

# “Why do you cite?” An investigation on Citation Intents and Decision-Making Classification Processes

Lorenzo Paolini – [Lorenzo.paolini11@unibo.it](mailto:Lorenzo.paolini11@unibo.it) - <https://orcid.org/0009-0003-3803-4011>  
Department of Classical Philology and Italian Studies, University of Bologna, Bologna, Italy

Sahar Vahdati - [sahar.vahdati@tu-dresden.de](mailto:sahar.vahdati@tu-dresden.de) - <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7171-169X>  
Nature-inspired machine intelligence group, SCaDS.AI center, Technical University of Dresden, Germany  
Institute for Applied Computer Science, InfAI - Dresden, Germany

Angelo Di Iorio – [angelo.diorio@unibo.it](mailto:angelo.diorio@unibo.it) – <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6893-7452>  
Department of Computer Science and Engineering, University of Bologna, Bologna, Italy

Robert Wardenga – [wardenga@infai.org](mailto:wardenga@infai.org) - <https://orcid.org/0009-0004-3317-6122>  
Institute for Applied Computer Science, InfAI - Dresden, Germany

Ivan Heibi – [ivan.heibi2@unibo.it](mailto:ivan.heibi2@unibo.it) – <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5366-5194>  
Research Centre for Open Scholarly Metadata, Department of Classical Philology and Italian Studies, University of Bologna, Bologna, Italy  
Digital Humanities Advanced Research Centre (/DH.arc), Department of Classical Philology and Italian Studies, University of Bologna, Bologna, Italy

Silvio Peroni – [silvio.peroni@unibo.it](mailto:silvio.peroni@unibo.it) – <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0530-4305>  
Research Centre for Open Scholarly Metadata, Department of Classical Philology and Italian Studies, University of Bologna, Bologna, Italy  
Digital Humanities Advanced Research Centre (/DH.arc), Department of Classical Philology and Italian Studies, University of Bologna, Bologna, Italy

## Abstract

Identifying the reason for which an author cites another work is essential to understand the nature of scientific contributions and to assess their impact. Citations are one of the pillars of scholarly communication and most metrics employed to analyze these conceptual links are based on quantitative observations. Behind the act of referencing another scholarly work there is a whole world of meanings and needs that needs to be proficiently and effectively revealed. This study emphasizes the importance of trustfully classifying citation intents to provide more comprehensive and insightful analyses in research assessment. We address this task by presenting a study utilizing advanced Ensemble Strategies for Citation Intent Classification (CIC) incorporating Language Models (LMs) and employing Explainable AI (XAI) techniques to enhance the interpretability and trustworthiness of models' predictions. Our approach involves two ensemble classifiers that utilize fine-tuned SciBERT and XLNet models as baselines. We further demonstrate the critical role of section titles as a feature in improving models' performances. The study also introduces a web application developed with Flask and currently available at <http://137.204.64.4:81/cic/classifier>, aimed at classifying citation intents.

One of our models sets as a new state-of-the-art (SOTA) with an 89.46% Macro-F1 score on the SciCite benchmark. The integration of SHAP and LIME for explainability provides insights into the decision-making processes, highlighting the contributions of individual words for the binary predictions produced by the base models of the ensemble, and highlighting the role that base models have in the final classification of a sentence, performed by a meta-classifier head. The findings suggest that the inclusion of section titles significantly enhances classification performances in the CIC task. Our contributions provide useful insights for developing more robust datasets and methodologies, thus fostering a deeper understanding of scholarly communication.

**Keywords:** Language Models, Ensemble Strategies, Explainable AI, Citation Intent Classification

# 1. Introduction

Assessing research is crucial in scholarly communication as it ensures the quality, relevance, and impact of scientific contributions, fostering an environment of accountability and continuous improvement. By evaluating research, scholars and institutions can identify significant advancements, recognize influential work, and allocate resources effectively to areas with the highest potential for innovation and societal benefit. Moreover, it supports the Open Science movement by promoting transparency, collaboration, and accessibility in research. Specifically, the application of citation analysis and bibliometrics as tools for evaluating research, and consequently for allocating research funding, occupies a central position in this process (Pride, 2022).

Many researchers have criticized the use of bibliometrics in research assessment, in particular shedding light on the paradoxical nature hidden behind the abuse of metrics involving citation counts as a proxy for research assessment. Pride (2022) states that there are no sufficient evidences to demonstrate a connection between research quality and citation rates, while Wallin (2005) accounts for the widespread use of the *Journal Impact Factor (JIF)* and of the *h-index* - two bibliometrics strongly relying on citation counts - as research quality proxies. Such citation-count-based metrics are used to evaluate researchers, publications, and journals (Li & Ho, 2008), staying unclear on the meaningful differentiation behind the types of citations. Indeed, some citations may indicate the reuse of a methodology while some others may merely serve as an acknowledgment of a prior work (Cohan et al., 2019). It is thus clear that differentiating the nature of citations is instrumental in providing more comprehensive and meaningful analyses in research assessment related fields (Small, 2018), and developing tools capable of retrieving influential papers, beyond citation counts, is fundamentally important also to promote more conscious research (Ritchie, 2008). Other possibilities within the field are related to the development of applications for enhanced information retrieval (Moravcsik & Murugesan, 1975; Pride, 2022), document summarization (Cohan & Goharian, 2015), and finally citations occupy a central role also in studies related to the evolution of scientific fields (Jurgens et al., 2018) where they are employed to construct citation networks and to frame different periods.




Figure 1. Example of an entity (citing paper) with two different in-text citations, each referring to distinct entities (cited papers) for different intents: Background and Method.

Recognizing the importance to meaningfully classify citation intents to advance scholarly communication also highlights the need for automated methods to accomplish this. Such a task is known in literature as *Citation Intent Classification (CIC)*, represented in Figure 1. As highlighted by Pride (2022), “the sheer volume of new research now being produced on an annual basis is far beyond the capacity of a single researcher to investigate even the narrowest of domains without effective search tools”, this huge amount of new research and consequent citations being produced makes manual classification extremely time consuming and difficult. Instead, automated systems

can process large datasets efficiently, providing useful insights into citation behaviors and helping in the discovery of patterns and trends that may be overlooked through manual analyses. In this context, Artificial Intelligence (AI) based solutions become pivotal, and explainable AI (XAI) emerges as a vital component.

XAI refers to methods and techniques that make the outputs of machine learning models, often considered black boxes (Ribeiro et al., 2016), understandable to humans. In citation intent classification, where the rationale behind the decision-making process of classifiers must be clear to ensure trust and reliability, both the models performing the classification task and their classification outcomes must be transparent and understandable. In this context, XAI emerges as a key tool to help explain the classification process. Additionally, providing detailed explanations of how the decision-making process for classification works within these models enables a better understanding of the research outcomes, which go hand in hand with the open science push for reproducible and trustworthy research artifacts. Indeed, with XAI researchers and evaluators can gain relevant insights into the working dynamics of automated systems, ensuring that the classifications are not only accurate but most important, also interpretable, understandable, and justifiable. This could potentially enhance the credibility of automated citation analysis tools and foster greater trust and acceptance of these technologies, finally leading to a higher integration of them for downstream applications and tasks, as it has been observed in other domains (Leichtmann et al., 2023; Trindade Neves et al., 2024).

Based on these observed needs and possibilities, in this work we address the task of Citation Intent Classification (CIC) by employing Language Models (LMs) and Ensemble Strategies. We also perform explainability-based studies to unveil the decision-making process of our models' predictions. To this end, we propose two ensemble classifiers for the SciCite dataset (Cohan et al., 2019). The reason behind the development of two models is that we argue and demonstrate the critical role that the titles of the sections in which the citations are contained have by adding them to the sentences used in the first ensemble and removing them to train the second. Both the ensembles make use of Binary Fine-Tuned LMs as baselines for predictions, trained with a granularly evaluated loop to overcome the overfitting problem that usually arise when dealing with LMs fine-tuning. Additionally, we incorporate mixed-precision training strategies to reduce both the computational resources used and the training time, also addressing the computational instability of this technique. The predicted binary probabilities are then stacked and fed to a Deep Learning-based Metaclassifier head aimed at providing the final classification output from them.

Our contributions can be outlined as follow: (i) we propose two ensemble-based models making use of Language Models for citation intent classification to incorporate into (ii) a web-based application for automatic extraction and classification of citation intents from PDF files, which (iii) maps the resulting labels to standardized object properties to enhance reusability; (iv) we achieve a new state-of-the-art of 89.46% Macro-F1 on the SciCite benchmark; and (v) we demonstrate the fundamental role that the structural position of citations within a research work have.

## 2. Preliminaries

Within the field of Citation Intent Classification (CIC), significant advancements and developments have recently been produced, mainly thanks to an increasing spectrum of available methodologies and theoretical frameworks. This section will present the theoretical ground-base to proficiently understand our work. It will start with a discussion on Citation Intent Classification schemas, to then provide an overview on the datasets available for the task. Following this, the section will briefly present historical approaches to the task, together with the main technological innovations that advanced the field. Finally, it will give a bird-eye view on the methodologies employed in this study. The section will briefly describe the Language Models employed for this research work, to then move on into more technical descriptions of the adopted methodologies and strategies in the following part. Next, we will present and discuss the results obtained, together with an explanation of what is presented, and with a discussion about possible improvements, but also challenges and limitations of the study. Next, the web-based application will be described in both its backend and frontend components. We will finally provide some conclusive remarks on the entire research work.

### 2.1. A feasible Citation Intent Classification Schema

It is extremely important to give enough consideration to the selection of a classification schema. In particular, practitioners should be aware that the chosen labels, as well as the number of classes they decide to include for this specific task, have a fundamental role in both the overall utility and impact of a dataset (Pride, 2022) and in the results that can be obtained by means of automated methods. This is particularly true when it comes to the application of more advanced methodologies such as Language Models (LMs). LMs are extremely adaptable and capable of extracting and understanding the context of portions of text - or sentences -, thus mapping to a meaningful and well-defined citation schema will for sure help the model in categorizing results in a more accurate manner.

This discourse traces its roots back to the seminal work “*Can Citation Indexing Be Automated?*”, by Garfield (1964). In this study, the author identifies 15 reasons for which an author may decide to cite another work, laying the foundations for further research in this domain. Following this foundational contribution many researchers have worked around the definition of a meaningful and accurate citation classification scheme (Kunnath et al., 2021), enriching the understanding and application of such methodologies in scholarly research.

#### 2.1.1. Classification Schema - Some Applications

Obtaining a good citation classification schema for annotating citations according to their purpose - or function - is extremely important for many possible applications. Among them, as stated also in the introduction of this work, citation analysis for research evaluation is a key operationalization of this kind of research (Jochim & Schutze, 2012; Pride, 2022). This emphasis on a robust citation classification schema is rooted in the diverse functions that citations serve in scholarly communication. These functions include, but are not limited to, acknowledging the source of ideas, evidencing arguments, illustrating methodological similarities, and connecting related academic discussions. A well-designed schema can capture these nuances, enabling more accurate analysis and interpretation of citation contexts.

The importance of such a schema extends to numerous areas beyond research evaluation. To provide an example, in the realm of academic writing and literature reviews, understanding the intent behind citations can clarify how each referenced work enriches the academic discourse, providing a more conscious way to engage with it. This insight is particularly relevant in bibliometrics, where a well-defined classification can refine the precision of impact assessments and trend analyses, offering a deeper perspective on the influence and evolution of research,

and providing for instruments possibly useful to develop alternative and more *grounded* measures. An illustrative example of this application is the study conducted by Jurgens and colleagues (2018) in “*Measuring the Evolution of a Scientific Field through Citation Frames*”, where the authors analyzed how scientific works frame their contributions through various types of citations, and the impact of this framing on the development of the field as a whole.

Overall, the creation of a detailed schema goes beyond technical accomplishment. It represents a core element in the advancement of scholarly communication, bridging the gap between quantitative citation metrics and qualitative academic impact. Such schema plays a pivotal role in shaping future research methodologies and analysis approaches in both scholarly and educational settings, but also in the more general field of research assessment. This strategic development is central in refining the understanding of academic influence in diverse domains (Pride, 2022).

Furthermore, developing a description logic schema compatible with web semantic technologies, can unlock the potential to treat bibliographic references, citations, and even rhetorical elements within scientific publications as semantic metadata. This would enable better organization, search, and integration for web-based scientific portals (Ciccarese et al., 2014). Building a shared language for scientific discourse using these schemas transforms bibliographic references, citations, and even rhetorical elements within papers into a rich layer of semantic data. This data becomes an interconnected web, allowing researchers to explore not just by keywords, but by relations.

