



# **LUX (Linguistic aspects Under eXamination): Discourse Analysis for Automatic Fake News Classification**

Lucas Azevedo, Mathieu D'aquin, Brian Davis, Manel Zarrouk

## **► To cite this version:**

Lucas Azevedo, Mathieu D'aquin, Brian Davis, Manel Zarrouk. LUX (Linguistic aspects Under eXamination): Discourse Analysis for Automatic Fake News Classification. The Joint Conference of the 59th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 11th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing (ACL-IJCNLP 2021), Aug 2021, Online, France. pp.41-56, 10.18653/v1/2021.findings-acl.4 . hal-03659147

**HAL Id: hal-03659147**

**<https://hal.science/hal-03659147v1>**

Submitted on 4 May 2022

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# LUX (Linguistic aspects Under eXamination): Discourse Analysis for Automatic Fake News Classification

Lucas Azevedo<sup>1</sup>, Mathieu d’Aquin<sup>1</sup>, Brian Davis<sup>2</sup>, and Manel Zarrouk<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Data Science Institute, Insight SFI Centre for Data Analytics

National University of Ireland, Galway

<sup>2</sup>ADAPT, DCU, School Of Computing

<sup>3</sup>Galilée Institute, University Sorbonne Paris North

{lucas.azevedo, mathieu.daquin}@nuigalway.ie

brian.davis@adaptcentre.ie

manel.zarrouk@sorbonne-paris-nord.fr

## Abstract

The democratization/decentralization of both the production and consumption of information has resulted in a subjective and often misleading depiction of facts known as Fake News - a phenomenon that is effectively shaping the perception of reality for many individuals. Manual fact-checking is time-consuming and cannot scale and although automatic fact-checking, vis a vis machine learning holds promise, it is significantly hindered by a deficit of suitable training data. We present both a novel dataset, VERITAS(VERifying Textual Aspects), a collection of fact-checked claims, containing their original documents and LUX(Language Under eXamination), a text classifier that makes use of an extensive linguistic analysis to infer the likelihood of the input being a piece of fake-news.

## 1 Introduction

Often defined as the intentional or unintentional spread of false information (K et al., 2019), Fake News has found fertile ground in the actual scenario of ever-growing data consumption and generation, where factors like news source decentralization, citizen journalism, democratization of media and astroturfing<sup>1</sup> (Lee, 2010) make the task of manually checking and correcting disinformation across the internet impractical if not infeasible, (Shao et al., 2016) despite the significant efforts of Fact-Checking Agencies - organised groups of journalists that manually identify and investigate rumours conveyed by Fake-news articles.

Consequently, it is imperative that we develop an efficient and reliable way to account for the veracity of what is produced and spread as information; this process is known as automatic fact-checking. (Hassan et al., 2015)

<sup>1</sup>Astroturfing is the practice of masking the sponsors of a message or organization to make it appear as though it originates from and is supported by grassroots participants.

Although there has been significant research effort to tackle the task of automatic fact-checking (Azevedo, 2018), the deficit of datasets containing organic news articles - in their entirety - which have been manually labeled with respect to their veracity is a common obstacle for the development of supervised classification models. The absence of such datasets makes researchers rely on other approaches, e.g., stance determination (Popat et al., 2017), knowledge base matching (Wu et al., 2014), trust assessment of sources (Balakrishnan and Kambhampati, 2011), data structuring (Conroy et al., 2015), network pattern analysis (Shao et al., 2016), etc.

In this work we present the challenges faced in the process of developing a language model enriched by discourse features for fake-news detection, along with experimental results. The contributions of this work are mainly two: the dataset creation process, described in Section 2 and the introduction of the text classification model, - LUX(Language Under eXamination), in Section 3.

Section 4 brings a comprehensive evaluation of both VERITAS and LUX, while also featuring an ablation analysis of the latter.

## 2 Datasets for Fake News Classification

### 2.1 Available Corpora on Fake News

The deficit of suitable corpora for the intended approach is the main influence behind the creation of the VERITAS Dataset, and by consequence, the VERITAS Annotator. Below we present a list of datasets commonly used in related tasks. Note that although the following are considered valuable resources for many related tasks, none of them include all of the three most important characteristics required for a content based supervised classifier which are i) a significant volume of entries, ii) gold standard labels and iii) the entire fake news articles

(i.e., the origin).

**Emergent16** a collection of 300 rumours and 2,595 associated news articles - a counterpart to ‘origin’ in the VERITAS Dataset. Each claim’s veracity is estimated by journalists after they have judged that enough evidence has been collected (Ferreira and Vlachos, 2016). Besides the claim labeling, each associated article is summarized into a headline and also labelled according to its stance towards the claim. Given the fixed structured of the website we were able to obtain valid labeled examples using a scraper.<sup>2</sup> Unfortunately they sum up to less than 100 usable claim-origin pairs (discussed in subsection 2.3).

**LIAR17** includes around 13K human-labeled short statements which are rated by the fact-checking website PolitiFact into: “pants on fire”, “false”, “barely true”, “half true”, “mostly true”, or “true” (Wang, 2017). The domain-restricted data as well as the reduced length of text that can be retrieved from this corpus makes it unsuitable for generic domain linguistic fake news detection.

**FakeNewsNet18** is a data repository containing a collection of around 22K real and fake news obtained from Politifact and GossipCop<sup>3</sup> fact-checking websites. Each row contains an ID, URL, title, and a list of tweets that shared the URL. It also includes linguistic, visual, social, and spatiotemporal context regarding the articles. This repository could still be used for supervised learning models if it were not for the fact that it does not provide sufficiently long texts to be used by a classifier based on linguistic aspects. For the same reason, **CREDBANK** (Mitra and Gilbert, 2015) and **PHEME** (Derczynski and Bontcheva, 2014) are also unsuitable for the authors’ use case. Those three datasets focus on network indicators (e.g. number of retweets, sharing patterns, etc.) of fake news, instead of its contents. CREDBANK is a crowd sourced corpus of “more than 60 million tweets grouped into 1,049 real-world events, each annotated by 30 human annotators”, while PHEME includes

4,842 tweets, in the form of 330 threads, related to 9 events.

**FEVER18** (Thorne et al., 2018) created FEVER, a set of more than 185K claims by modifying sentences from a collection of 50K Wikipedia articles. Annotators were tasked with annotating other sentences from the same article in respect to their stance towards the modified sentence. The corpus is the largest to our knowledge, but since it is synthetically created and focused on a sentence-level stance classification approach, it is unlikely to perform efficiently on heterogeneous web documents as a fake news classifier.

