API-first*, i.e. the API is specified first, application development follows. Swagger specifications are being used for automated interface testing, request validation, and comfortable testing with the Swagger user interface.

The **text classifier service** serves as a proxy that pre-processes inference requests and sends them to the model server container. Its functionality has been extended by pre-processing that contains dictionary look-ups, and cropping or padding of word sequences. The new code converts the text contained in a re-

quest into a batch of token sequences. The conversion is based on dictionary tables, which map words of a language to integers. Padding and cropping is necessary because every architecture is being trained on a fixed sequence length n , and sentences passed for inference may be longer or shorter.

The pre-processing is part of a separate service because it cannot be baked into a TensorFlow Serving (TFS) model graph without any major extra work, namely the development of custom TensorFlow operations (*custom ops*). In particular the lack of string manipulation functions was pivotal for the design decision to perform sentence pre-processing separately.

New integration tests validate the functionality of a job submission. However, as of now, they do not check any semantics, such as whether or not the classification is actually working.

A **sepcnn training job**, created by the job submission service, trains a separable CNN architecture. It is a Docker container whose Docker image is the primary contribution of this work, in terms of development.

On start-up, the container initializes the logger such that it redirects all logs to a file on the EFS. The environment variables contain the parameters which were specified by the model creator as well as additional information injected by the job submission service.

Upon initialization, the container loads a dictionary containing pre-trained word embeddings into the RAM. The dictionary is chosen based on the corresponding environment variable. It is stored inside of the container.

The datasets are mounted into the container and loaded in the next step. The container detects which type of dataset is present (either CSV or ZIP) and proceeds accordingly. If a ZIP file can be found, it is converted into the CSV format. We shuffle the entire dataset using the Linux command line utility `shuf`. We decided to use TensorFlow's `tf.data.TextLineDataset` in our input pipeline. The dataset input pipeline consists of the following steps:

1. Reading of the CSV file line-by-line using a `TextLineDataset`
2. Parsing of the CSV rows according to the RFC 4180 standard with TensorFlow's `tf.decode_csv` function
3. Shuffling in the input pipeline in a buffer holding 10,000 samples
4. Text pre-processing, i.e. conversion to lower-case, removal of special characters and double whitespaces, replacement of digits with the symbol #,

and conversion from word to token

5. Batching depending on the passed batch size

An input pipeline of this kind exists threefold: for training, validation, and test set.

The model graph construction receives the input pipeline `Tensor` objects. They serve samples from training, validation, or test set, depending on which iterator initializer has been initialized most recently. That way there is no need to feed inputs to the graph using the `feed_dict` parameter of the method `session.run` which is not recommended³. We are, however, still able to do so by using `tf.placeholder_with_default(toks, shape=toks.shape)` which can either be used to feed data manually or, if no data is provided, it pulls a batch from the dataset. We can switch between datasets by calling functions in the fashion of `session.run(iterator_train_init)`, where the initializer `iterator_train_init` would switch to the training input pipeline. The advantages of this setup are (1) high performance because the pre-processing of the next batch happens while the current batch is being used for stochastic gradient descent, (2) low memory footprint, because the entirety of the dataset is not held in RAM at any time⁴, (3) flexibility because it is still possible to feed data manually with a feed dictionary.

The next step is the construction of the actual model graph, that is the TensorFlow implementation of the presented architecture. We are using the TensorFlow layers API⁵. A noteworthy detail is the usage of two different optimization operations which we create using a single `AdamOptimizer` instance. The optimizer operations are constructed using two mutually exclusive lists of variables, the first containing θ and the second with D_{Δ} . This simplifies the unfreezing of the embeddings. Also worth mentioning is the implementation of the embedding lookup layer $v(\mathbf{t}; \mathbf{D})$: Since TensorFlow graphs are limited to a maximum size of approximately two gigabytes, D_{pre} cannot be stored as a constant in the graph. Instead, we define a placeholder and a variable for it. When initializ-

³According to the TensorFlow guide *Reading data*, “Feeding is the least efficient way to feed data into a TensorFlow program and should only be used for small experiments and debugging.”; https://www.tensorflow.org/api_guides/python/reading_data (accessed in September 2018).