A leading citation classification model is the *Citation Typing Ontology (CiTO)*, an OWL ontology specifically designed to capture both the factual and rhetorical purposes of citations in scholarly works (Peroni & Shotton, 2012). CiTO offers a rich vocabulary of 41 properties, enabling precise annotation of citation semantics. While CiTO allows for detailed characterization of citations (instances of the 'citation' class), this work focuses on three key citation reasons, represented by object properties associated with citation objects, to indicate whether the citing entity is: (1) using a method presented in the cited entity, (2) obtaining background information from the cited entity, or (3) using conclusions presented in the cited entity.

## 2.2. Datasets for Citation Intent Classification

A key aspect in developing an effective citation classification schema involves, as a sub-process, the development of a reliable, robust and comprehensive dataset. Most of the datasets designed for classifying citation contexts use their own specific and newly developed schema, thus making the integration of different datasets way more complicated. Such development of different and multifaceted citation schemes is indeed a good practice, mainly because it pushes for an advancement in the field, but the problem arises when looking at the composition of such datasets.

Undoubtedly, providing for the possibility to extend the various contributions could be important, primarily because this field faces a significant challenge due to the lack of extensive, highly curated, and diverse datasets (Cohan et al., 2019). This is mainly due to the resource-intensive work required to manually annotate them (Pride, 2022), and to the need of many different experts in many different fields capable - ideally trained - to fulfill this need. Manual annotation is crucial to obtain a reliable starting point for developing accurate classifiers, and before this, it is way more crucial in developing reliable and useful datasets. Currently, despite the diversity of approaches and theoretical models explored in citation intent research, there exists a limited number of manually annotated datasets. These available datasets are inadequate to serve as a definitive Gold Standard for the field.

The first dataset developed and widely used for the CIC task is ACL-ARC (Jurgens et al., 2018), which represents the first real useful contribution to the understanding of the facets of citation contexts within the specialized field

of Natural Language Processing (NLP) and Computational Linguistics. This dataset provides a rich, though monodisciplinary, ground for examining citation intents. Indeed, it contains nearly 2000 manually annotated citation contexts, and the authors employed a six-labels schema to categorize the intents - or functions - of citations. Even though the ACL-ARC dataset benefits from manual annotation by experts, it is very limited in both the number of citations it contains, and in the limited disciplinary focus, further constraining its comprehensiveness. These limitations result in a dataset that is less than ideal, providing for classifiers which are likely domain-specific, as well as mostly unable to generalize to new citation contexts for the underrepresented classes, reflecting thus the limitations and the narrow scope of the dataset.

Subsequently, the development of *SciCite* by Cohan and colleagues (2019) marks a significant advancement in the field of Citation Intent Classification (CIC). Unlike the more narrowly focused ACL-ARC Dataset, SciCite covers a wider spectrum of academic disciplines, incorporating citations extracted from both computer science and medicine related domains. This expansion into multiple domains significantly enhances the dataset's versatility and applicability, making it a more reliable and trustworthy benchmark for the CIC task. All the citations contained within the SciCite Dataset have been manually annotated, and the authors of the dataset, in contrast to the detailed six-labels schema used in the ACL-ARC Dataset, preferred a more coarse-grained approach to classification, providing a narrower and more broadly applicable outline. They supply three possible labels for nearly 11000 citation contexts, accompanied with additional metadata such as the title of the section in which the citation is contained, IDs of the publications, confidence levels, and so on.

### 2.3. Historical Approaches to Citation Intent Classification

Within the Citation Intent Classification (CIC) task, rule-based methods represent the earliest structured experiments. These strategies rely on predefined rules and heuristics developed by experts to classify citations based on specific patterns or keywords. Although somewhat rigid, this approach laid the groundwork for more dynamic classification systems by providing a structured means to process and interpret academic texts. Pioneering work by Garzone and Mercier (2000) applied automated methods to CIC for the first time, followed by Nanba and colleagues (2011), who used cue sentences to enhance citation sentence classification. However, such systems are limited by their reliance on the expertise of their creators, as they can only handle cases anticipated by the rule crafters (Kunnath et al., 2021).

Following rule-based systems, traditional machine learning (ML) techniques established the foundational groundwork for pattern recognition and predictive modeling. Teufel and colleagues (2006) advanced this field by employing the K-Nearest Neighbors (K-NN) algorithm to recognize citation functions within a twelve-label schema. Subsequent research explored various ML algorithms for text classification tasks related to citation intents. The following experimentations include *Random Forest (RF)* (Jurgens et al., 2018; Pride & Knoth, 2017; Valenzuela-Escárcega et al., 2015), *Naive Bayes (NB)* (Agarwal et al., 2010; Dong & Schafer, 2011; Sula & Miller, 2014), and *Support Vector Machines (SVM)* (Bakhti et al., 2018; Hassan et al., 2017; Pranckevičius & Marcinkevičius, 2017; Xu et al., 2013) mainly, but also other ML-based algorithms have been tested. While ML approaches offer more dynamic and flexible tools for CIC, they still require significant human expertise, particularly in manually determining the features for model training (Su et al., 2019).

Advancing further, the advent of deep learning (DL) and neural networks marked a paradigm shift in CIC, enabling models to learn intricate patterns from vast amounts of unstructured data. DL methodologies have significantly reduced the need for human expertise, addressing limitations of previous systems (Kunnath et al., 2021). However, therewith better models also larger datasets for effective training are needed. Convolutional Neural Networks (CNNs) and Recurrent Neural Networks (RNNs) have been pivotal in the CIC task, with CNNs excelling at extracting meaningful patterns from text and RNNs effectively processing sequential data. Despite their

strengths, RNNs face issues like the Vanishing and Exploding Gradient problems, limiting their ability to learn long-term dependencies (Bengio et al., 1994; Pascanu et al., 2013), and their short-term memory constrains processing long sequences (Shiri et al., 2023).

To overcome these challenges, advanced variants like Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) networks and Gated Recurrent Units (GRUs) were developed. LSTMs, introduced by Hochreiter and Schmidhuber (1997) and later improved by the generative-based intuitions of Graves (2013), enhance sequence analysis by maintaining long-term dependencies. A step ahead has been moved with Bidirectional-LSTMs (BiLSTMs), which process sequences in both directions, further improving the understanding of complex sequences (Aldhyani & Alkahtani, 2021; Cornegruta et al., 2016). Following from BiLSTMs, Gated Recurrent Units (GRUs), introduced by Cho et al. (2014), simplify the structure of recurrent cells and address the short-term memory problem. These use update and reset gates to selectively update and utilize information from previous time steps, capturing long-term dependencies in sequences (Dutta et al., 2020; Shiri et al., 2023). Although empirical evaluations show mixed results between GRUs and LSTMs (Chung et al., 2014; Dutta et al., 2020), both outperform traditional approaches in understanding long sequences, thus advancing the performances on the CIC tasks significantly, together with the plethora of available techniques.

## 2.4. Transformer and Language Models

The field of natural language processing (NLP) and artificial intelligence (AI) has undergone significant transformation with the advent of Language Models (LMs), particularly Large Language Models (LLMs). These models, rooted in deep learning and neural networks, are designed to understand, generate, and interact with human language. Shanahan (2022) defines LMs as “*generative mathematical models of the statistical distribution of tokens in the vast public corpus of human-generated text*”, encompassing words, sub-words, characters, and punctuation marks. Trained on extensive text datasets, LMs learn intricate linguistic patterns, grammar, and context, which make them proficient in processing sequential text data and in performing complex textual tasks (W. X. Zhao et al., 2023).

The transformative breakthrough in LMs was the introduction of the Transformer architecture by Vaswani et al. in their seminal paper "*Attention is All You Need*" (2017). This architecture, featuring an encoder, a decoder, and an attention mechanism, replaced the previously dominant recurrence, enabling significant parallel processing of input data. The attention mechanism, particularly self-attention, allows the model to process all input data parts simultaneously, learning relationships without positional dependence. The Transformer's encoder transforms input sequences into continuous representations, while the decoder generates output sequences auto-regressively, focusing on the encoder's output at each step. Position encoding information is added to both modules to compensate for the lack of recurrence. The Transformer's success over recurrence-based models is attributed to its enhanced understanding of long-range dependencies and reduced computational complexity and training time. Furthermore, empirical results show significant performance improvements with respect to recurrent networks (Vaswani et al., 2017).

Building on the Transformer architecture, some really advanced language models have been developed. These LMs, pre-trained on immense corpora, have demonstrated extraordinary capabilities in understanding and generating human-like text, and their proficiency in grasping the subtleties of language and context has been instrumental in advancing fields related to Natural Language Processing. The progression from traditional machine learning techniques to sophisticated LMs marks a significant step in the methodological landscape for tackling tasks such as Citation Intent Classification, enabling more detailed and accurate interpretations of the academic discourse (Beltagy et al., 2019; Lahiri et al., 2023; Mercier et al., 2021).



### 2.4.1. Citation Intent Classification: Promising LMs

Within Citation Intent Classification tasks, an array of diverse Pretrained Language Models (PLMs) can be deployed to obtain at least good outcomes. In the CIC domain, the specific linguistic content of scientific publications needs careful consideration because of the particular - and not trivial - vocabulary on which it is constructed. Academic discourse is characterized by a unique lexicon which is distinct from everyday conversational language and, in addition to a specialized terminology, it also presents a particular syntactical structure that is intrinsic to academic writing. Taking into consideration this distinction in vocabulary and sentence construction is crucial for the CIC task, as the efficacy of a LM in interpreting and classifying text is heavily influenced by its training data and therefore by its familiarity with the relevant linguistic domain.

Starting from this observation, when employing LMs to solve the Citation Intent Classification task it is particularly important to ensure that the chosen model is fine-tuned - or pre-trained - on a corpus that mirrors the specific language of the academic discourse. Such specificity in training should theoretically enable the model to understand and thus classify in a more precise way the intentions of the authors behind citations in scientific documents. The most promising language models to solve the CIC task seem to be *SciBERT* (Beltagy et al., 2019) and *XLNet* (Yang et al., 2019). The former is an encoder-only Language Model - thus particularly suited for text classification tasks - pre-trained on a set of academic research articles, which makes it a perfect fit for this task. XLNet instead has not been trained on a scientific based corpus, but it has been employed in this work because of its impressive ability in understanding language contexts, given by its innovative language modeling objective, and its dominance in current State-Of-The-Art (SOTA) methods in the CIC task on SciCite.

SciBERT emerges in the domain of language models (LMs) mainly because it is tailored specifically for processing and understanding scientific text. This model is a derivative of the well-known BERT (*Bidirectional Encoder Representations from Transformers*) model (Devlin et al., 2019), and it basically inherits the foundational architecture and training process from it, but diverges significantly in its training regime and intended applications. The fundamental distinctiveness of SciBERT lies in its specialized vocabulary, SCIVOCAB, as named by Beltagy and colleagues (2019). Indeed, differently from BERT, which is trained on a general corpus, SciBERT is trained on a large corpus of scientific literature. This corpus encompasses a wide range of scientific fields, providing SciBERT with an extensive and specific vocabulary, as well as with an enhanced ability to comprehend the structure and syntax of scientific language, both these elements are useful for a better understanding of the academic discourse with respect to a more general model. This specific training allows SciBERT to perform well on texts presenting scientific terminology and concepts, a domain in which general language models usually present lower performances. SciBERT has been used in the field of Citation Intent Classification, mainly from Cohan and colleagues (2019), and in a newly developed prompt-based framework (Lahiri et al., 2023), which makes use of the *OpenPrompt* library (Ding et al., 2022), SciBERT, and a verbalizer specifically developed for the task. Both experiments based on this model yield basically the same interesting results.

XLNet instead represents a significant innovation in the field of LMs, its training offers a new approach to natural language processing. As an extension and refinement of transformer-based models, XLNet addresses certain limitations of its predecessors, like BERT, while bringing a new perspective to language modeling. This model is distinguished by its unique training strategy, which combines some of the main aspects of both Autoregressive (AR) and Autoencoding (AE) models. With the AR pre-training objective, a model tries to estimate the probability distribution of a text corpus (Yang et al., 2019), starting from the assumption for which the next token in a sequence is directly dependent from the previous tokens. Thus, AR models, tries to learn statistical patterns within the training sentences, aiming at maximizing the probability of the subsequent word by computing the density estimation of the sequence. A major drawback is that the model, given a text sequence  $X = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ , factorizes the likelihood into either a *forward product* (Eq. 1a) or a *backward product* (Eq. 1b) (Peters et al., 2018), thus it

is only trained to encode contexts in a unidirectional way. This limitation is particularly relevant when it comes to tasks that need a deep bidirectional context understanding (Yang et al., 2019).

$$a) p(X) = \prod_{t=1}^T p(x_t | X_{<t}) \qquad b) p(X) = \prod_{t=T}^1 p(x_t | X_{>t})$$

**Eq. 1.** Likelihood of (a) a forward product and (b) a backward product. Basically, these two equations define the product of joint probabilities, derived from the *chain rule*. With  $X_{<t} = (x_1, \dots, x_t)$  denoting the vector of words in position  $t$  in ascending order, and  $X_{>t}$  basically denoting the opposite order (also visible from the product indexing).