**Snopes19** (Hanselowski et al., 2019) provides a large collection of more than 16 thousand manually annotated text snippets extracted from 6,422 [snopes.com](http://snopes.com) articles. Unfortunately, less than half of those snippets present a stance (agreeing or disagreeing) towards the fact-checked claim. Also, the annotated snippets are, by definition, only a portion of the original article. Nevertheless, an origin identification process could generate a significant amount of valid examples from this data.

Due to space restrictions, we cannot provide a detailed description of the following list of datasets, although is important to include them: **BuzzFeed16** (Potthast et al., 2018), **Kaggle**<sup>4</sup> and **NELA17** (Horne et al., 2018).

## 2.2 The VERITAS Dataset

The VERITAS Dataset is, to our knowledge, the most complete data collection of manually annotated claims in regards to their veracity. It is the only dataset to contain not only the mentioned veracity labels but also the document (in its entirety) from which the checked claim originated. VERITAS has been developed in a two step process: 1) Fact-Checking articles scraping and 2) Claim Origin Identification.

**Step 1: Scraping FCAs** As the cost for manually checking a large number of disputed claims is extensive, both in time and money, we have started the dataset creation process by scraping articles from fact-checking agencies and consequently trusting the work made by their journalists that undertake the processes of: 1) selecting controversial

<sup>2</sup>While web scraping can be done manually by a software user, the term typically refers to automated processes implemented using a bot or web crawler.

<sup>3</sup><https://www.gossipcop.com>

<sup>4</sup><https://www.kaggle.com/mrisdal/fake-news/data>

claims, 2) leveraging web documents that either support or deny those statements to 3) finally come to a veracity verdict. In simple terms, a Fact-Checking Article (FCA) is a narrative of this investigative process.

For each scraped FCA, we create an entry in the dataset and extract a number of attributes, most importantly: the claim, the veracity label, and the list of hyperlinks to the mentioned web documents, which we call *Origin Candidates*, since they will be the subject of the Origin Identification process. The code used to scrap the pages is openly available<sup>5</sup>.

**Step 2: Claim Origin Identification** One of the most important steps of the dataset creation pipeline was a task we defined as “origin identification”. In short, after three automatic ways of identifying the article in which a fact-checked claim originated were carried out and yielded non-satisfactory results, it was decided that a manual annotation process would be used to select the correct entries from the totality of the dataset. An annotation tool<sup>6</sup> was developed in order to make the task easier and faster. This annotation process not only provided a large and complete version of the dataset, but also leaves a possibility for an automation of the origin identification process as a future improvement of the project.

The final structure of each entry contains the following fields: Fact-Checking Article URL, Checked Claim, Claim Label, Tags, FCA date, Origin URL, Origin Domain, Origin Body, Origin Title, Origin Summary, Origin Keywords, Origin Date and Origin Author. Given the limited space, a more in-depth description of each field is not provided but can be found within the supplementary material (appendix 1) and also along an extensive description of the origin annotation process in (Azevedo and Moustafa, 2019). The past versions of the dataset are also openly available<sup>7</sup>

## 2.3 Consolidation of VERITAS Dataset

A consolidation of the VERITAS dataset followed the large annotation process over the scraped FCA pages that augmented both the quantity of annotated origins (1032 consolidated origins from more than 10k annotations) and the quality of the anno-

tations, measured by Krippendorff’s Alpha<sup>8</sup>, reaching a substantial score of 0.6014. This consolidation generated the fourth version of the dataset, here addressed as V4.

Given the constant structure of *Emergent.info* articles, we have also incorporated its few valid claims, i.e., the ones with “true” or “false” verdict, and their respective sources.

Although the majority of origins obtained from Emergent were linked to “true” claims, when aggregated to the consolidated origins from VERITAS v4.0, the data collection showed a false/true class imbalance ratio of  $\approx 1.44$ . Therefore, in order to quickly obtain “true” labeled news articles to balance the scraped Dataset, reporting articles were scraped and automatically labeled as “true” and composed a **separated** dataset where their headlines are used for the claim field. The sources of those articles were selected according to studies determining the least biased<sup>9</sup> and/or most trusted<sup>10</sup> news outlets in the U.S..

We are aware that the label assumption of those articles is far from ideal. Notwithstanding, it offers another **option** of palliative solution for the label unbalance issue and yielded positive results in similar works (Horne and Adali, 2017; Ireland, 2018). It should, however, be tested with caution and compared with other - also sub-optimal - methods, i.e., discarding “false” entries and/or implementing class weights on the model training. Both the collection of reporting articles and the emergent articles are provided **separately** so they can be optionally disregarded and eventually substituted by gold-standard data. Table 1 provides additional details about each subset.

Since the improvement of incorporating the entries from emergent was still to be evaluated by the proposed classifier, two different sample sets from the trusted sources were created, to balance both the v4.0 dataset by itself (V4+T1), as well as the concatenation of VERITAS and emergent (V4+EM+T2). The evaluation results will be presented at Section 4, as they are also the evaluation for the linguistic model. By comparing both balanced sets we can gain a better understanding of the

<sup>5</sup><https://github.com/lucas0/VeritasCrawler>

<sup>6</sup><https://github.com/lucas0/Annotator>

<sup>7</sup><https://github.com/lucas0/VeritasCorpus>

<sup>8</sup>[https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Krippendorff%27s\\_alpha](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Krippendorff%27s_alpha)

<sup>9</sup><https://www.businessinsider.com/most-biased-news-outlets-in-america-cnn-fox-nytimes-2018-8>

<sup>10</sup>[businessinsider.com/most-and-least-trusted-news-outlets-in-america-cnn-fox-news-new-york-times-2019-4](https://businessinsider.com/most-and-least-trusted-news-outlets-in-america-cnn-fox-news-new-york-times-2019-4)

Table 1: VERITAS Subsets

	#E	#T	#F	#U
VERITAS v4.0 (V4)	1032	276	664	92
Emergent (EM)	865	308	179	378
Trusted1 (T1)	388	388	-	-
Trusted2 (T2)	259	259	-	-
V4+T1	1420	664	664	92
V4+EM+T2	2156	843	843	470

*Columns represent #E: total entries, #T: true entries, #F: false entries, #U: unverified entries*

quality of the data obtained from emergent, keeping in mind that the difference in volume of entries would still affect the performance.

### 3 LUX - Language Under eXamination

The core contribution of this work is the investigation of the usage of linguistic aspects as discriminative features in a text classification model that should determine whether the given article is fake or not. We call this classifier LUX, short for Language Under eXamination.

Previous work investigated the use of such linguistic aspects as features for similar tasks such as deception detection (Reichel and Lendvai, 2016; Zhou et al., 2004), document clustering (Yu and Hatzivassiloglou, 2003a), text classification (Louis and Nenkova, 2011; Biyani et al., 2016) among others. Related works make use of few (mainly one) of those aspects and the majority of them report an improvement of their results by doing so.

