arXiv:1911.02648v2 [cs.DL] 3 Mar 2020

Textual analysis of artificial intelligence manuscripts reveals features associated with peer review outcome.

Philippe Vincent-Lamarre [1,2,*] Vincent Larivière [1]

December 21, 2021

1 École de bibliothéconomie et des sciences de l'information, Université de Montréal, Montréal, Canada

2 École de psychologie, Université d'Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada

* Corresponding author

Abstract

We analysed a dataset of scientific manuscripts that were submitted to various conferences in artificial intelligence. We performed a combination of semantic, lexical and psycholinguistic analyses of the full text of the manuscripts and compared them with the outcome of the peer review process. We found that accepted manuscripts scored lower than rejected manuscripts on two indicators of readability, and that they also used more scientific and artificial intelligence jargon. We also found that accepted manuscripts were written with words that are less frequent, that are acquired at an older age, and that are more abstract than rejected manuscripts. The analysis of references included in the manuscripts revealed that the subset of accepted submissions were more likely to cite the same publications. This finding was echoed by pairwise comparisons of the word content of the manuscripts (i.e. an indicator or semantic similarity), which were more similar in the subset of accepted manuscripts. Finally, we predicted the peer review outcome of manuscripts with their word content, with words related to machine learning and neural networks positively related with acceptance, whereas words related to logic, symbolic processing and knowledge-based systems negatively related with acceptance.

1 Introduction

Peer review is a fundamental component of the scientific enterprise and acts as one of the main source of quality control of the scientific literature [1]. The primary form of peer review occurs before publication

[2] and it is often considered as a stamp of approval from the scientific community [3, 4]. Peer-reviewed publications have a considerable weight in the attribution of research and academic resources [5, 6, 7].

One of the main concern about peer review is its lack of reliability [8, 9, 10]. Most studies on the topic find that agreement between reviewers is barely greater than chance [11, 12, 13], which highlights the considerable amount of subjectivity involved in the process. This leaves room for a lot of potential source of bias, which have been reported in several studies [14, 15, 16]. A potential silver lining is that it appears that the process has some validity. For instance, articles accepted at a general medicine journal [17] and journals in the domain of ecology [18] were more cited than the rejected articles published elsewhere, and the process appears to improve the quality of manuscripts, although marginally [19, 20, 21]. It is therefore surprising that a process that has little empirical support of its effectiveness, but a lot of evidence of its downsides [22] has so much importance.

The vast majority of studies on peer review have focused on the relationship between the socio-demographical attributes of the actors involved in the process and its outcome [23]. Comparatively, little research has focused on the association between the content of the manuscripts and the peer review process. This isn't surprising given that there is little publicly available datasets of manuscripts annotated as rejected or accepted, and whenever they are made available to researchers it is usually through smaller samples designed to answer specific questions. Another factor contributing to this gap in the litterature is that it is more time consuming to analyse textual data (either the referee's report or the reviewed manuscript) than papers' metadata. However, the increasing popularity of open access [24, 25] allows for a greater access to the full text of scientific manuscripts.

By scraping the content of arXiv, one of those repositories, [26] developed a new method to identify manuscripts that were accepted at conferences after the peer review process based on submissions around the time of major NLP, machine learning (ML) and artificial intelligence (AI) conferences. These preprints were then matched with manuscripts that were published at the target venues as a way to determine whether they were accepted or "probably-rejected". In addition, the manuscripts and peer-review outcomes were collected from conferences that agreed to share their data. [26] were able to achieve decent accuracy at predicting the acceptance of the manuscripts in their dataset. Other groups were able to obtain good performance at predicting paper acceptance with different machine learning models based on the text of the manuscripts [27], sentiment analysis of referee's reports [28], or the evaluation score given by the reviewers [29].

In this manuscript, we take advantage of the full text access to those manuscripts and explore linguistic and semantic features that correlates with the peer review outcome. Such features are relevant to two types of biases that could be involved in the peer review process: language and content bias. In the language bias, authors who aren't native English speakers could receive more negative evaluations due to the linguistic level of their manuscripts [30, 31, 32]. Our understanding of the extent to which such a bias could play

a role in research evaluation is still limited, which is worrying given the increasingly globalized scientific system that relies on one language: English [33]. In terms of content bias, innovative and unorthodox methods are less likely to be judged favourably [14]. This type of bias is also quite likely to play a role in fields that are dominated by a few mainstream approaches such as AI [34]. Conservatism in this field could impede the emergence of breakthrough or novel techniques that don't fit with the current trends.

In this manuscript, we address both types of biases by comparing the textual data (title, abstract and introduction) of the manuscripts. We first used two readability metrics (the Flesch Reading Ease (FRE) and the New Dale-Chall Readability (NDC) Formula), as well as some indicators of scientific jargon content, and found that manuscripts that were less readable and used more jargon were more likely to get accepted. Accepted and rejected manuscripts were compared on their psycholinguistic and lexical attributes and we found that accepted manuscripts used words that were more abstract, less frequent and acquired at a later age compared to rejected manuscripts. We then compared manuscripts on their word content and their referencing patterns through bibliographic coupling, and found that the subset of accepted manuscripts were semantically closer than rejected manuscripts. Finally, we used the word content of the manuscripts to predict their acceptance, and found that specific topics were associated with greater odds of acceptance.

2 Methods

2.1 Manuscript data

We used the publicly available PeerRead dataset [26] to analyse the semantic and lexical differences between accepted and rejected submissions to some natural language processing, artificial intelligence and machine learning conferences. We therefore used content from six platforms archived in the PeerRead dataset: three arXiv sub-repositories tagged by subject including submissions from 2007 to 2017 (AI: artificial intelligence, CL: computation and language, LG: machine learning), as well as submissions to three other venues: (ACL 2017: Association for Computational Linguistics, CoNLL 2016: Conference on Computational Natural Language Learning, ICLR 2017: International Conference on Learning Representations). This resulted in a dataset with 12,364 submissions. Although the submissions to ACL 2017 and CoNLL 2016 had an acceptance rate in [26], the information for each submission was not available in the dataset at the time of the analysis.

We limited our analysis to the title, abstract and introduction of the manuscripts, because the methods and results contained formulas, mathematical equations and variables, which made them unsuitable for textual analysis.

Platform	# Papers	# Accepted
ICLR 2017	427	172
ACL 2017	137	-
CoNLL 2016	22	-
arXiv:ai	4092	418
arXiv:cl	2638	646
arXiv:lg	5048	1827

Table 1: Number of papers per platform.

2.2 Semantic similarity

The textual data of each article, including the title, abstract, introduction were cleaned by making all words lowercase, eliminating punctuation, single character words and common stopwords. For all analyses except for the readability, scientific jargon and psycholinguistic matching, the stem of the word was extracted using the porter algorithm [35]. We used the Term Frequency Inverse Document Frequency (tf-idf) algorithm to create vectorial representations based on the field of interest (title, abstract or introduction). We then used those vectors to compute the cosine similarity between the pairs of documents.

2.3 Reference matching

In order to obtain manuscript's bibliographic coupling, we developed a reference matching algorithm because their format was not standardized across manuscripts. We used four conditions to group references together: 1- They were published the same year 2- They had the same number of authors 3- They had a similarity score above 0.7 (empirically determined after manual inspection of matching results) with a fuzzy matching procedure (*Token Set Ratio* function from the FuzzyWuzzy python library, https://github.com/seatgeek/fuzzywuzzy) on the author's names and 4- the article's title.

2.4 Psycholinguistic and readability variables

For the word frequency estimation, we used the $\text{SUBTLEX}_{\text{US}}$ corpus [36] from which we used the logarithm of the estimated word frequency + 1. For the concreteness, we used the [37] dataset providing concreteness rating for 40,000 commonly known English words. For the age of acquisition, we used the [38] age of acquisition ratings for 30,000 English words.

We used the readability functions as implemented in [39]. We used the Flech Reading Ease (FRE; [40, 41]) and the New Dale-Chall Readability Formula (NDC; [42]). The FRE is calculated based on the number of syllables per words and the number of words per sentence. The NDC is based on the number of words per sentence and the proportion of difficult words that are not part of a list of "common words". We also included two sources of jargon developed by [39]. The first one are science-specific common words, which are words used by scientist which are not in the NDC's list of common words. The other is the general science jargon, which are words frequently used in science, but aren't specific to

science (see [39] for methods). Finally, we complied a list of AI jargon from three online glossaries ($https://developers.google.com/machine-learning/glossary/$, $http://www.wildml.com/deep-learning-glossary/$ and $https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Glossary_of_artificial_intelligence$).

2.5 Data analysis

Because of the exploratory nature of the study and the large size of the datasets, null hypothesis significance testing has many shortcomings [43]. In some cases, we performed statistical analysis of the results and reported the p-value, but those results should be interpreted carefully. Our analyses rely on the effect size, as well as the cross-validated effects on the independent subsets of the PeerRead dataset (manuscripts from different venues and online repositories). All error bars represent the standard error of the mean.

2.6 Identification of geographic location

We searched through the email addresses of the authors to identify research within the United-States (US) and outside the US. We considered a manuscript as US based if at least one author had an email address that ended with ".edu".

2.7 Code and data availability

The custom python scripts and the data used to generate the results of this manuscript can be found at https://github.com/lamvin/PeerReviewAI.git.

3 Results

3.1 Readability

The readability of scientific articles has been steadily declining in the last century [39]. One possible explanation for this is that writing more complex sentences and using more scientific jargon increase the likelihood that a manuscript will get accepted at peer review. To investigate this hypothesis, we used two measures of readability on our data: the Flesch Reading Ease (FRE) and the New Dale-Chall Readability Formula (NDC). FRE scores decrease as a function of a ratio of the number of syllables per word and the number of word per sentence. NDC scores increase as a function of the number of words in each sentence and as the proportion of difficult words increase (words that are not present in the NDC list of common words). We also included the proportion of words from a science-specific common words and general science jargon list (constructed by [39]). In order to control for potential demographic confounds, we divided our dataset in the two categories: manuscripts within and outside the United States (US).

We found that both indicators of readability were correlated with the peer review outcome. FRE (higher score = more readable) was lower for accepted manuscripts, while NDC (higher score = less readable) was higher for accepted manuscripts (Fig. 1). This was the case for both US and non-US manuscripts (with no sizeable differences), for every section of the manuscript (title, abstract and introduction) and the effect was replicated within most platforms, except for the introduction with the FRE indicator.

As [39] reported that the proportion of scientific jargon has increased over the last century, we also wondered if the peer review process would reflect this effect. Using a list of general and specific scientific jargon, we found that the manuscripts containing the higher ratios of jargon were associated with higher acceptance rates. However, our list of science jargon was biased towards content from the life sciences. To confirm the relevance of these results to our dataset, we generated an AI jargon list (see Methods). Using this new list, we found a robust effect across platforms and document section, where a larger proportion of AI jargon predicted greater odds of acceptance for the manuscripts.

The replication of our results independently for US and non-US based manuscripts suggest that the effect is not driven by geographic locations. Statistical analysis are summarised in Tables 6 and 7.

3.2 Lexical correlates of peer review outcome

We then investigated the differences between accepted and rejected submissions based on lexical and psycholinguistic attributes. Given that we haven't found consistent differences between US and non-US based submissions, we pooled all manuscripts together for the rest of the analysis. We used the number of tokens (total number of words in a document) as well as two measures of lexical diversity: the number of types (unique words in a document) and the ratio between the types and token (Type-Token Ratio, TTR). We also used three psycholinguistic variables: the age of acquisition (AOA), concreteness and frequency (on a logarithmic scale). We computed the average values of those psycholinguistic variables on all types and all tokens.

We found consistent effects between the psycholinguistic variables and across platforms and section, with few exceptions. Words used in accepted manuscripts were less frequent, acquired later in life and more abstract than in rejected manuscripts on average (Fig. 2). The effects were consistent across all platforms except ICLR (which is smaller than the other ones).

Interestingly, we found that shorter titles, abstract and introduction were all associated with higher acceptance rates. Unsurprisingly, this translated in a bias towards manuscript with lower total types (for every section) for manuscript acceptance. However, when taking the ratio between the two (TTR, an indicator of lexical richness), we found that this variable was positively associated with manuscript acceptance. Results from the statistical analysis are summarised in Table 8.




Figure 1: Average readability and jargon proportion of US and non-US manuscripts.




Figure 2: Psycholinguistic and lexical scores of manuscripts.

3.3 High-level semantic correlates of peer review outcome

3.3.1 Bibliographic coupling and semantic similarity

We then looked at how similar the accepted manuscripts were compared to the rejected ones based on their semantic content. First we looked at the similarity of their title, abstract or introduction based on a tf-idf representation of their word content. Secondly, we looked at their degree of bibliographic coupling. We only compared pairs of manuscripts that shared at least one common reference for the next analysis (see table 2).

# of common cited references	Frequency
1	1,619,173
2	379,161
3	124,574
4	47,254
5-9	36,753
10-19	2,527
20-29	230
30-39	68
40-49	31
50-59	11
60-80	4

Table 2: Citation intersection for all papers.

As the two approaches quantify the content similarity of the documents, we wanted to verify whether those two metrics measured different aspects of the document content. It was previously reported that there

is a moderate correlation between the two measures in the field of economics [44]. We correlated the semantic distance with the bibliographic coupling of the document submitted to each platform. We used a semantic distance metric based on the cosine similarity between the tf-idf representation of each document, as well as both the citation intersection (# common references) and the Jaccard similarity coefficient (#references in common/ # references in total) as a measure of bibliographic coupling. We found a moderate correlation (Pearson $r > 0.20$ and < 0.40) between both measures of bibliographic coupling and semantic distance when pooling all platforms together depending on what section of the manuscript were compared (Fig. 3). This suggests that those two measures aren't redundant features of semantic content, and that they might capture different aspects of it. This also validates our algorithm for citation disambiguation as comparable correlations between the bibliographic coupling and textual similarity were reported in [44].




Figure 3: Correlation between semantic similarity and bibliographic coupling.

3.3.2 Bibliographic coupling and peer review outcome

We then looked at how accepted and rejected manuscripts differed based on the characteristics of their cited references (bibliographic coupling). We compared all pairs of manuscripts on the two indicators of bibliographic coupling (intersection and Jaccard index). Each pair of manuscripts was categorized as one of the following: "accepted": the two submissions were accepted, "rejected": the two submissions were rejected, and "mixed", one document was rejected and the other was accepted.

We found that accepted manuscripts had more references in common (Fig. 4) than the two other cat-

egories of manuscripts. The effect was slightly weaker for the Jaccard similarity (intersection over union of citations) and less consistent across platforms than the intersection. However, both metrics account for about 0.2% of the variance (All platforms, Jaccard: 0.228% and intersection: 0.21%).




Figure 4: Bibliographic coupling between accepted and rejected manuscripts.

3.3.3 Semantic similarity and peer review outcome

Having established that semantic similarity and bibliographic coupling capture different aspects of the relationship between documents, we also analysed the semantic similarity of the documents from the four platforms. Thus, for each platform we computed the td-idf distance between all pairs of document based on their word stem.

Overall, we found that accepted manuscripts were more similar to each other than rejected manuscripts based on their abstracts and introduction (Fig.5). We found a stronger effect for the similarity between the introduction ($R^2 = 0.01$) than for the abstract ($R^2 = 0.006$) when all platforms were pooled together. In other words, accepted pairs of manuscripts were more similar to each other compared to the other two pair types.

This analysis of the semantic similarity of documents (for both citations and text) showed some high levels trends based on whether or not the manuscripts were accepted after peer review. We therefore next examined the text content of the manuscripts with a more detailed approach to gain more insights on the patterns uncovered by the analysis on bibliographic coupling and textual similarity.




Figure 5: Semantic similarity between accepted and rejected manuscripts.

3.4 Words as a predictor of acceptance

Finally, after having established high-level associations between the rejected and accepted manuscripts, we attempted to predict the peer review outcome with a logistic regression using a bag-of-words approach. Overall, the model was fairly successful at predicting the peer review outcome on a 10-fold cross-validated dataset (Tables 3,4 & 5, random performance ~ 0.5 for all three metrics). The model was the most successful when the text of the introduction was used, followed by the text of the abstract and of the title.

After having established that we could predict to some extent the outcome of the peer review process with the word content of the manuscripts, we performed a more detailed analysis to try to get some insight about the key predictors of the outcome. We therefore computed the average tf-idf score of each stem for accepted and rejected manuscripts, and obtained measure of "importance" based on the difference between the two averages. This approach allowed us to identify the most important keywords predicting the

	Precision	Recall	F-score
AI	0.495 ± 0.048	0.501 ± 0.001	0.473 ± 0.002
CL	0.666 ± 0.029	0.538 ± 0.007	0.515 ± 0.011
LG	0.683 ± 0.01	0.629 ± 0.008	0.63 ± 0.009
ICLR	0.394 ± 0.045	0.486 ± 0.01	0.397 ± 0.026
All	0.694 ± 0.006	0.578 ± 0.003	0.58 ± 0.004

Table 3: Title based prediction performance (macro averaging).

	Precision	Recall	F-score
AI	0.598 ± 0.077	0.506 ± 0.003	0.484 ± 0.007
CL	0.691 ± 0.025	0.553 ± 0.008	0.54 ± 0.013
LG	0.724 ± 0.006	0.674 ± 0.004	0.682 ± 0.005
ICLR	0.426 ± 0.057	0.494 ± 0.012	0.403 ± 0.02
All	0.734 ± 0.006	0.632 ± 0.005	0.65 ± 0.006

Table 4: Abstract based prediction performance (macro averaging).

	Precision	Recall	F-score
AI	0.812 ± 0.035	0.523 ± 0.005	0.51 ± 0.01
CL	0.692 ± 0.015	0.57 ± 0.005	0.562 ± 0.007
LG	0.736 ± 0.009	0.712 ± 0.009	0.716 ± 0.009
ICLR	0.595 ± 0.064	0.527 ± 0.014	0.448 ± 0.026
All	0.744 ± 0.005	0.667 ± 0.005	0.684 ± 0.006

Table 5: Introduction based prediction performance (macro averaging).

acceptance of a manuscript (Fig. 6).

Although some differences were noticeable across platforms regarding the predictors of acceptance (Tables 9, 10 & 11) and rejection (Tables 12, 13 & 14), some robust patterns emerged. Word stems related to sub fields of neural networks and machine learning (e.g., learn, neural, gradient, train) were increasing the odds of the manuscript to be accepted. However word stems related to the sub fields of logic, symbolic processing and knowledge representation (e.g, use, base, system, logic, fuzzi, knowledg, rule) were decreasing the odds that a manuscript would get accepted.




