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Abstract—In social media, sentiments or online reviews are important information sources for product purchase decision-making. Usually, both favorable reviews and negative reviews from social media users may significantly impact companies’ trade. Therefore, effective and efficient methods for sentiment classification have currently become the most concerning issues for companies. One of the best useful methods is machine learning. However, when employing these sentiment classification methods, the class imbalance problems which are caused by imbalanced data need to be considered since the performance accuracy of the majority class is often higher than that of the minority class. Therefore, this study aims to propose the Modified Cluster based over-Sampling (MCS) method which is expected to be a novel cluster based over-sampling method, for imbalanced sentiment classification. Some UCI data sets and three sentiment classification cases including two actual cases of imbalanced text comments regarding MP3 products and electronic commerce services were our research data which were employed to illustrate the usefulness of our proposed method. The experimental results indicate that our proposed method is superior to conventional re-sampling methods, such as over-sampling, cluster-based sampling, and decision tree algorithm.
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I. INTRODUCTION

S

ocial media have been considered as the one of most important Internet applications (Chen et al., 2009; Chang et al., 2019). Recently, text content based social media, such as Facebook, micro-blog, Twitter, and Plurk have become crucial communication mechanisms used by an increasing amount of Internet users (Cohen and Krishnamurthy, 2006; Denecke and Nejdl, 2009; Singh et al., 2008; Chang et al., 2019; Chang et al., 2020). In the cyber world, textual comments, reviews, or opinions are usually powerful. These comments in social media can provide product information and recommendations from the customer perspectives (Chang et al., 2020). Chang et al. (2019) also considers these textual reviews are important bases for product-purchase decision making of potential customers. Qiu et al. (2018) believes that online reviews are an important asset for users who are making business decisions. Consequently, a diversity of enterprises attempts to use social media as useful channels to promote their products and respond to customers. However, the results are not always positive. For instance, some negative comments related to companies’ images or unfavorable evaluations of products will spread quickly and bring great damage to entrepreneurs. Besides, these negative product reviews can be treated as customer complaints which could provide useful information to improve specific enterprisers’ services (Tian et al., 2016). Therefore, to effectively classify online text comments’ sentiments has become the most concerning problem for social commerce (Nakayama and Wan, 2019). Sentiment classification which divides sentiments into positive and negative can identify customers’ emotions to help companies to carefully respond to customers’ comments (Zhang et al., 2015).

Sentiment analysis has become important as the number of digital text resources increases with the development of information and communication technology (Ruz et al., 2020; Gokalp et al. 2020). The studies of sentiment classification have attracted not only researchers in 1990s, such as Kessler et al. (1997), Spertus (1997), and Argamon et al. (1998), but also the current researchers in the area of information management, data mining, and computer sciences, such as Chaovalit and Zhou (2005), Wiebe and Riloff (2005), Wilson et al. (2005), Li et al. (2018) and Liu et al. (2020). Specially, Li et al. (2020) even used news sentiments to predict stock prices.

Machine learning algorithms have been considered as one of the most effective solutions for successfully classifying social media users’ sentiments (Zhang et al. 2015; Ibrahim and Abdulaziz, 2020; Xu et al., 2020). For example, Xu et al. (2020) proposed a continuous Naïve Bayes learning framework for large-scale and multi-domain e-commerce platform product review sentiment classification. Alam et al. (2020) used convolutional neural networks (CNN) to analyze sentiments in social media. Asif et al. (2020) used Support Vector Machines (SVM) to classify the sentiments of extremism and reported that SVM was superior to Naïve Bayes (NB).

However, Liu et al. (2009) indicated that the natural distribution of textual data used in text classification is often imbalanced. Such imbalanced data, for example, huge amounts of favorable comments overwhelm negative comments and vice versa, often cause class imbalance...
problems when applying machine learning methods to sentiment classification of textual data (Chen et al., 2008; Liu et al., 2008; Suresh et al., 2008; Su and Hsiao, 2007; Zhang et al., 2015). Therefore, class imbalance problems have been majorly concerned and currently attracted many researchers in various fields since the classification performance accuracy of the majority class is often higher than that of the minority class (Chen et al., 2008; Vashishtha and Susan, 2019; Fu et al., 2020). Particularly, class imbalanced problems were considerable issues in text mining domain, such as automatic text categorization (Liu et al., 2009; Ogura et al., 2011; Zheng et al., 2004; Chen et al., 2010; Sun et al., 2009), disease detection (Richhariya and Tanveer, 2020), fault diagnosis (Qian and Li, 2020), author identification (Stamatatos, 2008), direct marketing and churn prediction (Wong et al., 2020), credit risk prediction (Zanin, 2020), political and religious extremism detection (Asif et al., 2020), and spam detection (Sakkis et al., 2001). Specially, in the field of political detection, Chau and Xu (2007) mentioned that negative comments related to anti-Blacks, suicide, bomber making, drugs, and porn were comparatively much fewer than normal opinions. Asif et al. (2020) added some political, religious, or social issues which would cause extremism among people were depicted by their sentiments on social media. However, the existing researchers agreed that identifying minor comments effectively is more important than detecting normal comments in many textual classification cases. For instance, for spam identification, Cohen and Krishnamurthy (2006) concluded that although the amount of regular emails was much less than the amount of spam emails, identifying regular emails was more important than detecting spam ones. Stamatatos (2008) focused on author identification. The text categorization problems found in this study were that extremely few training texts were collected from some selective authors or a significant variation in the text-length was present among the available training texts of the selective authors.