Here we present a set of linguistic aspects that were shown to be correlated to deception. For each of these aspects, we present their contextual definition, along with a short literature review and a description of the methods we use to evaluate its presence or absence in a given piece of text. The objective is to build LUX (Language Under eXamination), a Fake News Classifier, effectively using these linguistic aspects to estimate the likelihood of an article containing fake news. Here, we present the results obtained with two baseline language models (BERT<sup>11</sup> (Devlin et al., 2018) and Word2Vec (W2V) (Mikolov et al., 2013)) towards building this classifier.

<sup>11</sup>Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers

We are aware of an imbued redundancy that our features might present, since the aspects analyzed by the different approaches, in some cases, overlap with each other, but expect that the eventual bias this redundancy might add to the model can be overcome with the implementations of techniques such as LDA (Linear Discriminant Analysis) or PCA (principal component analysis).

#### 3.1 Linguistic Aspects

**Subjectivity** Louis and Nenkova (Louis and Nenkova, 2011) observed that general sentences tend to be more subjective. Some of the shallow features that are correlated to the subjectivity level of a sentence are also used in their model, for example, punctuation marks, average number of characters and average number of words.

Pattern<sup>12</sup>, a python library for text analysis, states in its section about subjectivity: “Written texts can be broadly categorized into two types: facts and opinions.” Based on a lexicon of adjectives produced for product review analysis, pattern.en provides a function that maps the subjectivity score of a sentence to a range between 0 and 1 depending on the number of adjectives it contains. It also provides implementations of measuring functions for mood and polarity.

Riloff et Wiebe (Riloff et al., 2003) presents a methodology for the creation of the MPQA Subjectivity Lexicon. In summary, the authors: 1) use an automatic subjectivity classifier to label data while also 2) identifying patterns present in the sentences labeled as subjective and 3) use the learned patterns to improve the classification model(1) and iterate between the three steps, making bootstrapping possible. The MPQA Lexicon is also used for us to measure the subjectivity of a given text. Based on the lexicon, (Wilson et al., 2005) also created OpinionFinder, a Subjectivity Classifier.

Another interesting method was presented by (Yu and Hatzivassiloglou, 2003a), where a Naive Bayes classifier is trained over a Wall Street Journal dataset containing two classes: Subjective (every article with type Editorial or Letter to Editor) and Objective (Business or

<sup>12</sup><https://pypi.org/project/Pattern/>



News). By analysing low level features on the texts, the NB classifier achieved a 0.91 recall and 0.86 precision on the binary classification task.

In order to measure the subjectivity of a text, two values are calculated. Both are a sum of each word's subjectivity score normalized by the length of the document (in words) but use as reference different lexicons: the TextBlob<sup>13</sup> (a python library based on Pattern<sup>12</sup>) lexicon and the MPQA lexicon, described above.

**Specificity** Zhou et al. (Yu and Hatzivassiloglou, 2003b) uses specificity and measures it by words depicting the following aspects: perceptual information (sounds, smells, physical sensations and visual details) and spatio-temporal. (Fuller et al., 2009) measure bi-logarithmic type-token ratio (LogTTR) for evaluating specificity.

(Li and Nenkova, 2015) introduced Speciteller, a python framework for fast and accurate prediction of sentence specificity, which was enhanced and presented by (Ko et al., 2019). It introduces a new algorithm that adjust its weights to the training set, making it applicable to any domain, out-of-the-box. Speciteller is a machine learning classifier that uses as input a combination of:

#### Shallow features extracted from the text

Number of words, number of symbols, average number of characters per word, number of stop-words, explicit discourse connectives (Prasad et al., 2008). From lexicons (General Inquirer (Stone et al., 1962), MRC (Wilson, 1988) and MPQA) other features like sentiment, subjectivity, polarity, familiarity, concreteness, imageability and meaningfulness are also evaluated.

**Non-sparse features** Brown clusters (Brown et al., 1992) are used to classify words into 100 groups and a vector of corresponding cardinality is used to keep track of the frequency of each class in the input text. Speciteller also uses averaged Word embeddings to represent a sentence embedding. These also are 100-dimensional vectors provided by (Turian et al., 2010).

The ablation results show that Speciteller contributes significantly to the LUX classifier and suggest that the framework could be even more impactful if contemporary word embedding generation techniques were to be used.

**Complexity** (Biyani et al., 2016) focused on the detection of click-baits (that can be seen as a subcategory of fake news) and reported that features used to measure the formality of a text were the most correlated to click bait articles. Using a slang lexicon and a list of bad words, as well as several readability scores, they obtained a reasonable F-1 score of 74,9.

A 1999 paper by (Heylighen and Dewaele, 1999) presents a famous metric for Formality evaluation, named the F-measure (not to be confused with the F1 score). (Pavlick and Tetreault, 2016) present a statistical model for predicting formality, but do not provide access to the model's code.

Another famous work on the formality area is Coh-Metrix (Graesser et al., 2014), but the only access to its implementation is through a simple HTML portal, so we have discarded this option.

Fortunately, a python library<sup>14</sup> provides several readability measuring tools, including known metrics as the Flesch-Kincaid (Kincaid et al., 1975) and Coleman-Liau (Coleman and Liau, 1975), LIX (Björnsson, 1968) and RIX, which were also used by (Biyani et al., 2016). Those last two metrics are simple but effective, being the first one (LIX) calculated as  $W/S + C/W * 100$  where  $W$  is the number of words in a text,  $S$  is the number of sentences and  $C$  is the number of *complex words* (words with more than 6 letters). The RIX metric is a simpler and graded version of LIX and is calculated as  $C/S$ .

Another python library<sup>15</sup>, initially developed for the AFEL project (d'Aquin et al., 2018), provides more measuring tools for semantic complexity analyzer. The library starts by identifying the entities present in the input text and the relations between them in order to represent it as a knowledge graph which

<sup>13</sup><https://textblob.readthedocs.io/en/dev/>

<sup>14</sup><https://pypi.org/project/readability/>  
<sup>15</sup><https://github.com/afel-project/pySemanticComplexity/blob/master/pysemcom.py>

is then used to extract metrics as number of nodes, radius, assortativity<sup>16</sup> and other graph properties.

Both *readability* and *pySemCom* libraries are used by us to implement the highest amount of unique metrics for Complexity, Formality and Readability.

**Uncertainty** According to (Szarvas et al., 2012), “Uncertainty can be interpreted as lack of information: The receiver of the information cannot be certain about some pieces of information”.