Figure 6: Most important word stems for predicting peer review outcome.

4 Discussion and Conclusion

4.1 Summary of results

From a linguistic point of view, our results suggest that accepted manuscripts could be written in a more complex, less accessible English. Using two indices of readability, one of which is agnostic to the word content of the manuscript (FRE), we found that the accepted manuscripts obtained lower readability scores. Strikingly, we found the same effect for almost all our independent datasets. The same pattern was also observed for the title, the abstract and the introduction. Using a different type of readability indicator - the proportion of general, specific scientific and AI jargon words - we found that manuscripts that contained a greater proportion of jargon words were more likely to be accepted. This finding may partly explain that the readability of manuscripts has steadily declined during the last century [39]. In other words, it is possible that part of this decline could be attributed to a selection process taking place during peer review.

When considering the word content of the accepted manuscripts, we found that they had words that were acquired at a later age, that were more abstract and that were less common than the words from the rejected manuscripts. Additionally, these manuscripts were shorter and had increased lexical diversity. Once again, the effect size were small given the highly multivariate determination of the peer review outcome. The effects were replicated across multiples independent datasets from different fields in AI, which strengthens the conclusions of our analysis.

From a content point of view, we compared manuscripts based on their referencing patterns and word content. We compared the coupling both based on the raw number of common references (intersection) and the fraction of overlap between the manuscripts' references (Jaccard similarity). We found that accepted pairs had a larger intersection than other pairs, and found a similar, but less reliable effect for the similarity. We used a tf-idf vectorial representation of the text from all manuscripts in the database, compared all possible pairs of manuscripts, and we found that pairs of accepted manuscript had considerably more overlap between their word content. This high level analysis of the manuscript's content revealed that some topics might be associated with different odds of acceptance. We performed a correlation between the bibliographic coupling and the semantic similarity to get an idea of the how independent was the information provided by these two semantic indicators. As reported previously [44], we found a weak to moderate correlation between the two, which suggest that they provide distinct sources of information about topic similarity in accepted manuscripts.

Finally, we built a logistic regression to predict the peer review outcome, which revealed that using the title, abstract or introduction words lead to robust predictions. Our results are compatible with the presence of content bias, where trending topics in AI such as machine learning and neural networks were linked with greater acceptance rate, whereas words related to symbolic processing and knowledge-based reasoning lead to lower acceptance rates.

4.2 Implications

Taken together, our analysis of the linguistic aspects of manuscripts are coherent with linguistic biases during peer review. It has been reported that writers using English as their main language (L1) use words that are more abstract and less frequent than writers with English as their second language (L2) [45]. Additionally, this effect is exacerbated by the L2 proficiency (where larger differences are observed for beginners than advanced L2 speakers) [46]. The complexity of L2 writing was also shown to correlate with proficiency [47, 48, 49]. Our results are therefore compatible with the hypothesis that L2 writers are less likely to get their manuscript accepted at peer review.

Our results are also compatible with a content bias where manuscripts on the topics of machine learning techniques and neural networks have greater odds to be accepted at peer review. Leading figures of the AI community have raised their voice against the overwhelming dominance of neural networks and deep

learning in the domain of AI [50, 51, 52]. Recent successes of deep learning and neural networks might explain their dominance in the field, but a bias against other techniques might impede developments similar to the ones that lead to the breakthroughs underlying the deep learning revolution [53]. Following this idea, several researchers have indicated that symbolic processing could hold the answer to shortcomings of deep learning [54, 50, 55].

Other than biases during peer review, our results have implications for the quality of scientific communications. A recent report on reproducibility in machine learning found a positive correlation between the readability of a manuscript and successful replication of the claims that it makes [56]. Selecting for less readable manuscripts during peer review may therefore increase the proportion of non reproducible research findings.

4.3 Limitations

Although the main objective of our analysis was to investigate the presence of content or linguistic biases in peer review, all our of analysis are correlational, and there are possible confounds that could explain our results. For instance, while our findings that some linguistic aspects of the manuscripts - the readability and psycholinguistic attributes - were correlated with the peer review outcome, we cannot infer that those variables directly lowered the odds of acceptance.

Similarly, we cannot infer that there is a bias against manuscripts on the topic of machine learning techniques and neural networks. For instance, reviewers favouring high benchmark performance might accept more manuscripts using the state of the art techniques. In the scenario, reviewers would not reject a manuscript using a non-mainstream technique because of bias against it, but simply because they value some aspects where it under performs.

Another limitation to our findings is the methodology of the peer read dataset [26]. For most manuscripts included in the dataset, their status is inferred and the true outcome of the peer review process is unknown. Although [26] validated their method on a subset of their data, the accuracy is not perfect. However, we believe that the large size of the dataset is enough to counteract this source of noise. Only the minority of manuscripts included in their dataset had a true peer review outcome provided by the publishing venue. This highlight the need for publishers and conferences to open their peer review process in order to further advance our understanding of the strengths and limitations of the peer review process.

In sum, our results are compatible with the presence of a linguistic and a content bias in the peer review process of major conferences in AI. Although we were able to replicate our results across different dataset, similar studies have to be conducted both in the field of AI and in other disciplines to validate the conclusions of our study.

Acknowlegements

This research was funded by the Canada Research Chair program and the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada.

References

[1] J. Ziman, *Real science: What it is and what it means*. Cambridge University Press, 2002.

[2] S. Wakeling, P. Willett, C. Creaser, J. Fry, S. Pinfield, V. Spezi, M. Bonne, C. Founti, and I. Medina Perea, "'No comment'? A study of commenting on PLOS articles," *Journal of Information Science*, p. 016555151881996, Jan. 2019.

[3] A. Mulligan, "Is peer review in crisis?," *Oral Oncology*, vol. 41, no. 2, pp. 135–141, 2005.

[4] K. D. Mayden, "Peer Review: Publication's Gold Standard," *J Adv Pract Oncol*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 117–122, 2012.

[5] J. R. Tregellas, J. Smucny, D. C. Rojas, and K. T. Legget, "Predicting academic career outcomes by predoctoral publication record," *PeerJ*, vol. 6, p. e5707, Oct. 2018.

[6] E. C. McKiernan, L. A. Schimanski, C. Muñoz Nieves, L. Matthias, M. T. Niles, and J. P. Alperin, "Use of the Journal Impact Factor in academic review, promotion, and tenure evaluations," 2019.

[7] D. Moher, F. Naudet, I. A. Cristea, F. Miedema, J. P. A. Ioannidis, and S. N. Goodman, "Assessing scientists for hiring, promotion, and tenure," *PLOS Biology*, vol. 16, p. e2004089, Mar. 2018.

[8] J. C. Bailar, "Reliability, fairness, objectivity and other inappropriate goals in peer review," *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 137–138, 1991.

[9] C. J. Lee, "A Kuhnian critique of psychometric research on peer review," *Philosophy of Science*, vol. 79, no. 5, pp. 859–870, 2012.

[10] D. V. Cicchetti, "The reliability of peer review for manuscript and grant submissions: A cross-disciplinary investigation," *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 119–135, 1991.

[11] L. Bornmann, R. Mutz, and H.-D. Daniel, "A reliability-generalization study of journal peer reviews: A multilevel meta-analysis of inter-rater reliability and its determinants," *PloS one*, vol. 5, no. 12, p. e14331, 2010.

[12] E. Price, "The NIPS experiment," 2014.

[13] P. S. Forscher, M. Brauer, W. T. Cox, and P. G. Devine, "How many reviewers are required to obtain reliable evaluations of NIH R01 grant proposals?," 2019.

[14] C. J. Lee, C. R. Sugimoto, G. Zhang, and B. Cronin, "Bias in peer review," *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology*, vol. 64, pp. 2–17, Jan. 2013.

[15] P. U. K. De Silva and C. K. Vance, "Preserving the Quality of Scientific Research: Peer Review of Research Articles," in *Scientific Scholarly Communication: The Changing Landscape* (P. U. K. De Silva and C. K. Vance, eds.), Fascinating Life Sciences, pp. 73–99, Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2017.

[16] D. Murray, K. Siler, V. Lariviére, W. M. Chan, A. M. Collings, J. Raymond, and C. R. Sugimoto, "Gender and international diversity improves equity in peer review," *bioRxiv*, Jan. 2018.

[17] J. L. Jackson, M. Srinivasan, J. Rea, K. E. Fletcher, and R. L. Kravitz, "The Validity of Peer Review in a General Medicine Journal," *PLOS ONE*, vol. 6, p. e22475, July 2011.

[18] C. E. T. Paine and C. W. Fox, "The effectiveness of journals as arbiters of scientific impact," *Ecology and Evolution*, vol. 8, no. 19, pp. 9566–9585, 2018.

[19] S. Goodman, J. Berlin, S. Fletcher, and R. Fletcher, "Manuscript quality before and after peer review and editing at annals of internal medicine," *Annals of Internal Medicine*, vol. 121, pp. 11–21, July 1994.

[20] J.-P. E. Pierie, H. C. Walvoort, and A. J. P. Overbeke, "Readers' evaluation of effect of peer review and editing on quality of articles in the Nederlands Tijdschrift voor Geneeskunde," *The Lancet*, vol. 348, no. 9040, pp. 1480–1483, 1996.

[21] V. Calcagno, E. Demoinet, K. Gollner, L. Guidi, D. Ruths, and C. d. Mazancourt, "Flows of Research Manuscripts Among Scientific Journals Reveal Hidden Submission Patterns," *Science*, vol. 338, pp. 1065–1069, Nov. 2012.

[22] R. Smith, "Classical peer review: an empty gun," *Breast Cancer Research*, vol. 12, no. 4, p. S13, 2010.

[23] O. Sabaj Meruane, C. González Vergara, and Á. Pina-Stranger, "What We Still Don't Know About Peer Review," *Journal of Scholarly Publishing*, vol. 47, pp. 180–212, Jan. 2016.

[24] H. Piwowar, J. Priem, V. Larivière, J. P. Alperin, L. Matthias, B. Norlander, A. Farley, J. West, and S. Haustein, "The state of OA: a large-scale analysis of the prevalence and impact of Open Access articles," *PeerJ*, vol. 6, p. e4375, Feb. 2018.

[25] C. Sutton and L. Gong, "Popularity of arXiv.org within Computer Science," *arXiv:1710.05225 [cs]*, Oct. 2017. arXiv: 1710.05225.

[26] D. Kang, W. Ammar, B. Dalvi, M. van Zuylen, S. Kohlmeier, E. Hovy, and R. Schwartz, "A Dataset of Peer Reviews (PeerRead): Collection, Insights and NLP Applications," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.09635*, 2018.

[27] W. Jen, S. Zhang, and M. Chen, "Predicting Conference Paper Acceptance," p. 7, 2018.

[28] T. Ghosal, R. Verma, A. Ekbal, and P. Bhattacharyya, "A Sentiment Augmented Deep Architecture to Predict Peer Review Outcomes," in *2019 ACM/IEEE Joint Conference on Digital Libraries (JCDL)*, pp. 414–415, June 2019.

[29] F. Qiao, L. Xu, and X. Han, "Modularized and Attention-Based Recurrent Convolutional Neural Network for Automatic Academic Paper Aspect Scoring," in *Web Information Systems and Applications* (X. Meng, R. Li, K. Wang, B. Niu, X. Wang, and G. Zhao, eds.), Lecture Notes in Computer Science, pp. 68–76, Springer International Publishing, 2018.

[30] J. S. Ross, C. P. Gross, M. M. Desai, Y. Hong, A. O. Grant, S. R. Daniels, V. C. Hachinski, R. J. Gibbons, T. J. Gardner, and H. M. Krumholz, "Effect of Blinded Peer Review on Abstract Acceptance," *JAMA*, vol. 295, pp. 1675–1680, Apr. 2006.

[31] T. Tregenza, "Gender bias in the refereeing process?," *Trends in Ecology & Evolution*, vol. 17, pp. 349–350, Aug. 2002.

[32] A. J. Herrera, "Language bias discredits the peer-review system," *Nature*, vol. 397, p. 467, Feb. 1999.

[33] V. Larivière and J.-P. Warren, "Introduction: The Dissemination of National Knowledge in an Internationalized Scientific Community," *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, vol. 44, pp. 1–8, Mar. 2019.

[34] K. Hao, "We analyzed 16,625 papers to figure out where AI is headed next," Jan. 2019.

[35] M. F. Porter, "An algorithm for suffix stripping," *Program*, vol. 14, no. 3, pp. 130–137, 1980.

[36] M. Brysbaert and B. New, "Moving beyond Kučera and Francis: A critical evaluation of current word frequency norms and the introduction of a new and improved word frequency measure for American English," *Behavior research methods*, vol. 41, no. 4, pp. 977–990, 2009.

[37] M. Brysbaert, A. B. Warriner, and V. Kuperman, "Concreteness ratings for 40 thousand generally known English word lemmas," *Behavior research methods*, vol. 46, no. 3, pp. 904–911, 2014.

[38] V. Kuperman, H. Stadthagen-Gonzalez, and M. Brysbaert, "Age-of-acquisition ratings for 30,000 English words," *Behavior Research Methods*, vol. 44, no. 4, pp. 978–990, 2012.

[39] P. Plavén-Sigray, G. J. Matheson, B. C. Schiffler, and W. H. Thompson, "The readability of scientific texts is decreasing over time," *eLife*, vol. 6, p. e27725, Sept. 2017.

[40] R. Flesch, "A new readability yardstick," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 32, no. 3, pp. 221–233, 1948.

[41] J. Kincaid, R. Fishburne, R. Rogers, and B. Chissom, "Derivation Of New Readability Formulas (Automated Readability Index, Fog Count And Flesch Reading Ease Formula) For Navy Enlisted Personnel," *Institute for Simulation and Training*, Jan. 1975.

[42] J. S. Chall and E. Dale, *Readability revisited: the new Dale-Chall readability formula*. Brookline Books, May 1995. Google-Books-ID: 2nbuAAAAMAAJ.

[43] D. Szucs and J. P. A. Ioannidis, "When Null Hypothesis Significance Testing Is Unsuitable for Research: A Reassessment," *Front. Hum. Neurosci.*, vol. 11, 2017.

[44] M. Sainte-Marie, P. Mongeon, and V. Larivière, "Do you cite what I mean? Assessing the semantic scope of bibliographic coupling in economics," p. 10, 2018.

[45] S. A. Crossley and D. S. McNamara, "Computational assessment of lexical differences in L1 and L2 writing," *Journal of Second Language Writing*, vol. 18, pp. 119–135, June 2009.

[46] S. A. Crossley, T. Salsbury, D. S. McNamara, and S. Jarvis, "Predicting lexical proficiency in language learner texts using computational indices," *Language Testing*, vol. 28, pp. 561–580, Oct. 2011.

[47] J.-y. Kim, "Predicting L2 Writing Proficiency Using Linguistic Complexity Measures: A Corpus-Based Study," *englishteaching*, vol. 69, pp. 27–51, Dec. 2014.

[48] A. C. Lahuerta Martínez, "Analysis of syntactic complexity in secondary education EFL writers at different proficiency levels," *Assessing Writing*, vol. 35, pp. 1–11, Jan. 2018.

[49] N. N. Radhiah and Z. Abidin, "A longitudinal corpus study of syntactic complexity development in L2 writing," 2018.

[50] G. Marcus, "Deep learning: A critical appraisal," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1801.00631*, 2018.

[51] M. Jordan, "Artificial Intelligence — The Revolution Hasn't Happened Yet," Apr. 2018.

[52] W. Knight, "One of the fathers of AI is worried about its future," 2018.

[53] A. Krizhevsky, I. Sutskever, and G. E. Hinton, "Imagenet classification with deep convolutional neural networks," pp. 1097–1105, 2012.

[54] H. Geffner, "Model-free, Model-based, and General Intelligence," *arXiv:1806.02308 [cs]*, June 2018. arXiv: 1806.02308.

[55] M. Garnelo and M. Shanahan, "Reconciling deep learning with symbolic artificial intelligence: representing objects and relations," *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 29, pp. 17–23, Oct. 2019.

[56] E. Raff, "A Step Toward Quantifying Independently Reproducible Machine Learning Research," *arXiv:1909.06674 [cs, stat]*, Sept. 2019. arXiv: 1909.06674.

Section	Variable	p	Acc-Rej	Mean rejected	S.d. rejected	N rejected	Mean accepted	S.d. accepted	N accepted	Cohen's d
Title	FRE	2.9E-02	-3.56	-7.89	40.84	1714	-11.45	43.08	1113	0.085
Abstract	FRE	1.7E-07	-2.35	18.47	12.69	1882	16.12	11.94	1239	0.190
Introduction	FRE	3.0E-01	-0.38	27.14	10.04	1545	26.75	9.22	1215	0.040
Title	NDC	9.8E-09	0.53	15.19	2.38	1714	15.72	2.38	1113	0.222
Abstract	NDC	5.7E-06	0.15	12.50	0.90	1882	12.65	0.87	1239	0.165
Introduction	NDC	5.7E-11	0.18	12.12	0.77	1545	12.30	0.69	1215	0.249
Title	General	1.2E-02	0.02	0.38	0.22	1715	0.41	0.23	1113	0.099
Abstract	General	5.6E-06	0.01	0.30	0.07	1882	0.31	0.06	1239	0.163
Introduction	General	1.7E-01	0.00	0.26	0.06	1545	0.26	0.05	1215	0.052
Title	Specific	1.2E-02	0.02	0.41	0.23	1715	0.43	0.24	1113	0.098
Abstract	Specific	1.1E-05	0.01	0.32	0.07	1882	0.33	0.07	1239	0.158
Introduction	Specific	1.1E-04	0.01	0.28	0.06	1545	0.29	0.05	1215	0.147
Title	AI	2.9E-02	0.01	0.09	0.13	1715	0.10	0.14	1113	0.085
Abstract	AI	1.1E-05	0.01	0.05	0.03	1882	0.05	0.03	1239	0.159
Introduction	AI	1.0E-06	0.00	0.04	0.02	1545	0.04	0.02	1215	0.186

Table 6: Summary of statistics for readability and jargon usage of US based accepted and rejected manuscripts.