⁴Since the meta-architecture is designed to operate on large datasets, potentially many gigabytes in size, it was an important requirement to design the input pipeline in a way that never requires all data to be held in memory at a time.

⁵Documentation of the TensorFlow namespace `tf.layers`: https://www.tensorflow.org/api_docs/python/tf/layers

ing all variables, we feed the embedding dictionary as a numpy array, called `embeddings.gensim.vectors`:

```
1 embeddings_pretrained = tf.placeholder(tf.float32, shape=[embeddings.
    count, embeddings.size])
2 embeddings = tf.get_variable(initializer=embeddings_pretrained,
    trainable=False)
3 # ...
4 # variable initialization
5 sess.run([tf.group(tf.global_variables_initializer(),
6     tf.local_variables_initializer()),
7     feed_dict={embeddings_pretrained: embeddings.gensim.vectors})
```

Listing 1: Storage of embeddings as a TensorFlow variable

After construction of the model graph, the training starts. Every time the model achieves a new, best accuracy on the validation set, the weights are being saved in a checkpoint. Once the early stopping criterion is met, the weights from the best epoch are being restored from the corresponding checkpoint and used to classify the test set. This accuracy is presumably unbiased.

The last two steps before termination are zipping and upload of the TFS export of the model.

6 Future Work

While conducting research and experiments we have touched several aspects which qualify as potential topics for future research. We list them in this section.

As described in section 2, there have been hybrid approaches using CNNs in combination with RNNs. To the best of our knowledge, there are no reported attempts of **using separable convolutional layers in a hybrid architecture**. Since separable convolutional layers have proven to have comparable expressive power with a lower number of parameters, such an approach seems qualified to push the state-of-the-art further.

Even though our meta-architecture can be used with different word embeddings dictionaries, it was not within the scope of this work to experiment with **multi-lingual word embeddings**; see e.g. [Ammar et al. \(2016\)](#); [Conneau et al. \(2017b\)](#); [Lample et al. \(2017\)](#). These would potentially enable transfer to previously unseen languages.

For our results we have consistently used word2vec word embeddings which have

been trained on a Wikipedia corpus. However, the embeddings could also be trained on a different corpus. It is conceivable that **word embedding pre-training on a domain-specific corpus** increases the classification accuracy. Roy et al. (2017) present a method to train domain-specific word embeddings from sparse texts.

Throughout this project we have used pretrained word embeddings. Kim (2014) operates his CNN-based text classifier on **word embeddings retrained from scratch**. Performing and evaluating such a training with our architectures was beyond the scope of this work.

Goodfellow et al. (2014) have discovered that CNNs are vulnerable to **adversarial examples**: Slightly altered inputs which the model misclassifies. It has been shown by Liang et al. (2017); Gao et al. (2018) that deep text classifiers can also be fooled. We did not test our model with respect to such attacks.

We have conducted several experiments related to the **explainability** of the classifier. The gradient

$$\frac{\partial J(f(\mathbf{t}), l_{\text{target}})}{\partial v(\mathbf{t}; \mathbf{D})} \quad (10)$$

indicates how much changing a vector of the input sequence affects the loss, i.e. classification. While such saliency maps (suggested by Simonyan et al. (2013)) can be used to compute heatmaps for image classifiers (see Zhou and Kainz (2018)), we found them to be less accurate for a text classifier operating on word embeddings. We suspect that this is due to the nature of the word embedding space, where words laying close to each other can have a very similar meaning which is why a slight modification of an input vector can have a weak effect on the loss despite being important. The simpler approach of replacing every single word of the input sequence with an all-zero vector, i.e. *turning off* one word at a time, has yielded more intuitive results. However, it is naturally not capable of capturing the importance of an n -gram in the input. We have also tried to compute the gradient from above with respect to the first convolutional layer’s output, i.e.