Rubin (Rubin et al., 2006) provides a solid survey on Certainty Identification. Building on that, (Vincze, 2015) elaborates on the same subject and achieves great results (Vincze et al., 2008) on the CoNLL Shared Task 10, that aimed for the classification of uncertain texts from the BioScope corpus. The approach was implemented very conveniently as a python library for Uncertainty detection, that is used by us for uncertainty measurement. The classifier is a simple model trained on a corpus of words that were assigned a binary label regarding their certainty. The model only requires the input text to be P.O.S-tagged in order to resolve syntactic ambiguity.

(Reichel and Lendvai, 2016) tried to identify hoax-resolving tweets by using the ratio between four data augmented lexicons (knowledge, report, belief, and doubt) as features, along with low-level syntactic features, not achieving good results.

Loughran and McDonald Sentiment Word Lists (Loughran and McDonald, 2011) and MPQA (Deng and Wiebe, 2015) are Uncertainty Lexicons that are leveraged by us for the evaluation of this aspect. A simple average of uncertain words over the number of words of the input text is used in our model.

**Affect** (Pang and Lee, 2008) is an extensive review of the literature on sentiment analysis and opinion mining that encompasses the field of linguistic aspect evaluation, which this work is focused on.

(Whissell, 2004) provides the Dictionary of Affect in Language, which includes people’s

mean ratings for the Pleasantness, Activation, and Imagery of close to 9,000 words. The dictionary is a lexicon with ratings representing the two main dimensions of emotional space, valence and arousal, along with another rating for people’s assessment of imageability, i.e., how easily it is to form a mental picture of a word.

A better definition of Affect in the context of deception detection is necessary in order to decide which resource is more appropriate for the aspect evaluation, for now we are going to let the experiments evaluations indicate what is the most appropriate way of measuring affect for our task.

(Li and Nenkova, 2015) mention the MRC Psycholinguistic Database (Wilson, 1988) has words annotated w.r.t imageability among other aspects, while VADER (Valence Aware Dictionary and sEntiment Reasoner) (Hutto and Gilbert, 2014) is a lexicon and rule-based sentiment analysis tool that is specifically attuned to social media. Thus, it seems to be quite appropriate for us.

For this aspect we make use of two different sentiment classifiers: VADER and Pattern/TextBlob<sup>13</sup>, already mentioned on the Subjectivity section. From each one of the two classifiers we obtain three metrics: the sum of all the positive scores, the sum of all negative scores and the total sum of scores, all averaged respectively by the number of words with positive score, words with negative score and total number of words in the input text. By using these metrics we ensure that statistics as variance and range of emotion within the text is passed to the LUX classifier.

**Verbal Immediacy** (Mehrabian and Wiener, 1966) first defined Immediacy as a linguistic property that refers to the degree to which a source associates himself/herself with the topics of a message; that is, “immediacy is the degree to which a source approaches or avoids a topic”. Based on that definition, (Zhou et al., 2004) measured it by analysing spatial and temporal terms, passive voice ratio, self reference manner and group reference manner, among others. Different works relate the non-immediacy to the presence of deception in text since these try to disassociate oneself

<sup>16</sup><https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Assortativity>

from one’s communication.

Negative affect and passive voice are some indicators of non-immediacy. Since the first is already addressed by us, we will be using a ratio between passive sentences over the total number of sentences to determine how passive is the text. In this context, a sentence is deemed passive, if it contains a “BE” verb followed by some other, non-BE verb, except for a gerund.

**Diversity / Quantity / Pausality** Those are syntactic features and some of the previous defined ones already make use of one or more ways of measuring them. For example, the diversity measurement is used to evaluate a sentence’s Complexity. Still, there are many different ways to measure diversity and since we intend to remove the redundancy of the features anyways, we will measure it with many different formulas.

In a 2013 article, (Jarvis, 2013) proposed that the six properties of lexical diversity should be measured by Variability, Volume, Evenness, Rarity, Dispersion and Disparity. Using a python library<sup>17</sup>, we measure some of those metrics, namely different types of type-token ratio (TTR), vocd (McCarthy and Jarvis, 2007) and measure of textual lexical diversity (MTLD) (McCarthy, 2005).

Other simple aspects are also taken into account, as the overall quantity of words in absolute number and by P.O.S.-tag as well as the pausality, measured by the ratio between punctuation marks and number of sentences.

## 4 Evaluation and results

In simple terms LUX is a binary model for classifying general text into fake news / real news and it was originally proposed as a way to evaluate the efficiency of the above mentioned linguistic features. Aiming for generality, this model takes a text document (that could be a long article or a simple headline) as sole input and outputs the probabilities of it being fake or not, based on its psycho-linguistic profile and contextual representation. For the latter, different types of text encodings were tested and it became clear that the usage of fixed-size BERT document embeddings outperformed Word2Vec,

<sup>17</sup>[https://github.com/kristopherkyle/lexical\\_diversity](https://github.com/kristopherkyle/lexical_diversity)

which was tested on RNN, LSTM (Hochreiter and Schmidhuber, 1997) and Bi-LSTM (Schuster and Paliwal, 1997), with the latter having the best results, but still inferior to BERT.

After performing a grid search with different optimizers, activation functions, learning rates, training epochs and fully connected layer (FLC) dimensions, the initial model was decided to be composed of a simple ReLu<sup>18</sup> activated 64-dimensional FLC with a dropout of 30% attached to the final layer, of dimensionality 2 where a softmax filter would represent the false and true labels probabilities. Adam (Kingma and Ba, 2014) was the best performing optimizer and a combination of  $\alpha = 0.001$  over 100 training epochs generally yielded the best results. Figure 1 brings an outline of the model.




Figure 1: Outline of LUX classifier

All the reported values in Table 2 for Accuracy and F1 score come from a 9-fold training over the data. The results for the two best baseline models are also included, namely the same model using only the BERT document embeddings and only the w2v embeddings over a simple Bi-LSTM with 128 dimensions on the recurrent layer.

Since the data from FEVER18 (Thorne et al., 2018) and Snopes19 (Hanselowski et al., 2019) is composed of short statements a comparative analysis is also presented alongside a V4+EM+T2 run using only the claims as input text, instead of the larger body texts.

The final input for each article is a an ensemble of a document embedding generated by BERT

<sup>18</sup><https://deeptai.org/machine-learning-glossary-and-terms/relu>



Table 2: First Evaluation

Model	Dataset	Avg. Acc	Avg. F1
BERT*	V4	0.7365	0.734
W2V*	V4	0.6000	0.598
LUX	V4	0.7896	0.768
LUX	V4+T1	0.7603	0.757
LUX	EM	0.7911	0.778
LUX	V4+EM	0.7928	0.767
<b>LUX</b>	<b>V4+EM+T2</b>	<b>0.8050</b>	<b>0.804</b>
LUX	FEVER18	0.6942	0.691
LUX	Snopes19	0.7405	0.517
LUX	V4+EM+T2 <sup>#</sup>	0.7723	0.708

\*:Only the embeddings were used as input, these results serve as baselines to analyse the improvement added by LUX’s linguistic features

<sup>#</sup>:A version of V4+EM+T2 using the claim (and not the origin body) as input for comparison with other datasets focused on small texts.

trained on the BERT-Large uncased corpus<sup>19</sup> and the 97 linguistic features described in the previous section. A version of the code repository is available at <https://github.com/lucas0/Lux>.