Section	Variable	p	Acc-Rej	Mean rejected	S.d. rejected	N rejected	Mean accepted	S.d. accepted	N accepted	Cohen's d
Title	FRE	6.3E-06	-5.11	-4.52	38.52	6257	-9.62	41.16	1635	0.131
Abstract	FRE	2.4E-10	-2.10	20.16	13.59	7100	18.06	12.25	1817	0.157
Introduction	FRE	1.7E-01	0.36	28.02	10.52	5514	28.38	9.29	1769	0.036
Title	NDC	4.6E-20	0.61	15.01	2.37	6257	15.61	2.36	1635	0.256
Abstract	NDC	2.0E-05	0.11	12.44	1.09	7100	12.54	0.91	1817	0.101
Introduction	NDC	2.0E-16	0.18	12.05	1.03	5514	12.23	0.71	1769	0.187
Title	General	8.3E-04	0.02	0.38	0.22	6262	0.40	0.24	1635	0.098
Abstract	General	4.1E-26	0.02	0.29	0.07	7104	0.31	0.07	1817	0.262
Introduction	General	8.0E-10	0.01	0.25	0.06	5514	0.26	0.05	1769	0.150
Title	Specific	8.1E-05	0.03	0.41	0.23	6262	0.44	0.25	1635	0.116
Abstract	Specific	1.4E-26	0.02	0.31	0.08	7104	0.33	0.07	1817	0.263
Introduction	Specific	1.3E-35	0.02	0.27	0.06	5514	0.29	0.05	1769	0.310
Title	AI	1.5E-03	0.01	0.09	0.13	6262	0.10	0.15	1635	0.095
Abstract	AI	8.0E-37	0.01	0.04	0.03	7104	0.05	0.03	1817	0.330
Introduction	AI	3.0E-54	0.01	0.03	0.02	5514	0.04	0.02	1769	0.400

Table 7: Summary of statistics for readability and jargon usage of non-US based accepted and rejected manuscripts.

Section	Variable	p	Acc-Rej	Mean rejected	S.d. rejected	N rejected	Mean accepted	S.d. accepted	N accepted	Cohen's d
Title	Frequency tokens	8.12E-48	-0.21	3.12	0.60	7959	2.91	0.66	2742	0.34
Abstract	Frequency tokens	1.37E-27	-0.04	3.87	0.21	8983	3.83	0.19	3056	0.22
Introduction	Frequency tokens	7.01E-27	-0.04	3.95	0.18	7059	3.91	0.14	2984	0.21
Title	AOA tokens	4.64E-20	0.36	7.85	1.57	7920	8.21	1.80	2710	0.22
Abstract	AOA tokens	3.79E-20	0.08	6.50	0.44	8983	6.58	0.39	3056	0.18
Introduction	AOA tokens	5.19E-19	0.06	6.32	0.35	7059	6.38	0.27	2984	0.18
Title	Concreteness tokens	5.91E-02	-0.02	2.54	0.38	7953	2.53	0.36	2736	0.04
Abstract	Concreteness tokens	4.13E-01	0.00	2.36	0.12	8983	2.35	0.10	3056	0.02
Introduction	Concreteness tokens	1.04E-06	-0.01	2.33	0.09	7059	2.32	0.07	2984	0.10
Title	Frequency types	2.67E-44	-0.20	3.10	0.59	7959	2.90	0.66	2742	0.33
Abstract	Frequency types	5.08E-11	-0.03	3.40	0.21	8983	3.38	0.18	3056	0.13
Introduction	Frequency types	6.30E-18	-0.03	3.18	0.19	7059	3.15	0.14	2984	0.17
Title	AOA types	1.45E-18	0.34	7.87	1.56	7920	8.22	1.80	2710	0.21
Abstract	AOA types	2.92E-12	0.06	7.16	0.46	8983	7.22	0.42	3056	0.14
Introduction	AOA types	1.40E-17	0.06	7.39	0.38	7059	7.45	0.31	2984	0.17
Title	Concreteness types	1.68E-02	-0.02	2.55	0.37	7953	2.53	0.35	2736	0.05
Abstract	Concreteness types	2.66E-15	-0.02	2.50	0.12	8983	2.48	0.10	3056	0.15
Introduction	Concreteness types	1.47E-20	-0.02	2.55	0.09	7059	2.53	0.07	2984	0.18
Title	# tokens	2.28E-60	-1.27	9.78	5.03	7977	8.51	2.73	2748	0.28
Abstract	# tokens	3.93E-03	-10.82	169.34	202.13	8986	158.52	170.54	3056	0.06
Introduction	# tokens	5.39E-08	-98.57	851.91	1351.31	7059	753.34	455.07	2984	0.09
Title	# types	5.39E-67	-1.15	9.60	3.80	7977	8.45	2.63	2748	0.33
Abstract	# types	3.93E-03	-3.52	103.61	61.04	8986	100.09	57.27	3056	0.06
Introduction	# types	3.85E-03	-10.23	349.60	218.87	7059	339.37	130.78	2984	0.05
Title	TTR	1.34E-23	0.01	0.99	0.04	7977	1.00	0.02	2748	0.18
Abstract	TTR	2.76E-31	0.02	0.66	0.08	8986	0.68	0.08	3056	0.24
Introduction	TTR	9.02E-04	0.01	0.48	0.09	7059	0.49	0.08	2984	0.07

Table 8: Summary of statistics for lexical features for accepted and rejected manuscripts.

	AI Stem	AI Score accepted	AI Score rejected	CL Stem	CL Score accepted	CL Score rejected	LG Stem	LG Score accepted	LG Score rejected	ICLR Stem	ICLR Score accepted	ICLR Score rejected	All Stem	All Score accepted	All Score rejected
0	model	0.0345 ± 0.0043	0.0201 ± 0.0012	learn	0.0538 ± 0.0039	0.0452 ± 0.002	model	0.0252 ± 0.0018	0.019 ± 0.0012	featur	0.0231 ± 0.008	0.0017 ± 0.0017	learn	0.0483 ± 0.0017	0.0323 ± 0.0008
1	deep	0.0322 ± 0.0047	0.0215 ± 0.0013	bandit	0.0131 ± 0.003	0.0058 ± 0.0012	cluster	0.0124 ± 0.0017	0.0085 ± 0.001	structur	0.0234 ± 0.0086	0.0023 ± 0.0023	neural	0.035 ± 0.0017	0.0211 ± 0.0007
2	recognit	0.0136 ± 0.0035	0.0069 ± 0.0008	deep	0.0205 ± 0.0031	0.0141 ± 0.0015	graph	0.009 ± 0.0014	0.0057 ± 0.0008	latent	0.0198 ± 0.0088	0.0 ± 0.0	optim	0.0199 ± 0.0015	0.0087 ± 0.0005
3	visual	0.0097 ± 0.0028	0.0035 ± 0.0006	algorithm	0.0212 ± 0.0031	0.0161 ± 0.0016	languag	0.0077 ± 0.0012	0.0045 ± 0.0007	adapt	0.0205 ± 0.0082	0.0022 ± 0.0022	model	0.0302 ± 0.0015	0.0207 ± 0.0007
4	machin	0.0168 ± 0.0034	0.011 ± 0.001	linear	0.0127 ± 0.0029	0.0077 ± 0.0013	featur	0.0136 ± 0.0016	0.0105 ± 0.0011	stochast	0.0203 ± 0.0075	0.0042 ± 0.003	stochast	0.0136 ± 0.0013	0.0044 ± 0.0004
5	data	0.0175 ± 0.0034	0.0127 ± 0.001	fast	0.0101 ± 0.0025	0.0055 ± 0.001	gradient	0.0086 ± 0.0014	0.0057 ± 0.0008	learn	0.0695 ± 0.0094	0.0555 ± 0.0079	bandit	0.0097 ± 0.0012	0.0021 ± 0.0003
6	oneshot	0.0051 ± 0.003	0.0004 ± 0.0003	space	0.0064 ± 0.0019	0.0019 ± 0.0006	bayesian	0.0104 ± 0.0014	0.0075 ± 0.001	machin	0.024 ± 0.0086	0.0102 ± 0.0052	variat	0.0091 ± 0.0012	0.0021 ± 0.0003
7	measur	0.0079 ± 0.0026	0.0035 ± 0.0007	object	0.0069 ± 0.0021	0.0025 ± 0.0007	onlin	0.0138 ± 0.0017	0.011 ± 0.0011	svm	0.0136 ± 0.0078	0.0 ± 0.0	gradient	0.009 ± 0.0011	0.0021 ± 0.0003
8	align	0.0048 ± 0.0024	0.0006 ± 0.0003	onlin	0.0158 ± 0.0029	0.0115 ± 0.0015	function	0.0078 ± 0.0013	0.0052 ± 0.0008	parallel	0.0126 ± 0.0073	0.0 ± 0.0	gener	0.0191 ± 0.0014	0.0124 ± 0.0006
9	sequenti	0.0068 ± 0.0031	0.0026 ± 0.0006	entropi	0.0042 ± 0.0019	0.0004 ± 0.0003	vector	0.005 ± 0.001	0.0025 ± 0.0006	graph	0.0223 ± 0.0092	0.0098 ± 0.0049	structur	0.0127 ± 0.0013	0.0065 ± 0.0005
10	neural	0.0266 ± 0.0041	0.0225 ± 0.0013	pca	0.0057 ± 0.0023	0.0019 ± 0.0007	optim	0.0184 ± 0.0018	0.016 ± 0.0012	exponenti	0.0124 ± 0.0072	0.0 ± 0.0	spar	0.009 ± 0.0011	0.0029 ± 0.0004
11	entiti	0.0053 ± 0.0021	0.0011 ± 0.0004	regret	0.0061 ± 0.0022	0.0024 ± 0.0008	exploit	0.0032 ± 0.0008	0.0008 ± 0.0003	convolut	0.0209 ± 0.0084	0.0093 ± 0.0046	translat	0.0123 ± 0.0013	0.0066 ± 0.0005
12	relat	0.0084 ± 0.0028	0.0045 ± 0.0007	comparison	0.0061 ± 0.002	0.0024 ± 0.0007	kmean	0.0041 ± 0.0011	0.0018 ± 0.0005	extrem	0.0112 ± 0.0064	0.0 ± 0.0	convex	0.0066 ± 0.001	0.0009 ± 0.0002
13	disambigu	0.0046 ± 0.0023	0.0006 ± 0.0003	crowd	0.004 ± 0.002	0.0003 ± 0.0003	memori	0.0052 ± 0.0011	0.0029 ± 0.0006	duel	0.0104 ± 0.0077	0.0 ± 0.0	latent	0.0074 ± 0.001	0.002 ± 0.0003
14	latent	0.0084 ± 0.0028	0.0044 ± 0.0007	reinforc	0.0105 ± 0.0025	0.0068 ± 0.0012	depend	0.0046 ± 0.001	0.0023 ± 0.0006	semisupervi	0.013 ± 0.0075	0.0027 ± 0.0027	gaussian	0.0062 ± 0.0009	0.0014 ± 0.0003
15	featur	0.0158 ± 0.0036	0.0119 ± 0.0011	constraint	0.0065 ± 0.0022	0.003 ± 0.0008	spar	0.0089 ± 0.0014	0.0067 ± 0.0009	ensembl	0.0102 ± 0.0074	0.0 ± 0.0	par	0.0069 ± 0.001	0.0023 ± 0.0003
16	squar	0.0048 ± 0.0024	0.001 ± 0.0004	rule	0.0054 ± 0.0018	0.0019 ± 0.0006	regret	0.0043 ± 0.001	0.0023 ± 0.0006	denoi	0.0102 ± 0.0072	0.0 ± 0.0	infer	0.0108 ± 0.0011	0.0065 ± 0.0005
17	gener	0.0158 ± 0.0036	0.012 ± 0.001	nonconvex	0.0048 ± 0.002	0.0013 ± 0.0006	distribut	0.0105 ± 0.0015	0.0086 ± 0.001	boltzmann	0.0101 ± 0.0071	0.0 ± 0.0	matrix	0.0061 ± 0.0009	0.002 ± 0.0003
18	discret	0.006 ± 0.0027	0.0023 ± 0.0005	pairwi	0.004 ± 0.0018	0.0006 ± 0.0004	selfpac	0.0018 ± 0.0008	0.0 ± 0.0	advanc	0.0097 ± 0.007	0.0 ± 0.0	regret	0.0048 ± 0.0009	0.0007 ± 0.0002
19	speech	0.0073 ± 0.0026	0.0036 ± 0.0007	music	0.0049 ± 0.0021	0.0016 ± 0.0006	submodular	0.0038 ± 0.0011	0.002 ± 0.0006	bootstrap	0.0097 ± 0.0068	0.0 ± 0.0	recurr	0.0112 ± 0.0013	0.0071 ± 0.0005
20	sensor	0.0047 ± 0.0021	0.0011 ± 0.0004	featur	0.0163 ± 0.0029	0.013 ± 0.0015	parallel	0.0042 ± 0.001	0.0024 ± 0.0006	traffic	0.0095 ± 0.0068	0.0 ± 0.0	reinforc	0.0109 ± 0.0012	0.0069 ± 0.0005
21	supervi	0.0076 ± 0.0026	0.004 ± 0.0007	predict	0.0136 ± 0.0026	0.0104 ± 0.0013	chine	0.0018 ± 0.0007	1e-04 ± 1e-04	smooth	0.0093 ± 0.0066	0.0 ± 0.0	fast	0.0069 ± 0.0009	0.0031 ± 0.0004
22	largesc	0.0074 ± 0.0026	0.0038 ± 0.0007	convex	0.0093 ± 0.0027	0.0061 ± 0.0012	exponenti	0.0028 ± 0.0009	0.0012 ± 0.0004	pca	0.0091 ± 0.0065	0.0 ± 0.0	sampl	0.007 ± 0.001	0.0032 ± 0.0004
23	pursuit	0.0039 ± 0.0022	0.0004 ± 0.0002	face	0.0034 ± 0.0016	0.0003 ± 0.0003	hierarch	0.0059 ± 0.0012	0.0043 ± 0.0007	distribut	0.013 ± 0.0065	0.0039 ± 0.0028	network	0.0307 ± 0.0016	0.0269 ± 0.0008
24	addit	0.0045 ± 0.0026	0.001 ± 0.0004	squar	0.0036 ± 0.0018	0.0005 ± 0.0003	support	0.0041 ± 0.001	0.0025 ± 0.0006	errorcorrect	0.0088 ± 0.0088	0.0 ± 0.0	linear	0.0073 ± 0.001	0.0036 ± 0.0004
25	multimod	0.0054 ± 0.0024	0.0019 ± 0.0005	markov	0.0058 ± 0.002	0.0027 ± 0.0008	review	0.0029 ± 0.0008	0.0013 ± 0.0004	transform	0.0126 ± 0.0072	0.0038 ± 0.0038	bound	0.0069 ± 0.0009	0.0032 ± 0.0004
26	hierarch	0.0082 ± 0.0029	0.0047 ± 0.0008	multiarm	0.0037 ± 0.0019	0.0006 ± 0.0004	descent	0.005 ± 0.0011	0.0035 ± 0.0007	fast	0.0173 ± 0.0076	0.0088 ± 0.0046	minim	0.0054 ± 0.0008	0.0017 ± 0.0003
27	miss	0.0036 ± 0.0021	0.0002 ± 0.0002	limit	0.0049 ± 0.002	0.0018 ± 0.0007	smooth	0.0029 ± 0.0009	0.0014 ± 0.0005	tempor	0.0084 ± 0.006	0.0 ± 0.0	kernel	0.0074 ± 0.0011	0.0037 ± 0.0004
28	backpropag	0.0042 ± 0.0024	0.0008 ± 0.0003	use	0.0187 ± 0.0026	0.0156 ± 0.0013	theoret	0.0025 ± 0.0008	0.0011 ± 0.0004	decod	0.0084 ± 0.006	0.0 ± 0.0	sequenc	0.0073 ± 0.0011	0.0037 ± 0.0004
29	biolog	0.0036 ± 0.0022	0.0003 ± 0.0002	lifelong	0.0034 ± 0.002	0.0003 ± 0.0003	reinforc	0.0093 ± 0.0015	0.0079 ± 0.0009	approach	0.009 ± 0.0053	0.0006 ± 0.0006	emb	0.0106 ± 0.0011	0.007 ± 0.0005
30	annot	0.0041 ± 0.0021	0.0008 ± 0.0003	compon	0.0042 ± 0.0019	0.0012 ± 0.0005	sparsiti	0.0023 ± 0.0008	0.0008 ± 0.0004	consist	0.0083 ± 0.0058	0.0 ± 0.0	nonparametr	0.0044 ± 0.0009	0.0008 ± 0.0002
31	topic	0.0056 ± 0.0023	0.0023 ± 0.0005	track	0.0033 ± 0.0015	0.0003 ± 0.0002	percept	0.0018 ± 0.0007	0.0004 ± 0.0002	smile	0.0082 ± 0.0082	0.0 ± 0.0	attent	0.0068 ± 0.001	0.0033 ± 0.0004
32	predict	0.0151 ± 0.0036	0.0118 ± 0.001	propag	0.0047 ± 0.002	0.0017 ± 0.0007	provabl	0.002 ± 0.0008	0.0006 ± 0.0003	cluster	0.0127 ± 0.0063	0.0047 ± 0.0033	word	0.0106 ± 0.0011	0.0071 ± 0.0005
33	mixabl	0.0032 ± 0.0023	0.0 ± 0.0	hyperparamet	0.0034 ± 0.002	0.0005 ± 0.0004	transfer	0.0043 ± 0.0011	0.0029 ± 0.0006	input	0.008 ± 0.0057	0.0 ± 0.0	estim	0.0076 ± 0.001	0.0041 ± 0.0004
34	hypergraph	0.0033 ± 0.0024	0.0002 ± 0.0002	effici	0.0111 ± 0.0025	0.0082 ± 0.0013	thompson	0.0019 ± 0.0007	0.0005 ± 0.0003	interfac	0.0079 ± 0.0056	0.0 ± 0.0	predict	0.0121 ± 0.0012	0.0086 ± 0.0005
35	variabl	0.0053 ± 0.0024	0.0021 ± 0.0005	generali	0.0031 ± 0.0015	0.0002 ± 0.0002	speaker	0.0023 ± 0.0008	0.001 ± 0.0004	onlin	0.0248 ± 0.0086	0.0171 ± 0.006	converg	0.0047 ± 0.0008	0.0012 ± 0.0003
36	depend	0.0063 ± 0.0024	0.0031 ± 0.0006	model	0.0241 ± 0.003	0.0213 ± 0.0016	prior	0.0021 ± 0.0007	0.0008 ± 0.0003	exampl	0.0076 ± 0.0054	0.0 ± 0.0	random	0.0065 ± 0.0009	0.0031 ± 0.0004
37	librari	0.0038 ± 0.0023	0.0008 ± 0.0003	exploit	0.0043 ± 0.0018	0.0015 ± 0.0006	rel	0.002 ± 0.0008	0.0006 ± 0.0003	origami	0.0076 ± 0.0076	0.0 ± 0.0	spectral	0.0043 ± 0.0008	0.0009 ± 0.0002
38	perspect	0.0047 ± 0.0024	0.0016 ± 0.0005	valu	0.0035 ± 0.0016	0.0007 ± 0.0004	point	0.0031 ± 0.0009	0.0018 ± 0.0005	simplex	0.0075 ± 0.0075	0.0 ± 0.0	onlin	0.0102 ± 0.0011	0.0069 ± 0.0005
39	tree	0.0076 ± 0.0029	0.0046 ± 0.0007	statist	0.0062 ± 0.0021	0.0035 ± 0.0008	converg	0.0045 ± 0.001	0.0032 ± 0.0007	paint	0.0074 ± 0.0052	0.0 ± 0.0	nonconvex	0.0036 ± 0.0008	0.0003 ± 1e-04
40	multitask	0.0063 ± 0.0026	0.0032 ± 0.0007	sampl	0.007 ± 0.0022	0.0043 ± 0.001	larg	0.0041 ± 0.0009	0.0028 ± 0.0006	layerspecif	0.0072 ± 0.0072	0.0 ± 0.0	activ	0.0069 ± 0.001	0.0036 ± 0.0004
41	person	0.0044 ± 0.0023	0.0014 ± 0.0004	market	0.0029 ± 0.0015	0.0002 ± 0.0002	effici	0.0099 ± 0.0014	0.0086 ± 0.001	path	0.0072 ± 0.0072	0.0 ± 0.0	descent	0.0045 ± 0.0008	0.0013 ± 0.0002
42	classif	0.0153 ± 0.0034	0.0123 ± 0.0011	better	0.0033 ± 0.0017	0.0006 ± 0.0003	twitter	0.0016 ± 0.0006	0.0003 ± 0.0002	dictionari	0.0098 ± 0.0069	0.0027 ± 0.0027	hierarch	0.0065 ± 0.001	0.0034 ± 0.0004
43	consist	0.0043 ± 0.002	0.0013 ± 0.0004	activ	0.0062 ± 0.0021	0.0036 ± 0.0009	forest	0.0026 ± 0.0009	0.0013 ± 0.0005	graphlet	0.007 ± 0.007	0.0 ± 0.0	effici	0.0087 ± 0.001	0.0057 ± 0.0005
44	loop	0.0031 ± 0.0022	0.0002 ± 0.0002	mont	0.0032 ± 0.0017	0.0007 ± 0.0004	translat	0.0036 ± 0.0009	0.0023 ± 0.0006	consensusba	0.0069 ± 0.0069	0.0 ± 0.0	regular	0.0058 ± 0.0009	0.0028 ± 0.0004
45	nonparametr	0.0058 ± 0.0029	0.0029 ± 0.0007	carlo	0.0032 ± 0.0017	0.0007 ± 0.0004	queri	0.0023 ± 0.0008	0.001 ± 0.0004	train	0.0116 ± 0.0067	0.0047 ± 0.0034	submodular	0.0037 ± 0.0008	0.0009 ± 0.0002
46	varianc	0.0037 ± 0.0021	0.0008 ± 0.0003	coher	0.0029 ± 0.0017	0.0004 ± 0.0003	nearoptim	0.0019 ± 0.0008	0.0007 ± 0.0003	pragmat	0.0068 ± 0.0068	0.0 ± 0.0	depend	0.0051 ± 0.0008	0.0022 ± 0.0003
47	coevolut	0.0029 ± 0.0021	0.0 ± 0.0	contextu	0.004 ± 0.0018	0.0015 ± 0.0006	infer	0.0073 ± 0.0011	0.006 ± 0.0008	dropout	0.0068 ± 0.0068	0.0 ± 0.0	multitask	0.0047 ± 0.0009	0.0019 ± 0.0003
48	email	0.0028 ± 0.0016	0.0 ± 0.0	detect	0.0094 ± 0.0022	0.0069 ± 0.0011	semisupervi	0.0055 ± 0.0012	0.0042 ± 0.0008	nonadapt	0.0067 ± 0.0067	0.0 ± 0.0	match	0.0048 ± 0.0009	0.0019 ± 0.0003
49	genet	0.0037 ± 0.0022	0.001 ± 0.0004	estim	0.01 ± 0.0024	0.0076 ± 0.0012	detect	0.0086 ± 0.0012	0.0074 ± 0.0009	hidden	0.009 ± 0.0064	0.0025 ± 0.0025	regress	0.005 ± 0.0008	0.0022 ± 0.0003