Subsequently, when it comes to surpassing the limitations from which AE models suffer, there must be considered two main factors. First, we must consider that, similarly to AE models, also BERT uses a kind of data corruption during its pre-training. Indeed, BERT uses a masked language model (MLM) objective during pre-training where some of the tokens are masked, and the model learns to predict them based on the context provided by the unmasked tokens. However, this masking process does not occur during fine-tuning or inference, leading to a discrepancy between pretraining and fine-tuning or applicative scenarios. This discrepancy can impact the model's performance since it must adapt to a slightly different task than it was originally trained on. Secondly, with the MLM objective, each masked token is predicted independently from the other masked tokens, but just according to the unmasked context. This approach simplifies the complex dependencies between words in natural language, potentially limiting the model's ability to capture intricate relationships and long-term dependencies (Yang et al., 2019). With the novel permutation-based language modeling objective of XLNet, the problem related to the use of a single stream during context understanding is surpassed. This happens because this language modeling computes the density estimation of each possible permutation of input tokens, thus XLNet grasps a generalized understanding of language, capturing both the syntactic and semantic relationships between tokens, so each position learns to utilize contextual information from all positions, bypassing in this way the absence of bidirectional estimations in AR models. Additionally, since it computes the joint probability of each possible permutation of input tokens - it is an AR model -, it does not rely on data corruption (Yang et al., 2019), thus it does not require **[MASK]** tokens, overcoming also both the independence assumption, and the discrepancy between AEs use and pretraining, finally providing for an unsupervised learning context. By integrating the strengths of AR and AE, XLNet achieves a more comprehensive understanding of language when compared to traditional masked language models. However, this complexity also means that XLNet requires high computational resources for training and fine-tuning, which can be a limitation for some applications. Despite that, an XLNet based model, *ImpactCite* (Mercier et al., 2021), is the current state-of-the-art (SOTA) for Citation Intent Classification task on the SciCite dataset.

## 2.5 Ensemble Strategies

Another interesting research direction in classification tasks is related to ensemble strategies and ensemble learning in general, in which a set of weak - or baseline - learners are employed by means of an aggregation function to produce a single output based on different predictions from the base models (Mohammed & Kora, 2023). All the ensemble frameworks can be defined according to the baseline models and the aggregation function, and these two factors strongly affect the performances of the final classifier.

For what concerns the baseline models, these can be either homogeneous or heterogeneous, thus they can be of the same or of different types. Instead, the aggregation of their output can be a simple voting system, such as the *max voting* (Kim et al., 2003), the *average voting* (Montgomery et al., 2012), or the *weighted average voting* (Latif-Shabgahi, 2004). Additionally, it is also possible to define the aggregation function according to more advanced methods, and that is the case of meta-learning, in which an additional model is put on top of the baseline learners to learn itself from their predictions, either in the form of class-labels, or in the form of raw percentages in case of classification tasks (Mohammed & Kora, 2023; Soares et al., 2004).

Within ensemble frameworks it is also possible to harness the power of multiple baseline Language Models to produce different outputs subsequently fused by means of an aggregator (Huang et al., 2024; Jiang et al., 2023). To build such a framework, there are various possibilities, which may involve differentiated folds of data, multiple and heterogeneous - or homogeneous - baseline LMs, and multiple learning stages (Monteiro et al., 2021). In particular, the three most common strategies are known as Bagging (Breiman, 1996), Boosting (Freund & Schapire, 1996), and Stacking (Smyth & Wolpert, 1997)<sup>1</sup>.

The first strategy, known as *Bagging*, which is a shorthand for bootstrap and aggregating, involves training multiple instances of a model on different subsets of the training data, indeed small changes in training set usually lead to models with different predictive capabilities. These subsets are created by sampling with replacement (bootstrap sampling), and each model in the ensemble is trained independently to finally aggregate the predictions of these models with an average or max-voting strategy. Bagging helps reduce variance and improve the model's robustness by averaging out the errors from individual models.

Differently from Bagging, in which all models are independently trained in a parallel manner, when dealing with the second strategy we use a sequential approach. *Boosting* is an iterative technique in which each model is aimed at correcting the errors of its predecessor. During each iteration, the algorithm adjusts the weights of the training data based on the errors made by the previous model, thus giving higher importance to misclassified instances. The final model is a weighted combination of all these sequential models, with the more accurate ones having more influence. The last strategy is instead a kind of mix of the previous two.

Finally, when dealing with *Stacking*, we train multiple base models (sometimes referred to as *level-0* models) of the same or of different types, on the same or on different subsets of data. The predictions of these base models, usually in the form of probabilities or class labels, are then combined and used to train a meta-model (sometimes referred to as *level-1* model). This meta-training may involve, or not, a backpropagation of the final classification down to the base models to better direct their predictions by sacrificing computational resources<sup>2</sup>. Ensemble strategies like the ones just described demonstrated to improve classification performances in a wide range of tasks from various domains (Mohammed & Kora, 2023), and in many cases they perform better than more traditional methods with imbalanced classification tasks. Indeed, by harnessing the power of multiple classifiers, it is possible to deal more efficiently with underrepresented classes, as demonstrated in recent studies (Khan et al., 2024; L. Liu et al., 2022; S. Liu et al., 2017; D. Zhao et al., 2021).

### 2.5.1. Ensemble and XAI: Road to Understandable Predictions

Despite the generally good performances that can be achieved with ensemble strategies, the resulting models are usually difficult to interpret because of their large number of parameters and different interactions and steps that may take place through the decision-making process. Furthermore, the problem of interpretability arises in particular when employing Language Models (Longo et al., 2024), which make use of prompt embeddings and latent representations of the sentences to be classified. Such representations are passed through multiple layers of transformation and attention, which lead to untrackable predictions. Despite that, it is possible to add a layer of interpretability to the decisions made by these models and strategies, and this is particularly true for classification and regression problems (Longo et al., 2024). A completely different domain is instead the one related to the explanation of their generative capabilities, which is outside of the scopes of this research. Explainable AI (XAI) can help in understanding the decision-making process of these strategies, but also aid in refining the models by

---

<sup>1</sup> For a more detailed overview of these 3 strategies, we suggest the comprehensive review of Mohammed and Kora (2023).

<sup>2</sup> This backpropagation to the base models is particularly used with deep learning-based models, in which the gradient of the meta-model can be efficiently propagated back to the gradient of the base models, adjusting their weights and predictions accordingly.

highlighting areas where they may falter, thereby providing useful insights into their rationale to help in improving their accuracy and reliability for subsequent experimentations.

In the context of improving the interpretability of the outputs produced by complex models, techniques such as *LIME (Local Interpretable Model-agnostic Explanations)* (Ribeiro et al., 2016) and *SHAP (SHapley Additive explanations)* (Lundberg & Lee, 2017) demonstrated to be highly proficient. LIME tries to mimic the performances of any classifier by means of a surrogate and interpretable model, which perturbs the input data and observes the changes in the output, thereby identifying which parts of the input contribute to the final prediction, and how. The other XAI technique we will introduce is SHAP, which is grounded in the cooperative game theory and provides a unified measure of feature importance. It assigns each feature an importance value (*Shapley value*) for a particular prediction by considering the contribution of each feature to the outcome in different permutations. These methods not only give insights and a different and easier to understand perspective on the decision-making processes of these models, but also assist in refining them by pinpointing areas that needs improvement, thereby enhancing their accuracy and reliability. Thus, integrating XAI techniques is essential for advancing the transparency and trustworthiness of complex AI systems, ensuring they are both effective and understandable in practical applications.

### 3. Models and Experiments

This section outlines the implementation and the training dynamics of the two Ensemble Strategies designed to enhance the performances, as measured by Macro-F1 scores, in the classification of citation intents using the SciCite dataset. To employ this dataset for the experiments conducted in this work, we created a mapping between the three original labels (*Method*, *Background information*, and *Result comparison*) and three object properties selected from CiTO.

The object properties utilized are the following:

- <http://purl.org/spar/cito/obtainsBackgroundFrom> (for *Background Information* label – Class 1),
- <http://purl.org/spar/cito/usesMethodIn> (for *Method* label – Class 0),
- <http://purl.org/spar/cito/usesConclusionsFrom> (for *Result Comparison* label – Class 2).




Figure 2. Class (i.e. Method, Background and Result) distribution within SciCite for the three different collections used in ML: train, validation and test.

This dataset presents both a quite large number of datapoints, as well as a relatively multidisciplinary provenance of citation contexts. It is the dataset used for most benchmark experiments, and it is easily accessible in an *Huggingface Dataset library* compliant form. The main drawback of this dataset is represented by its unbalanced composition. This is a problem mainly for what concerns the use of machine learning-based approaches, with an underrepresentation of the *Result* class with respect to the other two (see Figure 2). Such unbalance is present in all the three standardized splits of SciCite (*train*, *validation*, and *test*). The unbalance is justified by the authors to represent trustfully the actual distribution of citations within a research work (Cohan et al., 2019).

Furthermore, the decision to employ ensemble models is primarily motivated by the relatively limited amount of available data points, which are insufficient to fully exploit the potential of a single Language Model. Additionally, the imbalance present in the dataset strongly suggests the use of a stacked approach to address and mitigate this issue effectively. The general structure of both the strategies, exemplified in Figure 3, is composed by six-baseline Language acting as binary classifiers (*level-0 models*) and a meta-classifier (*level-1*) model aimed at producing the final prediction. The outcomes of the experiments conducted in this work are two stacked ensemble models for the classification of citation intents: one model uses sentences that include the section titles in which the citations are contained, while the other model uses raw citation contexts. In this section we present the approach used to develop these Ensemble strategies and the experiments carried out to explain the predictions of the resulting models<sup>3</sup>.

---

<sup>3</sup> Please, note that for a full understanding or a detailed inspection of the experiments you should refer to the notebook publicly available in *Zenodo* (Paolini, 2024b) in which the entire code is reported together with training history and model evaluations.




Figure 3. Overview of the two ensemble strategies (both based SciBERT and XLNet) used to improve performance, measured by Macro-F1 scores, in classifying citation intents using the SciCite dataset. The figure shows the working mechanics and the steps followed for one Ensemble; the other strategy follows the same exact procedure.

### 3.1. Baseline Models: Level-0 Predictions

To develop the resulting Ensemble, we initially transform the multi-class classification problem into a binary task by mapping the corresponding labels of the SciCite dataset to 0 and 1. This transformation is useful to represent whether a particular sentence belongs to a specific class (0 for negative, 1 for positive), and thus to produce three binary datasets, one for each of the labels presented in SciCite. Subsequently, we employ three base versions of each of the two previously described language models (LMs) and fine-tune them for the binary task. Each version focuses on identifying whether a given sentence belongs to a specific class. Consequently, one model distinguishes between sentences categorized as "obtains background from" and other sentences, another distinguishes between "uses method in" and other sentences, and the last one distinguishes between "uses conclusions from" and other sentences. This methodology is applied to both SciBERT (Cased) and XLNet (Cased).

The three binary datasets are subsequently processed using two distinct tokenizers, one for SciBERT and the other for XLNet, resulting in six binary tokenized datasets derived from the original SciCite dataset. These datasets are prepared for fine-tuning the six language models. The tokenization process employs a maximum token window of 312, with padding and truncation applied at the end. This window size is chosen to balance the average lengths of the tokenized sentences (see Figure 4) with the computational resources required. Longer sentences demand higher computational resources, hence the selected window size aims to optimize this trade-off, without losing too much data. The data transformation steps described up to this point are applied indistinctly to both the scenarios, thus for sentences containing section titles, and pure citation contexts. Regarding the ensemble with the inclusion of section titles, we used the following prompt before tokenization:

“section\_title + “. ”+ citation\_context”.




Figure 4. Distribution of sentence length in tokens for both the models in the case utilizing section tiles. The three images represent the three splits of the dataset.

To employ the baseline models for the binary task we developed a fine-tuning loop structured to overcome the overfitting problem that usually arises when adapting LMs to downstream tasks. This loop allows for detailed assessments of the model's performance on the validation set, and it is accompanied by a scheduler to decrease learning rate on validation loss plateaus. Specifically, the model is evaluated after every 10 batches of training data within each epoch. Given that each batch is structured to contain 32 data points, this results in 25 evaluations per epoch. During each evaluation, the model's performance in terms of validation loss is compared to the best performance recorded up to that point. If the current validation loss is lower than the previous best, the model's state is saved as a checkpoint. This process ensures that the model is continuously monitored, and the best performing version is preserved, to finally be retrieved at the end of the loop. Additionally, an early stopping mechanism has been implemented to stop the fine-tuning process after 50 evaluations without performance increase.



