



GEXTEXT: GRAPHICAL KNOWLEDGE EXTRACTION FROM BIOMEDICAL LITERATURE

Abstract

Rob O'Shea
robert.o'shea.17@ucl.ac.uk

Contents

Abstract.....	2
Introduction	3
Method	4
Gextext Technical Overview	4
Text Corpora	5
Tasks Overview	5
Geographical Tasks	6
Drug Mechanisms Task	6
Stroke Comorbidities Task	6
Results.....	7
Google Analogies Task	7
Application Task Validation.....	7
Geographical Tasks	9
Biomedical Tasks.....	10
Discussion.....	12
Performance Comparison	12
Advantages and Disadvantages of Gextext.....	12
Conclusions	13
References	13

Abstract

PURPOSE: Literature review is a complex task, requiring the expert analysis of unstructured data. Computational automation of this process presents a valuable opportunity for high-throughput knowledge extraction and meta-analysis. Currently available methods are limited to the detection of explicit and short-context relationships. We address this challenge with Gextext, which extracts a knowledge graph of latent relationships directly from unstructured text.

METHODS: Let C be a corpus of n text chunks. Let V^{target} be a set of query terms and V^{random} a random selection of terms in C . Let $V = \{V^{target} \cup V^{random}\}$ and $|V| = p$. Let $\mathbf{X} \in \{0,1\}^{n \times p}$ indicate the occurrence of V in C . Gextext learns a graph $G(V, E)$ by correlation thresholding on Σ , the covariance matrix of \mathbf{X} , where thresholds are estimated by the correlations with randomly selected terms. Gextext was benchmarked against GloVE in tasks where embedding distance matrices were correlated against real-world similarity matrices. A general corpus was generated from 5,000 randomly selected Wikipedia articles and a biomedical corpus from 961 research papers on stroke.

RESULTS: Embeddings generated by Gextext preserved relative geographical distances between countries (Gextext: rho = 0.255, $p < 2.22e-16$; GloVE: rho = 0.086, $p = 1.859e-09$) and capital cities (Gextext: rho = 0.282, $p < 2.22e-16$; Glove: rho = 0.093, $p = 8.0805e-11$). Gextext embeddings organised drug names by shared target (Gextext: rho = 0.456, $p < 2.22e-16$; GloVE: rho = 0.091, $p = 0.00087$) and stroke phenotypes by body system (Gextext: rho = 0.446, $p < 2.22e-16$; GloVE: rho=0.129, $p = 1.7464e-11$).

CONCLUSIONS: Gextext extracts latent relationships from unstructured text, enabling fully unsupervised automation of the literature review process.

Introduction

Scientific literature databases contain a vast quantity of biomedical knowledge, collected through the cumulative efforts of innumerable researchers. Due to the complexity and variability of the subject matter, significant expertise is often required to accurately interpret the data. Consequently, utilisation of this resource is critically limited by human learning capacity. Artificial intelligence has facilitated advancements in many areas where this constraint has been encountered. However, the computational automation of biomedical knowledge extraction is complicated by the unstructured natures of both the input and output.

Pattern-level knowledge modelling has followed two distinct approaches, distributed word representations and graphical relational models. Distributed word embedding models aim to map the corpus vocabulary to a set of real valued vectors such that vector-vector distances reflect the similarity of the corresponding term pair. Similarity is estimated from term co-occurrence within short context windows. Word vector learning methods such as Continuous-Bag-Of-Words (1), Skip-Gram (1) and GloVE (2) enabled major developments in biomedical language understanding tasks (3–5). Open information extractions models (3,6–8) encode explicit relationships between entities as tuples. This exact approach is suited to some biomedical tasks, such as drug-gene interaction mining. Multiple relational statements may subsequently be compounded into a unified knowledge graph (9,10).

Where context is implicit, long intervals of text may separate related entities. Such latent references present a challenge for knowledge extraction. Word embedding methods depend on term co-occurrence within a short context window. The context window may be extended, at the cost of including a greater proportion of uninteresting or unrelated terms, reducing the signal-to-noise ratio. Traditional word embedding methods embedding each term in the corpus vocabulary. In many knowledge extraction tasks, such as protein network inference, relationships are sought between a small subset of rare terms, which may co-occur infrequently according to short context windows. The size of suitable corpora is often limited in such problems, complicating the embedding task. Consequently, a current demand exists for unsupervised knowledge extraction methods which offer reliable results in low resource settings. Open information extraction models depend on simple, correct and explicit descriptions of relationships. Consequently, incorrect statements, mutually conflictual statements and long-range patterns present challenges for this model class (6,11).