Recently, many researchers have studied imbalanced textual data (Wang et al., 2013; Tian et al., 2016; Li et al., 2018). For example, Li et al. (2018) proposed a domain-adaptive model that incorporates universal and domain-specific knowledge for imbalanced text sentiment classification. Wang et al. (2013) presented a sample cutting method for imbalanced text sentiment classification. Tian et al. (2016) proposed a topic sentence-based instance transfer method for imbalanced sentiment classification of Chinese product reviews. Liu et al. (2009) presented a simple probability-based term weighting scheme in which two critical information ratios were used to identify documents in minor categories. Stamatatos (2008) attempted to solve imbalanced textual data by segmenting the training texts into text samples basing on the size of the class, then produced a fairer classification model. Padurariu and Breaban (2019) employed a cost-sensitive method for imbalanced text data. Zheng et al. (2004) investigated the effectiveness of several feature metrics, such as information gain, Chi-square, correlation coefficient, and odds ratios based on Naïve Bayes and SVM for imbalanced text categorization classification. In the work of Xi et al. (2019), they considered that least squares support vector machine (LSSVM) was an effective method for solving class imbalance problems. Chen et al. (2011) proposed a new method to improve text categorization under class imbalance by exploiting the semantic context in text documents. Sun et al. (2009) used SVM to conduct a comparative study on the effectiveness of these strategies in the context of imbalanced text classification. El-Alfy and Al-Azani (2017) compared different classifiers for polarity determination in highly imbalanced short Arabic text datasets with and without the Synthetic Minority Over-Sampling Technique (SMOTE).

Following this trend, this study aims to propose a Modified Cluster-Based Over-Sampling (MCS) method to tackle the class imbalance problems in textual sentiment classification. Three cases including two actual cases of imbalanced textual comments regarding MP3 products and electronic commerce services were our research data which were employed to illustrate the effectiveness of our proposed MCS method. The experimental results were compared with traditional techniques, such as over-sampling, under-sampling, and cluster-based sampling.

II. RELATED WORKS

In recent years, imbalance data classification which is an intrinsic characteristic of multi-label data (Liu and Tsoumakas, 2020) and class imbalance problems have been so important that they have attracted a wide diversity of researchers in data mining areas (Andrzej, 2019; Henriquez et al., 2019; Hendry and Chen, 2019; Richhariya and Tanveer, 2020; Bria et al., 2020). Therefore, the amount of published papers regarding the class imbalance problems has been continuously increasing in IEEE and ACM (He and Garcia, 2009). In related works, several methods have been proposed to solve class imbalance problems. These methods can be divided into two groups. Methods in the first group are algorithm-oriented approaches which aim to propose new learning algorithms or modify existing methods. This group includes various approaches, such as Support Vector Machines (SVM) (Richhariya and Tanveer, 2020), one class learning, neural networks (NN), and information granulation-based methods. Particularly, Wu and Chang (2005) used SVM to tackle class imbalance problems while Richhariya and Tanveer (2020) presented a reduced universum twin SVM for class imbalance learning. Moraes et al. (2013) applied both SVM and Artificial Neural Networks (ANN) to classify a textual review. Yan et al. (2009) proposed an adjustment method of the separating hyperplane in SVM for the credit access application in commercial banks. Orriols-Puig et al. (2009) aimed to study the behavior of Michigan-style learning classifier systems on imbalanced domains and to use the lessons provided by the analysis to improve the modeling of rare classes. Manevitz and Yousef (2002) used one class learning SVM to detect rare events.