The models are fine-tuned utilizing different learning rates and weight decays across different experiments, but these two hyperparameters remain consistent within the same kind of models<sup>4</sup>. We employed the *cross-entropy loss* and the *AdamW* optimizer, which optimizes all the parameters by applying weight decay, except for *bias* and *LayerNormalization* to which weight decay is not applied. The exclusion of the weights of the *LayerNormalization* from the optimization with decay is because these parameters are part of a normalization mechanism rather than direct factors in representing the input-output relationship in the same way as traditional weights. Applying weight decay to these parameters may interfere with the normalization process, potentially leading to a destabilization of the training dynamics. Instead, for what concerns the *bias* terms, applying weight decay to them can lead to suboptimal fine-tuning, mainly because these do not interact with the input data in the same multiplicative way as weights. Weight decay penalization, in case of *bias* terms is generally unnecessary and can harm the model's ability to fit the data. Empirically, it has been observed that the exclusion of *bias* terms and *LayerNorm* weights from weight decay contributes to achieving more stable and effective training of deep learning models (Ba et al., 2016; Lahiri et al., 2023; Loshchilov & Hutter, 2017).

Finally, the loop employs mixed-precision training. Mixed-precision training is a technique that uses both 16-bit and 32-bit floating-point numbers to perform calculations during the training process. This approach significantly reduces the memory usage and increases the computational speed without sacrificing model accuracy. By using mixed-precision, we can leverage the benefits of modern hardware accelerators, such as the Google Colab's A100 GPUs employed for these fine-tuning processes, more effectively. We obtain in this way six fine-tuned binary classifiers, three SciBERT-based and three XLNet-based. These resulting level-0 models are not evaluated on the test set, nonetheless the trained level-0 models can be found in the two works developed by Paolini (2024c, 2024b) and can be evaluated on such set by following the data preprocessing steps described so far.

### 3.2. Metaclassification Process: Level-1 Predictions

The outputs of the six base models result in two tensors with 6 elements each (3 positive probabilities, and the 3 corresponding negative probabilities). These two tensors get subsequently filtered to contain only the positive prediction of each of the base models, and finally concatenated along the same dimension to produce a single tensor containing the 6 positive probabilities of the base binary models. Such a tensor is then employed to instantiate the metaclassification process, which is the one returning the final prediction of the entire ensemble strategy.

To develop the metaclassifier strategy and to have a meaningful comparison between possible improvements provided by a more advanced strategy, represented by a Deep Learning-based metaclassifier, we set up a baseline performance given by max, majority, and average vote scoring algorithms. The results of these strategies are used as baselines to understand how good the base binary classifiers are. Finally, we designed a Feed-Forward Neural Network (FFNN) for both the scenarios: with and without section titles. These two Neural Network (NN) models are trained on the final positive predictions extracted from the train set by the baseline models, evaluated on the predictions produced with the validation set, and finally tested on the ones obtained from the test set. The performances of these additional classification strategies are compared against the baseline scores given by the voting systems.

For what concerns the advanced classification strategies, the two main components of the ensemble strategy, namely the binary classifiers (level-0 models) and the metaclassifier (level-1 model), are trained separately. This means that the gradients computed from the metaclassifier training process are not back propagated to the baseline models. The FFNN model is designed with three fully connected layers. The architecture includes batch

---

<sup>4</sup> This means that each SciBERT-based model is fine-tuned with the same learning rate and weight decay. These two hyperparameters are instead different if compared with the three equal values within XLNet-based models fine-tuning.



normalization and dropout layers to improve generalization and prevent overfitting. The input layer receives the flattened outputs from the base models, and subsequent layers process these inputs through a series of non-linear transformations with *GELU* activation functions to produce the final classification output in the form of probability scores by means of a *SoftMax* activation. Between the two experiments of these work, the general structure of the FFNNs is the same, the difference is in the number of neurons contained in each layer, which has been tuned according to specific needs.

The labels of the datasets used to train the two FFNN models are first preprocessed using one-hot encoding to facilitate multi-class classification. This encoding transforms the labels into a binary matrix representation, still suitable for neural network inputs. The training procedure involves a loop employing Cross Entropy loss, an *Adadelta* optimizer with a learning rate scheduler that reduces the learning rate upon plateauing of the validation loss, and to prevent overfitting early stopping is implemented based on validation loss, halting training if no improvement is observed for a specified number of epochs. The training loop iterates over the dataset for a predefined number of epochs, with evaluations on the validation set at the end of each epoch. The model's state is saved whenever an improvement in validation loss is detected. Therefore, this training loop does not utilize fine-grained evaluations nor mixed-precision techniques. Finally, the best model's checkpoint with respect to validation loss is loaded back for both the experiments, and the trained meta-classifier is evaluated on the test set using metrics such as accuracy and macro F1-score. Additionally, a detailed classification report is generated to assess the performance across different citation intent classes.

### 3.3. Unveiling the Decision-Making Process

Once the ensemble strategies were established and the models were fine-tuned for the CIC task, we implemented two Explainable AI (XAI) techniques to understand the underlying decision-making process that guides both the ensembles in producing the final classification. The objective was to enhance the interpretability and, consequently, the trustworthiness of models' predictions. Specifically, we utilized *SHapley Additive exPlanations (SHAP)* (Lundberg & Lee, 2017) to identify the most influential words for each base model's binary prediction. Additionally, we applied *Local Interpretable Model-agnostic Explanations (LIME)* (Ribeiro et al., 2016) to understand how and in which measure the positive probability values produced by level-0 models are utilized by the metaclassifier for each class.

To integrate SHAP for the level-0 models interpretability, we undertook a series of steps common to both the ensembles. Initially, each of the base models, thus the three SciBERT models and the corresponding XLNet models, are placed into evaluation mode, and a text classification pipeline is built for each of them. We then prepared the test lists by extracting the relevant text inputs from the corresponding DataFrames<sup>5</sup>. These lists are finally analyzed using SHAP to understand the model predictions. The results of the analyses are SHAP values that indicate the contribution of each word to the model's predictions.

A common procedure for both the ensembles was employed also to analyze the predictions of the level-1 models, for which we utilized LIME by defining the 3 class labels and aggregating the explanations on the test set. In this explanation phase, we iterated over the test data, using the metaclassifier to generate predictions. The input data for the metaclassifier was then converted to a format suitable for LIME, ensuring compatibility with the explainer. We defined the feature names corresponding to the outputs of the base models, providing meaningful labels for the LIME explainer. A *LimeTabularExplainer* was initialized with the training data, configured for classification tasks, and set to discretize continuous features to improve interpretability. A custom function was defined to predict probabilities using the metaclassifier, which LIME uses to understand how changes in input affect predictions.

---

<sup>5</sup> Indeed, also for the XAI related approach, the data preparation steps are the same previously described. Therefore, the original dataset is transformed into the three binary datasets with the relative mapping, then everything is tokenized with the appropriate tokenizer. The only difference is that the datasets, in this scenario, were transformed into DataFrames to ensure the correct data handling by the SHAP library.

For each instance in the test set, the LIME explainer generated explanations, identifying the top features contributing to the metaclassifier's decisions. Finally, we aggregated the explanations of the LIME explainer to provide meaningful insights into how the models classify the citations according to their predicted level-0 positive probabilities.

While SHAP was instrumental in providing detailed insights into the individual contributions of words in the base models, LIME was chosen for the metaclassifier due to its strengths in this context. Indeed, LIME is particularly effective at providing local explanations for individual predictions (Ribeiro et al., 2016), a crucial aspect to understand the decision-making process of the metaclassifier, which combines the predictions of a limited set of base models to make the final decision. LIME indeed identifies the relevant probability values and features that influence the metaclassifier's decision for each class. This local interpretation is essential to gain insights into why the metaclassifier prioritizes certain base model predictions over others in specific instances, thus understanding how the metaclassifier weighs the contributions of each base model's prediction for different classes.

## 4. Results and Discussion

This section outlines the outcomes of our experiments on the classification of citation intents using the developed ensemble models, with and without the inclusion of section titles in the prompt for level-0 models. The performance metrics used for evaluation are accuracy and macro F1-score, which provide insights into the overall classification performance and the balance across different classes, respectively. A detailed presentation of the results is presented in *Table 1*.

*Table 1. This table presents the results of the experiments conducted in this research work, against the current SOTA on SciCite Dataset. \*The Class Based F1-Scores are computed thanks to Scikit-Learn Classification Report; thus, these values are rounded.*

Ensemble Strategy		Class-Based F1-Score*			Class-Based Accuracy			Accuracy	Macro-F1 Score
		Met	Bkg	Res	Met	Bkg	Res		
Without Section Titles	Max Voting	90.00	90.00	82.00	93.39	89.40	94.83	88.81	87.30
	Average Voting	90.00	91.00	83.00	93.60	90.05	95.27	89.46	88.04
	Majority Voting	90.00	91.00	83.00	93.60	90.05	95.27	89.46	88.04
	FFNN	90.00	91.00	85.00	93.49	90.05	95.91	89.73	88.48
With Section Titles	Max Voting	91.00	92.00	84.00	94.35	91.07	95.43	90.42	89.01
	Average Voting	91.00	92.00	84.00	94.46	90.96	95.32	90.42	89.01
	Majority Voting	91.00	92.00	84.00	94.46	90.96	95.32	90.42	89.01
	FFNN	91.00	92.00	85.00	94.51	91.34	95.64	<b>90.75</b>	<b>89.46</b>
Current SOTA	ImpactCite	-	-	-	85.79	88.34	92.67	-	88.93

The results demonstrate that the inclusion of section titles in the prompts used to train the base Language Models improves the performance of the resulting ensemble strategies. Specifically, the Feed-Forward Neural Network (FFNN) achieved the highest accuracy and macro F1-score in both scenarios, indicating its superior capability in handling the classification task compared to voting-based methods.

With section titles, the FFNN achieved a test accuracy of 90.75 and a macro F1-score of 89.46, outperforming all voting-based methods and surpassing the current State-Of-The-Art in the SciCite dataset, thus setting a new benchmark. Among the voting-based methods, Max Voting performed slightly better than Average and Majority Voting in terms of accuracy, though all three methods achieved the same accuracy and macro F1-score.

Without section titles, the overall performance decreased. The FFNN still achieved the highest accuracy and macro F1-score, but these values dropped to 89.73 and 88.48, respectively. Among the voting methods, Average and Majority Voting performed better than Max Voting, both achieving the same accuracy and macro F1-score of 89.46 and 88.04, respectively.

#### 4.1. Aggregated Feature Importance

For what concerns the outcomes of the explainability experiments, we report the most important textual features extracted with SHAP. Such features are presented together with their importance value, where the value represents how much a given word contributes to a positive classification by each level-0 model. These Shapley values are reported in *Figure 6* and *Figure 7*, respectively for the base models of the ensembles employing section titles, and for the ones utilizing raw citation contexts. The visualizations provided represent the average Shapley values of each feature across the entire test set. Together with the 15 top words that are the ones contributing the most to obtain a positive outcome for the binary task, we also report the mean of the other features encountered in the test set. Each of the two figures is composed of six subfigures, which represent the combination between the two LMs (*SciBERT* and *XLNet*) and the three object properties of CiTO (*obtainsBackgroundFrom*, *usesMethodIn* and *usesConclusionsFrom*). These results will be discussed in the following sections.

Finally, we report the percentages that contribute the most to the final classification performed by the metaclassifier in the multi-class scenario. These values, extracted with LIME, are reported in *Figure 8* and *Figure 9*, and represent the aggregated feature contribution across the entire test set, respectively for the metaclassifiers of the ensembles utilizing section titles, and for the one that classifies raw citation contexts for each class. Such aggregated measure gives insights into the decision-making process of the metaclassifier and elucidates the most important base models' predictions to obtain a certain outcome. Each figure contains three LIME subplots explanations, one for each class. Each subplot presents which of the positive prediction probabilities provided by level-0 models contribute the most to the final classification into a specific class.




Figure 5. Comparison of results obtained within this study against the previous SOTA.









Figure 6. SHAP-based explanations of the classifications in the test set for models utilizing section titles in their prompts. The results present the 15 most important words for each model, for each class, to positively classify a sentence as part of the specific class. The values presented are mean values.









Figure 7. SHAP-based explanations of the classifications in the test set for models utilizing section titles in their prompts. The results present the 15 most important words for each model, for each class, to positively classify a sentence as part of the specific class. The values presented are mean values.




Figure 8. LIME-based explanations of the metaclassifier predictions in the Ensemble utilizing section titles. The values presented refer to the test set and are aggregated through the entire split.




Figure 9. LIME-based explanations of the metaclassifier predictions in the Ensemble without section titles. The values presented refer to the test set and are aggregated through the entire split.