We present Gertext, a novel embedding technique to address these challenges. Gertext ingests the corpus in large bag-of-words windows, facilitating the modelling of long-range dependencies. Gertext supports the embedding of a small set of query terms, simplifying the embedding task in large vocabulary tasks. Sparse graphical modelling is exploited to identify latent similarity between query terms and return a relational graph. In this paper we present a technical description of the Gertext algorithm, followed by performance comparisons of Gertext and GloVE in five low-resource embedding applications.

Method

Gextext Technical Overview

Let V^{target} be a set of query terms. Let $G^0(V^{target}, E^0)$ denote the true knowledge graph of V^{target} , such that E_{ij}^0 indicates the existence of a relationship between the i^{th} and j^{th} terms in V^{target} .

Let C be a corpus of n text chunks with vocabulary W . Let V^{random} be a random subset of W , such that $V^{target} \cup V^{random} = \emptyset$. Let $V = V^{target} \cup V^{random}$ and $|V| = p$. Let $\mathbf{X} \in \{0,1\}^{n \times p}$ be a binary matrix indicating the occurrence of V in C , such that:

$$\mathbf{X}_{i,j} \leftarrow \begin{cases} 1, & V_j \in C_i \\ 0, & V_j \notin C_i \end{cases}$$

Let $\Sigma \in \mathbb{R}^{\{p \times p\}}$ be the correlation matrix of \mathbf{X} , such that:

$$\Sigma_{i,j} = \frac{\mathbb{E} \left[\left(\mathbf{X}_{:,i} - \mu_{\mathbf{X}_{:,i}} \right) \left(\mathbf{X}_{:,j} - \mu_{\mathbf{X}_{:,j}} \right) \right]}{\sigma_{\mathbf{X}_{:,i}} \sigma_{\mathbf{X}_{:,j}}}$$

We seek to estimate G according to the significant entries in Σ . This is a common approach to graphical modelling (12,13). This method is typically complicated by difficulty in selecting the significance threshold (14). A vector t of thresholds for V^{target} is estimated by modelling the null distribution. Under the sparsity assumption, a negligible minority of randomly sampled terms are expected to relate to the query terms. We exploit this assumption to estimate the distribution of $\Sigma_{i,j}$ under the condition that $E_{ij}^0 = 0$. t is estimated with significance level α by:

$$t_i \leftarrow \eta_{1-\alpha}(\Sigma_{i,V^{random}}), V_i \in V^{target}$$

Where $\eta_{1-\alpha}$ denotes the $(1 - \alpha)^{th}$ quantile. E is subsequently defined according to the entries of Σ which meet the significance criteria for both terms.

$$\hat{E}_{i,j} \leftarrow \begin{cases} 1, & \Sigma_{i,j} > \max\{t_i, t_j\} \\ 0, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

$$\therefore \mathbb{E}[\hat{E}_{i,j} = 1, E_{ij}^0 = 0] = \alpha^2$$

X	Smoking V_1	Cancer V_2	Chemo- therapy V_3	Nausea V_4
.. <u>smoking</u> prior to developing lung <u>cancer</u> ... C_1 ,	1	1	0	0
... <u>cancer</u> <u>chemotherapy</u> commonly causes <u>nausea</u> ... C_2	0	1	1	1
... <u>cancer</u> treated with <u>chemotherapy</u> ... C_3	0	1	1	0




Figure 1: Visual description of Gextext Method

Text Corpora

A general corpus was generated by downloading 5,000 randomly selected Wikipedia articles. A biomedical corpus was generated from recent biomedical literature in the field of stroke bioinformatics. A literature search was performed on the query "stroke AND (genomics OR genetics OR proteomics OR metabolomics)". Papers were subsequently vetted for relevance manually. This process generated a corpus containing 961 medical papers, in fulltext PDF format. Plaintext was extracted directly from the PDF files. Text pre-processing was limited to tokenisation in both corpora.

C was extracted from corpora by extracting 1,000-word chunks at intervals of 250 words. Thus, a 750-word overlap existed between each chunk and its antecedent. Each chunk was scanned for exact string matches with terms in V to generate X . Null rows in X (indicating chunks containing no occurrence of any term in V) were removed.