Given the initial results, the robustness added from the a different source, i.e. emergent, with the benefit from balancing classes using the trusted news (T2) yielded the best results. Consequently, it was decided this was the selected subset for the linguistic features ablation analysis.

#### 4.1 Ablation

Table 3 presents the three most impactful positive and negative features, i.e. features that, when removed, most decrease or most increase the accuracy of the model, respectively. Those are all results using as base the best model run, i.e., LUX model over the V4+EM+T2 data, depicted in Table 2. A longer table containing the results for the full ablation analysis can be found within the supplementary material (appendix 2).

**Positive Features(PF):** When individually removed, each of the 97 features of the model, 50 have report a decreased accuracy of the model by an average of 0.056%, where 21 ‘contribute’ with more than the average of all the positive features

and only 10 features decrease more than 1% accuracy when absent. All three top PF fall into the Quantity group, as P.O.S.-tag counts, while most of the most sophisticated, i.e. higher semantic level, make to the top 10. Besides the ones featured(pun intended) in the table, the top 10 also comprises, unordered: Pausability, Coleman-Liau informality score, specificity, measure of lexical textual diversity(MTLD), and three features from the semantic complexity evaluator (Venant and d’ Aquin, 2019): assortativity, average number of in-links, and the density. In short, those features are metrics from a graph generated from entities identified in the text, when matched against DBpedia knowledge graph. They refer to, respectively, the similarity of connections with respect to the vertice the number of edges a vertex has to other vertices; the number of links that go from entities of the global DBpedia to the identified entities; and the density of a graph stresses how much nodes are connected to each other.

**Negative Features(NF):** As expected, the negative features account for the other 47 features. On average, each negative feature increases the accuracy of the model by 0.6% when removed individually. From those, 17 have a better-than-average impact. Avoiding the risk of removing important features from the model and given the high number of negative features, we mention the 9 features that, when **not** considered, improved LUX’s accuracy by more than 1%, but focus the discussion on the top 3. Our results point to the number of VBD (verbs, in the past tense form) in the input text as being the third least important feature of the model, while the top two NF are metrics from the same complexity evaluation approach mentioned above. They are nbTypesStd and diameter of nodes, meaning respectively: the standard deviation on the number of different link types per node and the “spreadness”(sic.) of concepts, i.e., the more unrelated and specific concepts we have, the higher the diameter will be. The other six NF improved the accuracy of the model in more than 1% when removed are: the number of words P.O.S.-tagged as PDT (predeterminer), two readability metrics (Dale–Chall and Flesch Reading Ease) and three other features from PySemCom: number of entities, entities density in the text, standard deviation over the number of in-links.

<sup>19</sup>[github.com/google-research/bert/blob/master/README.md](https://github.com/google-research/bert/blob/master/README.md)

Table 3: Ablation Results

Feat.Idx	Feature	Avg. Acc	$\approx$ Removal Impact
<b>Most Positive Features</b>			
55	‘CD’	0.7864	-1.8%
74	‘RBR’	0.7871	-1.7%
71	‘PRP’	0.7904	-1.4%
<b>Most Negative Features</b>			
17	diameter	0.8215	+1.6%
23	nbTypesStd	0.8208	+1.5%
81	‘VBD’	0.8201	+1.5%

## 5 Conclusion and Future Work

This work has done the following two significant contributions: i) the consolidation of the VERITAS Dataset, which is unique due to its provision of organic origins for each given claim in the collection, which has, in turn, been manually verified by FCAs. Given the completeness of the released data, it can be a useful resource for a number of related tasks, namely: Document Retrieval, Stance Detection and Claim Validation. As a second contribution, we have confirmed the hypothesis that the inclusion of linguistic metrics as model features allows for a better text classification performance, at least in the target task of identifying fake-news.

After having set up an initial version of the classifier, named LUX, we could demonstrate an improvement from its first evaluation by increasing the quality and quantity of the training data, as well as removing the most negative features from the model. The final LUX version performs better than both tested baselines. When used to evaluate the quality of datasets, LUX yields better scores when trained with VERITAS, than when compared with two other fake-news datasets, FEVER18 and Snopes19.

Future work would involve the development of an automatic origin identification step for the VERITAS dataset would allow for a much larger version of it, which in turn could further enhance the classification model (LUX). If this step is achieved, a bootstrapping loop for claim veracity checking with origin identification would be complete, and both the inclusion of new entries to the data collection as well as the further training of classification model could be fully automated, having as their only bottleneck, the permanent scraping of manually fact-checked claims, which is already an

automatic process.

Another enhancement being added to this work is the output and analysis of BERT attention weights (Vaswani et al., 2017) for both explainability and interpretability of the model. (Yin et al., 2016; Rush et al., 2015)

Increasing the size of the VERITAS dataset could also be achieved by leveraging the work done by (Hanselowski et al., 2019) and identifying as the origins of a claim, the website containing the snippets annotated as ‘supportive’ of the claim. This task is currently ongoing.

## Acknowledgments

This work was supported by the Insight SFI Research Centre for Data Analytics (grant No 12/RC/2289\_P2).

## References

- Lucas Azevedo. 2018. Truth or lie: Automatically fact checking news. In *Companion of the The Web Conference 2018 on The Web Conference 2018*, pages 807–811. International World Wide Web Conferences Steering Committee.
- Lucas Azevedo and Mohamed Moustafa. 2019. Veritas annotator: Discovering the origin of a rumour. In *Proceedings of the Second Workshop on Fact Extraction and VERification (FEVER)*. Association for Computational Linguistics (ACL).
- Raju Balakrishnan and Subbarao Kambhampati. 2011. [Sourcerank: Relevance and trust assessment for deep web sources based on inter-source agreement](#). In *Proceedings of the 20th International Conference on World Wide Web, WWW ’11*, pages 227–236, New York, NY, USA. ACM.
- Prakhar Biyani, Kostas Tsioutsoulouklis, and John Blackmer. 2016. ” 8 amazing secrets for getting more clicks”: Detecting clickbaits in news streams using article informality. In *Thirtieth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- Carl-Hugo Björnsson. 1968. *Läsbarhet: Lesbarkeit durch Lix.(Aus dem Schwedischen)*. Liber.
- Peter F Brown, Vincent J Della Pietra, Peter V Desouza, Jennifer C Lai, and Robert L Mercer. 1992. Class-based n-gram models of natural language. *Computational linguistics*, 18(4):467–480.
- Meri Coleman and Ta Lin Liao. 1975. A computer readability formula designed for machine scoring. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60(2):283.
- Niall J Conroy, Victoria L Rubin, and Yimin Chen. 2015. Automatic deception detection: Methods for finding fake news. *Proceedings of the Association for Information Science and Technology*, 52(1):1–4.