## 4.2. Findings and Enhancement Possibilities

These findings indicate that the inclusion of section titles provides valuable contextual information that enhance the level-0 models' ability to accurately discern citation intents, even if utilizing raw prompt formats<sup>6</sup>. The additional context offered by section titles likely aids the models in understanding the usually clear<sup>7</sup> relationships between citations and their respective sections, thereby improving classification accuracy and macro-F1 scores. However, it is noteworthy that the models still perform robustly even without section titles. This robustness underscores the effectiveness of the ensemble approach in the classification task. The ensemble strategy's ability to combine predictions from multiple base models mitigates individual model errors and enhances the overall performance.

One significant advantage of ensemble strategies with respect to a single model is their capability to address the challenges posed by imbalanced datasets (Khan et al., 2024; L. Liu et al., 2022; S. Liu et al., 2017; D. Zhao et al., 2021), such as SciCite. By aggregating predictions from multiple models, ensembles can reduce the bias towards majority classes and improve the identification of minority ones. Furthermore, in this specific scenario where level-0 models are trained on a binary task, we have devised a method to directly focus on each of the three classes in the dataset which led this first component of the ensembles to manage class imbalance efficiently. This targeted focus enhances the model's sensitivity to the characteristics of each class, leading to better performances across the board by leveraging the strengths of diverse models, each potentially capturing different aspects of the data distribution for its specific class. Additionally, the metaclassifier head provides a way to weight individual models' predictions, thus harnessing the full potential of the strategy. This is particularly evident when we compare the class-specific accuracy of the ensemble models we developed against the previous State-Of-The-Art (SOTA), namely ImpactCite. Our models outperform the previous SOTA in all class-specific accuracy scores (see *Figure 5*). Despite that, the model that does not utilize section titles in its prompt performs slightly worse than ImpactCite when it comes to Macro-F1 score. Would have been interesting to compare the per class Macro-F1 scores of ImpactCite against our models, but these data are not available as of today.

The usefulness of the metaclassifier FFNN is particularly evident when looking at the score improvements obtained with respect to more traditional voting methods. This improvement makes clear that, even by looking only at the positive probabilities produced by each level-0 model, the metaclassifier can extract meaningful patterns between them. This improvement strongly suggests that providing more context to the metaclassifier could potentially lead to even higher performances. This could be achieved by integrating in the meta-classification process also the embedding of the sentence to be classified, to provide it with an even more direct association to the original datapoint. With this approach, the metaclassifier could theoretically learn also some textual patterns in which some basic models may falter, thus providing for a better and more informed mitigation of level-0 outcomes. Finally, with this approach, we could also observe the recognition of the more problematic textual characteristics for each specific model, thus leading to a more informed, transparent, and precise classification performance.

Another possibility could involve a broader array of base models and the integration of retroactive gradient computations<sup>8</sup>. With the addition of new and diverse base models we could further refine the ensembles' effectiveness because of a bigger set of outcomes which should theoretically provide a richer feature set for the ensemble to draw upon. Additionally, integrating retroactive training could offer an intriguing approach to the recalibration of the entire ensemble strategy to correct the decision-making process of the base models in a dynamic way. This

---

<sup>6</sup> We mean that the prompt built to integrate section titles within the citation context is aimed at simply concatenating these two elements, without any other textual fragment added.

<sup>7</sup> For a human reader.

<sup>8</sup> Thus, the ensemble would be trained in a single session by producing the level-0 probabilities and then classifying the sentences by means of the metaclassifier. Once this is done, the gradient is computed from the metaclassification outcome and back-propagated through the entire stack of models to help correcting the base predictions before providing them to the level-1 model.

should provide a more direct direction for weight adjustments, thus targeting the specific weaknesses of the level-0 models spotted by the metaclassifier, finally leading to a more balanced and effective overall performance.

The strategies outlined above are not isolated, or mutually exclusive; rather, they offer a synergistic potential which can be applied in combination across a broad spectrum of applications. Integrating and testing these approaches collectively allows for the exploration of their additive effect on enhancing model performance.

### 4.3. Understanding the Decision-Making Process

#### 4.3.1. SHAP for Level-0 Models

To better understand the results obtained, and to elucidate the decision-making process behind the two levels of the stacked ensembles we produced, we adopted SHAP for the level-0 binary predictions and LIME for the multi-class metaclassification. Starting from level-0 models, as expected, the SHAP-based analyses revealed many differences between the words considered important by SciBERT and XLNet to positively classify a sentence.

This difference is primarily evident by looking at the scores of the most important words given by all the XLNet models with respect to SciBERT models. Indeed, XLNet seems to be more confident for most words, with Shapley values that are nearly two times bigger than the ones provided by SciBERT. This difference may be explained by looking at the different vocabularies of the two models. While XLNet employs a standard vocabulary, SciBERT uses SciVOCAB, a vocabulary containing words from the scientific discourse domain. Such a difference may be sufficient to explain why SciBERT-based models dilute their scores: by recognizing more words with respect to XLNet-based models, SciBERT assigns simply more grades of importance, which results in lower scores since the Shapley values are distributed among more actors. The fact that SciBERT-based models recognize a higher number of features is also evident in the sum of additional features that can be seen in *Figure 6* and *Figure 7*, which assigns more than 11000 features to SciBERT-based models, against the nearly 10000 recognized by XLNet-based models. Another possible explanation may be that XLNet, which is clearly more sensitive to individual features contributions, has a better capability with respect to SciBERT in identifying and extracting the underlying semantics of a sentence. According to this perspective, XLNet's enhanced ability in modeling long-range dependencies and in extracting complex patterns becomes evident when it is simply better at focusing on the most important words. This may also derive from the language modeling objective of XLNet, which is aligned with the task since it does not require to mask words. This lack of discrepancy, that we highlighted also in the introductory part of the previous section, for sure contributes to the better performances observable in the benchmark obtained by XLNet-based models with respect to SciBERT-based models on the CIC task. Finally, another possible explanation of this difference could be attributed to the different pretraining corpora used by the two models. Since the one used for XLNet is more general, the model may just be better in capturing more generalizable features, which would explain this difference in Shapley values.

Another interesting result that can be observed from these studies is related to models aimed at classifying whether a sentence can be related to the *obtainsBackgroundFrom* (Background) object property. Models trained to identify the Background class indeed present less informative features as the top words contributing to identifying the positive belonging if compared with the top 15 words for Method and Results based models. This is evident in both the ensembles, with and without section titles. In fact, while the top contribution to recognize a sentence as part of the Background class is given by words such as *circumference*, *ramification*, or *difficulty*, we can observe that for Method class the top words contain *choose*, *used*, *methodology*, or *Method*, which are all words that can be recognized as part of a semantic field – a set of words that are related in meaning and cover a particular conceptual domain (Trier, 1931) - identifying something linked to a methodology or method. The same is true for Results class, where the top words present *similar*, *agrees*, *concur*, or *contradict*, which are all possibly recognizable as part of a semantic field near to something related to a result or a comparison. Additionally, the mean of

all the other features is basically negative for both SciBERT and XLNet based models only for the Background class, while is positive for Method and Results in the experiments with section titles. For what concerns the experiments without section titles, the mean is instead negative for all the three occurrences of SciBERT-based models, while it is negative only for the Background class when dealing with XLNet-based models. For what concerns the negative mean for SciBERT-based models in the context without section titles, we could attribute it to the fact that in a binary scenario both Method and Result classes are the less present. This data imbalance should be theoretically sufficient to explain this difference, but additional studies related to the number of words per sentence in these two cases would help in confirming this hypothesis. The imbalanced-based hypothesis is instead insufficient to explain the negative mean in Background class, which is the most represented and occupies more than half of the dataset. This difference, together with the different semantic field to which the top words pertain with respect to their label, strongly suggest that the Background class contains on average less informative features with respect to the other two. This may be due to a higher variance in the structure of background-related citation contexts, but additional studies would be needed to confirm this hypothesis. Nevertheless, this information may help in shaping future datasets for the CIC task.

Finally, we can observe that on average the models performed better with section titles, but also the mean of the features used to positively classify a sentence to a particular label is generally more positive in this scenario with respect to when we do not use section titles, in which the mean is negative for most of the models. This may be since the addition of the section title at the beginning of the sentence to classify may shape the entire classification process. But we cannot still confirm this hypothesis because of the different training regime on which the two experiments were carried out. Nonetheless, this is an interesting hypothesis that would be worth investigating.

#### 4.3.2. LIME for Level-1 Models

To conclude this part, we now explain how the metaclassifier works, and how its decision-making process is shaped by the individual model contributions. As shown above, in *Figure 8* and *Figure 9*, the metaclassification process slightly differs for the two ensembles, but the most important features for the final classification for each class are almost the same. The main difference we notice when comparing the two ensembles is that while for the ensemble with section titles SciBERT-computed features have a higher importance with respect to XLNet-computed features, for the other ensemble the opposite is true. This difference may contribute to confirming the hypothesis for which in general and less guided contexts, such as the one in which the citation sentence is not guided by the section in which it is contained, XLNet presents better generalization performances. But this cannot again be confirmed because of the different training regime to which level-0 models of the two experiments have been fine-tuned.

Despite the general difference between the two experiments, for the ones involving section titles, as said, the highest feature importance scores were dominated by SciBERT-related features, and this is particularly true for Class 0 (*usesMethodIn*). The feature `SciBERT_usesMethodIn > 0.64` presents an extremely high score, indicating that predictions with high confidence from SciBERT were critical for this class. Additionally, several features related to background and conclusions categories from both SciBERT and XLNet showed moderate positive contributions. For Class 1 (*obtainsBackgroundFrom*), features indicating high confidence from SciBERT in the background category were the most influential, even though with lower importance scores if compared to the ones attributed to Class 0 specific models when classifying their specific class. Interestingly, low confidence in method-related features also contributed positively to predicting Class 1. Negative importance scores for certain features suggested that high confidence in these categories could detract from the prediction. For Class 2 (*usesConclusionsFrom*), the most influential feature was `SciBERT_usesConclusionsFrom > 0.03`, with significant positive importance, even though the accepted confidence is low. Background features from both models also played a crucial role, though to a lesser extent than for Class 1. The results from the experiments involving

section titles highlight the dominance of SciBERT in influencing the metaclassifier's decisions. This might indicate that the text in section titles provided clear contextual cues that SciBERT could effectively leverage.

In the experiments without section titles, the importance of XLNet features increased markedly. For Class 0,  $XLNet\_usesMethodIn > 0.77$  was the most important feature, followed by  $SciBERT\_usesMethodIn > 0.76$ . The distribution of importance scores was more balanced between SciBERT and XLNet compared to the experiments with section titles. For Class 1, method-related features from XLNet were dominant. The feature  $0.03 < XLNet\_usesMethodIn \leq 0.06$  had the highest importance score, and several other XLNet-related features showed substantial positive contributions. This contrasts with the previous experiment, where background features from SciBERT were more influential. For Class 2,  $XLNet\_usesConclusionsFrom > 0.03$  was the most significant feature, with SciBERT features playing a less prominent role compared to the first experiment. In the absence of section titles, XLNet features became more influential. This is particularly evident for Class 1, where the reliance on low-confidence method features implies that the absence of section titles required the model to make more approximated distinctions, resulting in less reliable classifications.

The differences in feature importance between the two experimental setups underline the significance of textual structure in model performance. The presence of section titles provided clear contextual markers that SciBERT could leverage more effectively, while the absence of such structure allowed XLNet to demonstrate its better adaptability and robustness to less structured contexts.

Finally, when looking at the scores of these XAI experiments and at the per-class accuracy scores, it is evident that the predictions with respect to *usesMethodIn* are the most accurate. Indeed, together with high accuracy scores for this class, the consistent semantic field that we can approximate from the SHAP values, and the high impact that Method-specific models' prediction have in the final classification, we can assume that the predictions made by the ensembles for this class are the most accurate and reliable. The same is true for *usesConclusionsFrom*, but at a lesser extent. Unlike the other two classes, *obtainsBackgroundFrom* exhibits a more ambiguous and less structured classification dynamic. Its accuracy scores are the lowest among all the classes, despite being the most represented in the dataset. This suggests that the datapoints for this class present a less structured conformation. This is particularly evident when considering the confused semantic field and the relatively low importance that high-confidence values of Background-specific model predictions have in determining whether the outcome should be classified as *obtainsBackgroundFrom*. Despite the low scores obtained in LIME experiments for the *usesConclusionsFrom* class, which is significantly less represented than the other two classes in SciCite, and cannot thus be really compared with them, there is a noticeable difference in the importance of high confidence in the *obtainsBackgroundFrom* class when classifying sentences. This is especially apparent when compared to the medium confidence for the *usesMethodIn* class. This indicates that high-confidence predictions for *obtainsBackgroundFrom* are less effective in classification than medium-confidence predictions for *usesMethodIn*.

## 4.4. Challenges and Limitations

This chapter delves into the various challenges and limitations encountered during this study. While the research yielded significant insights in the Citation Intent Classification task, it was not without its set of difficulties. This part will start with a brief insight into the reproducibility of our experiments, to then face the dataset imbalance and the XAI related results.