In addition, deep learning, logistic regression, and neural networks have been employed to tackle this issue. For instance, Bria et al. (2020) proposed a two-stage deep learning framework to deal with the high-class imbalance encountered during training of small lesion detectors medical images. Williams et al. (2009) proposed a modified logistic regression method for imbalanced remote-sensing classification problems. Qian and Li (2020) proposed a class imbalance-robust network which combines feature extraction
and classification for bearing fault diagnosis.

The second group includes several re-sampling techniques. García et al. (2019) suggested re-sampling methods, either by under-sampling the majority class or by over-sampling the minority class, and then the most powerful techniques were selected for solving the class imbalance problems. The re-sampling techniques include (1) under-sampling, (2) over-sampling, (3) cluster-based sampling and kernel density estimation-based sampling, (4) cost sensitive, and (5) Mahalanobis Distance (MD) based two phase learning. In the under-sampling methods, the minority population is kept intact, while the majority population is under-sampled (Liu and Tsoumakas, 2020; Hamidzadeh et al., 2020). In contrast in the over-sampling methods, the minority examples are over-sampled so that the desired and fair class distribution is obtained in the training set (El-Alfy and Al-Azani, 2017; García et al., 2019; Raghuwanshi and Shukla, 2020).

Differently in the cluster-based sampling methods proposed by Altincay and Ergun (2004), Chen et al. (2009b), and Ofek et al. (2017) and the kernel density estimation-based sampling methods suggested by Kamalov (2020), the representative examples are randomly sampled from clusters or kernel density estimation. Furthermore, in the cost sensitive methods, the prediction accuracy is improved by adjusting the cost (weight) for each class (Min and Liu, 2009; Weiss and Provost, 2003; Zhang et al., 2019; Wong et al., 2020). Finally, in the Mahalanobis Distance (MD) based two phase learning methods, MD is firstly used to screen the majority examples which are ensured 100% that they are truly majority (Chen et al., 2009a).

Moreover, Wong et al. (2020) proposed cost-sensitive deep neural networks (NN) and cost-sensitive deep NN ensemble methods to address class imbalance problems. Ofek et al. (2017) proposed a fast clustering-based under-sampling method for classifying imbalance data. Liu et al. (2008) presented a weighted rough sets model in which weighted information entropy was used to deal with imbalanced data. Suresh et al. (2008) proposed two risk-sensitive loss functions to solve the class imbalance problems. Fernández et al. (2010) attempted to improve the behavior of fuzzy rule-based classification systems in imbalanced data-sets by adapting the 2-tuples based genetic tuning approach.

Generally, although the methods in the first group may have better performance than the methods in the second group, the methods in the second group are simpler and long training time are unnecessary. Therefore, this study focuses on re-sampling techniques which are to modify the class distributions of the training data by different sampling strategies. Over-sampling and under-sampling are the simplest methods. However, over-sampling cannot gain new information about the minority class, since under-sampling may lose useful information about the majority class (Japkowicz and Stephen, 2002). These supervised methods lack a rigorous and systematic treatment on imbalanced data and they still have some drawbacks (Huang et al., 2004). To enhance over-sampling and under-sampling, cluster-based sampling techniques (Altincay and Ergun, 2004) have been proposed. However, the number of clusters and how to choose representative examples are difficult to be determined in cluster-based sampling methods (Hulse et al., 2009).

Therefore, a cluster-based over-sampling approach has been presented to select those who have nearest distances from centroids of the built clusters to be representative examples for learning (Jo and Japkowicz, 2004; Ofek et al., 2017). Cohen et al. (2006) used the K-means algorithm to cluster examples and then employed the central point of a constructed cluster to represent the whole cluster. Li et al. (2008) presented an under-sampling method based on variable self-organizing map (SOM) clustering. They firstly used SOM to cluster data and then deleted some examples in the clusters that have high purities to improve the imbalanced situation.

Additionally, some researchers indicated that data complexity or data structure, such as over-lapping, lack of representative data (He and Garcia, 2009), and small disjuncts (Weiss and Provost, 2003) might be the causes of the class imbalance problems. Also, this work aims to study the sentiment classification problems; therefore, textual data which has some unique characteristics, such as high dimensionality and small sample size (i.e. the number of samples might be smaller than the number of attributes) will need to deal with because characteristics of textual data may influence the performance of classifiers.

To sum up, this study aims to propose a Modified Cluster based Sampling (MCS) method which introduces two objective indexes, purity and entropy, to determine the number of clusters. In addition, we implemented 2 sampling strategies to select representative examples to find a robust cluster-based sampling method to tackle the class imbalance problem in social media users’ sentiment classification. Several data sets from UCI data bank and three real cases of product reviews were experimented to illustrate the effectiveness of our proposed MCS method. Also, some experiments were implemented to evaluate the influences of handling textual data including both high dimensionality and small sample size.