- Mathieu d'Aquin, Dominik Kowald, Angela Fessel, Elisabeth Lex, and Stefan Thalmann. 2018. Afel-analytics for everyday learning. In *Companion Proceedings of the The Web Conference 2018*, pages 439–440.
- Lingjia Deng and Janyce Wiebe. 2015. Mpqa 3.0: An entity/event-level sentiment corpus. In *Proceedings of the 2015 conference of the North American chapter of the association for computational linguistics: human language technologies*, pages 1323–1328.
- Leon Derczynski and Kalina Bontcheva. 2014. PHEME: Veracity in digital social networks. In *UMAP workshops*.
- Jacob Devlin, Ming-Wei Chang, Kenton Lee, and Kristina Toutanova. 2018. Bert: Pre-training of deep bidirectional transformers for language understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04805*.
- William Ferreira and Andreas Vlachos. 2016. Emergent: a novel data-set for stance classification. In *Proceedings of the 2016 conference of the North American chapter of the association for computational linguistics: Human language technologies*, pages 1163–1168.
- Christie M Fuller, David P Biro, and Rick L Wilson. 2009. Decision support for determining veracity via linguistic-based cues. *Decision Support Systems*, 46(3):695–703.
- Arthur C Graesser, Danielle S McNamara, Zhiqiang Cai, Mark Conley, Haiying Li, and James Pennebaker. 2014. Coh-matrix measures text characteristics at multiple levels of language and discourse. *The Elementary School Journal*, 115(2):210–229.
- Andreas Hanselowski, Christian Stab, Claudia Schulz, Zile Li, and Iryna Gurevych. 2019. A richly annotated corpus for different tasks in automated fact-checking. In *Proceedings of the 22nd Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning (CoNLL2019)*.
- Naeemul Hassan, Bill Adair, James T Hamilton, Chengkai Li, Mark Tremayne, Jun Yang, and Cong Yu. 2015. The quest to automate fact-checking. *world*.
- Francis Heylighen and Jean-Marc Dewaele. 1999. Formality of language: definition, measurement and behavioral determinants. *Interne Bericht, Center "Leo Apostel", Vrije Universiteit Brussel*, 4.
- Sepp Hochreiter and Jürgen Schmidhuber. 1997. Long short-term memory. *Neural computation*, 9(8):1735–1780.
- Benjamin D Horne and Sibel Adali. 2017. This just in: Fake news packs a lot in title, uses simpler, repetitive content in text body, more similar to satire than real news. In *Eleventh International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*.
- Benjamin D Horne, Sara Khedr, and Sibel Adali. 2018. Sampling the news producers: A large news and feature data set for the study of the complex media landscape. In *Twelfth International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*.
- Clayton J Hutto and Eric Gilbert. 2014. Vader: A parsimonious rule-based model for sentiment analysis of social media text. In *Eighth international AAAI conference on weblogs and social media*.
- Sonnet Ireland. 2018. Fake news alerts: Teaching news literacy skills in a meme world. *The Reference Librarian*, 59(3):122–128.
- Scott Jarvis. 2013. Capturing the diversity in lexical diversity. *Language Learning*, 63:87–106.
- Anoop K, Manjary Gangan, Deepak P, and Lajish V L. 2019. *Leveraging Heterogeneous Data for Fake News Detection*, pages 229–264.
- J Peter Kincaid, Robert P Fishburne Jr, Richard L Rogers, and Brad S Chissom. 1975. Derivation of new readability formulas (automated readability index, fog count and flesch reading ease formula) for navy enlisted personnel. Technical report, Naval Technical Training Command Millington TN Research Branch.
- Diederik P Kingma and Jimmy Ba. 2014. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.6980*.
- Wei-Jen Ko, Greg Durrett, and Junyi Jessy Li. 2019. Domain agnostic real-valued specificity prediction. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, volume 33, pages 6610–6617.
- Caroline W Lee. 2010. The roots of astroturfing. *Contexts*, 9(1):73–75.
- Junyi Jessy Li and Ani Nenkova. 2015. Fast and accurate prediction of sentence specificity. In *Twenty-Ninth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
- Tim Loughran and Bill McDonald. 2011. When is a liability not a liability? textual analysis, dictionaries, and 10-ks. *The Journal of finance*, 66(1):35–65.
- Annie Louis and Ani Nenkova. 2011. *Automatic identification of general and specific sentences by leveraging discourse annotations*. In *Proceedings of 5th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing*, pages 605–613, Chiang Mai, Thailand. Asian Federation of Natural Language Processing.
- Philip M McCarthy. 2005. *An assessment of the range and usefulness of lexical diversity measures and the potential of the measure of textual, lexical diversity (MTLD)*. Ph.D. thesis, The University of Memphis.
- Philip M McCarthy and Scott Jarvis. 2007. vocd: A theoretical and empirical evaluation. *Language Testing*, 24(4):459–488.