### 4.4.1. Reproducibility Issues and Computational Instability

The reproducibility crisis in science has emerged as a great concern across various disciplines, casting doubts over the reliability of numerous research works. In his study, Baker (2016) shows how, within the scientific community, a significant number of researchers deal with reproducibility related problems, some are not able to reproduce other’s experiments, and some are neither capable of reproducing their own works. This acknowledgment, from over 1500 surveyed scientists, reveals the pervasive nature of the reproducibility crisis, suggesting that it is not confined to some fields, but it is a widespread issue affecting the totality of scientific domains. To better understand the nature of such crisis, Meng (2020) suggests an innovative perspective on it. The author provides a better definition of what reproducibility in research landscape means, differentiating it from replicability, and shifting the focus on how these two central components of trustworthy research builds the concept of reliability. By providing such differentiation, Meng underline the need for clear definitions and for rigorous methodologies to efficiently face the reproducibility crisis, putting emphasis on the role of data science as a pivotal element. Finally, Peng (2015) tries to identify the nature of this widespread crisis in the lack of analytical skills from within the scientific community. The author argues, and strongly pushes for a more robust application of statistical principles and data science methodologies in scientific research, to enhance reproducibility, providing a bulwark against this crisis. A disciplined approach, together with rigorous data analysis and strategic experimental design may help to solve this pervasive problem. Together, these works draw a comprehensive picture of the reproducibility crisis, highlighting its implications for the credibility of scientific research and the trust placed in scientific findings by the public and the scientific community alike. They call for a synergistic effort to address the underlying causes of the crisis, advocating for enhanced transparency, methodological rigor, and the adoption of statistical and data science tools as indispensable elements of the solution. Clearly, the open accessibility to codes and workflows has a central role in healing the crisis.

This is one of the main reasons for which whatever have been produced within this research is openly available, cited, referenced and easily accessible. This extends to models, source codes, explanation values, and to the implementations of the workflows designed for this project. All the experiments performed make use of a fixed seed and deterministic algorithms to obtain reproducible experiments, but this is not always guaranteed, specifically in *PyTorch* and with the use of mixed-precision training. The use of 16-bit floating-point numbers can lead to small numerical differences in computations, which might accumulate and result in slightly different model parameters across training runs. These differences are typically minor, but they affect reproducibility in fine-grained evaluations and when working with very sensitive models such as the ones employed as level-0 for the stacked ensembles. Additionally, as reported in *PyTorch* documentation “*completely reproducible results are not guaranteed across PyTorch releases, individual commits, or different platforms. Furthermore, results may not be reproducible between CPU and GPU executions, even when using identical seeds*”. Despite that, we have used deterministic algorithms for CUDA where possible, and we set a consistent seed for random operations. But, even with these strategies, results slightly vary between different runs of the same fine-tuning loop for level-0 language models.

To have a grasp on these variations across different runs, we performed a computational instability experiment. We run the same training loop ten times for the method-class-specific SciBERT base model and collected accuracy scores, macro-F1 scores, and loss values computed on the validation set. The results of this experimentation are reported in *Figure 10*. The outcomes of this experiment demonstrate general consistency in the validation metrics across multiple training runs. The validation macro-F1 score achieved a mean of 0.8779 with a standard deviation




Figure 10. Results of the computational instability experiment on the method-specific base SciBERT model across 10 runs of the fine-tuning loop.

#### 4.4.2. Dataset Imbalance

Another challenge that this research project dealt with is related to the scarcity of data within the SciCite dataset, and its inherent class imbalance. As shown in *Figure 2*, the SciCite dataset’s label distribution is highly skewed. The overrepresentation of the Background class, when compared against the number of datapoints pertaining to the Result class, represents a problem, and this is particularly visible within all the models trained over this dataset, which fail to classify Result instances with the Macro-F1 scores that these show over the other two classes. As can be further inspected within *Table 1*, all the models produced within this work have a specific Result class F1 that is lower with respect to the F1 scores of the other two classes. This difference can easily be attributed to the class imbalance of the employed dataset. Moreover, not only the represented classes are imbalanced, but the Result class contains at most 1000 datapoints for training, which are clearly not sufficient to provide a comprehensive representation of it. Within this study, the main strategy adopted to face this issue revolved around the use of class-specific models within the ensemble, but this demonstrated to be not sufficient to completely mitigate the imbalance. Thus, the more direct possibility to solve this problem involves the integration of the SciCite dataset with other datasets produced for the CIC task. Nevertheless, this is not an easy option, in particular because of the different classification schemes employed by the other datasets, which would require a meticulous mapping. Furthermore, the extracted context does not always maintain a coherent structure across different datasources, making the interoperability of datasets even more difficult. Within the CIC domain, it is thus extremely important to find a general schema, which may be applicable to different sources, as general as possible and as specific as necessary

of 0.0013, indicating a high degree of reliability in model’s performance. Similarly, the validation accuracy has a mean of 0.9056 and a standard deviation of 0.0010. Finally, the validation loss showed a mean of 0.2498 with standard deviation of 0.0002. The low standard deviations across these metrics suggest that the model’s performance is not significantly affected when using mixed-precision. This may be due to the use of fine-grained evaluations, which could theoretically contribute to reach a similar performance peak across different runs of the fine-tuning loop. Nonetheless, the small differences across runs may sum between the different models employed as baselines, thus leading to major differences within the entire stacked ensemble model.

The choice to still employ mixed precision and fine-grained evaluations was guided by the need to reduce computational times, even with the perspective of integrating in the future some advanced hyperparameters search techniques. This problem is instead absent for the training of the metaclassifier, which computes only fixed calculations, and it is thus completely reproducible.

with respect to the needs of these citation-based applications. In this way it would be possible to guarantee interoperability between datasets, making their integration immediate.

Finally, in dealing with the SciCite dataset, we noticed that the model failed to extract common patterns within the Background related sentences. Indeed, even though the class-specific Macro-F1 scores for this class are high, their accuracy is lower, indicating that the sentences are not representative of a common structure that makes them immediately recognizable as such. These kinds of considerations, together with the ones we reported in the previous section are useful to provide a direction to future experiments and dataset creation. Despite that, the explanations provided cannot be taken as absolute, and this is particularly true because LIME and SHAP have their drawbacks since these strategies do not consider feature dependence and do not determine an optimal explanation size (Gohel et al., 2021). These limitations are particularly important when trying to explain the predictions of level-0 models, for which more intricate operations happen, and a more complex explanation would be required to fully understand them.



## 5. CIC Application

This chapter presents the implementation of the state-of-the-art (SOTA) ensemble model developed in this study through a web application powered by *Flask* and currently available<sup>9</sup>. *Flask*<sup>10</sup>, a lightweight and versatile web framework, facilitates the integration of the model variants, including those trained without section titles, into a user-friendly web-based platform. This chapter provides an overview of the application's development and functionality.

### 5.1. General Aim and Description

The application was created within the *OpenCitations* infrastructure<sup>11</sup>, that is currently working in the *GraspOS* project<sup>12</sup>, which aims to build a data infrastructure and promote an ethical research assessment system based on Open Science (OS) principles in Europe. *GraspOS* supports the *European Open Science Cloud (EOSC)* ecosystem by integrating tools that track research service usage and promote OS principles. Citation data is crucial for promoting openness, legitimacy, and knowledge sharing within academic communities, aligning with *GraspOS* and OS principles.

The classifier described here is a component of a broader application designed to automate the extraction and classification of citation intents from PDF files of research works. The classifier part of this tool, which is the one developed within this study and the master thesis of Paolini (2024a) includes a backend for loading the various models produced as outcomes of this work, for preprocessing data in a compliant form, and for finally classifying citation contexts. The tool was developed with *Flask*, *Python*, *HTML*, *CSS*, and *JavaScript* and it is currently available to the public in its Beta version.

### 5.2. Design and Implementation

The core of the software is the *Predictor* object, which handles predictions, GPU device allocation if available, and tokenization processes tailored for section-based and non-section-based data. It also generates a downloadable JSON file with classification results.

The backend includes several key components:

- *EnsembleClassifier*: Loads base models from the server according to the *Predictor*'s instructions.
- *DataProcessor*: Manages data preprocessing, including reading, formatting, and structural checks.
- *MetaClassifierSection* and *MetaClassifierNoSection*: Define the metaclassifier architectures for the two data scenarios.

The backend processes data and uses the ensemble models to classify citation contexts according to the selected mode. It also incorporates a human-defined threshold to ensure classification reliability, mapping results to the Citation Typing Ontology (CiTO) for enhanced interoperability. The threshold devised for this task is based on the output probability returned by the entire classification process. If none of the three classes has been chosen with a confidence higher than 90%, then the classification is considered unreliable, and mapped to <http://purl.org/spar/cito/citesForInformation> (Unreliable), which is a general scope object property used to describe a non-characterized citation within CiTO.

---

<sup>9</sup> <http://137.204.64.4:81/cic/classifier>

<sup>10</sup> <https://flask.palletsprojects.com/en/3.0.x/>

<sup>11</sup> <https://opencitations.net/>

<sup>12</sup> <https://www.graspos.eu/>



### 5.3. User Interface

The interface, created with Flask, HTML, CSS, and JavaScript, is minimalistic and sufficiently user-friendly in this first release (see *Figure 11*). It allows users to input data as text tuples or JSON files and select the mode of analysis between:

- *Mixed*, which employs both the ensembles to dynamically discern citations with and without section titles and use the respective model for classification.
- *With Section Titles* for sentences containing section titles, this mode employs the ensemble trained with section titles.
- *Without Section Titles* for raw citation contexts, which employs the ensemble trained with pure citations.

The classification results are displayed after the backend loads the models and classify the given citation sentences. Once the classification has been performed, the application returns detailed results for all the predictions, in which are displayed both the level-0 models confidence scores, as well as the metaclassifier confidence and the final classification mapped to CiTO (see *Figure 12*). The tool also provides an option to download detailed JSON files containing citation data and the produced classification metadata.

Select your classification mode:

Mixed  With Section Titles  Without Section Titles

nessun file selezionato

```
[
  ('Introduction', 'In his 1945 essay 'As We May Think', Vannevar Bush observed how 'publication has been extended far beyond our present ability to make real use of the record' [Bush, 1945].'),
  ('Introduction', 'Licklider expanded on this with the vision of a symbiotic relationship between humans and machines. Computers would take care of routine tasks such as storage and retrieval, 'preparing the way for insights and decisions in scientific thinking' [Licklider, 1960].'),
  ('Introduction', 'Computing has indeed revolutionized how research is conducted, but information overload remains an overwhelming problem [Borrmann and Mutz, 2014].'),
  ('Introduction', 'In May 2022, an average of 516 papers per day were submitted to arXiv [arXiv, 2022]. Beyond papers, scientific data is also growing much more quickly than our ability to process it [Marx, 2013]. As of August 2022, the NCBI GenBank contained 1.49 × 1012 nucleotide bases [GenBank, 2022].')
]
```

*Figure 11. User input interface. The user can decide the classification mode, and whether to upload data in text(with a list of tuples containing section titles – if possible - and citation contexts) or JSON format.*

<b>Sentence:</b> 0
<b>SECTION:</b> Introduction
<b>CITATION:</b> In his 1945 essay 'As We May Think', Vannevar Bush observed how 'publication has been extended far beyond our present ability to make real use of the record' [Bush, 1945].
<b>SCIBERT MET POSITIVE PROBABILITY:</b> 0.027594441547989845
<b>SCIBERT BKG POSITIVE PROBABILITY:</b> 0.9479248523712158
<b>SCIBERT RES POSITIVE PROBABILITY:</b> 0.007289402186870575
<b>XLNET MET POSITIVE PROBABILITY:</b> 0.021375877782702446
<b>XLNET BKG POSITIVE PROBABILITY:</b> 0.9609192609786987
<b>XLNET RES POSITIVE PROBABILITY:</b> 0.0028760619461536407
<b>MET ENSEMBLE CONFIDENCE:</b> 0.00039628162630833685
<b>BKG ENSEMBLE CONFIDENCE:</b> 0.9989715814590454
<b>RES ENSEMBLE CONFIDENCE:</b> 0.0006320800166577101
<b>FINAL PREDICTION:</b> obtainsBackgroundFrom (BACKGROUND)

*Figure 12. Visualization of the classification results for a single sentence.*

## 6. Conclusion and Future Works

Understanding why researchers cite other works is pivotal in analyzing academic discourse. Citation Intent Classification (CIC) aims to provide deeper insights into the underlying motivations behind citations, which can enhance research assessment and improve the transparency and reliability of scholarly communication. This study contributes to this objective by presenting advanced ensemble models for the CIC task, which demonstrated to be proficient in solving dataset imbalance-related issues. Indeed, as can be observed in *Table 1* and *Figure 5*, both the ensembles developed within this research outperform the previous SOTA for CIC on the SciCite benchmark in basically all class-specific accuracy scores, demonstrating the essential role played by the stacked architecture employed in this study. Furthermore, we demonstrated how across 10 runs of the same fine-tuning loop developed for this task the results remain strongly consistent even though we employed mixed-precision. This suggests that the fine-grained evaluations performed possibly help in reaching a similar performance peak across different models' runs, but to confirm this hypothesis further studies are needed. Finally, we developed and publicly released a first version of a web-based application to automatically classify citation contexts with our models. We extended from the original SciCite schema by mapping the 3 original labels to CiTO object properties to enhance interoperability, but also added an additional and more general citation function to classify citation contexts over which our model is not sufficiently confident.