III. PROPOSED METHODOLOGY

A. Implemental Procedure

This section will introduce the detailed implemental procedure of the proposed MCS approach which can be separated into three phases. As shown in figure 1, they are “clustering”, “selecting representative examples from constructed clusters”, and “learning”.

In the clustering phase, we gathered similar examples into clusters. The objective of Phase II is to select representative examples from the constructed clusters. In this phase, we used over-sampling techniques which mean duplicating the minority examples until the class imbalance situation was improved. Consequently, for selecting representative examples, the majority examples were kept intact and the minority examples were duplicated by utilizing two strategies, named MCS1 and MCS2. Depending on measuring the Euclidean distances between examples and the central point of the built cluster, MCS1 selects the representative minority examples and then employs over-sampling technique to duplicate these minority examples until the class imbalance situation was improved. MCS2 uses three data characteristics (minimum, median, maximum) of every single one cluster as
the representative minority examples. Then those selected representative minority examples were joined together with the majority examples to be the training set. In the final phase, the objectives of MCS1 and MCS2 were to build classifiers from this balanced training set. In this study, we employed a decision tree (C4.5) to be our learner. Moreover, we compared our proposed methods with traditional methods under consideration of different dimensionality and small sample size of data. Hopefully, we could find one robust cluster-based sampling method for imbalanced sentiment classification.

**Phase I: Build Cluster**

Step 1: Construct clusters from the minority objects. K-mean has been utilized to construct cluster objects. Purity and entropy indexes are also used to determine number of clusters.

Step 2: After clustering, we separate majority and minority examples into two groups. We do nothing for the majority examples. We only apply over-sampling technique to the minority examples.

**Phase II: Cluster based sampling**

Step 3: Compute the Euclidean distance between objects and the central point of cluster.

Step 4: Select representative samples which are close to the central point. Those objects will be the representatives of the constructed clusters.

Step 5: Implement over-sampling technique. The selected minority examples will be duplicated till their amount is equal to the majority examples.

**Phase III: Build Classifiers**

Step 6: Combine those duplicated minority examples (in Step 5) with the original majority examples to be the training data set.

Step 7: Build a classifier by using decision tree (C4.5).

**C. MCS2**

MCS2 uses another kind of over-sampling method to produce representative minority set in phase II. Unlike MCS1, MCS2 uses three data characteristics such as minimum, median, and maximum to be the represent one constructed minority clusters. In other words, we use three statistically descriptive values to denote every single one cluster. Detailed algorithm of implementing MCS2 can be found as bellow.

**Phase I: Build Cluster**

Step 1: Construct clusters from the majority examples. In this work, K-mean will be utilized to cluster objects. The majority population is kept intact.

Step 2: For each cluster, we separate majority and minority examples into two groups. We do nothing for the majority examples. We only apply over-sampling technique to the minority examples.

**Phase II: Cluster based sampling**

Step 3: Compute values of minimum, median, and maximum for every minority class cluster. These three values will become the representatives of the constructed clusters of minority examples.

**Phase III: Build Classifiers**

Step 4: Combine those representatives with the original

---

**Entropy**

\[
Entropy = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{n_i}{n} E(C_i) \quad (1)
\]

**Purity**

\[
Purity = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \frac{n_i}{n} P(C_i) \quad (2)
\]

Where,

\[
E(C_i) = -\frac{1}{\log q} \sum_{i=1}^{q} \frac{n_i}{n} \log \frac{n_i}{n}
\]

\[
P(C_i) = -\frac{1}{n_i} \max_i (n_i)
\]

and \( q \) denotes the number of class labels, \( n_i \) means the percentage of class label \( r \) in cluster \( i \), \( k \) is number of constructed clusters.

Unlike traditional over-sampling method which merely randomly duplicates the minority examples until the imbalanced situation is improved, after clustering, MCS1 firstly selects the minority examples which are close to the central point of built clusters to be our representatives of each constructed cluster. Then, we used oversampling technique to duplicate the representative minority examples. Next, these duplicated minority examples were combined together with the majority examples to be the training set. Finally, we built a classifier from this balanced training set. The detailed steps for MCS1 are as follows:

**Phase I: Build Cluster**

Step 1: Construct clusters from the minority objects. K-mean has been utilized to construct cluster objects. Purity and entropy indexes are also used to determine number of clusters.

Step 2: After clustering, we separate majority and minority examples into two groups. We do nothing for the majority examples. We only apply over-sampling technique to the minority examples.