- Albert Mehrabian and Morton Wiener. 1966. Non-immediacy between communicator and object of communication in a verbal message: application to the inference of attitudes. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 30(5):420.
- Tomas Mikolov, Kai Chen, Greg Corrado, and Jeffrey Dean. 2013. [Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space](#).
- Tanushree Mitra and Eric Gilbert. 2015. Credbank: A large-scale social media corpus with associated credibility annotations. In *Ninth International AAAI Conference on Web and Social Media*.
- Ndapandula Nakashole and Tom M Mitchell. 2014. Language-aware truth assessment of fact candidates. In *ACL (1)*, pages 1009–1019.
- Bo Pang and Lillian Lee. 2008. Opinion mining and sentiment analysis. *Foundations and trends in information retrieval*, 2(1-2):1–135.
- Ellie Pavlick and Joel Tetreault. 2016. An empirical analysis of formality in online communication. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 4:61–74.
- Kashyap Popat, Subhabrata Mukherjee, Jannik Strötgen, and Gerhard Weikum. 2017. Where the truth lies: Explaining the credibility of emerging claims on the web and social media. In *Proceedings of the 26th International Conference on World Wide Web Companion*, pages 1003–1012. International World Wide Web Conferences Steering Committee.
- Martin Potthast, Johannes Kiesel, Kevin Reinartz, Janek Bevendorff, and Benno Stein. 2018. [A stylistic inquiry into hyperpartisan and fake news](#). In *Proceedings of the 56th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics (Volume 1: Long Papers)*, pages 231–240, Melbourne, Australia. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Rashmi Prasad, Nikhil Dinesh, Alan Lee, Eleni Miltasakaki, Livio Robaldo, Aravind K Joshi, and Bonnie L Webber. 2008. The penn discourse treebank 2.0. In *LREC*. Citeseer.
- Uwe D Reichel and Piroska Lendvai. 2016. Veracity computing from lexical cues and perceived certainty trends. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1611.02590*.
- Ellen Riloff, Janyce Wiebe, and Theresa Wilson. 2003. [Learning subjective nouns using extraction pattern bootstrapping](#). In *Proceedings of the Seventh Conference on Natural Language Learning at HLT-NAACL 2003*, pages 25–32.
- Victoria L Rubin, Elizabeth D Liddy, and Noriko Kando. 2006. Certainty identification in texts: Categorization model and manual tagging results. In *Computing attitude and affect in text: Theory and applications*, pages 61–76. Springer.
- Alexander M Rush, Sumit Chopra, and Jason Weston. 2015. A neural attention model for abstractive sentence summarization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1509.00685*.
- Mike Schuster and Kuldip K Paliwal. 1997. Bidirectional recurrent neural networks. *IEEE transactions on Signal Processing*, 45(11):2673–2681.
- Chengcheng Shao, Giovanni Luca Ciampaglia, Alessandro Flammini, and Filippo Menczer. 2016. Hoaxy: A platform for tracking online misinformation. In *Proceedings of the 25th international conference companion on world wide web*, pages 745–750.
- Philip J Stone, Robert F Bales, J Zvi Namenwirth, and Daniel M Ogilvie. 1962. The general inquirer: A computer system for content analysis and retrieval based on the sentence as a unit of information. *Behavioral Science*, 7(4):484.
- György Szarvas, Veronika Vincze, Richárd Farkas, György Móra, and Iryna Gurevych. 2012. Cross-genre and cross-domain detection of semantic uncertainty. *Computational Linguistics*, 38(2):335–367.
- James Thorne, Andreas Vlachos, Christos Christodoulopoulos, and Arpit Mittal. 2018. [FEVER: a large-scale dataset for fact extraction and VERification](#). In *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Human Language Technologies, Volume 1 (Long Papers)*, pages 809–819, New Orleans, Louisiana. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Joseph Turian, Lev Ratinov, and Yoshua Bengio. 2010. Word representations: a simple and general method for semi-supervised learning. In *Proceedings of the 48th annual meeting of the association for computational linguistics*, pages 384–394.
- Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. 2017. Attention is all you need. In *Advances in neural information processing systems*, pages 5998–6008.
- Rémi Venant and Mathieu d’Aquin. 2019. Towards the prediction of semantic complexity based on concept graphs. In *12th International Conference on Educational Data Mining (EDM 2019)*, pages 188–197.
- Veronika Vincze. 2015. *Uncertainty detection in natural language texts*. Ph.D. thesis, szte.
- Veronika Vincze, György Szarvas, Richárd Farkas, György Móra, and János Csirik. 2008. The bioscope corpus: biomedical texts annotated for uncertainty, negation and their scopes. *BMC bioinformatics*, 9(11):1–9.
- William Yang Wang. 2017. ”liar, liar pants on fire”: A new benchmark dataset for fake news detection. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1705.00648*.



- Cynthia Whissell. 2004. Using computer-scored measures of emotion and style to discriminate among disputed and undisputed pauline and non-pauline epistles. *Perceptual and motor skills*, 98(3-suppl):1117–1125.
- Michael Wilson. 1988. Mrc psycholinguistic database: Machine-usable dictionary, version 2.00. *Behavior research methods, instruments, & computers*, 20(1):6–10.
- Theresa Wilson, Paul Hoffmann, Swapna Somasundaran, Jason Kessler, Janyce Wiebe, Yejin Choi, Claire Cardie, Ellen Riloff, and Siddharth Patwardhan. 2005. Opinionfinder: A system for subjectivity analysis. In *Proceedings of HLT/EMNLP 2005 Interactive Demonstrations*, pages 34–35.
- You Wu, Pankaj K Agarwal, Chengkai Li, Jun Yang, and Cong Yu. 2014. Toward computational fact-checking. *Proceedings of the VLDB Endowment*, 7(7):589–600.
- Wenpeng Yin, Hinrich Schütze, Bing Xiang, and Bowen Zhou. 2016. Abcnn: Attention-based convolutional neural network for modeling sentence pairs. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 4:259–272.
- Hong Yu and Vasileios Hatzivassiloglou. 2003a. Towards answering opinion questions: Separating facts from opinions and identifying the polarity of opinion sentences. In *Proceedings of the 2003 conference on Empirical methods in natural language processing*, pages 129–136. Association for Computational Linguistics.
- Hong Yu and Vasileios Hatzivassiloglou. 2003b. [Towards answering opinion questions: Separating facts from opinions and identifying the polarity of opinion sentences](#). In *Proceedings of the 2003 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 129–136.
- Lina Zhou, Judee K Burgoon, Jay F Nunamaker, and Doug Twitchell. 2004. Automating linguistics-based cues for detecting deception in text-based asynchronous computer-mediated communications. *Group decision and negotiation*, 13(1):81–106.

## 6 Appendix

### 6.1 Description of VERITAS fields

**Fact-Checking Article URL** The article where the fact-checker journalist analyses the claim, its source(s), characteristics, possible counter arguments, etc.

**Checked Claim** The main affirmation being verified in the article.

**Claim Label** The verdict, along with the source document of a fact candidate compose the input/outcome pairs of the dataset to be used in our classification model. In other applications or tasks it might not even be necessary.

We assign the gold-standard status to this annotation, given that each one of those checked documents was manually investigated by one or more fact-checking journalists, before coming to a verdict regarding its veracity, and thus, are as trustworthy as the journalists and correspondent fact-checking agencies themselves.

Different FCAs use different labels, e.g. ‘mostly-true’, ‘mixture’, ‘unproven’, etc. consequently there is a need for normalization or removal of the ones that cannot be directly mapped into “true” nor “false”.

**Tags** The set of tags used by the journalist that wrote the fact-checking article. These are mainly used for navigation within the website but could be used for clustering of the dataset and retrieval of other claims regarding the same topic.

**FCA Date** The date the claim was checked by one of the fact-checking agencies.

**Origin URL** The URL of the web document that originated the claim, i.e. its origin. Here, origin is defined as a source that directly supports the claim.

Note that an origin does not have to be the very first article that stated the claim and that there could be multiple origins for a single claim.