This conclusive section will present some more detailed insights into the role of section titles within the structural composition of the sentence to be classified. Additionally, it will present some future works we are envisioning to improve the reliability of the web-based application. Finally, it will provide a conclusive remark on this research work.

### 6.1. Structural Features: the case of Section Titles

Our experiments demonstrated the essential role played by section titles to classify citation contexts. The role of such features becomes particularly evident when looking at the different performance obtained by the two ensembles. An additional demonstration of the significance of these structural elements is given also by the XAI-related studies we performed on Language Models by computing Shapley values. In fact, the models employing section titles for training present a generally more positive trend in individual words' scores with respect to the models trained with raw citation contexts only. This difference underscores the pivotal role that such features have in shaping the binary classification performed at the level-0 of the stack.

Ascertained the importance of section titles within the sentence to be classified, it is possible to delineate some pathways to improve performances in the CIC task, and to obtain more reliable systems. A possibility to enhance this work may involve the integration of Language Models and Ensemble strategies within the broader framework of Neuro-Symbolic Systems (Yu et al., 2023). Within this kind of frameworks, it is possible to obtain classifications which are no more solely based on the intrinsic semantics of contexts, but take into consideration also other structured data sources, such as Knowledge Graphs (KG), on which it is possible to execute logical reasoning operations (Garcez et al., 2015; Daniele et al., 2022). KG for citation data may be extremely informative with respect to possible logical rules contained within them, and this is particularly true since we demonstrated how effective the integration of structural elements in the sentence is. Exploiting the real structural significance of section titles beside their semantic meaning could theoretically provide further performance enhancements. Finally, the production of Knowledge Graph Embeddings (KGEs) provides the possibility to easily integrate this structured data source with the embeddings computed by means of Language Models (LMs). Such integration between KGE and LMs may be operated in a multitude of ways, but their delineation goes outside the scope of this work. Despite that, integrating logical rules and symbolic and sub-symbolic elements with the intrinsic semantics of citation contexts extracted through LMs should theoretically provide a more structured approach to

CIC, and a better explainability of the obtained results (Pan et al., 2024), which could be critical to obtain reliable systems to utilize in production environments.

## 6.2. Citation Intent Classifier: Future Releases




Figure 13. SHAP values to classify a sentence as Background sentence in the context with section titles. Red parts represent negative influence, blue parts positive token influence.

As mentioned before, the web-based application is at its first release and has been improved after its first draft developed as an outcome of the master thesis “Enhanced Citation Intent Classification with Population-based training, Ensemble Strategies, and Language Models” (Paolini, 2024a). Following the work presented so far, we aim to improve our tool by adding the possibility to generate real time explanations of the sentences classified through both SHAP and LIME, which offer through their APIs the possibility to visualize the results in dynamic and interesting ways (see Figure 13 and Figure 14). Together with this improvement, and together with the detailed explanations of the decision-making process of these ensembles, we also aim to provide the user with the possibility to manually decide the threshold to discern reliable and unreliable classifications. By means of these explanations, together with a manual threshold directly defined by the end user according to his/her necessities, we aim to develop an even better and more user-friendly tool, which could potentially be adapted to different use cases.

Together with that, we aim to increase the performances of the backend models thanks to the dataset we aim to develop, and by means of the inclusion of Knowledge Graph Embeddings (KGEs) in the classification pipeline. Finally, within this improved version of the application, we would like to add an additional Language Model, fine-tuned to discursively present and produce explanations and visualizations of the classification process. This would hopefully add a layer of reliability and understandability to our tool, ideally pushing for a greater adoption of it.




Figure 14. Single LIME explanation for the case with section titles. The image presents features' contribution to classification into a particular class.

### 6.3. Final Remarks

Overall, a conclusive perspective on this research finds the CIC domain at a juncture point between the need to understand the academic discourse, which may lead to a better research assessment, and the progress in Natural Language Process (NLP) and Artificial Intelligence (AI) related domains. This work underscored the critical need of a comprehensive and well-curated dataset for the CIC task, also providing empirical demonstrations with respect to the critical role that the amount and quality of data have in the outcomes that can be obtained. An exemplar demonstration of this is given by the lower performances across all models for the Background class in terms of accuracy and comprehensibility on the test set of the SciCite dataset. Another interesting case is the one related to the Result class, which clearly contains an insufficient number of datapoints for the development of a comprehensive model. This is evident when looking at Macro-F1 scores obtained for this specific class, but also by looking at the aggregated explanation produced with LIME for this class. Indeed, as said before, LIME finds a low number of useful features for the final classification as part of *usesConclusionsFrom*, and this is derived by the insufficient number of instances of this class.

Despite that, the most noteworthy achievement of this work has been the production of an ensemble model which surpasses the State-Of-The-Art (SOTA) for the CIC task within SciCite, namely *EnsIntWS* (Paolini, 2024c). Additionally, we also publicly release the ensemble model not utilizing Section Titles and developed within this study as *EnsIntWoS* (Paolini, 2024b). This result is extremely promising, mainly considering the possible enhancements that may derive from the application of the techniques outlined above. Additionally, a major contribution of this work is related to the explanations provided to make the decision-making process of the developed models more transparent and understandable. In conclusion, we set this work as a starting point to advance the CIC task and guide the development of future datasets, two processes that should go hand in hand with the field of XAI that, as we demonstrated, could be beneficial also to understand and correct possible biases within the developed tools. This work contributes to shaping research within the field of Citation Intent Classification, and to the ongoing dialogue within the academic community, providing new building blocks to understand the pivotal role that citations play within the academic discourse.

## Bibliography

1. Agarwal, S., Choubey, L., & Yu, H. (2010). Automatically classifying the role of citations in biomedical articles. *AMIA ... Annual Symposium Proceedings. AMIA Symposium, 2010*, 11–15.
2. Aldhyani, T. H. H., & Alkahtani, H. (2021). A Bidirectional Long Short-Term Memory Model Algorithm for Predicting COVID-19 in Gulf Countries. *Life, 11*(11), 1118. <https://doi.org/10.3390/life11111118>
3. Artur D 'Avila Garcez, Besold, T. R., Raedt, L. D., Földiak, P., Hitzler, P., Icard, T., Kai-Uwe Kühnberger, Lamb, L. C., Miikkulainen, R., & Silver, D. L. (2015). *Neural-Symbolic Learning and Reasoning: Contributions and Challenges*. <https://doi.org/10.13140/2.1.1779.4243>
4. Ba, J. L., Kiros, J. R., & Hinton, G. E. (2016). *Layer Normalization* (Version 1). arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.1607.06450>
5. Baker, M. (2016). 1,500 scientists lift the lid on reproducibility. *Nature, 533*(7604), 452–454. <https://doi.org/10.1038/533452a>
6. Bakhti, K., Niu, Z., & Nyamawe, A. S. (2018). Semi-Automatic Annotation for Citation Function Classification. *2018 International Conference on Control, Artificial Intelligence, Robotics & Optimization (ICCAIRO)*, 43–47. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ICCAIRO.2018.00016>
7. Beltagy, I., Lo, K., & Cohan, A. (2019). *SciBERT: A Pretrained Language Model for Scientific Text*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.1903.10676>
8. Bengio, Y., Simard, P., & Frasconi, P. (1994). Learning long-term dependencies with gradient descent is difficult. *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks, 5*(2), 157–166. <https://doi.org/10.1109/72.279181>
9. Breiman, L. (1996). Bagging predictors. *Machine Learning, 24*(2), 123–140. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00058655>
10. Cho, K., Van Merriënboer, B., Gulcehre, C., Bahdanau, D., Bougares, F., Schwenk, H., & Bengio, Y. (2014). Learning Phrase Representations using RNN Encoder–Decoder for Statistical Machine Translation. *Proceedings of the 2014 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing (EMNLP)*, 1724–1734. <https://doi.org/10.3115/v1/D14-1179>
11. Chung, J., Gulcehre, C., Cho, K., & Bengio, Y. (2014). *Empirical Evaluation of Gated Recurrent Neural Networks on Sequence Modeling* (Version 1). arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.1412.3555>
12. Ciccarese, P., Shotton, D., Peroni, S., & Clark, T. (2014). CiTO + SWAN: The web semantics of bibliographic records, citations, evidence and discourse relationships. *Semantic Web, 5*(4), 295–311. <https://doi.org/10.3233/SW-130098>
13. Cohan, A., Ammar, W., Van Zuylen, M., & Cady, F. (2019). Structural Scaffolds for Citation Intent Classification in Scientific Publications. *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North*, 3586–3596. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/N19-1361>
14. Cohan, A., & Goharian, N. (2015). Scientific Article Summarization Using Citation-Context and Article's Discourse Structure. *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 390–400. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/D15-1045>

15. Cornegruta, S., Bakewell, R., Withey, S., & Montana, G. (2016). Modelling Radiological Language with Bidirectional Long Short-Term Memory Networks. *Proceedings of the Seventh International Workshop on Health Text Mining and Information Analysis*, 17–27. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/W16-6103>
16. Daniele, A., Campari, T., Malhotra, S., & Serafini, L. (2022). *Deep Symbolic Learning: Discovering Symbols and Rules from Perceptions*. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2208.11561>
17. Devlin, J., Chang, M.-W., Lee, K., & Toutanova, K. (2019). BERT: Pre-training of Deep Bidirectional Transformers for Language Understanding. *Proceedings of the 2019 Conference of the North*, 4171–4186. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/N19-1423>
18. Ding, N., Hu, S., Zhao, W., Chen, Y., Liu, Z., Zheng, H., & Sun, M. (2022). OpenPrompt: An Open-source Framework for Prompt-learning. *Proceedings of the 60th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics: System Demonstrations*, 105–113. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2022.acl-demo.10>
19. Dong, C., & Schafer, U. (2011). Ensemble-style Self-training on Citation Classification. *Proceedings of 5th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing*, 623–631.
20. Dutta, A., Kumar, S., & Basu, M. (2020). A Gated Recurrent Unit Approach to Bitcoin Price Prediction. *Journal of Risk and Financial Management*, 13(2), 23. <https://doi.org/10.3390/jrfm13020023>
21. Freund, Y., & Schapire, R. E. (1996). Experiments with a new boosting algorithm. *Proceedings of the Thirteenth International Conference on International Conference on Machine Learning*, 148–156.
22. Garfield, E. (1964). Can Citation Indexing Be Automated? *Can Citation Indexing Be Automated?*
23. Garzone, M., & Mercer, R. E. (2000). Towards an Automated Citation Classifier. In H. J. Hamilton (Ed.), *Advances in Artificial Intelligence* (Vol. 1822, pp. 337–346). Springer Berlin Heidelberg. [https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-45486-1\\_28](https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-45486-1_28)
24. Gohel, P., Singh, P., & Mohanty, M. (2021). *Explainable AI: Current status and future directions* (arXiv:2107.07045). arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2107.07045>
25. Graves, A. (2013). *Generating Sequences With Recurrent Neural Networks* (Version 5). arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.1308.0850>
26. Hassan, S.-U., Akram, A., & Haddawy, P. (2017). Identifying Important Citations Using Contextual Information from Full Text. *2017 ACM/IEEE Joint Conference on Digital Libraries (JCDL)*, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1109/JCDL.2017.7991558>
27. Hochreiter, S., & Schmidhuber, J. (1997). Long Short-Term Memory. *Neural Computation*, 9(8), 1735–1780. <https://doi.org/10.1162/neco.1997.9.8.1735>
28. Huang, Y., Feng, X., Li, B., Xiang, Y., Wang, H., Qin, B., & Liu, T. (2024). *Ensemble Learning for Heterogeneous Large Language Models with Deep Parallel Collaboration* (arXiv:2404.12715). arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2404.12715>
29. Jiang, D., Ren, X., & Lin, B. Y. (2023). *LLM-Blender: Ensembling Large Language Models with Pairwise Ranking and Generative Fusion* (arXiv:2306.02561). arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/2306.02561>
30. Jochim, C., & Schutze, H. (2012). Towards a Generic and Flexible Citation Classifier Based on a Faceted Classification Scheme. *International Conference on Computational Linguistics*.