**Phase II: Cluster based sampling**

Step 3: Compute the Euclidean distance between objects and the central point of cluster.

Step 4: Select representative samples which are close to the central point. Those objects will be the representatives of the constructed clusters.

Step 5: Implement over-sampling technique. The selected minority examples will be duplicated till their amount is equal to the majority examples.

**Phase III: Build Classifiers**

Step 6: Combine those duplicated minority examples (in Step 5) with the original majority examples to be the training data set.

Step 7: Build a classifier by using decision tree (C4.5).
majority examples to be the training data set. Step 5: Build a classifier. In this study, we use decision tree (C4.5) to construct classifiers.

D. Traditional Re-sampling Methods for Imbalanced Data

In this work, the proposed MCS1 and MCS2 will be compared with traditional re-sampling techniques for solving class imbalance problem, such as Li’s method, cluster based under-sampling (CBS), and over-sampling method. Let’s briefly introduce these comparative methods.

Firstly, we introduce Li’s method (2008). After clustering the majority examples, this method uses the under-sampling strategy of removing the examples whose purities are higher than others to reduce the amount of majority examples. However, there is slightly different from the original approach. For example, we only conduct the single one class examples and use two indexes to determine the number of clusters. The detailed algorithm of Li’s method can be found as follows.

Phase I: Build Cluster
Step 1: Construct clusters from the majority objects. In this step, K-mean and two indexes, purity and entropy, have been employed to construct clusters.
Step 2: Separate majority and minority examples into two groups. The minority population is kept intact.

Phase II: Cluster based Sampling
Step 3: Rank the purities of all constructed clusters.
Step 4: Remove those examples in the clusters whose purities are higher than others till the imbalanced situation has been improved.

Phase III: Build Classifiers
Step 5: Join those representative majority examples and the original minority examples together to be the training data set.
Step 6: Build a classifier.

In CBS method, we use two indexes to determine the suitable number of clusters. Then we use under-sampling method to select representative examples from both majority and minority examples. Over-sampling method is to reduplicate the minority examples till the imbalanced situation has been improved. DT means we do nothing for imbalanced data and merely implement decision tree algorithm.

E. Measurement Index

This section will introduce some indexes used in this study. First one is overall accuracy (OA). But, OA is not enough for imbalanced sentiment classification. OA considers misclassification errors to be equal. But as we know, a highly imbalanced class situation does not have equal costs that favor the minority class, which is often the class of primary interest. Consequently, in addition to OA, we use positive accuracy (PA), negative accuracy (NA), and geometric mean of PA and NA (G-Mean) to evaluate classifiers. The definition of OA is as equation (5).

\[ \text{Overall Accuracy} = \frac{TP + TN}{TP + FP + TN + FN} \] (5)

, where TP is the number of true positive; TN denotes the number of false negative; FP means the number of false positive; TN represents the number of true negative.

In this study, PA and NA represent the ability of detecting the positive (majority) and negative (minority) examples, respectively. PA and NA are defined as

\[ PA = \frac{TP}{TP + FN} \] (6)
\[ NA = \frac{TN}{FP + TN} \] (7)

Another index G-mean defined in equation (8) has been introduced. This index is to maximize the accuracy on each of two classes while keeping these accuracies balanced. For instance, a high PA by a low NA will result in a poor G-mean.

\[ G\text{-mean} = \sqrt{PA \times NA} \] (8)