Tasks Overview

The Google Analogies task is a commonly used benchmarking task for word embedding quality. The task requires the correct identification of semantically or syntactically analogous terms. In order to compare the performance of Gextext and GloVe on a small corpus, we removed tasks containing 38 words which did not occur in the corpus and limited the responses to the 867 terms occurring the tasks. Gextext term similarity was quantified using Σ .

Application tasks were defined to evaluate the quality of learned embeddings in general and biomedical and applications. Each task required the embedding of a vocabulary such that the distance matrix of the embedding correlated with some real-world dissimilarity matrix (2,15,16). Accordingly, entities embedded at nearby locations were expected to share some real-world property. Conversely, unrelated entities were expected to occupy distant regions in the embedding. Furthermore, categories

within the vocabulary were expected to correspond to clusters in the embedding. Ideally, this phenomenon should arise naturally due to the association of embedded distance and semantic dissimilarity.

Application Tasks were created the embedding of semantically clustered vocabularies (i.e. for which natural categorical partitions exist). The quality of the generated embeddings was subsequently quantified with two measures. Firstly, the association between the semantic dissimilarity matrix and the embedding’s distance matrix was measured, by Spearman’s correlation ($Test_A$). If a reasonable quantitative measure of semantic dissimilarity existed (such as in the geographical tasks, where geodetic distance between capital cities was used), this was used to generate the semantic dissimilarity matrix. Where semantic dissimilarity was entirely categorical, 0 was assigned if terms shared category or 1 otherwise. A second test measured the information gained by clustering on the embedding, with respect to the actual semantic categories of the vocabulary. Mutual information was measured between cluster memberships and categories ($Test_B$).

$$Test_A \leftarrow Cor\left(dist(V_i^{target}, V_j^{target}); dissimilarity(V_i^{target}, V_j^{target})\right)$$

$$Test_B \leftarrow Mutual.Info(Clusters; Categories_{V^{target}})$$

In each task, 25-, 50- and 100-dimensional GloVe embeddings were trained on the corpus. Distance matrices were generated by pairwise cosine similarity. Term clusters were identified by K-means clustering, where the optimal number of clusters was determined according to the gap statistic (18). Geodesic distance matrices were measured for each Gextext embedding graph. For unconnected pairs, distance was defined as $(d_{max} + 1)$, where d_{max} is the diameter of the largest component in the graph. Clusters were identified by Louvain clustering (19).

Geographical Tasks

The countries task required the embedding of country names to reflect the topology of the world map. Geographical distance was measured between capital cities for each pair of countries in the general corpus. In $Test_A$ the embedding’s distance matrix was correlated against the geographical distance matrix. In $Test_B$ mutual information was measured between clusters on the embedding and the continental locations of the place names. The capital cities task required the embedding of capital cities in a manner equivalent to that of the countries task.

Drug Mechanisms Task

The drug mechanisms task required the embedding of generic drug names to reflect protein target sharing. Drug names and targets were identified by string matching with the ChEMBL database. In $Test_A$ the embedding’s distance matrix was correlated against a categorical dissimilarity matrix (dissimilarity = 0 if drugs shared target and 1 otherwise). In $Test_B$ mutual information was measured between clusters on the embedding and target proteins.

Stroke Comorbidities Task

This tasks required the embedding of clinical terms, so that nearby terms had similar relevance to stroke. A vocabulary of 74 terms was generated. Each term was assigned a body system category as appropriate from one of “cancer, cardiometabolic, connective tissue, gastrointestinal, neuropsychiatric, respiratory”. The term “stroke” was also included in the target vocabulary. In $Test_A$ the embedding’s distance matrix was correlated against a categorical dissimilarity matrix (dissimilarity = 0 if terms related to the same body system and 1 otherwise). In $Test_B$ mutual information was measured between clusters on the embedding and body systems.

Results

Google Analogies Task

Gextext outperforms GloVE in semantic and syntactic embedding tasks, trained on the general corpus. The proportion of correct responses achieved by GloVE is considerably lower than that achieved on the 2008 Wikipedia corpus (GloVE_100: semantic = 67.5, syntactic = 54.3) (2). This performance discrepancy is due to the small size of training corpus (the 2008 Wikipedia corpus contains over 2,000,000 articles, 400x larger than the corpus used here).