**Origin Domain** The origin URL domain. This can have great impacts in results of a neural network classifier’s accuracy, or even in the weighting of a simpler classifier method. Examples of using the URL domain as a feature

for it’s content veracity are not new. (Nakashole and Mitchell, 2014; Balakrishnan and Kambhampati, 2011)

**Origin Body** The whole text extracted from the origin URL. Which method is used to obtain the Origin Body is the main difference across the versions, as discussed above.

**Origin Title** The title of the origin page. This is another possibly useful feature for related tasks or extra features for our classifier. (Popat et al., 2017)

Since the title and the checked claim have similar lengths, using this attribute instead of the whole origin text would have probably yielded better results on the stance classification ranking.

**Origin Summary** Besides being faster than the previously used crawling methods, the current version of the crawler<sup>5</sup> also generates a summary of the origin. This could be a valuable piece of information but would demand checking whether it is a valid depiction of the content of the origin.

**Origin Keywords** Similar to the Tags of the fact-checking article with the difference that these are obtained by the great article curator newspaper3k<sup>20</sup>. This could also be used as a feature for the Origin Identification Classifier (see on Future Work section).

**Origin Date** The date at which the origin article was published.

**Origin Author** The author of the origin article.

---

<sup>20</sup><https://newspaper.readthedocs.io/en/latest/>

## 6.2 LUX’s full ablation table

Table 4: Ablation Results (Ordered from most Positive Features to most Negative Features)

Feat.Idx	Feature	Avg. Acc	$\approx$ Removal Impact
55	‘CD’	0.8237	-0.01862
74	‘RBR’	0.82304	-0.01796
71	‘PRP’	0.81973	-0.01465
52	‘.’	0.81775	-0.01267
2	Coleman-Liau	0.81709	-0.01201
18	assortativity	0.81576	-0.01068
24	nbLinkInMean	0.81576	-0.01068
41	Measure of lexical textual diversity (MTLD)	0.81576	-0.01068
94	Speciteller scores	0.81576	-0.01068
29	densityDBPedia	0.8151	-0.01002
16	radius	0.81444	-0.00936
43	MTLD (moving average, bi-directional)	0.81444	-0.00936
34	Simple TTR	0.81378	-0.0087
40	Hypergeometric distribution D (HDD)	0.81378	-0.0087
76	‘RP’	0.81378	-0.0087
15	nbNodes	0.81246	-0.00738
26	nbLinkOutMean	0.81246	-0.00738
6	SMOGIndex	0.8118	-0.00672
50	‘)’	0.8118	-0.00672
70	‘POS’	0.8118	-0.00672
82	‘VBG’	0.81113	-0.00605
7	RIX	0.81047	-0.00539
64	‘MD’	0.81047	-0.00539
77	‘SYM’	0.81047	-0.00539
68	‘NNS’	0.80981	-0.00473
85	‘VBZ’	0.80981	-0.00473
27	nbLinkOutStd	0.80915	-0.00407
32	nbNodes-yago	0.80915	-0.00407
46	‘#’	0.80849	-0.00341
59	‘IN’	0.80849	-0.00341
62	‘JJS’	0.80849	-0.00341

*Continued on next page*

Table 4 – Continued from previous page

<b>Feat.Idx</b>	<b>Feature</b>	<b>Avg. Acc</b>	<b>≈Removal Impact</b>
93	Sum TextBlob’s Subjectivity score over sentences	0.80849	-0.00341
87	‘WP’	0.80783	-0.00275
1	ARI	0.80717	-0.00209
28	nbNodes-DBPedia	0.80717	-0.00209
51	‘,’	0.80717	-0.00209
35	Root TTR	0.8065	-0.00143
39	Moving average TTR (MATTR)	0.8065	-0.00143
53	‘.’	0.8065	-0.00143
86	‘WDT’	0.8065	-0.00143
12	nbUniqueConcepts	0.80584	-0.00076
13	conceptsWordsRatio	0.80584	-0.00076
38	Mean segmental TTR (MSTTR)	0.80584	-0.00076
45	#tokens	0.80584	-0.00076
63	‘LS’	0.80584	-0.00076
65	‘NN’	0.80584	-0.00076
66	‘NNP’	0.80584	-0.00076
84	‘VBP’	0.80584	-0.00076
36	Log TTR	0.80518	-0.0001
72	‘PRP\$’	0.80452	0.00056
0	Kincaid	0.80386	0.00122
57	‘EX’	0.80386	0.00122
79	‘UH’	0.80386	0.00122
80	‘VB’	0.80386	0.00122
91	Sum TextBlob’s Polarity score over sentences	0.80386	0.00122
58	‘FW’	0.8032	0.00188
95	Count of ‘.’-tag tokens	0.8032	0.00188
22	nbTypesMean	0.80254	0.00254
31	density-Schema	0.80254	0.00254
54	‘CC’	0.80254	0.00254
78	‘TO’	0.80254	0.00254
19	density	0.80187	0.0032
47	‘\$’	0.80187	0.0032
60	‘JJ’	0.80187	0.0032
21	textDensityStd	0.80121	0.00387

*Continued on next page*



Table 4 – *Continued from previous page*

<b>Feat.Idx</b>	<b>Feature</b>	<b>Avg. Acc</b>	<b>≈Removal Impact</b>
30	nbNodes-Schema	0.80121	0.00387
37	Mass TTR	0.80121	0.00387
44	#terms	0.80121	0.00387
61	‘JJR’	0.80121	0.00387
67	‘NNPS’	0.80121	0.00387
90	“““	0.80121	0.00387
9	nbNodesKB	0.80055	0.00453
10	nbWord	0.80055	0.00453
48	””””	0.80055	0.00453
49	‘(’	0.80055	0.00453
56	‘DT’	0.80055	0.00453
75	‘RBS’	0.79989	0.00519
92	Sum VADER’s Polarity score over sentences	0.79989	0.00519
4	GunningFogIndex	0.79923	0.00585
5	LIX	0.79791	0.00717
33	density-yago	0.79725	0.00783
42	Measure of lexical textual diversity (moving average, wrap)	0.79725	0.00783
88	‘WP\$’	0.79725	0.00783
73	‘RB’	0.79658	0.0085
14	uniqueConceptsWordsRatio	0.79592	0.00916
83	‘VBN’	0.79592	0.00916
25	nbLinkInStd	0.79526	0.00982
3	FleschReadingEase	0.7946	0.01048
89	‘WRB’	0.7946	0.01048
8	DaleChallIndex	0.79328	0.0118
11	nbConcepts	0.79328	0.0118
69	‘PDT’	0.79129	0.01379
20	textDensityMean	0.78997	0.01511
81	‘VBD’	0.78997	0.01511
23	nbTypesStd	0.78931	0.01577
17	diameter	0.78865	0.01643