$$\frac{\partial J(f(\mathbf{t}), l_{\text{target}})}{\partial f^{(c)}(v(\mathbf{t}; \mathbf{D}); \mathbf{K})}, \quad (11)$$

with the goal of finding the importance of n -grams, where n is the width of the receptive field of the first convolutional layer. This attempt has yielded similar results as the saliency map method described in Equation 10. Approaches which train a local approximation, such as LIME by Tullio Ribeiro et al. (2016), could be a part of future work as well.

7 Conclusion

In this work we have designed a deep neural network meta-architecture which is suitable for a variety of large-scale text classification tasks. It is based on separable convolutional layers which come with a significant reduction of the number of trainable parameters.

An empirical evaluation has shown that our classifier achieves competitive accuracies on a range of datasets, despite having relatively few trainable parameters. Comparison with simpler methods have shown that the neural network performs better if a sufficient number of samples is available for training.

Our suggested parameterizations (referred to as min, medium, and deep sepcnn) serve as a first reference point for users who want to apply the concept to a custom classification problem. Our results have shown that the deepest architecture achieves — when trained with one million word embeddings — the best accuracy on large Amazon review datasets, which we attribute to its capability of learning complex representations.

The datasets we trained on vary in several aspects: The number of classes is different, ranging from two (binary classification) to 14. Also the average sample length differs, ranging from 38 (AG’s News) to 80 (Amazon Review Full). The complexity of the DBPedia task for instance is the assignment of Wikipedia abstracts to article categories. It is much simpler than predicting how many stars a review corresponds to (Amazon Review Full dataset). Still, the classifier can be *successfully* trained on all problems.

Our method outperforms the character-level CNN from [Zhang et al. \(2015\)](#) on all larger datasets despite having fewer network parameters. On the small and simple AG’s News dataset, traditional methods perform better than both, character-level and word-level approaches. Our meta-architecture has proven to be applicable to large datasets which require semantic understanding.

After completing the research, the MLF platform has been extended by an additional, deep learning text classifier. In order to integrate the new service into the platform, we modified two existing services, namely the customizable training service and the text classifier service which is responsible for inference. We have packaged the trainable meta-architecture itself in a Docker image containing dataset pre-processing, an input pipeline, the actual TensorFlow model graph, and training procedures.

References

- Mehdi Allahyari, Seyed Amin Pouriyeh, Mehdi Assefi, Saied Safaei, Elizabeth D. Trippe, Juan B. Gutierrez, and Krys Kochut. A brief survey of text mining: Classification, clustering and extraction techniques. *CoRR*, abs/1707.02919, 2017. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1707.02919>.
- Waleed Ammar, George Mulcaire, Yulia Tsvetkov, Guillaume Lample, Chris Dyer, and Noah A. Smith. Massively multilingual word embeddings. *CoRR*, abs/1602.01925, 2016. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1602.01925>.
- J. P. C. Chiu and E. Nichols. Named Entity Recognition with Bidirectional LSTM-CNNs. *ArXiv e-prints*, November 2015.
- François Chollet. Xception: Deep learning with depthwise separable convolutions. *CoRR*, abs/1610.02357, 2016. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1610.02357>.
- Junyoung Chung, Çağlar Gülçehre, KyungHyun Cho, and Yoshua Bengio. Empirical evaluation of gated recurrent neural networks on sequence modeling. *CoRR*, abs/1412.3555, 2014. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1412.3555>.
- Alexis Conneau, Guillaume Lample, Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, Ludovic Denoyer, and Hervé Jégou. Word translation without parallel data. *CoRR*, abs/1710.04087, 2017a. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1710.04087>.
- Alexis Conneau, Guillaume Lample, Marc’Aurelio Ranzato, Ludovic Denoyer, and Hervé Jégou. Word translation without parallel data. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1710.04087*, 2017b.
- J. Gao, J. Lanchantin, M. L. Soffa, and Y. Qi. Black-box Generation of Adversarial Text Sequences to Evade Deep Learning Classifiers. *ArXiv e-prints*, January 2018.
- Xavier Glorot, Antoine Bordes, and Yoshua Bengio. Domain adaptation for large-scale sentiment classification: A deep learning approach. In *Proceedings of the 28th international conference on machine learning (ICML-11)*, pages 513–520, 2011.
- I. J. Goodfellow, J. Shlens, and C. Szegedy. Explaining and Harnessing Adversarial Examples. *ArXiv e-prints*, December 2014.
- Ian Goodfellow, Yoshua Bengio, and Aaron Courville. *Deep Learning*. MIT Press, 2016. <http://www.deeplearningbook.org>.

- Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Delving deep into rectifiers: Surpassing human-level performance on imagenet classification. *CoRR*, abs/1502.01852, 2015. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1502.01852>.
- Sepp Hochreiter and Jürgen Schmidhuber. Long short-term memory. *Neural computation*, 9(8):1735–1780, 1997.
- Jeremy Howard and Sebastian Ruder. Fine-tuned language models for text classification. *CoRR*, abs/1801.06146, 2018. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1801.06146>.
- Sergey Ioffe and Christian Szegedy. Batch normalization: Accelerating deep network training by reducing internal covariate shift. *CoRR*, abs/1502.03167, 2015. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1502.03167>.
- Rie Johnson and Tong Zhang. Effective use of word order for text categorization with convolutional neural networks. *CoRR*, abs/1412.1058, 2014. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1412.1058>.
- Rie Johnson and Tong Zhang. Supervised and semi-supervised text categorization using lstm for region embeddings. *ArXiv e-prints*, February 2016. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1602.02373>.
- Lukasz Kaiser, Aidan N. Gomez, and François Chollet. Depthwise separable convolutions for neural machine translation. *CoRR*, abs/1706.03059, 2017. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1706.03059>.
- Nal Kalchbrenner, Edward Grefenstette, and Phil Blunsom. A convolutional neural network for modelling sentences. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1404.2188*, 2014.
- Yoon Kim. Convolutional neural networks for sentence classification. *CoRR*, abs/1408.5882, 2014. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1408.5882>.
- Diederik P. Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *CoRR*, abs/1412.6980, 2014. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1412.6980>.
- Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Geoffrey E Hinton. Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 1097–1105, 2012.
- Siwei Lai, Liheng Xu, Kang Liu, and Jun Zhao. Recurrent convolutional neural networks for text classification. In *AAAI*, volume 333, pages 2267–2273, 2015.