IV. IMPLEMENTATION

A. Employed Data

In this study, we firstly use five data sets from UCI machine learning repository which are available from the website (www.ics.uci.edu/~mlearn) to evaluate the effectiveness of our proposed MCS method in general case. In order to create imbalanced data set, we combine all classes together except the minority class. Therefore, we transfer multi-class into binary-class classification problem. Table 1 summarizes the basic information of the five used data sets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data set</th>
<th>Data set size</th>
<th>No. of attributes</th>
<th>Attribute value</th>
<th>Class distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haberman</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Integer</td>
<td>Survived: 74% Died*: 26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ionosphere</td>
<td>351</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Integer, Real</td>
<td>Good: 69% Bad*: 31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAE</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Categorical, Integer</td>
<td>Low*: 32.5% Med: 33.1% High: 34.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td>759</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Integer</td>
<td>Healthy: 66% Diabetic*: 34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contraceptive Method Choice (CMC)</td>
<td>1473</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>Categorical, Integer</td>
<td>No-use: 43% Long-term*: 22% Short-term: 35%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: In class distribution column, “*” indicates the minority class, when we combine other class examples to be our majority class.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Data Set</th>
<th>Notation</th>
<th>No. of attributes</th>
<th>Data Size</th>
<th>Class distribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>MP3 product evaluation</td>
<td>MP3</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>Positive: 305 Negative: 44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>EC service comment</td>
<td>EC</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Positive: 140 Negative: 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Movie Review</td>
<td>Movie</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>Positive: 700 Negative: 300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Besides, this work focuses on imbalanced sentiment classification problem. Therefore, we employs three imbalanced sentiment data sets including two real cases from
real world social media users’ comments and one famous movie reviews database (available at http://www.cs.cornell.edu/people/pabo/movie-review-data/).
Table 2 summarizes the brief background of these three employed imbalanced sentiment data sets. The first two data sets are from “reviewcenter (www.reviewcentre.com)”. By focusing the topics of “electronic commerce service (EC)” and “MP3 product evaluation (MP3)”, we collect 200 and 349 reviews, respectively. There are 140 positive and 60 negative comments in EC data set and the amount of attributes is 66. In MP3 data set, we collect 304 positive and 44 negative comments, and there are 300 attributes to describe MP3 data. Moreover, because these comments have no class labels, we use the 10-star rating system in “reviewcenter” website to define users’ sentiments. For example, a comment will be labeled as positive (negative) if the rate is above 7 stars (below 4 stars). Those comments whose rates are between 4 and 7 stars have been disregarded. The last data set comes from movie reviews database. In order to create imbalanced data set, we randomly select 700 positive and 300 negative comments to be our experimental corpus. The dimensionality of movie review data is 325. Moreover, four-fold cross validation experiment has been implemented in this study.
In addition, the shareware Rubryx (http://www.sowsoft.com/rubryx) has been utilized to extract key words (attributes of textual data) in this work. Rubryx segments words based on n-gram (unigram, bigrams, and tri-grams) features. Before extracting n-gram key words, some frequently used stop words should be removed. Readers can find a useful stop word list which is available at http://www.dcs.gla.ac.uk/idom/ir_resources/linguistic_utils/stop_words. Each comment is converted into a vector of terms (keywords) with term frequency.

B. Results of Five UCI Data Sets
This section will evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed MCS1 and MCS2 in UCI data sets. Table 3 summarizes the implemental results of our proposed MCS1 and MCS2 and traditional methods on five UCI data sets. Even implementing 4 fold cross validation experiment, we merely list mean value and standard deviation (SD) for the purpose of being easily understood. In this table, “DT” means we do nothing for imbalanced data and just implement decision tree algorithm. PA and NA denote the ability of identifying the majority examples and minority examples, respectively. In the results of DT, we found PAs are very high and NAs are very low in “Haberman”, “TAE”, “CMC”, and “Diabetes” data sets. That means there are serious class imbalance problems in these four data sets. But, in “Ionosphere” set, this problem is not very bad.

Since G-mean can take both PA and NA into consideration, we firstly use this index to measure the performances of proposed methods. From table 3, all G-means of five data sets indicate that MCS2 has the best performance compared than MCS1, CBS, Li’s method, over-sampling, and DT. This situation also could be easily confirmed from Figure 2. From this figure, readers can easily find the peaks of performance curves locate at MCS2.
Moreover, MCS2 also can increase over accuracy in most experiments such as “TAE”, “CMC”, “Ionosphere” and “Diabetes”. MCS1 is only slightly better than other traditional re-sampling methods in “TAE”, “Ionosphere”, and “Diabetes.” MCS1 is worse than CBS in “Haberman” and “CMC” data. Therefore, from the results, we can conclude that MCS2 is more effective than MCS1. In addition, compared with traditional re-sampling techniques, MCS2 can not only increase G-mean, but also increase the overall accuracy.

C. Results of Five UCI Data Sets
This section will evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed MCS1 and MCS2 in UCI data sets. Table 3 summarizes the implemental results of our proposed MCS1 and MCS2 and traditional methods on five UCI data sets. Even implementing 4 fold cross validation experiment, we merely list mean value and standard deviation (SD) for the purpose of being easily understood. In this table, “DT” means we do nothing for imbalanced data and just implement decision tree algorithm.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Proposed Methods</th>
<th>Traditional Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MCS1 (%)</td>
<td>MCS2 (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haberman</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OA</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OA</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMC</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OA</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ionosphere</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OA</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM</td>
<td>92.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diabetes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OA</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GM</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: “DT” means we do nothing for imbalanced data and just implement decision tree algorithm.
Fig. 2. Comparisons between the proposed MCS method and traditional methods by considering G-mean

D. Results of Three Imbalanced Sentiment Classification Cases

This section will evaluate the effectiveness of the proposed MCS1 and MCS2 in textual data. Table 4 summarizes the experimental results of implementing our methods in three real cases of sentiment classification. From the results of DT, we can found there are serious class imbalance problems in all three cases. It means that in these cases PA is very high but NA is unacceptably low. In other words, if we do nothing for these three imbalanced sentiment classification data, a classifier cannot identify any negative comments (minority class).