Table 9: Most important predictors for acceptance in decreasing order of importance: title

	AI Stem	AI Score accepted	AI Score rejected	CL Stem	CL Score accepted	CL Score rejected	LG Stem	LG Score accepted	LG Score rejected	ICLR Stem	ICLR Score accepted	ICLR Score rejected	All Stem	All Score accepted	All Score rejected
0	measur	0.016 ± 0.0028	0.008 ± 0.0005	matrix	0.0167 ± 0.0027	0.0091 ± 0.001	word	0.0122 ± 0.0012	0.0078 ± 0.0007	algorithm	0.0446 ± 0.0049	0.024 ± 0.0028	model	0.0514 ± 0.0012	0.0344 ± 0.0006
1	machin	0.0173 ± 0.002	0.0128 ± 0.0005	new	0.0179 ± 0.0014	0.013 ± 0.0006	measur	0.0107 ± 0.0009	0.0068 ± 0.0005	learn	0.0494 ± 0.0049	0.0329 ± 0.0032	learn	0.043 ± 0.0011	0.0301 ± 0.0005
2	variabl	0.0117 ± 0.002	0.0075 ± 0.0005	cluster	0.0195 ± 0.0033	0.0152 ± 0.0016	bound	0.0154 ± 0.0012	0.0126 ± 0.0008	deep	0.0219 ± 0.004	0.0075 ± 0.0015	bound	0.0157 ± 0.0009	0.0059 ± 0.0003
3	visual	0.0095 ± 0.0021	0.0054 ± 0.0005	algorithm	0.0423 ± 0.0026	0.0385 ± 0.0013	target	0.0078 ± 0.0009	0.005 ± 0.0005	label	0.0212 ± 0.0061	0.0071 ± 0.0019	neural	0.0248 ± 0.0009	0.0151 ± 0.0004
4	imag	0.0183 ± 0.0032	0.0144 ± 0.0009	imag	0.0157 ± 0.0025	0.012 ± 0.0011	domain	0.0106 ± 0.001	0.0079 ± 0.0006	optim	0.0247 ± 0.0038	0.0112 ± 0.0021	optim	0.0218 ± 0.0009	0.0124 ± 0.0004
5	deep	0.0185 ± 0.0025	0.0147 ± 0.0007	kernel	0.0133 ± 0.0026	0.0097 ± 0.0013	languag	0.01 ± 0.0009	0.0077 ± 0.0006	classif	0.0216 ± 0.004	0.009 ± 0.002	gradient	0.0131 ± 0.0008	0.004 ± 0.0003
6	forest	0.0049 ± 0.0021	0.0013 ± 0.0003	number	0.015 ± 0.0014	0.0115 ± 0.0006	stochast	0.0114 ± 0.001	0.0094 ± 0.0006	sampl	0.0176 ± 0.0035	0.0063 ± 0.0018	estim	0.0153 ± 0.0009	0.0064 ± 0.0003
7	net	0.006 ± 0.0021	0.0025 ± 0.0004	region	0.0054 ± 0.0014	0.0023 ± 0.0004	invari	0.004 ± 0.0008	0.0021 ± 0.0004	function	0.023 ± 0.0046	0.012 ± 0.0023	sampl	0.0163 ± 0.0009	0.0079 ± 0.0004
8	corrupt	0.0045 ± 0.0019	0.0012 ± 0.0003	solv	0.0106 ± 0.0012	0.0076 ± 0.0006	constraint	0.0067 ± 0.0009	0.0048 ± 0.0004	convolut	0.0155 ± 0.004	0.0046 ± 0.002	train	0.0247 ± 0.0009	0.0165 ± 0.0004
9	autoencod	0.0075 ± 0.0024	0.0041 ± 0.0005	rnn	0.0057 ± 0.0017	0.0028 ± 0.0005	phrase	0.0029 ± 0.0007	0.0011 ± 0.0002	problem	0.0277 ± 0.0034	0.0177 ± 0.0022	convex	0.0099 ± 0.0008	0.0018 ± 0.0002
10	group	0.0075 ± 0.0019	0.0043 ± 0.0005	detector	0.0037 ± 0.0015	0.0009 ± 0.0003	sourc	0.0057 ± 0.0007	0.0039 ± 0.0004	network	0.0284 ± 0.004	0.019 ± 0.0027	task	0.0247 ± 0.0009	0.0169 ± 0.0004
11	reconstruct	0.0059 ± 0.0021	0.0027 ± 0.0003	work	0.0138 ± 0.0011	0.011 ± 0.0006	rbm	0.003 ± 0.0008	0.0012 ± 0.0004	effici	0.0175 ± 0.0026	0.0083 ± 0.0015	regret	0.0098 ± 0.0009	0.0021 ± 0.0002
12	cluster	0.0183 ± 0.0037	0.0152 ± 0.0012	machin	0.0141 ± 0.0013	0.0114 ± 0.0007	represent	0.0146 ± 0.001	0.0129 ± 0.0007	regular	0.0125 ± 0.004	0.0036 ± 0.0011	function	0.0194 ± 0.0009	0.0117 ± 0.0004
13	dataset	0.0176 ± 0.0017	0.0147 ± 0.0006	lowrank	0.005 ± 0.0012	0.0023 ± 0.0004	embed	0.0086 ± 0.001	0.0068 ± 0.0007	matrix	0.015 ± 0.0049	0.0063 ± 0.0018	algorithm	0.0325 ± 0.001	0.025 ± 0.0005
14	recoveri	0.0046 ± 0.0016	0.0017 ± 0.0003	adapt	0.0104 ± 0.0016	0.0077 ± 0.0007	sentenc	0.0053 ± 0.0008	0.0036 ± 0.0005	kernel	0.013 ± 0.005	0.0044 ± 0.0027	approxim	0.0142 ± 0.0008	0.0068 ± 0.0003
15	svm	0.0081 ± 0.0021	0.0052 ± 0.0006	ensembl	0.0054 ± 0.0016	0.0027 ± 0.0006	cca	0.0023 ± 0.0009	0.0006 ± 0.0002	recommend	0.0088 ± 0.0037	0.0003 ± 0.0003	stochast	0.0117 ± 0.0007	0.0044 ± 0.0002
16	affin	0.0038 ± 0.002	0.001 ± 0.0003	rbm	0.0043 ± 0.0018	0.0017 ± 0.0007	convex	0.009 ± 0.0009	0.0073 ± 0.0006	comput	0.0177 ± 0.0026	0.0095 ± 0.0018	matrix	0.0109 ± 0.0009	0.0038 ± 0.0003
17	prior	0.0079 ± 0.0019	0.0051 ± 0.0005	learn	0.0438 ± 0.0024	0.0412 ± 0.0013	previou	0.0074 ± 0.0005	0.0057 ± 0.0004	guarante	0.0093 ± 0.0023	0.0011 ± 0.0005	distribut	0.0167 ± 0.0008	0.01 ± 0.0003
18	convolut	0.0116 ± 0.0022	0.0089 ± 0.0006	music	0.0047 ± 0.0016	0.0022 ± 0.0006	regret	0.0087 ± 0.001	0.0071 ± 0.0007	number	0.0143 ± 0.0025	0.0061 ± 0.0013	gener	0.0249 ± 0.0008	0.0183 ± 0.0004
19	data	0.0327 ± 0.0026	0.0299 ± 0.0009	scale	0.0073 ± 0.0012	0.0048 ± 0.0005	averag	0.0051 ± 0.0006	0.0035 ± 0.0004	bound	0.0143 ± 0.0041	0.0062 ± 0.002	method	0.0295 ± 0.0009	0.023 ± 0.0004
20	spectral	0.0061 ± 0.0018	0.0034 ± 0.0004	user	0.0093 ± 0.0018	0.0068 ± 0.0008	annot	0.004 ± 0.0007	0.0024 ± 0.0003	robust	0.0133 ± 0.0037	0.0052 ± 0.0012	latent	0.0097 ± 0.0008	0.0032 ± 0.0002
21	better	0.0098 ± 0.0012	0.007 ± 0.0004	spectral	0.0054 ± 0.0013	0.0029 ± 0.0005	attent	0.0056 ± 0.0007	0.004 ± 0.0004	layer	0.0104 ± 0.0035	0.0025 ± 0.0011	infer	0.0142 ± 0.0008	0.0079 ± 0.0004
22	node	0.0074 ± 0.0022	0.0047 ± 0.0005	onlin	0.0104 ± 0.0017	0.008 ± 0.0008	point	0.0089 ± 0.0008	0.0074 ± 0.0005	propos	0.0271 ± 0.0026	0.0201 ± 0.002	stateoftheart	0.0132 ± 0.0005	0.0071 ± 0.0002
23	auction	0.0033 ± 0.0021	0.0006 ± 0.0002	convex	0.0102 ± 0.0018	0.0078 ± 0.0008	boltzmann	0.0028 ± 0.0006	0.0013 ± 0.0002	time	0.0162 ± 0.0032	0.0092 ± 0.0016	converg	0.01 ± 0.0007	0.004 ± 0.0002
24	similar	0.0111 ± 0.0019	0.0085 ± 0.0005	compress	0.004 ± 0.0013	0.0017 ± 0.0004	challeng	0.0082 ± 0.0006	0.0067 ± 0.0004	grid	0.0078 ± 0.0048	0.0009 ± 0.0006	linear	0.0112 ± 0.0007	0.0053 ± 0.0002
25	adaboost	0.0031 ± 0.0016	0.0005 ± 0.0002	train	0.0205 ± 0.0017	0.0183 ± 0.001	hand	0.0033 ± 0.0005	0.0017 ± 0.0002	cnn	0.0086 ± 0.0049	0.0018 ± 0.0009	guarante	0.0087 ± 0.0006	0.0029 ± 0.0002
26	confid	0.004 ± 0.0018	0.0015 ± 0.0003	instanc	0.0069 ± 0.0013	0.0046 ± 0.0006	composit	0.0037 ± 0.0006	0.0022 ± 0.0003	svm	0.0088 ± 0.0038	0.002 ± 0.001	variat	0.0085 ± 0.0007	0.0027 ± 0.0002
27	refer	0.0052 ± 0.0015	0.0027 ± 0.0003	depth	0.0032 ± 0.0013	0.001 ± 0.0003	prior	0.0061 ± 0.0007	0.0046 ± 0.0004	space	0.0149 ± 0.0037	0.0082 ± 0.0017	theoret	0.0097 ± 0.0006	0.0041 ± 0.0002
28	exact	0.0056 ± 0.0015	0.0031 ± 0.0003	decomposit	0.0048 ± 0.0013	0.0025 ± 0.0004	transfer	0.005 ± 0.0008	0.0035 ± 0.0005	bandit	0.009 ± 0.0033	0.0024 ± 0.0014	loss	0.0097 ± 0.0008	0.0041 ± 0.0003
29	stochast	0.0121 ± 0.002	0.0096 ± 0.0006	item	0.0055 ± 0.0017	0.0033 ± 0.0007	articl	0.0032 ± 0.0005	0.0017 ± 0.0003	graph	0.0145 ± 0.0046	0.0078 ± 0.0025	demonstr	0.0142 ± 0.0005	0.0088 ± 0.0002
30	studi	0.0125 ± 0.0014	0.01 ± 0.0004	audio	0.0037 ± 0.0014	0.0015 ± 0.0005	question	0.0061 ± 0.0008	0.0046 ± 0.0005	multiclass	0.0071 ± 0.003	0.0005 ± 0.0005	empir	0.01 ± 0.0005	0.0047 ± 0.0002
31	combin	0.0098 ± 0.0014	0.0074 ± 0.0004	random	0.0103 ± 0.0016	0.0081 ± 0.0008	metric	0.0067 ± 0.001	0.0053 ± 0.0006	veri	0.0098 ± 0.0024	0.0032 ± 0.0009	spars	0.0086 ± 0.0007	0.0033 ± 0.0002
32	kmean	0.0052 ± 0.0022	0.0028 ± 0.0005	unsupervis	0.007 ± 0.0016	0.0048 ± 0.0006	structur	0.015 ± 0.0011	0.0136 ± 0.0007	norm	0.0065 ± 0.0026	1e-04 ± 1e-04	regular	0.0094 ± 0.0007	0.0042 ± 0.0003
33	best	0.0078 ± 0.0011	0.0055 ± 0.0003	rate	0.0109 ± 0.0019	0.0088 ± 0.0008	belief	0.0033 ± 0.0007	0.0019 ± 0.0003	kernelbas	0.0064 ± 0.0033	0.0 ± 0.0	improv	0.0164 ± 0.0006	0.0113 ± 0.0003
34	mani	0.0119 ± 0.0012	0.0096 ± 0.0004	addit	0.0078 ± 0.0012	0.0057 ± 0.0004	signific	0.0056 ± 0.0005	0.0042 ± 0.0003	class	0.0111 ± 0.0027	0.0047 ± 0.0014	simpl	0.0108 ± 0.0005	0.0058 ± 0.0002
35	spatial	0.0047 ± 0.0015	0.0024 ± 0.0004	manipul	0.0027 ± 0.0011	0.0007 ± 0.0002	noisi	0.004 ± 0.0005	0.0026 ± 0.0003	adapt	0.0121 ± 0.0035	0.0058 ± 0.0016	achiev	0.0139 ± 0.0005	0.0089 ± 0.0002
36	convex	0.0104 ± 0.0023	0.0082 ± 0.0006	semisupervis	0.0047 ± 0.0015	0.0027 ± 0.0005	provid	0.014 ± 0.0007	0.0127 ± 0.0005	constant	0.0065 ± 0.0021	0.0002 ± 0.0002	kernel	0.0092 ± 0.001	0.0042 ± 0.0004
37	composit	0.005 ± 0.0014	0.0027 ± 0.0004	real	0.007 ± 0.0009	0.005 ± 0.0004	hierarch	0.0046 ± 0.0007	0.0032 ± 0.0004	exist	0.0164 ± 0.0027	0.0102 ± 0.0016	word	0.0195 ± 0.0011	0.0149 ± 0.0006
38	research	0.0078 ± 0.0014	0.0056 ± 0.0004	reinforc	0.0073 ± 0.0014	0.0053 ± 0.0006	extract	0.0067 ± 0.0007	0.0054 ± 0.0004	onlin	0.0106 ± 0.0027	0.0045 ± 0.0015	sequenc	0.0114 ± 0.0008	0.0069 ± 0.0004
39	gradient	0.0113 ± 0.002	0.009 ± 0.0006	partit	0.0039 ± 0.0013	0.0019 ± 0.0004	energi	0.0037 ± 0.0008	0.0024 ± 0.0003	consid	0.0142 ± 0.0023	0.008 ± 0.0015	predict	0.0163 ± 0.0008	0.012 ± 0.0004
40	onlin	0.0111 ± 0.0023	0.0089 ± 0.0007	ssc	0.0021 ± 0.0015	0.0002 ± 0.0002	repres	0.006 ± 0.0005	0.0047 ± 0.0003	continu	0.0094 ± 0.0033	0.0034 ± 0.0012	bandit	0.0058 ± 0.0007	0.0016 ± 0.0002
41	subspac	0.0054 ± 0.0026	0.0032 ± 0.0005	net	0.0041 ± 0.0012	0.0022 ± 0.0005	drift	0.0021 ± 0.0007	0.0008 ± 0.0003	corrupt	0.0068 ± 0.0033	0.0008 ± 0.0006	depend	0.0105 ± 0.0006	0.0063 ± 0.0003
42	memori	0.0081 ± 0.0019	0.006 ± 0.0005	select	0.0118 ± 0.0017	0.0099 ± 0.0008	translat	0.0053 ± 0.0008	0.004 ± 0.0006	point	0.0124 ± 0.0038	0.0065 ± 0.0016	network	0.0298 ± 0.0011	0.0256 ± 0.0006
43	realworld	0.0069 ± 0.0011	0.0047 ± 0.0003	mechan	0.0053 ± 0.0012	0.0034 ± 0.0005	unknown	0.0046 ± 0.0006	0.0034 ± 0.0004	case	0.0114 ± 0.0022	0.0055 ± 0.0012	translat	0.0123 ± 0.001	0.0082 ± 0.0005
44	power	0.0073 ± 0.0012	0.0051 ± 0.0004	analysi	0.0117 ± 0.0012	0.0098 ± 0.0006	gap	0.003 ± 0.0005	0.0018 ± 0.0002	potenti	0.0087 ± 0.0021	0.0029 ± 0.0009	sentenc	0.011 ± 0.0009	0.0069 ± 0.0004
45	motif	0.0029 ± 0.0022	0.0008 ± 0.0003	confid	0.0031 ± 0.0012	0.0012 ± 0.0003	opinion	0.0019 ± 0.0006	0.0007 ± 0.0002	rnn	0.008 ± 0.0042	0.0022 ± 0.001	problem	0.0257 ± 0.0008	0.0216 ± 0.0004
46	signal	0.0068 ± 0.0017	0.0046 ± 0.0005	bandit	0.007 ± 0.0018	0.0051 ± 0.0008	dirichlet	0.002 ± 0.0005	0.0008 ± 0.0002	new	0.0163 ± 0.0022	0.0106 ± 0.0015	pars	0.0069 ± 0.0007	0.0029 ± 0.0003
47	text	0.0087 ± 0.0023	0.0065 ± 0.0005	regret	0.0102 ± 0.002	0.0083 ± 0.001	syntact	0.0021 ± 0.0004	0.0008 ± 0.0002	review	0.0076 ± 0.0049	0.0019 ± 0.0009	paramet	0.0113 ± 0.0006	0.0073 ± 0.0003
48	particularli	0.0035 ± 0.0009	0.0014 ± 0.0002	matric	0.0055 ± 0.0013	0.0037 ± 0.0006	recoveri	0.0027 ± 0.0005	0.0014 ± 0.0003	predict	0.0164 ± 0.0035	0.0108 ± 0.0022	nonconvex	0.0048 ± 0.0006	0.0008 ± 1e-04
49	librari	0.003 ± 0.0015	0.0009 ± 0.0002	dcop	0.0019 ± 0.0014	1e-04 ± 1e-04	mdp	0.0023 ± 0.0007	0.0011 ± 0.0003	data	0.0296 ± 0.0038	0.024 ± 0.0026	outperform	0.0098 ± 0.0004	0.0059 ± 0.0002