Table 1: Google Analogies task performance. Gextext was compared to GloVE following training on a small corpus of 5,000 Wikipedia articles.

	<i>Semantic Rank</i>	<i>Semantic Correct</i>	<i>Syntactic Rank</i>	<i>Syntactic Correct</i>
Gextext	0.9079	0.0836	0.8501	0.0321
GloVE_25	0.8228	0.039	0.7077	0.0079
GloVE_50	0.8523	0.0147	0.7212	0.0024
GloVE_100	0.8443	0.0026	0.7012	0.0006

Application Task Validation

For each application task objective, hypotheses were formulated that embedded distance would associate with some semantic dissimilarity. Distance matrices of Gextext embeddings correlated significantly with semantic dissimilarity matrices for each task (Countries: $\rho = 0.255$, $p < 2.22e-16$; Capital Cities: $\rho = 0.282$, $p < 2e-16$; Therapeutic Agents: $\rho = 0.282$, $p < 2e-16$; Stroke Comorbidities: $\rho = 0.282$, $p < 2e-16$), thereby validating the assigned task objectives.




Figure 2: Performance of Gextext and GloVE (with 25-, 50- and 100- dimensional vectors) in each task. Left: Test A, Spearman correlation of the semantic dissimilarity matrix and the embedding's distance matrix. Right: Test B, Mutual information between clusters estimated on the embedding and semantic categories.




Figure 3: Network of world countries learned from the Wikipedia corpus. Vertices are coloured according to continent.

Geographical Tasks

The distance matrix of the Gextext countries embedding correlated with the inter-capital distance matrix ($\rho = 0.255$, $p < 2.22e-16$). The GloVE embeddings correlated weakly with inter-capital distance, achieving maximal performance with a 50-dimensional embedding ($\rho = 0.086$, $p = 1.859e-09$). Clusters found on the Gextext graph were moderately informative with respect to the continents (mutual info = 0.943). Clusters found on the GloVE embeddings were less informative - the highest mutual information was again achieved by the 50-dimensional representation (mutual info = 0.664). The distance matrix of the Gextext capital cities embedding correlated with true inter-capital distances ($\rho = 0.256$, $p < 2.22e-16$). Clusters found on the Gextext graph were informative with respect to the continents (mutual info = 0.767). Several rare city names were isolated on the Gextext graph. The GloVE embeddings were less faithful to the inter-capital distance matrix. The 50-dimensional embedding performed best on $Test_A$ ($\rho = 0.093$, $p = 8.0805e-11$), though the 100-dimensional offered the most informative clusters (mutual info = 0.454).




Figure 4: Network of therapeutic agents learned from the biomedical corpus. Agents are coloured according to primary target.

Biomedical Tasks

Gextext demonstrated excellent performance in the “Therapeutic Agents” task, learning a graph on which geodesic distance correlated inversely with target sharing ($\rho = 0.456$, $p < 2.22e-16$). Furthermore, clusters mapped approximately to targets (mutual info = 1.246). 100-dimensional GloVE embeddings performed moderately in both $Test_A$ ($\rho = 0.091$, $p = 0.0008692$) and $Test_B$ (mutual info = 0.871), attaining considerably lower scores than Gextext. Gextext also achieved the highest performance in the Stroke Comorbidities task, learning a graph on which clusters approximately partitioned diseases by body system (mutual info = 1.125). Geodesic distance increased between diseases of different body systems on this graph ($\rho = 0.446$, $p < 2.22e-16$). Optimal GloVE

performance was attained with the 100-dimensional embedding, in both $Test_A$ ($\rho=0.129$, $p = 1.7464e-11$) and $Test_B$ (mutual info = 0.929).




Figure 5: Induced subgraph of the Stroke Comorbidities graph learned by Gextext on the biomedical corpus.

Visual inspection of the stroke comorbidities graph learned by Gextext confirms that adjacent terms were clinically associated. The random sample of vertex neighbourhoods demonstrates that neighbouring vertices in the Gextext graph indicate common comorbidities and similar phenotypes. For example, *alzheimer's*, *depression* and *bipolar* are found in the neighbourhood of *schizophrenia*. Likewise, the neighbourhood of *hepatitis* contains *hepatoblastoma*, *cholangiocarcinoma*, *pancreatitis* and *hemochromatosis*. It is therefore evident that Gextext learned clinically relevant disease associations in the biomedical corpus. The stroke vertex itself is embedded between a cluster of cardiometabolic vertices and a cluster of neuropsychiatric vertices.