- Guillaume Lample, Alexis Conneau, Ludovic Denoyer, and Marc’Aurelio Ran-
zato. Unsupervised machine translation using monolingual corpora only.
arXiv preprint arXiv:1711.00043, 2017.
- Y. Lecun, L. Bottou, Y. Bengio, and P. Haffner. Gradient-based learning applied
to document recognition. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 86(11):2278–2324, Nov
1998. ISSN 0018-9219. doi: 10.1109/5.726791.
- J. Y. Lee and F. Dernoncourt. Sequential Short-Text Classification with Recur-
rent and Convolutional Neural Networks. *ArXiv e-prints*, March 2016.
- B. Liang, H. Li, M. Su, P. Bian, X. Li, and W. Shi. Deep Text Classification
Can be Fooled. *ArXiv e-prints*, April 2017.
- Min Lin, Qiang Chen, and Shuicheng Yan. Network in network. *CoRR*,
abs/1312.4400, 2013. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1312.4400>.
- Tomas Mikolov, Kai Chen, Greg Corrado, and Jeffrey Dean. Efficient estimation
of word representations in vector space. *CoRR*, abs/1301.3781, 2013. URL
<http://arxiv.org/abs/1301.3781>.
- Jeffrey Pennington, Richard Socher, and Christopher D. Manning. Glove:
Global vectors for word representation. In *Empirical Methods in Natu-
ral Language Processing (EMNLP)*, pages 1532–1543, 2014. URL [http://
www.aclweb.org/anthology/D14-1162](http://www.aclweb.org/anthology/D14-1162).
- Gabriel Pereyra, George Tucker, Jan Chorowski, Lukasz Kaiser, and Geoffrey E.
Hinton. Regularizing neural networks by penalizing confident output distri-
butions. *CoRR*, abs/1701.06548, 2017. URL [http://arxiv.org/abs/
1701.06548](http://arxiv.org/abs/1701.06548).
- Arpita Roy, Youngja Park, and Shimei Pan. Learning domain-specific word
embeddings from sparse cybersecurity texts. *CoRR*, abs/1709.07470, 2017.
URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1709.07470>.
- Pavel Simakov, Sanders Kleinfeld, and Pavithra Vijay. Machine learning text
classification guide, 2018. URL [https://developers.google.com/
machine-learning/guides/text-classification/](https://developers.google.com/machine-learning/guides/text-classification/).
- K. Simonyan, A. Vedaldi, and A. Zisserman. Deep Inside Convolutional Net-
works: Visualising Image Classification Models and Saliency Maps. *ArXiv
e-prints*, December 2013.

- Nitish Srivastava, Geoffrey Hinton, Alex Krizhevsky, Ilya Sutskever, and Ruslan Salakhutdinov. Dropout: A simple way to prevent neural networks from overfitting. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 15:1929–1958, 2014. URL <http://jmlr.org/papers/v15/srivastava14a.html>.
- Christian Szegedy, Wei Liu, Yangqing Jia, Pierre Sermanet, Scott E. Reed, Dragomir Anguelov, Dumitru Erhan, Vincent Vanhoucke, and Andrew Rabinovich. Going deeper with convolutions. *CoRR*, abs/1409.4842, 2014. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1409.4842>.
- M. Tulio Ribeiro, S. Singh, and C. Guestrin. “Why Should I Trust You?”: Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier. *ArXiv e-prints*, February 2016.
- Joseph Turian, Lev Ratinov, and Yoshua Bengio. Word representations: A simple and general method for semi-supervised learning. ACL ’10, pages 384–394, Stroudsburg, PA, USA, 2010. Association for Computational Linguistics. URL <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=1858681.1858721>.
- Pascal Vincent, Hugo Larochelle, Isabelle Lajoie, Yoshua Bengio, and Pierre-Antoine Manzagol. Stacked denoising autoencoders: Learning useful representations in a deep network with a local denoising criterion. *Journal of machine learning research*, 11(Dec):3371–3408, 2010.
- Ying Wen, Weinan Zhang, Rui Luo, and Jun Wang. Learning text representation using recurrent convolutional neural network with highway layers. *CoRR*, abs/1606.06905, 2016. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1606.06905>.
- Wenpeng Yin, Katharina Kann, Mo Yu, and Hinrich Schütze. Comparative study of CNN and RNN for natural language processing. *CoRR*, abs/1702.01923, 2017. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1702.01923>.
- Xiang Zhang, Junbo Jake Zhao, and Yann LeCun. Character-level convolutional networks for text classification. *CoRR*, abs/1509.01626, 2015. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1509.01626>.
- Ye Zhang, Stephen Roller, and Byron C. Wallace. MGNC-CNN: A simple approach to exploiting multiple word embeddings for sentence classification. *CoRR*, abs/1603.00968, 2016. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1603.00968>.
- K. Zhou and B. Kainz. Efficient Image Evidence Analysis of CNN Classification Results. *ArXiv e-prints*, January 2018.