Table 10: Most important predictors for acceptance in decreasing order of importance: abstract

	AI Stem	AI Score accepted	AI Score rejected	CL Stem	CL Score accepted	CL Score rejected	LG Stem	LG Score accepted	LG Score rejected	ICLR Stem	ICLR Score accepted	ICLR Score rejected	All Stem	All Score accepted	All Score rejected
0	layer	0.0174 ± 0.003	0.012 ± 0.0008	learn	0.0546 ± 0.0025	0.046 ± 0.0014	model	0.0496 ± 0.0015	0.0437 ± 0.0011	network	0.0373 ± 0.0048	0.0132 ± 0.0018	model	0.0578 ± 0.0012	0.0405 ± 0.0006
1	word	0.0208 ± 0.0034	0.0157 ± 0.0011	label	0.0242 ± 0.0025	0.0175 ± 0.0014	word	0.0178 ± 0.0015	0.0122 ± 0.0009	algorithm	0.0406 ± 0.0041	0.0198 ± 0.002	learn	0.0484 ± 0.001	0.0337 ± 0.0006
2	vector	0.0188 ± 0.0025	0.0142 ± 0.0007	train	0.0284 ± 0.0019	0.0224 ± 0.001	languag	0.0141 ± 0.001	0.0097 ± 0.0006	learn	0.0508 ± 0.0041	0.0302 ± 0.0028	estim	0.0188 ± 0.0008	0.0073 ± 0.0003
3	label	0.0233 ± 0.0032	0.0189 ± 0.0011	class	0.0177 ± 0.0017	0.0123 ± 0.0008	object	0.0176 ± 0.001	0.0141 ± 0.0007	matrix	0.0226 ± 0.0051	0.0048 ± 0.0014	optim	0.024 ± 0.0008	0.0133 ± 0.0004
4	activ	0.0123 ± 0.0022	0.0082 ± 0.0006	classifi	0.017 ± 0.0019	0.0117 ± 0.0009	sentenc	0.008 ± 0.0009	0.0049 ± 0.0005	kernel	0.0209 ± 0.0065	0.0038 ± 0.0026	function	0.0257 ± 0.0008	0.0152 ± 0.0004
5	speech	0.0093 ± 0.002	0.0052 ± 0.0005	imag	0.0225 ± 0.0025	0.0174 ± 0.0013	document	0.0094 ± 0.001	0.0065 ± 0.0007	label	0.0253 ± 0.0059	0.0088 ± 0.0023	bound	0.0177 ± 0.0008	0.0076 ± 0.0004
6	bit	0.0061 ± 0.0018	0.0022 ± 0.0004	classif	0.018 ± 0.0016	0.0133 ± 0.0008	annot	0.0061 ± 0.0007	0.0033 ± 0.0004	deep	0.0219 ± 0.0038	0.0056 ± 0.0011	gradient	0.0153 ± 0.0008	0.0056 ± 0.0003
7	lstm	0.0078 ± 0.0025	0.004 ± 0.0005	kernel	0.0196 ± 0.0032	0.0152 ± 0.0017	arm	0.0072 ± 0.0012	0.0045 ± 0.0008	adversari	0.0159 ± 0.0057	0.0013 ± 0.001	sampl	0.02 ± 0.0008	0.0104 ± 0.0004
8	neural	0.0196 ± 0.0022	0.0158 ± 0.0007	margin	0.0092 ± 0.0016	0.005 ± 0.0006	event	0.0067 ± 0.0011	0.004 ± 0.0005	function	0.0274 ± 0.0045	0.0137 ± 0.0021	matrix	0.0157 ± 0.0009	0.0063 ± 0.0003
9	predict	0.0217 ± 0.0026	0.018 ± 0.0008	represent	0.0189 ± 0.0018	0.0149 ± 0.0009	entiti	0.0066 ± 0.0009	0.004 ± 0.0006	imag	0.0246 ± 0.0049	0.0114 ± 0.003	distribut	0.0219 ± 0.0008	0.0125 ± 0.0004
10	represent	0.02 ± 0.0022	0.0163 ± 0.0008	variat	0.0087 ± 0.0014	0.0051 ± 0.0006	graph	0.0131 ± 0.0013	0.0106 ± 0.0009	bound	0.0195 ± 0.0037	0.0068 ± 0.0019	algorithm	0.035 ± 0.0009	0.0257 ± 0.0005
11	answer	0.0098 ± 0.0022	0.0061 ± 0.0006	face	0.0067 ± 0.0013	0.0031 ± 0.0005	vector	0.0155 ± 0.0009	0.0131 ± 0.0006	train	0.0277 ± 0.0036	0.015 ± 0.0017	train	0.0294 ± 0.0008	0.0211 ± 0.0005
12	bandit	0.0096 ± 0.0027	0.006 ± 0.0007	converg	0.0118 ± 0.0013	0.0083 ± 0.0007	embed	0.0108 ± 0.0011	0.0084 ± 0.0008	convolut	0.0139 ± 0.0037	0.0017 ± 0.0006	convex	0.0108 ± 0.0007	0.0026 ± 0.0002
13	video	0.0077 ± 0.002	0.0042 ± 0.0006	updat	0.0091 ± 0.0012	0.0056 ± 0.0005	caption	0.0037 ± 0.0008	0.0015 ± 0.0003	optim	0.022 ± 0.0032	0.0101 ± 0.0015	approxim	0.016 ± 0.0007	0.0078 ± 0.0003
14	scale	0.0106 ± 0.0017	0.0072 ± 0.0004	ensembl	0.0059 ± 0.0018	0.0025 ± 0.0005	path	0.0049 ± 0.0007	0.0026 ± 0.0004	sampl	0.0189 ± 0.0032	0.0073 ± 0.0017	neural	0.0238 ± 0.0008	0.0156 ± 0.0004
15	unlabel	0.0072 ± 0.0016	0.0037 ± 0.0004	predict	0.02 ± 0.0019	0.0166 ± 0.001	label	0.0204 ± 0.0015	0.0182 ± 0.0011	neural	0.0219 ± 0.0035	0.0107 ± 0.002	loss	0.014 ± 0.0008	0.006 ± 0.0004
16	cnn	0.0111 ± 0.0025	0.0078 ± 0.0008	multiclass	0.006 ± 0.0013	0.0027 ± 0.0005	translat	0.0075 ± 0.0009	0.0054 ± 0.0005	layer	0.0154 ± 0.003	0.0043 ± 0.0011	regret	0.011 ± 0.001	0.0031 ± 0.0003
17	perform	0.0204 ± 0.0012	0.0171 ± 0.0004	regular	0.0131 ± 0.0015	0.0098 ± 0.0009	submodular	0.0045 ± 0.0011	0.0025 ± 0.0007	bandit	0.0137 ± 0.0048	0.0029 ± 0.0015	stochast	0.0114 ± 0.0006	0.0042 ± 0.0002
18	transform	0.0097 ± 0.0019	0.0064 ± 0.0005	elast	0.004 ± 0.0017	0.0007 ± 0.0003	nlp	0.0038 ± 0.0004	0.0019 ± 0.0003	arm	0.0118 ± 0.0047	0.0013 ± 0.001	infer	0.0159 ± 0.0008	0.0088 ± 0.0004
19	learn	0.0531 ± 0.0031	0.05 ± 0.0011	data	0.0354 ± 0.0019	0.0323 ± 0.0011	attent	0.0069 ± 0.0009	0.005 ± 0.0004	regular	0.013 ± 0.0043	0.0029 ± 0.0006	kernel	0.0128 ± 0.0012	0.0057 ± 0.0005
20	imag	0.0239 ± 0.0033	0.0208 ± 0.0012	adr	0.003 ± 0.0018	0.0 ± 0.0	arab	0.002 ± 0.0007	0.0002 ± 0.0002	regret	0.0149 ± 0.005	0.005 ± 0.002	paramet	0.0153 ± 0.0006	0.0086 ± 0.0003
21	speaker	0.0045 ± 0.0021	0.0014 ± 0.0004	sequenc	0.0114 ± 0.0018	0.0085 ± 0.0007	descriptor	0.0026 ± 0.0007	0.001 ± 0.0003	graph	0.0198 ± 0.0056	0.0104 ± 0.0025	latent	0.0112 ± 0.0008	0.0047 ± 0.0003
22	regret	0.0135 ± 0.0033	0.0104 ± 0.001	robust	0.0079 ± 0.0013	0.005 ± 0.0004	probabilist	0.0059 ± 0.0005	0.0043 ± 0.0003	architectur	0.0134 ± 0.003	0.0041 ± 0.0011	linear	0.0126 ± 0.0005	0.0061 ± 0.0002
23	memori	0.0098 ± 0.0021	0.0067 ± 0.0006	learner	0.0086 ± 0.0016	0.0058 ± 0.0007	imag	0.0236 ± 0.0016	0.022 ± 0.0013	paramet	0.0153 ± 0.0022	0.0061 ± 0.0012	regular	0.0114 ± 0.0007	0.005 ± 0.0003
24	recognit	0.0119 ± 0.0017	0.0088 ± 0.0006	loss	0.0158 ± 0.002	0.0129 ± 0.0011	local	0.0105 ± 0.0008	0.0089 ± 0.0005	reward	0.0175 ± 0.0049	0.0086 ± 0.0034	method	0.0277 ± 0.0007	0.0215 ± 0.0004
25	cluster	0.0218 ± 0.0046	0.0188 ± 0.0015	svm	0.0092 ± 0.0019	0.0064 ± 0.0008	regret	0.0114 ± 0.0013	0.0098 ± 0.001	classifi	0.0159 ± 0.0032	0.0073 ± 0.0014	gener	0.0265 ± 0.0007	0.0203 ± 0.0003
26	caption	0.0047 ± 0.0022	0.0017 ± 0.0004	estim	0.0188 ± 0.0017	0.016 ± 0.001	text	0.009 ± 0.0008	0.0075 ± 0.0006	norm	0.0109 ± 0.0027	0.0023 ± 0.0011	vector	0.0166 ± 0.0008	0.0105 ± 0.0004
27	distanc	0.0096 ± 0.0021	0.0066 ± 0.0005	nonlinear	0.0079 ± 0.001	0.0051 ± 0.0005	supervis	0.0096 ± 0.0007	0.008 ± 0.0005	gener	0.0265 ± 0.0029	0.018 ± 0.0016	converg	0.0104 ± 0.0006	0.0043 ± 0.0002
28	bengio	0.0063 ± 0.0017	0.0033 ± 0.0003	dropout	0.005 ± 0.0019	0.0023 ± 0.0007	causal	0.0038 ± 0.0009	0.0022 ± 0.0005	svm	0.0109 ± 0.0045	0.0026 ± 0.0011	spars	0.01 ± 0.0007	0.004 ± 0.0003
29	topic	0.0098 ± 0.0028	0.0069 ± 0.0008	cover	0.0048 ± 0.001	0.0022 ± 0.0002	market	0.003 ± 0.0007	0.0015 ± 0.0003	set	0.0256 ± 0.0026	0.0175 ± 0.0015	predict	0.0192 ± 0.0008	0.0134 ± 0.0004
30	convex	0.0127 ± 0.0021	0.0099 ± 0.0007	visual	0.0082 ± 0.0013	0.0055 ± 0.0006	structur	0.0159 ± 0.0009	0.0144 ± 0.0006	stochast	0.0116 ± 0.0025	0.0037 ± 0.001	bandit	0.0074 ± 0.0008	0.0018 ± 0.0002
31	translat	0.0088 ± 0.0023	0.0059 ± 0.0006	dictionari	0.0061 ± 0.0015	0.0034 ± 0.0007	mixtur	0.0054 ± 0.0008	0.0039 ± 0.0005	confid	0.0086 ± 0.0041	0.0009 ± 0.0004	network	0.0328 ± 0.0011	0.0272 ± 0.0006
32	weight	0.0134 ± 0.0018	0.0106 ± 0.0006	exampl	0.0164 ± 0.001	0.0138 ± 0.0005	covari	0.0049 ± 0.0007	0.0034 ± 0.0004	weight	0.0136 ± 0.0026	0.0059 ± 0.0015	variat	0.0087 ± 0.0006	0.0034 ± 0.0002
33	microphon	0.0028 ± 0.0019	0.0 ± 0.0	function	0.0273 ± 0.0019	0.0247 ± 0.0011	corpora	0.0026 ± 0.0004	0.0011 ± 0.0002	minim	0.0117 ± 0.0019	0.004 ± 0.0009	guarante	0.0086 ± 0.0004	0.0035 ± 0.0002
34	dataset	0.0162 ± 0.0016	0.0134 ± 0.0006	detector	0.0042 ± 0.0012	0.0017 ± 0.0004	phrase	0.0035 ± 0.0006	0.002 ± 0.0004	convex	0.0099 ± 0.0025	0.0028 ± 0.0009	polici	0.0123 ± 0.001	0.0073 ± 0.0005
35	theano	0.0032 ± 0.0021	0.0004 ± 1e-04	infer	0.0129 ± 0.0016	0.0104 ± 0.0008	semant	0.0083 ± 0.0007	0.0069 ± 0.0005	perturb	0.0074 ± 0.0032	0.0003 ± 0.0002	task	0.0244 ± 0.0008	0.0194 ± 0.0004
36	sourc	0.0085 ± 0.0019	0.0059 ± 0.0005	tempor	0.0061 ± 0.0012	0.0037 ± 0.0005	spl	0.0014 ± 0.0008	0.0 ± 0.0	predict	0.0186 ± 0.0037	0.0116 ± 0.002	norm	0.0072 ± 0.0007	0.0022 ± 0.0002
37	decod	0.0053 ± 0.0015	0.0027 ± 0.0004	assign	0.0066 ± 0.001	0.0042 ± 0.0004	depend	0.011 ± 0.0006	0.0097 ± 0.0005	flow	0.0079 ± 0.0045	0.0012 ± 0.0004	label	0.0172 ± 0.001	0.0123 ± 0.0005
38	dropout	0.0056 ± 0.0026	0.0031 ± 0.0006	section	0.0275 ± 0.0014	0.025 ± 0.0008	diffus	0.0023 ± 0.0006	0.0009 ± 0.0003	hash	0.007 ± 0.0046	0.0004 ± 0.0003	random	0.0108 ± 0.0005	0.0059 ± 0.0002
39	atp	0.0029 ± 0.0018	0.0003 ± 0.0002	multipl	0.0092 ± 0.0008	0.0068 ± 0.0004	interact	0.0066 ± 0.0006	0.0052 ± 0.0004	data	0.0315 ± 0.0035	0.0249 ± 0.0027	posterior	0.0064 ± 0.0006	0.0016 ± 0.0002
40	phrase	0.0055 ± 0.0018	0.003 ± 0.0005	modal	0.0034 ± 0.0011	0.0011 ± 0.0004	question	0.009 ± 0.0008	0.0077 ± 0.0006	featur	0.0236 ± 0.0036	0.017 ± 0.0027	sequenc	0.0144 ± 0.0008	0.0095 ± 0.0004
41	dae	0.0029 ± 0.0018	0.0004 ± 0.0002	approxim	0.0157 ± 0.0014	0.0135 ± 0.0008	privaci	0.0048 ± 0.001	0.0034 ± 0.0007	batch	0.0076 ± 0.0032	0.0011 ± 0.0006	sentenc	0.0164 ± 0.001	0.0116 ± 0.0005
42	gpu	0.0053 ± 0.0018	0.0028 ± 0.0004	spike	0.0028 ± 0.0011	0.0005 ± 0.0002	inform	0.0156 ± 0.0006	0.0143 ± 0.0005	loss	0.0134 ± 0.0031	0.007 ± 0.0023	nmt	0.0075 ± 0.001	0.0028 ± 0.0004
43	path	0.0059 ± 0.0017	0.0034 ± 0.0005	channel	0.0032 ± 0.0011	0.001 ± 0.0002	price	0.0033 ± 0.0007	0.002 ± 0.0003	approxim	0.0134 ± 0.0025	0.007 ± 0.0014	pars	0.0091 ± 0.0008	0.0044 ± 0.0003
44	unsupervis	0.0092 ± 0.0016	0.0068 ± 0.0005	cnl	0.0023 ± 0.0016	0.0 ± 0.0	smooth	0.0053 ± 0.0006	0.0041 ± 0.0004	iter	0.0082 ± 0.002	0.0019 ± 0.0006	empir	0.0084 ± 0.0003	0.0038 ± 1e-04
45	feedback	0.0066 ± 0.002	0.0042 ± 0.0006	forecast	0.0029 ± 0.0014	0.0008 ± 0.0002	nmt	0.0017 ± 0.0006	0.0004 ± 0.0002	crowdsourc	0.0067 ± 0.004	0.0006 ± 0.0003	assumpt	0.0091 ± 0.0004	0.0045 ± 0.0002
46	autoencod	0.0071 ± 0.0021	0.0047 ± 0.0006	scene	0.0044 ± 0.0015	0.0023 ± 0.0005	context	0.0081 ± 0.0006	0.0068 ± 0.0004	permut	0.006 ± 0.0024	0.0 ± 0.0	reward	0.0099 ± 0.0008	0.0054 ± 0.0004
47	kernel	0.0178 ± 0.0043	0.0154 ± 0.0013	textur	0.0026 ± 0.0013	0.0004 ± 1e-04	som	0.0016 ± 0.0006	0.0004 ± 0.0002	rate	0.0128 ± 0.0031	0.0068 ± 0.0016	depend	0.0122 ± 0.0005	0.0078 ± 0.0002
48	question	0.0101 ± 0.0018	0.0077 ± 0.0006	sampl	0.0212 ± 0.0018	0.0191 ± 0.0011	link	0.004 ± 0.0006	0.0028 ± 0.0003	class	0.0127 ± 0.0026	0.0068 ± 0.0012	gaussian	0.0069 ± 0.0005	0.0025 ± 0.0002
49	request	0.0034 ± 0.0013	0.0011 ± 0.0002	framework	0.0116 ± 0.0009	0.0094 ± 0.0005	global	0.0057 ± 0.0005	0.0045 ± 0.0003	log	0.0072 ± 0.0017	0.0013 ± 0.0005	observ	0.0125 ± 0.0005	0.0082 ± 0.0003