In MP3 case, MCS2 has a better G-mean (62.39%) than MCS1 (49.9%), CBS (55.74%), Li’s method (45.68%), over-sampling (61.15%) and DT (8.05%). Besides, in top three good methods, MCS2 is more stable (SD: 14.68%) than over-sampling (SD: 10.59%) and CBS (8.71%). In EC case, top two methods which has best performance are the proposed MCS1 (61.70%) and MCS2 (63.06%). Both of them outperform CBS (54.9%), Li’s method (54.3%), over-sampling (59.0%) and DT (49.7%). But, in this case, MCS1 (SD: 3.61%) is more stable than MCS2 (SD: 14.68%). Besides, compared with traditional re-sampling techniques including CBS, Li’s method, and over-sampling, MCS1 and MCS2 do lose too much overall accuracy.

Figure 3 provides an overview of comparisons between the proposed MCS methods and traditional re-sampling methods in movie review case, MCS1 has better performance than MCS2, CBS, Li’s method, and DT. Particularly, G-mean of MCS1 is 57.9%, of MCS2 is 55.62%, of CBS, of Li’s method is 56.9%, over-sampling is 55.2%, and of DT 53.8%, respectively. Similarly, SD of MCS1 is 3.68%, of MCS2 is 4.62% of CBS is 1.51%, of Li’s method is 1.95%, of over-sampling is 3.61%, and of DT is 2.69%, respectively.

TABLE IV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Index</th>
<th>Proposed Methods</th>
<th>Traditional Methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
<td>Mean SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MCS1 (%)</td>
<td>MCS2 (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MP3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OA</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>17.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OA</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Movie</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA</td>
<td>45.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OA</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EM</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In MP3 case, MCS2 has a better G-mean (62.39%) than MCS1 (49.9%), CBS (55.74%), Li’s method (45.68%), over-sampling (61.15%) and DT (8.05%). Besides, in top three good methods, MCS2 is more stable (SD: 14.68%) than over-sampling (SD: 10.59%) and CBS (8.71%). In EC case, top two methods which has best performance are the proposed MCS1 (61.70%) and MCS2 (63.06%). Both of them significantly outperform CBS (54.9%), Li’s method (54.3%), over-sampling (59.0%) and DT (49.7%). But, in this case, MCS1 (SD: 3.61%) is more stable than MCS2 (SD: 14.68%). Besides, compared with traditional re-sampling techniques including CBS, Li’s method, and over-sampling, MCS1 and MCS2 do lose too much overall accuracy.

Figure 3 provides an overview of comparisons between the proposed MCS methods and traditional re-sampling methods in movie review case, MCS1 has better performance than MCS2, CBS, Li’s method, and DT. Particularly, G-mean of MCS1 is 57.9%, of MCS2 is 55.62%, of CBS, of Li’s method is 56.9%, over-sampling is 55.2%, and of DT 53.8%, respectively. Similarly, SD of MCS1 is 3.68%, of MCS2 is 4.62% of CBS is 1.51%, of Li’s method is 1.95%, of over-sampling is 3.61%, and of DT is 2.69%, respectively.
E. Effects of Small Sample Size Problem

This section will introduce the effects of the small sample size (SSS) problem which means the number of attributes (x) is larger than data size (n) on our proposed methods. Since the SSS problem is very common in textual data, we used three sentiment classification data to do experiments. In order to create an SSS situation, we reduced sample size (SSS) problem which means the number of attributes (x) is larger than data size (n). In this study, we experimented two SSS situations in which x: n has been set up as 2:1 and 4:1, respectively. Table 6 provides the setting of the SSS situation in our experiments. Figures 4–6 list the results of different SSS situations on three textual data. It might not be easy to see the performance changes when varying SSS situations. Therefore, we merely considered G-mean and drew classifiers’ performance changes as in Figures 4–6.