Term	Neighbourhood
stroke	hypertension, thrombosis, infarction, ischemia, fibrillation, stenosis, atrial, mellitus, cardioembolic, carotid, dementia, parkinsons, alzheimers, depression
retinoblastoma	medulloblastoma, astrocytoma, hemangioblastoma, rhabdomyosarcoma, pheochromocytomas
hepatitis	hepatoblastoma, angiocarcinoma, cholangiocarcinoma, pancreatitis, hemochromatosis, biliary
schizophrenia	alzheimers, depression, bipolar
rheumatoid	atherosclerosis, osteoarthritis, psoriasis, uveitis, fracture, asthma

Figure 6: Sample of neighbourhoods in the stroke comorbidities graph generated by Gextext.

Discussion

Performance Comparison

In our assigned tasks, Gextext outperforms GloVe in all measures. The geographical task posed a difficult challenge for knowledge embeddings, as explicit details of the geographical entities' relative locations would presumably be rare in randomly selected Wikipedia articles. Therefore, the information required to generate the graphs was almost entirely implicit. Other inherent challenges included the large number of relations required and the rarity of several entities. Gextext's strong performance indicates its power to detect latent relationships within non-specific corpora.

In the biomedical tasks, similarity was evaluated using categorical measures. Consequently, the binary nature of the Gextext graph provided a well-defined measure for the relatedness of entities. In the drug clustering task, clusters corresponded closely to drug targets, presenting a valuable opportunity for semi-supervised drug-target prediction. In the phenotypic modelling task, vertex neighbourhoods contained similar phenotypes and risk factors for comorbidities. This approach may find application in the multivariate modelling of rare phenotypes, such as the suggestion of missing diagnoses, given patient comorbidity profiles. In some cases, the paths between terms on the graph indicated mediating phenotypes, presenting an opportunity for network vulnerability approaches to disease prevention.

Advantages and Disadvantages of Gextext

It should be noted that GloVe returns an embedding which contains a vector representation for each term in the vocabulary. This objective is far more complex than the embedding of the small vocabulary subsets used in this task. Gextext frames the embedding task as a p -dimensional graphical inference problem. Therefore, with large target vocabularies it faces the reliability challenges associated with high-dimensional model selection (20,21).

Gextext uses random terms to model the expected correlation measures of unrelated terms, using a significance cut-off which is exceeded at a predictable rate by random terms. Application of Gextext to a set of unrelated terms will produce a graph with sparsity approximately equal to α . In tasks where the target vocabulary is selected at random, an adjusted threshold of $t_i \leftarrow \max(\Sigma_{i,V}^{random})$ may provide more reliable results.

The complexity of GloVe scales as $O(|W|^2)$ (2,22), necessitating the generation of a large co-occurrence matrix for the entire vocabulary. Gextext requires the $O(|V|^2)$ calculation of the

covariance matrix of \mathbf{X} , providing an efficient alternative for tasks where $|V^{target}| \ll |W|$. The support for vocabulary subsetting is expected to be particularly advantageous in the modelling of short corpora with large vocabularies.

Conclusions

Gextext efficiently extracts latent relationships from unstructured text, enabling fully unsupervised automation of the literature review process. The method supports the generation of an embedding for a small subset of the corpus vocabulary, substantially simplifying the task. We demonstrate in four low-resource task simulations that Gextext outperforms GloVe, an industry standard word embedding method. The method demonstrates broad applicability in various tasks across general and specialist domains. Optimal tasks for Gextext analysis specify a moderate sized target vocabulary and supply a large corpus of relevant documents. Further biomedical applications of Gextext may include drug repurposing, predictive diagnostics and genomic network inference.