Table 11: Most important predictors for acceptance in decreasing order of importance: introduction

	AI Stem	AI Score accepted	AI Score rejected	CL Stem	CL Score accepted	CL Score rejected	LG Stem	LG Score accepted	LG Score rejected	ICLR Stem	ICLR Score accepted	ICLR Score rejected	All Stem	All Score accepted	All Score rejected
0	rank	0.0011 ± 0.0011	0.0062 ± 0.0009	network	0.0223 ± 0.0032	0.0283 ± 0.0018	network	0.0305 ± 0.002	0.0361 ± 0.0016	deep	0.0163 ± 0.0066	0.0286 ± 0.007	use	0.0113 ± 0.0009	0.0204 ± 0.0007
1	learn	0.0459 ± 0.0043	0.051 ± 0.0016	bayesian	0.0063 ± 0.0019	0.0121 ± 0.0015	deep	0.0236 ± 0.0019	0.0268 ± 0.0015	hash	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0113 ± 0.0066	base	0.0035 ± 0.0006	0.0125 ± 0.0006
2	reinforc	0.0033 ± 0.0019	0.0079 ± 0.0009	gener	0.0088 ± 0.0021	0.0139 ± 0.0015	adapt	0.0078 ± 0.0012	0.0108 ± 0.0011	risk	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0113 ± 0.0057	recognit	0.0026 ± 0.0006	0.0093 ± 0.0006
3	robust	0.0009 ± 0.0009	0.005 ± 0.0008	classif	0.0075 ± 0.002	0.0115 ± 0.0014	estim	0.0062 ± 0.0011	0.0088 ± 0.001	explor	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0105 ± 0.0062	detect	0.0029 ± 0.0006	0.0096 ± 0.0006
4	distribut	0.0055 ± 0.0021	0.0094 ± 0.001	recurr	0.0027 ± 0.0012	0.0068 ± 0.0012	framework	0.0032 ± 0.0008	0.0058 ± 0.0008	neural	0.0248 ± 0.0072	0.0353 ± 0.0074	speech	0.0009 ± 0.0004	0.0065 ± 0.0005
5	process	0.0027 ± 0.0016	0.0064 ± 0.0008	imag	0.0042 ± 0.0015	0.0082 ± 0.0013	connect	0.0004 ± 0.0003	0.0029 ± 0.0007	bayesian	0.0062 ± 0.0045	0.0165 ± 0.0068	approach	0.0057 ± 0.0008	0.0112 ± 0.0006
6	matrix	0.0025 ± 0.0014	0.0062 ± 0.0009	dynam	0.0032 ± 0.0014	0.007 ± 0.0012	fast	0.0056 ± 0.0011	0.0081 ± 0.001	deriv	0.0 ± 0.0	0.01 ± 0.0059	logic	0.0016 ± 0.0004	0.0071 ± 0.0006
7	code	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0037 ± 0.0007	nonparametr	0.0007 ± 0.0007	0.0046 ± 0.0011	perform	0.0016 ± 0.0006	0.0039 ± 0.0007	continu	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0095 ± 0.0056	data	0.0071 ± 0.0009	0.0122 ± 0.0006
8	word	0.0014 ± 0.0011	0.0051 ± 0.0007	tempor	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0037 ± 0.0009	state	0.001 ± 0.0005	0.0033 ± 0.0007	multiarm	0.0 ± 0.0	0.009 ± 0.0065	classif	0.0059 ± 0.0008	0.0109 ± 0.0006
9	gaussian	0.0022 ± 0.0015	0.0058 ± 0.0009	method	0.0065 ± 0.0018	0.0101 ± 0.0013	classifi	0.0043 ± 0.001	0.0064 ± 0.0009	trace	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0086 ± 0.0062	plan	0.0019 ± 0.0005	0.0066 ± 0.0005
10	compress	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0034 ± 0.0007	word	0.0033 ± 0.0014	0.0065 ± 0.0011	recurr	0.0084 ± 0.0013	0.0105 ± 0.0012	twin	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0086 ± 0.006	intellig	0.0005 ± 0.0003	0.005 ± 0.0005
11	adversari	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0034 ± 0.0007	game	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0032 ± 0.0009	recognit	0.0058 ± 0.001	0.0079 ± 0.0009	spammer	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0084 ± 0.006	fuzzi	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0045 ± 0.0005
12	polici	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0033 ± 0.0006	rank	0.0032 ± 0.0014	0.0062 ± 0.0012	similar	0.0011 ± 0.0005	0.0032 ± 0.0007	multiview	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0083 ± 0.0048	reason	0.0017 ± 0.0005	0.0061 ± 0.0005
13	complex	0.001 ± 0.001	0.0043 ± 0.0007	tree	0.0024 ± 0.0012	0.0054 ± 0.0011	video	0.0019 ± 0.0007	0.004 ± 0.0007	gate	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0083 ± 0.0058	belief	0.0011 ± 0.0004	0.0054 ± 0.0005
14	submodular	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0032 ± 0.0007	dual	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0027 ± 0.0008	big	0.0012 ± 0.0005	0.0033 ± 0.0007	contextawar	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0082 ± 0.0048	survey	0.0002 ± 0.0002	0.0042 ± 0.0005
15	converg	0.0013 ± 0.0013	0.0045 ± 0.0007	multilabel	0.0007 ± 0.0007	0.0033 ± 0.001	analysi	0.0064 ± 0.0011	0.0085 ± 0.0009	point	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0078 ± 0.0055	probabilist	0.0038 ± 0.0007	0.0077 ± 0.0006
16	iter	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0031 ± 0.0006	train	0.0036 ± 0.0015	0.0062 ± 0.0011	imag	0.0063 ± 0.0012	0.0083 ± 0.001	optim	0.0091 ± 0.0069	0.0167 ± 0.006	inform	0.0028 ± 0.0006	0.0068 ± 0.0005
17	kernel	0.0074 ± 0.0026	0.0104 ± 0.0012	paramet	0.0022 ± 0.0013	0.0048 ± 0.0011	scene	0.0004 ± 0.0003	0.0022 ± 0.0006	net	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0075 ± 0.0053	analysi	0.0062 ± 0.0008	0.01 ± 0.0006
18	transform	0.0 ± 0.0	0.003 ± 0.0006	interact	0.0006 ± 0.0006	0.0032 ± 0.0008	time	0.0034 ± 0.0008	0.0052 ± 0.0008	languag	0.0038 ± 0.0038	0.0112 ± 0.005	robot	0.0002 ± 1e-04	0.0039 ± 0.0004
19	segment	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0029 ± 0.0006	search	0.0025 ± 0.0011	0.0051 ± 0.001	rank	0.0046 ± 0.0011	0.0063 ± 0.0009	budget	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0074 ± 0.0053	automat	0.0011 ± 0.0004	0.0048 ± 0.0004
20	net	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0029 ± 0.0006	practic	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0026 ± 0.0008	architectur	0.0023 ± 0.0007	0.004 ± 0.0007	quantiz	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0073 ± 0.0052	ontolog	0.0003 ± 0.0002	0.0038 ± 0.0004
21	problem	0.003 ± 0.0015	0.0059 ± 0.0008	data	0.0107 ± 0.0022	0.0133 ± 0.0014	tensor	0.0019 ± 0.0007	0.0036 ± 0.0007	perturb	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0073 ± 0.0052	knowledg	0.0046 ± 0.0008	0.0078 ± 0.0006
22	similar	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0027 ± 0.0006	discoveri	0.0012 ± 0.0008	0.0037 ± 0.0009	whi	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0016 ± 0.0005	markov	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0072 ± 0.0041	comput	0.0034 ± 0.0007	0.0066 ± 0.0005
23	label	0.0018 ± 0.0013	0.0045 ± 0.0008	unsupervi	0.0032 ± 0.0015	0.0057 ± 0.0011	pattern	0.0009 ± 0.0004	0.0025 ± 0.0006	pixel	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0071 ± 0.0071	deci	0.0024 ± 0.0006	0.0055 ± 0.0005
24	solv	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0027 ± 0.0006	annot	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0024 ± 0.0008	person	0.0011 ± 0.0005	0.0027 ± 0.0006	transfer	0.0 ± 0.0	0.007 ± 0.0049	techniqu	0.0007 ± 0.0003	0.0038 ± 0.0004
25	autoencod	0.0023 ± 0.0016	0.0049 ± 0.0008	variabl	0.0007 ± 0.0007	0.0031 ± 0.0008	varianc	0.0003 ± 0.0003	0.0019 ± 0.0005	batch	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0069 ± 0.0053	web	0.0004 ± 0.0002	0.0034 ± 0.0004
26	activ	0.0033 ± 0.0017	0.0059 ± 0.0008	multitask	0.0017 ± 0.0012	0.0041 ± 0.001	trace	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0016 ± 0.0006	multicor	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0069 ± 0.0069	studi	0.0014 ± 0.0004	0.0043 ± 0.0004
27	maxim	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0026 ± 0.0006	event	0.0017 ± 0.001	0.0041 ± 0.0009	new	0.0021 ± 0.0007	0.0037 ± 0.0007	viewpoint	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0067 ± 0.0067	evalu	0.0032 ± 0.0006	0.006 ± 0.0005
28	feedback	0.0008 ± 0.0008	0.0034 ± 0.0007	construct	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0023 ± 0.0007	distanc	0.0007 ± 0.0004	0.0023 ± 0.0006	tree	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0067 ± 0.0048	framework	0.0026 ± 0.0006	0.0053 ± 0.0005
29	convex	0.0034 ± 0.002	0.006 ± 0.0009	mixtur	0.0023 ± 0.0014	0.0045 ± 0.0011	action	0.0008 ± 0.0005	0.0023 ± 0.0006	financ	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0066 ± 0.0066	review	0.0005 ± 0.0003	0.0032 ± 0.0004
30	interact	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0025 ± 0.0005	variat	0.0033 ± 0.0015	0.0054 ± 0.0011	repr	0.0077 ± 0.0012	0.0093 ± 0.001	nonneg	0.0033 ± 0.0033	0.0099 ± 0.0058	autom	0.0003 ± 0.0002	0.0029 ± 0.0004
31	empir	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0024 ± 0.0006	plan	0.0019 ± 0.0011	0.004 ± 0.0009	autoencod	0.0035 ± 0.001	0.005 ± 0.0008	lstm	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0066 ± 0.0047	set	0.0022 ± 0.0005	0.0048 ± 0.0004
32	guarant	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0023 ± 0.0006	error	0.0007 ± 0.0007	0.0028 ± 0.0008	effect	0.0008 ± 0.0004	0.0024 ± 0.0005	opposit	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0065 ± 0.0065	artifici	0.0004 ± 0.0002	0.003 ± 0.0004
33	bandit	0.0057 ± 0.0023	0.008 ± 0.001	categor	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0021 ± 0.0007	convolut	0.0109 ± 0.0015	0.0124 ± 0.0012	minim	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0064 ± 0.0045	perform	0.0009 ± 0.0003	0.0033 ± 0.0004
34	algorithm	0.0132 ± 0.0029	0.0155 ± 0.0011	hybrid	0.0006 ± 0.0006	0.0027 ± 0.0008	solut	0.0004 ± 0.0003	0.0019 ± 0.0005	clinic	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0063 ± 0.0046	uncertainti	0.0007 ± 0.0003	0.0031 ± 0.0004
35	constrain	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0023 ± 0.0005	threshold	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0021 ± 0.0007	transform	0.0014 ± 0.0006	0.0029 ± 0.0007	provabl	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0063 ± 0.0044	event	0.0016 ± 0.0005	0.0039 ± 0.0004
36	emb	0.0046 ± 0.0019	0.0069 ± 0.0008	discret	0.0012 ± 0.0009	0.0033 ± 0.0009	hash	0.0016 ± 0.0007	0.0031 ± 0.0007	exploit	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0062 ± 0.0044	agent	0.0009 ± 0.0004	0.0032 ± 0.0004
37	base	0.007 ± 0.0022	0.0093 ± 0.0009	regress	0.0043 ± 0.0016	0.0063 ± 0.0012	residu	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0015 ± 0.0005	power	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0062 ± 0.0044	recommend	0.0011 ± 0.0004	0.0033 ± 0.0004
38	noisi	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0022 ± 0.0006	answer	0.0017 ± 0.001	0.0038 ± 0.0009	prefer	0.0002 ± 0.0002	0.0016 ± 0.0005	stream	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0062 ± 0.0044	extract	0.0034 ± 0.0006	0.0056 ± 0.0005
39	privaci	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0022 ± 0.0006	addit	0.0 ± 0.0	0.002 ± 0.0008	predict	0.0116 ± 0.0014	0.013 ± 0.0011	mixtur	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0062 ± 0.0062	theori	0.0023 ± 0.0006	0.0045 ± 0.0005
40	commun	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0022 ± 0.0005	sourc	0.0 ± 0.0	0.002 ± 0.0007	approxim	0.0053 ± 0.0011	0.0067 ± 0.0009	prognosi	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0062 ± 0.0043	sentiment	0.0021 ± 0.0005	0.0042 ± 0.0004
41	multiclass	0.0012 ± 0.0012	0.0034 ± 0.0007	compar	0.0006 ± 0.0006	0.0026 ± 0.0008	pixel	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0014 ± 0.0006	kmean	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0061 ± 0.0043	social	0.002 ± 0.0005	0.004 ± 0.0004
42	infer	0.0046 ± 0.0019	0.0068 ± 0.0008	cluster	0.0123 ± 0.0028	0.0142 ± 0.0017	dialogu	0.0009 ± 0.0005	0.0022 ± 0.0006	task	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0061 ± 0.0044	tool	0.0003 ± 0.0002	0.0024 ± 0.0003
43	video	0.0009 ± 0.0009	0.003 ± 0.0006	domain	0.0017 ± 0.001	0.0036 ± 0.0009	ordin	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0014 ± 0.0005	neg	0.0 ± 0.0	0.006 ± 0.0043	cognit	0.0004 ± 0.0002	0.0025 ± 0.0004
44	sen	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0021 ± 0.0005	interpret	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0019 ± 0.0007	seri	0.002 ± 0.0006	0.0034 ± 0.0007	nonconvex	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0059 ± 0.0042	engin	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0021 ± 0.0003
45	markov	0.001 ± 0.001	0.003 ± 0.0006	transfer	0.0023 ± 0.0014	0.0043 ± 0.001	belief	0.0013 ± 0.0005	0.0026 ± 0.0006	memori	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0059 ± 0.0059	program	0.0053 ± 0.0008	0.0073 ± 0.0006
46	belief	0.0007 ± 0.0007	0.0028 ± 0.0006	context	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0019 ± 0.0006	express	0.0005 ± 0.0003	0.0018 ± 0.0005	guarant	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0059 ± 0.0042	concept	0.0003 ± 0.0002	0.0024 ± 0.0003
47	subspac	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0021 ± 0.0005	sequenc	0.0031 ± 0.0016	0.005 ± 0.0012	use	0.0164 ± 0.0014	0.0177 ± 0.0011	discoveri	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0059 ± 0.0041	search	0.0036 ± 0.0007	0.0057 ± 0.0005
48	output	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0021 ± 0.0006	label	0.002 ± 0.0011	0.0039 ± 0.0009	search	0.0036 ± 0.0008	0.0049 ± 0.0008	higherord	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0058 ± 0.0058	semant	0.0068 ± 0.0009	0.0089 ± 0.0006
49	spectral	0.0017 ± 0.0012	0.0037 ± 0.0007	semidefinit	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0019 ± 0.0007	pool	0.0003 ± 0.0003	0.0016 ± 0.0005	investig	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0058 ± 0.0041	databa	1e-04 ± 1e-04	0.0021 ± 0.0003