31. Jurgens, D., Kumar, S., Hoover, R., McFarland, D., & Jurafsky, D. (2018). Measuring the Evolution of a Scientific Field through Citation Frames. *Transactions of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 6, 391–406. [https://doi.org/10.1162/tacl\\_a\\_00028](https://doi.org/10.1162/tacl_a_00028)
32. Khan, A. A., Chaudhari, O., & Chandra, R. (2024). A review of ensemble learning and data augmentation models for class imbalanced problems: Combination, implementation and evaluation. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 244, 122778. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eswa.2023.122778>
33. Kim, H.-C., Pang, S., Je, H.-M., Kim, D., & Yang Bang, S. (2003). Constructing support vector machine ensemble. *Pattern Recognition*, 36(12), 2757–2767. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0031-3203\(03\)00175-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0031-3203(03)00175-4)
34. Kunnath, S. N., Herrmannova, D., Pride, D., & Knoth, P. (2021). A meta-analysis of semantic classification of citations. *Quantitative Science Studies*, 2(4), 1170–1215. [https://doi.org/10.1162/qss\\_a\\_00159](https://doi.org/10.1162/qss_a_00159)
35. Lahiri, A., Sanyal, D. K., & Mukherjee, I. (2023). CitePrompt: Using Prompts to Identify Citation Intent in Scientific Papers. *2023 ACM/IEEE Joint Conference on Digital Libraries (JCDL)*, 51–55. <https://doi.org/10.1109/JCDL57899.2023.00017>
36. Latif-Shabgahi, G. R. (2004). A novel algorithm for weighted average voting used in fault tolerant computing systems. *Microprocessors and Microsystems*, 28(7), 357–361. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.micpro.2004.02.006>
37. Leichtmann, B., Humer, C., Hinterreiter, A., Streit, M., & Mara, M. (2023). Effects of Explainable Artificial Intelligence on trust and human behavior in a high-risk decision task. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 139, 107539. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2022.107539>
38. Li, Z., & Ho, Y.-S. (2008). Use of citation per publication as an indicator to evaluate contingent valuation research. *Scientometrics*, 75(1), 97–110. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11192-007-1838-1>
39. Liu, L., Wu, X., Li, S., Li, Y., Tan, S., & Bai, Y. (2022). Solving the class imbalance problem using ensemble algorithm: Application of screening for aortic dissection. *BMC Medical Informatics and Decision Making*, 22(1), 82. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12911-022-01821-w>
40. Liu, S., Wang, Y., Zhang, J., Chen, C., & Xiang, Y. (2017). Addressing the class imbalance problem in Twitter spam detection using ensemble learning. *Computers & Security*, 69, 35–49. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cose.2016.12.004>
41. Longo, L., Brcic, M., Cabitza, F., Choi, J., Confalonieri, R., Ser, J. D., Guidotti, R., Hayashi, Y., Herrera, F., Holzinger, A., Jiang, R., Khosravi, H., Lecue, F., Malgieri, G., Páez, A., Samek, W., Schneider, J., Speith, T., & Stumpf, S. (2024). Explainable Artificial Intelligence (XAI) 2.0: A manifesto of open challenges and interdisciplinary research directions. *Information Fusion*, 106, 102301. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.inffus.2024.102301>
42. Loshchilov, I., & Hutter, F. (2017). *Decoupled Weight Decay Regularization* (Version 3). arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.1711.05101>
43. Lundberg, S., & Lee, S.-I. (2017). *A Unified Approach to Interpreting Model Predictions* (arXiv:1705.07874). arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1705.07874>
44. Meng, X.-L. (2020). Reproducibility, Replicability, and Reliability. *Harvard Data Science Review*, 2(4). <https://doi.org/10.1162/99608f92.dbfce7f9>

45. Mercier, D., Rizvi, S., Rajashekar, V., Dengel, A., & Ahmed, S. (2021). ImpactCite: An XLNet-based Solution Enabling Qualitative Citation Impact Analysis Utilizing Sentiment and Intent. *Proceedings of the 13th International Conference on Agents and Artificial Intelligence*, 159–168. <https://doi.org/10.5220/0010235201590168>
46. Mohammed, A., & Kora, R. (2023). A comprehensive review on ensemble deep learning: Opportunities and challenges. *Journal of King Saud University - Computer and Information Sciences*, 35(2), 757–774. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jksuci.2023.01.014>
47. Monteiro, J. P., Ramos, D., Carneiro, D., Duarte, F., Fernandes, J. M., & Novais, P. (2021). Meta-learning and the new challenges of machine learning. *International Journal of Intelligent Systems*, 36(11), 6240–6272. <https://doi.org/10.1002/int.22549>
48. Montgomery, J. M., Hollenbach, F. M., & Ward, M. D. (2012). Improving Predictions using Ensemble Bayesian Model Averaging. *Political Analysis*, 20(3), 271–291. <https://doi.org/10.1093/pan/mps002>
49. Moravcsik, M. J., & Murugesan, P. (1975). Some Results on the Function and Quality of Citations. *Social Studies of Science*, 5(1), 86–92. <https://doi.org/10.1177/030631277500500106>
50. Nanba, H., Kando, N., & Okumura, M. (2011). Classification of research papers using citation links and citation types: Towards automatic review article generation. *Advances in Classification Research Online*, 11(1), 117–134. <https://doi.org/10.7152/acro.v11i1.12774>
51. Pan, S., Luo, L., Wang, Y., Chen, C., Wang, J., & Wu, X. (2024). Unifying Large Language Models and Knowledge Graphs: A Roadmap. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 36(7), 3580–3599. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TKDE.2024.3352100>
52. Paolini, L. (2024a). *Enhanced Citation Intent Classification with Population-Based Training, Ensemble Strategies, and Language Models*. <https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.11535143>
53. Paolini, L. (2024b). *EnsIntWoS*. Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.11652577>
54. Paolini, L. (2024c). *EnsIntWS*. Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.11653641>
55. Paolini, L. (2024d). *Ensemble and XAI experiments for Citation Intent Classification* [Computer software]. Zenodo. <https://doi.org/10.5281/ZENODO.11616206>
56. Pascanu, R., Mikolov, T., & Bengio, Y. (2013). *On the difficulty of training Recurrent Neural Networks* (arXiv:1211.5063). arXiv. <http://arxiv.org/abs/1211.5063>
57. Peng, R. (2015). The Reproducibility Crisis in Science: A Statistical Counterattack. *Significance*, 12(3), 30–32. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1740-9713.2015.00827.x>
58. Peroni, S., & Shotton, D. (2012). FaBIO and CiTO: Ontologies for Describing Bibliographic Resources and Citations. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3198992>
59. Peters, M., Neumann, M., Zettlemoyer, L., & Yih, W. (2018). Dissecting Contextual Word Embeddings: Architecture and Representation. *Proceedings of the 2018 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 1499–1509. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/D18-1179>
60. Pranckevičius, T., & Marcinkevičius, V. (2017). Comparison of Naive Bayes, Random Forest, Decision Tree, Support Vector Machines, and Logistic Regression Classifiers for Text Reviews Classification. *Baltic Journal of Modern Computing*, 5(2). <https://doi.org/10.22364/bjmc.2017.5.2.05>



61. Pride, D. (2022). *Identifying and Capturing the Semantic Aspects of Citations*. <https://doi.org/10.21954/OU.RO.000146FF>
62. Pride, D., & Knoth, P. (2017). Incidental or Influential? - Challenges in Automatically Detecting Citation Importance Using Publication Full Texts. In J. Kamps, G. Tsakonas, Y. Manolopoulos, L. Iliadis, & I. Karydis (Eds.), *Research and Advanced Technology for Digital Libraries* (Vol. 10450, pp. 572–578). Springer International Publishing. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-67008-9\\_48](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-67008-9_48)
63. Ribeiro, M., Singh, S., & Guestrin, C. (2016). “Why Should I Trust You?”: Explaining the Predictions of Any Classifier. *Proceedings of the 2016 Conference of the North American Chapter of the Association for Computational Linguistics: Demonstrations*, 97–101. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/N16-3020>
64. Ritchie, A. (2008). *Citation Context Analysis for Information Retrieval*. [https://www.researchgate.net/publication/230800457\\_Citation\\_Context\\_Analysis\\_for\\_Information\\_Retrieval](https://www.researchgate.net/publication/230800457_Citation_Context_Analysis_for_Information_Retrieval)
65. Robins, R. H. (1970). Ferdinand de Saussure, Cours de Linguistique Générale, édition critique par Rudolph Engler, volumes 1–3. Wiesbaden: 1967–1968. Pp. xii + 515. *Journal of Linguistics*, 6(2), 302–304. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022226700002711>
66. Shanahan, M. (2022). *Talking About Large Language Models* (Version 5). arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2212.03551>
67. Shiri, F. M., Perumal, T., Mustapha, N., & Mohamed, R. (2023). *A Comprehensive Overview and Comparative Analysis on Deep Learning Models: CNN, RNN, LSTM, GRU* (Version 2). arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2305.17473>
68. Small, H. (2018). Characterizing highly cited method and non-method papers using citation contexts: The role of uncertainty. *Journal of Informetrics*, 12(2), 461–480. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.joi.2018.03.007>
69. Smyth, P., & Wolpert, D. H. (1997). Stacked Density Estimation. *Neural Information Processing Systems*.
70. Soares, C., Brazdil, P. B., & Kuba, P. (2004). A Meta-Learning Method to Select the Kernel Width in Support Vector Regression. *Machine Learning*, 54(3), 195–209. <https://doi.org/10.1023/B:MACH.0000015879.28004.9b>
71. Su, X., Prasad, A., Kan, M.-Y., & Sugiyama, K. (2019). Neural Multi-task Learning for Citation Function and Provenance. *2019 ACM/IEEE Joint Conference on Digital Libraries (JCDL)*, 394–395. <https://doi.org/10.1109/JCDL.2019.00122>
72. Sula, C. A., & Miller, M. (2014). Citations, contexts, and humanistic discourse: Toward automatic extraction and classification. *Literary and Linguistic Computing*, 29(3), 452–464. <https://doi.org/10.1093/lc/fqu019>
73. Teufel, S., Siddharthan, A., & Tidhar, D. (2006). Automatic classification of citation function. *Proceedings of the 2006 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing - EMNLP '06*, 103. <https://doi.org/10.3115/1610075.1610091>
74. Trier, J. O. (1931). *Der deutsche Wortschatz im Sinnbezirk des Verstandes: Die Geschichte eines Sprachlichen Feldes*.

75. Trindade Neves, F., Aparicio, M., & De Castro Neto, M. (2024). The Impacts of Open Data and eXplainable AI on Real Estate Price Predictions in Smart Cities. *Applied Sciences*, 14(5), 2209. <https://doi.org/10.3390/app14052209>
76. Valenzuela-Escárcega, M.-A., Ha, V., & Etzioni, O. (2015). Identifying meaningful citations. *Workshops at the Twenty-Ninth AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*.
77. Vaswani, A., Shazeer, N., Parmar, N., Uszkoreit, J., Jones, L., Gomez, A. N., Kaiser, L., & Polosukhin, I. (2017). *Attention Is All You Need* (Version 7). arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.1706.03762>
78. Wallin, J. A. (2005). Bibliometric Methods: Pitfalls and Possibilities. *Basic & Clinical Pharmacology & Toxicology*, 97(5), 261–275. [https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1742-7843.2005.pto\\_139.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1742-7843.2005.pto_139.x)
79. Xu, H., Martin, E., & Mahidadia, A. (2013). Using heterogeneous features for scientific citation classification. *Proceedings of the 13th Conference of the Pacific Association for Computational Linguistics*.
80. Yang, Z., Dai, Z., Yang, Y., Carbonell, J., Salakhutdinov, R., & Le, Q. V. (2019). *XLNet: Generalized Autoregressive Pretraining for Language Understanding* (Version 2). arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.1906.08237>
81. Yu, D., Yang, B., Liu, D., Wang, H., & Pan, S. (2023). A survey on neural-symbolic learning systems. *Neural Networks*, 166, 105–126. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.neunet.2023.06.028>
82. Zhao, D., Wang, X., Mu, Y., & Wang, L. (2021). Experimental Study and Comparison of Imbalance Ensemble Classifiers with Dynamic Selection Strategy. *Entropy (Basel, Switzerland)*, 23(7), 822. <https://doi.org/10.3390/e23070822>
83. Zhao, W. X., Zhou, K., Li, J., Tang, T., Wang, X., Hou, Y., Min, Y., Zhang, B., Zhang, J., Dong, Z., Du, Y., Yang, C., Chen, Y., Chen, Z., Jiang, J., Ren, R., Li, Y., Tang, X., Liu, Z., ... Wen, J.-R. (2023). *A Survey of Large Language Models* (Version 13). arXiv. <https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2303.18223>