![Table V Results of Hypotheses Tests for Comprehensive Evaluations](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>G-mean P-value</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1</td>
<td>[H_0 : \mu_{MCS2} \leq \mu_{MCS1}]</td>
<td>0.266</td>
<td>Accept H0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[H_1 : \mu_{MCS2} &gt; \mu_{MCS1}]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2</td>
<td>[H_0 : \mu_{MCS2} = \mu_{MCS1}]</td>
<td>0.533</td>
<td>Accept H0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[H_1 : \mu_{MCS2} \neq \mu_{MCS1}]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3</td>
<td>[H_0 : \mu_{MCS2} \leq \mu_{\text{Li's method}}]</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>Reject H0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[H_1 : \mu_{MCS2} &gt; \mu_{\text{Li's method}}]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4</td>
<td>[H_0 : \mu_{MCS2} \leq \mu_{CBS}]</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>Accept H0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[H_1 : \mu_{MCS2} &gt; \mu_{CBS}]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5</td>
<td>[H_0 : \mu_{MCS2} \leq \mu_{\text{over-sampling}}]</td>
<td>0.148</td>
<td>Accept H0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[H_1 : \mu_{MCS2} &gt; \mu_{\text{over-sampling}}]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6</td>
<td>[H_0 : \mu_{MCS2} \leq \mu_{DT}]</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>Reject H0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[H_1 : \mu_{MCS2} &gt; \mu_{DT}]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7</td>
<td>[H_0 : \mu_{MCS1} \leq \mu_{\text{Li's method}}]</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>Reject H0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[H_1 : \mu_{MCS1} &gt; \mu_{\text{Li's method}}]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8</td>
<td>[H_0 : \mu_{MCS1} \leq \mu_{CBS}]</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td>Accept H0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[H_1 : \mu_{MCS1} &gt; \mu_{CBS}]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H9</td>
<td>[H_0 : \mu_{MCS1} \leq \mu_{\text{over-sampling}}]</td>
<td>0.326</td>
<td>Accept H0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[H_1 : \mu_{MCS1} &gt; \mu_{\text{over-sampling}}]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H10</td>
<td>[H_0 : \mu_{MCS1} \leq \mu_{DT}]</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>Reject H0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[H_1 : \mu_{MCS1} &gt; \mu_{DT}]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Fig. 4. The results of considering small sample size in MP3 case](image)

![Fig. 5. The results of considering small sample size in EC case](image)

![Fig. 6. The results of considering small sample size in Movie review case](image)

Note: "x" means the amount of attributes and "n" is data size.
classifiers decrease except in Li's method. When the SSS situation changes from the original set to 4:1, Li’s method is more stable than other methods. In addition, when only comparing MCS1 and MCS2, unlike MCS2, MCS1’s performance drops slightly.

Figure 5 provides the effects of SSS problems in EC cases. From this figure, we can find that the performances of DT and Li’s method decrease to zero when the SSS situation is set to 4:1. The results of over-sampling and traditional CBS also show that they suffer from SSS problems. In contrast, in our MCS1 and MCS2, their performances do not drop very dramatically. In contrast, they keep stable performances when varying SSS situations. Considering movie review results in Figure 6, MCS1 cannot be influenced when SSS situations change from original set to 4:1. However, the performances of other methods including MCS2 have decreased. To sum up, MCS1 outperforms MCS2 and other traditional re-sampling methods when thinking of SSS problems in textual sentiment data.

V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The class imbalance problems are very common issues in text classification, so they need to be consider seriously when applying machine learning methods for sentiment classification. In order to enhance re-sampling methods, we proposed MCS1 and MCS2 methods which are expected to provide a possible solution for the class imbalance problems. The research data were five UCI data sets and three imbalanced sentiment classification data. After successful experiments, it can be concluded that in most cases, MCS2 outperforms MCS1 and other traditional techniques, such as CBS, Li’s method, over-sampling, and DT. In addition, although some results (3 in 5 UCI data and 2 in 3 sentiment classification cases) indicate MCS1 is slightly better than other re-sampling methods, we have no significant evidence to claim that. This part is needed to be validated by doing additional experiments.

Secondly, SSS problems are very common and has become a critical issue in textual data. Without implementing dimensionality reduction approaches, MCS1 has a better and more stable performance than MCS2 and other traditional re-sampling techniques. The reason is that MCS2 uses an over-sampling method, which duplicates minority examples until the imbalanced situation are improved in order to select representative minority class examples. This approach might dramatically solve the SSS problems and better classification performance.

Integrating feature selection (feature extraction techniques) into the proposed method might be a potential direction for future works. Moreover, although this study focuses on imbalanced sentiment classification, our proposed method is also suitable for classifying sentiment in any text-based communication tools, such as text content-based social media and some websites combined with social commerce. However, if we need to identify customers’ sentiment in a call center, voice data should be handled. It is also a good direction for future experiments.
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