Table 12: Most important predictors for rejection in decreasing order of importance: title

	AI Stem	AI Score accepted	AI Score rejected	CL Stem	CL Score accepted	CL Score rejected	LG Stem	LG Score accepted	LG Score rejected	ICLR Stem	ICLR Score accepted	ICLR Score rejected	All Stem	All Score accepted	All Score rejected
0	adapt	0.0054 ± 0.0012	0.009 ± 0.0006	code	0.0017 ± 0.0006	0.0059 ± 0.0008	network	0.0263 ± 0.0013	0.0333 ± 0.0011	languag	0.007 ± 0.0022	0.0354 ± 0.0049	logic	0.0022 ± 0.0004	0.0091 ± 0.0005
1	robust	0.003 ± 0.0009	0.0065 ± 0.0005	pattern	0.0024 ± 0.0008	0.0061 ± 0.0008	classif	0.0137 ± 0.0009	0.0176 ± 0.0008	word	0.0105 ± 0.0036	0.0335 ± 0.0061	user	0.0046 ± 0.0006	0.0102 ± 0.0004
2	strategi	0.0031 ± 0.0009	0.0061 ± 0.0005	recognit	0.004 ± 0.001	0.0074 ± 0.0007	learn	0.0434 ± 0.0014	0.0471 ± 0.0011	relat	0.002 ± 0.0008	0.0155 ± 0.0035	detect	0.0041 ± 0.0004	0.0094 ± 0.0004
3	topic	0.0023 ± 0.0008	0.0053 ± 0.0006	structur	0.0122 ± 0.0018	0.0155 ± 0.001	accuraci	0.0089 ± 0.0006	0.0115 ± 0.0005	semant	0.0077 ± 0.003	0.0199 ± 0.004	speech	0.0022 ± 0.0004	0.0074 ± 0.0004
4	local	0.0048 ± 0.0012	0.0078 ± 0.0005	base	0.0142 ± 0.001	0.0174 ± 0.0007	train	0.0209 ± 0.001	0.0235 ± 0.0009	linguist	0.0003 ± 0.0003	0.012 ± 0.0028	concept	0.002 ± 0.0003	0.0069 ± 0.0004
5	approach	0.0175 ± 0.0015	0.0204 ± 0.0006	represent	0.0111 ± 0.0014	0.0142 ± 0.001	neural	0.0176 ± 0.001	0.0202 ± 0.0008	speech	0.0022 ± 0.001	0.0126 ± 0.0035	research	0.0039 ± 0.0003	0.0087 ± 0.0003
6	score	0.001 ± 0.0005	0.0039 ± 0.0004	stateoftheart	0.0058 ± 0.0007	0.0085 ± 0.0005	approxim	0.0106 ± 0.0008	0.013 ± 0.0008	annot	0.0008 ± 0.0006	0.0108 ± 0.0034	ontolog	0.0005 ± 0.0002	0.0053 ± 0.0004
7	defin	0.0024 ± 0.0006	0.005 ± 0.0004	semant	0.0054 ± 0.0011	0.008 ± 0.0008	rule	0.0033 ± 0.0006	0.0054 ± 0.0006	emot	0.0006 ± 0.0006	0.0103 ± 0.0045	paper	0.0129 ± 0.0003	0.0175 ± 0.0002
8	sgd	0.0006 ± 0.0004	0.0033 ± 0.0006	sampl	0.0128 ± 0.0016	0.0154 ± 0.0011	complex	0.0093 ± 0.0006	0.0114 ± 0.0006	model	0.036 ± 0.0042	0.0449 ± 0.0038	belief	0.0016 ± 0.0003	0.006 ± 0.0004
9	environ	0.0016 ± 0.0006	0.0042 ± 0.0004	continu	0.0023 ± 0.0005	0.005 ± 0.0006	attack	0.0011 ± 0.0003	0.0032 ± 0.0006	answer	0.0014 ± 0.0008	0.0097 ± 0.0036	plan	0.003 ± 0.0005	0.0074 ± 0.0005
10	agent	0.0029 ± 0.0013	0.0054 ± 0.0006	agent	0.0045 ± 0.0012	0.0071 ± 0.0009	addit	0.0054 ± 0.0005	0.0074 ± 0.0004	translat	0.0056 ± 0.0031	0.0134 ± 0.0037	fuzzi	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0043 ± 0.0004
11	reinforc	0.0027 ± 0.0009	0.0052 ± 0.0005	languag	0.0081 ± 0.0013	0.0107 ± 0.0009	cnn	0.0051 ± 0.0008	0.007 ± 0.0008	text	0.0086 ± 0.004	0.0164 ± 0.0031	robot	0.0018 ± 0.0003	0.0061 ± 0.0004
12	test	0.0059 ± 0.0011	0.0083 ± 0.0005	activ	0.0031 ± 0.0007	0.0057 ± 0.0007	local	0.0069 ± 0.0007	0.0087 ± 0.0006	question	0.0035 ± 0.0013	0.0108 ± 0.0034	intellig	0.0015 ± 0.0002	0.0055 ± 0.0003
13	set	0.0171 ± 0.0016	0.0196 ± 0.0006	latent	0.0047 ± 0.0011	0.0072 ± 0.0008	fuzzi	0.0008 ± 0.0003	0.0026 ± 0.0005	corpu	0.0002 ± 0.0002	0.0074 ± 0.0018	decis	0.0043 ± 0.0004	0.0083 ± 0.0004
14	plan	0.0011 ± 0.0007	0.0035 ± 0.0006	class	0.0094 ± 0.0013	0.0119 ± 0.001	layer	0.0089 ± 0.0009	0.0106 ± 0.0008	process	0.0087 ± 0.0017	0.0158 ± 0.0021	reason	0.004 ± 0.0004	0.0079 ± 0.0004
15	student	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0024 ± 0.0005	autoencod	0.0008 ± 0.0004	0.0032 ± 0.0006	regress	0.0059 ± 0.0008	0.0076 ± 0.0007	discours	0.0008 ± 0.0008	0.0077 ± 0.003	inform	0.0113 ± 0.0006	0.0152 ± 0.0004
16	embed	0.005 ± 0.0015	0.0073 ± 0.0007	topic	0.0038 ± 0.0011	0.0062 ± 0.0009	thi	0.0303 ± 0.0006	0.0321 ± 0.0005	web	0.0012 ± 0.0009	0.008 ± 0.0029	recognit	0.004 ± 0.0004	0.0078 ± 0.0003
17	region	0.0012 ± 0.0007	0.0035 ± 0.0004	current	0.003 ± 0.0006	0.0054 ± 0.0005	privaci	0.0016 ± 0.0005	0.0033 ± 0.0006	causal	0.0012 ± 0.0012	0.0079 ± 0.0044	discuss	0.0024 ± 0.0003	0.0061 ± 0.0003
18	context	0.0034 ± 0.0009	0.0057 ± 0.0004	dropout	0.0004 ± 0.0003	0.0028 ± 0.0008	power	0.0045 ± 0.0004	0.0061 ± 0.0004	import	0.0038 ± 0.0012	0.0105 ± 0.0018	describ	0.0042 ± 0.0003	0.0079 ± 0.0003
19	error	0.0074 ± 0.0013	0.0097 ± 0.0006	annot	0.0022 ± 0.0006	0.0046 ± 0.0007	gpu	0.0015 ± 0.0004	0.0032 ± 0.0005	english	0.0006 ± 0.0006	0.007 ± 0.002	web	0.0012 ± 0.0003	0.0049 ± 0.0003
20	dimens	0.0029 ± 0.0009	0.0051 ± 0.0005	causal	0.0018 ± 0.0009	0.0042 ± 0.001	input	0.0076 ± 0.0006	0.0092 ± 0.0006	separ	0.0021 ± 0.0013	0.0085 ± 0.0027	process	0.0091 ± 0.0005	0.0127 ± 0.0003
21	arm	0.0007 ± 0.0005	0.0029 ± 0.0005	encod	0.0028 ± 0.0007	0.0052 ± 0.0006	initi	0.0028 ± 0.0004	0.0044 ± 0.0004	sentenc	0.0047 ± 0.002	0.0111 ± 0.0025	use	0.0258 ± 0.0005	0.0292 ± 0.0003
22	learner	0.0018 ± 0.0009	0.0039 ± 0.0005	process	0.0101 ± 0.001	0.0124 ± 0.0007	theori	0.0034 ± 0.0004	0.005 ± 0.0004	task	0.0192 ± 0.0037	0.0255 ± 0.0027	knowledg	0.0082 ± 0.0006	0.0115 ± 0.0004
23	domain	0.0072 ± 0.0016	0.0093 ± 0.0007	bayesian	0.0059 ± 0.0011	0.0082 ± 0.0008	recurr	0.0056 ± 0.0006	0.0072 ± 0.0006	dictionari	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0063 ± 0.0034	softwar	0.0004 ± 1e-04	0.0037 ± 0.0003
24	word	0.0083 ± 0.002	0.0105 ± 0.0008	search	0.0055 ± 0.0011	0.0077 ± 0.0008	activ	0.0058 ± 0.0007	0.0074 ± 0.0006	address	0.0026 ± 0.0009	0.0088 ± 0.0016	rule	0.004 ± 0.0005	0.0072 ± 0.0004
25	achiev	0.0094 ± 0.0011	0.0114 ± 0.0004	label	0.0097 ± 0.0015	0.0119 ± 0.0012	dataset	0.0141 ± 0.0007	0.0156 ± 0.0007	extract	0.005 ± 0.0016	0.0112 ± 0.0024	techniqu	0.0082 ± 0.0005	0.0114 ± 0.0003
26	abil	0.0023 ± 0.0006	0.0044 ± 0.0003	text	0.0058 ± 0.0012	0.008 ± 0.0008	reduc	0.0057 ± 0.0005	0.0072 ± 0.0004	inform	0.0113 ± 0.002	0.0174 ± 0.0023	search	0.0057 ± 0.0006	0.0088 ± 0.0004
27	pca	0.0007 ± 0.0005	0.0027 ± 0.0004	speech	0.0018 ± 0.0006	0.004 ± 0.0007	binari	0.0037 ± 0.0006	0.0052 ± 0.0005	polit	0.0006 ± 0.0006	0.0065 ± 0.004	theori	0.0035 ± 0.0003	0.0065 ± 0.0003
28	problem	0.0249 ± 0.002	0.0269 ± 0.0007	memori	0.0031 ± 0.0008	0.0052 ± 0.0007	architectur	0.0083 ± 0.0008	0.0098 ± 0.0006	effect	0.0067 ± 0.0014	0.0126 ± 0.0018	classifi	0.006 ± 0.0005	0.009 ± 0.0004
29	rnn	0.0026 ± 0.0013	0.0046 ± 0.0006	regress	0.0056 ± 0.0013	0.0078 ± 0.0009	loss	0.0084 ± 0.001	0.0098 ± 0.0008	patient	0.0007 ± 0.0007	0.0065 ± 0.0034	semant	0.0095 ± 0.0007	0.0125 ± 0.0005
30	behavior	0.0023 ± 0.0009	0.0043 ± 0.0004	local	0.0062 ± 0.0011	0.0084 ± 0.0007	dimension	0.0043 ± 0.0006	0.0057 ± 0.0005	phrase	0.0014 ± 0.001	0.0072 ± 0.0026	review	0.0013 ± 0.0003	0.0041 ± 0.0003
31	covari	0.0005 ± 0.0003	0.0025 ± 0.0004	variat	0.0033 ± 0.0008	0.0054 ± 0.0007	convnet	0.0006 ± 0.0003	0.0019 ± 0.0005	use	0.0291 ± 0.0023	0.0347 ± 0.0024	event	0.0031 ± 0.0006	0.006 ± 0.0004
32	allow	0.0059 ± 0.0011	0.0078 ± 0.0004	knowledg	0.0066 ± 0.0011	0.0086 ± 0.0008	make	0.0067 ± 0.0004	0.0081 ± 0.0004	identifi	0.0045 ± 0.0016	0.0101 ± 0.0024	tool	0.0027 ± 0.0003	0.0053 ± 0.0003
33	program	0.0037 ± 0.001	0.0057 ± 0.0006	gene	0.0002 ± 0.0002	0.0023 ± 0.0007	adversari	0.0034 ± 0.0007	0.0048 ± 0.0006	similar	0.0093 ± 0.0027	0.0148 ± 0.0036	extract	0.0058 ± 0.0005	0.0084 ± 0.0003
34	deriv	0.0051 ± 0.001	0.007 ± 0.0004	possibl	0.0047 ± 0.0007	0.0067 ± 0.0006	manifold	0.0019 ± 0.0004	0.0033 ± 0.0005	audio	0.0024 ± 0.0017	0.0078 ± 0.0032	databas	0.0015 ± 0.0003	0.0041 ± 0.0003
35	framework	0.0093 ± 0.0012	0.0111 ± 0.0005	method	0.0282 ± 0.0018	0.0302 ± 0.0011	convolut	0.0091 ± 0.0009	0.0105 ± 0.0007	human	0.0051 ± 0.0018	0.0105 ± 0.0025	articl	0.0014 ± 0.0003	0.0039 ± 0.0002
36	transfer	0.0022 ± 0.0011	0.0041 ± 0.0006	pars	0.0007 ± 0.0003	0.0027 ± 0.0007	lstm	0.0028 ± 0.0005	0.0041 ± 0.0006	lexicon	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0054 ± 0.0025	pattern	0.003 ± 0.0004	0.0056 ± 0.0003
37	dropout	0.0011 ± 0.0007	0.0029 ± 0.0006	gpu	0.0004 ± 0.0002	0.0024 ± 0.0005	appli	0.0088 ± 0.0005	0.0101 ± 0.0005	charact	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0053 ± 0.002	program	0.0064 ± 0.0007	0.009 ± 0.0005
38	particular	0.0037 ± 0.0008	0.0055 ± 0.0003	dialogu	0.0 ± 0.0	0.002 ± 0.0006	predict	0.0155 ± 0.0011	0.0169 ± 0.0008	tag	0.0005 ± 0.0005	0.0057 ± 0.0026	social	0.0025 ± 0.0003	0.0048 ± 0.0003
39	simpl	0.007 ± 0.0012	0.0088 ± 0.0004	risk	0.0019 ± 0.0007	0.0038 ± 0.0006	deep	0.0161 ± 0.0011	0.0174 ± 0.0008	summar	0.0017 ± 0.0009	0.0067 ± 0.0035	base	0.0144 ± 0.0005	0.0167 ± 0.0003
40	path	0.0011 ± 0.0006	0.0029 ± 0.0005	decod	0.0003 ± 0.0003	0.0022 ± 0.0005	recommend	0.004 ± 0.0008	0.0053 ± 0.0007	align	0.0017 ± 0.0009	0.0066 ± 0.0031	autom	0.001 ± 0.0002	0.0034 ± 0.0002
41	difficult	0.0019 ± 0.0006	0.0037 ± 0.0003	converg	0.0067 ± 0.0012	0.0086 ± 0.0008	cifar	0.0017 ± 0.0004	0.003 ± 0.0004	plan	0.0016 ± 0.001	0.0065 ± 0.003	manag	0.0004 ± 1e-04	0.0028 ± 0.0002
42	cnn	0.0042 ± 0.0014	0.006 ± 0.0007	dataset	0.012 ± 0.0012	0.0139 ± 0.0009	allow	0.0069 ± 0.0005	0.0082 ± 0.0004	sourc	0.0035 ± 0.0012	0.0083 ± 0.002	text	0.0084 ± 0.0006	0.0108 ± 0.0004
43	detect	0.0063 ± 0.0016	0.0081 ± 0.0006	perform	0.0168 ± 0.0012	0.0187 ± 0.0007	theoret	0.0077 ± 0.0006	0.009 ± 0.0005	summari	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0048 ± 0.0026	technolog	0.0005 ± 1e-04	0.0028 ± 0.0002
44	batch	0.0011 ± 0.0006	0.0028 ± 0.0004	lstm	0.001 ± 0.0005	0.0028 ± 0.0006	depth	0.0013 ± 0.0004	0.0025 ± 0.0004	account	0.0015 ± 0.0008	0.0062 ± 0.0024	arab	1e-04 ± 1e-04	0.0024 ± 0.0003
45	superior	0.0014 ± 0.0006	0.0032 ± 0.0003	news	0.0003 ± 0.0002	0.0021 ± 0.0005	nonlinear	0.0037 ± 0.0005	0.005 ± 0.0005	experi	0.0094 ± 0.0016	0.0142 ± 0.0017	automat	0.0045 ± 0.0004	0.0068 ± 0.0002
46	outlier	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0017 ± 0.0004	rule	0.0048 ± 0.0014	0.0067 ± 0.0009	polici	0.0063 ± 0.0008	0.0075 ± 0.0008	embed	0.0069 ± 0.0025	0.0115 ± 0.0035	present	0.0126 ± 0.0005	0.0149 ± 0.0003
47	encourag	0.0005 ± 0.0003	0.0022 ± 0.0003	sentenc	0.0033 ± 0.001	0.0051 ± 0.0007	problem	0.0255 ± 0.001	0.0267 ± 0.0008	automat	0.0025 ± 0.0009	0.0071 ± 0.0016	engin	0.002 ± 0.0003	0.0042 ± 0.0003
48	solver	0.0012 ± 0.0005	0.0029 ± 0.0004	reward	0.0029 ± 0.0009	0.0047 ± 0.0007	review	0.0021 ± 0.0005	0.0033 ± 0.0006	natur	0.0079 ± 0.0015	0.0124 ± 0.0018	aim	0.0023 ± 0.0002	0.0045 ± 0.0002
49	variat	0.0039 ± 0.0012	0.0056 ± 0.0005	scheme	0.0042 ± 0.0009	0.006 ± 0.0006	outcom	0.001 ± 0.0003	0.0022 ± 0.0003	role	0.0002 ± 0.0002	0.0048 ± 0.0013	measur	0.0064 ± 0.0005	0.0086 ± 0.0004