References

1. Mikolov T, Corrado G, Chen K, Dean J. Efficient Estimation of Word Representations in Vector Space. arXiv. 2013;1–12.
2. Pennington R, Socher J, Manning C. GloVe: Global Vectors for Word Representation. 2014.
3. Ganguly D, Roy D, Mitra M, Jones GJF. A word embedding based generalized language model for information retrieval. In: SIGIR 2015 - Proceedings of the 38th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval. 2015. p. 795–8.
4. Tang D, Wei F, Yang N, Zhou M, Liu T, Qin B. Learning sentiment-specific word embedding for twitter sentiment classification. In: 52nd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, ACL 2014 - Proceedings of the Conference. Association for Computational Linguistics; 2014. p. 1555–65.
5. Zhang Y, Chen Q, Yang Z, Lin H, Lu Z. BioWordVec, improving biomedical word embeddings with subword information and MeSH. Sci data. 2019 Dec 10;6(1):52.
6. Angeli G, Premkumar MJ, Manning CD. Leveraging linguistic structure for open domain information extraction. In: ACL-IJCNLP 2015 - 53rd Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics and the 7th International Joint Conference on Natural Language Processing of the Asian Federation of Natural Language Processing, Proceedings of the Conference. 2015. p. 344–54.
7. Mausam, Schmitz M, Bart R, Soderland S, Etzioni O. Open language learning for information extraction. In: EMNLP-CoNLL 2012 - 2012 Joint Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing and Computational Natural Language Learning, Proceedings of the Conference. 2012. p. 523–34.
8. Banko M, Cafarella MJ, Soderland S, Broadhead M, Etzioni O. Open information extraction from the web. In: IJCAI International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence. 2007. p. 2670–6.
9. Fauqueur J, Thillaisundaram A, Togia T. Constructing large scale biomedical knowledge bases

- from scratch with rapid annotation of interpretable patterns. In: Proceedings of the 18th BioNLP Workshop and Shared Task. Stroudsburg, PA, USA: Association for Computational Linguistics; 2019. p. 142–51.
10. Sang S, Yang Z, Wang L, Liu X, Lin H, Wang J. SemaTyP: a knowledge graph based literature mining method for drug discovery. *BMC Bioinformatics*. 2018 Dec 30;19(1):193.
 11. Wang X, Zhang Y, Li Q, Chen Y, Han J. Open Information Extraction with Meta-pattern Discovery in Biomedical Literature. *ACM-BCB 2018 - Proc 2018 ACM Int Conf Bioinformatics, Comput Biol Heal Informatics*. 2018;18:291–300.
 12. Rosato A, Tenori L, Cascante M, De Atauri Carulla PR, Martins dos Santos VAP, Saccenti E. From correlation to causation: analysis of metabolomics data using systems biology approaches. Vol. 14, *Metabolomics*. 2018. p. 37.
 13. Sulaimanov N, Koeppel H. Graph reconstruction using covariance-based methods. *Sulaimanov Koeppel EURASIP J Bioinforma Syst Biol*. 2016;19.
 14. Sulaimanov N, Koeppel H. Graph reconstruction using covariance-based methods. *EURASIP J Bioinforma Syst Biol*. 2016;
 15. Mikolov T, Chen K, Corrado G, Dean J. Distributed Representations of Words and Phrases and their Compositionality. 2013.
 16. Bengio Y, Ducharme R, Vincent P, Jauvin C, Ca JU, Kandola J, et al. A Neural Probabilistic Language Model. Vol. 3, *Journal of Machine Learning Research*. 2003.
 17. Chen M, Gimpel K. Smaller Text Classifiers with Discriminative Cluster Embeddings. *Proc 2018 Conf North Am Chapter Assoc Comput Linguist Hum Lang Technol*. 2018;2:739–45.
 18. Tibshirani R, Walther G, Hastie T. Estimating the number of clusters in a data set via the gap statistic. *J R Stat Soc Ser B (Statistical Methodol)*. 2001 May 1;63(2):411–23.
 19. Blondel VD, Guillaume J-L, Hendrickx JM, Jungers RM. Distance distribution in random graphs and application to networks exploration. 2007.
 20. Foygel R, Drton M. Extended Bayesian information criteria for Gaussian graphical models. In: *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 23: 24th Annual Conference on Neural Information Processing Systems 2010, NIPS 2010*. 2010.
 21. Wasserman L, Roeder K. HIGH-DIMENSIONAL VARIABLE SELECTION. *Ann Stat*. 2009;37(5A):2178–201.
 22. Friedman J, Hastie T, Tibshirani R. Sparse inverse covariance estimation with the graphical lasso. 2007;1–14.
 23. Zhou S, Edu S, Ch RME, Xu M. High-dimensional Covariance Estimation Based On Gaussian Graphical Models Philipp R " utimann. *Journal of Machine Learning Research*. 2011.