Table 13: Most important predictors for rejection in decreasing order of importance: abstract

	AI Stem	AI Score accepted	AI Score rejected	CL Stem	CL Score accepted	CL Score rejected	LG Stem	LG Score accepted	LG Score rejected	ICLR Stem	ICLR Score accepted	ICLR Score rejected	All Stem	All Score accepted	All Score rejected
0	polici	0.0052 ± 0.0015	0.0094 ± 0.0009	user	0.0087 ± 0.0016	0.0136 ± 0.0012	learn	0.0498 ± 0.0013	0.0529 ± 0.0012	languag	0.0121 ± 0.0029	0.0349 ± 0.0045	section	0.0179 ± 0.0006	0.0271 ± 0.0004
1	detect	0.0056 ± 0.001	0.0096 ± 0.0007	bandit	0.004 ± 0.0011	0.008 ± 0.001	algorithm	0.0387 ± 0.0013	0.0417 ± 0.0012	word	0.0146 ± 0.0046	0.0368 ± 0.006	logic	0.0031 ± 0.0004	0.0105 ± 0.0005
2	graph	0.0093 ± 0.0022	0.0129 ± 0.001	embed	0.0056 ± 0.0011	0.0094 ± 0.001	architectur	0.0087 ± 0.0006	0.0116 ± 0.0007	plan	0.0015 ± 0.0007	0.0139 ± 0.0041	ontolog	0.0005 ± 1e-04	0.0066 ± 0.0005
3	spars	0.0066 ± 0.0014	0.0102 ± 0.0008	word	0.0137 ± 0.002	0.0174 ± 0.0014	approxim	0.013 ± 0.0008	0.0158 ± 0.0008	logic	0.0006 ± 0.0004	0.0129 ± 0.0036	concept	0.0031 ± 0.0003	0.0091 ± 0.0004
4	state	0.0082 ± 0.0011	0.0112 ± 0.0006	log	0.0029 ± 0.0006	0.0063 ± 0.0007	network	0.0319 ± 0.0015	0.0347 ± 0.0013	relat	0.0082 ± 0.001	0.0202 ± 0.003	user	0.009 ± 0.0007	0.0144 ± 0.0006
5	matrix	0.0135 ± 0.002	0.0164 ± 0.001	regret	0.0091 ± 0.0019	0.0124 ± 0.0013	sampl	0.0188 ± 0.0011	0.0215 ± 0.001	semant	0.0093 ± 0.0026	0.0208 ± 0.0034	describ	0.0057 ± 0.0002	0.0104 ± 0.0002
6	cost	0.0065 ± 0.0015	0.0095 ± 0.0007	document	0.0073 ± 0.0013	0.0106 ± 0.0012	random	0.0092 ± 0.0006	0.0118 ± 0.0006	event	0.0028 ± 0.001	0.0135 ± 0.0042	detect	0.0051 ± 0.0004	0.0099 ± 0.0004
7	model	0.0433 ± 0.0027	0.0459 ± 0.0011	mixtur	0.0034 ± 0.0008	0.0064 ± 0.0009	comput	0.0187 ± 0.0006	0.0212 ± 0.0006	translat	0.005 ± 0.0014	0.0156 ± 0.0034	research	0.0068 ± 0.0003	0.0116 ± 0.0002
8	recommend	0.0031 ± 0.0008	0.0058 ± 0.0007	translat	0.0044 ± 0.001	0.0073 ± 0.0009	action	0.0087 ± 0.0008	0.0111 ± 0.0009	web	0.0011 ± 0.0005	0.0114 ± 0.0038	inform	0.0136 ± 0.0004	0.0183 ± 0.0003
9	event	0.0032 ± 0.001	0.0057 ± 0.0008	arm	0.0036 ± 0.0016	0.0062 ± 0.0012	train	0.0268 ± 0.001	0.0291 ± 0.001	user	0.009 ± 0.0019	0.019 ± 0.0037	knowledg	0.0093 ± 0.0005	0.0138 ± 0.0004
10	featur	0.0245 ± 0.0029	0.027 ± 0.0012	search	0.0072 ± 0.0011	0.0099 ± 0.0008	classifi	0.0126 ± 0.0009	0.0147 ± 0.0009	annot	0.0031 ± 0.001	0.0119 ± 0.0031	fuzzi	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0043 ± 0.0005
11	decis	0.0056 ± 0.0012	0.0079 ± 0.0006	reward	0.0073 ± 0.0016	0.0099 ± 0.0011	data	0.0341 ± 0.0011	0.0362 ± 0.001	represent	0.0111 ± 0.0023	0.0199 ± 0.0025	semant	0.0111 ± 0.0006	0.0152 ± 0.0005
12	entiti	0.0033 ± 0.0011	0.0056 ± 0.0007	text	0.007 ± 0.0011	0.0095 ± 0.0009	convolut	0.0086 ± 0.0007	0.0105 ± 0.0008	inform	0.0139 ± 0.0017	0.022 ± 0.0023	web	0.0017 ± 0.0002	0.0057 ± 0.0004
13	reinforc	0.0029 ± 0.0006	0.0052 ± 0.0005	structur	0.0132 ± 0.0011	0.0158 ± 0.0009	search	0.0075 ± 0.0007	0.0094 ± 0.0006	ontolog	0.0006 ± 0.0005	0.0086 ± 0.003	speech	0.0048 ± 0.0004	0.0088 ± 0.0005
14	anomali	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0022 ± 0.0005	arab	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0024 ± 0.0008	layer	0.0141 ± 0.0011	0.0158 ± 0.001	question	0.0077 ± 0.0018	0.0156 ± 0.0037	plan	0.004 ± 0.0006	0.008 ± 0.0005
15	design	0.006 ± 0.0007	0.0082 ± 0.0004	memori	0.0042 ± 0.0007	0.0065 ± 0.0008	stream	0.002 ± 0.0003	0.0037 ± 0.0005	phrase	0.0021 ± 0.0012	0.01 ± 0.0032	event	0.0046 ± 0.0006	0.0083 ± 0.0005
16	action	0.0079 ± 0.0016	0.0101 ± 0.0009	depend	0.0089 ± 0.0007	0.0112 ± 0.0007	polici	0.0083 ± 0.001	0.01 ± 0.0009	knowledg	0.0087 ± 0.002	0.016 ± 0.0024	extract	0.0065 ± 0.0004	0.0101 ± 0.0004
17	patient	0.0014 ± 0.0006	0.0036 ± 0.0006	column	0.0022 ± 0.0006	0.0045 ± 0.0007	rate	0.0099 ± 0.0008	0.0116 ± 0.0008	formula	0.0004 ± 0.0002	0.0076 ± 0.0022	rule	0.0056 ± 0.0006	0.0092 ± 0.0004
18	base	0.0127 ± 0.0008	0.0147 ± 0.0004	compon	0.0047 ± 0.0005	0.0071 ± 0.0006	regress	0.0073 ± 0.0006	0.009 ± 0.0007	answer	0.0058 ± 0.0025	0.0128 ± 0.0035	agent	0.0105 ± 0.0008	0.0139 ± 0.0007
19	reward	0.0067 ± 0.0018	0.0087 ± 0.0008	lexic	0.0005 ± 0.0002	0.0028 ± 0.0006	target	0.0079 ± 0.0007	0.0096 ± 0.0006	verb	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0068 ± 0.003	program	0.008 ± 0.0008	0.0114 ± 0.0005
20	algorithm	0.0404 ± 0.003	0.0424 ± 0.0011	annot	0.0036 ± 0.0009	0.0058 ± 0.0007	point	0.0109 ± 0.0007	0.0125 ± 0.0006	transit	0.0011 ± 0.0004	0.0079 ± 0.0025	present	0.0094 ± 0.0003	0.0127 ± 0.0002
21	node	0.0067 ± 0.0017	0.0087 ± 0.0007	rbm	0.0023 ± 0.0009	0.0044 ± 0.001	matrix	0.0151 ± 0.0011	0.0167 ± 0.001	discours	0.0016 ± 0.0011	0.0084 ± 0.0039	social	0.0033 ± 0.0003	0.0067 ± 0.0004
22	categori	0.0033 ± 0.0006	0.0052 ± 0.0005	languag	0.0111 ± 0.0015	0.0132 ± 0.001	person	0.0026 ± 0.0003	0.0041 ± 0.0004	reason	0.0028 ± 0.0005	0.0093 ± 0.0016	reason	0.0061 ± 0.0003	0.0095 ± 0.0003
23	dual	0.0018 ± 0.0007	0.0038 ± 0.0005	gaussian	0.0055 ± 0.0009	0.0076 ± 0.0008	denot	0.0048 ± 0.0004	0.0064 ± 0.0004	claus	0.0005 ± 0.0003	0.007 ± 0.0029	softwar	0.0008 ± 1e-04	0.0042 ± 0.0003
24	gaussian	0.0051 ± 0.0011	0.0071 ± 0.0006	constraint	0.0073 ± 0.001	0.0094 ± 0.0008	stochast	0.0095 ± 0.0007	0.0111 ± 0.0007	emot	0.0016 ± 0.001	0.0081 ± 0.0037	intellig	0.0032 ± 0.0002	0.0065 ± 0.0003
25	causal	0.0011 ± 0.0007	0.003 ± 0.0007	solut	0.0088 ± 0.0008	0.0108 ± 0.0007	svm	0.0057 ± 0.0007	0.0072 ± 0.0008	solver	0.0013 ± 0.0007	0.0076 ± 0.0032	discuss	0.0051 ± 0.0002	0.0083 ± 0.0002
26	similar	0.0096 ± 0.0012	0.0116 ± 0.0006	entiti	0.0038 ± 0.001	0.0059 ± 0.0009	class	0.0129 ± 0.0008	0.0144 ± 0.0007	corpu	0.0014 ± 0.0007	0.0075 ± 0.0014	process	0.0113 ± 0.0004	0.0145 ± 0.0003
27	game	0.0048 ± 0.0016	0.0068 ± 0.0008	local	0.0081 ± 0.0009	0.0101 ± 0.0008	cnn	0.0086 ± 0.001	0.0101 ± 0.001	dynam	0.0019 ± 0.0006	0.0079 ± 0.0016	recognit	0.0061 ± 0.0003	0.0092 ± 0.0003
28	risk	0.0024 ± 0.0005	0.0044 ± 0.0005	case	0.0116 ± 0.0007	0.0135 ± 0.0005	sketch	0.0005 ± 1e-04	0.002 ± 0.0005	syntact	0.0008 ± 0.0005	0.0068 ± 0.0018	human	0.0083 ± 0.0005	0.0114 ± 0.0004
29	point	0.0103 ± 0.0013	0.0122 ± 0.0006	onlin	0.0085 ± 0.0014	0.0104 ± 0.0009	sgd	0.0038 ± 0.0007	0.0053 ± 0.0007	text	0.012 ± 0.0034	0.0179 ± 0.0034	servic	0.0011 ± 0.0002	0.0042 ± 0.0003
30	dynam	0.0047 ± 0.0007	0.0066 ± 0.0005	hyperparamet	0.0018 ± 0.0004	0.0037 ± 0.0008	weight	0.0108 ± 0.0008	0.0123 ± 0.0007	align	0.0013 ± 0.0006	0.0071 ± 0.0028	databas	0.0019 ± 0.0002	0.0049 ± 0.0003
31	item	0.0051 ± 0.0018	0.007 ± 0.0009	attribut	0.0033 ± 0.0009	0.0052 ± 0.0008	nois	0.0066 ± 0.0006	0.008 ± 0.0007	describ	0.0067 ± 0.0008	0.0124 ± 0.0013	technolog	0.0012 ± 1e-04	0.0042 ± 0.0002
32	norm	0.0056 ± 0.0012	0.0075 ± 0.0008	pca	0.0024 ± 0.0007	0.0043 ± 0.0008	game	0.0058 ± 0.0009	0.0072 ± 0.0008	mean	0.0056 ± 0.0011	0.0112 ± 0.0018	search	0.0077 ± 0.0005	0.0107 ± 0.0004
33	practic	0.0061 ± 0.0006	0.008 ± 0.0003	matrix	0.0147 ± 0.0018	0.0166 ± 0.0013	theorem	0.0042 ± 0.0004	0.0056 ± 0.0005	tree	0.0052 ± 0.0019	0.0108 ± 0.0032	text	0.0116 ± 0.0007	0.0145 ± 0.0005
34	manifold	0.0026 ± 0.0009	0.0044 ± 0.0007	project	0.0047 ± 0.0008	0.0065 ± 0.0006	multiclass	0.0025 ± 0.0005	0.0039 ± 0.0005	tag	0.0017 ± 0.0011	0.0072 ± 0.0025	organ	0.0028 ± 0.0002	0.0057 ± 1e-04
35	recoveri	0.0009 ± 0.0004	0.0027 ± 0.0004	summar	0.0026 ± 0.0004	0.0045 ± 0.0006	adversari	0.0053 ± 0.0009	0.0066 ± 0.0008	pars	0.0017 ± 0.0009	0.0071 ± 0.0021	formula	0.0012 ± 0.0002	0.0041 ± 0.0003
36	attack	0.0014 ± 0.0007	0.0032 ± 0.0006	tag	0.002 ± 0.0006	0.0038 ± 0.0007	low	0.0044 ± 0.0003	0.0057 ± 0.0004	retriev	0.0011 ± 0.0006	0.0064 ± 0.0019	decis	0.0059 ± 0.0004	0.0088 ± 0.0004
37	onlin	0.0087 ± 0.0017	0.0105 ± 0.0008	rule	0.0059 ± 0.0009	0.0077 ± 0.0009	perturb	0.0022 ± 0.0004	0.0035 ± 0.0005	articl	0.0023 ± 0.0008	0.0074 ± 0.0019	theori	0.0043 ± 0.0002	0.0072 ± 0.0003
38	data	0.0331 ± 0.0025	0.0349 ± 0.0009	score	0.0036 ± 0.0007	0.0053 ± 0.0006	neural	0.0185 ± 0.0009	0.0198 ± 0.0008	lexic	0.0014 ± 0.0009	0.0065 ± 0.0021	pattern	0.0042 ± 0.0004	0.007 ± 0.0003
39	thi	0.0423 ± 0.0012	0.0441 ± 0.0005	kmean	0.0027 ± 0.001	0.0045 ± 0.0009	column	0.0027 ± 0.0004	0.004 ± 0.0005	intellig	0.0017 ± 0.0006	0.0068 ± 0.0013	robot	0.0034 ± 0.0004	0.0062 ± 0.0004
40	hypothesi	0.0024 ± 0.0006	0.0042 ± 0.0004	track	0.0016 ± 0.0004	0.0033 ± 0.0006	gradient	0.0127 ± 0.001	0.014 ± 0.0008	state	0.0097 ± 0.0016	0.0148 ± 0.0032	person	0.0023 ± 0.0002	0.0052 ± 0.0003
41	famili	0.0025 ± 0.0006	0.0042 ± 0.0003	extract	0.0063 ± 0.001	0.008 ± 0.0006	attack	0.0027 ± 0.0006	0.004 ± 0.0007	descript	0.0018 ± 0.0006	0.0069 ± 0.0018	solver	0.0022 ± 0.0003	0.005 ± 0.0004
42	real	0.0037 ± 0.0005	0.0054 ± 0.0003	english	0.0009 ± 0.0003	0.0026 ± 0.0004	relu	0.0012 ± 0.0003	0.0024 ± 0.0005	pomdp	0.0003 ± 0.0003	0.0054 ± 0.0026	base	0.0127 ± 0.0003	0.0155 ± 0.0002
43	modul	0.0006 ± 0.0002	0.0022 ± 0.0003	mean	0.0065 ± 0.0006	0.0082 ± 0.0005	seri	0.0044 ± 0.0006	0.0056 ± 0.0007	databas	0.0017 ± 0.0008	0.0066 ± 0.0026	techniqu	0.0084 ± 0.0003	0.0111 ± 0.0003
44	known	0.0067 ± 0.0007	0.0083 ± 0.0003	cnn	0.0049 ± 0.0013	0.0066 ± 0.001	profil	0.0009 ± 0.0002	0.0021 ± 0.0004	arab	0.0 ± 0.0	0.0049 ± 0.0027	articl	0.0022 ± 0.0003	0.0048 ± 0.0003
45	infer	0.0102 ± 0.0018	0.0118 ± 0.0007	player	0.0026 ± 0.0008	0.0042 ± 0.0009	student	0.002 ± 0.0006	0.0032 ± 0.0006	evalu	0.0061 ± 0.001	0.0109 ± 0.0012	document	0.0078 ± 0.0006	0.0105 ± 0.0005
46	email	0.0016 ± 0.0005	0.0032 ± 0.0004	grid	0.0013 ± 0.0005	0.0029 ± 0.0006	reservoir	1e-04 ± 1e-04	0.0013 ± 0.0005	sentenc	0.0061 ± 0.0021	0.011 ± 0.0023	belief	0.0025 ± 0.0003	0.0051 ± 0.0004
47	elast	1e-04 ± 1e-04	0.0017 ± 0.0005	match	0.0048 ± 0.0008	0.0065 ± 0.0007	acceler	0.002 ± 0.0002	0.0032 ± 0.0004	document	0.0085 ± 0.0028	0.0133 ± 0.0031	environ	0.005 ± 0.0004	0.0076 ± 0.0004
48	dimension	0.0065 ± 0.001	0.0081 ± 0.0006	email	0.0019 ± 0.0004	0.0036 ± 0.0006	size	0.0078 ± 0.0005	0.009 ± 0.0004	theori	0.0038 ± 0.0009	0.0086 ± 0.0018	sat	0.0005 ± 1e-04	0.003 ± 0.0003
49	control	0.0053 ± 0.001	0.0069 ± 0.0006	descript	0.0022 ± 0.0004	0.0038 ± 0.0005	techniqu	0.0104 ± 0.0005	0.0116 ± 0.0005	domain	0.0097 ± 0.0034	0.0144 ± 0.0031	conclus	0.0012 ± 1e-04	0.0037 ± 1e-04

Table 14: Most important predictors for rejection in decreasing order of importance: introduction